U. S. Congress

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION.

VOLUME LII.

WASHINGTON:
1915.


UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

VOLUME LII. PART III.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *January 24, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. BAKER as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all, the inspiration of all that is purest, noblest, best in us; the author and finisher of our faith. We are here to-day in memory of a departed soul who left behind him an enviable record, a mechanic, a soldier, a journalist, a Member of this House, and, though his career was cut short by the hand of death, whatever he did he put his soul into it and won the plaudits of his fellows for efficiency and faithfulness, than which no greater tribute can be paid to any man.

It is not the man who lives longest but the man who puts into a short life the best that is in him who accomplishes most. We mourn his going, but the memory of his genial and optimistic view of life, which under the most adverse and discouraging circumstances left its impress and still lives in the hearts of all with whom he came in contact, to him the well done, good and faithful servant, came in all its fullness, and though his body has passed into dust his soul lives to the glory and honor of his Maker.

Be this our comfort and solace to those to whom he was nearest and dearest. Give to us and to them the upward look, the undying hope in Him who burst the bonds of death, the earnest of all who put their trust in Him, and Thine be the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. DRUKKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BREMNER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the special order for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. DRUKKER, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That Sunday, January 24, 1915, be set apart for services upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. ROBERT G. BREMNER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. DRUKKER. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House who had signified their intention of being here to-day have been unexpectedly called from the city. I ask unanimous consent that they may print in the RECORD remarks on the life, character, and services of the late Mr. BREMNER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that Members who desire to do so may print in the RECORD remarks on the life, character, and services of the late Mr. BREMNER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DRUKKER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 711.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ROBERT G. BREMNER, late a Member of this House from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his distinguished public career the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

[Mr. HAMILL addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if we are to understand the brave soul in whose memory we are assembled to-day, we must understand something at least of the philosophy which bore him up even in the unspeakable agonies which gripped his poor body as he dropped slowly down into the valley of the shadow of death.

BOB BREMNER was one of the finest souls it has ever been my good fortune to know. While my personal acquaintance with him was but brief; while we met only a very few times, and then only for fleeting moments, I had known of him for years, and had known of his work as a newspaper man, and as an evangel of that great gospel of brotherhood in spreading which almost his latest breath was given.

We were drawn together by a kinship of faith, by a kinship of aspiration, by a kinship of desire. All the great heart of BOB BREMNER was responsive to the cry of the oppressed. He hated injustice. His anger flamed out against tyranny. Every fiber of his being rebelled against a social system which condemns increasing thousands to involuntary poverty.

Against this stupid system BOB BREMNER arrayed himself in deadly and unrelenting conflict. To the very last hours of his life he was dedicated to its overthrow; and there can be no doubt that had disease not laid him low he would have become a power in this House, as he had been a power in his State and in his city, for the advancement of the fundamental truths which lay at the base of his philosophy and made living to him worth while.

The increase of poverty with the increase of wealth was to him a monstrous perversion of the natural order. He could reconcile the fact with no sane interpretation of God's design in this world. To him the want and misery which he saw all around him were a frightful indictment of our so-called Christian civilization. It was at the same time a sharp and bitter impeachment of a social order which would tolerate it.

While there was never a more charitable being on earth than BOB BREMNER, charity, in his estimation, was no solution of the problem which forces itself upon our attention at every turn. He gave with a free hand, yet knowing that in giving he was perhaps accentuating the evil which he sought to relieve. But he never was content with mere giving. That did not salve his conscience as it salves the conscience of so many. He felt that more than this was demanded, and so he gave of his life, of his labor, of the very essence of his fine soul to the solution of the problem itself by breaking down the barriers between labor and opportunity, between the worker and the good things which wait on effort.

BOB BREMNER saw with a clear vision the monstrous blasphemy against the Creator of that comfortable doctrine which ascribes the present social order to a dispensation from on high. He knew that God did not create this beautiful earth for the fortunate few. He knew it was created for all the children of men. The heaven, even the heaven is the Lord's; but the earth hath He given to the children of men—not to some of the children; not to the children of some men; not to my lord or his grace; not to the first comers and their heirs and assigns forever, but to all the children of men throughout all the generations; theirs to live and labor on; theirs to enjoy; theirs to make blossom as the rose.

I do not know what faith as to the future our friend had. I do not know that conventional faith had any hold on him at all. But I do know that he had a religion of humanity which irradiated his life and gave it a sweet and beautiful meaning. With Henry George he felt that it was not selfishness that enriches the annals of every people with heroes and saints.

It is not selfishness that on every page of the world's history bursts out in sudden splendor of noble deeds or sheds the soft radiance of benignant lives. It was not selfishness that turned Gautama's back to his royal home or bade the Maid of Orleans lift the sword from the altar; that held the Three Hundred in the Pass of Thermopylæ, or gathered into Winkelried's bosom the sheaf of spears; that chained Vincent de Paul to the bench of the galley, or brought little starving children during the Indian famine tottering to the relief stations with yet weaker starvelings in their arms. Call it religion, patriotism, sympathy, the enthusiasm for humanity or the love of God—give it what name you will; there is yet a force which overcomes and drives out selfishness; a force which is the electricity of the moral universe; a force beside which all others are weak.

And it was this force which possessed BOB BREMNER and bore him up even when the shadows were gathering around about him. With him it was possible to say in the words of the great leader he was so proud to follow:

Look around to-day. Lo, here, now, in our civilized society, the old allegories yet have a meaning, the old myths are still true. Into the Valley of the Shadow of Death yet often leads the path of duty, through the streets of Vanity Fair walk Christian and Faithful; and on Greatheart's armor ring the clanging blows. Ormuzd still fights with Ahriman—the Prince of Light with the Powers of Darkness. He who will hear, to him the clarions of the battle call.

How they call, and call, and call, till the heart swells that hears them! Strong soul and high endeavor, the world needs them now. Beauty still lies imprisoned; and iron wheels go over the good and true and beautiful that might spring from human lives. And they who fight with Ormuzd—

As our brother so bravely did—

though they may not know each other—some where, some time, will the muster roll be called.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, when night was coming upon the Hon. ROBERT GUNN BREMNER; when tortured by a gnawing pain and martyred by experiment, he soothed his sufferings with the thought—

My life is not worth one-tenth of the effort that has been put forth to save it. I am ready for the scrap-heap, but I feel the cutting and

281112

the doctoring has added to the knowledge——. Some poor soul who comes after may benefit. The question is not whether I am going to get well or not, but rather if I am going to live up to ideals under tests; for dying gamely is just as helpful to the race as living bravely. Some day science will conquer, and I think I would rather be in the category of those who were in the fight, and helped win the victory, than be one of those who placidly reap the benefit.

Then he voiced his dominant characteristic—a sinking of self in the welfare of others.

He had an eye single upon the advancement of all but himself. In a long and close companionship, I never heard him seek personal preferment or consideration; and he was influenced to accept the nomination which resulted in his election to the House of Representatives, largely because by so doing it was believed he would strengthen the chances of his associates.

His father was a victim of the decaying industries of Wick, Caithness, Scotland, of which Stevenson wrote: "The meanest of man's towns in the boldest of God's bays."

While "Bob" was yet a child in arms his father emigrated to Canada. The spirit of this father, which enabled him to cast aside the memory of a lost fortune and begin life anew, in not only a new enterprise but in an unknown country, was inherited by "Bob" BREMNER in a marked degree.

Believing the sphere of his youth too narrow, without plan, and armed alone by a supreme confidence in his own resourcefulness, early in life he passed from his rural home to one of our largest cities.

Without assistance, he procured employment in this unfamiliar environment. Progressing, step by step, he soon became the proprietor and editor of one of the most influential newspapers in northern New Jersey, and a benefactor of the poor and distressed.

His faults were other people's virtues.

I occupy the desk that was once my late colleague's, and am inspired by Carlyle's lines, conspicuously pasted thereon by him!

"Out of eternity this new day is born;
Into eternity at night will return.
Behold it aforetime no eye ever did,
So soon it forever from all eyes is hid.
See here has been dawning another blue day,
Think; wilt thou let it slip useless away?"

He entertained no fear, except of idleness and uselessness. There seemed no limit to his ambition or his activities. While lying in apparent agony, a smile struggling with a facial twitch of pain, his greeting was ever "Never felt better in all my life," a pardonable misstatement. He shamed us all who were prone to complain.

That smile has passed from us, but the memory of it is here, and we may retain it as our most valuable asset. He taught us to work, to produce, to suffer, and yet to smile. And fortunate is the man who profits by "Bob's" lesson.

He was never spectacular, but ever persuasive. There was none of the spurious about BOB BREMNER. He detested hypocrisy and falsehood—the falsehood of deeds as of words. Born in poverty, suffering as a pioneer, he understood the poor and their struggles, and with indomitable courage he fought their fight.

His virtues were natural—he had no veneer. We served in one regiment through the Spanish-American campaign of 1898 and in close companionship I observed him—at all hours, under every mental and physical influence.

Truly, he was an asset to the world; he improved his talents and will hear "Well done."

A companion of the press has handed me his tribute to our bereaved colleague. I have read it, and feel that it must strike a harmonious chord in every breast.

(In memoriam R. G. BREMNER, by L. H. Robbins, Newark News.)

UPWARD.

Upward his watchword was, and year by year,
Joy in his eyes, he climbed the rugged way.
Even when death's hard hand struck icy fear
Into his soul, he halted not a day.

Upward he toiled through grief no friend might know,
True to his dream at any painful price.
Serving his fellow men we saw him go
Up to the very door of Paradise.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago there passed from among us one of the most remarkable men who ever sat in this legislative body, ROBERT GUNN BREMNER, a Representative from the seventh congressional district of New Jersey. Following the old and beautiful custom of this House, we pause to-day in our legislative labors to pay our tributes of respect to his memory and to tell as best we may the story of his short but very useful life and to point out the lesson of that life.

It was not my good fortune to know BOB BREMNER until election to this House brought us into association with one another. In the all too short time between our first meeting and his death I saw but little of him, and yet that little was sufficient to convince me that BOB BREMNER was one of the noblest of men. I must leave to those of my colleagues who knew him longer and more intimately the pleasant task of recounting his many and more intimate virtues.

Membership in this great body has its responsibilities and its cares, but it also has its compensations. One of the greatest of these is the intimate and enduring friendships which we form with one another. My friendship—aye, my love—for BOB BREMNER began, as it did with every one else who had the good fortune to know him, from the moment almost of our introduction. That friendship will be one of the dearest memories I shall take with me when I leave this House. The old saying, "To know him was to love him," applied with special force to BOB BREMNER.

The world surely is better because BOB BREMNER lived. Every Member of this House who knew him at all—indeed, every man and woman in America who followed his manly fight for life against the ravages of the dread disease which was slowly but surely overwhelming him, is the better because the Almighty saw fit to place the great soul of BOB BREMNER in its tenement of clay for a few short years.

BOB BREMNER was indeed "a brave man struggling in the storms of fate." Coupled with indomitable courage and great optimism was a never-failing cheerfulness, which enabled him to smile while undergoing the most intense pain. He possessed in a rare degree the ability to look on the brighter side of life and to impart to all who came within his reach much of the cheerfulness which radiated from him.

His all-pervading good humor made him a welcome addition to any group of his fellows. His entrance into this Chamber was always the signal for many eyes to be turned on him in admiration of his manly struggle against fate, and for a number of his colleagues to gather around him to inquire how he was getting on and to be entertained by his quaint and witty comments on men and events.

I shall never forget the last visit made to him by Congressman HART and myself at Dr. Kelly's sanitorium in Baltimore a few days before his death. We found him propped up in bed with Bible on one side and a volume of Shakespeare on the other. When we entered the room it was plain to us that the shadow of death was even then upon him. I believe that he knew that he had but a very few days to live and yet he was as cheerful as when I first met him. He assured us that he would be back at his work in a short time and told us of the plans he was making for his return to the House and to his congressional labors. He appeared to take as keen an interest in events as if he really expected to be back at his work the following week. We recited at some length the story of our patronage and other troubles of the preceding week, to his great amusement. He recounted to us his own troubles along the same line with his usual zest and good humor. It was almost impossible to realize that a spirit such as his was about to leave us.

BOB BREMNER was as unselfish as he was heroic. His heroism and unselfishness can be expressed in no better way than in the simple statement from what was to be his deathbed that even if the treatment to which he was being subjected were to prove unsuccessful in his own case, he was glad to suffer if the experiment should result in relieving others afflicted with the dread disease which was soon to claim him for its own. He suffered intense agony in these experiments, not so much, I believe, in the hope that it might benefit himself as that it would benefit others.

I can not conclude this feeble tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague without a reference to the sisterly devotion and affection of Miss Helen Bremner. Miss Helen was with her brother constantly. She aided him in his congressional work, and when the heavy hand of illnesss was laid upon him and he was unable to go to his office she was his very able and courteous substitute. At the end of each day she dropped the rôle of secretary to take up that of nurse.

While BOB BREMNER's death was a very great loss to all the members of his family, it was, if possible, an even greater loss to Miss Helen, who never left the bedside of her brother during the last eight days of his illness.

BOB BREMNER's friends were legion. By none was he more esteemed and loved than by President Wilson and his lamented wife. It is fitting that I should close with this tribute to his memory by President Wilson:

I am deeply grieved by the loss of BOB BREMNER. He was a personal friend, whom I greatly admired, and was such a man as attracts deep affection. Throughout his suffering, which was long-continued,

he seemed never to think of himself, as he certainly never spoke of himself, and he was throughout as keenly interested in the diligent performance of his public duties and in kindly offices to others as if he had been free from pain. I feel that a beautiful spirit has gone out of the world.

Mr. DRUKKER. Mr. Speaker, ROBERT GUNN BREMNER was born in Keiss, Scotland, December 17, 1873, and it was from his Scotch ancestry that he inherited much of the indomitable will and courage which marked his career. At an early age he went to Toronto and ultimately settled on a farm in the neighboring village of Camella. He studied diligently, taught school, and subsequently came to Paterson, N. J., where he engaged in newspaper work. At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War he enlisted in Company C, Second New Jersey Volunteer Infantry. In 1902 he became editor and publisher of the Passaic Herald and served in that capacity up to the time of his death.

BOB BREMNER, as he was familiarly called, had the faculty of making and retaining friends. His mind was a storehouse of knowledge; his disposition sunny and cheerful. He was eminently fitted for the career he had mapped out and for the duties which were imposed upon him during the last year of his life.

His marked ability and leadership early attracted attention; and though suffering from an incurable illness he was nominated by his party without opposition to represent the seventh congressional district of New Jersey in the Sixty-third Congress. Only those who were favored with intimate acquaintance know how with pain-racked body he sought faithfully to carry out the wishes of his constituents. Those who were most closely associated with him during his protracted illness recall that even the greatest suffering could not break this masterly spirit of cheerfulness. No matter how severe his agony, this man, whose body was so cruelly spent by disease, had always the same tender smile and cheery welcome for his visiting townspeople.

History has made heroes of men whose deeds required no such fortitude as was displayed by this young Passaic editor, in whom bodily affliction could not put a check upon ambition, and who was able to look at life hopefully and philosophically even though, in his own heart, he knew that nothing could save him.

We can well believe the story which reached us from his bedside during his last hours. When asked why he submitted to further treatment after the attending physicians were forced to admit that it was impossible to extend further relief, he replied:

> They may not be able to help me, but they can learn something from their experience which may be of help to others.

As an editor he did much for his city, where his pen was always ready to advocate reform. His life will be measured not by his achievements in this Chamber, where his illness prevented him from regular attendance, but in Passaic, N. J., where he labored long and was untiring in his efforts to advance the public good.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the late Member of this House in whose memory we are now gathered has living within my district two brothers, one a very earnest and devout minister of the Gospel, and the other a lawyer of capability and success, of energy and good example. Knowing well these gentlemen, for I count them my friends, I was naturally much interested in meeting their brother when I became a Member of this House.

I had learned somewhat of his illness, but I was hardly prepared to see the inroad of this fatal malady so marked and so advanced. I first saw him sitting on the front row beyond the last aisle to the right of the Speaker with his arm apparently beneath the sleeve of his coat and supported by a dark bandage of cloth. It was apparent that the winding sheet of death was more than half about him, but despite this gloomy picture I found the greeting cordial and cheerful, a face of smiles, almost effeminate in tenderness, and here and there a seam or line that indicated intensity of suffering, but a fortitude to combat it. Such a personality attracted me as I am sure it attracted every Member who met him.

It is a fine thing to see a man battling against tremendous adversities of life. It is an inspiration to see a great soul endeavoring to overcome the moral and physical difficulties of the world. But to observe at close hand a man fighting for his life against such transcendent obstacles, with supreme cheerfulness and rare courage, will perhaps leave to you and to me a stimulus for the public good, a contribution to our official standards, greater than any forensic triumphs that may resound through this Hall.

Eloquence may be sometimes preserved by the records of this House; wit may here and there leave a shaft to be seen in after years; reason and exposition may cleave the clouds of our doubts; but I suspect I voice the inner conscience of the membership of the House should I observe that you and I are most helped in the discharge of our public duties by contact with a clean, lofty soul standing firm amidst racking pain and lowering clouds that gather about the end of the journey, and knowing no hypocrisy and no cant.

In the short period of life, which is but a watch in the night, it is more helpful to strike hands with some sincere man, burdened with the same responsibilities, than to be moved by those forces that sometimes lend majesty to this forum. We have in our natures those subtle, finer, and more enduring qualities that find their sources in the spirit, and to the spirit the still small voice is deep if not loud. Contact with such a character lends luster and exaltation to life.

Mr. Speaker, it is a mournful pleasure to associate myself with the membership of this House in giving some expression to my appreciation of ROBERT G. BREMNER and to pay my feeble tribute to this patient, hopeful man, with a serene but intrepid spirit, laboring for good amidst pain and agony and walking the last path of earth with a faith and a hope we may well envy.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The exercises having been concluded, in accordance with the resolution already adopted, the House will stand adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under the order previously agreed to, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, January 25, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 25, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 15, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO CONTRABAND (S. DOC. NO. 716).

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STONE. Before the Senator does that, will he yield for just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. I withhold the demand.

Mr. STONE. I have here a document that I have made two or three efforts to have printed as a document. It is correspondence mentioned in the papers this morning in reference to contraband. Several Senators have told me that they want to have it printed as a document. I should like to have consent to have it printed in the RECORD and also made a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. One or the other.

Mr. STONE. I will ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Utah withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing the correspondence as a Senate document?

Mr. STONE. I should like to have 5,000 additional copies printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Gallinger	Overman	Sterling
Brady	Hardwick	Page	Stone
Brandegee	Hollis	Perkins	Sutherland
Bristow	Johnson	Pittman	Thomas
Bryan	Jones	Pomerene	Thompson
Burton	Kern	Robinson	Thornton
Camden	La Follette	Root	Tillman
Catron	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Townsend
Chamberlain	McCumber	Sheppard	Vardaman
Chilton	McLean	Sherman	Warren
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Shively	White
Clark, Wyo.	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Williams
Cummins	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Dillingham	Norris	Smith, Ga.	
Fletcher	Oliver	Smoot	

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] requested me to announce that he is busy on committee work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is engaged in presenting a matter to the Committee on Indian Affairs and is unable to attend the session of the Senate this morning.

Mr. OLIVER. My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is unable to attend the session of the Senate on account of serious illness. I make this announcement for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll. There is a quorum present.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented the credentials of REED SMOOT, chosen by the electors of the State of Utah a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish to address myself this morning to the amendment to the pending ship-purchase bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I may find it necessary hereafter to speak upon another important phase of the proposed legislation, but at present I speak upon that alone.

I wish at the outset to say a few words regarding the discussion of the measure. I hope I am not warped or carried away by feeling or by any partisan considerations, but it does not seem to me that this bill to put the Government of the United States into the business of foreign shipping is receiving the kind of discussion which a measure of great importance and novelty ought to have. It is a very important measure. It is important not merely because it involves the expenditure of a vast sum of money at a time when we have been forced to make up a deficit in our revenues by imposing an extraordinary tax which we call the war-revenue tax, but it is important because it embarks the Government of the United States upon a new departure, based upon a reversal of the principles of government which we have always followed up to this time. No such change of principle and policy was in the contemplation of the people of the United States when the present administration was put into power by their votes. No such reversal of principle and policy was ever discussed and passed upon by the people of the United States in any election.

Plainly the judgment of the people should be taken so far as it is possible by the ordinary methods in which a free, self-governing people proceed with the conduct of their Government. Plainly if there be any strength or virtue in our representative government such a new departure and reversal of principle and policy should have the fullest possible discussion in the great public forum of the Congress of the United States. Is this measure receiving that? It seems to me, sir, that it is not.

The bill in its present form was reported on the 6th of January. During the month before in December it had been introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] and referred to the Committee on Commerce. It was reported by that committee without hearing and without any extended consideration or discussion in the committee.

The bill was brought before the Senate for consideration, if I am not mistaken in my dates, on the 4th day of the present month, and the Senator from Florida presented in a brief and not exhaustive or extensive manner the report in favor of the bill. Upon that day notice was given that discussion of the bill by the minority in the Senate would be regarded as improper and obstructive. Those are substantially the words that were used by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. Notice was given which stigmatized all discussion of the bill by the minority as obstructive and improper.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire who gave that notice?

Mr. ROOT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] gave that notice.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I certainly did not myself, because I stated positively that we would afford ample opportunity for full discussion.

Mr. ROOT. The Senator from Missouri, who introduced the bill, gave the notice, and he accompanied it by the statement that they had the votes to pass the bill.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROOT. In advance of any discussion, in advance of any consideration, the notice was given that the majority in the Senate had the votes to pass the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I was looking for the record of exactly what occurred. I did look that up when the Senator from New York made a statement somewhat similar to the one which he repeats this morning, and I thought later to have the exact facts shown from the record of what was said repeated here. I am not able at this moment to turn to that record, not recalling the exact time when the colloquies occurred; but if the Senator will permit me a few moments, as soon as I can look it up I will be very glad to have the exact facts and everything that was said in consecutive order stated.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to yield the floor.

Mr. STONE. I am not asking the Senator to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not rule that the Senator from New York had yielded the floor.

Mr. ROOT. I say that because it is commonly reported——

Mr. STONE. But the statement——

Mr. ROOT. That it will be regarded during the progress of this debate as a yielding of the floor by the Senator holding it if he permits any interruption for the purpose of any speech or business whatever—that is the understanding—except the asking of a question.

Mr. STONE. Very well; I will wait until the Senator from New York concludes his address, Mr. President, and then I will produce the RECORD, for I am sure the Senator from New York does not wish to make a misleading statement, although a mistaken one.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not wish to do the Senator from Missouri any injustice. Like him, I have not examined to get the precise words which were used. I am stating the effect of what he said upon my mind, the effect upon the mind of all the Senators about me, and upon the minds of all the Senators with whom I have since conversed. The effect was that the Senator from Missouri intended on the 4th of January to give notice that discussion of this ship-purchase bill on this side of the aisle would be regarded as improper and obstructive. He accompanied that by the statement: "We have the votes to put the bill through, unless it is prevented from coming to a vote by improper or obstructive tactics." That was but the beginning.

Two days after this notice was given a substitute bill was introduced striking out everything that had been in the measure on the 4th of January and substituting an entirely new measure, with much that was in the old, but a new measure from beginning to end. Since that time we have not been discussing this bill; there has been no discussion of this bill in this representative body. Some of us who have been opposed to the bill have been making speeches about it, but the bill has not been discussed.

I have sat here and counted with wonder from time to time the numbers of the majority who have been present while men eminent for learning and experience and ability and patriotism have been attempting to discuss the bill. I have seen here four Democratic Senators present, three present, one present. I marked the presence of but one Democratic Senator in this Chamber by saying to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]: "If some one would call Mr. FLETCHER out of the Chamber, we might move to adjourn." I say that has been the rule—one, three, four, five, half a dozen Senators present while the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] have been trying to perform their duty of discussing this great and novel measure in the Senate of the United States. The men who announced at the beginning that they had the votes to carry the bill have been absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], with that genial humor which so often brightens the closing hours of our legislative days, had—I will not say the effrontery, but I will say—the disrespect to tell the Senate that the speeches made by these gentlemen were not worth listening to. He said what was true, that he was not obliged to listen to the Senator from Ohio or to the Senator from Massachusetts or to the Senator from Iowa—that is true—but when having been absent, not having heard one word, he comes into the Senate and says they were not worth listening to, that they were long speeches with nothing in them, he denies the efficacy of the American system of representative government; he discredits the Senate of the United States; for, sirs, there is not now and never has been

in our history a group of men whose study and thought and expression upon great public questions have been of greater value to the people of the United States than the Senators whom I have pointed out and who, the Senator from Mississippi says, are not worth listening to.

Why is it, Mr. President, that this course has been followed? Not because the Senators upon the other side really believe that the contributions these Senators have made to the discussion of this bill are not worth listening to, but for a very different reason. It has not been the ordinary fatigue or desire to attend to other business; it has been for a specific purpose. Before I state that purpose, let me add that not only had there been an announcement at the beginning that you had the votes to pass the bill, and, subsequent to that, abstention from the meetings of the Senate during our attempts at discussion; not only has there been the open and public declaration that what the ablest men in the minority had to say on this new subject is not worth listening to, but the rules of the Senate have been so used, have been used in such an unusual and extraordinary way as to make any attempt at discussion upon this side of the Chamber most burdensome and difficult.

I am now speaking on the 25th day of January, but we are proceeding according to the Calendar of Business, from which I read, and according to the order of the majority of the Senate, upon the legislative day of Friday, January 15, 1915. Why is that fiction employed?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ROOT. I yield so far as I may without losing the floor.

Mr. HUGHES. I merely desire to ask the Senator if that situation does not exist by virtue of unanimous consent entered into in this body?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it does not exist by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, practically by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROOT. It does not exist practically by unanimous consent. It exists against my open and vigorous objection, and it exists because of the voting down of a motion to adjourn made by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and the carrying by the majority of a motion for a recess until 11 o'clock, instead of the ordinary adjournment.

Mr. President, why is it that for 10 days we have been conducting our business under a fiction, under a false pretense—the pretense that we are in the day of January 15? Why, sir, it is in order that we may have from 11 o'clock in the morning until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, during which no business can be transacted, except the making of speeches on this bill; that is, eight hours of continuous speaking on this bill with no other business. This fiction of a continuous legislative day cuts out the morning hour; it cuts out the order of business under which petitions and memorials may be presented, under which bills may be introduced, under which reports of committees may be submitted; all business of the Senate is pushed aside by this fiction in order that the opponents of this bill may be turned into the Chamber under the necessity of speaking continuously eight hours every day, and with the threat looming up before us of night sessions also, and speaking to empty benches on the other side.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ROOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not rise especially to ask a question, but I rise——

Mr. ROOT. Then, Mr. President, I feel that I can not yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I rise for the purpose of correcting an error in the statement of the Senator from New York, and I hope he will permit me to do that.

Mr. ROOT. If I do not lose the floor I will gladly yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not ask the Senator to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will not lose the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. I appeal to the Senator if he will not permit me to correct what I think is a misleading, an unintentionally misleading, statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I should be glad to be corrected.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have been in the Chamber not all the time since this debate began, but I have been in the Chamber as much during the speech of the Senator from Ohio and the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts as has any other Senator in this body.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. SMOOT, and others. Oh!

Mr. SIMMONS. But I want to say, as a result of my observations, believing that I was present as much as any other Senator in this body while those two speeches were being delivered, that, as a rule, there were as many Senators on this side of the Chamber while those speeches were being delivered as there were on the other side.

Sometimes there were more on the other side than on this side, and sometimes there were more on this side than on the other side; the attendance on both sides has been exceedingly meager. The great Senator from New York was in his seat very little of the time during the deliverance of those two speeches. It has been the case since I have been here that when a filibuster was going on and a Senator was speaking largely for the purpose of consumption of time both sides of the Chamber have been a little indifferent with reference to attending the discussions. I do not believe the Senator's criticism of the absence of Senators on this side is any more just than a like criticism of the absence of Senators on the other side during the delivery of the two speeches referred to. I may be wrong about it, but my recollection is that the Senator from New York was present but a very short time, a very small portion of the time while the two Senators to whom I have referred occupied the floor.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is wise in saying that he may be mistaken about it, for he was not here to see whether the Senator from New York was present or not. He may have an invisible cap or coat, and if he has been present he has worn it, for I hoped very much from the fairness and intellectual integrity of the Senator from North Carolina that the arguments that were being made would produce an effect upon his mind, notwithstanding the arrogant assertion that his party had the votes to pass this bill and would pass it. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] spoke not more than an hour and a half, and I sat and wished Senators upon the other side might be here to hear him. The fact remains, conceded by the Senator from North Carolina, that the benches were empty except now and then two or three or four. The fact remains that there has been no discussion of this bill, but there has been a conspiracy of silence on the part of the Democratic Party, which "has the votes" to pass the bill; and by a fiction which continues for 10 days the legislative day of January 15 it has been made as hard as possible for the opponents of the bill to discuss it.

Mr. President, this bill is being put through by the pressure of physical weakness. It is being put through by means of making it as exhausting as possible for the opponents of the bill to discuss it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ROOT. I will ask the Senator not to interrupt me again. I have been diverted from the line of my remarks and have spent more time upon this phase of the matter than I had intended to.

Sir, there are two objects of discussion in a representative body. One is to convince one's colleagues, to produce an effect upon the minds of one's colleagues. That is the deliberation, the consideration of the representative body. That, sir, does not exist in regard to this bill. No one can deny it. There have been discussions behind closed doors, we are told by the newspapers. There have been discussions in the Democratic caucus, amendments offered and adopted, amendments offered and rejected behind closed doors, but no discussion of this great measure in this representative body.

I am not one, sir, who flouts at caucuses. I think there may well come a time in the course of the progress of legislation when a party shall undertake to act as a unit; but, sir, it ought to be after discussion, and not before discussion or as a substitute for discussion. You are substituting secret discussion in your caucus to the exclusion of that discussion and consideration of this great measure which the Constitution, the spirit of our free American Government, demands.

There is another object of discussion, sir, and that is an object which reminds me of the old phrase, so familiar to some of us, "leading in prayer." When we properly discuss a measure of public importance we not only address ourselves to each other, but we are leading, stimulating, inciting the thought and discussion of the people of the whole country; and that, sir, is after all the great, the all-important, the indispensable function of a public legislative body. Once we begin in the Senate to discuss a new measure, as little attention as may seem to be paid to specific utterances, some get into the press; in all the great newspaper offices there are men whose business it is to read the RECORD; public discussion begins; pertinent conversation among citizens begins; in all the places where American voters meet they begin to discuss, and gradually,

through the press and through letters, telegrams, and conversations comes back to the body a sense of public judgment.

Mr. President, when has there been proposed to the American Congress a measure which required that kind of discussion more plainly than this novel and important measure? Yet it is denied by the continued pressure of a fictitious legislative day, and long hours, and abstention from discussion upon the side of the majority, pressing on the progress of this measure for the purpose of putting it through by brute force and weight of votes before the people of the United States can think about it and discuss it and express their opinion upon it.

Mr. President, the fact that this measure can not have that kind of discussion and be passed at this short session consistently with doing the primary work of the session upon the appropriation bills shows that it ought not to pass at this short session. You can pass it, my friends upon the Democratic side of this Chamber. You can pass the bill. You have it in your power. The Senator from Missouri was right when he said: "We have the votes, and will pass it." You can do it because upon this side of the Chamber are men who have grown old in the public service, and whose physical strength makes it impossible for them to do what their sense of duty would dictate. You can pass it, but you do it at the fearful risk of denying to the people of the United States that consideration and discussion and formation and expression of judgment to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, important as this bill is, I am not sure that the subject I am now discussing is not still more important. The modification of constitutional government by practice is a gradual but resistless process. We are all familiar with the change in our constitutional system which practice has made in regard to the election of a President. The electoral college no longer is at liberty to speak its own mind or to act upon the dictates of its own judgment. Gradual progress has nullified the constitutional provision, and has created a new system. That process has taken place in many a land. When Louis XIV declared himself to be the State, it had become the sole function of the Parliament of Paris to register—not to discuss, but to register his decrees. I have seen national legislative bodies which have reached that point. I have seen them, have been present in them, when no voice was clear enough, no courage high enough, to break away from the custom which accepted and registered the directions of the chief executive. It was the result of a gradual process.

Let us not be too confident that we are proof against such a process. We abandon to-day the performance of our function of so discussing this measure among ourselves that there shall be real deliberation, real consideration, real forming of opinion here, of discussing it so that the people of the country shall follow us in discussing it in forming and expressing their opinion, and we have taken one step further than ever before in the process which will make us a registering body rather than a legislative body.

I do not mean that it will come to-morrow. I do not mean that other bills may not come on which there will be discussion; but I mean that we are taking a step in a process which is fraught with danger and with fatal results to representative government. We can justify our existence as a body only by the performance of our duty.

Oh, sir, the liberties of a free people depend upon the courage and persistency of a minority. They depend upon independence of thought and action on the part of all the members of a legislative body. If we are merely to register, if we are to refrain from discussion, if we are to smother our judgment, we are contributing our part toward a process more fatal to our country than any legislation we can devise, more injurious than any benefit we can render.

Now, Mr. President, let me turn my attention to the bill itself, and what it does.

It is an emergency measure. It puts in the hands of three members of the Cabinet practically $40,000,000, with power to increase the amount for the purpose of entering into the business of ocean transportation on the part of the Government of the United States.

I looked to see what may have prompted the sponsors of the bill, and I find that in the testimony of the protagonist in its behalf, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, the emergency character of the bill is clearly and forcibly stated. I read from his testimony taken on the 1st of September, 1914, before the House committee, the hearing of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on House bill 18518. He says:

> A great deal of our commodities and our products are dependent and have been dependent for outlet upon some of the foreign bottoms which are now idle, and that, in turn, has, of course, had an injurious reflex action upon our commerce. The immediate problem confronting us is to provide additional facilities for carrying American products in the foreign trade; and in order to do that, we must depend upon either private capital to make these investments in ships to be sailed under our flag or else the Government will have, as an emergency measure, to come to the assistance of the country.

He says also:

> Of course this measure is designed to be an emergency measure. It never was contemplated that this should be a permanent operation on the part of the Government. Still I think the provision for the disposition of these ships is ample in case the necessity for them shall have disappeared. Therefore the bill was drawn with reference to the immediate emergency that is to be met.

He says also:

> You are facing a situation now where you can not measure economy against the interests of the American people, and you must assume also, in the discussion of subsidy, which I am opposed to on principle anyway, you must assume that companies are available to take advantage of any subsidy that would be granted. They are not available, and there is no telling how soon they could be organized. It is only by the Government dealing with this question in double-fisted fashion that relief can be given.

There was something said about South American trade, but manifestly that is not an emergency and not any part of the emergency, for everyone agrees that there is more shipping to transact the South American business than there is business to be transacted for the present, and there is no emergency there.

I said this puts a large amount of money in the hands of these gentlemen. They are at liberty to subscribe for $10,000,000 of stock. They are bound to subscribe for 51 per cent of that. They are to offer the remainder to public subscription; but it is agreed that the business is to be conducted at a certain loss. The Secretary of the Treasury states that with great frankness in the hearing; and therefore it is assumed by him and by other sponsors of the measure that there will be practically no private subscriptions for stock. It is quite evident that no one would from ordinary and proper commercial motives subscribe at par for the minority stock of a measure which is advertised beforehand as a losing measure.

Therefore the Government will subscribe for all the stock under the terms of the bill. They are authorized to sell $30,000,000 of Panama bonds, making $40,000,000. They are authorized to increase the stock indefinitely with the approval of the President.

The newspapers say that in the Democratic caucus an amendment has been adopted which will limit that increase to $10,000,000 more, and I will without dwelling further upon it assume that to be the limit, making $50,000,000. They are to put $50,000,000 into a losing business, the loss upon which will have to be made up from taxation.

Of course, this must be but an emergency measure. Of course, it is only as an emergency measure that anyone would propose to do such a thing at a time when we have had to impose an extraordinary war-revenue tax upon the people of the country because of a deficit in our revenue. Every man who pays his part of that war-revenue tax will be contributing to make up the loss upon the shipping business which is authorized by this bill, and of course it is an emergency measure.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ROOT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I assume that the Senator from New York does not desire to misrepresent the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the testimony given by him about the first of September. I read that testimony very carefully last night. I think the Senator is in error when he states that the Secretary of the Treasury admitted that this whole business would be operated at a loss. At one stage of his testimony there was something said by the Secretary which might have had that construction, but later the Secretary made the positive statement that while he was satisfied a part of the ships would be operated at a loss, especially that part which were engaged on the new routes for the purpose of building up new trade, he was equally satisfied that other of these ships would be operated at a profit; and there is nowhere, I think, in his testimony anything that could be construed as a statement, taken in connection with the qualifications, that there would be a loss upon the entire operation.

Mr. ROOT. The Secretary of the Treasury says in his testimony:

> It is not only a question of establishing these routes, many of which will undoubtedly have to be operated at a loss for a time in order to establish the necessary trade relationships, but the Government will also have the power to establish rates that will be advantageous to American commerce.

He says:

> I think one of the essential requisites is that the Government shall have the power to establish these lines and see that they are operated in such a way, even at a loss, as to benefit the commerce of this country.

There are other expressions at various points in his testimony which leave no doubt whatever that that is his expectation.

We need not rely solely upon his expectations, but we know that as a matter of fact private enterprise operating American ships has been a losing enterprise. Upon good authority it is stated that there are, or there were a few weeks ago, 2,000,000 tons of shipping engaged in the commerce of the world under foreign flags and owned by American citizens. Why? Because the conditions of foreign commerce under the laws of the United States are such as to make profit practically impossible.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has called my attention to a clause in the President's message where he says:

It—

That is, the Government—

It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

So the proposal is to go into a losing business, and to go into a losing business at a time when we are making up a deficit by an extraordinary war-revenue tax; and, of course, I say it can be regarded only as an emergency measure.

Now, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce to buy or build ships. How can the emergency be met? Manifestly, not by building ships. The small fleet of ships which could be procured by the use of this $50,000,000 would require from a year to 18 months, as I am advised, to build. So that will not meet the emergency. The emergency is the prevalence of high rates for the carriage of American produce to Europe. There is no emergency anywhere else.

It is true all the steamers in the world that are free are coming in to get the benefit of those high rates, and the ordinary working of economic laws is sure to bring the rates down. But for the moment there is the emergency, and but one emergency, and that is high rates of carriage for American produce to Europe.

It is true our farmers are getting $1.40 for their wheat, so that those high rates are paid not by us but by the purchasers abroad. It is true the export of foodstuffs has been greater within the last few months than ever before in our history. Still, there is an emergency. It is true cotton is bringing 8 cents, and the interposition of Government which was so strenuously demanded here a few months ago in order to save the cotton producers proved to be unnecessary. Still the rates of transportation of cotton are high and there is an emergency. But the emergency can not be met by building ships. We have got to buy them. Now, why?

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator from New York allow me to ask him one more question and then I will not interrupt him again?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have trenched probably rather much upon his patience already.

Mr. ROOT. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says it is proposed that the Government shall go into a losing business. Does the Senator see any particular difference between the Government going into a losing business and the Government inviting private citizens of this country to go into what is admitted to be a losing business with a guarantee that by subsidies that loss will be made up out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ROOT. Oh, Mr. President, I see many differences, but I am not going to discuss them here to-day. I am speaking upon an entirely different subject. I wish that I could detach the mind of the Senator from North Carolina from certain preconceived ideas which evidently possess it and get him to attend to the subject that I am talking about.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator was just talking upon the subject about which I asked the question.

Mr. ROOT. I have been pressing upon the Senate the emergency nature of this bill, and I had passed on to the question as to how the emergency can be met. I was saying you can not meet it by building ships because you can not get them in time to meet the emergency. You have got to buy them. Where are you going to buy them? You meet no emergency by buying ships that are already engaged in transporting our products. You meet no emergency by buying free ships.

A report of a committee of the Chamber of Commerce of New York presented to that body on the 4th of the present month makes an observation on that subject which is very pertinent and it is very good authority. This was a special committee on the American merchant marine in foreign trade appointed by the chamber of commerce of the greatest commercial city of the country. In their report, which I shall hereafter have occasion to bring to the attention of the Senate at large, they say:

Government ownership of ocean lines can not bring to our aid a single vessel except by building. Every steamship in the world is working to-day except those interned in neutral ports. If these can be transferred to our flag without international complications, there will be no difficulty in financing the transfer of those suitable for freight carrying, for their earnings will justify the purchase.

Now, that is high authority of men who know far more than you and I know about the great complicated world-wide business of ocean freight carriage.

There is left, then, to meet the emergency nothing but the purchase of vessels which are prevented by the conditions of war from engaging in the business of transportation now. I therefore was not surprised in reading the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury to find that he plainly contemplated meeting this emergency by the purchase of vessels which are, to use the common although not very correct expression, interned because of war risks; that is to say, the vessels which are remaining in the ports where they were found at the outbreak of the war, unable or unwilling to put to sea for fear of capture; vessels belonging to one or another of the belligerent powers.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has called attention to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury upon this subject; there are but a few words of it, and I wish to call your attention to it again as a part of what I have to say. In this same hearing from which I have quoted this occurred:

Mr. EDMONDS. Will they not be able to get plenty of bottoms when they can make financial arrangements for payment for the cargo?

Secretary MCADOO. I do not think so. An immense number of bottoms have been withdrawn from service.

Mr. EDMONDS. There are still quite a number of idle bottoms in New York Harbor to-day.

Secretary MCADOO. The number of bottoms that are idle in New York Harbor are largely bottoms that can not be put into service now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. How would this bill add to the number of available bottoms when it proposes to make its purchases from existing bottoms? It will not add to the volume of bottoms.

Secretary MCADOO. There is a large number of idle bottoms. They may be purchased.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Chiefly, are not those all German bottoms?

Secretary MCADOO. More of those are idle at the moment than any other.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It has been suggested that there would be grave objection to our undertaking to purchase German bottoms.

Secretary MCADOO. Why?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The newspapers make the statement that objection has come from the nations concerned in this war.

Secretary MCADOO. Of course, I shall not attempt to talk of diplomatic matters.

Mr. SAUNDERS. They say that would be equal to furnishing immediate pecuniary aid—that is, to Germany?

Secretary MCADOO. That is a question altogether aside, I think, from the issue. I believe that it can not be successfully disputed by any individual or any nation that this Government or any Government has a right to buy merchant ships, provided it buys them in good faith and for a neutral purpose, and that is exactly what would be done in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. If we should buy some French ships, too, that would alter the situation. In other words, if they had some, as well as Germany, that objection would not be urged?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We would not buy any French ships, because they are not to be bought.

Secretary MCADOO. I infer from what you tell me, of from what you have read in the papers, that those ships, if purchased, would be purchased from the German Government. I understand that those ships are simply owned by German companies in which German citizens are stockholders. It does not follow that the proceeds of a purchase from a private corporation of that country would be turned over to the Government.

It is quite plain that Secretary McAdoo took the same view of the way in which it would be possible—the only way in which it would be possible—to utilize this legislation for the purpose of meeting this emergency that I take; that is, that the only way is to purchase these idle bottoms, to purchase these ships of belligerents which are unable to go to sea because, if they went to sea, they would be captured. It is perfectly evident that that purchase was in the contemplation of the officer who was to be the head of the shipping board, and who came before the committee of the House to explain the bill. He came, having in mind this bill as a bill which would enable him and his associates, when passed into a law, to buy those ships. In the report in the House which followed this testimony, Report No. 1149, Sixty-third Congress, second session, by Mr. ALEXANDER, submitted September 8, 1914, the committee say:

Fears are expressed that we will involve ourselves in complications with Great Britain and France if we buy German ships. That may be. The bill does not direct the shipping board to buy ships of the subjects of any particular nation. They have the widest discretion in the purchase or construction of vessels. We have no reason to believe they will act otherwise than with the greatest care in whatever they may do.

It is perfectly plain that the committee of Congress which reported the bill did it with the understanding that the bill author-

izes the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General to buy these ships, and that they were contemplating the purchase of these ships in a situation that can not be met in any other way than by the purchase of these ships.

The Secretary of the Treasury made a speech on this subject in Chicago. It is a speech, the central thought of which is one of the most amazing ever proposed by a responsible officer of the Government of the United States. While it is apart from the line of my discussion, I can not refrain from quoting it. He said:

> The objection that the shipping bill puts the Government in the shipping business is not tenable. Those who urge it seem to forget that it is the duty of the Government to engage in any activities, even of a business nature, which are demanded in the interest of all the people of the country, when it is impossible to engage private capital in such operations.

Do my friends think that that proposition does not need discussion by the Congress of the United States and by the people of the United States, before the man who holds that view has unlimited millions put into his hands with which to put the Government into business?

I will return to the precise line of discussion; and that is the contemplation and the purpose to meet this emergency by the purchase of the belligerent ships that, unless we buy them, can not go to sea without being captured. In this speech the Secretary further said:

> Some timid people have argued that if the Government is interested as a stockholder in a shipping company, and a ship of such company should be seized by a belligerent and brought into a prize court, the sovereignty of the Government would be involved. There is no ground whatever for this view. If the Government operated ships outright, just as it operates the vessels of our Navy, an awkward situation of this character might arise; but where a nation is merely a stockholder, or the sole stockholder, in a private corporation, its sovereignty is not and can not be directly involved if the ships of such a corporation become the subjects of litigation in a prize court concerning any issue which does not involve the Government itself. The Government would stand in relation to such a corporation exactly as any individual stockholder does to a corporation in which he is interested. A suit against the corporation does not necessarily involve the shareholders.

You perceive, sir, whenever this subject is suggested and objection is made to the purchase of these ships, it is met by an argument in favor of the purchase of the ships. This is the last argument which has come to my notice from the Secretary of the Treasury, having been delivered on the 9th of this month, after the pending bill was laid before the Senate—an argument, a lawyer's argument, by the man who is to be the head of the shipping board in favor of the power to buy the ships.

The Secretary of Commerce has said in a speech which I have not before me, delivered last Friday, I believe, at St. Louis, that he contemplated the purchase of British ships. Mr. President, there is no difference in principle, and before I get through I think I will show that there is no difference in the obstacles in the way of purchasing ships of one belligerent as compared with the ships of another belligerent.

I am not talking about this because the ships are German; I am talking about it because they are belligenent ships, and they are liable to be captured on the high seas as belligerents; they are liable to be torpedoed by submarines as belligerents; they are liable to be seized in foreign ports as belligerents; and I am alarmed by the evidences here that the proposed shipping board means to put the Government of the United States in the position of giving the protection of its flag to such ships when they sail out. German, or British, or French, or Austrian, or Russian, or what not, the objection is to the purchase of belligerent ships, and, as I have said, that objection has been met by the argument to which I have referred whenever it has been proposed to the gentlemen whom we are about to endow with these vast powers.

But there is another circumstance more potent in its effect upon my mind than the manifest necessities of the emergency which would require the purchase of belligerent ships, more compelling in my mind than the expressions of the gentlemen who are going to transact the business in favor of the right to purchase belligerent ships, more compelling even than the practical admission that that is what they have in mind, and that is the filing of an opinion by the Solicitor for the State Department in the Senate on the 11th of August last. I do not remember the exact date, but the bill to create the shipping board and to endow it with the power to build or buy ships had just been introduced in the House when, on the 11th of August, a paper was presented by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] in the Senate to be printed, and it was printed as Document No. 563, Sixty-third Congress, second session. That paper contained an opinion by Mr. Cone Johnson, Solicitor for the State Department. In support of the right to buy these ships, he states these conclusions:

> 1. Merchant ships of a belligerent may be transferred to a neutral after the outbreak of hostilities.
> 2. If the sale of the ship is made in good faith, without defeasance or reservation of title or interest in the vendor, without any understanding, expressed or tacit, that the vessel is to be retransferred after hostilities and without the indicia or badges of a collusive or colorable transaction.
> 3. But transfer can not be made of such vessel in a blockaded port or while in transitu.
> 4. The transfer must be allowable under and in conformity to the municipal regulations of the country of the neutral purchaser.
> 5. The declaration of the London convention that transfers of an enemy vessel to a neutral during war will not be valid unless it be shown that the same was not made to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed, if it were controlling of the question, relates only to the good faith of the transfer and not to the ulterior motive of the parties to reap the natural advantages to flow from the operation of the vessel under the flag of a country not at war, while it inverts the burden of proof of the good faith of the transaction.

That opinion was dated August 7, 1914. It was presented in the Senate August 11, four days after, almost coincidentally with the introduction of the bill, and it must stand before us as the opinion upon which this legislation finds its claim of right.

Mr. Johnson is a lawyer of character and position, a lawyer of ability, but he says in the conclusion at the close of the opinion:

> This memorandum is hurriedly struck off, and I have not had time or opportunity to revise it; but it is believed that it correctly presents the status of the question involved.

Why "hurriedly struck off?" What exigency called for haste in the consideration of this vastly important subject? The answer may be found by sending our minds back to the fact that it was announced and publicly reported that it was intended to put this shipping bill through then, last summer, during the last session; and this hurried memorandum—a lawyer's opinion that it is all right to buy these belligerent ships—is the basis upon which the legislation proceeds.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will not the Senator permit me to interrupt him once more?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator if, at the time that opinion was presented to the Senate, the Senate was not engaged in the consideration of the ship-registry bill, and if it was not with reference to the ship-registry bill that that opinion was expressed?

Mr. ROOT. I do not know. I have not looked to see, and I have not cared to see, what particular thing the Senate was engaged in doing. What I do see is that in great haste, coincidently with the beginning of this movement for the purchase of ships, there is presented to us a lawyer's opinion that we have a right to buy these belligerent ships. Therefore, Mr. President, I have come to the conclusion that the international situation is important, that it is serious, that it is our duty to consider it, and that it is my duty to discuss it.

There are two reasons which press that duty upon me with great weight. One is that I find, according to my own opinion, which is fallible, upon which I do not place, I hope, any greater weight than long experience of many errors leaves in my mind, that in the haste which for some reason or other was imposed upon him the Solicitor for the State Department has failed to consider fully the state of the law regarding which he was writing, and has been led, through the inadvertence of haste, to give radically and seriously incorrect advice upon this important subject.

The other consideration which makes me feel bound to ask for the attention of the Senate to my own views of what is the true state of the law is the fact that it happened to be my duty to give the instructions for the Government of the United States to the delegates to the London conference, and to direct their action during all the earlier part of the existence of that conference by daily cable communication, and afterwards as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to discuss and vote favorably upon the report of the conclusions of that conference, and afterwards, as a member of the Senate, to vote to advise the President to ratify. So, sir, when I see that under the law which I am advised we are about to pass it is the intention of the agents whom we shall constitute to buy these ships; when I see that that purpose has been formed and is liable to be executed under what I believe to be an erroneous opinion as to the state of the law and the international situation which they will meet, I feel bound to give the best I can in the

way of expressing and explaining my views of the true condition of the law.

I am going now to say something which most of you know. Some of you may not have given attention to it, however, and therefore I will state the rudiments of the case.

The London conference was a sequel of the second Hague conference of 1907. At this second Hague conference the delegates of the United States, under the instructions of their Government, pressed strongly for the creation of two judicial tribunals which should pass upon international disputes. One was an international prize court, made up by the representatives of different nations, which should pass upon questions of prize—just such questions as are arising now—so that instead of going to the courts of the captor country, which apply the law of that country, with the disadvantages that a claimant naturally has in going into the country of the captor and arguing his case before a branch of the government that has captured his ship, he would go to an impartial tribunal, selected from the various countries of the world. That court was created by a treaty called "the prize-court treaty." The other court was a general judicial tribunal which should pass upon all justiciable questions arising between nations, to be composed of judges who should devote their entire time to it, and be paid adequate salaries, and be a really judicial tribunal. That court never has been constituted, although provision was made for it.

It was not constituted because there could not be an agreement upon the way of appointing the judges, but the prize-court treaty was signed, and that has been ratified by the United States. That is to say, the Senate has advised and consented to its ratification. But when it came to the ratification of that treaty by European powers, there arose a question as to what law the court would apply, and it seemed to many representatives of different European countries that there was a long list of disputed questions that a prize court would have to pass upon, and that in order to make the court effective there must be some agreement upon the law they were to apply—questions relating to blockade, relating to contraband, relating to continuous voyages, relating to the transformation of merchant ships to warships, relating to the transfer of ships from a belligerent to a neutral flag—and accordingly Great Britain called a meeting of the representatives of the chief commercial powers of the world, to be held in London in December, 1908.

That meeting was attended by the representatives of Great Britain, France, The Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Russia, Japan, and the United States. I think I have enumerated them all. There were 10 of them. They discussed these difficult questions. There was long discussion upon the question which is raised by the proposal to buy these belligerent ships—that is, the right of transfer of a vessel from a belligerent flag to a neutral flag. The conclusions to which the conference came upon that subject were stated in these words:

TRANSFER TO A NEUTRAL FLAG. ARTICLE 55.

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected before the outbreak of hostilities, is valid, unless it is proved that such transfer was made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

Then follows a clause which is not pertinent here, and the article proceeds:

Where the transfer was effected more than 30 days before the outbreak of hostilities, there is an absolute presumption that it is valid if it is unconditional, complete, and in conformity with the laws of the countries concerned, and if its effect is such that neither the control of, nor the profits arising from the employment of, the vessel remain in the same hands as before the transfer.

Then there is a clause not relevant here, and then follows:

ART. 56. The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

Then follow some clauses not relevant here.

You have there, sir, three situations stated:

First. If the transfer is effected before the beginning of hostilities it is valid unless it is proved that the transfer was made in order to evade the consequences to which the enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

Second. If the transfer was effected more than 30 days before the opening of hostilities, there is an absolute presumption that it is valid, even though it was made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed, provided it is unconditional, complete, and there is no interest reserved. Of course, the declaration that a transfer more than 30 days before the outbreak of hostilities is valid if it is unconditional, complete, and in conformity with the laws of the countries concerned, neither the control of nor the profits arising from the employment of the vessel remaining in the same hands as before the transfer, carries by necessary implication the declaration that a transfer made less than 30 days before the opening of hostilities is not valid, although all those conditions exist, provided it was made to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

The third situation is a transfer after the outbreak of hostilities, where the transfer is void, unless it is proved that it was not to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

It is the opinion of the Solicitor, who has given that opinion to the State Department, as it has been communicated to us, that these provisions of the declaration of London do not involve any question as to the motive with which the transfer is made; that when the declaration says the transfer shall be valid before hostilities unless it is proved that it was made in order to evade, and that it shall be invalid after hostilities unless it is proved that it was not made in order to evade, it involves no question of motive. Prima facie, one would say that that is all motive; that there is nothing but motive in that provision. A thing done in order to evade is done with the motive of evading. There would seem to be nothing but motive in this; but the Solicitor does not think so, and he has advised to the contrary.

Now, sir, the question may arise, and naturally would arise, Why should we discuss the declaration of London? Why should the Solicitor have given an opinion upon the declaration of London? It has not been ratified. The Senate has advised and consented to its ratification, but before the documents of ratification were ever deposited the war came, and it never has been ratified. The reason why the declaration of London is subject to consideration although we are not bound by it is that England and France and Russia have adopted it with some modifications not touching this subject as their law for the present conflict.

Let me repeat, for the purpose of making myself clear, we are not bound by the declaration of London because it has not been ratified; that is, we are not bound by it as a convention, as an agreement, whatever effect the steps which led to it may have upon the propriety or wisdom of our conduct. The convention which embodied that agreement has not become a binding convention among the nations of the earth. It receives its importance because England and France and Russia have, by express provision, made it the law of those respective countries, and Germany, in an order to which I shall call your attention later, has in substance done the same thing. Her law for this war in somewhat different phrase, but with the same effect, is made to conform to the terms of the declaration of London which I have read.

It may be fortunate for us, fortunate for all who wish to secure freedom of trade, that this is so, because when the Conference of London met in December, 1908, there was no rule of international law regarding the transfer of a vessel from a belligerent to a neutral flag. International law requires the general acceptance of nations, and there had been no general acceptance of any rule by the nations of the earth.

The first thing that was done in the conference was to call for a statement from the different countries regarding their position upon the various disputed points that the conference sought to settle, and I call your attention now to the rules which were stated by the principal countries concerned in the present war.

I read from the proceedings of the International Naval Conference held in London, December, 1908, to February, 1909, printed by the British Government and called "Miscellaneous No. 5, 1909."

I will say that this report of the proceedings has never been translated from the original French, it is not open to access generally, and I think it must have been that the Solicitor in the haste of preparing his opinion has failed to observe the contents of this report, which gives the proceedings, the discussion, and conclusions reached from time to time by the conference. I am sure that if he had read this attentively he would have come to a different conclusion.

I call your attention now to the rules of national law stated by these different nations at the opening of the conference, for that is the background to which we have to go.

France. The change of nationality of ships of commerce effectuated after the declaration of war is null and of no effect.

Russia. The belligerents have the right not to recognize the neutral character of every ship of commerce purchased by neutral citizens from an enemy's state or one of its nationals unless the new proprietor proves that the acquisition had become definitive before he had knowledge of the commencement of the war.

Germany. The neutral or enemy character of a ship of commerce is determined by the flag that it carries. A ship flying a neutral flag will nevertheless be treated as an enemy ship if up to the opening of hostilities or within the two weeks which have preceded it has carried the enemy flag.

There are France, Germany, and Russia. Great Britain and the United States presented an entirely different rule, the rule of complete transfer and good faith. The Solicitor for the State Department has substantially stated what the American rule has been and what the British rule has been, subject to some modifications which it perhaps was not necessary that he should state.

In the conference these two different views confronted each other, the view of France and Russia and Germany that a transfer after the opening of hostilities was void and the view of Great Britain and the United States that a transfer made complete and in good faith would be recognized.

Mr. President, there being no rule of international law, each country applies its own law in such cases. Indeed, when a capture is made it is always made under the law of the captor. That is our law. Our Supreme Court has decided it. It is the municipal law of the captor that is in force when the capture is made.

The courts of England and America have said that the law of nations is a part of the law of the country, and we enforce the law of nations. But here there was no law of nations because no rule had ever been accepted. So as the law stood when this conference opened, if there had been a transfer of a merchant ship from the flag of a belligerent to the flag of a neutral any time after the opening of hostilities the armed ships of France, of Germany, and Russia would have ignored the transfer and treated the vessel as an enemy vessel, notwithstanding the transfer.

Mr. President, that was the law of France when her navy rendered us a service more memorable than any other that one nation ever rendered to another and held the mouth of the Chesapeake and made the surrender at Yorktown possible. That was the law of France then and for all the century and more that has passed. That was the law of Russia on that never-to-be-forgotten day when her fleet sailed into the harbor of New York during the Civil War. That was the law of Germany, whose ships are lying unable to proceed to sea in the harbors of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other ports. There was no escape from the capture of any vessel from one of these belligerents by the cruisers of another belligerent which may chance to meet her, notwithstanding the transfer to the American flag, except to compel these great nations to abandon the law they have held for generations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Notwithstanding the fact that this was the law of Russia and of France, and it has been the law of those two nations for a long time, have they not agreed during the present war to adopt the declaration of London as their law?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have already stated that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then if that be true——

Mr. ROOT. I beg the Senator not to draw me on by leading me into a discussion of questions, however interesting they are, which arise in his mind, because if I do what I think I ought I have got to go through a rather complicated subject. As I have already said, the significance of the declaration of London is that these countries who started with these perfectly strict and unyielding rules have adopted the declaration of London as their rule for this war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And have modified their old position to that extent.

Mr. ROOT. They have modified their old position to that extent. So, although the declaration of London is not binding upon us as a convention, although it was never ratified, if we undertake to protect our flag upon a ship purchased from a belligerent we are driven to the declaration of London as the basis on which we must proceed. The old law was much more strict and unyielding than the declaration is, and that is why the Solicitor for the State Department was quite right in giving his opinion regarding the meaning of this provision of the declaration of London, and that is why I am going on to discuss that meaning. I have taken so much time because I have frequently observed the statement about the declaration of London, that it is not binding; that it was not ratified. If we could not have recourse to that declaration of London, these old rules are the only thing we would meet.

We have then reached this position, that these belligerent powers—England, France, Russia, and Germany—will enforce the provision of the declaration of London, and if we object to their enforcing that we come against still worse rules for neutral trade, that is, the old rules which three of them stated at the beginning of the conference. So their adoption of the declaration of London is an advantage to us of which we must avail ourselves so far as practicable.

When the different countries had stated their position regarding the transfer of the flag there was a statement prepared for the use of the conference which undertook to formulate certain propositions for discussion, basing those propositions upon the varied statements of rules by the different countries, and the basis which was formulated for discussion regarding the transfer of the flag I will now read. This is basis 35:

A ship can not be transferred to a neutral flag in order to escape the consequences which its quality as an enemy ship draws upon it.

36. The transfer effected before the opening of hostilities is valid if it has come about regularly. That is to say if it involves nothing fictitious or irregular which renders it suspicious.

37. After the opening of hostilities there is an absolute presumption of knowledge of the transfer which is effected while the ship is in the course of a voyage.

Upon that they proceeded to a discussion. After the discussion proceeded for a considerable time these statements were made by the representatives of Germany and Great Britain. Mr. Kriege, the very able and experienced adviser of the German Foreign Office, who was the representative of that country at this conference, said:

We are in accord with the authors of the summary upon the principle that a ship can not be transferred to a neutral flag with a view to escape the consequences which its quality as an enemy ship draws on it, but in the point of view of existing rights and for considerations of practical order we wish to see adopted the system of our memorandum which would have the double advantage of facilitating the task of commanders of cruisers and of avoiding consequences to neutral commerce.

Mr Crowe, one of the English delegates, explained the principle that was intended to be expressed in basis 35—that is to say, "that a commercial man subject of a belligerent State ought not to escape the consequences of war while transferring his ships under a neutral flag, but the application of this principle it is difficult to find among the memoranda by a rule precise and generally recognized."

There you see that the German and the English representatives were drawing together upon the rule which looked not so much to what we would call good faith as to the purpose for which the transfer was made.

A short time after Mr. Kriege, the German representative, stated with great lucidity the actual point of difference which had been reached by the conference. I read from page 183 of this publication of the proceedings:

Mr. Kriege exposed the manner in which, according to him, this question ought to be treated in the basis of discussion. This exposé, with the motives which have inspired it, is found treated in Annex 73.

A formal paper which he presented. I call your especial attention to it because it was a formal paper and has a very important bearing upon determining the meaning of this declaration. In this paper he says:

I desire to call the attention of the commission to a divergence which appears to exist between the proposition of the United States of America on the one part, and, upon the other part, the propositions of Great Britain and Germany.

Remember that our representatives and the British representatives had presented a rule which called for good faith in the transfer, and now he says:

This is a question of the meaning of the term "good faith." The propositions are all three, in accord to prescribe that the transfers made during a war or immediately before a war are to be made in good faith.

Only it seems that, in the idea of the delegation of the United States of America, the good faith would exist if the agreement relative to the transfer was genuine and definitive and involved nothing fictitious or irregular. On the other hand the German and Britannic propositions understand by good faith the absence among the motives of the transfer of the intention to withdraw the ship from the effect of the right of capture.

You perceive that is precisely what Mr. Johnson in his opinion says does not exist in the declaration. Let me read it again:

On the other hand the German and British propositions understand by good faith the absence among the motives of transfer of the intention to withdraw the ship from the effect of the right of capture.

In the sense of these propositions as according to the original text of Basis 35 the transfer would be null and without effect from the moment when it should have been induced by the desire of the vendor to put himself under protection from the loss which the confiscation of the ship would inflict upon him. The transfer would be, on the contrary, recognized as valid when there was ground to believe that it would have been effected also if the war had not arisen or had not been imminent at the moment of the conclusion of the contract.

After that presentation of the precise point in difference which had been reached between the delegates of the United States on the one hand and the delegates of these other powers, including England and Germany, on the other hand, the subject was submitted to a drafting committee to endeavor to formulate a rule which would be satisfactory, and I now wish to call your attention to the report of that committee. I will say, in order to indicate the materiality of the report, that it contains the rule which now appears in the declaration. It was presented in the ninth session of the commission—that is, with the con-

ference sitting as in committee of the whole—on the 6th of February, 1909. I read the record of proceedings:

The delegation of the United States of America made a reserve on the subject of the first article of the rule—

Which was reported upon the transfer of a flag, and the committee of the whole, the commission, adopted the report with the understanding that the part to which the American delegates objected, upon which they made their reserve, was to be reconsidered, and not deemed as adopted. That reserve of the American delegates appears on page 290 of these proceedings. By reference to it we find that it related not at all to the transfer of the flag after the opening of hostilities, but related solely to the transfer of the flag before the opening of hostilities. They say:

The American delegation regrets to find itself obliged to make a reserve upon the first article of the regulation relative to the transfer of flag. It considers that a rule which says, "The transfer to a neutral flag of an enemy ship before the opening of hostilities is valid, unless it shall be established that the transfer has been effected with a view to escape the consequences which the enemy character of the ship draws upon it," is not in accord with the spirit of modern rules adopted at The Hague concerning war, which have for their end to guarantee the security of international commerce against the surprises of war and wishing, conformably to modern practice, to protect as much as possible the operations engaged in in good faith and in course of execution before the beginning of hostilities.

The report was reconsidered upon that reserve. You perceive the American delegates accepted the rule which related to transfers after the beginning of hostilities, but objected to the rule relating to transfers before. A compromise was made. Under that compromise a new provision making a distinction between transfers 30 days before and less than 30 days before the opening of hostilities was made. Upon that our delegates agreed; that is to say, they got a rule which made all transfers more than 30 days before the war valid if they were real; they got a rule which made all transfers at any time valid if they were not made with the motive of avoiding the risk of war. Before 30 days they were valid, even though they were made with that motive; after 30 days they were valid unless they had that motive. On that they agreed.

When the drafting committee came to make its report to the committee of the whole, there was a full discussion of the question which Mr. Kriege had brought up by his very lucid statement of the different views as to what constituted good faith. That report leaves no doubt as to the meaning of this regulation, and no doubt whatever that the advice which has been given to the State Department and communicated to us as a basis for this legislation is erroneous. The report says—I read from pages 326 and 327 of the proceedings of the conference, translating, I hope, with substantial correctness.

The report has just stated the rules as I have read them, the rules as they were finally adopted. The report says of those rules:

The validity of the transfer is at the beginning subordinated to the accomplishment of certain judicial conditions, having for their object to show that the proprietor has been divested in a definitive manner and without reserve of his title to the ship over which he should preserve no control. If these conditions have not been fulfilled, for example, if the effect of the transfer has been subordinated to the eventualities of the war, the transfer is presumed to have taken place with the intention of shunning the consequences of the war, and it is declared null.

This is simple.

Behold the difficult point. All the juridical conditions have been fulfilled; but the captor is able to establish that the transfer, regular in substance and in form, has been effected with a view to escaping the consequences which the enemy character entails. Will he be permitted to make this proof in order to arrive at the result of declaring the transfer void, or will the intention of avoiding the consequences of the war result only from the failure to accomplish the juridical conditions? It has appeared doubtful to some. It has been recalled that the condition of good faith was exacted in a distinct manner, independently of juridical conditions, and that so, even if these conditions were fulfilled, one could prove that the sale had been made in bad faith; but how is this to be understood? It is a delicate point. The captor evidently will not view "good faith" in the same manner as the vendor. The vendor will consider that he acts honestly if he divests himself regularly and definitively of his ships, because he does not wish to run the risk of losing them by the exercise of the right of prize. The captor will think that there has not been good faith in wishing to escape from the consequences of war. If one considers the simple juridical interpretation, it seems, indeed, that a prize court, in the presence of the proposition reported above, would hold the transfer valid because the juridical conditions had been fulfilled, and would not place itself in the point of view of the captor in order to consider if there had been good or bad faith.

The majority of the committee did not accept this result, and accordingly, desiring an unequivocal formula, the following has been adopted:

The transfer to the neutral flag of an enemy ship effected before the opening of the hostilities is valid, unless it should be established that the transfer has been effected with a view to escape the consequences which the enemy character entails.

There, Mr. President, is a statement as plain as words can make it, that the terms which are used in the rule embraced in the declaration were substituted for the words "good faith" that our delegates were pressing for, in order that the intention to escape the consequences of the right of capture should be a separate and substantive ground for invalidating the transfer. There is no escape from that. There is no man here who could state with greater certainty and lucidity the purpose of the rule than it is stated in this report by Mr. Renault, the greatest of living teachers of international law, and the official adviser of the French foreign office.

That report of the drafting committee was adopted by the Committee of the Whole; it was made by the Committee of the Whole to the conference in plenary session, and it was adopted by the conference. If the conference could have heard read the advice given to our State Department and laid before the Senate as the basis of this legislation, it could not have controverted the conclusion of that advice in more positive and more unambiguous terms. I can find no words in which to show that the Solicitor for the State Department was wrong in his advice so clear as the words of Mr. Renault in this report.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand the Senator from New York to have shown that in addition to there having been payment in consideration and bona fides, in the usual meaning of that term, it must also appear that the ship was not transferred in order that the capture of it might be avoided. If it should turn out that the vendor transferred it with that desire; that is, that he transferred it in order that it might not be captured, and the vendee did not participate in that intention, would that be sufficient to meet the requirements of the rule, or does it require that there should be a participation on the part of both the vendor and the vendee in the desire to avoid capture?

Mr. ROOT. Clearly, Mr. President, the motive is a motive which is ascribed to the vendor. It is he who is seeking to take his ship out of the danger of capture; it is he who will substitute the valuable consideration that is necessary in place of the vessel that he can not use except at the risk of capture. The vendee prior to the transaction has no motive whatever in regard to the ship. It is the owner of the ship who escapes from the effect that the enemy character of the ship brings upon it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. The distinguished Senator has been giving us the propositions upon this important question submitted by the representatives of the various nations in response to the suggestion of the British Government. As I recall, a statement came from France as well as from Germany. Will the Senator kindly advise us whether the American delegates stated for the benefit of the conference, in response to the invitation, the position of our Government?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the American delegates did not upon this point present any memorandum as to the position of the United States at the outset, but shortly after the discussion began they did present a statement of their views.

Mr. WALSH. They were called upon to make a formal statement of the position taken by their Government, together with the authorities which they desired to submit in support of the view taken. Will the Senator, who then was Secretary of State, advise us as to why our delegates did not comply with that request?

Mr. ROOT. Because the delegates of the United States presented, as the basis of their position upon the whole range of questions the naval war code and discussions of the Naval War College, and it was deemed wiser, as those discussions covered the entire range, not to attempt to commit them to any more definite and precise statement.

Mr. WALSH. Are we to understand the Senator, then, that they did not make a definite statement on any of the seven propositions submitted by the Government of Great Britain?

Mr. ROOT. I do not remember about the others; I have not examined the facts as to them.

Mr. WALSH. Very well. Will the Senator have the kindness to advise us in that connection if the delegates from Austria-Hungary made a statement as to the position of their Government, and, if it is brief, will he give it to us?

Mr. ROOT. They made a statement, and the representatives of various other countries made statements. The delegates of Austria-Hungary made a statement which was much

nearer in its view the position of Great Britain and the United States than it was the position of France and Russia.

Mr. WALSH. My recollection is that the delegates from Austria-Hungary made a statement to the effect that the French doctrine was entirely obsolete and had been disregarded by France.

Mr. ROOT. They did not go so far as that. They said in their statement that it was too strict, and that France had modified it or varied from it in the war of 1870; but we can hardly take the statement of Austria-Hungary regarding the position of France as against the formal official statement of France herself.

Now, I want to give credence to what I have said about what happened in this conference by reading from a distinguished publicist, a professor in the University of Vienna, Prof. von Ferneck, who was one of the Austrian delegates to the conference of London. I read from an article by him in the Handbuch Des Völkerrechts, for 1914. He says, in chapter 5, under the heading "Transfer of the Flag":

It may well be said that this subject, which is perhaps of much less importance to neutrals than that of contraband or of blockade, was the object of extraordinary attention on the part of the conference.

Omitting some irrelevant remarks, he proceeds:

For some time it seemed as though an unanimous solution of this question could not be reached. The reason for this was that the interests in the subject on the part of the powers represented at the conference were of a widely differing character, and that the laws and the customs of different States are dissimilar in important respects. The United States of America, France, Italy, The Netherlands, and Russia recognize without exception the transfer of enemy merchant ships to a neutral flag when the transfer is completed before the outbreak of the war; Germany, France, and Russia declare without exception as null and void any transfer of flag made after the outbreak of the war—these are strict, uncompromising solutions that may indeed be understood from a theoretical point of view, but in practice lead to difficulties.

Several of the powers, among them Great Britain, the American Union, and Germany insisted that in order to be valid in law, the transfer must have been intended in "good faith," and according to the American interpretation "good faith" meant not fictitious, while the other powers understood by "good faith" that the owner himself must not have intended to make it impossible for the opponent to seize the ship.

You will perceive that that answers the question put by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and it states in few words just what Mr. Renault's report says.

The other powers—

Says Prof. von Ferneck—

understood by "good faith" that the owner must not have intended to make it impossible for the opponent to seize the ship.

And so, as Mr. Renault's report said, in order that they might have an unequivocal expression, because there were these two views of "good faith," they put in a rule which states in so many words the second view, according to Prof. von Ferneck, that "the owner must not have intended to make it impossible for the opponent to seize the ship." He proceeds:

By a remarkable argument, the American delegation controverted the idea that the shipowner could not protect himself against the prize law by transferring his ship to a neutral flag.

* * * * * * *

At the second session of the commission, the delegates were evidently eager to reach an agreement that would avoid the harshness of the consequent enforcement of a principle: The transfer of the flag effected before the outbreak of the war should be regarded as valid, the transfer after the outbreak of the war as invalid; in both cases the presumption might be refuted by counter evidence. In the course of the third meeting of the commission the question regarding the elaboration of "special rules regarding the transfer previous and the transfer subsequent to the opening of the hostilities" was referred to the investigating committee. This committee made its report at the ninth session of the commission. The rules which this committee had elaborated met the idea of the agreement, but did not meet with the full approval of the American delegation, for the reason that they did not take into account the thought developed in the declaration referred to above. In order to overcome this difficulty, the representatives of Great Britain proposed at the eleventh session of the commission "in the interest of neutral commerce" to add the following: * * * there shall be absolute presumption of validity, if the transfer was effected more than 30 days before the opening of the hostilities, provided it is in absolute and complete conformity with the laws of the countries interested, and has for its object that the control over the ship and over the earnings resulting from its use does not remain in the same hands that exercised this control before the transfer." To this the American delegation agreed; it yielded in principle, but obtained a practically important concession: The question of "good faith" might be raised only with regard to such ships as were transferred within the last 30 days before the outbreak of the war.

I find, Mr. President, that Italy upon two occasions since the Conference of London has applied the rule. In the Revue Générale de Droit International Public, of September–October, 1913, there is a report of the case of the sailing vessel *Vasilios* and of the sailing vessel *Aghios Georghios*, Greek ships, or ships flying the Greek flag, which had been Turkish vessels at the opening of the war between Italy and Turkey, and had been sold to a Greek citizen, admitted to Greek registry, and were flying the Greek flag. The ships were seized, condemned, and sold. So that we may add Italy to the powers which have adopted this rule of the Declaration of London.

Germany has put herself upon the same basis, in terms which leave no possible doubt. I read from Prize Ordinance of September 30, 1909, published in the Law Gazette of the Empire for 1914, No. 50:

I approve the accompanying prize ordinance, and direct that in the enforcement of the prize law my fleet commanders shall, during the war, proceed in accordance with the provisions of the prize ordinance. In so far as it may be necessary to make exception thereto in special cases, you shall make proposition to that end to me. I empower you to give such interpretation to this ordinance and to make such changes thereto as may be necessary, provided they are not of fundamental importance.

(Signed) WILHELM.

In the absence of the Imperial Counselor.

(Countersigned) v. TIRPITZ.

Dated September 30, 1909. Promulgated at Berlin, August 3, 1914, the date of the beginning of the war.

The ordinance, Section II, is as follows:

Enemy ships and their cargoes.—With the exceptions specified under 6—

Which are not relevant here; they relate to cartel ships, hospital ships, etc.—

With the exceptions specified under 6, enemy ships are subject to capture.

Ships are adjudged enemy or neutral ships by the flag they are entitled to carry.

The flag which a ship is entitled to carry is determined in accordance with the flag law of almost all maritime states from an official document that any merchant ship must have on board.

If the nationality of a ship can not be readily established, and especially if the document required in accordance with the flag law of the respective state is not in evidence, then the ship shall be considered as an enemy ship.

Ships that after the outbreak of the hostilities have been transferred from the enemy to the neutral flag are also to be considered as enemy ships—

(a) If the commander is not convinced that the transfer would have followed, even if war had not broken out, as, for instance, by succession, or by virtue of a construction contract.

(b), (c), and (d) pertain to matters which are not relevant.

That points to the German understanding of the rule; and I will say that in the final report of the London conference, which is printed in this document containing the solicitor's opinion, an illustration is given of the meaning of the rule—that is, for instance, "in case of inheritance."

Applying these illustrations, the rule becomes plain. The ordinary trade in ships is not to be prevented. Trade in the ordinary course of business is not to be prevented. The ordinary devolution of property is not to be interfered with. If the owner of a ship belonging to a belligerent dies, the property may devolve upon a neutral. The rule does not prevent it, and the neutral flag will protect it. If you or I have ordered a ship from a shipyard in Germany or Great Britain, and the ship is constructed, and we take it, if the ship was ordered before the war and the transfer was made after the war that transfer is manifestly in the ordinary course of business, as the German rule says, under a construction contract. But none of these great nations will permit a citizen of an enemy to rob it of its prize by transferring to a neutral the ships it is entitled to capture on the high seas.

Mr. President, we are not bound by that; but that is the state of the law of England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and I presume the allies of these countries, and that is what we have to run up against if we buy these belligerent ships; for of course no one will contend for a moment that the Hamburg-American Line or the North German Lloyd Line is selling its ships in the ordinary course of business, or for any reason other than that they can not go out on the ocean and carry on their business, and no one would doubt it if we were to buy a British ship and put it in the Bremen trade or the Hamburg trade. There can be no purchase now of ships that have been lying idle six months, under the conditions of this war, that is not stamped with a purpose that invalidates the transfer under the rule of the declaration of London equally with those old and more severe rules which were presented at the beginning of the conference.

But, Mr. President, I have been considering this subject as if an American citizen were to buy. I have said about that, that we are not bound by the rules of these countries. We are at liberty to say: "Our rule is different, and we insist upon its being applied." I have always believed in that rule, sir. I believe in it now. I instructed our delegates to the Second Hague Conference to urge upon the conference the immunity of all private property at sea in time of war. Our delegates fought loyally for the rule which our courts applied, and which is in furtherance of that beneficent and liberal rule. But there is the law of Europe, and against that we will come; and I repeat, it is their law that will be enforced in the treatment of this subject. We should be left to protest and attempt

to get them or some court of arbitration to abandon their rule and adopt ours. How easy it would be, sir, for us to bring that about through the voluntary action of any country or the action of any court of arbitration, in view of the fact that they have adopted the rule of the declaration of London to which our delegates finally agreed, to which our Government agreed in sending it to the Senate for ratification, and to which the Senate agreed by advising and consenting to the ratification, I shall not discuss.

But, says the Secretary of the Treasury, the Government of the United States could not be involved in any difficulty if it were to buy these ships—that is to say, if this proposed corporation were to buy the ships:

> Some timid people have argued that if the Government is interested as a stockholder in a shipping company, and a ship of such company should be seized by a belligerent and brought into a prize court, the sovereignty of the Government would be involved. There is no ground whatever for this view.

I am sorry to write myself down in the category of timid people, but I must, for I do not agree with the Secretary of the Treasury in the idea that there is no ground whatever for this view, and I am filled with apprehension by the idea of putting these vast powers into the hands of a man who thinks there is no ground whatever for that view.

A question was put to the counselor of the State Department, Mr. Lansing, before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House. I read from the hearings on Senate bill 5259 and H. R. 5980, dated August 20, 1914:

> Mr. WILLIAMS. The first question that we want information on, as a legal proposition, is the liability that would attach to this Government if the Government itself was operating a line of steamships engaged in the transportation of goods to South America and to European countries compared with the liability of a steamship company or an individual engaged in the same business. Can you give us some information along these lines?
>
> Mr. LANSING. I suppose you refer to neutrality and to the question of contraband?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. LANSING. I think that the transportation of contraband to a belligerent port in a public ship of the United States would go much further than the mere matter of liability, and that it would be regarded as an unneutral act.
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. That the United States transporting goods to English, French, or German ports would be a violation of neutrality?
>
> Mr. LANSING. I think it might be so regarded.

That is what we have to deal with. That is what the Secretary of the Treasury does deal with in the words I have read from him. He says:

> If the Government operated ships outright, just as it operates the vessels of our Navy, an awkward situation of this character might arise; but where a nation is merely a stockholder, or the sole stockholder, in a private corporation, its sovereignty is not and can not be directly involved if the ships of such a corporation become the subjects of litigation in a prize court concerning any issue which does not involve the Government itself. The Government would stand in relation to such a corporation exactly as any individual stockholder does to a corporation in which he is interested. A suit against the corporation does not necessarily involve the shareholders.

Mr. President, that is not the law as it has been understood by the Government of the United States, or as it has been applied. In the Delagoa Bay case our Government went straight through the legal fiction of a Portuguese corporation and asserted and enforced the rights of American citizens who were stockholders of that corporation precisely as if they had been the owners themselves. The British Government did the same thing in the same case. Time and again the rule which was established in that case has been applied to the affairs of these legal fictions which give to the real owners of property the municipal right of succession and limitation of liability and the use of a corporate seal, etc. Of course, Mr. President, it stands to reason that a municipal statute giving to A and B and C rights to sue and be sued in corporate form and to have limitation of liability and to act through a seal are no concern of another Government if A and B and C, through that form, have injured or affected the rights of that other Government. The idea is idle and baseless that the Government of the United States, by the exercise of its vast national power, can wrest enormous funds from its people by taxation, can use those funds to withdraw from Germany's right of capture British ships and from France's and Great Britain's right of capture German ships, and say:

> I can not be called to account because I have made a statute under which I protect myself by a legal fiction, calling myself a trading corporation.

Ah, no! the real and serious affairs of this world are not conducted in that way. Whatever we do through this corporation that we create and own, we do as a government, and are responsible for as a government.

In the case of the *Parlement Belge*, which was referred to the other day by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the courts of England were called upon to consider the effects of government ownership. The Government of Belgium owned a boat plying across the channel from Ostend to some British port, much like our municipal ferries, and the question was raised, that being a trading boat engaged solely in trading operations, whether it was to be treated as subject to the laws relating to trading ships or was to have the immunities which pertained to government ships. The court below held that it was subject to the laws relating to trading ships. The court above reversed the decision, and held that, being the property of the Government of Belgium, it was immune from the English laws relating to trading ships. The reality of things, sir, prevents us from escaping by any possibility from responsibility for the use of our national power to withdraw any belligerent ships that we may now purchase from the right of capture on the part of the other belligerents, whether we proceed by the fiction of a corporation or directly.

There is only one possible escape from the condemnation and forfeiture of a prize court for every ship of this kind that is purchased. That is the possible protection of the sovereignty of the United States, preferring to occupy the position of violating neutrality rather than to submit to condemnation.

What is the meaning, sir, of the violation of neutrality? It means taking sides in the controversy. It means helping one belligerent against another. It means that after all our proclamations and our efforts we abandon the attempt to be neutral, and we take sides in the great conflict; and we can not stop. We can not measure the number of steps. One unneutral act by us will lead to acts by others that will compel further acts by us, more acts by others and more by us and more by them, until we are in the thick of the controversy.

Remember, sir, the condition of the world to-day. I am arguing against the Government of the United States buying, not a ship, but an international quarrel with every ship. Somebody said to me: "It is buying a claim, not a ship." No. It is buying a quarrel, not a ship; and I say, remember the condition of the world. Recall to your minds all that you have read during the past six months of the condition of feeling on the part of the people in all these countries—England, Belgium, France, Germany, Russia, Servia, all of them—tense to the highest degree, in that condition of exaltation which holds prudence for naught.

Why, sir, we were ready to fight, from Mason and Dixon's line to Canada, on the instant, when Mason and Slidell were taken from the *Trent*, and Great Britain mobilized her fleet. It was ruin for the North if we fought—certain ruin. We could not stand against the gallant South and against mighty England. Our blockade would be gone; but we were ready to fight, because every heart of the North was full of emotion, and every nature was tense with feeling, and we cared naught for prudence. That is Europe to-day.

If we are going to maintain our neutrality we must hold close to it, and keep out of all needless causes of controversy. And let us remember ourselves. We have kept, hitherto, a united America. We have stood behind the President in his neutrality proclamations. Here and there fault has been found on one side or the other, but we have stood by him; but do not forget that there are here millions of Germans who love their fatherland, and I honor them for it. I should think less of them if their natures were not awakened by the peril and the stress of the land that gave birth to them and their fathers. They are alive and tense. There are millions of men of English blood, born and bred with a love for Anglo-Saxon liberty and the laws that we inherited from England. Do not imagine that they are not thinking and feeling, and if you precipitate this country into a controversy where Europe feels and acts upon the feeling that we have taken sides we will rend ourselves.

No; the only safe course is to keep out of unnecessary controversial questions with as great care and conservatism and caution as possible, for we never can tell where a controversy will lead us.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that any shade of party politics has fallen upon the consideration of this measure. We have in the Senate long felt that it was our duty to lay aside party when we reach the water's edge. We have considered the terms of treaties and advised the President, of whatever party, in accordance with the best of our judgment and our conscience. When we have reached the water's edge we have said we leave party.

This bill proposes a business which is all beyond the water's edge—international in its aspect and in its purpose. It is international at a time of intense emotion and certain controversy. I wish we could have considered it—I wish we could consider it now—as Americans earnest for the peace and prosperity of our country, forgetful of party.

Mr. President and Senators, there is no crime against our country so wicked as the crime of conducting our international relations with a view to party popularity. The two considerations are incompatible and can not exist at the same time in any mind. He who has charge of our foreign affairs must deal with them regardless of the effect upon his political future or his party's advantage or he can not deal with them as the public safety demands. The man who is considering his political future and his party's advantage should keep out of foreign relations. The two can not coexist.

One incident for which I impute blame to no one has recently happened which illustrates what I say. The note that was sent by our State Department to Great Britain a short time ago regarding the search for contraband, endeavoring to remedy serious evils of delay and perhaps indifference in making the search for contraband, which is admittedly the right of belligerents, was a moderate, a reasonable, and a proper note. No one in the world had a right to find fault with it. But before the note was delivered in Great Britain and before it was made public here the newspapers were filled by somebody, I do not know whom, with an account of it, far, far from the truth, with an account of it which pictured the administration as standing up against frightful odds and dreadful danger for a view of American rights which no serious student of international law ever thought of asserting and which the note did not assert. Both this country and England were filled with an erroneous view of that note and that erroneous view persists. It could have been given for no other purpose than a political purpose and it was a crime against the American people and against the peace of the world to misrepresent it.

I will not proceed. I will not specify or illustrate further. I will close what I have to say by expressing the most fervent hope that we may deal both in this great deliberative body and in the executive department of the Government with this serious, grave question as lovers of our country with all the wisdom and experience and ability that we can bring to our country's service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is seldom that the Senate of the United States listens to the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] without being instructed as well as pleased. I take it for granted, Mr. President, there are none of us here who do not want the Government of the United States to be absolutely and strictly neutral as regards the pending hostilities in Europe. I take it for granted that there is no good American who will not be neutral himself, and I apprehend, as the Senator from New York does, some danger of our being self-rent because of our various European derivations. Back in Washington's administration a traveler from Europe said he "could find no Americans, he found either Frenchmen or Englishmen"; but, notwithstanding that fact, Washington, as President, and Jefferson, as Secretary of State, held the helm firmly and this country escaped being mixed up with the European wars. Just so now, Woodrow Wilson and William J. Bryan will hold the helm of the ship of state steady and firm on an appointed American course and hold us free of European international entanglements.

I find to-day that there are in America so-called German-Americans who are very much more German than they are American, and some so-called French-Americans who are very much more French than they are American, and some American citizens of English and Scotch derivation who, although they do not hyphenate themselves, are yet behaving as though they were very much more English and Scotch than American. But all these do not amount to much. They are merely the negligible fringe. The great body of the people are Americans first, no matter what their original derivation was, and they are going to remain so, and they are going to remain in absolute sympathy with an administration which holds the helm down hard and prevents the American Republic from being mixed up with these troubles. Some of these people are trying to get us into war now. Several newspapers—and I might mention some which are not a thousand miles from here—are writing editorials every now and then in which there seems to be a purpose of dragging the United States Government into trouble with one or the other of the European powers.

All that is very true, Mr. President, but, upon the other hand, Americans have their rights. The rule is that a neutral has a right to trade. The exception is the belligerent's right to interfere. His right to interfere, luckily for us at this time, is based upon express law and agreement. It can not be said by the Senator from New York or by anybody else that if the Government of the United States proceeds to protect its commerce it is thereby unfriendly to anybody anywhere.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York says he is sorry to see, or he would be sorry to see, any partisanship injected into this discussion. In heaven's name, who injected it? The gentlemen upon the other side of the aisle did. The legislation had no sooner been broached than they proceeded to act almost as a solid party against it. Before there had been any discussion or any argument or anything else a little coterie on that side of the Chamber proceeded to declare that we would have to stay here until the 4th of March, or made a similar declaration, if we passed this legislation. It is not our fault. They declared war. They made this a partisan question. They did it in the interest of the present owners of ships.

The Senator from New York has erected a man of straw, as I shall proceed to show after a minute; but, first, before I go to that I want to say a few words about what the Senator said of personal import.

Mr. President, it is lucky that hard words do not break bones, even when the hard words are pronounced ex cathedra by men who are ex-Secretaries of various departments and ex-presidents of conventions, where the business of decreeing by the way of the voice of a so-called "brutal majority" seemed to strike no terror to them.

Ex cathedra, ex-Secretary, or ex-permanent or temporary convention chairman—it is all one—and all embodied in the Senator from New York. They are all exes. All have worked by "decree" of the majority. Witness the Republican convention of 1912.

But to come to the personal issue so unnecessarily raised by the Senator from New York. The Senator from New York accused me of being guilty of "effrontery." Consider that, now! In what consisted my effrontery? In denying and disproving the assertion of the Senator from Michigan that none on the other side of this Chamber had been filibustering, that none of them had been speaking merely to consume time. Of course, the Senator from New York, with all his ex cathedra utterances, knows that I was right and there was no "effrontery" in asserting the truth and in proving it. You have been filibustering. You are filibustering. You have been and are speaking to consume time and not in honest debate.

Besides that, I am not the sort of a man to be guilty of effrontery. It is a sort of thing that never occurs to my mind nor to any other sincere mind concerning me. What self-satisfied complacency of temperament it must take to accuse a man of being guilty of effrontery because he has asserted that you Republicans were filibustering. Not one of you on honor in private conversation will deny it.

Then the Senator from New York accuses me of disrespect to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] because he says I said "their speeches were not worth listening to." I did not say exactly that. My recollection is that the Senator from New York was not in front of me when I was speaking, anyhow. He is generally out of the Chamber. He was not paying any more attention than a good many of us who were discussing the issue had been paying attention to the speakers who afterwards or before were merely consuming time.

What I meant to say, and what I do say, is that no speech nine hours long is worth listening to, I do not care who made it.

Mr. RANSDELL. Thirteen hours long.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am informed that one of them was 13 hours long. I thought it was 9 hours. It covers 65 pages of the RECORD. The man who would pretend that he was wise enough to speak intelligently enough to fill 65 pages of the RECORD, and that it was all worth while, would be getting a reputation under false pretenses, because God never made anybody that wise, and I do not suppose He ever will.

I have listened frequently with very much interest and attention to both those Senators. I served with them on the other side and on this side, and I have in my time obtained much information from them; but the minute I find a man piling a whole lot of books on his desk with the idea of taking up all the time he can, then I retreat to the cloakroom, and I have no apology to make for it. Life is too short and art is too long for me to be wasting even my insignificant attention upon perfunctory efforts of that sort.

The Senator from New York seems to be astonished at two things—the unprecedented character of this legislation, and the unprecedented methods to which we are resorting in order to carry it to its consummation. I do not remember whether the Senator from New York was Secretary of War at the time or not, but in an administration where he was in the Cabinet the United States Government proceeded to purchase and to operate a line of steamships between New York and Panama, and the Government of the United States is now operating it, just as we propose to operate these ships, under "the fiction of a corporation," as he calls it, the stock being voted by a man in the War Department. So the measure is not unprecedented.

I do not remember how the Senator from New York voted on the question; I remember how I did; but it has not been long since we authorized the United States Government to buy and operate a railroad up in Alaska—$30,000,000—for a few thousand people. Whether what we are doing is right or wrong it is not unprecedented therefore.

Now, as to the method of meeting your method over there. Is that unprecedented? We are meeting unprecedented talk by unprecedented silence. The Senator from New York quarrels with us because we do not talk. I have heard of men quarreling with others because they did not let them talk, but I never heard them quarrel with a man because he did not talk. If you can not win this debate and impress the country with the solidity of your arguments and the justness of your views when we keep quiet, what sort of fix would you be in if we talked? What would be your fate?

If all that gush by the Senator from New York had not been pronounced solemnly and in the ex cathedra, ex-Cabinet member style, people would have laughed at it; but I did not see a ripple of amusement on either side; I looked around at the time to see if I could. Such is the force of dignity! Such the force of a combinaiton of exes!

The Senator from New York said the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] said, "We have the votes." Yes; but in Heaven's name what good would that do us if we fall into this trap you set of helping you to consume the time between now and the 4th of March? Shall we be forced by solemnity of utterance to be particeps criminis in that crime against time and American commerce!

Is this the first time in the Senate of the United States when the minority wanted to filibuster that the majority passed a self-denial ordinance and kept its month not altogether but comparatively closed? So there is nothing unprecedented in the method, either.

The truth is we on this side have made up our minds to put through certain legislation. Most of you on that side have made up your minds that we shall not do it if you can help it. All we are asking is a vote, and what you are doing is preventing a vote or trying to prevent it. We shall continue to try to force a vote. The Senator from Missouri was justified in saying, "We have the votes," but if you think we have not the votes—and some of your newspapers and treasonable Democratic papers say we have not; they say there is a great disintegration over here—then why not let us have a vote and beat us and be done with it and get through with it now?

I never received as high a compliment in my life, I never heard as high a compliment to this side, and I appreciate it, because I was one of them, as the pathetic appeal of the Senator from New York this morning that we should talk. It is the first time in my life I ever had anybody to indulge in pathos while begging me to talk, and I never heard Republicans pathetic before in my life while begging Democrats to talk.

You do not know what you are doing. We might take you at your word, and if we did, you would be as much punished as we have been here in the last three or four days by long-winded, senseless speeches, and most of you would defend yourselves in the same way that we did—by going into the cloakrooms or over into your offices to dictate letters or do something else, and I can not say that I would blame you very much.

Then the Senator from New York said that after we introduced this bill we brought in a substitute, as he called it, "an entirely new bill." Of course, the Senator from New York knew we had not done that. The Senator from New York took advantage of the letter. Of course, in a parliamentary sense, we did bring in a bill striking out all except the enacting clause, and substituting for it another bill, but of course the Senator from New York knew that the substitute was, nine-tenths of it, a repetition of the original bill, and only in a parliamentary sense could it be said to be a new bill. Yet the effect was sought to be made upon the country that we introduced an entirely new bill; that we knew so little about what we wanted that we introduced one bill, then threw it out—threw it in the wastebasket—and brought in another, a new and a different one. The old bill and the new bill are just as nearly one as the Senator here before me is the same that he was three weeks ago, although in the meantime certain changes have taken place in the color of his hair, his complexion, and the inside blood and muscles in him.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator makes use of a phrase. Those of you who know stupid human nature know how important phrases are in life. He accuses us over here of "a conspiracy of silence." Do you know what the American people would like above all things in the world? I will tell you: That the whole blessed Congress would enter into "a conspiracy of silence"; that is, if the Senator means by that a conspiracy to keep silent more than they do or have done.

But what is this "conspiracy of silence"? From the phraseology of the Senator from New York and from his manner of saying it you would imagine it was a crime of some sort. In other words, the man who does not speak—and, according to the Republican precedents and examples, 13 hours or 9 hours or 7 hours—is guilty of a crime against this august parliamentary body. This body has a reputation of being an exceedingly talkative body, but this is the first time I have ever heard that to keep silent in it was treason to it. But the Senator seems to think so. We are just simply trying to keep from participating, from being particeps criminis, in an attempt to obstruct and delay and hinder the business of this body.

But the Senator from New York is mistaken when he says that no argument has been made upon this side. The Senator in charge of this bill [Mr. FLETCHER] opened it with a statement—and a very clear and a very complete one—accompanied by a very good argument, and thus far it has not been replied to.

As I said the other day, "enough is as good as a feast." If a man could in 10 or 15 minutes make an argument that somebody else can not reply to in 13 hours, why should he consume even 10 or 15 minutes more? Why should his friends add perfume to the violet?

The Senator from New York this morning indulged in some real discussion himself. He says that discussion is "stimulating." Yes; discussion is, if it is real discussion; but discussion merely to consume time is not stimulating. It is sleepifying, somnolent. It is of exactly the opposite effect. No man can be safely stimulated for 13 or 9 or 7 hours without intermission. I have listened a hundred times to the Senators, whom I was not criticizing, but whose consumption of time merely I was criticizing, and have found what they said edifying, interesting, and to me, at any rate, very instructive and pleasing. Whenever they are in earnest they are all that; but a man who has such mental ability that he can handle a great subject in two hours with interest becomes uninteresting and an all-around bore when he occupies 13 hours or 9 hours. Daniel Webster, if he had tried speaking that long on a stretch, would. Patrick Henry could not have done it if he had tried.

Let us talk common sense. We have not deprived you of any opportunity over there. You can talk all you please; we could not keep you from it if we would, and we would not if we could. All we are doing is giving you an hour's extra time every day to talk. We are, indeed, giving you "the morning hour"—two hours nearly—and after a bit we will give you two hours more at night, and then maybe after a while we will give you from breakfast to breakfast; but we are not going to say at any time in this discussion that you shall not talk. On the contrary, the more you say you want to talk the more time we are going to give you to talk in. Nobody can be more indulgent than we. I can imagine nothing more kindly than that. Nobody, moreover, has deprived you of any right of offering any amendment to this bill, or of having it adopted, provided only you let the Senate vote on it and a majority of the Senate votes with you.

Now, Mr. President, to come to some points in the discussion of the question itself. The Senator from New York says that the Secretary of the Treasury "admits that this will be a losing business," if we go into it. The Secretary of the Treasury did say that upon some routes it would be during the period of organization, and for some time, a losing business. But a losing business, Mr. President, to whom? To the Government? Perhaps. To the people of the United States? No; for we are now paying $16,000,000 a month unnecessarily for ocean freight. In four months and seven days we would save enough to the American people upon ocean freights, as they are now, compared with what they formerly were, to pay every dollar of this $40,000,000 back if we lost it all; and nobody contends that we would lose it all. It is not a losing business, even for the Government, to that extent. If it were a losing business, I do not suppose we would lose over 10 per cent or 15 per cent in that time. There are two sorts of losing businesses; one is a loss to the Government and the other is a loss to the people. The idea of any Republican standing up here and talking about not taking over a losing business! There never was a protective tariff passed since the world began that was not predicated upon the assumption and assertion that without the assistance of the taxing power the business protected would be a losing business; and in that case, when it is protected, who loses after it is protected? The people. In this case, if anybody loses it will be the Government, while the people themselves gain manifold that much.

The Senator from New York said that our wheat was selling at such and such a price and our cotton at 8 cents, and when he said cotton was selling at 8 cents he looked as if he thought you

and I were getting rich. It costs about 10 cents to make cotton. The Senator from New York thinks we are getting awfully rich with cotton at 8 cents, and therefore he says all the legislation we try to pass upon this side has proven itself to have been unnecessary. What an encyclopedia of ignorance about cotton is he not the author of?

Mr. President, I will call attention in a few moments to a few things about freight rates; but to take cotton alone, where the freight rates upon cotton prior to the war were 30 and 35 cents a hundred, which would be from a dollar and a half to a dollar and seventy-five cents a bale, the freight rate now is from $13 to $17 a bale.

Yet the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] spent hours upon this floor trying to prove by affidavits and letters and certificates of interested persons that there was not a shortage of tonnage to carry our frieght. What could have accounted for this immense increase in freight rates except a shortage of tonnage? The very day that the Senator from Ohio was making that speech—the very day and the very day after he made a part of it—the Washington Post's news columns were full of statements of the fact that the railroads going into several ports in the United States had refused to receive any more grain or foodstuffs because the warehouses were full and there was no ocean tonnage to carry them abroad. That was another lesson in the futility of receiving the affidavits and certificates of interested persons, whose testimony can not be relied upon from the very nature of the case.

One thing I want to go into especially. The Senator from New York says that the only ships we can buy are German ships. Why, Mr. President, that is not correct. Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch ships, and ships from other places are for sale. That is not all. Ships adapted to the foreign trade now engaged in our coastwise trade are for sale. That is not all. Tramp ships are for sale.

The tramp ship is a peculiar thing and has a peculiar utility in the commerce of the world. The great steamship lines can enter into a combination, and sometimes attempt to do it, and approximate what we call a trust; but along comes a tramp ship and says: "I want to be loaded with wheat or cotton at this port." So there never has been an ocean transportation trust. The tramp ship kept it from coming into operation. But when great wars come and danger fields on the ocean come the tramp ship flees the danger zone. Why? Because if a vessel is a part of a great company and is carried into a prize court the company can afford to wait for an adjudication and is not ruined, or if damage occur from a war which has taken place the company can afford to wait until it is paid; but where a man owns a tramp ship, and his entire fortune is in it, holding him up for three months or six months will result in his ruin. So he gets out of that sort of trade as quickly as he can and gets into a trade where it is more safe—follows a safer route. So there are tramp ships for sale, tramp ships leaving our trade and gone to other—perhaps East Indian and Oriental—routes. I will show after a while more specifically where these ships are, or I will insert a list of them in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there is, however, this thought back of all this: In my opinion we shall not need to buy many ships to correct this exploitive oceanic freight-rate evil. The German and Austrian ships have disappeared from the sea; they are interned. Many of the British and French ships have been requisitioned or commandeered. Tramp ships have to a large extent disappeared from the north Atlantic trade, especially that part which goes into the North Sea or the English Channel. The consequence of that is that the great lines have been left in command of the situation. The consequence of that is that the great lines have proceeded to act in a piratical or in an exploitive way. I will take back the word "piratical," because it is but natural that they should take advantage of the situation; but they have proceeded to act in an exploitive way. They have raised freight rates up all the way from 300 per cent to 900 per cent, and in some cases, as I shall show after a while, 1,100 per cent. They know they can carry this trade for less, and they know that their pretense for charging all this high price is the fear of mines and the fear of capture is fictitious—a mere pretense. There is not a mine between us and Liverpool; there is not a mine between us and the west coast of South America or the east coast of South America, either; there is not a mine between San Francisco and the Orient. There is no occasion in the world why either the marine insurance or the freight rates should be enlarged upon any of those routes. There is some occasion why it should be enlarged to Scandinavian ports and the ports reached by going through the English Channel or the North Sea, but they have raised freight rates everywhere; they have taken advantage of the situation; they are cutting the throat of American commerce, not alone in the war zone, but south of us and east of us and southwest of us.

What difference does it make that oats should be selling as high as they now are, for example, when freight rates here are 6 shillings 6 pence per bushel, as one man writes to the Secretary of the Treasury he must agree to pay if he ships at all. That is not a freight rate to Hamburg or Bremen, mind you, but a freight rate to Liverpool. It is prohibitive. Of course the man is not going to ship at all. Besides that, the steamship companies tell him that they do not think they can give him tonnage anywhere, because they are carrying other things which are more profitable to themselves.

This being the situation, it is my opinion that the moment the United States Government steps into this arena, panoplied and armed and ready for war—"red-eyed," as a Senator said here the other day—that that moment the major part of this evil, which makes such an emergency, will disappear. How? These people will voluntarily reduce their freight rates in order to keep the United States Government from continuing permanently a line of business which they think would result in great damage to them.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment. They will not wait for the actual competition, but they will reduce their rates because of the anticipated competition. Whether I am wrong in that or not is debatable, of course. It is a mere matter of speculation and opinion as to the future, but, at any rate, it is my judgment, or the result of my judgment.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Mississippi to say just now that the rates charged for carrying grain were prohibitive. I should like to know how he sustains that contention?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that. I said that certain rates here referred to from certain ports to Europe were prohibitive. There are other ports. One of the curious things about this situation is that rates are not the same from different ports.

Mr. WEEKS. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that the rate on a bushel of oats of 6 shillings and sixpense is prohibitive, but there have been 54,000,000 bushels of grain shipped up to the 15th day of January this year more than were shipped last year. Does not that indicate that there is a considerable amount of shipping available for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it does.

Mr. WEEKS. An ample amount?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it does not. If I understood the Senator, he asked me if there was an ample amount of tonnage for grain.

Mr. WEEKS. That was part of the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Evidently there is not, or the warehouses and elevators in our cities would not be standing to-day chock full of grain and the railroads would not be giving notice that they did not want to carry any more to certain ports.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Mississippi know that the difficulty is that of unloading on the other side of the ocean; that the foreign ports are crowded with shipping and that a great number of ships are waiting to discharge their cargoes in foreign ports, and that that is the reason for the shortage of tonnage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not. I yielded for a question. I do not care to argue that. I merely made the statement that they could not get the tonnage and that they are not getting it now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I can not yield. I will yield to the Senator for a question, but not for anything else.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only wanted to assure my friend the Senator from Mississippi that the freight rates were not only high, but——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon, but if I yield to him except for a question I shall lose the floor, and I do not wish to do that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York and others have taken the position that about the only ships we could purchase were German ships, and then they have taken the position that we can not purchase German ships. Mr. President, so far as the law is concerned, the Senator from New York need not have taken so long as he did to explain it, because the plain law is in the declaration of London. I differ from the Senator from New York about this. He says the declaration of London is not binding upon us. I

say that it is. I say that it is binding upon us for two reasons: First, because we agreed to it, although the mere formality of the exchange of ratifications had not taken place prior to the war. We are, therefore, morally bound by it.

Then I say that the declaration of London is binding upon us for another reason. Russia, France, and England, all three, have declared it to be the rule by which they shall be guided during this war; and the Senator from New York knows that it is a principle of international law that the captor's law is the law of the war, subject only to a trial in a prize court after seizure, and to such treaties as may exist between the two countries submitting such questions to arbitration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment. In this particular case the declaration of London is binding upon us, subject only to differences about the interpretation of it—the construction of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I want simply to say to the Senator from Mississippi that, as I understood the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], he said that technically people might say that we were not bound by the London convention or treaty; but I do not think the Senator from New York took the position that morally we were not so bound, for his whole argument was based upon that idea.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know what the Senator from New York *meant*, but he *said* we were not bound by it. He is not here; he is pursuing the advice which I gave to Senators the other day—when they did not expect to be entertained to absent themselves from the Chamber, and he is probably right in that. He left immediately after he concluded his speech.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is probably at luncheon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know where he is nor what he meant; I only know what he said; and he said that we were not bound by the treaty of London. It is rather late for luncheon.

Mr. President, the law of the case is very clearly expressed; in brief it is this: That as to the purchase of ships taking place over 30 days before the outbreak of hostilities such purchase is absolutely valid; as to the purchase taking place within 30 days before the outbreak of hostilities it is presumed to be valid, but proof can be introduced by the captors to show that the sale was not to avoid the consequences of war, that is not valid; in other words, the burden of proof is then upon the captor; as to the purchase of ships belonging to belligerents by neutral powers, taking place after the outbreak of hostilities, they are invalid; but that, again, is subject to rebuttal by proof, the burden of proof this time being upon the owner of the ship to prove that the sale was not made to avoid the consequences of war. That, in short, is the entire law; and it is contained in articles 55 and 56 and the first part of article 57 of the declaration of London; and any Senator who will read it will find it there as clearly as if he listened to somebody spend three hours trying to explain what it means. I shall put it in the RECORD right here as a part of my remarks. I do not want to detain the Senate by reading it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHAPTER 5.—TRANSFER TO A NEUTRAL FLAG.

ART. 55. The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected before the outbreak of hostilities, is valid, unless it is proved that such transfer was made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed. There is, however, a presumption, if the bill of sale is not on board a vessel which has lost her belligerent nationality less than 60 days before the outbreak of hostilities, that the transfer is void. This presumption may be rebutted.

Where the transfer was effected more than 30 days before the outbreak of hostilities there is an absolute presumption that it is valid if it is unconditional, complete, and in conformity with the laws of the countries concerned and if its effect is such that neither the control of nor the profits arising from the employment of the vessel remain in the same hands as before the transfer. If, however, the vessel lost her belligerent nationality less than 60 days before the outbreak of hostilities and if the bill of sale is not on board, the capture of the vessel gives no right to damages.

ART. 56. The transfer of any enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

There, however, is an absolute presumption that a transfer is void:

(1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port.

(2) If a right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor.

(3) If the requirements of the municipal law governing the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled.

CHAPTER 6.—ENEMY CHARACTER.

ART. 57. Subject to the provisions respecting transfer to another flag, the neutral or enemy character of a vessel is determined by the flag which she is entitled to fly.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED. In the light of the speech of the Senator from New York this morning——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri understands——

Mr. REED. I am going to ask a question. In the light of the speech of the Senator from New York this morning, in which he intimated that the Senate could not deliberate when its Members are absent, I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether, in view of the fact that on the Republican side of this Chamber there are just 8 Republicans present and 35 absent, he regards the 35 as deliberating within the definition of the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes——

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will answer the question. I think they are deliberating; I think they are very sensibly deliberating besides, and I would not have them put to the trouble of being here for $10, and I am a poor man. [Laughter.] I would rather they were absent, or at least those of them who do not wish to listen; and I realize that they are not absent out of any disrespect for me, but because they are tired of this whole business, as most of us are.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to suggest to the Senator that he count the number on the Democratic side, and he will find about 12 out of 52. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is very true; but it is also true that we have not been letting out a wail like the one that went up from Jericho because Senators are occasionally out of the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as a Member of Congress by the name, I believe, of Cobb, from Alabama, once remarked, I have a little trouble finding "where I am at," these interruptions are so irrelevant; but having discovered it, I go on.

The truth is—dwelling for one moment upon the issue which has been precipitated into the argument of the merits of this case—that Senators could not attend to their business at all if they remained in this Chamber all the time while the Senate was in session to listen to the speeches made. As a consequence, when Senators are interested in a given subject, when they are interested in the manner of handling it, and when they are not bored to death by a filibuster like this or something else, remain in a majority in the Senate, although not altogether; but when a filibuster like this or something else of the long-winded character is boring them to death—tired—they leave, and, heaven knows, I do not blame them. The only men who have been solicitous of their attendance on the floor during this debate have been the men who have been speaking—some of them for 13 hours or 9 hours or 7 hours at a time—and I notice that as soon as even they get through, although they are clamoring for somebody to listen to their discussion, they leave the Senate Chamber to a man, as the Senator from New York, lately clamoring, has lately left.

I myself am willing to listen only to myself now and then, but these gentlemen seem to have adopted that as a usual practice, so that when they themselves are not talking they think it well enough to be absent. I am not quarreling with them; it is perhaps a very wise thing to do.

Now, to get back to the question. The Senator from New York says that he is "filled," "appalled," "with apprehension" lest the sovereignty of the United States shall be brought into question by some capture or international dispute concerning one of the ships contemplated to be operated under this bill. Why, how could it be? The ships are to be the ships of a corporation of the District of Columbia. The Government is not seeking to hide behind the corporate name at all, but, on the contrary, by the very fact that it does incorporate the company, is announcing to the belligerents that the vessels belonging to the proposed corporation will be subject to all the rules and regulations of international law that affect any other vessels belonging to any other corporation or to any private citizen. Yet the Senator from New York went on and spent quite a good deal of time in talking about our "withdrawing ourselves" behind "the fiction of a corporation" and in warning us that we could not withdraw these vessels from international law because of the fact that the corporation contains three Cabinet officers. Whoever thought we could? The very object of incorporating was that we should not do so.

About three or four days after the outbreak of the European war I introduced a bill here for the Government itself to buy ships and to operate them or to charter or to lease them. This

bill is better than the one which I introduced, for the reason that it avoids the very rock upon which we might have split and against whose presence the Senator from New York warns us. This is a very much better bill. The only quarrel I have is that we have waited so long for the relief. We might have had this law five months ago; and if we had had it five months ago we would have saved during that five months up to this good hour $80,000,000 in freights to the American people—twice all the money that is called for under this bill—and now Senators are going on and filibustering against it and delaying it, when it is costing about $16,000,000 a month to the American people. Every day that you delay it you are costing the American commerce one-thirtieth of that amount—about half a million dollars a day. Is your love of talk worth that? Is there a man in the Senate who does not know how he is going to vote on this bill? Is there a man here who has not to his own satisfaction studied it from every facet which it can present or which it has presented to him? What right have you to fine the American people this amount of money—about half a million dollars a day—while you are talking about whether or not I have "effrontery," or whether somebody else ought to talk who has not talked, or consuming time to deny that you are filibustering when you know you are?

Now, one other thing, Mr. President, and I shall sit down, because I do not want to take up much time. Senators who have considered the question as to whether we have a right to buy the ships of belligerents have considered it entirely from the standpoint of law. We have no right to buy ships of belligerents after hostilities wherever those ships are sold for the purpose of evading or escaping the natural consequences of war. There is no more doubt about that than there is doubt about the first elementary definition of what constitutes murder in the statute of any State in the Union, but there might arise a question as to what constituted this evasion—whether sale of interned vessels did.

The Senator from New York says that the belligerent nations are not going to consent that they should not "swoop down upon their prey." That is very true; but a German ship interned in an American port within the 3-mile limit or within the port is not subject to become "the prey" of any belligerent power. What is the consequence of that? Great Britain, the chief maritime power, and France, her ally, if they have anything at heart next to whipping their enemy in this war, have at heart the destruction of the merchant marine of their enemies. Suppose that merchant marine is kept in our ports until the end of the war. What then becomes of it? Why, it goes right back to its German owners, does it not? Or suppose a French ship or a Russian ship is interned here. It would go right back to its French or Russian owners. Suppose in the meanwhile it is sold to us, especially when about a third, maybe, of its value has already been taken up in port and harbor and demurrage charges that must be paid at our ports.

It is not a mere question of law; it is a question of diplomacy as well. Knowing, as I think I do, the wisdom of the Government of Great Britain—and it has been a very wise Government, whatever else may be said of it during all the ages—it seems to me that if proper diplomatic efforts were used, both Great Britain and France would consent, and gladly consent, for us to purchase all the German merchant marine that exists on the earth. So it is not a question merely of law.

Mr. President, in connection with the assertions made by me with regard to freight rates, I wish to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a tabulation of letters written to the Secretary of Commerce and to the Secretary of the Treasury by shippers and merchants all over the United States, giving the amount that freight has risen. I do not want to read the whole tabulation, but I want to read a few things from it merely to justify what I have said before.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator a question before he leaves the subject of the purchase of ships that might be interned in American ports. I want to say to the Senator that that is one thing that, to me, has been a very serious proposition. I believe that it is one of the serious things to be considered, and I am asking the question not in an unfriendly spirit. Does the Senator believe that any of the belligerent nations would consider it to their advantage if some interned ship of their enemy were sold to the corporation to be created by the pending bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have just dwelt upon that a little. If I were an Englishman and sat in the English cabinet—and you can only judge what other people think by what you would think if you were in their place—I should be very glad to see the entire German merchant marine transferred to American citizens; and if I were a German I would be very glad to see the entire British merchant marine transferred to American citizens, provided only they were transferred when they were interned and could not be captured and when, under these circumstances, at the end of the war they would, if not sold, go back to their original owners. Of course, that does not involve their sale on the high seas, where they might be captured.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, it would involve, as I look at it, the question as to whether they would be captured or not. Of course, they might engage in carrying contraband, when they would be subject, like any other ship, to capture; but I am not speaking of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not, either.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to take it on this ground alone, whether the Senator thinks the interned ships, if purchased by Americans, if they went out on the sea would not be captured by the enemy of the country under whose flag they had formerly sailed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. Preisdent, in answer to the Senator's question, just what Washington and Jefferson did to maintain neutrality during the French Republic and Napoleonic eras Wilson and Bryan are doing to maintain neutrality now, and I have no idea that this administration and this corporation acting under its tutelage would be stupid or foolish enough to buy a single interned ship of a single belligerent without previously by diplomacy settling the question that the other belligerent would not object.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if that is the Senator's idea, would the Senator favor an amendment to the bill that would practically put that statement in the act?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no use in it. I would not favor an amendment to the bill saying that we should not buy the ships of any belligerent, because I think by diplomatic procedure we can buy them without any probability of trouble.

Now, let me say another thing while we are upon that subject. So far from endangering our neutrality, this passage of this bill is going to help to maintain it. Now, why? Because it is unthinkable that this corporation will ever carry any contraband, and there will be a certificate, under section 12 of the act, stating just exactly what is loaded upon the ship, and her cargo will not be concealed with that certificate carried by the captain.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that; but that is not my question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The sole reason why our commerce has been bothered so much lately is because some ships will try to carry contraband, and some of them will, even worse, try to carry contraband concealed. It is unthinkable that this corporation, with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury a part of it and largely controlling it, would permit anything of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator on that point; but I do not think that has anything to do with the question I propounded. Now, I wish to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I answered the other question. I do not think we are going to buy them unless it is agreeable.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand. If it is the theory of this legislation, however, that we believe our Government should not buy unless it is agreeable to the other belligerents, it seems to me the way to make it safe is to put it in the law itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I should think not, because——

Mr. NORRIS. But there might be a difference of opinion on that point. Now, I wish to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me tell the Senator why I think not—because if you set two people to trading—and diplomacy is international trading—and if in advance you tell one party just how far he can go, there is not much room for him to trade in.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true; but the Senator announces publicly that in his judgment they would not under any circumstances do it unless it was agreeable to the other party. I do not see any difference between having that understanding, if that is to be known, and putting it in the law itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a very plain difference between expressing my opinion here and putting it in the law and saying to all those countries that unless they consent this can not be done.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator himself says he believes it would be true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think it necessary to consult all the belligerents. Of course, in theory, they would all be concerned, but the Senator knows that in practice the only ships involved here are the German ships that are interned.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If Great Britain and France do not object, we can purchase them, and there will be no trouble. Germany could not object.

Mr. NORRIS. Germany could not object. Now, I want to ask the Senator another question. Suppose this bill is passed, and an interned ship is purchased without getting the consent of the other belligerents. Is it not true, as a matter of international law, that that ship is subject to seizure?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Absolutely; and the seizure itself is subject again to a hearing in a prize court.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or, if there is a question between the two countries that exceeds that in importance, to the decision of an arbitration commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Still, if any arbitration should come out of it, the arbitration commission probably would not pass on it until after the war was over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. NORRIS. That would come later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is very true. Now, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to proceed.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to get the Senator's idea of the legal question involved here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have given that.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator says the matter would go to a prize court.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, in a prize court the very legal question itself would be involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That and the construction.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. In the prize court would not the fact that the ship was interned and the fact that it was purchased after hostilities began be conclusive in favor of the right to seize the ship?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it would not.

Mr. NORRIS. Would it not always follow?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will read to the Senator the exact language of the law:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved—

Now, that is, of course, proved by the owner. The burden of proof is upon him.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS (reading)—

Unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

The interesting question arises right there, when a vessel which is interned, and therefore not liable to capture as long as it remains interned, is sold by its owner, a citizen of a belligerent country, to a corporation or citizen of a neutral country, whether it can be said that is was sold to evade the consequences of capture, because, per contra, it was not liable to capture as long as it lay interned. To give my opinion on that interesting question, if I were a part of the court, I would decide that whether it was interned or not they had to prove more than the fact that it was interned in order to escape this declaration that that transfer was void.

Now, it goes on:

There, however, is an absolute presumption that a transfer is void in these following three cases:

(1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port.

That is self-evident.

(2) If a right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor.

That is self-evident. Of course that would not be in good faith.

(3) If the requirements of the municipal law governing the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled.

Those are the exceptions, and that is the law.

Mr. NORRIS. Those are not the exceptions. Those are the cases where there would not be any proof admitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are the exceptions to the right and scope of rebuttal. Now, then, to go ahead, in further reply to the question of the Senator: These vessels are the vessels of a corporation. There is no intent, nor could there possibly be any effect, of withdrawing them in part or in whole from the operation of every principle of international law. They will be just as much subject to condemnation and seizure, and to the same extent subject to it, as a vessel owned by the Senator from Nebraska sailing the high seas or a vessel owned by a corporation doing business from New Orleans to Liverpool. No question of sovereignty of the United States is involved in it to the slightest extent.

In the bill which I introduced I made the United States buy the ships; and I expressed in the bill, first, the pledge of the United States that they would not carry contraband of war, and, secondly, a declaration that the United States would "regard it as an unfriendly act" for any nation to touch one of them. This is wiser legislation, and better in every sense than that proposed by my bill. The very reason why this is a corporation is to escape that very difficulty, which, I frankly confess, I myself at first did not guard against.

When the Senator asks me whether or not these ships would be subject to seizure, of course my reply is that it depends upon what they are doing. If they are doing anything that would subject any other ship to seizure, they will be subject to seizure, and they will have exactly the same right of appeal to a prize court or to arbitration that any other ship would have.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I should like to ask the Senator if he can give an instance where one of these ships, interned during the war so far, could be sold by its owner with any other object in view than to avoid seizure. The fact that it is interned and that the owner does not take his ship out on the high seas is the best evidence in the world, although it may not be conclusive, that he is afraid of seizure. That is especially true when there is such a demand for ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have already given the Senator my opinion for what little it is worth.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted the Senator to give me a case, if he could. I am not saying that he could not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have already given the Senator my opinion to the best of my ability, which is that if the question were put before me as a judge as to whether the fact that a vessel was interned relieved it from the exemption, I would rule that it did not.

Mr. NORRIS. I think any of us would.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because, although it could not be seized in a port or within the 3-mile limit, the motive underlying the sale in the mind of the vendor would be to get the use of his ship.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And he could not get the use of his ship on the high seas without the danger of capture. I have stated that twice.

Mr. NORRIS. He has interned his ship with the very object of escaping capture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know. I have stated that twice.

Mr. NORRIS. If this bill were passed, and the Senator were in charge of this corporation, and he had the buying of ships by virtue of this law, would he feel that he was justified in buying one of these interned ships without getting in advance the consent of the other belligerents?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not.

Mr. NORRIS. That answers it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In justice to myself, not to be dogmatic about it, I will say that my opinion is worth no more than that of any other lawyer of equal ability, and the opinion of the Solicitor for the State Department seems to be to the contrary; but, as the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] showed this morning, I think the solicitor did not have before him a part of these transactions, and I have thought that all the time. But, Mr. President, I have been drawn away from the point somewhat——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one thing further, please. There is one other point I desire to make, and then I will submit to another interrogation.

The Senator from New York said this morning that where the Government owned stock in a corporation a foreign country would hold that corporation to be the Government. That not only is not justified by the history of the world, but it is denied by it. For example, when the Germans took Paris in the war of 1870-71, they had at their disposal the entire assets of the Bank of France, in which the French Government had more stock and more interest than anybody else in the world; and yet even Bismarck, the very apostle of the doctrine that "might makes right," the man who went further than almost any man ever did in identifying national assets with a government and seizing them when he could, held that the German Government had no right to seize the assets of the Bank of France, and the German Government did not do it, and it was put distinctly upon the ground that it was a private corporation, although the president and the principal officers of the Bank of France were the appointees of the French Government.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator a question in connection with his discussion of article 56 of the Declaration of London, which reads as follows. The Senator has already read it, but I read it again in order to point my question:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

If I understand the Senator correctly, he interprets that as though the only consequence to which such a vessel would be exposed would be that of capture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the Senator misunderstood me. I considered that consequence as sufficient in answering the question. Of course, there are other consequences as well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then the Senator concedes what would seem to be the obvious construction of the language, that such a vessel may be exposed to a variety of consequences?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One of which is the consequence of being interned itself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Exactly. That is what I was going to ask the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the very reason why, if it were left to my judgment, I would hold that the fact that the ship was interned had nothing to do with it; that it was, notwithstanding that fact, being sold to evade the consequences of being an enemy ship; but better lawyers than I hold to the contrary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, I will ask the Senator whether, if a vessel is interned in one of our ports, one of the consequences avoided by the sale of that vessel would not be that of having the vessel remain idle in the port, or of going out and being subject to capture?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I say. One of the consequences would be its being interned itself; and of course it follows from that that being interned it can not be earning anything while it is lying idle at the port.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, the transfer of such a vessel, according to the Senator's own view, if I understand it, the mere transfer of such a vessel which has been interned——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have answered the question which the Senator put to me. Of course I do not think the Senator is asking me the question merely to make me keep the floor, but I have answered that question several times.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I am not doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi further yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What I wanted to know—and I am asking the question in perfect good faith—is whether or not it is the view of the Senator, under this language of article 56, that if a vessel belonging to a citizen of a belligerent country is interned, the transfer of that vessel under such circumstances would be in itself a void transfer under the language of article 56?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be if the prize court held that such a transfer of an interned vessel of itself constituted "a transfer" for the purpose of "evading the consequences" which would naturally come to it as a vessel of a belligerent country. I have said that if I were on this court and were called upon to decide the question I would hold in the affirmative.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the senior Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask just one question before the Senator yields the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have some things here I want to read, and then I want to insert something. Now the Senator can go ahead.

Mr. SMOOT. I was just going to ask a question as to a statement that I understood the Senator to make, namely, that in the war of 1870 the deposits of the Bank of France were held not to be the property of France itself, because it was a corporation. Did I understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not only the deposits, but all of its assets.

Mr. SMOOT. As I remember, it was held that the deposits did not belong to France; that they belonged to the depositors, and therefore France was not to be held for those deposits. I never heard it stated before, nor did I understand, that it was so held because of the fact that it was a corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it was held to be a private and not a public concern because it was a corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. That was not what I understood.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Bank of the United States, in which the Federal Government had a very large share of the stock—I have forgotten how much now—was held to be subject to the private corporation laws of the country.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate in reading the statements about freight rates, to which I referred a moment ago, to justify or to prove the statements I made. I did intend to read a few of them, but I have been detained upon the floor so long by questions that I shall ask to include them as a part of my remarks.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES. I rise simply in response to the request of the Senator. I think that information ought to be given to us here in the Senate, and I object to printing it in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I find here a letter from the Garcia & Maggini Co., general commission merchants, San Francisco, Cal., in which they say:

To a great extent these goods have been in New York for a long time, for the reason that our forwarding agents, Messrs. C. B. Richards & Co., could not get any space.

Besides, freight rates have advanced over 300 per cent since the war broke out, and lately, and within 15 days, freights have advanced fully 100 per cent.

This is dated January 5.

I have a letter from William Haas & Sons, who manufacture shovel handles. These other people dealt in dried fruits. William Haas & Sons, manufacturers of shovel handles, say:

For years our entire output has been disposed of abroad, but owing to the present prohibitive tariff in ocean transportation we are unable to deliver our goods; consequently our plant will remain closed down until such rates are established as will enable us to market our goods.

Charles E. Moore, president of the Leaf Tobacco Association, of Baltimore, in a letter of December 28, says:

Some of our exporting members shipping to Holland points have signed contracts with this company, expiring December 31, 1914, for a rate of $3.50 per hogshead of tobacco. This contract has been disregarded entirely, and the rate increased, first, to $5.25; then to $6.85; and to-day a notice that it will be $7.50 until further notice. This, I repeat, in the face of the written contract for $3.50 per hogshead.

Here is a letter from Gano, Moore & Co., who deal in coal, coke, iron, steel, and ores. They say:

The shortage of vessels is so serious now that it is practically stopping the exportation of coal. We have several orders for coal, principally to South American ports, and it is impossible to secure vessels.

Then the Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., of New York, say:

Before the month of July, 1914, shipments of Portland cement to the Argentine Republic and Uruguay were possible at $2.45 per ton; to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, $3.60 per ton. These rates were advanced the early part of August 50 per cent, were subsequently reduced so that the advance was equivalent to 25 per cent for the July rates, and these rates have advanced since the latter part of September until now they are $6 per ton to Rio by some lines and $8.50 per ton by other lines; $6 per ton to the Argentine Republic. And notwithstanding these high rates, there is no possibility of obtaining ships, transportation, or accommodation for our product. * * *

Now, remember, this is in the South American trade. There are no mines, no anything else, no question of contraband that can arise at all—no war risk of any description.

Then here is the American Tripoli Co., manufacturers of Tripoli flour. They say:

We have an offer of some orders from Barcelona, Spain, and the first two of the attached letters refer to our efforts to get quoted us a rate from New Orleans to Barcelona; and you will see that the steamship company operating steamers to Barcelona refuse to quote rates at all. In the first letter, the reason given was that other commodities which permit of a higher rate are being carried, so that our material, which must have a lower rate, is not at all desirable, and they even refuse to quote rates at all.

That is on a line between New Orleans and Barcelona, away south of the theater of war. That is the route traveled by those ships.

Here is one from W. B. Cooper & Co., cotton merchants:

Please allow us to indorse the action of the administration in trying to secure boats for the movement of American products.

We are frank to say that as a general proposition we are not anxious to see the United States Government get into too many lines of business, but when 3 cents per pound or more is to be paid freight on cotton across the water against 35 cents per 100 pounds six months ago, it is time something should be done, in our opinion.

Three cents per pound is $15 per bale; 35 cents per hundred pounds, the old rate, is $1.75 per bale. This new rate is $15 per bale, and this is not to a German port but to British ports; Great Britain has control of the sea, and there is no danger of capture.

Then, here is one from Frank F. Fee, president of the Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., in which he says:

It is now a serious menace to our business by reason of our inability to get reasonable and in some cases our inability to get any ocean rates on our production of hardwood lumber. We usually ship through the

port of New Orleans to British and continental ports. The writer has been to New Orleans personally and is informed by the steamship agents that they are receiving a tonnage of cotton and wheat and other commodities for the belligerents at such high rates and at such easier loading and unloading that they make tremendous profits for their vessels, and they do not want to take lumber tonnage—

That ought to interest the Senator from Washington, who comes from a lumber State—

We can say that we have before us inquiries for many carloads of lumber which could be shipped immediately, provided reasonable rates could be had. * * * Further, one of the steamship agent's commission for a single month was $25,000.

That is the agent's commission. That shows you what money they are making.

Here is one from M. B. Nelson, general sales manager of the Long-Bell Lumber Co.:

I inclose a quotation from ship brokers issued under date of December 26, showing rates have advanced more than 300 per cent.

Here is one from a provision and packing company:

We are exporters of provisions, etc., to Hamburg, Germany; Rotterdam, Holland; London and Liverpool, England.

Now, mind you—

Early in 1914 we signed contracts covering rates on export freight to London and Liverpool via Atlantic Transport Line and White Star Line from New York, with J. D. Roth, general western freight agent of the above-named lines, in which we are named ocean rate of 20.5 per cent per gross ton. These rates have been raised 10 per cent per gross ton since the beginning of the war.

That is with regard to shipments to Liverpool and London—no German cruisers at sea; no mines on that route.

The Chattanooga Wheelbarrow Co. writes to the same effect.

H. F. Heilman, treasurer of the Levi Smith Co. [Ltd.], lubricating-oil manufacturers at Clarendon, Pa., writes as follows:

Our export business with foreign countries has been quite heavy in past years, and Rotterdam was one of our principal ports and generally made contracts with the Holland-American Line at Baltimore to cover all our shipments to this port during the year. When our contract expired in 1913, we did not think it wise to renew the same at the then high rates, and held back, preferring to ship on the open market; but in March the Holland-American Line insisted on us closing a contract for the year 1914 or else pay the highest open-market rate, making a difference of about 4 cents per hundredweight at that time, and with great reluctance we finally consented to cover our shipments to this port by another contract for the year. * * * Also, inclosed copy herewith of their letter to us dated November 4, notifying us of disregarding that contract and asking an advance of 50 per cent. * * * This contract rate was 22 cents per hundredweight for the year, whereas their latest advice (a few days ago) the rate had advanced for shipments of this commodity to Rotterdam to 70 cents per hundredweight, which is simply outrageous.

Here is one from Brown & Adams, wool commission merchants. They say that the increase has been 150 per cent.

Here is one from Ike Manheimer, engaged in dealing in green and dried apples. He says that they are having much trouble in securing space at all, and that the freight on fresh apples in barrels is equal to the value of the apples.

Here is a letter from the American Vulcanized Fiber Co. That does not make any difference, because that enters into contraband business, I suppose.

Here is one about glue. There is the same complaint there.

Here is one from E. P. McBurney, vice president of the Empire Cotton Oil Co., in which he says that they are experiencing trouble in booking shipments and that inquiries develop that shipowners have restricted their vessels almost exclusively to cotton by charter or at very high rates, because they are getting $15 and $17 a bale. Hereafter you will see that where they ship to Germany they are getting $17.50, and $15 to Great Britain.

The Phoenix Iron & Steel Co., of Galveston, Tex., writes to the same effect.

Stengel & Rothschild, tanners and manufacturers of patent leather, make their shipments to Italy. They say:

We are experiencing considerable difficulties with shipments of our goods to Italy. The normal freight rate for patent leather in cases has been 50s. per ton, with possibly 5 per cent primage, but we have just been asked a rate of 120s. plus 5 per cent for the same class of freight.

That is nearly 150 per cent increase.

L. & E. Frenkel, importers of electrical specialties, write along the same lines.

J. D. Kremelberg & Co., of Baltimore, say that the freight rate on tobacco has been raised from $4 per hogshead to about $27, or nearly 3½ cents a pound, so that tobacco shipments have become out of the question.

R. M. Bryan, eastern manager of the Black Diamond, New York, N. Y., December 30, 1914:

This business—the coal industry—has been almost prostrated by the inability of shippers to secure vessels and upon terms that will permit them to make shipments.

McEwan Lumber Co., Azalea, N. C., December 29, 1914:

Would say that for our part the present rates are practically prohibitive, as they have advanced 10 cents and 15 cents per hundredweight, and in many cases even these rates are not protected except for immediate acceptance and subject to confirmation by steamship lines. * * * It is our information that the steamship companies are giving other tonnage carrying higher freight rates preference, and in some instances are limiting their boats to a certain small amount of lumber tonnage.

Another from Henry Lauts & Co., Baltimore, Md., December 29, 1914:

The present rates charged by this line—the Holland-American Line—are almost prohibitive, and are a decided menace to the tobacco export industry of this country.

V. F. Holmes, estate of Victor Holmes, deceased, exporter of zinc oxide, Boston, Mass., December 28, 1914:

Since the European-war situation developed this business has been very considerably hampered by a number of conditions, among them the scarcity of freight vessels, exceedingly high rates of exchange, and, what is more important, the freight outlook for 1915.

R. R. Dancy & Co. (cotton), Houston, Tex., December 26, 1914:

Last week brokers asked $17 per bale freight to Germany—Bremen. Now $14.

I said a moment ago it was $17.50, I believe; but I was mistaken, it was $17.

Here is a letter from Danforth Geer, president Walter A. Wood Mowing & Reaping Machine Co., Hoosick Falls, N. Y., January 9, 1915, containing a statement that it is very difficult to get tonnage at all, and expressing the hope that some measure may be enacted or some policy created which will relieve the present situation in time to affect their business interests this year.

Here is one from Meyer Hecht, a dealer in skins and hides in New York, who says:

I, too, want to protest that the steamship lines are charging me two or three times as much as formerly and then do not give me room for my shipments.

Dumee, Son & Co., cotton, Philadelphia, Pa., December 29, 1914:

We wish to enter strenuous protest against the prohibitive freight rates being charged by the trans-Atlantic lines on cotton and cotton linters to European ports. * * * One year ago we paid a rate of 45 cents and 50 cents per hundred pounds on compressed and uncompressed cotton linters, respectively, from New York to Rotterdam. To-day we are asked $2.50 and $3 per 100 pounds.

This is a very low quality of cotton, taken off the seed after the cotton is ginned on the plantation. It is taken off at the cotton-oil mill and is worth 2 to 4 cents a pound. Note the freight rate is 2½ to 3 cents a pound—almost fully the value of the product.

Gabriel Nachman, wool stock, New York, N. Y., December 28, 1914:

We are large shippers of woolen rags. * * * Steamship companies have advanced their freight rates from one-fourth cent per pound to $1.10 per hundred pounds, and even at that rate they refuse to take rags; therefore have not been able to ship any for export in over four weeks.

Here is one from C. Stallings & Co., Lynchburg, Va., tobacco exporters.

Here is another from A. P. Husband, secretary Millers' National Federation, Chicago, Ill.

There is attached a tabulated statement of ocean freight rates on flour published by the International Mercantile Marine from several American ports to London, Aberdeen, and Liverpool. You will note that it gives the general freight rates from the named American ports to ports in the United Kingdom—mind you not to Germany or Austria—advanced 100 per cent; not a German cruiser to capture it and not a mine to bother them.

Panama Railroad Co., January 15, 1915. A Government concern, which must have coal to defend the canal and to keep up construction and repair work.

Our stock of coal has been reduced from 90,000 to 40,000 tons, and both the Earn Line and our company are scouring the charter market in the effort to secure sufficient tonnage to carry to the Isthmus the amount of coal it is imperative we should keep there.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not seen the last draft of the bill—the third edition, I believe it is—but I read that the proposition is that an additional $10,000,000 may be issued, making $30,000,000 in all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was unlimited in the first draft. It is limited to $10,000,000 now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Inasmuch as there are hundreds and hundreds of steamships plying the Atlantic, does the Senator think that 25 or 30 steamships would very materially change the rates of transportation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I do; but, in addition to that answer, our bill would give many more than 30 ships. Freight ships do not cost a million and a quarter of dollars apiece.

Mr. GALLINGER. England has 12,000 cargo ships, I believe; so the number we propose is negligible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have known one tramp steamer that went into the ports of New Orleans and Savannah and lowered the rate of freight on cotton immediately.

Mr. GALLINGER. For the moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And then another thing: Do not forget, the shipowners, although in temporary combination, are pretty well frightened by the idea of the United States going into this sort of policy permanently. As far as I am concerned, I hope to heaven it never will; but they are afraid the United States will go into it, and they are going to reduce freight rates and try to prevent it and make the venture upon the part of the Government a losing venture, and, if they do make it a losing venture, then the people will profit by the Government's loss.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have noticed it is the opinion of a distinguished expert that to have ships enough to transport our products to foreign countries and bring back our imports it would take at least $600,000,000 to purchase the ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know about that. I have not looked into it satisfactorily, but I have looked into it far enough to be able to state, I think, that it will not take that much. But that has nothing to do with this measure. It would take a large amount of money in comparison with $40,000,000, but not that much. That was one of the statements made by interested parties hostile to this legislation, like a statement made on the same authority by a Senator here on the floor that there was a surplus of tonnage lying all around, from which he inferred that we did not need this legislation. But, Mr. President, I have quoted most of those freight rates, and I have here a summary of the most striking increases which I think would abbreviate the thing very much in the RECORD, and I shall now, if the Senate agrees, insert the summary instead of these items.

Mr. JONES. I would like very much to hear that. This has been very valuable information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is not going to hear it at this time. It is a mere matter whether the Senator desires it to go in the RECORD instead of the freight rates which I read, or whether he would rather the longer citation of items I have read should go into the RECORD.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to whatever the Senator has read going into the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not read the short one, too.

Mr. JONES. I object to anything being put into the RECORD without reading, because I do not have time to read the RECORD now, with what I have to do, and so I like to hear it on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the merits of the shipping bill. I am assembling some data and authorities upon which I mean to predicate and support some remarks I purpose to make on the bill at an early day. I arise now merely to correct a statement made more than once by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and which he repeated to-day, as to some remarks I made about forcing this bill so as to prevent a fair discussion of it, boasting that we had or thought we had votes enough to pass the bill. The statement as made by the Senator from New York was not in any sense warranted by anything I said, either by the text of what I said or by any construction of it that would not be strained and extremely remote from the facts.

Mr. President, there is not now and there has not been, so far as I know or believe, any purpose on the part of any Senator on this side to restrict a fair, sensible, and even ample discussion of the pending bill. I readily concede that a measure of this importance should be discussed until the attitudes of Senators who are for it and who are against it have been sufficiently made known. But, Mr. President, when we are confronted by a situation clearly showing an organized purpose on the part of Senators on the other side to go much further than is necessary in all reason to amply debate the measure and to carry on a studied course of obstruction under the guise of debate, with the ultimate view of defeating a vote, then I do not hesitate to say that Senators are abusing the privilege they are allowed for freedom of debate under the rules of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] read us, as he is accustomed to do, a lecture on absenteeism, inattention, lack of interest in the debate. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with what the Senator said in that behalf. I wish he could castigate Senators severely enough, particularly Senators on this side of the Chamber, to make them out of a sense of shame, if not of duty, remain here in the Chamber while the public business is being transacted, or at least remain within the immediate call of the Senate.

But I question, Mr. President, whether the Senator from New York would undertake the task of inducing Senators to stay here if he thought he could succeed. I doubt whether he would be delighted if he saw every Democratic Senator in his seat throughout each day, for if that were so less opportunity would be given to filibustering Senators on the other side to take advantage of their absence.

The Senator from New York has not honored his colleagues with his presence overmuch. He complains of the absence of Senators, but he does not set them a good example by being present. He teaches by precept, not by example. Scarcely had he closed his address this morning until he fled the Chamber. His beatific countenance has not beamed upon us since, and probably will not during the remaining tedious hours of this session. Where is he? I can not answer that question. It may be that he is enjoying a well-earned leisure, reflecting upon the honors he won here this morning by his great oratorical outburst. He may have left for New York. He may be now flying to the metropolis to hold discreet converse with some of his constituents, to devise new methods of embarrassing the progress of this legislation. I do not know where he is; perhaps his immediate whereabouts is not a matter of impressive importance.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] indulged in a like tirade a day or two ago, upbraiding Senators upon this side who did not sit here to listen to the addresses delivered by distinguished Senators such as Senators ROOT, WEEKS, and others he named. Since the 4th day of January the RECORD shows that numerous roll calls have been had.

Mr. REED. Fifty-five.

Mr. STONE. My colleague says 55. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] voted or was present 36 times and was absent or not voting 19 times. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] was present, as shown by these roll calls, 28 times and away 27 times. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] was present 27 times and away 28 times; and yet from these sources we hear complaints that we do not sit here to listen to these debates and participate by our presence in the current business of the Senate. That record, Mr. President, shows the utter emptiness and insincerity of these criticisms.

Mr. President, I now come directly to the matter to which I arose to address myself. It will take but a few moments to dispose of it. On the 4th day of January the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] said:

> Sir, there has been no discussion here since I have been in this body so imperative in its demands upon the Members of the Senate as the discussion of this bill. There has been no measure going so deep to the basis of our institutions as this bill. It comes here, sir, under circumstances which are repugnant. There was no hearing before the committee of the House on such a measure as we have before us. There was no hearing before the committee of the Senate. The demand for a hearing was refused, and the bill was reported speedily, peremptorily, with but slight opportunity for discussion; and now, sir, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], in advance, with some show of feeling, which I know was evanescent and which, I trust, does not even now continue, has stigmatized all discussion of this bill on the part of the minority as—what were the words?—"improper and unjustifiable."
>
> The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], with that kindliness and fairness which always characterize him, has told us that there was no disposition to interfere with the debate on this bill, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in advance gives notice to the country that the debate on this bill is to be regarded as obstructive, improper, and unjustifiable.

Now, let us see what foundation there is for that. Whatever of foundation there is for it is to be found in a colloquy in which I participated, recorded in the second column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 4, at page 906. This colloquy occurred just before the Senator from New York made the speech from which I have quoted. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] had the floor when the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] arose and asked recognition. I now quote the colloquy.

> Mr. GALLINGER. I yield the floor.
>
> Mr. JONES. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire something of which he is probably aware as indicating the character of argument and the means the other side intend to use to put this bill through. The majority leader of the Senate was quoted as having said immediately after the President's message with reference to this bill, "We have the votes to put it through."
>
> Mr. GALLINGER. I observed that, and I have had it whispered in an ear that always serves me well that, assuming they have the votes, they are going to resort to tactics which will be opposed as strenuously as possible, so far as a few of us are concerned, at least.
>
> Mr. STONE. Mr. President, we have the votes to put it through if ever we can get a chance to vote. Unless Senators on the other side adopt some plan or scheme of inexcusable and unpardonable obstruction we will get to a vote, and we have the votes to pass the bill.
>
> Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senators on this side should resort to the same tactics that the Senator's colleague resorted to on the immigration bill, would he think that that was very much to be condemned?
>
> Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not discussing what occurred on other bills or what individual Senators have done. It is rather an impertinent

question for the Senator to propound, and I think an improper one, to ask me to animadvert upon the conduct of any Senator, and particularly on that of my own colleague. I am speaking as to this bill. I am answering the statements made in the form of criticism by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is oversensitive.

Mr. STONE. No; I am not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has on more than one occasion, with a great deal of earnestness and with some acerbity, during the past few months charged this side of the Chamber with unduly and improperly obstructing legislation. Now, Mr. President, for one, I propose to be the judge of my own conduct in this matter, and I shall pursue such a course in the debate on this bill as I think the importance of the measure demands at my hands.

Now, what is there in any statement that I made—and I have read it all—that justifies the Senator from New York or any other Senator asserting and reasserting that I had stated "with some show of feeling" that "the discussion of this bill on the part of the minority would be improper and unjustifiable," or to justify the Senator in saying that I had declared in advance that debate on this bill is to be regarded as obstructive, improper, and unjustifiable? I said no such thing, and I had no such idea in mind when I made the declaration which the Senator misquoted and criticized.

I meant to say then, and I assert now, that I am in favor of full, fair, and free discussion; but when Senators conduct an organized, determined, and practically admitted filibuster to prevent a vote, then I do say that such so-called debate is unjustifiable and improper.

If this be treason, make the most of it.

Mr. President, if there be no particular reason to the contrary, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. STONE. I withhold the motion for a moment, in accordance with the wishes of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to make a few observations and a suggestion. I do not wish to unnecessarily delay the motion of the Senator from Missouri, but if I should not do what I have in mind now at this time probably it would be inopportune at some other time.

I want to call the attention not only of the Senate—and that is unnecessary—but I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that when the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] rose to address the Senate this morning, and during the entire time that he occupied the floor in addressing the Senate, he had the attention of a full house, both on this side of the Chamber and on the other side of the Chamber. I want to say that, as is known to the Members of the Senate, the Senator from New York never indulges in dilatory discussion; and whenever the Senator from New York or any other Senator on either side of the Chamber on this question or any other question rises here for the purpose of real, genuine, honest discussion he is very apt to get serious attention from both sides of the Chamber. Certainly nothing has developed in this debate that indicates that when a Senator is really discussing a question with the purpose of enlightening the Senate and not for the purpose of consuming time he has not had as good attention on this subject as he had ordinarily upon other questions.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I am trenching a little upon the purpose of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and I would rather not yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply rose to ask a question, and perhaps the Senator would like to correct his statement after I have asked it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Probably.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he believes the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] was discussing this question with any intention whatever of a filibuster?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Iowa had just as good attention in the discussion of this subject as he would have had if he had been discussing any other subject before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, is another question, Mr. President; but I wanted to say to the Senator——

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the proposition that I laid down—that nothing has occurred in connection with this debate that indicates that a Senator who is engaged in honest discussion will not get as good a hearing upon this question as he ordinarily gets upon any other question.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to say that the Senator from Iowa discussed this question for over a couple of hours, and for the greater part of that time there was not to exceed two Senators upon the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS. That does not militate at all against the proposition that I laid down. The suggestion of the Senator from New York was that this side of the Chamber had refused to give a hearing to discussion from the other side of the Chamber; that there was on this side of the Chamber an organized conspiracy of silence; and I am saying now only that when a Senator on the other side rises to discuss this question in the way of honest and fair debate he will get just as good and fair a hearing from this side on this question as he would on any other important question; but on this question or any other question that may come before the Senate, speaking out of my experience since I have been a Member of the Senate—and that has been for 14 years—when it is thoroughly understood in the Chamber that a Senator is speaking merely for the purpose of consuming time, for the purpose of obstructing legislation, Senators on both sides of the Chamber have generally retired to the cloakrooms.

Mr. President, we have had some speeches here from Senators after they had been advertised in the press of the country, after it had been proclaimed in a leading newspaper published in this city that we were to have speeches from certain Senators who had won a reputation for filibustering legislation to death. When those speeches were being made they did not have any greater audience on the other side or on this side than has heretofore been accorded men who it was known were engaged in the purpose and work of obstructing legislation.

The Senator from New York has complained of what he calls the "fiction of the legislative day." He has charged that it has been inaugurated for the purpose of forcing through this legislation by brute force. Why, Mr. President, this is not the first time the Senate has pursued that course of procedure. Repeatedly in recent years, both this side of the Chamber when it was responsible for legislation and the other side of the Chamber when it was responsible for legislation which for any reason it was sought to facilitate or which was threatened with defeat by obstructive tactics have, for the purpose of promoting legislation and securing a vote upon a measure, adopted this legislative-day fiction for the purpose of getting rid of the morning business and saving two hours daily in the discussion.

The Senator says we have adopted this fiction for the purpose of forcing through this legislation by brute force. I want to say to Senators on the other side of the Chamber that I could say with as much plausibility and with as much justification that the course which they are now pursuing has been adopted for the purpose of defeating this legislation by brute force.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to make a suggestion in connection with that, and I wish the Senator would let me do that, and then I will yield to him.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senators on the other side agree with the Senator from New York that we have a "conspiracy of silence" on this side of the Chamber, and that that conspiracy of silence grows out of the fact that we are unwilling to debate this question, to meet the arguments made upon the other side—if the Senator has that idea, and if, on the other hand, it is not the purpose of the Senators on that side of the Chamber to filibuster this measure to death, I have a proposition to make to them. It has been stated in the press that it is the deliberate purpose of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to debate this question until the 4th day of March rather than to permit a vote upon it. It has been stated in the press that you have held a caucus and that you have selected 25 Senators on that side who are to keep the floor, if necessary, until this measure is defeated, if it takes until the expiration of the session under the Constitution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a minute; let me make my proposition. If that is not the purpose of Senators, if it is not their purpose to filibuster this legislation to death, if Senators want honest debate on this side of the Chamber as well as on that side of the Chamber, I make this proposition to the Senator from New Hampshire, the leader of the other side, and I think it will be acquiesced in by my colleagues:

We will agree right now, if that side of the Chamber will consent, to a rule that this debate shall be continued for 10 calendar days; that the time of debate shall be divided equally between that side of the Chamber and this side of the Chamber, and that we will occupy our part of the time, if you will enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that at the end of that 10 days we may vote upon this measure. We have 7 hours of session each day under the plan we are operating upon.

That will amount to 70 hours of debate, or an hour apiece for 70 speeches or 2 hours apiece for 35 speeches. That ought to be enough for honest and fair and legitimate debate.

Will the Senator agree to that? Or is it the Senator's purpose and the purpose of his party to continue this debate, if it is necessary to prevent a vote, until the 4th day of March next?

Mr. GALLINGER. Before responding to that question I want to ask the Senator what reckless newspaper it was that said that the minority had held a caucus and had selected 25 Senators to make speeches?

Mr. SIMMONS. Probably I should have said that with reference to the first statement I made. If I said a newspaper published the other statement, probably I was mistaken. I have heard that around the Chamber.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the majority side of this Chamber has held caucuses day and night. The minority had a little conference, covering about half an hour on one day.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not objecting to your conference.

Mr. GALLINGER. And they made no such arrangement as the Senator suggests.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am glad to hear the Senator say they have not.

Mr. GALLINGER. They have not.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator answer me with equal frankness as to whether it is the purpose of himself and his colleagues to continue this debate until the 4th of March, if it is necessary, to prevent a vote upon this question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I hope the majority will see the propriety of taking up the great supply bills of the Government and passing them first.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator decline to answer that question?

Mr. GALLINGER. No, Mr. President; I never decline to answer questions. I will say to the Senator that I have not occupied any time in this debate. I propose to occupy such time as I think is proper. I shall discuss the question of Government ownership. I shall discuss the question of the merchant marine. I shall discuss the new question that has been projected into this debate by the majority side of invading the domestic commerce of the United States with these foreign ships—a matter that we voted against 2 to 1 at the last session of Congress. I shall discuss those questions in my own time and in my own way and take as much time as I think is proper to present them adequately. I do not speak for any other man on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall hear the Senator with great pleasure, and as I think probably he will indulge only in honest discussion, I think he will have a pretty good audience; but that does not answer the question I asked.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not expect an audience; and now, in answer to the Senator's question, I shall object to closing this debate in 10 days.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean by that that it is the purpose of his side of the Chamber to continue this discussion until the 4th of March, if it is necessary, to prevent a vote on this measure?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not say that, because I do not know it to be the purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator think that is the purpose? Has not the Senator reason to believe that that purpose has been agreed upon?

Mr. GALLINGER. I know that it has not been agreed upon.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has not the Senator reason to believe that that is the fixed purpose of that side of the Chamber?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not a mind reader, and I am not going to judge what my colleagues think about it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator evidently does not desire to answer that question.

Mr. President, I think nobody in the country seriously doubts that it is the purpose of the other side to continue this discussion until the 4th of March if that is necessary to prevent a vote. In those conditions, Mr. President, I hope and I trust that this side of the Chamber will not aid them in that filibuster. If they think 10 days is not enough, then I think we will enlarge that and make it 15 days. If they will agree to that, Mr. President, then we will join in the discussion with them; but as long as the discussion is for the purpose of filibustering this legislation to death, and nothing else, we are not going to help them any further than is necessary in order to put our side of this controversy before the country.

Now, Mr. President, one other matter. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] sought to create the impression that this legislation was for the purpose of enabling the Government to buy these belligerent vessels that are interned in our waters; and in order to support that argument he made the point that contemporaneously, either immediately before or immediately after the introduction of this bill, there was presented to the Senate of the United States a written opinion of the Solicitor for the State Department, Mr. Cone Johnson; that these two documents, so far as concerned ascertaining the purpose of the Senate committee with reference to confining these purchases to interned vessels, were to be read together and the Cone Johnson document taken as a part of the res gestae.

Mr. President, I have taken the pains to look up that matter. I find, as a matter of fact, that this opinion of Mr. Cone Johnson was prepared on the 7th day of August. On the 11th day of August, while we had up for consideration in the Senate what is known as the ship-registry bill, in connection with which a discussion of these questions had been had in the Senate, I presented to the Senate this opinion of Mr. Cone Johnson and had it read into the RECORD. The bill that the Senate now has under consideration was not introduced in the House until the 4th day of September, or nearly a month after Mr. Johnson's opinion was presented to the Senate, and was not introduced in this Chamber until the 9th day of December, as I now recall; so that the two have no relation whatsoever.

Mr. President, the opinion of Mr. Cone Johnson has been assailed. I am not undertaking to say that Mr. Cone Johnson has interpreted the law with absolute accuracy, but I do mean to say, upon the point raised by the Senator from New York, that Mr. Cone Johnson's opinion was only to the point that the London conference had simply changed the former rule so as to throw the burden of proof upon the purchaser in certain cases, whereas theretofore it had been upon the captor. In certain conditions under the old law there was a presumption in favor of the purchaser, but it was a rebuttable presumption. The burden was upon the captor to rebut that presumption. The London conference changed it so as to make it a presumption against the purchaser in certain cases, but only a presumption, and the only change in the rule was that the burden of rebutting the presumption was thrown upon the purchaser instead of upon the captor, as theretofore.

Mr. President, it is attempted in the discussion to-day to get away from the real merits of this controversy, by trying to focus the minds of the Senate and of the country upon the idea that we are seeking to buy interned ships; that the purpose of the Government in presenting this legislation is to get these ships, because possibly they can be purchased at this time at a low price, and that that is the main moving purpose with reference to this legislation.

I wholly repudiate that suggestion. We are not limited to interned ships. We may build ships. We may buy ships from others than the Germans or the Austrians. I think I can say, and I think I can say it truthfully, and I think the country will bear me out in the statement, that when the Senator from New York says that the effect of this legislation will be, not to buy ships, but to buy a quarrel, he impugns the high standards as a friend of peace—peace upon this continent and peace throughout the world—of the man who sits in the White House, and who will have control of this business. He has not received any Nobel prizes as a friend of peace, but his record during the last few months, his record since trouble broke out across the border to the south of us, his record since the Old World was engulfed in war, has been a record of peace, a record of conciliation, the record of a man who so longed to see his countrymen and his country at peace with the world that he would submit to what possibly others not so inclined toward peace would not have submitted to. I am sure no man who is familiar with this man's record, no man who appreciates his purpose and his efforts in behalf of peace, will impute to him any purpose to secure or desire to secure legislation that might result in the purchase of a quarrel. No one will impute to him the purpose, if he has the power to prevent it—and he has the power, under this bill—to do anything in the execution of the powers conferred upon him by this measure that in his judgment would result in embroiling us in war with another country.

No, Mr. President! I join the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the statement—and the country will believe that statement, because they know who Woodrow Wilson is, because they know his record and his history and his feelings upon this subject—that if this legislation passes, none of those interned vessels will be purchased until it has been first ascertained, in the proper way and through the proper channels, that the purchase of the vessel will not lead to war or to entanglements out of which war might be evolved.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] was rather unfortunate and ungenerous, too, in his charge of absenteeism upon the part

of the Democratic side of the Senate during the discussions of this ship-building bill.

It has been my honor and privilege on a number of occasions, through the graciousness and courtesy of the Vice President, to occupy the Presiding Officer's chair. I will say that I have been quite assiduous in my attendance upon the sessions of the Senate, and I think that will be agreed to by the Senators on the other side, and I believe justly by the Senator from New York. It has been my habit, I will say, while I was occupying that chair, sometimes to jot down various thoughts on various subjects; and this happened on January 20, 1915, during the discussion of the ship-building bill:

Senator BURTON now speaking on the ship-building bill. At this time, 1.45 p. m., there are in the Chamber two Republican Senators and five Democrats. BURTON has now spoken over 3 hours to-day. Yesterday he spoke 6. He seems as fresh as when he started.

[Laughter.]

So, I say to my Republican friends, the archives—the records—will deny your statement. The facts are that the Democrats have been in attendance quite as assiduously as have the Republicans during this debate. I have felt sometimes that the discussion was worthy of a little more liberal attendance, but we were thankful for what we got.

I want to say for myself at this time that I have no particular desire to air my views on this question again, but I hail a ship-building bill with the greatest delight. I have been an advocate of Government transportation for many years of my life, and I hail with delight this opportunity to vote for a ship-building bill. There were many features in the bill originally that I did not like. Thank heaven, they have been eliminated. One of them was the feature that we were to blaze the way and finally transfer these ships to some private corporation. Then, too, I wish, instead of the shipping board, the Government might deal directly with this controversy and buy ships or build ships and run them or sell them.

The Senator from New York this morning made some reference to the matter of profit. It is a horrible thought that the only way to bring a matter home to the Government is through dollar bills and coin. To me it is repulsive. I can not imagine a system whereby the Government should go in it to make money out of the people. I would that the blessings of the Government through transportation as well as in many other channels might be handled by the Government. I believe it would be to the advantage and to the well-being of our whole land.

I believe that this bill is a popular measure and one much needed at this particular time, and I might hope that we may so intrench and establish ourselves that the thought of ever eliminating this from the matters of Government may be in the vague and distant future. I shall vote for this bill with a great deal of relish, hoping that some day the shipping-board feature of it may be eliminated. My friends, I say to you, Republicans and Democrats, this will be one of the most popular measures that has ever been placed on the statute books and future generations will rise up and bless you for this beneficent piece of legislation.

While I am on my feet I will say that I have in my hand an address delivered by Mr. George W. Norris in Philadelphia, December 29, 1914, touching this question, that to me is unanswerable, and I ask without reading that I may have the privilege of presenting it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. JONES. Is it an address by our colleague from Nebraska?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is not.

Mr. NORRIS. I have just come into the Chamber, and I understood the Senator from Washington to ask a question.

Mr. JONES. I merely wanted to know whether the address referred to by the Senator from New Jersey was delivered by the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is by another gentleman named Norris.

Mr. JONES. Then I object.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I would be proud if it had been delivered by the senior Senator from Nebraska, but when the time comes and he may have had an opportunity to express himself as the gentleman from Philadelphia did express himself I trust and hope he will do it in more potent terms and make a more indelible impression by voting for the measure.

Mr. JONES. I would be glad to hear the address read, but I do object to having it printed without reading.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. All right; let it go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I believe, desires to proceed. I inquire of him whether he would prefer to begin to-morrow morning? I believe there is some executive business that is quite important, and it can be attended to this evening. If the Senator would like, we can postpone hearing him until to-morrow morning.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is quite agreeable to me to have the executive business transacted. I think it is as important.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say further that it is my purpose to ask this evening that we adjourn to allow a reasonable time to-morrow morning for morning business. I want to go on with this bill just as fast as we can, and unless there is too much time being consumed I probably will not ask to have the Senate take up the bill at once, but will allow some reasonable time for morning business to-morrow morning before making that motion.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I suppose if we adjourn the regular business hour will occur?

Mr. FLETCHER. I know, but it would be in order for me to move to take up the bill before the expiration of the morning hour.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Surely.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it important to do so with a view of facilitating the public business and accommodating the Senator from New Hampshire.

DISTRICT EXCISE BOARD.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, in the discussion of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, on page 1700 of the RECORD of January 16, this occurred:

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission, I will ask if the President did not appoint two members of that board, and when their characters were called to his attention were the names not withdrawn?

Mr. JONES. He did so very promptly, and I wish he had withdrawn the others. I should say that one of the names was withdrawn not because of the character of the appointee, but because he had been a most open and determined opponent of the law.

That refers, of course, to the members of the excise board. I do not want any injustice done to anyone, and while I would rather not by giving the name of one of the parties, thereby possibly reflect to a certain extent upon the others, I do feel that in justice to one of the gentlemen against whom no charges as to his character were made that his name should be put in the RECORD so as to make that fact clear. The one against whose character no charges were made was Mr. John B. Colpoys.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Mr. SISSON, and Mr. DAVIS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19076) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. ROBERT G. BREMNER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 6121. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara and State of New York; and

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on the upper White River above Batesville, Ark., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles and Fresno, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for an investigation by the United States Reclamation Service of the irrigation project of the Victor Malley Mutual Water & Power Co., which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of Solano County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented resolutions adopted at the Thirty-fourth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, in Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the boiler-inspection laws, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Burns, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the President to levy an embargo on exports of war materials, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Canada, Garden City, Gaylord, Hoxie, White City, Logan, Herington, Stuttgart, Russell, Deerfield, Herkimer, Kansas City, Inman, Lincolnville, Alma, Clay Center, Bremen, Barnes, Hanover, Waterville, Linsborg, Seguin, Linn, Arkansas City, Garden Plain, and Cheney, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baldwin, Webster, and Webber, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor in the Philippine Islands, which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Topeka, and Newton, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Galena, Kans., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 5818) granting a pension to William H. Hayes, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of the Typographical Union of Richmond, the Typographical Union of Elkhart, and the Central Labor Union of Elkhart, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in convict-made goods, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of O. B. Sandifer, G. T. Werner, Lee N. Fanning, and sundry other citizens of North Manchester, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of a proposed amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill relative to the transmission of obscene matter through the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, the South Side Chapel of the Evangelical Church, the Standard Bearers of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, the Young People's Association of the South Side Evangelical Church, the Young Woman's Christian Association, the Riverside Christian Church, the Riverside Club, the Thursday Club, the Woman's Franchise League, the Woman's Missionary Society of the First Evangelical Church, and the Missionary Society of the First Congregational Church, all of Elkhart, in the State of Indiana, praying for Federal censorship of motion-picture films, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 7363) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Mahar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7364) granting an increase of pension to Katherine R. Doolittle;

A bill (S. 7365) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O. Oliver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7366) granting an increase of pension to James A. Snodgrass (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7367) granting an increase of pension to Zeruah A. Newell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Rogers (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Morgan W. Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE):

A bill (S. 7370) granting an increase of pension to Henry Vanderpool (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7371) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Kirk (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7372) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Simmons (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7373) granting a pension to John W. Detwiler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7374) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Fisher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7375) granting an increase of pension to Philena Harmer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7376) granting a pension to Elmer Harry Martin;

A bill (S. 7377) granting a pension to Mary Weber;

A bill (S. 7378) granting a pension to Uain A. Bigler;

A bill (S. 7379) granting a pension to Harry L. Wilson;

A bill (S. 7380) granting an increase of pension to Catherine M. Peck;

A bill (S. 7381) granting a pension to George W. Shearer;

A bill (S. 7382) granting a pension to John Williams;

A bill (S. 7383) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Johnstonbaugh;

A bill (S. 7384) granting an increase of pension to George Weidner;

A bill (S. 7385) granting an increase of pension to George Miller;

A bill (S. 7386) granting a pension to Martha J. Miller;

A bill (S. 7387) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Means;

A bill (S. 7388) granting an increase of pension to Martin O'Laughlin;

A bill (S. 7389) granting a pension to G. M. Richart;

A bill (S. 7390) granting a pension to Elizabeth Reese;

A bill (S. 7391) granting a pension to Frank E. Lawrence;

A bill (S. 7392) granting a pension to Caroline E. Pahl;

A bill (S. 7393) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Farnham;

A bill (S. 7394) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rauch;

A bill (S. 7395) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Carson;

A bill (S. 7396) granting an increase of pension to M. P. Holter; and

A bill (S. 7397) granting a pension to Alice J. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7398) granting an increase of pension to William H. Terwilliger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7399) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Zeimer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 7400) granting a pension to William Manley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 7401) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $45,000 for the extension, enlargement, and construction

of the Le Clair and Riverton ditches for the irrigation of Indian allotments on the north side of the Big Wind River, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 20347. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., Monday, January 25, 1915) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 15), 1915.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frank P. Wheeler, of Blue Lake, Cal., to be register of the land office at Eureka, Cal., vice David J. Girard, whose term will expire February 7, 1915.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Robert Emmett Jeffery, of Newport, Ark., to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay, vice John L. de Saulles, declined.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

C. L. Cleveland to be postmaster at Centerville, Ala., in place of Nelson C. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

ARKANSAS.

M. E. Sherland to be postmaster at McGehee, Ark., in place of M. A. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

CALIFORNIA.

Fred M. Kelly to be postmaster at Needles, Cal., in place of Fred M. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

COLORADO.

Robert E. Norvell to be postmaster at Hayden, Colo., in place of Clayton Whiteman. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Sarah J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Georgetown, Colo., in place of H. T. Hamill. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

CONNECTICUT.

Edward M. O'Brien to be postmaster at Waterbury, Conn., in place of James M. Pilling. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1915.

DELAWARE.

Edwin V. Ocheltree to be postmaster at Greenwood, Del. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

J. Frank Starling to be postmaster at Dover, Del., in place of James A. Hirons. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

FLORIDA.

Thomas E. Blackburn to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

James F. McKinstry to be postmaster at Gainesville, Fla., in place of Louis C. Lynch. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

GEORGIA.

Albert S. J. McRae to be postmaster at McRae, Ga., in place of Albert S. J. McRae. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

IDAHO.

Emily B. Davis to be postmaster at Milner, Idaho, in place of E. C. Davis, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

W. B. Barnum to be postmaster at Ridgway, Ill., in place of Robert J. Hemphill. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Fred Beehn, sr., to be postmaster at West Salem, Ill., in place of G. C. Walser. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

Hazel L. Garvey to be postmaster at Blandinsville, Ill., in place of Charles L. Blandin. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

Solomon H. Handy to be postmaster at Marshall, Ill., in place of Edith Cole. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1915.

Helen G. Longenbaugh to be postmaster at Moweaqua, Ill., in place of J. E. Longenbaugh, deceased.

J. C. Neal to be postmaster at Neoga, Ill., in place of Edmund E. Dow. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1915.

INDIANA.

John A. Cody to be postmaster at New Albany, Ind., in place of M. Bert Thurman. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Theodore Hoss to be postmaster at Fowler, Ind., in place of Charles E. Hampton, resigned.

Henry E. Snyder to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ind., in place of Eli T. Steckel. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

J. Bruce Pessell to be postmaster at Butler, Ind., in place of Thomas Rudd. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

Lewis Phillippe to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of William V. Barr. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Charles Van Arsdall to be postmaster at Hymera, Ind., in place of Cary J. McAnally. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

IOWA.

Cary C. Beggs to be postmaster at Moulton, Iowa, in place of Charles M. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1914.

Charles A. Britch to be postmaster at Ida Grove, Iowa, in place of William J. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

Peter J. Cool to be postmaster at Baxter, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Madge Fell to be postmaster at Fremont, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Carl L. Little to be postmaster at Ames, Iowa, in place of L. M. Bosworth. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1914.

Max Mayer to be postmaster at Iowa City, Iowa, in place of Henry G. Walker. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1915.

William F. Oehmke to be postmaster at Larchwood, Iowa, in place of James J. Pruitt. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

Frank B. Wilson to be postmaster at Greenfield, Iowa, in place of Robert B. Oldham. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

KANSAS.

Wilford B. Flaugher to be postmaster at Cimarron, Kans., in place of Lissie H. Shoup. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1915.

Carl E. Hallberg to be postmaster at Courtland, Kans., in place of William Freeburg. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

Arthur C. Inlow to be postmaster at Hill City, Kans., in place of Harry C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1914.

W. E. Mattison to be postmaster at Mount Hope, Kans., in place of Philip B. Dick. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

Frank E. Munger to be postmaster at Atwood, Kans., in place of Jonah E. Nickols. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

Thomas Pore to be postmaster at Cedar Vale, Kans., in place of Austin Brown. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Isaac N. Richardson to be postmaster at Delphos, Kans., in place of A. J. Scranton. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

William L. Scott to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, Kans., in place of George E. Ward, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

C. E. Beeler to be postmaster at Calhoun, Ky., in place of Ellsworth McEuen. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

L. T. Doty to be postmaster at Owenton, Ky., in place of James P. Hutcheson, removed.

B. M. Powell to be postmaster at Corydon, Ky., in place of Smith Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

MARYLAND.

Samuel A. Wyvill to be postmaster at Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of Fred W. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1915.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Bernard Campbell to be postmaster at Millville, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Marianna J. Cooke to be postmaster at Milford, Mass., in place of George P. Cooke, deceased.

Thomas F. Donahue, jr., to be postmaster at Groton, Mass., in place of Fred H. Torrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

Benjamin P. Edwards to be postmaster at Topsfield, Mass., in place of Benjamin P. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

Edward Gilmore to be postmaster at Brockton, Mass., in place of Joseph M. Hollywood. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1914.

Sydney Harrocks to be postmaster at Westminster, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

Thomas F. Hederman to be postmaster at Webster, Mass., in place of W. I. Marble. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1913.

Aloysius B. Kennedy to be postmaster at Rochdale, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

William B. Mahoney to be postmaster at Westfield, Mass., in place of William H. Foote. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1914.

MICHIGAN.

James Fraser to be postmaster at Webberville, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

MINNESOTA.

Clarence O. Madson to be postmaster at Halstad, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Sophus A. Nebel to be postmaster at Braham, Minn., in place of Severin Mattson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

George Neumann to be postmaster at Osseo, Minn., in place of Stella M. Owen. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

Alvin A. Ogren to be postmaster at New London, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

O. P. Oseth to be postmaster at Oslo, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Nels J. Thysell to be postmaster at Hawley, Minn., in place of Fred Herring. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

MISSISSIPPI.

Walter E. Dreaden to be postmaster at Lambert, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Susette E. McAlpin to be postmaster at Bolton, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

MISSOURI.

John R. Blackwood to be postmaster at Hannibal, Mo., in place of Thomas B. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

William H. Farris to be postmaster at Houston, Mo., in place of William T. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1915.

John T. Haley to be postmaster at Steelville, Mo., in place of John C. Lark. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

George H. King to be postmaster at Birch Tree, Mo. Office become presidential January 1, 1915.

Edward F. Layne to be postmaster at Center, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

MONTANA.

Jefferson D. English to be postmaster at Big Sandy, Mont., in place of Harry S. Green, resigned.

I. T. Whistler to be postmaster at Browning, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1914.

NEW JERSEY.

Richard J. Fox to be postmaster at Grantwood, N. J., in place of Patrick J. Carney, resigned.

Isaac Klein to be postmaster at Salem, N. J., in place of Joseph Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

Louis J. Langham to be postmaster at Hammonton, N. J., in place of Thomas C. Elvins. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

Charles C. Stewart to be postmaster at Mays Landing, N. J., in place of L. W. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

NEW YORK.

James R. Mapes to be postmaster at Canaseraga, N. Y., in place of Adolph Bluestone, removed.

James R. Mayne to be postmaster at Heuvelton, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank E. Ellickson to be postmaster at Regent, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Waldo Leonhardy to be postmaster at Williston, N. Dak., in place of Gustave B. Metzger. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Henry W. O'Dell to be postmaster at Reeder, N. Dak., in place of Henry W. O'Dell. Incumbent's commission expired July 20, 1913.

F. W. Peterson to be postmaster at Sentinel Butte, N. Dak., in place of Walter A. Shear. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

OHIO.

Samuel R. Coates to be postmaster at Maynard, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Henry C. Fox to be postmaster at Coldwater, Ohio, in place of C. F. Morvilius. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Louis N. Gerber to be postmaster at Middleport, Ohio, in place of F. G. Hunker. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

J. E. Halliday to be postmaster at Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of Earl W. Mauck, resigned.

Grover Cleveland H. Hipp to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of Bruce E. McClure. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Charles J. Kessler to be postmaster at New Lexington, Ohio, in place of Joseph A. Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Charles A. Lamberson to be postmaster at Coshocton, Ohio, in place of Seth M. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

Grover C. Naragon to be postmaster at Amsterdam, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

Robert T. Spratt to be postmaster at Malvern, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

L. K. Thompson to be postmaster at Uhrichsville, Ohio, in place of George W. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

Henry W. Streb to be postmaster at Canal Dover, Ohio, in place of John J. Roderick. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

OKLAHOMA.

Dorothy L. Avant to be postmaster at Avant, Okla., in place of J. O. Parker, deceased.

OREGON.

W. R. Cook to be postmaster at Madras, Oreg., in place of Fred Davis, resigned.

Gaphart D. Ebner to be postmaster at Mount Angel, Oreg., in place of Thomas L. Embler. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

Mary E. Fitzpatrick to be postmaster at Beaverton, Oreg., in place of Fred W. Cady. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

J. J. Gaither to be postmaster at Toledo, Oreg., in place of Renns A. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Charles O. Henry to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of Hugh O. Worthington. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

John W. Hughes to be postmaster at Fossil, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Mary T. Mangold to be postmaster at Gervais, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

George C. Mason to be postmaster at Jefferson, Oreg., in place of Charles M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

Lovie R. Watt to be postmaster at Amity, Oreg., in place of Arlington B. Watt. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

W. C. Wilson to be postmaster at Joseph, Oreg., in place of Polk E. Mays. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James F. Drake to be postmaster at Hawley, Pa., in place of D. James Colgate. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1915.

B. Stiles Duncan to be postmaster at Duncannon, Pa., in place of William H. Pennell. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

Winifred Hughes to be postmaster at Tioga, Pa., in place of G. Gillette Saxton. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

John B. Shea to be postmaster at Eldred, Pa., in place of Claude H. Heath. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1914.

RHODE ISLAND.

Francis Fagan to be postmaster at Pascoag, R. I., in place of Warren W. Logee. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

J. Elmer Thewlis to be postmaster at Wakefield, R. I., in place of Arthur W. Stedman. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Dana T. Crosland to be postmaster at Bennettsville, S. C., in place of Thomas B. McLaurin. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

James M. Holm to be postmaster at Pierre, S. Dak., in place of Joseph B. Binder. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1914.

A. J. Johnson to be postmaster at Murdo, S. Dak., in place of William B. Yarosh. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1915.

TENNESSEE.

John L. Nowlin to be postmaster at Sparta, Tenn., in place of Samuel L. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

TEXAS.

Horace C. Blalock to be postmaster at Marshall, Tex., in place of Henry O. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Robert G. Branson to be postmaster at Burleson, Tex., in place of William P. Lace. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

Joe H. Campbell to be postmaster at Matador, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Hugo J. Letzerich to be postmaster at Harlingen, Tex., in place of Hugo J. Letzerich. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Joseph W. Singleton to be postmaster at Waxahachie, Tex., in place of W. G. McClain. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

UTAH.

T. L. Sullivan to be postmaster at Eureka, Utah, in place of E. W. Redmond, resigned.

VERMONT.

James E. Burke to be postmaster at Burlington, Vt., in place of Buel J. Derby. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

George W. Gorman to be postmaster at Barre, Vt., in place of Edward B. Bisbee. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Byerly to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Va., in place of J. A. Riddel. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Crandal Mackey, jr., to be postmaster at Rosslyn, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

WASHINGTON.

John L. Field to be postmaster at Quincy, Wash., in place of Carey W. Stewart, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Fred S. Hathaway to be postmaster at Grantsville, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

WISCONSIN.

Philip B. Bartlett to be postmaster at Melrose, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 15), 1915.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Joseph T. Carruth to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank F. Steele to be receiver of public moneys at Helena, Mont.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. William A. Mann to be brigadier general.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. William Bryden to be captain.
Second Lieut. Leo J. Ahern to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Donald M. Beere to be first lieutenant.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Ervin L. Phillips to be major.
First Lieut. Douglas H. Jacobs to be captain.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. George C. Bowen to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John H. Hester to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Franklin L. Whitley to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Alfred H. Hobley to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Arthur J. Hanlon to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Olin O. Ellis to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Elmer C. Desobry to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Emile V. Cutrer to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Bessie Bevill, Kensett.
Mary G. Clark, Bald Knob.
William K. Estes, Calico Rock.
Robert H. Harrison, Tuckerman.
Sylvester K. Hohes, Murfreesboro.
Jesse C. Latta, Piggott.
Noble J. Nixon, Mulberry.
Joe J. Shaddock, Thornton.
Benjamin W. Thomasson, Rison.
Philip J. Smith, Dumas.

CALIFORNIA.

L. F. Kuhn, Stockton.

MINNESOTA.

C. S. Dougherty, Northfield.

NEW YORK.

Edward T. Cole, Garrison.
Gregory Dillon, New Rochelle.
Charles R. Flanly, Babylon.
John W. McKnight, Castleton.
Maud Rogers, Bridgehampton.
John W. Salisbury, Hamburg.
James J. Smith, Fleischmanns (late Griffin Corners).

OHIO.

William Alexander, Miamisburg.
Thomas O. Armstrong, Middle Point.
E. W. Fisher, Sugarcreek.
John E. Robbins, Jeffersonville.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William A. Ketterer, Rochester.
P. F. Leininger, Myerstown.
Walter James McBeth, Braddock.
Robert McCalmont, Franklin.
J. Edwin McCanna, Paoli.
Thomas J. McClelland, Boswell.
Edward L. Mifflin, sr., Ridley Park.
John A. Robinson, Brownsville.
Jesse S. Stambaugh, Spring Grove.
Frank T. Stiner, Moylan.
R. Morgan Root, Pottstown.
Ralph S. Wagner, New Florence.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

H. J. Hobart, Woonsocket.
Linville Miles, Langford.

TENNESSEE.

Jesse F. Jones, Loudon.
William D. Kyle, Kingsport.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 25, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for Thy continued care in the manifold blessings Thou are daily bestowing upon us, especially for every great thought, noble impulse, and high aspiration which lifts us into the higher realms of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. Continue, we beseech Thee, Thy care, and thus lead us on our way rejoicing to the larger life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

W. R. ELLIS.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a very brief clipping from a newspaper article upon the late W. R. Ellis, formerly a Member of this House. He had a long and honorable service in responsible positions in Indiana, as well as a Representative from Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the late W. R. Ellis. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRINTING SPEECHES IN THE RECORD.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. When a Member gets permission to print in the RECORD the speech of another than his own, is it optional with him to print the whole or a part of the speech?

The SPEAKER. That is owing to the permission he asks for.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. He asks to print the speech.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that that is within the discretion of the Member.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Do I understand that there was an agreement reached on Saturday last to set aside District day?

The SPEAKER. No; when unanimous consent was asked to come in at 11 o'clock to-day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected to meeting at 11 o'clock unless we took up the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the gentleman from South Carolina agreed to make the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Chair thinks the general idea was to go into Committee of the Whole on that bill. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing; in cooperation with the States, companies, or individuals, or otherwise, $5,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask if this is not new legislation?

Mr. FOWLER. I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's inquiry goes to the last paragraph just read?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. That paragraph has been carried in the Bureau of Plant Industry, and has been transferred to this place in the bill by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BOOHER. Last year there was a provision carried for the same thing of $5,000?

Mr. LEVER. There was.

Mr. BOOHER. What section of the country is this logged-off land in?

Mr. LEVER. It is in the extreme western part of the country on the Pacific coast, and the most of the work is done in Oregon. If the gentleman wants more information on the subject, I will yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. BOOHER. I want to ask the gentleman one or two questions first. How many different kinds of powder are there in the country that needs testing by the Agricultural Department, and how long does it take?

Mr. LEVER. The test is to find the best powder adapted to clearing this logged-off land——

Mr. BOOHER. Blowing out stumps?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Does it require an expert to know how much dynamite to put under a stump, or what kind of powder?

Mr. LEVER. The department thinks so, the committee thinks so, and Congress thought so.

Mr. BOOHER. How many tests have been made?

Mr. LEVER. I think this is the third time the item is in the bill.

Mr. BOOHER. Have they not found out of the few kinds of powder we have which is the best?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from Oregon to answer the question.

Mr. BOOHER. One more question first. They also want to know about the utilization of the by-products in the process of clearing. What is the by-product, cordwood?

Mr. LEVER. The stumps and limbs, and in my country the sawdust is a by-product, and we are making a good deal of alcohol out of it.

Mr. BOOHER. In our country we do not need an expert to tell us what to do with sawdust; we pack ice in it and it answers the purpose first-rate.

Mr. LEVER. We do not need an expert to tell us how to pack ice in sawdust.

Mr. BOOHER. Well, you had a great deal of expert assistance in making up the bill.

Mr. LEVER. We did.

Mr. BOOHER. And I think you needed it, too. I would like to have the gentleman tell me why it is that we have to have an expert to go around and tell a man that a limb of a tree will make wood and how we ought to dig the stumps out and plow the land.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The purpose of the item is to aid the farmers in sections formerly covered by trees which have been cut over and logged and show how to clear the land up at the least possible expense. The item is made broad enough to cover all possible investigation. I think there will be no further tests of powder except it may be for some incidental purpose. Most of the work will be done in the problem of getting rid of the stumps as they stand in the ground. I have had inquiries from all parts of the United States. A gentleman from North Carolina came to see me and I gave him some information which I derived, in part, from the department, and he said it was just what he desired; he and others had acquired logged-off lands and desired to make them into farms. It is designed to investigate the method of removing the stumps with the least possible expense, which has been a very troublesome problem.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman who bought this large body of logged-off lands wants the Government now to tell him how he can clear it of stumps in the cheapest way, so that he can get a big profit out of the men to whom he sells the land, does he not?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know whether he wants the Government to tell him, only I think he wants it to be able to tell other people as well as himself how they can clear off their land at the least possible expense, just the same as we tell the farmers in the southern part of this country how they can best rid their lands and their cattle of the cattle tick.

As to the by-products, out in the western section of the country there are thousands of acres of land being logged over every year by the logging corporations, and the lands are left with the tops and the stumps upon them.

Mr. BOOHER. To whom does that land belong?

Mr. HAWLEY. The land that has been logged over belongs to the logging corporations and to individual owners.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are a number of by-products from the removal of these stumps. The Douglas fir has great branching roots, and when stumps are properly blown out, if powder is used, they make good ships' knees, the very best that can be obtained, much better than can be made by taking a straight stick and bending it.

Mr. BOOHER. I remember when I was a boy my father cleared a lot of pine land at one time, and we pulled the stumps and made stump fences out of them. We did not need an expert to tell us how to do that. I presume on the old farm where I was raised they have some of the stump fences that they had when I was a boy. We did not need anybody to tell us what to do or how to remove stumps.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will yield—such stumps were probably 24 to 30 inches in diameter.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; and some of them larger.

Mr. HAWLEY. Out in our country we have the problem of removing stumps which are from 7 to 14 feet in diameter, and a stump fence made out of such stumps would be some fence.

Mr. BOOHER. Are there not men in your State and in every community who can blow out stumps, and who know just how much dynamite it takes to blow out a stump without any expert from the Agricultural Department to tell them?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman has completed his question, I should like to take the floor for two or three minutes to make a statement.

Mr. BOOHER. I just want to know why it is necessary to have a Government expert to tell people, especially large corporations, which the gentleman says are logging off their lands, the best way to remove the stumps. Why should the Government go to the expense of sending an expert there to tell them how to do it for the least expense? I do not believe they are doing it for the farmers anywhere. The farmer does not need it. When he wants to blow his stumps out, he buys some dynamite and hires a man at $2 a day to do it.

Mr. COX. Or else does it himself.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; or else does it himself.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman is proceeding on the theory that this money is to be used for the investigation of powders to be used in blowing out stumps, and probably none of it will be used for that purpose.

Mr. BOOHER. Well, now——

Mr. HAWLEY. If I can get a moment when the gentleman has completed his question, I will tell him.

Mr. BOOHER. What business has the Agricultural Department to be testing powder if it is not to be used for agricultural purposes?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly they can make these tests for agricultural purposes, but I say they are not doing it under this item. They have done that. That has been practically determined, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. BOOHER. Then why make another appropriation?

Mr. HAWLEY. The appropriation is to cover all possible questions arising in the removal of stumps, but it was not thought advisable to limit it in any particular, but to make it so general that they could resort to all methods and all investigations, because it is a very great problem. A man goes out and buys 160 acres of the finest kind of land, in the bottoms along the rivers, in the Olympic Peninsula, or elsewhere, where the trees were once 300 feet high and left stumps 10 to 14 feet in diameter. Such lands are found all along the coast and in the alluvial plains of the river valleys. They are the richest lands we have and they grew the finest trees. The trees have been removed and the stumps remain. Now, to blow out one of these stumps by the ordinary method with powder is too expensive. The farmer can not afford it. But there are other methods of removing stumps, and while the work has been done mostly in the State of Washington and not very much of it in my State, I have had information from those who have investigated it so far, and from farmers who have actually seen the work in operation, and they are very enthusiastic about the results.

Mr. BOOHER. Are they using dynamite?

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will permit me. When they use powder to blow out the stump, if it is good for ships' knees, they can sell it if there is an available market; but if they blow out the stump and leave it on the ground, in two or three great pieces, it takes a donkey engine to handle them. It tears up the ground, and they are in worse condition than they were before, so far as cultivating the land is concerned. Now, there have been several methods devised of burning the stumps in place. The old method of char-pitting will do for small stumps, but not for the large ones. There have been methods devised, one of which is to bore a hole down through the stump to the ground, and then another at an angle, and by that means burn the stump in place. They are working on that problem now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon have five minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon moves to strike out the last word and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are other methods—of boring holes in the stump just above the ground and then extending them at an angle down beneath the surface of the ground and putting in hot coals or red-hot pieces of iron, and by a blast of air forcing the draft down into the holes, and by that means they burn out the stump entirely and get rid of it in place.

There is no great hole blown out in the ground. It is burned out and they then proceed——

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit right there?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, are not people all over the country boring into stumps and filling them with coal oil, boring several holes, saturating them, and then setting them on fire, burning them out and clearing it off down to the ground? They have been practicing that for years.

Mr. HAWLEY. They have on small stumps; yes.

Mr. BOOHER. They have no large stumps out in my country. Now, it does not take quite an expert—it is not necessary, the way I look at this, to have an expert come and tell him that if he bores several holes in a stump and fill it in with coal oil, or kerosene as it is called, it can be saturated, and it then can be set afire and burned out. They do not need to have $5,000 for that.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] calls attention to the other provision here in regard to the several by-products. They can recover turpentine and various other by-products from the stumps when it is possible to do so. There are probably millions of acres now covered with logged-off lands in the West that would make as good lands for farming as there are in that section of the country. They are covered with these stumps. There are plenty of people who want to get them, who are ready to buy them. I know of a colony of 50 or 60 people who have gone into one section, and they are asking for this very information. They do not come from a country where they have stumps, and they do not know how to get them out. Now, there are people in all the Southern States who know how to rid their land of the Texas cattle tick, and if you say because some of them do know, let us not appropriate any more money for the eradication of the cattle tick; there are some people who know about how to get rid of the boll weevil and to circumvent it by raising other crops; we ought not to say because there are some who do, therefore let us not make any appropriation for it. That would cut out a million or more dollars from this bill. But there are problems in this matter of stump eradication that we have not yet solved in great communities. This is a very modest sum and will do an immense amount of good.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me ask the gentleman, Who gets the by-products from these stumps on these logged-off lands? To whom does it belong?

Mr. HAWLEY. To the men who own the land.

Mr. BOOHER. Why do not they take out these stumps and get this by-product without calling on the Government to do it for them?

Mr. HAWLEY. They want the Government to find out what the by-products are now, how they can be saved, and how the stumps can be burned out in place, and there are thousands of other instances in the gentleman's own district and all parts of the United States——

Mr. BOOHER. Not in my district.

Mr. HAWLEY. Where such problems are attempted to be solved.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. BOOHER. If you are going to appropriate this money for this purpose, why not appropriate enough so that we can publish a bulletin and send one to every one of these men who want this information? It is now published in a bulletin; all

this information the gentleman is seeking to get here now is published in a bulletin by the Agriculture Department.

Mr. HAWLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There is information we desire in the use of burning machines that is not published in any bulletin that I have seen, and it seems to me that the investigation can be very profitably continued.

Mr. BOOHER. I have read very carefully recently, since this bill was brought in, the bulletin on logged-off land, and it seems to me that that gives all the information that a man could desire if he wanted to read; but if it is necessary for some fellow to tell him, of course he will not read; but perhaps when the immigration bill becomes the law everybody will be able to read the bulletins, and this character of appropriations will cease.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was reserved against it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to have the Chair rule upon the point of order, although what the point of order is I have not heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know what the point of order was.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman reserved it. May I ask the gentleman what the point of order is?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any authorization for this item at all. It is true it is carried in the bill of last year, but that is no authorization. It is a private matter, devoted to private property and private benefit. There is no authorization in the general law giving the right to appropriate money for private purposes or benefit of private individuals.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield? He is entirely in error in the assumption that any of this money goes to private individuals. Not a dollar of it goes to a private individual, any more than an appropriation for the boll weevil or the cattle tick or the hog cholera.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, certainly. The gentleman from Oregon has just said that the benefit of this $5,000 goes to the corporations practically within his territory for the purpose of handling big stumps.

Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit——

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think the gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said that there would be people benefited by it in North Carolina, in all sections of the United States, individual farmers, and also those who own large bodies of land.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; but the gentleman did say that the logged-off land belonged to corporations.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; in part.

Mr. FOWLER. And, of course, the corporations would get the benefit of the use of this $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will allow the Chair to suggest, the question now before the Chair is the question of the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I am aware of that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. And that it might benefit only a few people does not affect the point of order, as the Chair sees it. The Chair will be glad to hear suggestions on the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. My objection to the paragraph, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman in charge of the bill anything to say?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the language of the act creating the Department of Agriculture is exceedingly broad, and if the Chair can make any connection between the clearing off of a piece of land and the effect it may have upon its development for agriculture and dairy purposes, then the Chair must hold this proposition in order. You certainly can not cultivate land at all without clearing it. If the Chair does not have the language at hand, I will read it. It is as follows:

> There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, it seems to me that when the Chair can make a connection between the purposes of an item in this bill and its relationship to agriculture, in the broadest and most comprehensive sense of that word, the item is bound to be held in order, and the Chair has heretofore ruled that uniformly.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to differ with the distinguished chairman. If this point has ever been ruled upon since its insertion into the Agricultural appropriation bill, I am not aware of it.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I did not make that statement. I said items of a similar character have been ruled upon.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not so understand the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. Then I was mistaken in what I said.

Mr. FOWLER. If this paragraph has ever been passed upon by a point of order heretofore, Mr. Chairman, I say that I am not aware of it. Now, certainly, if the language creating the Department of Agriculture is to be construed as broadly as the chairman of this committee intimates, then there would be no end to it—no limitation whatever. He intimates that that which is connected with agriculture, wherever it may be, is a subject for legislation by the Congress. The grinding of an ax is connected with agriculture. We may just as well appropriate $5,000 for expert information for grinding axes, because an ax is one of the most useful instruments in clearing off ground. Mr. Chairman, if we extend this question of the authority of Congress to look into agriculture and legislate for it to the extent that is indicated by the chairman of this committee, then I repeat, Mr. Chairman, there is no limitation on this committee whatever. It might bring in a bill for sharpening axes, or they might bring in a bill for the purpose of inventing a new auger or any other implement that is used on the farm.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow a suggestion?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to him for a question only.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will put my suggestion in the form of a question if the gentleman insists upon my putting it that way. Is it not possible that the gentleman is using an illustration that is very apt in connection with this appropriation? May it not be that in this appropriation somebody has an "ax to grind"?

Mr. FOWLER. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I did not desire to go to the extent of impugning the motives of any gentleman on this committee, because in my opinion they are honorable gentlemen, of such high character that it would be very unbecoming in me to make any reflection whatever. But these gentlemen are human; and if there are certain interests in their districts by their constituents, they will work for them, just as I did to get an appropriation to protect Shawneetown and that territory. This is of a character, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, that leads into endless machinations of any man who might want to get some benefit for his own people.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, but I insist on the point of order, and I insist that there is no authorization for this.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order raised by my colleague goes practically to almost every item in this bill, and if sustained will probably result in cutting out most of the provisions in the bill. For instance, there is no specific authority for investigation of plant diseases or for the control of diseases of orchards or for the controlling of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs. I simply read three items in less than one-half page of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. MANN. There is no distinction in principle between studying the diseases of forest trees and studying the methods of removal of forest stumps in order to make the land suitable for agricultural purposes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is no specific authority for the creation of the office of markets. There is no specific authority for the creation of the office of public roads. Practically every item in this bill will go out on the point of order if the Chair sustains this point of order.

Mr. MANN. Every year, I think, since I have been a Member of the House, at the beginning of the consideration of the appropriation bill some man who is opposed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, some man who is opposed to the development of the Agricultural Department, like my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], makes some point of order on some item, denying authority to make an appropriation. Every year we go over the same discussion, gentlemen insisting there is no authority to make these appropriations under the organic act creating the department, and other gentlemen insisting that there is. And every year, in my recollection, the Chair has

overruled the point of order on the strength of this general authority. The organic act creating the Department of Agriculture is in general terms and practically authorizes an appropriation for anything in the way of acquiring or diffusing information for agricultural purposes, considered in their broadest sense.

Now, what is the item? I read:

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing.

That is in connection with agriculture and forestry. Those are all the items that are included in this paragraph, and certainly they come within the terms of agriculture in its broadest and most comprehensive sense, because in its broadest and most comprehensive sense the term "agriculture" includes not only agriculture but horticulture, floriculture, forestry, dairying, irrigation, marketing, and all the other terms which come into this bill.

It is true that occasionally a term comes into the bill which is subject to a point of order, where there is no authority. I doubt very much whether the provision in reference to good roads is included in the term "agriculture," even in its broadest sense. I do not recall now whether or not there has been a ruling on that, but if you can provide for methods of constructing roads running through agricultural districts, which certainly are not very closely connected with agriculture, you can provide for preparing the ground for cultivation. That is all this item does.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is there any provision in this bill appropriating money for good roads?

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly there is, and there is every year.

Mr. GORDON. Whereabouts?

Mr. MANN. Under the roads provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The act creating the Department of Agriculture in its first section is as follows:

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

It does not seem to the Chair that it could have been framed in broader and more extensive language, and the Chair is of opinion that, after all is said and done, the Department of Agriculture is largely a department of investigation and experimentation and demonstration.

This provision against which a point of order is made provides for the study of "methods of clearing off logged-off lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing," and so forth. It is pretty clear to the mind of the present occupant of the chair that this has to do with agriculture, and I think the Chair is not without precedents. On April 29, 1902, when the Agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration, the Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, made a point of order against this provision:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of proposed food preservatives and coloring matters, to determine their relation to digestion and to health, and to establish the principles which should guide their use; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of the chemical and physical tests which are applied to American food products—

And so forth. A point of order was made against that provision, and the then occupant of the chair, quoting the organic act which is above quoted, said:

Now, while this may not be free from some doubt, yet as food products are closely connected with agriculture "in the most comprehensive use of the word," and as this provision in the bill simply permits the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a regulation having this end in view, the Chair is inclined to believe, and will so rule, that it is not subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Now, undoubtedly, if the preparation for food of the products of the soil, such as was carried in that bill, was not subject to a point of order by reason of the comprehensiveness of the organic act, the preparation of the land for the growing of these products could not be held to be foreign to the subject of agriculture, and the Chair thinks that the point of order is not well taken, and it is therefore overruled.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes.

Mr. GORDON. I will have to object. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Make it 17 minutes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that so many gentlemen want to speak, I will object at this time.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I would not move to strike out this paragraph if this was the first time it had appeared in this bill, but it is the third time that we are asked to make an appropriation of $5,000 for this identical purpose.

Now, if the experts of the Department of Agriculture in two years can not determine the strength of powder, can not determine how much it will take to blow out a 9-foot stump or a 6-foot stump or a stump of any other dimensions; if they can not in two years tell what the by-product is good for; if they can not tell a farmer that the limbs will make wood, and that they might sell the stumps for something, in two years' time, they will never get to the point where they will determine it.

Now, they have published an extensive bulletin on logged-off land and its uses; if the people will not get those pamphlets and study them, I do not think this Congress ought year after year to appropriate money to tell people what to do. We are doing it all over the country—instead of letting people support the Government we are trying all we can to have the Government support the people.

Now, why should we continue this appropriation? I can not understand, when people know, or could know from reading a bulletin published at public expense how to do these things, and still refuse to do it, why you should send the experts of the Government around to teach a man how to do that thing. I hope this provision will be stricken out, along with a good many others in this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the observations of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] ought to be conclusive with this committee, for they show the utter foolishness of continuing an appropriation of this sort from year to year. So long as Congress continues to appropriate money the Agricultural Department will continue to take it.

I arose primarily for the purpose of making an observation on the arguments presented by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to the effect that this appropriation is analogous to one made for the extermination of hog cholera or pests that infest agriculture. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no analogy between the two. The idea of authorizing money year after year in order to instruct the logging companies how they can best log and clear their lands and then compare an appropriation of that sort with an appropriation to exterminate the pests or contagious or infectious diseases among farm animals or among people is to my mind rather far-fetched. If they have to go back to such an appropriation as that to obtain a precedent for the appropriation of this $5,000, it seems to me they are hard put for argument. I submit to the membership of this House that there is absolutely no analogy between the appropriations made to exterminate diseases and such an appropriation as this—absolutely none. To make use of arguments adduced for the purpose of defending laws appropriating money to combat contagious, infectious diseases to support an appropriation for money for such a purpose as this, especially in view of the fact, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri, that for two years in succession the Agricultural Department has received $5,000 for this specific purpose and has thoroughly investigated and published in Farmers' Bulletins its findings and conclusions as to the best methods of exterminating stumps, it seems to me it is time to stop the appropriation, and I think the item should be stricken out.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say a word. I made some remarks a moment ago when the point of order was up. This item is for the benefit of every wooded section of the country. A gentleman from North Carolina, as I stated, came to my office, and others have come from the eastern section, and asked information about clearing up land, because they knew that I had been giving the matter some attention. There are in the Middle West large sections of the country where land has been logged over and left covered with stumps. In our country some of the best of our lands have once grown large timber—large forests—and I have seen them, after re-

duced to cultivation, yield 50 to 70 bushels of wheat to the acre and from 80 to 90 bushels of oats to the acre. This is to cover the entire subject, including their clearing and use for agricultural and dairy purposes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. What percentage of land in your section of the country is owned by individual settlers?

Mr. HAWLEY. That I could not tell the gentleman. The lands are cut over by settlers or by companies who own the timber, but the timber companies have little use for the lands after they are cut over, and they offer them for sale in the community at reasonable prices. Sometimes bodies of men form little colonies, buy the land, and work on it together clearing the land. I know of 50 or 60 families going in to work together clearing up land, and they have told me that the stumps are very large and hard to take out; and they want me to tell them of some method of getting rid of them instead of blowing them out—by burning them. The lands are fine agricultural lands.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman think that 25 per cent of the lands are owned by individual settlers?

Mr. HAWLEY. Of the lands to be benefited by this investigation, a great deal more than that. I think all the benefit of this appropriation would go to the individual settlers. There might occasionally be a body of men who would get together and clear up land, but it will largely be done by the individual settler who uses his spare time in the winter that otherwise would be lost in clearing the land. I hope, for the benefit of the large body of these men, it will be allowed to remain in the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman has said that somebody in North Carolina who is interested in this matter came to him for information. Will the gentleman state his name?

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish I could remember the gentleman's name, but I can not.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It was not this gentleman of North Carolina.

Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, no; it was not a Member of the House. It was some man who was interested with others in the clearing up of logged-over lands.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULINGS. It has been stated here that former appropriations for this purpose have resulted in investigations and a conclusive report on this subject. If this is so, there would not seem to be any need of an additional appropriation. What is the fact about it?

Mr. HAWLEY. That is a mistake. The former appropriations of $5,000 have been used, information has been gathered and disseminated, but there are still other problems like removing the big stumps by the burning process. This is to enable the department to get other information. From what I know it has not solved this problem fully. They ought to complete the work already started and they have not done very much in the way of the by-products problem. There will be a use for the $5,000 in completing the work, in carrying out the work already undertaken, and some new phases of the work.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, twice the Agricultural appropriation bill has carried a provision for this purpose, and, as I understand, all that money has been used in the West. Apparently it has been used for the purpose of teaching the people how to clear up logged-off land. In this discussion it has developed that some trees that have been felled are 10 or 15 feet in diameter. These mammoth denizens of the forest require correspondingly large foundations in order that they may maintain themselves. Consequently, immense roots have been sent out into the ground, and it has been learned, through the ingenuity of ship men, that these big roots make fine ship knees; and inasmuch as these large forests are under the domination of the Lumber Trust, it is a very nice proposition to get the United States to blow out these roots for the purpose of making ship knees; and after they are blown out it is a nice thing to make a contract with the shipbuilding company to furnish these big, fine ship knees at a large price. Mr. Chairman, I would not have referred to this had it not come out in the discussion from the gentleman who undoubtedly is the author of this provision of the bill. The sequel of this appropriation is covered up under the guise of preparing land for grazing purposes, in order that milk and butter may be produced in quantities and in order that the Government may examine into powder to see whether powder is explosive or not, and to find out whether, if explosive, it can be exploded in connection with the removal of stumps in the western part of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used three minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of this item is to study the utilization of by-products of logged-off land. Gentlemen may regard this as a very unimportant little item, but I desire to call attention to some facts. When I was a boy my father burned cotton seed. It was an encumbrance to the farm. We did not know what to do with it. The experts of the country began to study the problem, just as they are studying this problem, with the result that they found that cotton seed contains very valuable food and fertilizer products, which are now valued in the South at nearly $275,000,000 a year. When I was a boy we regarded the sawdust in the lumber yard as an absolute handicap to the work. Scientists and experts, studying from day to day and hour to hour, discovered that out of sawdust you could make alcohol.

Mr. FOWLER. People have known about wood alcohol a long time.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman allow me to proceed? The result is that we have invested in that business hundreds and thousands of dollars. When I was a boy and when the chairman was a boy we did not know that there could be any utilization of pine stumps. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that to-day they are producing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of turpentine out of pine stumps, all because somebody somewhere was given the authority to investigate these by-products. That is all there is in this item. I hope it will remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GORDON) there were—ayes 16, noes 42.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $235,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Is it an amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; an amendment to this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

At end of line 20, page 4, insert:

"For the fiscal year 1917, and annually thereafter, specific estimates shall be submitted for salaries for all personal services required in the Department of Agriculture at Washington, D. C., and except as specific appropriations may be made thereunder, personal services shall not be employed in that department at Washington, D. C."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman be kind enough to state his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I will make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. There is no doubt that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will withhold his ruling for a moment, I want to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. LEVER. The matter of these statutory salaries and lump-sum salaries took the committee by surprise on Saturday. We think we gave the real fundamental reasons in the discussion on Saturday, but since that time I have had prepared for me a memorandum for the Secretary of Agriculture himself, sustaining the viewpoint of the committee; but I feel this way about it: If Congress desires this segregation, in the face of the opinion of the best experts of the country to the contrary, the Committee on Agriculture is no more and no less than the servant of the House; and I will suggest to my friend from North Carolina that if he will reserve this amendment and offer it under the miscellaneous items of the bill, near the end of it, I shall be very glad indeed not to make the point of order, so far as I am concerned, and will debate the question thoroughly and let the committee decide it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In offering the amendment I recognize, of course, that it is legislation and subject to a point of order, and it will be legislation and subject to a point of order at the place he suggests; and, of course, the gentleman can not pledge other Members of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I said to the gentleman that I would not make it if offered at the place in the bill further on. I will make it here, however.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I readily concede the point of order, and I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the gentleman from North Carolina offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 20, on page 4, insert the following:

"No money appropriated by this act in any lump sum shall be used to pay for any service or class of work in the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1916 in excess of the rate of compensation paid for such service or work in the department December 31, 1914.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order on that that it is legislation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. With respect to the point of order, I submit, respectfully, that it is merely a limitation on the appropriation and is not subject to the point of order. I do not care to argue so simple a matter as that to the present occupant of the chair. I think it is clearly in order for that reason and also because of the Holman rule.

Mr. LEVER. It does not on its face show a reduction.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There is a pretty clear inference; but I submit that it is a limitation on the appropriation, and that such an amendment has time and again been held to be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman by what authority has the department been paying salaries out of the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; absolutely without authorization of law, as I understand it.

Mr. LEVER. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, they have been paying salaries in accordance with section 169 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, however they have been fixed or paid, this amendment which has just been read from the desk is nothing more or less than a limitation, so far as the rules of the House are concerned, upon the appropriations carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina, if he desires to be heard.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture under section 169 of the Revised Statutes, which I will read, is authorized to make such employment of clerks and other officials and employees as he desires. The section reads:

Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. But, if the gentleman will permit, such salaries as are fixed by law and carried in the appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. The statute says "at such rate of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Of course; but they are not appropriated for except in the lump sum. My amendment seeks to place a limitation upon the salaries, that they shall not be in excess of those sums.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is clearly a limitation. It provides that no part of this lump-sum appropriation shall be used in the payment of the salaries in excess of the salaries paid during the present current fiscal year. It seems to the Chair that is a limitation on the use of that lump-sum appropriation and is in order. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface what I desire to say as to the advisability of adopting this amendment by assuring the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that I have no spirit of antagonism toward the bill or toward the Department of Agriculture. On the other hand, I am entirely friendly to the appropriations carried in this bill for the purpose of investigations by the Agricultural Department, and there is every reason why I should be; but, as I stated here on Saturday in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I believe that it is not good practice or that it is not good policy or in the interest of the proper expenditure of our money to appropriate lump sums for the payment of salaries in the executive departments of the Government, and particularly I think it is not wise that these lump sums should go on interminably. The purpose of the amendment I have offered is to give the House, from year to year in the making up of this appropriation and others, some knowledge of the salaries that are paid to the men who are employed other than by the specific direction of Congress and whose salaries are fixed other than by law. I believe it is in the interest not only of good legislation, but I believe it is in the interest of good administration of the Department of Agriculture, and if I did not think so I would not have offered the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the proposition proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina has been debated by both officials of the Department of Agriculture and by members of the Committee of Agriculture for 15 years, and we have been trying to work out the best method of handling the scientific force in the Department of Agriculture. The policy of the committee has been to transfer as rapidly as possible to the statutory roll, where we can have our eyes on them, from year to year, such employees as are strictly clerical and as are not merely temporary. I hold in my hand a memorandum furnished me by the Secretary of Agriculture this morning which clearly defines the position of the Department of Agriculture. Not only that, but it clearly defines the position of probably every agricultural thinker in the United States in reference to this matter. I am going to ask that this memorandum be printed in full, but I desire to read only briefly from it at this juncture:

STATEMENT SHOWING THE INADVISABILITY OF MAKING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE STATUTORY.

In the light of experience and as the result of extended investigation it is believed that the effect of lump-sum appropriations for salaries for investigational, experimental, and extension work has been to enlarge the scope and usefulness of the Department of Agriculture by enabling the department to undertake new lines of work as authorized and to handle effectively the natural increase of business, and that the effect of prescribing fixed salaries by statutory provision would undoubtedly be to arrest progress by limiting the usefulness and efficiency of the service. In many branches of the Department of Agriculture the volume of business fluctuates greatly during certain seasons, and a force which is sufficient to handle the normal or average amount of work for the year is insufficient to handle it promptly during seasons of great activity.

A system of statutory salaries wherein employees and rates of compensation are definitely fixed by law is workable only in branches of the service whose work is uniform in volume and character and where the force required to handle the work can be estimated a year or more in advance. Obviously such conditions do not obtain in the Department of Agriculture, whose field is steadily extending and diversifying as Congress authorizes and whose work is largely of an investigational or experimental nature.

The experience of the various research institutions throughout the country, including the universities and agricultural experiment stations, shows that work of this character can be most effectively conducted when there is possible a flexibility of compensation sufficient to allow an immediate readjustment of salaries when necessary to meet changed conditions of the work itself or changes in the personnel of the staff.

It is necessary for the head of the Department of Agriculture to have authority to take immediate action to meet efforts which are continuously being made to get investigators to leave the department. In very few cases of this kind is it necessary for the department to pay its employees the amount tendered them by the institutions or commercial organizations, they being willing usualy to remain with the department for much less money than is offered them elsewhere. It is thought that the Secretary ought to have sufficient latitude to handle such cases when they arise and the needs of the service require, otherwise frequently the department would lose the benefit of years of service of an investigator who had not completed the project upon which he was engaged. In a department where the work is largely administrative, regulatory, or routine employees are paid for work completed from day to day, while in the Department of Agriculture a man might not complete a task for a number of years; and if after a service of, say, four or five years, the investigator should receive a tempting offer from an educational institution or a commercial organization it is believed that the department should be in a position to meet the outside offer rather than lose the uncompleted work of such an investigator, for which the department has been paying during the life of the project.

The unavoidable delays in securing specific legislation for employing the technical specialists who may be necessary in the prosecution of work authorized by Congress, or for changing the compensation of those employed, are certain to result in making the work that is of an investigational rather than a regulatory nature more and more stereotyped in character and therefore less useful.

The principal disadvantage in a statutory roll for a scientific force is the lack of flexibility compelling the department to pay higher salaries than is necessary in some cases and preventing it from promptly recognizing its efficient and valuable employees for meritorious service, making it impossible to enlarge the force to meet changing conditions brought about by increased business and new responsibilities, and making it impracticable promptly to take up new lines of agricultural investigation as authorized. The principal advantage of the lump-sum system is that of elasticity, permitting the department to adjust its force to meet the exigencies of the work and to pay such rates of compensaion, within the limit fixed by Congress, as may be necessary to retain the services of efficient employees.

No particular advantage is seen in prescribing by law the number of investigators and experimenters of each grade and class so long as there is a maximum salary limit beyond which the department can not go; on the other hand, it would be a distinct disadvantage and a detriment to the work should Congress prescribe many months in advance a fixed number of employees at specified salaries for each type of investigational work. On some of the projects of the department for a certain period an agronomist would be required, and six or nine months later, in lieu of an agronomist, a pathologist might be needed. Should Congress make a statutory provision for an agronomist the department would be unable to put in that statutory place a pathologist, there being no elasticity to a statutory position.

In the conduct of certain lines of the work of the Department of Agriculture, such as the farmers' cooperative demonstration work, as well as many lines of the investigational and experimental work, the department receives cooperative aid from States, counties, crop-improvement associations, colleges and schools, and various other organizations outside the Federal service, such cooperative aid being applied largely toward the salaries and traveling expenses of the employees engaged in carrying on the work. This cooperative aid, while it amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, sometimes comes at irregular intervals, the department at times being required to pay the entire salaries of employees engaged on cooperative work, at other times paying part of their salaries only. The work of such employees is at all times under the supervision of officials of the department. To fix by law the salaries of the employees engaged on investigational, experimental, or extension work would render the administration of such work very cumbersome and extravagantly expensive to the Federal Government.

The operation of a statutory system would result in increased cost from lack of flexibility, in that when a vacancy occurred in a higher grade it would likely be filled by promotion from a lower grade, though there might be no one in a lower grade whose services were fully worth the higher salary, or by the appointment of a new man to whom it would not be good policy to pay the higher salary until he had fully demonstrated his value for the work in question.

Some time ago one of the pathologists left the department to go to Cornell University at a greatly increased salary. There was no one available to take his place in the department, and the work was therefore divided among a number of men, his salary being simply credited to the lump-fund appropriation. If his salary had been fixed by law, it would have been thought practically necessary to employ some one who had not yet reached a point where he could earn the salary paid to the gentleman who left the service. The present crop technologist in charge of grain standardization investigations of the department had charge of the work for four years before he reached the salary received by his predecessor in charge of the work. The former plant pathologist in chage of orchard-spraying demonstrations in the Bureau of Plant Industry resigned on January 31, 1912, at which time he received a salary of $2,760 per annum. His successor in charge of orchard-spraying demonstrations, a well-qualified but much younger man, has not yet reached as high a salary, he now receiving but $2,280 per annum. The physiologist formerly in charge of soil bacteriology investigations was receiving a salary of $3,000 per annum when he left our service, and it was six years before his successor reached that salary. The State agent having charge of the farmers' cooperative demonstration work in the State of North Carolina, until a few months ago received a salary of $2,500 per annum, paid entirely by the department, but half his salary, $1,250 per annum, is now paid by a cooperating agency.

The scientific and technical employees in the Government service are paid from lump-sum appropriations in a number of departments, among them being the following: The Reclamation Service, the Geological Survey, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Public Health Service.

The entire funds of the Reclamation Service, Department of the Interior, estimated for the current fiscal year at $9,000,000, out of which all salaries are paid, are lump sum, the salaries being fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

In the Geological Survey there is appropriated for statutory salaries but $65,240, while in the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, there is appropriated for every requisite expense for and incident to the authorized work of the Geological Survey, including, among other things, "personal services within the District of Columbia and in the field," to be expended under the regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, $1,240,280. For a tabulated statement showing these several appropriations see attached table. In addition there was appropriated for the Geological Survey, in the deficiency act approved April 6, 1914, $100,000 in lump sum available for the payment of personal services.

An officer who is deemed sufficiently competent and trustworthy to be placed in charge of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau of it, should not only be held responsible for its proper administration, for the proper expenditure of the appropriations made by Congress, but for securing adequate results as well. In this connection it might be said that while the appropriation act of the Department of Agriculture authorizes lump-sum salaries as high as $4,500 per annum, yet in that department there is not a salary paid from a lump sum that reaches that amount within $500.

The marked efficiency in investigational and demonstrational work which the Department of Agriculture has developed in recent years has been largely due to the fact that as soon as the consideration of a problem has disclosed the lines along which it could most effectively be attacked the department has been able to concentrate all the available funds and efforts upon the problem in the most effective way. It is believed that any serious restriction of its freedom of action in this respect would be distinctly harmful and that it would lessen the efficiency and usefulness of the department.

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Geological Survey, including the purchase for field use only of not exceeding four motor-propelled vehicles at a total cost not exceeding $2,800, and not exceeding 16 horse-drawn vehicles at a total cost not exceeding $2,400, and personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, to be expended under the regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and under the following heads:

For pay of skilled laborers and various temporary employees	$20,000
For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States	350,000
For geologic surveys in various portions of the United States	400,000
For chemical and physical researches relating to the geology of the United States, including researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts	40,000
For preparation of the illustrations of the Geological Survey	18,280
For preparation of the report of the mineral resources of the United States	75,000
For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources	150,000
For purchase of necessary books for the library, including directories and professional and scientific periodicals needed for statistical purposes, including payment in advance for subscriptions to publications	2,000
For engraving and printing geologic maps	$110,000
For continuation of topographic surveys of the public lands that have been or may hereafter be designated as national forests	75,000
Total	1,240,280

Let me give you a specific instance. We have an outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease in this country, which threatens the cattle industry. If we did not have the flexibility of a lump-sum appropriation, if we provide for an inflexible, inelastic, unbending statutory roll that would enable the Department of Agriculture to employ only sufficient veterinarians to do the work, the country would be utterly at the mercy of this disease, and the Department of Agriculture would be bound hand and foot, and could not move a peg in arresting it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman to point out how in the slightest degree the amendment which I have offered would affect the number of people employed?

Mr. LEVER. The amendment pending as proposed, if it is passed, would be one step further in the direction of the adoption of the amendment the gentleman from North Carolina just introduced, and which went out on the point of order. Now, then, you may have a virulent outbreak of cholera among the hogs in a section of the country. We are carrying $350,000 here in a lump sum to cover such a contingency. We believe it is sufficient, but the disease may be of such a violent nature, and may spread so rapidly, that we would have to call upon the lump sums contained in the bill for the Bureau of Animal Industry for additional sums and make a deficit, as we did with the foot-and-mouth disease, to meet the situation. We need veterinarians, experts to control that disease. Suppose we had written into this bill that you could have only 200 experts engaged in that line of work, and it was found, in order to make it effective, we needed 500 to do it. Do you think it is a good policy, gentlemen, to tie the department up in any such fashion? I want to say to my friend from North Carolina that he and I and other Members of this House must learn to trust the good judgment and the discretion and honesty of the head of this great Department of Agriculture.

This department differs in its work, differs in its manner of conduct, from any other department of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. The work of the Department of Agriculture is in nowise similar to the work in the Post Office Department, for instance. The officials of the Post Office Department can estimate within 10 men the number of postal clerks they will need a year in advance. But the Secretary of Agriculture must be given some discretion, some leeway, some latitude in meeting emergencies and exigencies which arise and which threaten the very life of some of our greatest industries. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to trust the men who for years and years have been studying this question—consecrated, honest, honorable men, men of wise judgment. I am willing to trust their integrity in the enforcement of the law and in the expenditure of these lump-sum appropriations.

I very much hope the amendment will be voted down overwhelmingly. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. I may not fully understand it, but I do not remember it just exactly as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] evidently does. I understand that it does not forbid the employment of more men in any line of work. It would forbid the increase of pay to any man whose salary is now fixed by the department or by law.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman carefully scan the amendment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I only heard it read. I have not taken it from the desk to read it myself.

Mr. MANN. It is certainly susceptible to the construction that no more money shall be spent for the work next year than was being spent on December 31.

Mr. LEVER. No matter what the exigency might be.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I beg the gentleman's pardon. If the gentleman will allow——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I decline to yield further now. I think if that is true, and I admit it is from the statement made by

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], it is further reason for rejecting the amendment. Now, as to the increase of salaries of men now employed therein, the total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture to-day is at least 14,000, and many of them are paid from the lump sum. A part of them only have their salaries fixed by law and are on what we call the statutory roll. I think it would be unwise for Congress to say by the adoption of this amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture, nor any of the other officials of the department, shall have authority during the year under any circumstances to increase the pay of any man on the lump-sum roll. It would be unwise, it seems to me. Now, certainly, if the amendment is as broad as is suggested, and would forbid the employment of an extra number of men regardless of the emergency or contingency for extra work that might arise, then this amendment ought not to be adopted.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, just a moment.

Mr. GORDON. Does the Chair wish to recognize anyone in favor of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is only seeking to carry out the usual practice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the Chair that I would like to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. GORDON. I am in favor of the amendment. The last two speakers were against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to be recognized in favor of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes. That will give us ample time. Then I hope we will go ahead with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will bear that in mind, but the Chair was proceeding to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read for the information of the committee.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I think the reading of this amendment clearly refutes the contention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and of the last gentleman who spoke, that the purpose of this amendment is to limit the number of employees. It simply limits the salary. In other words, it attempts to restrict the Department of Agriculture to its constitutional duty and function.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the amendment say it restricts the compensation for a class of work?

Mr. GORDON. No; it does not. No official shall receive more than he received on December 31.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not as acute as he usually is.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It says service or class of work.

Mr. GORDON. It certainly does. I think I understand the English language and know what the amendment means.

But so far as I am concerned, I am not especially inclined to delegate to any Secretary of Agriculture or anybody else the constitutional duties imposed upon Congress. If we are not fit to perform these duties, let us amend the Constitution and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to fix salaries. The Constitution, which we all swore to support here, without equivocation or evasion, provides that no appropriation except for the Army and Navy shall be made for a longer period than one year, I thinks it is.

Now, of course, this is just an indirect way—this thing of appropriating lump sums to some head of a department, and letting him go out and hire people and fix salaries—an indirect way of Congress delegating its functions to some member of the executive department. I am very much surprised that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] has not been adopted heretofore. It seems to me clear that it ought to be done.

The last gentleman who spoke, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], seems very willing to concede that the Secretary of Agriculture is very much better qualified than he is to fix these salaries. Well, if he thinks he is not qualified on that subject he ought to resign from the Committee on Agriculture and let somebody be appointed who is willing to take the responsibility.

This appropriation of lump sums to be disbursed at the discretion of executive officers ought not, it seems to me, to be tolerated by Congress. It appears to me, although I am a new Member here, that it is a system of evading responsibility on the part of this House that ought not to be tolerated.

Now, I speak in no spirit of hostility to the distinguished gentleman who is occupying the position of Secretary of Agriculture. But he has not been elected to Congress yet, and this thing of making lump-sum appropriations and allowing the head of a department to raise salaries to suit his own sweet will is, it seems to me, a thing that Congress, when it understands it, ought not to tolerate, and I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is appropriate, necessary, and proper and ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin for or against the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps the Chair ought to recognize some one who is against it.

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time in arguing whether this amendment prevents an increase in the amount appropriated or the amount expended for different classes of work, although that is clearly what the amendment says. However, I do not suppose that is the intention of the author of the amendment. It illustrates, however, the difficulty of preparing an amendment on the floor of the House which will take all the work out of a great department of the Government.

For me, I am in favor of the Department of Agriculture and the development of the work in the Department of Agriculture. I am sorry that so many gentlemen of the House, whenever an agricultural bill comes before the House, make carping criticism of the methods of appropriations for that department, which they forget when appropriations for other departments are up for consideration. First, I believe in making appropriations specifically, and not in lump sums, so far as is possible; but I notice that the great Committee on Appropriations, which holds a membership which can not be excelled or probably equalled in this House, and which very readily criticizes the agricultural bill, which carries a total in the neighborhood of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000—that great committee brings in the sundry civil bill and the legislative bill with lump appropriations galore. Here is a lump-sum appropriation in the sundry civil bill of this year, $2,110,000 in one lump for the Life-Saving Service; $2,350,000 in one lump for the Revenue-Cutter Service; $1,300,000 for salaries, and so forth, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; $1,625,000 in a lump sum for the wages of plate printers, and so forth, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; $10,150,000 in a lump sum, in a short paragraph, for defraying the expenses of the collection of customs; $2,275,000 in a lump for the Lighthouse Service; $2,649,500 in a lump, in a short paragraph, for the Immigration Service. Why, if such appropriations as those had been included in lump sums by the Committee on Agriculture, not only the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations but all the rest of the House would have thrown a fit. But they condone great appropriations in lumps, which ought to be segregated in their own committee, and then they find grievous fault with the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should prevail, it would paralyze the Department of Agriculture. Even if it goes only to the extent that the author desires, what is the situation? The Department of Agriculture picks up young men who wish to take up scientific work. They start them at low salaries and develop them until they become great scientists. It is idle to suppose that you can start a young scientist at a salary of a thousand dollars or twelve hundred and expect him as he remains in the service, developing and growing, to retain that salary, and everyone knows it. These other departments have regular promotions provided by law, but the Department of Agriculture under these lump-sum appropriations does not have the regular promotions provided by law; and if the purpose of the gentleman was to keep from increasing salaries, we all know that it would paralyze the Department of Agriculture; and for me, I am for that department and its great work. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP and Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Indiana for or against the amendment?

Mr. CULLOP. I am for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may have a clear understanding of the amendment I am going to read it to the committee again. It provides:

No money appropriated by this act in any lump sum shall be used to pay for any service or class of work in the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1916 in excess of the rates of compensation paid for such service or work in the department December 31, 1914.

The amendment does not limit the number of employees, but it does limit the compensation of employees in the class of work for which they are employed and provides that they shall not be paid in excess of the pay they have received this last year. I do not think it is contemplated by the chairman of the committee that the rate of compensation shall be increased, nor would it be necessary under the conditions that it should be; but it is wise legislation to provide now, in the passage of this appropriation bill, that the men who are to be employed in this department for the coming year shall know what the salaries are to be in the class of work or service they are to render. The Secretary of Agriculture, as the head of that department, ought to ask that it be done. Gentlemen say they are for this kind of a law and that this limitation should be fixed by statute. If so, why do they oppose this amendment? That is exactly what it does. Now, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the chairman of this committee, that the work done in the foot-and-mouth disease was not satisfactory to the people of this country, especially in the State of Indiana, where this disease existed in some localities; but it was done in such a way as to impose hardship, and in many instances serious charges have been made against the character of work done. The people of that great State sustained great losses because, as some of them assert, of the unfair, unjust, or incompetent handling of this matter. Hardships were imposed on stock feeders and shippers which produced severe and serious criticism and aroused much antipathy against the officials having it in charge.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. Did the gentleman vote for the $2,500,000 appropriation carried in the deficiency bill the other day for this work?

Mr. CULLOP. I did; and I advocated the passage of it; but in my judgment the careless work done in this department cost the cattle producers of Indiana twice that sum, a thing which could have been avoided and ought to have been avoided if proper regulations or orders had been promulgated by the department or the official in charge. Stock was jockeyed at stockyards at Indianapolis when there was no reason on earth for it, as well-informed persons assert. If the man in charge of this business from the department had done his duty to the people and the public, it is charged, much would have been saved to stock raisers, and the severe criticisms made in this regard by people who were in position to know would have been avoided; and the stock shippers and the stock producers would not have suffered the loss they have sustained because of the character of work that was performed in this regard in Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, it can not be denied that the manner in which the foot-and-mouth disease has been handled by those in charge of that work has been not only very expensive to the Government but far more so to the farmers in the several States infected. It broke out in a herd of cattle near Niles, Mich., and an official was detailed to examine the herd. He did so, and surely he did not diagnose the disease properly, either because of his incompetency or disregard of duty, because he did not prevent shipments from this herd to be made to different parts of the country, scattering the disease over several States and infecting different sections of the country. It was a serious blunder on some person's part and could have only been the result of either incompetency on his part or a willful neglect of public duty. His conduct in this matter deserves attention from the department he represented, as his acts in this matter were costly and dangerous.

But, sir, it is not only his handling of the disease at Niles, Mich., that deserves criticism, but also in Indiana. The people of that State have suffered immensely because either of his incompetency or his utter disregard of duty. The toll levied upon the stock shippers there because of his want of proper regard for the rights of shippers deserves the severest criticism, they assert, and is receiving it. Because of his failure or inability to properly regulate the matter, stock shippers were "docked" unreasonably in the sale of their stock. He could, if he had been competent and attended properly to his duty, they claim, have prevented this "docking" process in the sale of their stock and prevented the enormous losses many of them sustained. It could have been avoided if he had done his duty in this particular, but it was not done, and whether this failure was the result of incompetency or some other cause I am not advised. It worked a great hardship as well as injustice upon innocent persons, who were in no manner responsible for it or his official position. One thing is clear, however, if he had been competent and done his duty this disease would have been confined to the herd at Niles, Mich., where it first appeared, and would not have been scattered over the country, entailing great loss to both the Government and many cattle producers in several of the States in this Union. That he is receiving public censure does not make reparation to the injured or restore the losses incurred. He deserves further attention, and I hope will receive it. One thing sure, it would seem better attention should be given work of this far-reaching importance in order that a repetition may not occur. Personally I do not know who is to blame, but one thing is apparent, some one is, and whoever it is he should be held responsible.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not apply to the class of service or limit the number to be employed in any class or service in the department, but it does limit the compensation of the employees who are to be employed in that service, and provides that it shall not in the coming year exceed what has been paid in the year just closed. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I advised the Chair several times that I am in favor of it, and I have not changed my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is seeking to divide the time equally between those in favor of the amendment and those opposed to it.

Mr. GORDON. The Chair recognized two gentlemen who were opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is simply seeking to divide the time equally. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the only effect of this amendment is to provide that the salaries now paid to employees of any class who are paid out of lump-sum appropriations shall not be increased during the next fiscal year. In private employment to-day it is the policy of every business man, recognizing the business depression that is so general throughout the country, not to increase salaries. From a governmental standpoint where we are paying salaries much in excess of those being paid for similar employment in the world outside, especially in the Agriculture Department, we can well afford, with a deficit facing us for the next fiscal year, to have this restriction placed upon the discretion of the department heads, so that at least for one year the rate of compensation shall not be increased over that paid on December 31, 1914.

It is no new argument for the chairman of this committee to say that the heads of the departments do not wish to be restricted in the expenditure of lump-sum appropriations, as it is invariably true that every head wishes to have free rein in the disbursement of moneys for their bureaus, and from the legislative standpoint this is highly objectionable. There is no bill that so offends in the number of lump-sum appropriations as the Agricultural appropriation bill.

When the Post Office Committee established that great business adjunct of the department, the postal savings bank, did the House grant them unlimited time in which to adjust their salaries? No. Study the legislative appropriation bill and you will find that the salaries of all of these experts are fixed. When we organized the business adjunct of the parcel post, did we place a restriction as to the salaries that we fixed? You will find that we limited the salaries. And that is a business establishment that it might well be argued needed some leeway.

It is for the purpose of placing restrictions upon their discretion, so that they will not waste these moneys that are carried in this bill, that this amendment is offered. Here we have an item carrying $230,000 for farm management. Of that $230,000 the sum of $110,000 is paid for salaries in Washington alone and only $35,000 for salaries without, and the balance for field service. We have another item in this bill for the field investigation of crop estimates. Where in 1914 there were but 15 men receiving salaries of $1,500, in the present estimate they ask for 43 men with salaries of $1,500, another instance of the abuse of lump-sum appropriations. And when we come here trying to restrict the extravagance of this department we are

told that it will interfere with the commendable work that this department is doing in the foot-and-mouth disease and the hog-cholera investigation. We know that that is without merit, for the reason that there will be no salary affected so far as those respective appropriations are concerned. This amendment only provides that the rate of compensation for each individual shall not be increased during the next fiscal year. It places some limitation on increases for the next fiscal year, and I call upon Democrats and Republicans alike who are in favor of retrenchment and the restriction of extravagant appropriations to vote for this commendable amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that no money shall be used from this lump sum to pay for any service or class of work in the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year of 1916 in excess of the rate of compensation paid for such service or work in the department December 31, 1914.

Now, it seems that there can be no question as to what construction will be placed on that language. It not only puts a limitation on the amount to be expended for service, but it puts a limitation on the amount to be expended for work, because it says "service or work." The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] says that the amendment proposes to limit the compensation, and nothing else. If it proposes to limit the compensation and nothing else, you will have to change the language of the amendment. I say it is not wise and not best to limit the compensation even, for the reason, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a moment ago, that this department employs young men, and having developed them in a line of work of this department, as they grow more useful to the Government of the United States and more beneficial to the people of the United States, it is necessary to pay them an adequate compensation in accordance with their increased efficiency in the labor which they perform. Unless you do pay them adequate compensation private interests will reach out and pluck them from the service in which they have been developed at the expense of the Government and utilize them for their own personal advantage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that in the practice of the Agricultural Department, as far as scientific men are employed, when they graduate to a higher class of work they are put to a different class of work and receive a higher compensation, and this amendment does not affect that?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is sometimes done where they can be transferred to a higher class of work for which they have been developed by reason of the knowledge that they have acquired in the service that they have performed. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says that they fix the salaries in the Post Office Department. There is a wide difference between the services rendered in the Post Office Department and that rendered in the Agricultural Department. The Post Office Department salaries are definitely defined, and the employee works eight hours a day, no more. A scientist in the Agricultural Department is not limited to hours of work, but frequently works all day and oftentimes into the wee small hours of the night.

As I said a moment ago, they are oftentimes taken from the Department of Agriculture and carried out into private enterprises to serve persons in private business. A few years ago, in order to prevent that taking place, Congress authorized, if necessary, a raise in salaries that might be paid to scientists from $4,000 to $4,500. It was necessary to give the department that leeway in order to retain these men in the service. To show that the department is not abusing this discretion that was conferred, they have not raised a single salary above $4,000. That was given as a discretionary power that they might use it when it became necessary, but as it has not become necessary it has not been used. Now, the gentleman stated that private enterprises and business were holding down salaries. Yes; and in the public departments, in the Department of Agriculture we are holding down salaries, because we have not increased salaries in this bill except a few, and they are unimportant and inferior positions, where it was necessary to increase them in order to do justice to the employees who are performing the service. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I regret extremely that a Member of this House in an effort to discharge what he conceives to be his legislative duty can not do so without being held up by members of the Committee on Agriculture and other Members of the House as antagonistic to the Agricultural Department. I also regret extremely that I am censured because I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee when I undertake to criticize what I regard to be an unwise legislative practice, or departmental practice, in the bill presented to the House by my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and in doing that I regret that I subject to criticism the committee upon which I serve because possibly the same evil has not been corrected in some bills which it handles. Now, I have no antagonism to the Agricultural Department. On the contrary, I am in favor of its encouragement and of making appropriations for the extension of the work that is legitimate. But, on the other hand, I have an abiding conviction that as long as the Congress of the United States, in the Agricultural bill or any other appropriation bill, appropriates money in a lump sum for the payment of personal employment—and without charging anyone who administers that fund with corruption or even with maladministration—it is inevitable that the appropriations will not be used as wisely or salaries fixed as economically as if there was a supervision outside of the Agricultural Department.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, reads as follows:

SEC. 5. That any person violating section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved August 5, 1882 (Stat. L., vol. 22, p. 255), shall be summarily removed from office, and may also upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year.

Now, the statute which that refers to is as follows:

That no civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall after the 1st day of October next be employed in any of the executive departments, or subordinate bureaus or offices thereof at the seat of government, except only at such rates and in such numbers, respectively, as may be specifically appropriated for by Congress for such clerical and other personal services for each fiscal year; and no civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger, mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall hereafter be employed at the seat of government in any executive department or subordinate bureau or office thereof or be paid from any appropriation made for contingent expenses, or for any specific or general purpose, unless such employment is authorized and payment therefor specifically provided in the law granting the appropriations, and then only for services actually rendered in connection with and for the purposes of the appropriation from which payment is made, and at the rate of compensation usual and proper for such services; and after the 1st day of October next section 172 of the Revised Statutes, and all other laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and all laws and parts of laws authorizing the employment of officers, clerks, draftsmen, copyists, messengers, assistant messengers, mechanics, watchmen, laborers, or other employees at a different rate of pay or in excess of the numbers authorized by appropriations made by Congress, be, and they are hereby, repealed; and thereafter all details of civil officers, clerks, or other subordinate employees from places outside of the District of Columbia for duty within the District of Columbia, except temporary details for duty connected with their respective offices, be, and are hereby, prohibited; and thereafter all moneys accruing from lapsed salaries, or from unused appropriations for salaries, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the contention made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] that the language of the amendment that I have offered will in the slightest degree affect the amount of money appropriated. It would be asinine, in my judgment, for anybody to pass on it and make such a construction. It says "for compensation or work," the work meaning the service performed, and that construction, I think, would be placed upon it.

I believe it would not do anything except place a limitation on the expenditure of the lump sum for personal employment. It would prevent the lump sums in this act from being used to increase the pay of persons paid from those lump sums over and above the amount paid them on December 31 last.

I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting the remainder of what I read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to extend his remarks in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment ought to be adopted. In my judgment, it is susceptible only of the interpretation put upon it by the gentleman who presented it. Fairly interpreted it means that out of this lump-sum appropriation no employee shall receive more compensation for his services than he received last year. I think also that it is extremely unjust to the friends of the amendment to intimate that they are hostile to the Department of Agriculture. I doubt if there be in the House any gentleman more willing to vote reasonable appropriations for the department than I have been. I have always voted for such appropriations and have done my best in every legitimate way to foster the interests of that department. And I consider also that it was very extravagant to say, as was said by a gentleman a few minutes ago, that the adoption of this amendment would paralyze the Department of Agriculture. "Paralyze" was the word he used.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I have but a short time, if the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to ask if the gentleman can tell us whether these employees are continued in the service from year to year or is it a temporary service?

Mr. COOPER. It is my understanding that all of them are regularly in the service from year to year.

The Department of Agriculture sent to the committee which prepared this bill a book of estimates. Here is a copy of that book. It contains a statement—a statement made, remember, by the department itself—showing in detail the number and kind of employees which it desired to have in the bureau and what compensation it proposed that each employee should receive. Why, then, did not this bill make specific, detailed appropriations to cover these specific, detailed estimates for salaries, or for such of them as the committee might deem meritorious? But no; the bill contains nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it puts almost a quarter of a million of dollars into the hands of a bureau chief and tells him to hire men and pay salaries in his discretion.

Now, there is not any use in saying to us who are opposed to lump-sum appropriations based, as this appropriation is based, upon detailed estimates that we are undertaking to paralyze the Department of Agriculture. I know some of these bureau chiefs. All are fine men. But no man ought to be authorized to take $230,000 or more out of the Treasury of the United States and expend it as may please him in paying salaries for employees of the sort listed in this book of estimates. Not even the President of the United States ought to be empowered to expend such a sum in his discretion except to meet a great public emergency.

The gentleman from Illinois said that we ought to make this lump-sum appropriation because, he said, there are young men employed in the department, worthy young men, who must from time to time be promoted and receive more pay or the department can not keep them. Now, if there be any such necessity as this, why did not the book of estimates make reference to this alleged fact and contain an estimate of the amount probably necessary to meet the requirements of the case? The department could easily have told the Committee on Agriculture that there were a certain number of young men in the employ of the department, some of whom were exhibiting much ability, and that it would like so much margin for them. But there is no suggestion of this kind in the estimates. The $230,000 is to be a lump sum for one man to spend in his discretion. The department estimates are not in the slightest degree to bind him. Now, there is no use in attempting to evade the issue. Lump-sum appropriations are bad. The fact strongly urged by the gentleman from Illinois that other bills have contained lump-sum appropriations does not at all justify us in making the lump-sum appropriation in this bill. We ought from session to session of Congress put a stop to such appropriations of the public funds. That previous Congresses have made them affords no reason why we should continue the wrongful practice now. Lump-sum appropriations based on detailed estimates ought to be done away with. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, who is an exceedingly able lawyer, places upon this amendment one construction. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], an equally able lawyer, places upon this amendment another construction. My amiable and charming friend, the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. STAFFORD], another able lawyer, places upon this amendment one construction. My violent friend from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP], another of the very ablest lawyers in this House, puts upon this amendment another construction. It seems to me that when lawyers differ so radically about the construction of a simple 10-line amendment that it is well for the friends of agriculture to stick to the old line of doing business.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for just one moment in order that I may correct the gentleman? I do not care to be rated in this House as an eminent lawyer when I am not a lawyer at all, and I am the only man who is not a lawyer who has passed upon it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the gentleman ought to be. The gentleman talks and acts like one. [Laughter.] This proposition to amend and the different constructions that these lawyers place upon it this morning illustrate how dangerous it is to pass a hurriedly drawn amendment which goes to the very vitals of a system that has been growing up for 25 years. I offered this morning, to the gentleman from North Carolina, not to make the point of order on a proposition similar to this if he would offer it at the close of this bill, when we could debate it out, and he would not accept it. I had in my mind a carefully drawn amendment which might do the work so that the committee could pass upon it without any doubt. I intended to oppose my own amendment, but I wanted to know what the committee thought about it.

But the gentleman would not submit to it, and then asked us to pass an amendment upon which no two lawyers in this House can agree. Now, gentlemen, my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], who is one of the fairest men in this body, complains because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that this amendment would paralyze the usefulness and in a measure restrict the activities of the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman from Illinois is absolutely right. I read you from the statement of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture furnished me this morning:

> The marked efficiency in investigational and demonstrational work which the Department of Agriculture has developed in recent years has been largely due to the fact that as soon as the consideration of a problem has disclosed the lines along which it could most effectively be attacked the department has been able to concentrate all the available funds and efforts upon the problem in the most effective way. It is believed that any serious restriction of its freedom of action in this respect would be distinctly harmful and that it would lessen the efficiency and usefulness of the department.

That is the statement of the head of this department. While I do not and would not accuse the gentleman supporting this amendment of any desire to cripple the Department of Agriculture, I do not hesitate to say that, in my judgment, based upon 12 years of experience on the Agricultural Committee, the adoption of this amendment would work an absolute harmful revolution in the methods of the Department of Agriculture and its great work would suffer immensely. I feel that I have been bred and born, as it were, in the Department of Agriculture. As a Democrat I stood faithfully by that great man, James Wilson, who is so much responsible for building up the department. He stood by this system. I am standing by the distinguished man who is at the head of it now, a learned man, an economist, and a student. He stands by this system, and says that the adoption of an amendment of this character would seriously retard his work. I ask the friends of agriculture to vote down this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $623,360.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that there is an apparent increase in the expense of the office of the Secretary of $283,480 as compared with the bill of last year. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain to the committee why that is.

Mr. LEVER. Twenty-three thousand dollars of the apparent increase is the natural increase carried in the item to investigate and encourage the adoption of new methods of farm practice and farm management, and the other is an increase by way of transfers.

Mr. BOOHER. The balance of that increase, then, is brought about by the rearrangement of the office of the Secretary?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say I followed the chairman of this committee as a friend of agriculture on the question now before the House, and I want to congratulate this House on having the services of such a distinguished and able man, as well as his associates on the committee, Mr. LEE of Georgia and others. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to challenge one statement made by the chairman when he suggested that we should accept the views of the Secretary on agricultural questions.

While I am willing to follow him as a friend of agriculture when he is right and feel that his advice should be sought, still I reserve the right to differ with him when I think he is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to make a lengthy argument at this time on rural credits, but for the purpose of urging immediate action on this the most important economic question now before the American people. When the bill is up for consideration I hope to discuss the issues involved in detail. I have studied the question with much interest, and while I have introduced a bill myself I have no personal ambition to serve and truthfully say what I want is action on rural-credit legislation and the passage of a bill that will add more profit to the farmer and thereby contribute to the happiness of the people on the farm and make more attractive farm life. The Member of this

House who aids in checking the depopulation of the rural districts and stops the overcrowding of towns and cities serves his country well. Let us broaden the field of opportunity of the farmer by giving him long-term loans at reasonable interest rates.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to remind the Democratic Members of the platform pledges at Baltimore to give the farmers rural-credit legislation. The end of this session is near. The needs of a rural-credit banking system in this country are urgent. The commercial banks do short-term business, and in order to meet present-day conditions on the farm and reduce interest on farm loans it is proposed to make farm loans for the purpose of farm improvement. The money advanced by the rural-credit bank must be applied on the farm in such manner as to improve the farm and make farming more profitable. The local associations, being responsible for the return of loans contracted and being the trustees of funds, see that money loaned for farm improvement is properly applied by the person securing the money; and these trustees are personally interested in making no loans to persons who would not take pride in the upbuilding of his farm and community.

There are two schools of thought on farm loans in this House. One favors Government financial aid to the proposed rural-credit banks, while the other is opposed to Government aid, either by the Government loaning directly out of the Treasury or by purchase of stock or bonds of the rural-credit banks. It is generally admitted that the rural-credit banks are a success in European countries without Government aid. There is ready sale for the rural-credit bonds. It is also admitted by both sides that when the various European Governments first established the rural-credit banks the Government gave them financial aid until the bonds were thoroughly established as high-class bonds for investment in the money markets.

Mr. Chairman, the rural banking system has been in operation in some European countries several hundred years, and yet the conditions prevailing in the United States are so different that we can not take the European systems as a safe criterion to follow when enacting legislation to meet our needs. Under European laws it is nearly impossible to sustain loss by a loan should a borrower undertake to default in payment.

Owing to conditions prevailing in Europe the farmers were not dilatory about organizing associations and giving their individual, collective, and mutual obligation to pay all bonds issued; but in this large country of 48 States, with 48 different kinds of collection laws and with our exemption laws and various other laws favorable to borrowers, the environments present difficulties to be overcome. I have seen agricultural financial enterprises operated by farmers for the common good succeed, and I have also seen farmers sustain serious loss by having to assume obligations contracted for the benefit of community participants in financial enterprises promoted for the community uplift.

If we pass a rural credit bill authorizing the organization of rural banks, and call for subscription from the farmer and require his obligation as a member of a rural credit association to guarantee individually, collectively, and mutually the payment of a loan maturing from 5 to 30 years in the future, in my opinion many years will pass before the farmers feel the good effects of such a rural credit bill. The financial gain of those nonborrowing farmers will not be sufficient to induce them readily to guarantee the payment of bonds issued by the association to secure cheap money for a borrowing member of such association. They will hesitate before entering into a surety obligation. The bill I introduced provided that the Government should purchase enough stock to perfect the organization and issue rural credit Government bonds for the purpose of purchasing the bonds issued by the rural credit local banks in sufficient quantity to guarantee the success of the rural credit bank, and as soon as capital seeks these bonds as an investment the Government shall withdraw aid to such banks. If the Government does nothing more than provide a rural credit system and furnishes no Government aid, it will be many years before the farmer receives the much-needed relief. The financial aid of the Government, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary to give confidence in the rural credit banks and assure success to the rural credit system proposed. When the safety as an investment of the rural credit association bonds is established these bonds can be sold as cheaply as Government bonds and funds secured to loan farmers at or near 4 per cent on long-term loans. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an inquiry of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] in reference to the expense of the office of farm management. Where is the appropriation for the carrying out of the Lever Act?

Mr. LEVER. It is in the State relations service, which you will come to later on in the bill.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing in here that says anything about the Lever Act?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there is. I will give the gentleman the page in a moment. It is in the State relations service, further on in the bill, and set out specifically.

The Clerk read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU.

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 assistant chief of bureau, $3,250; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $3,000; 1 chief of division of stations and accounts, $2,750; 1 chief of printing division, $2,500; 3 chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 23 clerks, class 2; 30 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at $1,000 each; 10 clerks, at $900 each; 1 telegraph operator, $1,200; 1 assistant foreman of division, $1,600; 1 chief compositor, $1,400; 1 lithographer, $1,500; 2 lithographers, at $1,200 each; 1 pressman, $1,200; 5 compositors, at $1,250 each; 14 printers, at $1,200 each; 11 printers, at $1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at $720 each; 1 chief instrument maker, $1,400; 3 instrument makers, at $1,200 each; 2 skilled mechanics, at $1,200 each; 7 skilled mechanics, at $1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, $840; 1 skilled mechanic, $720; 6 skilled artisans, at $840 each; 1 engineer, $1,300; 1 fireman and steam fitter, $840; 4 firemen, at $720 each; 1 captain of the watch, $1,000; 1 electrician, $1,200; 1 gardener, $1,000; 4 repairmen, at $840 each; 6 repairmen, at $720 each; 4 watchmen, at $720 each; 17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 31 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 88 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $450 each; 37 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $360; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $333,400.

Mr. FOWLER and Mr. PAGE of North Carolina rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the provision in line 24, on page 4, "one assistant chief of bureau, $3,250."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] makes a point of order against the item on line 24, page 4, which reads, "one assistant chief of bureau, $3,250."

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, sir. There is no authorization for this place, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Chair that this language from the statute transferring the Weather Bureau Service from the Signal Corps to the Department of Agriculture, section 4, says:

The Weather Bureau shall hereafter consist of one Chief of Weather Bureau and such civilian employees as Congress may annually provide for and as may be necessary to properly perform the duty devolving on said bureau by law.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; but Congress has not provided for this place.

Mr. LEVER. Congress is doing it now.

Mr. FOWLER. That is my objection.

Mr. LEVER. That is your objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. As I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], he desires to make these salaries specific instead of having them included in the lump-sum appropriation. This assistant chief of the bureau is on the lump-sum roll, and he is paid out of that. If he is transferred, as this proposes to transfer him, it will take him out of the lump-sum and put him on the statutory roll.

Mr. FOWLER. He is the very man that was in league with Willis L. Moore——

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not in order.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman can not escape the reply——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that he will hear an argument on the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I yielded to the gentleman, and he raised the question that the office was an office which was provided for in the lump-sum appropriation. I say, that in the lump sum there is no office provided for, and that is the onus of the lump-sum provision.

Mr. Chairman, the bill did carry some time ago a provision for an assistant, but after the scandalous condition was shown up in the Weather Bureau, when the Executive was compelled to reach out his strong arm in order to stop and cleanse it, this man and this position were dropped.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that the provision has not been dropped. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is absolutely right. It has been carried heretofore in the lump sum, and the gentleman whom the gentleman from Illinois is attacking has been in this service for 30 years, and I have no doubt is as honest as the gentleman from Illinois ever had time to be.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, it is queer to me how gentlemen will stand up for men who were turned out of this service——

Mr. LEVER. I do not know the man at all——

Mr. FOWLER. Turned out by the executive department.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is absolutely wrong again.

Mr. FOWLER. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this provision was carried in the bill some time ago, but after the scandalous conduct in the Weather Bureau and after the President of the United States, with his clean hands, brushed out of this service the unholy and unclean, then this position was dropped, and the man who once held it was taken out of the service. But sometime afterwards he was placed back in the service on the lump-sum cart, and that cart has been hauling him around in the Weather Bureau from time to time for the last year or more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the year ending June 30, 1914, among other things, provided—and that was when I was making war on the immense increase not only in the number of employees but against the unwarranted increase in the salaries—this provision was adopted and placed practically at the end of that bill, and it reads as follows:

And hereafter every officer and employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he is ready to rule, but he will hear the gentleman longer if he has anything more to say.

Mr. FOWLER. At that time, Mr. Chairman—and I hold before me a copy of the law—the provision for the Weather Bureau carried with it a provision for a salary of $6,000 for the chief, and for the assistant $3,250. At the last session of Congress—the last general session of Congress—this position was dropped, and it was dropped because of the fact that there was, as I recollect, such a strong opposition to the man who held that position that he had to be dropped out of the service, and hence the office was discontinued.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an effort on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to revive this place for the sole purpose of placing back this discredited man, who ought to have forever forfeited his right to any service in any department of this great Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there is ample authority for the appointment by the Chief of the Weather Bureau of this assistant. It also appears that it is only a transfer from the lump sum to the statutory roll. The Chair has no knowledge of the man who is to fill the position, and if he had it would not affect the position of the Chair.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no transfer of this position from the lump sum, because it was once provided for regularly in the bill and was dropped entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be placed on record correctly in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make this statement—if he is correctly informed on that subject, he will make this suggestion to the gentleman from Illinois: If the item was not in the law for a few years, it would not affect the law now, and it is in order to appropriate.

Mr. FOWLER. It was not affected by the organic law, except by the general law of appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. The rule is that where it is carried the salary of the last appropriation is the correct salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do it for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee for information. On line 25, at the bottom of page 5, the bill last year carried 27 messenger boys, at $360 each, and I notice this bill carries 37. What is the reason for this increase of 10?

Mr. LEVER. Ten messenger boys last year were carried under the lump-sum appropriation, and that appropriation has been reduced, and they have been transferred here.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is satisfactory, Mr. Chairman.

While I have a moment remaining, I want to make a little clearer my position and that of my committee when attacked, or when reference was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to our carrying lump-sum appropriations from which personal compensation was paid. I desire to call the attention of the committee and of the House to the fact that in the act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years this language occurs in section 7:

SEC. 7. That no part of any money contained herein or hereafter appropriated in lump sum shall be available for the payment of personal services at a rate of compensation in excess of that paid for the same or similar services during the fiscal year 1912; nor shall any person employed at a specific salary be hereafter transferred and hereafter paid from a lump-sum appropriation a rate of compensation greater than such specific salary, and the heads of departments shall cause this provision to be enforced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the legislative act for the fiscal year 1913 that section 7 was amended to read as follows:

SEC. 7. That no part of any money contained herein or hereafter appropriated in lump-sum shall be available for the payment of personal services at a rate of compensation in excess of that paid for the same or similar services during the preceding fiscal year; nor shall any person employed at a specific salary be hereafter transferred and hereafter paid from a lump-sum appropriation a rate of compensation greater than such specific salary, and the heads of departments shall cause this provision to be enforced: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to mechanics, artisans, their helpers and assistants, laborers, or any other employees whose duties are of similar character and required in carrying on the various manufacturing or constructing operations of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, that law applies to every single department of this Government except the Agricultural Department, and the salaries carried in lump sums in other bills, in the sundry civil bill, for instance, for various departments of the Government, are controlled absolutely by the language I have read from the law. In the Agricultural appropriation bill enacted for the year ending June 30, 1914, a specific exception is made to these two provisions of law as they touch the Agricultural Department.

I felt, Mr. Chairman, that I should say this much and place this statement in the RECORD in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois that the amendment I have offered to this bill might apply to other bills that come from the committee on which I serve. I want to say to him and to the committee that the language I have read, limiting this matter, applies to all those bills except the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman if this provision that he refers to as being in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is not now in force with regard to arsenals, navy yards, and other institutions of that kind where Federal employees are engaged at yearly stipends?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It applies, with the exception made in that later law which I read, which exempts certain classes of employees.

Mr. MOORE. Since that provision is being applied in that way, and is being complained of by those who think it works hardship in certain arsenals, and so forth, why should an exception be made in the Agricultural Department, where they are still permitted, at discretion, to give increased salaries or to pay special compensation?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not know how the gentleman from Pennsylvania voted on my amendment awhile ago.

Mr. MOORE. I voted for the gentleman's amendment, for the reason that while I believe in paying fair compensation I do not believe an exception should be made against those who work in the industries and in favor of those who work in the Agricultural Department. It seems to me that they should be treated alike.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. My position has been stated in reference to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Where is that exception carried for the Agricultural Department?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That exception is carried in the Agricultural bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I ask for two minutes more to answer this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I will state that the paragraph making an exception of the Agricultural Department from the operation of the provisions that I read from the deficiency and

legislative acts is carried in the Agricultural appropriation act approved March 4, 1913, on page 20, in the last paragraph of that page.

Mr. MANN. I remember it. I just wanted to get it in the RECORD; that is all.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say. I wanted merely to let the Committee of the Whole know that there was a provision of law applicable to every other appropriation bill except the one now under consideration. Therefore, what the gentleman has to say about the application of this to the sundry civil bill, which comes from the Appropriations Committee, does not hold, because there is this limitation placed upon it, the exact limitation that I was endeavoring to place upon the Agricultural bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] and myself are quite in accord in theory upon the subject of lump-sum appropriations. The real distinction between us is that the gentleman from North Carolina opposes lump-sum appropriations in the Agricultural bill, but encourages them in the bills which come from his own committee. I oppose them in both places, and seek to have specific appropriations made in both cases as far as possible, whether it is in the Agricultural bill or the sundry civil bill that comes from the Committee on Appropriations, or the legislative bill that comes from the Committee on Appropriations, or any other bills that come from the committee of which my friend from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] is an honored and distinguished member. Now, it is no criticism of the gentleman from North Carolina that these items are carried in the sundry civil bill. He has been overpowered in that committee in the past. He went on the committee some years ago, and is growing up nearer to the head of the committee, and doubtless will soon have his way in the committee, when these $10,000,000 lump-sum appropriations and $2,000,000 lump-sum appropriations now carried in the sundry civil bill will disappear. I cordially join with him in the effort to segregate them into separate items.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the gentleman ought, at any rate, to accord to me the credit for the effort that has been made, which has been effective so far as the other bills are concerned.

Mr. MANN. I am coming to that. It seems that I can not quite please the gentleman from North Carolina. In the midst of a commendation of the gentleman for his effort he still insists that I am criticizing him. I am not. I am commending him. I want to join with him to abolish these abominable lump-sum appropriations reported from the Committee on Appropriations right along, while they are criticizing such things if any other committee does them.

My friend from North Carolina refers to a provision in the old legislative bill which was repealed, so far as the Agricultural Department was concerned, by a deliberate act of Congress for reasons which seem sufficient to Congress. The Committee on Appropriations, seeing the abuses growing out of lump-sum appropriations, have on several occasions endeavored to correct some of those abuses by legislation, and the provisions in the two laws to which the gentleman has referred were two efforts made by the Committee on Appropriations. But my friend from North Carolina did not cite the last effort made by the Committee on Appropriations, which does not apply to the Agricultural Department. The Committee on Appropriations have three times, by legislation, endeavored to correct these abuses, and each time they admit their efforts are in vain, that they have not learned how, or if they have learned how they have not acted upon the information, to prepare the necessary form of language to cover the case. And yet my distinguished and beloved friend from North Carolina attempted a little while ago to do it on the floor in pencil in a sentence, without a moment's warning, and thought he could accomplish it. In the last sundry civil appropriation bill which was approved last August only the Committee on Appropriations tried its hand again.

[The time of Mr. MANN having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

This act was passed after the Agriculture Department had been excepted from the provisions of the previous act. This act was designed by the Committee on Appropriations to be put into law without the knowledge of the members of the Committee on Agriculture in order to overcome the exception which members of the Committee on Agriculture had put into the law without the knowledge of the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

Section 12 provides:

SEC. 12. That it shall not be lawful hereafter to pay to any person, employed in the service of the United States under any general or lump-sum appropriation, any sum additional to the regular compensation received for or attached to any employment held prior to an appointment or designation as acting for or instead of an occupant of any other office or employment. This provision shall not be construed as prohibiting regular and permanent appointments by promotion from lower to higher grades of employments.

This provision put into the law covering the Agricultural Department was designed to accomplish the purpose which the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina this morning was designed to accomplish, according to his statement. But this provision was so clumsily drawn, notwithstanding it passed in both Houses of Congress, that it would take my friend from Philadelphia or some Philadelphia lawyer to unravel it and tell what its effect was. It covered the Agricultural Department. It is a little plainer, in my judgment, than the amendment offered this morning by my friend from North Carolina. Very likely, before the present Agricultural bill becomes a law, there will be a provision inserted excepting the Department of Agriculture from the provisions of this law, and the committee will put into the sundry civil bill another provision covering the Department of Agriculture, and so on ad infinitum.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman very rarely needs any information as to what has taken place, but as far as my recollection goes the provision in the sundry civil bill was offered from the floor by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. MANN. He is a member of the Committee on Appropriations; it came from the Committee on Appropriations. I remember when it was offered that it had the approval of the Committee on Appropriations, who had not dared to report it in the bill for fear that the members of the Committee on Agriculture would discover it, and hence it was offered from the floor when they were not paying attention. I did not object.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a few questions. On page 5, line 19, it says, "17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each," and then it goes on and designates in like language—184 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, in all. What I want to ask is, why can not you separate those and let us know who are the laborers, the messengers, and who are the messenger boys; and, in the second place, why you have so many in the Weather Bureau?

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman, first, of course there is employed in the central office at Washington a number of messengers, which will be found in other items in the bill. In addition, we appropriate for 206 Weather Bureau stations in different parts of the country, in which there are a great many messenger boys, who handle messages and the business of the station.

Mr. GOULDEN. What would be the particular duty of a messenger boy in an outlying station?

Mr. LEVER. If a telegram comes in showing an observation or forecast and that forecast is to be sent to the bulletin boards in a city, like the great city of New York, on exchange, the messenger boy would handle that as a part of his duty. Another part of his duty is to learn to be an observer himself. He grows up in the service, as it were, and these messenger boys are really students of meteorology.

Mr. GOULDEN. Have you increased the salaries of these boys from year to year as they grow older in the service and in usefulness? I see that they run all the way from $360 to $720 per year.

Mr. LEVER. We have not increased the salaries this year, but they are graded. Now, as to why we call the messenger boy a laborer. It sometimes happens that one of these boys may be desired not only to do messenger service, but to do a laborer's service as well. The Civil Service Commission has held that in order that that may be done the title shall be such as to permit it, and so the title conforms to the civil-service regulation.

Mr. GOULDEN. Would it be possible to separate this item into so many messengers and so many laborers?

Mr. LEVER. It would be possible, but it would make the service more expensive. Here is a boy acting as a messenger for two or three hours in the day and the balance of the day he is needed as a laborer.

Mr. GOULDEN. What struck me was the large number, and I wanted to know their use and why they could not be

segregated. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LINTHICUM having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and resolutions of the following titles:

December 28, 1914:

H. R. 6867. An act to increase and fix the compensation of the collector of customs for the customs collection district of Omaha.

January 7, 1915:

H. R. 6939. An act to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota.

January 11, 1915:

H. R. 13698. An act for the relief of Charles A. Coulson.

January 14, 1915:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Patents to exchange printed copies of United States patents with the Dominion of Canada.

January 16, 1915:

H. R. 13815. An act to increase the limit of cost for the construction of a public building at Marlin, Tex.

January 21, 1915:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution directing the selection of a site for the erection of a statue in Washington, D. C., to the memory of the late Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade.

January 25, 1915.

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of the Atlantic Canning Co.; and

H. R. 20241. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, $1,185,150, including not to exceed $599,660 for salaries, $122,170 for special observations and reports, $279,000 for telegraphing and telephoning.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 12, on page 8, after the comma, following the word "reports," insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee about this $279,000 for telegraphing and telephoning. It seems like an enormous sum of money for that purpose.

Mr. LEVER. It is a large sum of money, as a matter of fact, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, but the gentleman must keep in mind that the Weather Bureau service extends to almost every hamlet in this broad land of ours, the West Indies and the like of that. A few years ago this whole question of telephone and telegraph service in the Weather Bureau was investigated by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, and that subcommittee was very much pleased with the situation as they found it. It is a large sum of money, but it is necessary in promoting the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has recently had some hearings on the postalization of the telegraph and telephone service of the country, and I rise to inquire whether the chairman can inform the committee what rate the Government pays for the very liberal use of the telegraph system by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. LEVER. I am sorry to say I do not have that information right at hand. It is in the committee room, but I do not happen to have it among my papers; but, as I say in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, this matter was looked into pretty thoroughly by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture several years ago, before I was chairman of the committee, and they felt satisfied with the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a general impression that the Government has a special rate of 1 cent a word, and I was wondering whether that rate applies or whether there were lower terms than that, even when a department or bureau uses it in such a large way.

Mr. LEVER. I see that my data shows that they pay the Government rate for miscellaneous messages, namely, administrative and other telegrams from Washington. This rate is 20 cents for 20 words, and so forth, as fixed by the Postmaster General. Circuit weather reports are sent at special rates fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreement with the companies performing the services. All forecasts, and so forth, for distribution to the public are paid for at Weather Bureau special rates.

Mr. POWERS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if this is about the usual amount carried in the Agricultural bill for this purpose?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there is no change in it whatever.

Mr. MANN. There is a $4,000 increase.

Mr. LEVER. That is not an actual increase; it is an apparent increase.

Mr. MANN. Yes; it is increased in this item.

Mr. MOORE. Is this telephoning and telegraphing what is known as official work altogether, or does it go to private concerns?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; it is entirely official, as I take it.

Mr. MOORE. There are certain institutions of a private nature that are very much interested in having this kind of information. Do they pay the telephone and telegraph charges when they get the information from the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. I should think so; yes. I think so, although that question has never occurred to me before.

Mr. MOORE. There are certain experimental stations conducted by private individuals, large concerns, and I would like to know whether they pay for information they receive by telephone and telegraph. It is important for them to receive it immediately, of course.

Mr. LEVER. I take it, of course, if they are receiving telegrams for their own private information, they would have to pay for the telegrams. This covers the official telegrams of the Weather Bureau Service.

Mr. MOORE. The Department of Commerce has recently required all those who ask for consular reports to pay for them, and has generally begun a system of economizing with regard to all publications. It seems to me if this information which costs the Government $279,000 is sent to private individuals, the question of making them pay for it ought to be considered.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied that is what is done now.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me right there? Why should any private individual pay for it when it is a public service?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind some corporation or some big concern that desires it for its own information, and they pay their own telegrams. I rather think that is likely, but I am not sure.

Mr. MADDEN. They would not pay the reply.

Mr. LEVER. I rather think they pay for the reply, but I am not sure.

Mr. MOORE. That is what I wanted to find out, whether in the event a man wants to know about the weather in order to properly protect his cranberry crop or to cover certain orange trees or take care of potato plants—whether in the event of his seeking that information the Government would pay the expense of advising him. Here is a large item and——

Mr. LEVER. That may be proper; but I do not happen to have the information, because I did not anticipate the question, but I will get it for the gentleman to-morrow if he desires.

Mr. MOORE. I will put it this way, so it can be understood readily: I am conducting a large farm, and it is necessary for me to have certain information quickly in order that I may protect my crops or otherwise safeguard my property. I ask the bureau what the condition of the weather is likely to be to-morrow or the next day. Does the bureau furnish that information for nothing?

Mr. LEVER. I would think not, because I do not think they should do it. If a request comes upon the Weather Bureau to furnish the information to a private individual or private individuals in a community, I think they should pay for it.

Mr. MOORE. I asked the question particularly because——

Mr. LEVER. I think that is the rule, although I am not posted on that, because I did not anticipate the question.

Mr. MOORE. I am asking the question particularly because the Department of Commerce—and I did not care to drag that in now—has insisted that those seeking consular reports shall pay for them, and it is a fair question, in view of the large item of $279,000 for telephone and telegraph.

Mr. LEVER. I will get the information and put it in the RECORD if the gentleman desires it.

Mr. MOORE. I will be very much obliged to the gentleman if he will do so.

Mr. LEVER. I will put it in to-morrow.

Where forecasts are requested for private persons, same must be paid for by the party asking for them. Such reports are never furnished at Government expense. The Weather Bureau maintains in operation 443 miles of telegraph and telephone lines in various sections of the country. Of course all weather information passing over such lines is a free service for the general benefit of the public.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOULDEN. On page 6, line 19, it says:

For subsistence, care, and purchase of horses and vehicles, the purchase and repair of harness, for official purposes only.

I want to ask what those horses are used for. What particular use would an official have for them in Washington or elsewhere?

Mr. LEVER. We have two horses out at Mount Weather which they are going to dispose of as quickly as they can, and they have a horse and wagon at the central station in this city.

Mr. GOULDEN. My idea was that the bureau ought to be up to date and not use horses and vehicles, but automobiles, and save time and money in the end, besides being more comfortable.

Mr. LEVER. Well, we will come to that automobile item later.

Mr. GOULDEN. Thank you.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I find that this bill carries in the Weather Bureau a lump sum of $599,660, a very substantial increase in the lump sum over that carried in the last bill, which was $590,000, in round numbers, and which was carried in the previous bill. Lump-sum provisions in appropriation bills have become very numerous in some of the appropriation bills in the House, while in other departments they are scarcely known. For instance, the Post Office Department has provided for the salary of practically all the servants in that department, so that there is no mistake whatever of the amount to be received. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is not a department, either in this Government or any other, where there is a greater work carried on with more success and satisfaction than is carried on in the Post Office Department. I take it that it is because of the definiteness which surrounds all of the work, and because of the carrying into effect the vast divisions of this work, according to the law which governs it.

Now, we find in this service under the lump-sum proposition men who get $300 a year for their services, and other men getting the large salary of $3,500 a year, with no system, with no regulation, nothing except the opinion of one man.

It is to be regretted that a former Chief of the Weather Bureau so abused this lump sum that it brought disgrace upon the Department of Agriculture. Not only did he bring disgrace upon the Department of Agriculture, but he forfeited the position which he held by his conduct. Not only that, but he carried with him a large number of employees in the service of this bureau down to disgrace. In order to carry out his scheme and plan to be appointed Secretary of Agriculture, he had automatically, if you choose to call it that way, increased the salaries of a large number of employees under him. These men were to become his henchmen in spreading the news throughout the land at the expense of the United States that he, the Chief of the Weather Bureau, was of such superior quality in his make-up of mind and soul, and his knowledge of the Weather Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, that he alone was the only man fit for the duties of that great position. Mr. Chairman, not only that, but he sent these men broadcast throughout the country to work up sentiment, and they held great banquets at certain places for the purpose of getting certain men and organizations, like the Typographical Union, wedded to his cause. Such are the evils of the lump sum, Mr. Chairman, and such will be an opportunity for like evils whenever a lump sum of any magnitude is placed at the disposal of any one man.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SLAYDEN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, on two occasions the gentleman from Illinois, who is soon, I regret to say, to leave the House, has taken occasion to find fault with a former officer of the Government—the Chief of the Weather Bureau. I have no particular reason to defend this officer, although he was a personal friend of mine, but I feel that when a man is not on the floor and has no opportunity to speak in his own behalf it is only fair that one who does know him should at least say a word for him when he is attacked and can not defend himself. Just what the grievance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I have no grievance, except that he threatened me at one time if I did not withdraw a point of order against his salary when it was sought to increase it from $4,500 to $6,000 without any legal authority.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has always tried to be fair in the House with regard to the treatment of laboring men, and, so far as the gentleman whom he criticizes is concerned, and whom he now says threatened him on one occasion, I will say that he made it a rule also to be the friend of the laboring men.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman that personally I never knew the Chief of the Weather Bureau until he called me out in a council some two years ago after I had made a point of order against the increase of his salary. Personally I have nothing against him, but I resent anything that is done for the purpose of trying to influence Members of Congress in their conduct here on the floor of this House.

Mr. MOORE. But the gentleman——

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say, further, to the gentleman that I have no disposition to rehearse these grievances, except in connection with the appropriation of lump sums, and had it not been for the lump-sum question I would not have raised this question here.

Mr. MOORE. I think I begin to understand the gentleman from Illinois. If I do understand, the gentleman was called out of the House on one occasion by this Chief of the Weather Bureau, and was threatened?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. May I inquire in what way the gentleman from Illinois was threatened?

Mr. FOWLER. Well, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has well said, it is not very proper to make statements in the absence of other men, and I always feel that that is true. Yet I put it to him, if he was going to punish my constituents if I did not come in and withdraw the point of order against the increase of his salary; and he said: "Most certainly I will. That is the most natural thing to do."

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the gentleman to say that he did not intend to make a personal assault——

Mr. FOWLER. No; I did not——

Mr. MOORE. Upon this former officer of the Government, and he makes that statement. That I understand to be the gentleman's position?

Mr. FOWLER. Well, in so far as the conduct of the late Chief of the Weather Bureau is concerned, prior to my meeting him I know nothing, but since that time I know a great deal that I have not time to relate.

Mr. MOORE. That is an indefinite sort of statement; but the gentleman agrees as to this, that it is not altogether fair to a man who is not present and who has no right to speak on this floor to attack him in his absence.

Mr. FOWLER. It is an unfortunate thing that sometimes such must be the case. It is the only way we can reach matters, and had his case not been made a matter of record by his removal, then probably I would not have said anything about it.

Mr. MOORE. I have always understood the gentleman to be the friend of the downtrodden, the friend of the poor, the friend of the laboring man, particularly the man who worked on the farm, and his purpose has been rather to aid and uplift than——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Let it be two minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Two minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be permitted to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Now, if the gentleman will not interrupt me, I shall try to conclude in those two minutes. I think the gentleman and I agree that it is not fair, even though we have the privilege as Members of the House under the Constitution, to say what we please about men who are not here. I think the gentleman agrees with me as to that. Now, as to the former bureau chief, Mr. Willis Moore, my information is that he was a very good sort of a Democrat. I do not mean to say that that would influence the gentleman from Illinois in his criticism. But Mr. Moore was a very earnest officer of the Government, and so far as we know was a very efficient one. I think no finger of criticism can be leveled against him in the matter of integrity. I think it will be found that his record was clean so far as the conduct of the business of his bureau was concerned; a very earnest and a very energetic man. Some may think that at times he was ambitious in that he was extremely anxious to make a good record.

If he threatened the gentleman from Illinois in the manner indicated by the gentleman, I would be very much surprised, because the gentleman from Illinois is an able-bodied man, vigorous and strong in body as well as in intellect.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Pardon me for a moment. The gentleman is strong in body as well as in intellect, and I am amazed that he should worry over anyone calling him to the door and making any insinuation that he would do him any harm whatever. In such an emergency the gentleman should have notified his friends in the House. I am sure if such a threat was made, and the gentleman had indicated it to us, some of us would have gone out to help him. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. MANN. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 14, strike out line 14.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I would not have the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other gentleman on the floor of the House misunderstand me with reference to the late Chief of the Weather Bureau. He never threatened to inflict any violence upon my person, but his threat was to inflict punishment upon my constituency, by virtue of his office, if I did not withdraw the point of order against the increase of his salary. I do not want the RECORD to go out without being complete, because it is just to the gentleman that I should state the matter perfectly fairly and right, because he is not present to give his version on the matter.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not withdraw the amendment to strike out the paragraph without unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out line 14 of page 8 of the bill.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 editor and compiler, $2,250; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, $1,680; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,380 each; 3 clerks, at $1,320 each; 1 clerk, $1,300; 1 clerk, $1,260; 42 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, $1,100; 1 clerk, $1,080; 50 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $960 each; 65 clerks, at $900 each; 1 architect, $2,000; 1 architect, $900; 1 illustrator, $1,400; 1 laboratory helper, $1,200; 1 laboratory helper, $1,020; 2 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 1 laboratory helper, $600; 1 laboratory helper, $480; 1 instrument maker, $1,200; 1 carpenter, $1,100; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, $1,000; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 32 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 11 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at $840 each; 13 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at $720 each; 4 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $660 each; 11 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $600 each; 3 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $540 each; 33 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; 6 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 watchman, $720; 1 charwoman, $600; 1 charwoman, $540; 11 charwomen, at $480 each; 4 charwomen, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $300; 2 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $353,630.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 9, line 8, by striking out "$1,000," after the word "custodian," and inserting "$1,200."

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, line 8, by striking out "$1,000," after the word "custodian," and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$1,200."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this employee is on the statutory roll or paid from the lump sum. If he is on the statutory roll, my friend's point of order would be good; but if it is paid from the lump sum, it would not be good. I hope my friend will not insist upon his point of order.

There are two men in this particular service. They do exactly the same kind of work. I have seen the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and I believe that but for the action of some one above him this increase would have been recommended as being deserved by this employee, but on account of the condition of the Treasury no recommendation for increase in salaries have been made by anyone. These two parties—the one who gets $1,200 and the one who gets $1,000—do exactly the same service. The one who gets the $1,000 resides in my district. He was appointed under a civil-service examination, and because of his merit and worth has been advanced from $600 in the Forestry Service and transferred to the Bureau of Animal Industry until now he is paid $1,000. As I say, he is doing the same identical work, in the same room, in the same service, as the man who is paid the $1,200. He is a competent, efficient, and worthy man, has a good record, and does his work well.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. This is for one messenger and custodian?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How is it possible to tell whether the two messengers perform the same service?

Mr. BARTLETT. They are in the same room, right together, and work together at the same kind of work.

Mr. MANN. What do they do?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will read to the gentleman a statement prepared for me, which shows what the duties are:

CUSTODIAN OF SUPPLIES, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

In addition to the supervision of the supply room, the custodian is called upon to perform other duties, so that the work of the office of custodian of supplies may be reported in two groups; i. e., office work and outside work.

Office work. Supervision of the supply room constitutes the major portion of the duties of the custodian. The various divisions and field stations of the bureau receive their expendable property and such nonexpendable property not ordered direct from manufacturers through this office. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, 5,335 requisitions for supplies were received and purchases aggregating $26,711.03 made. There remained on hand at the close of the fiscal year stock valued at approximately $25,000. Due to the recent epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease throughout the country, the volume of business has been increased very materially, necessitating much overtime work and an increase in the purchase of supplies.

After examination to see that they have been duly approved by the chief of the division and chief clerk of the bureau, supply requisitions are given to the mailing clerks, who carefully fill each item. Should there be any items on a requisition that can not be filled (due to delays in receipt of supplies from contractors), back orders are made and filled upon receipt of such items in stock. Requisitions are invoiced as soon after being filled as practicable and receipts for nonexpendable properties secured from all divisions and field stations.

Bills of lading for all freight shipments are caused to be made, and all express, incoming and outgoing, and foreign-mail shipments are handled through this office. To minimize loss and breakage, thermometers, inspection-service badges, syringes, brass bands, and special supplies for hog-cholera work are sent by registered mail. Our daily outgoing mail approximates 1½ tons.

Records are kept of all serially numbered supplies, including stamps, certificates, and forms used in the meat inspection and quarantine services, padlocks, seals, metal tags, etc. Detailed records are kept of all supplies received and dispensed, which have a twofold purpose. First, the amount of supplies furnished and used by each division and field station may be ascertained, and, second, the amount of stock on hand at any time may be determined at once. It is the duty of the clerk of this office to see that sufficient stock of all supplies is kept on hand and to cause to be ordered all necessary supplies.

Outside work. Charwomen and laborers come under the supervision of the custodian, and a high efficiency of work is always required. Orders for ice for laboratories are made and accounts kept of towels furnished offices and laboratories and those sent laundries.

This man is as much entitled to the $1,200 as the man who works right by him and with him. They perform the same, identical service; both are faithful and efficient, and both have good records in the service.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How long has the young man, in whom the gentleman is interested, been employed in the service?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think he has been there for probably six years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know how long the other man who gets $1,200 has been employed there?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think about the same length of time or longer. I am not positive about that. I would not say for certain.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Has the gentleman any information as to the relative efficiency of these two men?

Mr. BARTLETT. I did have a letter from the chief of the bureau on the subject during the last session, which I have not at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have seen Dr. Melvin with reference to both these men, and he says they are both very efficient. I have no question that if the matter was left to him this increase would not be objected to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Has any recommendation been made for an increase?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not by the Secretary of Agriculture. My information is that a recommendation has been made by the chief of the division, but not by the Secretary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I presume the gentleman knows that on account of the condition of the Democratic Treasury at this time, very few, if any, salaries are being increased.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I might say on account of the Democratic condition of the Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. That condition has not been caused, however, by increasing the salaries of men who do work like this.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. If I have time, I will yield with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know this man who is performing this service?

Mr. BARTLETT. I know him personally and well.

Mr. MANN. Is he from the gentleman's district?

Mr. BARTLETT. He is.

Mr. MANN. Is he a good man?

Mr. BARTLETT. He is.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Georgia has made out a pretty good case. He is one of the oldest Members in this House and one of the ablest Members of the House.

Mr. FORDNEY. And one of the nicest Members of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. He is going out of the House, much to the regret of the House. I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will withhold his point of order and let the House vote on this proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend.

Mr. MANN. It is not much, and the case seems to be a reasonably fair one.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much, of course——

Mr. MANN. Let the House settle it.

Mr. BUTLER. Let the House vote on it.

Mr. LEVER. As the gentleman from Illinois says, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is one of the oldest and most honored Members of this House, and is about to quit its service voluntarily. If the House desires to vote this amendment up, I shall not interpose a technical way of preventing it, although I should like to say to the House that the committee reporting this bill has been exceedingly careful to hold down increases in salaries, and I should hate very much to see a precedent set here.

Mr. MANN. This is no precedent.

Mr. LEVER. I should hate to see a precedent established that other gentlemen would endeavor to take advantage of. With the understanding that this is not to be a precedent, I shall let the House vote upon it, although I myself shall vote against it. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. According to the authorization of the Department of Agriculture and the rulings of the Chair heretofore, I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is absolutely mistaken. This is a statutory provision, and the salary was fixed in the bill of 1914. I withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington has called my attention to a provision in the preceding section, page 9, lines 7 and 8, that instead of having 1 messenger and custodian, at $1,200, and 1 messenger and custodian, at $1,200, they should be put in one clause.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 9, lines 7 and 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to return to page 9, lines 7 and 8. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 9, lines 7 and 8, by striking out the words "1 messenger and custodian, at $1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, at $1,200," and insert "2 messengers and custodians, at $1,200 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in lines 7 and 8, page 9, the following language: "One messenger and custodian, at $1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, at $1,200," and insert in lieu thereof "2 messengers and custodians, at $1,200 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. How will the remainder of this section be read, by paragraphs, or will we wait until the section is concluded?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer a motion at the end of any paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $398,800, of which sum $50,000 may be used for live-stock demonstration work, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals for breeding purposes: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 6, page 12, by striking out the words "Bureau of Plant Industry" and inserting "States Relations Service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of hog cholera and dourine, $235,000: *Provided*, That of said sum not less than $50,000 shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *And provided further*, That not more than $75,000 of said sum shall be used for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of the disease known as dourine, and of which sum of $75,000 which is hereby appropriated for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of dourine, $25,000 shall be immediately available: *And it is further provided*, That this appropriation of the sum of $235,000 for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of hog cholera and dourine shall not be construed as preventing the expenditure of any unexpended balances from appropriations heretofore made for the same purpose.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I do so for the purpose of getting some information.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think an amendment can not be offered to a paragraph against which a point of order is reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the point of order is made.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not want to be forced to make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I am going to make it if the gentleman does not.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will let the gentleman from Illinois make it. All I wanted was information.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against the last proviso.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. My purpose was to find out from the chairman whether the paragraph appropriates $235,000 or $470,000.

Mr. LEVER. The paragraph appropriates $235,000, as shown on the face of the bill, and approximately an additional sum of $140,000, which is an unexpended balance from a former appropriation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is, $140,000 out of the $235,000?

Mr. LEVER. No; we passed a separate act last session appropriating $600,000 to be used for hog cholera and dourine, $500,000 to be used for hog cholera. We are informed by the department that of that sum we will have on hand the 1st of July $140,000 unexpended, so that the total appropriation by this act will be $235,000 and the unexpended balance of $140,000, making $375,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my objection to this is largely what the gentleman from South Carolina has just stated. Here is a reappropriation of an unexpended balance, and while I raised some objection to appropriating a lump sum to pay employees, it seems to me that this reappropriation indirectly of unexpended balances instead of allowing them to go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts is a worse practice than the other.

Mr. LEVER. The estimate, I will say to the gentleman, of the department was for $375,000, but the committee thought that it would be better to appropriate $235,000 and let them expend the unexpended balance.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then there was an estimate submitted for this amount?

Mr. LEVER. There was a supplemental estimate. It was not in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would like to say, further, that in the second proviso in regard to the $75,000 for the eradication of dourine, you provide that $25,000 of that shall be immediately available. Now, that is a deficiency, and the appropriation should not be carried in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. It is true it is a deficiency. The hog cholera and dourine were not estimated for in the Book of Estimates, because, I assume, that it was understood by the officials of the department that the committee would take the same action this year as it did last, and report a separate bill; but the committee concluded that it would be hard to get a separate bill through on account of the press of business, and hence, put it in this bill, considering that the work was so important that no objection would be raised to it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. At that point I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be better to appropriate directly the amount they ask for than to put in a reappropriation of an unexpended balance?

Mr. LEVER. That might have been wiser, but it seems to me it is the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is exactly the lesson I am trying to impress upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that it is not the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum, that there is a great difference in directly appropriating money for an object and this indirect way of reappropriating money that should, under good legislative procedure, be turned back into the Treasury.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from South Carolina is a pretty good learner and he is very glad to have these teachings.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman make it on the entire paragraph, or just on the proviso?

Mr. MANN. To the last proviso.

Mr. LEVER. It is subject to a point of order, of course.

Mr. MANN. It is clearly subject to a point of order, and I would like to get some information. It does not mean anything. What does the gentleman hope to accomplish if this stays in the law? What is the purpose of this proviso?

Mr. LEVER. The purpose in the mind of the committee—I do not know that it would accomplish it—was to reappropriate $140,000 of the $600,000 which we appropriated this year for this work.

Mr. MANN. An item to that effect would be in order and would certainly do something, but the item that is in the bill is not in order; and if enacted into law, would not accomplish that purpose. What is the language of it? You first make an appropriation of $235,000 and then say in the proviso:

> That this appropriation of the sum of $235,000 for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of hog cholera and dourine will not be construed as preventing the expenditure of any unexpended balances from appropriations heretofore made for the same purpose.

Well, now, it would not be so construed if this was not in the law; and if this is in the law, it is not a reappropriation of the sum that has already been appropriated; so it does not mean anything. If the gentleman wants to appropriate the unexpended balance of the appropriations, that is in order, and a proper amendment can be made to do it; but this language enacted into law would make a man who looked at it laugh, if it did not hurt him so that he cried, and would not accomplish anything.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman that this language was drawn by the Department of Agriculture; and really I do not think the committee gave very much attention to it.

Mr. MANN. And I have no doubt that the clerk who drew this did not give much attention to it.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman have an amendment to suggest in place of that? I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. I do not think I could suggest an amendment offhand that would probably accomplish it.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that we pass it over temporarily.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass over this item temporarily without prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to pass over this last proviso without prejudice.

Mr. MANN. Ask leave to return to this proviso and offer the amendment later in reference to hog-cholera items.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to this item at a later time for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to return to page 14 for the purpose of offering an amendment at a later period. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 14, in line 2, after the word "animals," strike out "*And provided further*" and insert "that $150,000 of the sum appropriated shall be set aside and used for the production of antihog cholera serum to be sold and distributed at its approximate cost."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Chair understood that this was offered as a committee amendment. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood it was a committee amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not offered as a committee amendment. I offered it on my own responsibility, and in support of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that Congress is confronted with a proposition which seems to me is unwise. The proposition is that Congress shall appropriate $235,000, and of that amount $185,000 shall be available for the eradication of hog cholera. The practice of the department is to manufacture or purchase antihog-cholera serum, go into the several counties—I believe 17—in the various States of the Union to furnish the serum, and to administer it without any expense to the people of those various localities. Upon investigation we find that 17 counties are being supplied with this serum and veterinary service without expense, and, of course, at the expense of the 2,483 counties outside. It does not seem to me that it is just to tax the people of the 2,483 counties for the benefit of people in 17 counties, and probably, as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] last year, in response to the greatest pull. But be that as it may; besides, according to the statement of the chief of bureau, Dr. Melvin, foot-and-mouth disease is spread through hog-cholera serum manufactured and sold. I read to you from the hearings, so that there may be no mistake about it. I refer you to page 238:

> Mr. MOSS. Is it not true, Dr. Melvin, that the foot-and-mouth disease was sent into Indiana through hog-cholera serum shipped in from Chicago?
>
> Dr. MELVIN. It was shipped in with virus, not serum. There was a plant located adjacent to the stockyards in Chicago which sent out at least one batch of virus quite extensively in Indiana and Ohio and some in Illinois. Of course this virus—not the serum, but the virus—is obtained from hogs that are sick with cholera, and we know now that in this case these hogs were also sick with the foot-and-mouth disease. The hogs did, of course, manifest hog-cholera lesions, but the foot-and-mouth lesions were not noticed, and the virus caused several outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease. But the virus was traced as quickly as we learned of this, and a great deal of it was obtained and destroyed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does not seem right to me that the Federal Government should inspect these factories and O. K. the serum sent out and in that way spread the foot-and-mouth disease in this country.

I believe that we should act upon the suggestion of Dr. Melvin that a certain amount of money be made available for a laboratory that would enable the department to manufacture the serum; at least what it uses in its operations. My amendment is simply to set aside $150,000 of the $235,000 for the production of this serum.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, while I am in sympathy, in the main, with the position assumed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], yet I should not want his amendment to prevail. I attach considerable importance to my own activities in securing the inauguration of the work of the department in regard to hog-cholera control. Now, this work comprises really two different activities—one is the manufacture of serum and its practical application, to prove that the hog cholera can be controlled by that method; and, second, the question of supervision by the department of private plants that are engaged in the manufacture of serum and the sale of it to the people of this country.

It must be apparent to everyone that we should have pure virus and pure serum if this method of control is to become successful. The department recognizes just as clearly as the gentleman from Iowa does the truth of that proposition; and all over the United States there are springing up private plants to engage in the manufacture and sale of serum to supply the demand which the successful experimentation by the department has created.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has called attention of the House to the fact that one plant out of this number sold impure virus; but the Department of Agriculture is now undertaking a strict supervision of all these plants so as to make it impossible that there shall be a repetition of this sale of impure serum, and to develop, if possible, through the supervision of the Government and by private initiative, private energy, and private capital, an ample supply of pure serum for all the people of the United States who may desire to employ this method of hog-cholera control.

It should be remembered that this is only the second year in which the Department of Agriculture has attempted a general demonstration in the field to prove the efficacy of the serum treatment. The gentleman's amendment will lessen the ability of the department to go out on the farms of our country and demonstrate under actual farm conditions the efficacy of the serum treatment, and it would at the same time not give to the department the machinery sufficient to supply serum to all the farmers of the United States. It would cripple the present activities without creating effective effort in the new field suggested by his amendment.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Not at present, please. I will yield in a moment.

Let us carry out this work as it was originally planned. Let us first demonstrate to the farmers of the United States that hog cholera can be controlled by the serum treatment; that it is entirely possible to make the method a commercial sucess. At the same time let us continue this new field of activity—that of supervision over the private manufacturers—and see if it is not possible to supply serum that is reliable to every farmer in the United States by commercial methods of manufacture and sale. I will concede the fact that if supervision fails, if it becomes apparent that it is impossible for pure and potent serum to be sold to the people of the United States by private manufacture, under the supervision of the Government of the United States, there will be no alternative than for the Government to undertake its manufacture and sale. But I submit that in advance of such demonstration there is no necessity for the United States to begin the commercial manufacture and sale of serum. Considering the shortness of time in which this method of control has been brought prominently before the people of the United States—which is only about two years—and that private manufacturers are just entering the field, I think we ought not to make a radical change in the method of dealing with this most important problem. We have a rational method, it seems to me. First, the United States Government is manufacturing a limited amount of serum, and by sending its experts into representative areas and inoculating exposed hogs it is effectively demonstrating both the method and the value of the treatment. At the same time the manufacture of this serum is being engaged in by private manufacturers in all parts of the United States under Government supervision and control. We have here a sure foundation for broad, rational success.

Mr. POWERS. I would like to ask the gentleman the number of manufacturers engaged in the manufacture of serum?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I do not know the exact number; I am told there are about 80. I know there are at least 4 or 5 in my own State, and I think you will find them in all the important hog-raising States of the Union. They are springing up very rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Then, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it would put the Government of the United States in competition with these private manufacturers of serum?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to answer the question.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAUGEN. The proposition is this: Dr. Melvin came before the committee a year ago. He asked for $100,000 for a laboratory, and the committee denied it. They have been asking now for this $100,000 appropriation to enable the department to make serum for its own use, and Dr. Melvin says it is not right to expect them to use the potent serum.

The department says that it gave to 17 counties the foot-and-mouth disease. Are you going to appropriate $185,000 to spread the foot-and-mouth disease? Here is the committee proposing to appropriate $2,500,000 to stamp out the foot-and-mouth disease, and are we to appropriate $185,000 for the purpose of spreading a disease which we are trying to eradicate from the country? That is the proposition, gentlemen.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, now, referring to the inquiry of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] and also to the remarks of my friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], of course it would place the Government in competition with these private manufacturers, but in such a small way that I do not think that would be the most objectionable feature. In fact, the amount of money proposed to be devoted to the manufacture of serum would produce so small an amount when measured by the total demand as to suggest the utter inadequacy of the gentleman's proposal, if viewed from a friendly viewpoint. The gentleman from Iowa is too well informed on this subject even to contend seriously that the adoption of his amendment would largely increase the output of serum.

The first objection I urge to the amendment is that, having started out on an experiment along lines which everyone must concede are the very best which can be chosen, we have not followed out that work long enough to bring about definite results, and now it is proposed to change this plan radically. It was only the purpose for the Government to manufacture in a limited way, for purposes of demonstration. It was then proposed to make field demonstrations, to show that serum could be applied successfully under actual farm conditions. Having done this, the Government could withdraw from this field and leave it wholly to private initiative and enterprise. In order to make it possible for the Government to retire it is proposed to take supervisory control of private manufacturing operations to insure purity and strength of their output. This is a rational program, and should have the support of this body, as it has been given that of our committee.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. In a moment. Now, in regard to this unfortunate occurrence that there was some impure virus disseminated. Let me call your attention to the fact that impure virus has in times past been disseminated for the cure of smallpox in human beings, so that it is not an unknown occurrence. It is to be remembered that this impure virus was sent out under unusual circumstances and conditions which will probably never again be present. Besides, the work of supervisory control on the part of the Government had just been inaugurated.

Recognizing these facts, the present bill appropriates money to make this supervision by the Government effective, to extend such control over every manufactory in the United States so that it may be demonstrated that it will be possible to manufacture pure virus in private laboratories.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I would like to inquire if the manufacture of serum is in an experimental stage, or if there is any question but that it can be manufactured successfully?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I do not wish to pose as an expert in this matter, but I will say that the manufacture has passed entirely beyond the experimental stage; but it is a fact that in order to keep the serum up to its proper standard of potency it requires careful testing and absolute integrity on the part of the manufacturer.

The demand varies widely in different seasons, so that much loss may be sustained by deterioration of product after manufacture which may not be sold. It may therefore develop that its manufacture can not be done on a profitable basis by private capital. That question is yet to be determined. In fact, the

temptation to hold the product too long is one of the main evils to be overcome.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that in these large establishments for the manufacture of serum the Government has an inspection system?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. That is true.

Mr. MOORE. And you say this bill proposes to improve upon that inspection?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It proposes to appropriate more money for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE. So that if impure serum has at any time gone out on the market it is owing to the lack of proper administrative control?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. That was brought out in the hearings. They said that the supervision over the manufacture of serum is a question that will require experience and perhaps a greater degree of thoroughness than they have given it in the past, but the department recognizes that condition and proposes to meet it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like just in a moment to answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HAUGEN. Just in a moment. I would like to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amendment proposed does not in any way interfere with the inspection of the present plants. The bill provides for $235,000, and $50,000 is set aside for inspection, which leaves $185,000 for the eradication of hog cholera. I propose to set aside $150,000 of the $185,000, which will give the department $150,000 for the production of the serum and $35,000 for eradication, educational, and demonstration work.

Mr. MOORE. Would not the gentleman's amendment put the Government in competition with these manufacturing establishments that are now under Government inspection?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of this serum turned out each year. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars—that is not a drop in the bucket.

Mr. LEVER. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that several gentlemen may desire to speak on this amendment, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. I do not think that much time will be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture has given a good deal of attention to this matter in the effort to learn what the department has been doing in the effort to control and eradicate hog cholera, and I am sure I am stating the situation correctly when I say that the committee is convinced that the work so far done by the department is not very satisfactory.

I believe the committee could report, also, that the chief difficulty with the entire proposition is in getting potent, pure serum. An appropriation of $50,000 has been made for the purpose of paying the expense of inspection of privately conducted factories where virus and serum are made, but there is nothing clearer in the world than that with such a sum of money this work can not be carried on properly. Inspectors, if they are to inspect factories so critically as to be sure that the serum is proper in every respect, must inspect more closely than is reasonably possible and must put in more time than they can possibly put in, and the employment of more men than such appropriation as we have made will provide for will be necessary.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that instead of using any portion of this money for actual demonstration work it ought all to be used in inspection work? I make the inquiry for this reason——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You mean the inspection of factories?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; of factories—the serum.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Oh, we shall have to have money for demonstration work, and we shall have to have money for the production of potent, pure serum.

Now, the Department of Agriculture is suspicious of all serum made in this country except that which it makes itself, or serum made at the laboratories in some of the agricultural colleges of the country. Notwithstanding all the inspection that officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry have been able to carry on at these privately conducted and privately owned laboratories, in no case that I remember have they been willing to use serum from such factories. In no case will it recommend its use. In no case will it guarantee the results of its use. In no case will it undertake the work of inspection or assist in the eradication or control of the disease where serum from these private factories is used. That all being true we are brought down to this one proposition, that pure and potent serum must be supplied, and it seems to me it is up to the Federal Government to make some provision for manufacturing it. It will take a lot of money, but that is a work that must be done.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. The gentleman does not wish his words to be interpreted as saying that none of the serums manufactured by private plants are effective, or that they will not be potent if used?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I state that the testimony of the officials from the Department of Agriculture is to the effect that they themselves are unwilling to use any of the serums from private factories; that they are unwilling to recommend serum from private factories; that they are unwilling to work with it; that they are unwilling to recognize the work done by that serum; that they are unwilling to guarantee a cure, or that preventive measures will be effective if serums from the private factories are used.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Government does not take any of this serum that is privately manufactured?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will not say that they do not take any, but I will say they do not like to take it. They take very little of it. They do not take it unless they are compelled to, and they have very little confidence in it.

Mr. MOORE. If there is an epidemic of some disease amongst the cattle and serum is needed, where does the Government get it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They are making some of it, and they get the rest of it, when they can, from the laboratories of State agricultural colleges, and the serums made by the Government and by the agricultural colleges are the only serums worth using.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited by unanimous consent.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with all that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] says about the privately manufactured serums. If the Government does not use any of them and does not recommend their use, why do we spend so much money in inspecting these plants and inspecting the serums? If they are not good for anything, why do you spend any money on them? I do not know why just as good serum can not be manufactured at the stock yards in this country as can be manufactured at any place by the Government. I can not understand why men who go into the business as a private enterprise can not manufacture serum of just as good quality as can be manufactured at the agricultural colleges. At all the great stock centers in this country they have plants manufacturing this serum. The Government sends inspectors there. They almost take charge of these establishments, and if their inspection is not good for anything, why do we appropriate money for it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know that from one of these very factories, inspected by the Government, serum was sent out that when used spread broadcast the foot-and-mouth disease over the country and cost this country millions of dollars?

Mr. BOOHER. If they went and inspected that plant and inspected that serum and permitted it to be sent out, and it spread the foot-and-mouth disease, it is a great pity that the inspectors themselves did not get the foot-and-mouth disease, for their inspection must have been absolutely worthless.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan in this, that it was not

serum which was sent out, but virus which was sent out, which caused the spread of the disease.

Mr. BOOHER. There have been epidemics of other diseases affecting animals, and the Government was not so terribly anxious about the serum used. Take the blackleg, which was very prevalent in the West, and very contagious, and killed all the animals infected. A virus was manufactured that was used by the farmers and veterinary surgeons. They applied it, and they got along very well, and it cured that disease and stamped it out entirely. Now, I believe a virus can be found that will relieve the hog-cholera situation. They have not found anything yet that will cure it, but they do prevent it, if used in proper time. I object more to the appropriation here for the experimental work with this serum than to anything else. We are spending too much money for experimental work. Take the States of Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, from which most of the hogs in this country come. In those great States in one county they have a man doing experimental work with this serum. The farmers living three or four hundred miles away, or even 50 miles away, get no advantage from that experimental work. They can not go there and wait until some man's hogs are attacked with cholera in order to get some advantage of the experimental work.

In every community all over our country there are veterinary surgeons. They know how to administer this serum, and if the Government, by its inspection service, will provide a good serum, something that will do the work it is intended to do, it will be administered by the people themselves. I remember one year ago, when we had the Agricultural bill up for consideration, I read to the committee a statement from a farmer in my district who had vaccinated his own hogs—242 head of them. It cost him a dollar a head. He got proper serum that prevented hog cholera among his hogs, and some of his neighbors also vaccinated their hogs with the same serum. Not one of the vaccinated hogs died, while those who did not use it lost all their hogs. That was good serum, and it was made in the district in which I live. There are four plants in that district, two of them recently established. I do not know whether they have been inspected yet by the Government, but I do know that the serum of the other two has been approved and sold under Government inspection, and I believe it is inspection that we need, rather than so much experimental work.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Do gentlemen on the other side desire any further time?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like two or three minutes and my colleague three or four minutes. I suggest the gentleman ask unanimous consent to extend the time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important amendment. The great loss our farmers have sustained not only by hog cholera but through foot-and-mouth disease where that disease has been spread by the use of virus, it seems to me, should caution us to be very careful about voting down an amendment of this kind. In Cedar County, in my district, a veterinary surgeon used virus in the vaccination of hogs afflicted with cholera, and that virus afterwards, it turned out, was made from hogs taken from Chicago that had been infected not only with cholera but also with foot-and-mouth disease. And every place that that veterinary surgeon vaccinated hogs with that virus there developed on that farm a case of foot-and-mouth disease. On the Matthews farm in that county the Government will pay about $8,000 for one-half the value of the cattle and hogs destroyed on that farm because of foot-and-mouth disease.

Dr. Melvin at the hearings has asked that at least $100,000 be appropriated for the purpose suggested by the amendment. In this connection we must remember that the other outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States originated by importing into this country vaccine for the purpose of vaccinating for smallpox. It is very important that the virus and the serum that we use for the control of hog cholera should be absolutely pure if they are to serve the purpose for which they are intended. The Agricultural Department says that they can not recommend virus or serum that is being used and manufactured by private concerns. In the case of the manufacture of virus it is necessary to use a hog that has hog cholera. At the same time it is important to determine also whether that hog has the foot-and-mouth disease. If it has both, then the use of the virus will communicate the foot-and-mouth disease to the animals, not alone to those that have been vaccinated but also to the rest of the animals on the farm.

It only requires about $100,000 to equip a plant and perform this service, and if the Government is to undertake this work it seems to me that a part of this appropriation could be spent just as Dr. Melvin asks that it be spent, to equip a Government plant that will be adequate for the purpose of educating other manufacturers to do their work and turn out a pure serum and a virus in a scientific way. I hope the amendment may prevail. It does not increase the appropriation, and I believe that a good deal of good will result from it.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Can not all that be accomplished by a thorough system of Government inspection?

Mr. GOOD. We have spent a good deal of money this year in inspection, and yet as many cases of the foot-and-mouth disease originated this year in the United States by the use of hog cholera serum as originated in any other way.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Iowa does not want to make a misstatement. The facts are that the shipment of the virus was from 1 establishment out of 81.

Mr. GOOD. I understand; there was only one factory that made a shipment of that kind, but it was this shipment that started the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease to a large extent, at least this is true so far as Iowa was concerned. We would not have had foot-and-mouth disease in the district I represent but for this kind of virus.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the distinction between virus, serum, and antitoxin?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know that I can give the gentleman the chemical analysis. I only know that as far as serum is concerned it is used to prevent hog cholera. The virus is used for vaccination after the animal is afflicted with hog cholera, and for the cure of the same. I do not know what the antitoxin is used for.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have not given the same study to this matter as perhaps have the members of the Committee on Agriculture, but it seems, from the arguments on this floor, that the main objection to the use of the serum coming from the private manufacturers' establishments is that they are impure, and that the Government will neither use them nor recommend their use.

If this argument is carried to its logical conclusion, the Government would therefore say to the people all over the United States that no serum can be depended upon except that which the Government itself deals out. Carrying it further, the Government would usurp the power and authority of manufacturing and selling all the serum that is used over the entire country, because it says, both by its words and conduct, that it deals in the only serum that is reliable or can be depended upon.

It has developed that out of 81 private manufacturing establishments engaged in the manufacture of serum only one of the entire number has put out serum that has been detrimental when used. I shall have to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. I do not believe this Government should enter into the manufacture and exclusive sale and use of the serums to be used by the people in the United States.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, do not let us make a mistake in regard to this most important matter. There have been several contentions, and we should not become confused regarding them. First, I want to call attention to the claims that impure virus was disseminated from one private plant in Chicago. That is true; but let me call your attention to the fact that the hog must be sick before the virus can be taken from him. It is a fact that impure virus was sent out, but the hog was supposed to be sick from cholera alone. There was no knowledge that foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent in the United States, and hence it was not even suspected that they were afflicted with the foot-and-mouth disease. It happened, however, that the hogs were sick with cholera and afflicted with the foot-and-mouth disease at the same time. It is a condition which can not arise again, and doubtless it is the last time that such unfortunate results will be experienced. This should not cause Congress to make a radical change of policy in dealing with the plague of hog cholera. Let us keep that in our minds. Now, in regard to the Government not using serum from private plants. The Government plans a certain amount of demonstration work. At the same time the Government manufactures a certain amount of serum at their own plant. They so plan it that they will have enough serum from their own plant to do all the demonstration work they are planning,

and naturally prefer to use serum from their own plant. The reputation of the United States Government is way and above that of any private manufacturer in the United States; the department, in their demonstration work, uses every prevention against failure, and that is the reason they prefer to use serum from their own plant. The Government was charged with the duty of making successful demonstrations, and the department is to be commended for taking every precaution, because its failure would mean the abandonment of this method of hog-cholera control. The fact that its methods are successful is the reason that private laboratories are being built and operated. I want to say that serum manufactured in private laboratories has given the best of results in hundreds of instances. There is absolutely no warrant to charge that the manufacture of serum in private laboratories is a failure. I can give the names of hog raisers in my own district whose herds have been saved by such serum.

This result has been achieved not alone in my State but in many other States, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] has said. The manufacture of serum by private plants all over the United States is due to the fact that the United States Government, first by manufacturing serum and then by actual demonstration, has proven that this method of control is absolutely successful.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman distinguishes between the word "serum" and the word "virus."

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the committee what the distinction is?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I do not wish to be considered as a scientific expert——

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman is.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Thank you. As I understand the terms "virus" and "serum," there is this distinction to be made: Virus is a living microbe which has the power to perpetuate itself or to reproduce itself when injected in the healthy blood of a suitable host. Virus when introduced in the blood of a healthy hog will produce hog cholera. Standing by itself it has no power to give immunity to hogs, but is a destructive agent. It is used in two ways in hog cholera control work. One is to give hogs acute cholera, so as to use them both in testing the potency of serum and to perpetuate the manufacture of serum; it is also used in the "simultaneous" process of immunizing hogs, which I will describe in a moment.

Serum is rather an antitoxin, and has the power to combat and perhaps to destroy—at least to give limited immunity from the microbes of the hog-cholera virus. Serum as used in this control work is secured by selecting a hog which is immune from hog cholera and injecting into its blood a large portion or "dose" of virus. The blood of such a hog is then drawn and constitutes "serum" as we are using the term. This serum when injected into the blood of a healthy hog gives to the animal a large power of resistance or immunity for a limited period. When complete immunity is desired the "simultaneous" treatment is resorted to. This consists in injecting a small portion of virus and also a full portion of serum. Thus the hog is practically given the cholera by the virus and is made immune by the serum. Through this method full immunity is imparted to the treated animal.

Mr. STAFFORD. And what is "toxin"?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. A toxin is a poison which does not have the power to reproduce itself. It is a destructive agent; but one more word. The Government now is not only demonstrating to the farmers and others that this method of control can be successfully used, but they are in helpful cooperation with private manufacturers in the United States—a friendly cooperation by supervision so as to make their work equally successful. The Department of Agriculture, through cooperation, through demonstration, hopes to make it possible for every hog grower in the United States to gain an accurate knowledge about the serum method of control and to accomplish the equally important achievement of bringing such serum within the reach of every farmer in the United States. This is the first regular Agricultural appropriation bill which has carried an appropriation for this work. This fact emphasizes how new it is, and I do not want this great cooperative experiment that we have started—an experiment designed to demonstrate the efficacy of potent serum when properly used to protect hogs against exposure of hog cholera, and by means of helpful supervision by the United States Government to enable private manufacturers to perfect their methods so as to supply pure serum and virus to farmers, and thereby proving that both the manufacture and the use of serum are successful and profitable—to fail. I do not want it to be possible to break it down in the very first appropriation bill that comes before the United States Congress.

Mr. LEVER. How much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that the gentleman from South Carolina use his time first. I understood gentlemen on the other side had 5 minutes remaining, and that the time was extended for 15 minutes, which would give 10 minutes to me and 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina. Five minutes has been used on this side and 5 on that side, and there now remains 5 minutes to each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think the gentleman is right. The Chair was calculating 15 minutes in all.

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman to let me conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Iowa has 5 minutes and I will have 4.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen here seem to be much concerned about competition—that the Government is going into the business of producing the serum and selling it in competition with private concerns. There is no such thought. The $150,000 worth of serum is not as much as a drop in the bucket. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of this serum sold annually. There are about 81 factories in the country, and in offering this amendment I have no intention of interfering with the manufacture of it; nor do I find fault with the inspection of these factories. I believe they are doing the very best they can do. I want to encourage them in every way I can; but here comes the Chief of Bureau of Animal Industry who has this matter in charge, and he asked the Committee on Agriculture to give $100,000 for a plant. In order that there may be no mistake as to the present plant, I read for the information of the House:

> Dr. MELVIN. As it is, our original plant was a very small affair—put up match boards. The floor space was not half the size of this room—
>
> Referring to the committee room—
>
> To provide for this work, we bought some of these portable houses, put them up, and made them into a laboratory.

That is the recommendation and statement of Dr. Melvin, the chief of the bureau. Will we take the advice of the man in charge, the one who discovered this cure or serum, or will we take the suggestion of somebody else? My amendment is simply to set aside $150,000 so that the department may have a suitable place to prepare the serum, and if there is any surplus that it may be sold at its approximate cost. The department will still be left with $35,000 for the eradication of hog cholera and enough money to carry on experiments in, say, two or three counties. I believe that is all I care to say.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield if he has the time?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. I happen to know of a certain establishment, that I know to be well conducted, and which is subject to Government inspection, and the question with me is—the gentleman has answered the question in the matter of competition—whether, when we have these plants inspected by the Government, it is necessary for the Government to engage in the business itself?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will read to the gentleman from the hearings:

> Dr. MELVIN. I do not think we ought to be expected to use serum except that which we feel fully satisfied is all right.
> Mr. HAUGEN. But you have a way of testing it, have you not?
> Dr. MELVIN. Well, it has to be tested in batches.
> Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.
> Dr. MELVIN. And that requires a good deal of work.
> Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not safe to assume that the States will furnish a serum that is properly made?
> Dr. MELVIN. Most of them would. I would be afraid to trust all of them.

They are not buying serum from the private concerns. They buy from the States. I have said at various times I have faith in it. I believe it has some merit. If you will refer to the hearings, you will find that Dr. Dorset, in charge of this work, represented to the committee that in the county of Dallas, in my own State, out of 118,000 hogs Dallas County lost only 9,182. The reports made to some 1,150 bankers in my State show that Dallas County lost 15,954. The assessor's return of that county reports 16,124 hogs lost during the year 1913.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. Three years ago we began the work of undertaking to find a plan for the eradication of hog cholera, or its control, in this country by an appropriation of $75,000. Last year we appropriated

$500,000 for that purpose, and the department expended it upon plans which they themselves drew. I believe they have demonstrated that the control of hog cholera in this country is a possibility. At the same time Dr. Dorset, in immediate charge of the work, before the committee this year convinced me, and I think a majority of the committee, that the department itself had not as yet concluded what the best method of control was. And this item in this bill is inserted for the purpose of permitting the department to continue its investigational work along such lines as will develop a positive and definite plan of control. I will read to you from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Dorset, let us see if we can not summarize this thing: Your experience has demonstrated, first, that, if you have a potent serum, you can very largely retard the progress of this disease among the hogs. That is the first proposition your experience brings out?

Dr. DORSET. That we can save the hogs from death from the cholera.

The CHAIRMAN. That you can save them from death from hog cholera if you have a potent serum?

Dr. DORSET. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The next proposition is that, if you had plenty of money and plenty of potent serum, you could go into a definite area and eradicate hog cholera. Are you willing to say that?

Dr. DORSET. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not willing to say that yet? Your experience also has brought you to the conclusion that the projects outlined by the department and adopted by this committee and by the House probably do not indicate the best way of handling this situation?

Dr. DORSET. No, sir; I will not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. You will not say that?

Dr. DORSET. I think that at the present time it is the best. I think we should continue essentially as we have done, with this fund as an appropriation here in such shape that we can use the larger portion of it for one purpose or another, as may be necessary. For instance, we say in this suggested amendment that not less than $50,000 shall be used for inspecting serum plants.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let me interrupt you just there. You have tried this plan for years. What progress have you made? You discovered the serum nine years ago, and you have been working on it and experimenting with it for nine years. How much more do you know now than you did nine years ago? You have followed this plan. I have read the bulletins issued—I think more than nine years ago; but as you say it was 9 years ago, we will accept that: it seems to me that it was 15 years ago. Whenever it was, they said at that time that this whole problem was solved. Now, what progress have you made? I agree that if you have a potent serum it is an absolute preventive. But you have not the potent serum, and you will not get it if you have to depend on the present system of inspection, and the only way you can furnish it is for the States or the Federal Government to do it. In my opinion, the department never can superintend a hundred factories by any means and get potent serum in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. That is just what we are trying to get an opinion from Dr. Dorset about. In your judgment, out of the experience that you have had, do you believe it is possible to control the hog cholera?

Dr. DORSET. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is possible to control the losses from the disease. By that I do not mean at present its eradication.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I ask a question there, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is this a correct statement, Dr. Dorset: That, with your experience and what you believe can be done, the production of hogs in this country can be safely carried on with a certainty of profit to the farmer?

Dr. DORSET. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the production of hogs increased?

Dr. DORSET. Undoubtedly.

Dr. MELVIN. I think these charts show that.

Mr. MOSS. Do you believe, from your experience, that this present work ought to be carried on by the Government, instead of being dropped?

Dr. DORSET. I believe this work should go on. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are just beginning to know what we can do, and we do not yet know the best way to accomplish what we have finally in view—the cheapest and most economical way to do the work efficiently.

Now, the Government is conducting a serum plant at Ames, Iowa. Therefore the Government has the means to demonstrate what potent serum means in the control of hog cholera as against an impotent serum. So it is not necessary to go into the building of a large manufacturing plant to give them the means to investigate that phase of the subject. However, the theory of the committee is that inasmuch as the men in charge of this work admit that they have not come to a definite conclusion, that they have not arrived at a state of mind where they can say that any one plan is feasible, so that some conclusion can be reached, the committee thought it wise to give them this appropriation to continue their investigational work, without any regard to the establishment of a manufacturing plant. We think it would be exceedingly unwise at this time to burden ourselves with a big establishment, which we would have trouble in getting rid of in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. A moment ago I reserved the right, with the consent of the committee, to return to this item. I find in looking over the act appropriating $600,000 for the control of hog cholera and duorine that it is a continuing appropriation, and that the language to which the gentleman from Illinois made the point of order and which the Chair sustained was not at all necessary. Therefore it is not necessary for us to return to it. I just wanted to bring it to the attention of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement to return to the point indicated will be canceled and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L., p. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, the sum of $375,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of the meat-inspection law may be extended to the inspection of reindeer.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the proviso.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of putting in the RECORD statistics showing the value of farm animals in this country. These figures show the importance of this industry. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

VALUE OF FARM ANIMALS—ESTIMATED TO BE WORTH $5,969,253,000, SHOWING LARGE INCREASE.

An increase in farm animals in the United States is shown by statistics given out by the Department of Agriculture. January 1 the animals were valued at $5,969,253,000, an increase of $78,024,000, or 1.3 per cent over their value January 1, 1914.

Horses numbered 21,195,000, an increase of 1.1 per cent over last year; were valued at $103.33 per head, and their aggregate value was $2,190,102,000.

Mules numbered 4,479,000, an increase of 0.7 per cent; were valued at $112.36 per head, and aggregated $503,271,000 in value.

Milch cows numbered 21,262,000, an increase of 2.5 per cent; were valued at $55.33 per head, with an aggregate value of $1,176,838,000.

Other cattle numbered 37,067,000, an increase of 3.4 per cent; were valued at $33.38 per head, with an aggregate value of $1,237,376,000.

Sheep numbered 49,956,000, an increase of 0.5 per cent; were valued at $4.50 per head, with an aggregate value of $224,687,000.

Swine numbered 64,618,000, an increase of 9.6 per cent; were valued at $9.87 per head, with an aggregate value of $637,479,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $3,000; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, $2,500; 1 officer in charge of publications, $2,250; 1 landscape gardener, $1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, $2,250; 1 superintendent of seed weighing and mailing, $2,000; 1 executive clerk, $2,250; 3 executive clerks, at $1,980 each; 1 assistant superintendent of seed warehouse, $1,400; 1 seed inspector, $1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,400; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,020; 1 seed warehouseman, $1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, $840; 6 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at $1,500 each; 21 clerks, class 2; 48 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or draftsman, $1,200; 1 clerk, $1,080; 8 clerks, at $1,020 each; 23 clerks, at $1,000 each; 45 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, $900; 21 clerks, at $840 each; 2 clerks, at $720 each; 1 laborer, $780; 42 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 11 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 26 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 1 artist, $1,620; 1 clerk or artist, $1,200; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 photographer, $840; 1 laboratory aid, $1,440; 1 laboratory aid, $1,380; 3 laboratory aids or clerks, at $1,200 each; 1 laboratory aid or clerk, $1,080; 2 laboratory aids or clerks, at $1,020 each; 1 laboratory aid, $900; 5 laboratory aids, at $840 each; 7 laboratory aids, at $720 each; 4 laboratory aids, at $600 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, $720; 1 map tracer, $600; 2 gardeners, at $1,440 each; 4 gardeners, at $1,200 each; 8 gardeners, at $1,100 each; 15 gardeners, at $900 each; 19 gardeners, at $780 each; two skilled laborers, at $960 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 3 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 1 assistant in technology, $1,400; 1 assistant in technology, $1,380; 1 mechanical assistant, $1,200; 1 blacksmith, $900; 1 carpenter, $900; 1 painter, $900; 1 teamster, $840; 1 teamster, $600; 21 laborers, at $540 each; 24 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; 3 laborers or charwomen, at $480 each; 2 laborers or charwomen, at $360 each; 3 laborers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 16 charwomen, at $240 each; 11 messenger boys, at $360 each; 4 messengers boys, at $300 each; in all, $424,150.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 20, on page 15, after the word "clerk," insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There seems to be a very considerable difference in the number of employees carried in this item from the current law, and I merely wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if all these were transfers of employees formerly paid from the lump-sum appropriation, or are they new employees?

Mr. LEVER. There are absolutely no new employees on this statutory roll. Some of them have been transferred here from the Bureau of Farm Management; others have been transferred from other bureaus here; but there are absolutely no new places.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Many of these were formerly paid from lump-sum appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee, so far as salaries for administrative work here in Washington are concerned, whether they are all now provided for on the statutory roll or whether any salaries are being paid from the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that probably, with one or two exceptions, all of the assistant chiefs are carried in the lump-sum appropriation, and they are in a large measure administrative officers. They are a combination of scientific men and administrative officers. Beyond that I think all of the administrative officers are carried on the statutory roll so far as I know.

Mr. STAFFORD. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, there was expended here in Washington out of lump-sum appropriations for administrative work in the Forest Service the amount of $154,000. Has the expense for that administrative work been carried to the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. I would prefer, if the gentleman would allow me, to wait until we get to the Forest Service to discuss that particular point, because I do not have my hand on the papers here. But I will explain that fully. It is due to the rearrangement of the Forest Service and a repeal of the 15 per cent provision and the general reorganization of the salary roll of that bureau. The gentleman knows that I can not carry all these things in my mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I know that that would be impossible, but I was trying to find out once for all what is the policy of the committee, so far as transferring from the lump-sum appropriation to the statutory roll is concerned, the salaries of officials or employees who are engaged in administrative work here in Washington.

The statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1914 shows that here in Washington, in the Bureau of Animal Industry, $12,000 and more was paid for that character of work out of lump-sum appropriations; in the Plant Industry Bureau, $23,000; in the Forest Service, $154,000; in the Bureau of Chemistry, $12,000, and so on.

Now, I would like to inquire if it is the purpose of the committee to eliminate employees from the lump-sum appropriation and carry in the bill proper the salaries of all the employees who are engaged in administrative work or are you going to leave some still in the lump-sum appropriation and carry others on the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the policy of the committee—and I will say it again, because I have said it two or three times already—the policy of the committee is to transfer, so far as we know and as far as it is possible for us to do it, all administrative officers from the lump-sum appropriation to the statutory roll; all clerical positions pure and simple, and all positions which in their very nature have become permanent instead of temporary.

That is the general policy on which the committee worked. For instance, a man may be employed for six months in some bureau and at the end of six months he goes out, but it is found subsequently that they need him back, and he comes back, and they employ him for a year. When it is evident to the department that he is needed permanently, we transfer him to the statutory roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. In some cases men may perform administrative work, although it may be of a scientific character, and in such cases they will still be paid out of the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I say that probably most of the assistant chiefs are carried on the lump-sum roll. Personally, I will say to the gentleman that it is probably better that these men should be carried on the statutory roll. I see no reason why they should not be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the control of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control, and by putting into application methods of control already discovered, $47,350.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, page 17, strike out the word "control." In lines 2, 3, and 4, page 18, strike out the words "and by putting into application methods of control already discovered." In line 4, page 18, strike out "$47,350" and in lieu thereof insert "$57,175."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to that amendment on line 22, page 17. It should read, "For the investigation." Strike out the word "control" and insert the word "investigation."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wants to know why this ought to be done, as I presume.

Mr. MANN. Of course this very much changes the scope of this appropriation. I would like to know what the reason is for that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I may say that it was discovered by the committee that in doing chestnut-blight disease work the funds were being used in the work of eradicating the disease—that is, used by plans which involved the cutting down of the trees and the burning of them—and the committee came to the conclusion that this disease, being such a contagious one, easily carried on the feet of birds and in almost any other way, and by the wind, it was foolish to continue that kind of work, and we thought it better to make this language express plainly on its face what the committee expected of that work in the future, namely, that it should be investigational work. That is the view of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Then it is not intended any longer to have the Government go into the forests and destroy the trees?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. How about the gypsy moth? This was a companion piece to the gypsy-moth item in the first place.

Mr. LEVER. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a distinct difference between those two items.

Mr. MANN. I was just asking for information, because I did not recollect.

Mr. LEVER. We have not changed our policy in that respect. I think the two propositions are entirely different. The chestnut blight has practically spread all over the country, and I see no hope of ever controlling it unless we discover some resistant varieties of chestnuts; on the other hand, I believe there is a possibility of controlling the browntail and gypsy moths.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman indicate that the department will cease its work of cutting down the trees?

Mr. LEVER. The department will cease its work of cutting down chestnut trees.

Mr. MOORE. That is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. LEVER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. What success has the department had in its effort to stop the spread of the chestnut blight?

Mr. LEVER. None, I think. The disease is continuing to spread, and I think it will continue to spread. As the gentleman knows, his own State of Pennsylvania appropriated a considerable sum of money at one time to cooperate with the department.

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. LEVER. I believe the last item of this kind in the Pennsylvania appropriation was vetoed by the governor of that State, and the State has ceased to appropriate for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE. There was a very large appropriation originally?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And I wanted to find out if other States have ceased making appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. The State of Virginia has appropiated $2,500, the State of West Virginia $5,000, the State of North Carolina $500, and the State of Ohio $1,500.

Mr. MOORE. So that the States have practically ceased appropriating for this purpose.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Unless the States continue their appropriations for stopping the disease by cutting down and destroying the trees, there will be nothing for the Government to do hereafter, except investigation.

Mr. LEVER. That is all; and I am sure that the experts agree that the idea of trying to stop a disease which has been spread all over the country and which can be carried on the feet of birds is a foolish proposition.

Mr. MOORE. There is no doubt that it spreads very rapidly.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. In the current law, for this year, the appropriation for this purpose was $69,510.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In the bill as reported by the committee they reduced that to $47,350.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now you have offered an amendment which eliminates the destruction of the trees and provides only for investigation, but at the same time you propose to increase the appropriation considerably.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I really can not understand the philosophy or logic of that.

Mr. LEVER. I will explain that to the gentleman. We found that of the $20,000 which the department was estimating for this work of endeavoring to control the chestnut blight, approximately $10,000 was to be used for eradication work, and the other $10,000 was to be used for investigational work. The committee, not knowing the exact situation at the time, inadvertently struck out the entire $20,000. We felt, however, after examining more thoroughly into the question, that it would be well to continue the investigational work, and hence we restore the $10,000.

Mr. MANN. There is no increase in the work, then?

Mr. LEVER. No increase at all.

Mr. MOORE. May I inquire of the gentleman whether, in the event of the disease appearing in Ohio, where, I am just informed, it has appeared, the Government would be in a position, by reason of this appropriation, to cooperate with the State of Ohio?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; if Ohio desired to cooperate.

Mr. MOORE. In furnishing information and such aid as might be given?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly; yes; but the Government would not be in a position to go into the woods and cooperate with the State of Ohio in cutting down the trees and burning them.

Mr. MOORE. I will say that in Pennsylvania the disease has done about the worst it could do. It has swept the State.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Can the gentleman state whether out of this appropriation money is provided for the inspection of chestnut trees which are shipped from the eastern part of the United States to other parts of the United States to discover whether or not they are infected with this chestnut blight?

Mr. LEVER. No; this item does not carry that appropriation, but there is an appropriation in the bill for that purpose. The gentleman remembers the quarantine act which we passed several years ago?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. In that item we have an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. SLOAN. There are ample funds, then, to continue that work?

Mr. LEVER. Ample funds; all that the department asked for.

Mr. SLOAN. I will say to the gentleman that there are numerous cases where chestnut trees are being transplanted throughout the West, being shipped there from the Eastern States, and our people are concerned in maintaining pure and healthy chestnut trees. Of course, out in that country we sometimes deal in chestnuts and sometimes bring them back to Washington. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the control of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants, $56,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item—"for the control of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants, $56,000"—induces me to say a word about the potato crop of Maine, which I observe from the report is intended to be covered in part by the appropriation. In Maine they have what is known as the powdery scab.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that the $5,000 increase allowed by the committee is to be used in the study of the potato scab, which is found largely in Maine, but has gone to New York and threatens the potato industry of the whole country. Further on we carry an appropriation of $50,000 for quarantine work.

Mr. MOORE. I was about to ask of that. My information is that the quarantine has been established as against the potatoes of Canada as well as the potatoes from Maine, and that the inspection is in force as against the exportation of pontoes from Maine. That is to say, the Department of Agriculture has agents in the State of Maine, and potatoes are not permitted to go out of the State unless they are entirely free of the powdery scab or wart, or whatever it may be; that they are subject to inspection by the agents of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. That is true of the rest of the districts in which it occurs.

Mr. MOORE. I am informed that the department has allowed for the purpose of inspection $50,000, and that if the shipper desires to get his potatoes out of Maine he can not do so except on the Government's approval. What I want to find out is where the $50,000 to pay for the inspection of potatoes in Maine comes from.

Mr. LEVER. It is carried in an item under the head of "Domestic potato quarantine," in "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 74 of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Subject to the discretion of the department.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The Secretary has the power to take money out of a lump sum to make an inspection in the State of Maine.

Mr. LEVER. On page 74 of the bill the gentleman will find, under the head of "Domestic potato quarantine," an appropriation of $50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with those States in the inspection of Irish potatoes where a quarantine has been or hereafter shall be established by the Secretary of Agriculture prohibiting the movement of such potatoes from any State into any other State, and so forth.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for the information, which in part covers my inquiry, but apparently the whole of the $50,000 was used in Maine last year.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is true except the least bit in the State of New York, where this disease recently has appeared.

Mr. MOORE. My information further is that the $50,000 was not sufficient to pay for the inspection in Maine, and it was necessary to make some arrangement with the potato growers by which an additional $50,000 was contributed by them for the purpose of making up a fund of $100,000 in order to get the crop to market. I want to know whether the department stands sponsor for that contribution of what might be a demand for an additional $50,000 on pain of not getting the potatoes out of the State.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will recollect that the powdery-scab outbreak occurred late last year. The department then estimated in a Senate amendment for $100,000 for this work. It passed the Senate, and $50,000 was agreed to in conference. The department this year gives us an estimate of $100,000 for the work, but the committee, in its judgment, thought $50,000 adequate. I may say in that connection that when this item was in conference in the Senate there came to the conferees a kind of understanding that the State of Maine would handle a part of this work. The Legislature, however, of the State of Maine has not met since that time, and no arrangement has been made. The shippers have voluntarily agreed to a tax of $2 a carload of potatoes upon themselves to supplement the fund of the Federal department. We think we are contributing amply to this work, which is confined very largely to a comparatively small area.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the chairman of the committee for giving us the information, but it seems to me this is an unusual situation, and one to which the committee ought to give careful attention. Here are farmers, as much so as in any other State in the Union, men who have made a specialty of raising potatoes, and who raise the most wonderful crops to be found anywhere in the country—single tracts of 100 acres of living green. These men have had their difficulties as farmers, and they have to get to market. They must get the potatoes out of the ground, but the department levies upon them a quarantine and tells them that they can not get the product to market unless it meets the Government inspection. This is the product of the soil; it is the result of toil of the man on the farm. The Government appropriates $50,000 for the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the inspectors to say whether the

potatoes, the product of the farmer, shall go to the market; but this is not sufficient to enable them to get the crops out. They must not only stand the espionage or the inspection, but, in addition, they must put their hands into their own pockets and put up an additional sum of $2 per carload in order to take away from the farm the products they have raised by their own toil.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the gentleman wants to refer to this as espionage. The item in this bill comes at the urgent request of the delegation from Maine, both in the House and the Senate.

Mr. MOORE. If the word is too harsh, and maybe it is, I will retract it, because I do not want to do anything to injure the prospect of the Maine farmer selling this product. But the fact is that the Government has said to the potato raisers of Maine that before they can sell their potatoes they must be inspected. That is a condition that is not imposed against the apple raiser of Arkansas or the cotton grower of any State. That condition is not levied against farmers throughout the country. It applies to the farmer in Maine, who lives up in the extreme northeastern part of the country, where it is harder to get to market than it is for many other farmers. The Maine potato farmer must not only bear his proportion of the expenses of the taxpayer, but he must put his hand in his own pocket and match dollar for dollar the appropriation of the Federal Government in order to get his potatoes out to market. It is an unusual condition.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman overlooks the fact that this potato disease is very infectious, while the diseases of apples and one thing and another are not infectious at all.

Mr. MOORE. We have the chestnut blight, and there are apples which rot in places, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. ANDERSON. But that does not scatter all over the country as the potato rot does.

Mr. MOORE. But there is a scale that strikes the apple tree and others and passes along just the same. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to ask me a question? If not, I merely want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me that it is rather an unfair handicap against the farmers of Maine to compel them to keep their patotoes under control until the Government inspects them and then make them pay for the inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chairman upon the item that has been referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. What is done with the money contributed by the farmers in connection with this inspection?

Mr. LEVER. That money is used as a cooperative fund with which to carry on the work provided in this item.

Mr. MARTIN. It does not go into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. LEVER. No; it does not, as I understand it.

Mr. MARTIN. Who expends it, who disburses it, who has charge of it?

Mr. LEVER. There is evidently a cooperative arrangement between the State of Maine, the people in this infected district, and the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that cooperation in the State of Maine a cooperation by the farmer who has a carload of potatoes he wants to sell?

Mr. LEVER. It is a cooperative arrangement, I am pretty sure, though I am not positive, between the Federal Government and the individuals concerned in the area in which the infection occurs. I may be wrong in that statement, but I think not.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand it is merely a temporary arrangement to be continued until an appropriation can be made by the State legislature, the intention being later on for the State to cooperate with the Federal Government for maintaining the quarantine.

Mr. LEVER. It is temporary, I am sure.

Mr. MARTIN. I was about to say it seems to me that a system of that sort would be subject to many objections. Of course, if there is to be real cooperation between the Federal Government and the State authorities in connection with the inspection that might be quite permissible, but to allow individuals to cooperate, whose property is to be inspected, to contribute is——

Mr. LEVER. That system would be wrong generally, but the gentleman knows this was a sudden emergency and the department had to do the best it could under the circumstances until the Legislature of Maine met.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the chairman does not understand it is intended to make this system continuing?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there is very serious objection to it.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman understands that there was a contribution made to make up this fund to match the Government fund in order to complete the inspection.

Mr. MARTIN. So I gathered from what has been said.

Mr. MOORE. That is a fact that has not been denied.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand; but I understood the chairman to say that this is but a temporary means to get along until the State of Maine shall make some provision by the State.

Mr. MOORE. The question is, Why should the State of Maine do it?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it is not unusual that the State and Federal authorities unite in their efforts to suppress any matter of plant disease; but it is extremely unusual that individuals who have property to be inspected should be permitted to contribute to pay the cost of inspection services.

Mr. MOORE. It seemed to me so, and that was the reason I brought it up.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to say the suggestion of cooperation between the State of Maine and the Federal Government came as a suggestion from the people of Maine.

Mr. ANDERSON. The hearings show that.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, in Weld County, where the potato blight has been raging for the past five years or more, the Government has recently entered into an agreement with an association of farmers in that county to erect an experimental station for the purpose of discovering the causes of the blight and the possible means of prevention. They have not only contributed land, but they have also contributed cash to pay for the construction of the necessary equipment.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that the State government?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. The State government not as yet, but the individuals there have contributed in a joint project for the construction and maintenance and operation of this experimental station and the Government is to contribute so much during this fiscal year or during the next fiscal year for its operation.

Mr. MADDEN. Has there been any law passed authorizing that?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that there is any law; I do not know that there is any law against it.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It is in line with the policy of the Government to investigate these plant diseases and the farmers of that district welcome that opportunity to work together with the Government for a solution of this trouble that has been raging so disastrously and so harmfully there for several years past.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman, if he will yield, whether there is not a United States statute prohibiting the acceptance of contributions toward the inspection services of the country, contributions from individuals?

Mr. LEVER. I am not able to inform the gentleman on that. I am no lawyer, as the gentleman knows. I am a farmer.

Mr. ANDERSON. According to my recollection, this bill specifically authorizes that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $2,545,336.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SLOAN. I do so for the purpose of saying a few things about a matter of some interest to the House that I was not able to say by reason of being called from the Chamber when we were discussing the Bureau of Animal Industry a while ago in relation to the expenditures made by the department in eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease.

Criticisms were presented on the floor of the House this afternoon upon the Bureau of Animal Industry and the method of treating that subject, and inasmuch as the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture has recently been conducting hearings on that subject, at which the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry appeared and submitted evidence as to what the Government had done and accomplished, I thought it was no more than due to the House that a few facts should be given to show what the department has been doing.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that possibly the gentleman has been misinformed as to any criticism of the department. I certainly made none.

Mr. SLOAN. No. They were made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] stating that the department had not conducted that matter properly in the State of Indiana.

Now, this disease broke out in southern Michigan and northern Indiana. I do not think that Representatives of any of those States where it originated should seriously criticize the Government for immediately taking hold of that matter and going to the expense it has gone in eradicating that disease in a very large part of the infected districts of the United States. It broke out in 20 States of the Union, breaking out originally, as I said, in southern Michigan and spreading immediately to northern Indiana. It broke out at a time, early in the fall, when cattle were being shipped from one part of the country to another quite generally, just at a time when it would make conditions very favorable for its general distribution throughout the United States. It demanded drastic and almost heroic action on the part of the Department of Agriculture, and it was taken. This disease was a menace not only to the cattle, sheep, and hogs of this country, but the disease is transmissible to human beings. Prompt and courageous action was entitled to commendation instead of criticism. Nearly all of the States in the Union cooperated with the Department of Agriculture under their several quarantine laws and regulations.

The head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, appearing before the committee I have named, was able to state that in nearly all of the States of the Union it had been reduced to a very limited area, and had been absolutely done away with in a number of the States; that the States generally met the Government on the basis of one-half of the expenditures; met the Government cheerfully, and met the demands of the Government, as the Government met the demands of the States, so that in only very small areas is the disease a matter of great menace at this time.

I make this statement as due to a public official, Dr. Melvin, who for a great many years has been at the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry and has distinguished himself in meeting large and important problems arising under his particular bureau's jurisdiction, and meeting them successfully.

I am satisfied that the great State of Indiana is not seriously criticizing the Bureau of Animal Industry or the department for the manner in which it conducted that work in that State in the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. With the permission of the House, I shall present and have extended in the RECORD a statement of expenditures and work done by the Bureau of Animal Industry in this behalf—a statement which has been presented to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of the statement referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Statement showing number and kind of animals slaughtered and the cost of animals, burial, property destroyed, disinfection, and miscellaneous supplies in the various States on account of the foot-and-mouth disease to Dec. 31, 1914, inclusive.

State.	Counties.	Herds.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Goats.	Total number animals.
Connecticut	2	24	538	.....	105	.....	643
Delaware	1	12	152	.....	49	.....	201
District of Columbia	1	2	23	.....	5	.....	28
Illinois	50	484	14,653	507	21,587	11	36,758
Indiana	18	94	2,172	615	3,340	.....	6,127
Iowa	6	32	979	32	1,581	.....	2,592
Kentucky	9	39	817	.....	308	.....	1,125
Maryland	10	39	744	197	531	.....	1,472
Massachusetts	9	50	1,109	9	3,471	4	4,593
Michigan	15	236	2,922	802	4,004	.....	7,728
Montana	3	32	1,408	237	11	.....	1,656
New Hampshire	1	3	78	.....	26	.....	104
New Jersey	5	23	743	6	212	.....	961
New York	11	85	3,570	60	267	2	3,899
Ohio	31	169	3,204	2,652	4,254	1	10,111
Pennsylvania	25	654	11,059	269	6,565	3	17,896
Rhode Island	3	36	721	1	135	.....	857
Virginia	1	1	19	.....	15	.....	34
Washington	1	1	102	.....	.....	.....	102
Wisconsin	10	31	1,255	1,764	1,269	1	4,289
Total	212	2,046	46,268	7,151	47,735	22	101,176

State.	50 per cent appraisal animals slaughtered.	50 per cent cost burial of animals.	50 per cent appraisal property destroyed.	Miscellaneous expenses.	Total amount.
Connecticut	$17,893.55	$289.87	$900.43	$913.20	$19,997.05
Delaware	4,033.88	248.00	669.30	594.39	5,545.57
District of Columbia	1,447.00	28.00	2.00	.....	1,477.00
Illinois	573,492.60	.....	24,200.00	28,000.00	625,692.60
Indiana	80,211.93	1,535.53	1,731.93	2,141.50	85,620.94
Iowa	39,896.47	321.33	1,082.46	862.61	42,072.92
Kentucky	19,859.70	300.62	696.77	1,504.42	22,361.51
Maryland	21,270.00	1,500.00	1,745.00	2,000.00	26,515.00
Massachusetts	58,682.37	2,250.00	2,000.00	5,000.00	67,932.37
Michigan	103,966.38	3,568.85	2,490.69	5,376.50	115,402.42
Montana	33,530.10	77.50	547.14	204.58	34,359.32
New Hampshire	2,479.75	95.00	.....	505.38	3,080.13
New Jersey	31,771.62	1,353.75	354.97	419.30	33,899.64
New York	140,771.25	2,176.43	1,513.64	6,093.23	150,554.55
Ohio	133,559.79	3,510.64	3,756.61	1,464.76	142,291.80
Pennsylvania	360,809.65	3,802.95	8,470.57	7,520.45	380,603.62
Rhode Island	23,228.25	.....	1,031.58	2,296.19	26,556.02
Virginia	588.92	20.00	26.38	.....	635.30
Washington	2,025.00	.....	.....	.....	2,025.00
Wisconsin	49,626.92	3,036.47	2,486.39	2,556.45	57,706.23
Total	1,699,055.13	24,115.04	53,705.86	67,452.93	1,844,328.99

State.	Employees engaged in work.		Salaries.	Subsistence and transportation.	Total expense.
	Veterinarians.	Lay inspectors.			
Connecticut	7	2	$2,052.50	$1,343.18	$23,392.73
Delaware	3	6	3,079.17	1,731.94	10,336.68
District of Columbia	4	8	385.68	1,054.63	2,917.31
Illinois	110	48	30,224.14	24,428.35	680,345.09
Indiana	25	18	11,946.99	8,541.62	106,109.55
Iowa	13	10	5,578.29	4,625.78	52,276.99
Kentucky	22	4	3,136.34	2,513.88	28,011.73
Maryland	22	11	8,135.43	5,866.29	40,516.72
Massachusetts	17	14	7,658.87	4,317.24	79,908.48
Michigan	35	23	16,181.38	11,461.04	143,044.84
Montana	17	6	6,000.74	5,545.65	45,905.71
New Hampshire	3	2	350.00	200.75	3,630.88
New Jersey	10	.....	2,746.43	4,608.05	41,254.12
New York	35	51	12,067.14	7,210.17	169,831.86
Ohio	38	20	13,124.44	14,062.94	169,479.18
Pennsylvania	60	31	23,335.83	18,195.42	422,134.87
Rhode Island	6	16	3,862.70	2,302.42	32,721.14
Virginia	3	.....	.....	.....	635.30
Washington	3	.....	159.45	78.90	2,263.35
Wisconsin	21	10	5,853.36	6,102.76	69,662.35
Total	454	280	155,878.88	124,171.01	2,124,378.88
Additional miscellaneous supplies	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,260.16
Advertising	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500.00
Total	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,129,138.04

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Referring to the remarks of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], I am very glad to say that the State of Indiana has cooperated cordially, and I think effectively, with the Department of Agriculture in the work of maintaining a quarantine in our State against the foot-and-mouth disease.

At the outbreak of the disease in our State we did not happen to have any appropriation available for defense purposes. The Department of Agriculture was generous enough to accept the word of the governor of the State to the effect that when our legislature met he would recommend an appropriation to pay one-half of whatever expense might be incurred in combating the disease. The Department of Agriculture for the time being took over the whole expense of protecting the live-stock interests of the State, and thus prevented the convening of a special session of the Indiana Legislature, which would have been otherwise absolutely necessary. We have a State quarantine division, with Dr. Nelson at the head, which acted in full sympathy with the Department of Agriculture. The governor of our State has given the Department of Agriculture cordial support, and I am confident that the great mass of the farmers of the State of Indiana are feeling that they have received great benefit and prompt protection. The whole live-stock industry of the State of Indiana was for the moment at risk, and only the fact that we have had an effective quarantine has made it possible to continue animal husbandry as a profitable branch of industry.

Doubtless there have been criticisms by individuals; in this free American country of ours all restrictive measures are apt

to meet with some opposition. It is a tendency of the American people to criticize restrictive measures, and it is therefore a difficult task for the Government to deal with such a situation as comes up in a quarantine. A portion of my district was in the quarantined area, and it had not a single case of foot-and-mouth disease; yet I feel that the Department of Agriculture was fully and wholly justified in taking the precautionary measures that it did to protect the live-stock industry of our State.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield there?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. COX. How much money will it take to compensate for the loss of cattle killed out in Indiana as the result of this work?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I can not say exactly, but I should think it would approach $100,000, or go beyond that.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman give the committee any idea as to the total value of the cattle in Indiana that would have been affected if this emergency had not been met and this action had not been taken?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. In 1910 the aggregate value of our cattle approximated $40,000,000; at the present moment I should place the value close to $50,000,000.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, I will say that the figures were $80,000 up to the first of this year.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. There have been some additional losses since then, so that my approximation of $100,000 is very nearly correct. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in Indiana the cattle industry has been one of our disappearing industries. We have a million more hogs in Indiana now than we had 10 years ago. We have 12,000 more dairy cattle than we had 10 years ago, but during the last five years our beef cattle have declined in numbers from 729,000 in 1910 to 693,000 in 1915. We can not afford to lose any more ground in this direction. We must exert every effort to replace our former splendid herds of beef cattle and to fill our half empty feed lots. For this reason I desire to go on record that I not only approve heartily of what the Department of Agriculture has done in Indiana to meet this supreme crisis, but I believe that the Indiana farmers owe it a great debt of gratitude. Indeed, I may go further and say that the citizenship of our State, without regard to occupation, are under obligations to the Department of Agriculture for the way they came to the relief of the live-stock industry in the State of Indiana, and I feel perfectly confident that this feeling generally prevails throughout the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For soil-bacteriology and plant-nutrition investigations, including the testing of samples, procured in the open market, of cultures for inoculating legumes, and hereafter if any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or misbranded, the results of the tests may be published, together with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by whom the cultures were offered for sale, $42,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I notice the committee has introduced some new phraseology in the paragraph, from line 9 to 15, inclusive. I wish to inquire what is the special work that is intended to be performed by the department, particularly as to the investigation of private establishments and the publication of those investigations with the names of the manufacturers when they are proven not to be up to the standard?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows, of course, that in recent years a great many companies are manufacturing various kinds of inoculating cultures for leguminous plants; that many soils require this bacteria before leguminous plants can grow at all. It has been discovered that a great deal of misbranded and impure inoculating material is being sent out, and the department requires authority here to do with this as we do with misbranded and mixed seeds, publish the name of the party, so that we can get a better brand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the private manufacturer, who is engaged in the manufacture of these legumes, to have no voice whatever in determining whether his product is up to the standard as prescribed by the Agricultural Department?

Mr. LEVER. Well, they would not publish anything against the private manufacturer without a hearing.

Mr. STAFFORD. This phraseology gives the department absolute authority to ruin the established business of a manufacturer without even a hearing.

Mr. LEVER. This language is identical with the language carried as to misbranded seed. The department does not publish the names of the parties handling misbranded seeds without first giving them an opportunity to be heard. It is a very bad thing to have a farmer send and get some of this inoculating material for clover, for instance, and then find it does not do the work. And we are trying to stop this abuse, and we thought it was the quickest way to do it, by providing for it in this appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I quite agree with the purpose of the provision. However, I can see how this might work in the hands of some subordinate official to the great detriment of some manufacturer who may not have been granted a hearing, and just because his manufactured output might not conform to the standard set up by one of these subordinate officials. We want to throw safeguards around the consumers of this country, but we also want to take into consideration not to surrender the rights of private manufacturers in the disposal of their own products.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that we have not heard of any protest in regard to misbranded seed distributers being published without notice to them, and I think we can trust to the good discretion and judgment of the department in this matter. It is a small matter, and yet it is a large matter, and I think the quicker we get it into the law the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman just proposed that if this is found not to be workable, it might be open to amendment next year. I call attention to the fact that we are now amending the law, which becomes a permanent law by the very phraseology here carried, without any consideration of its effect by the committee. The hearings do not contain a line as to the protection of the public or protection to the manufacturer.

Mr. LEVER. The committee did not need any consideration of this. It was such a small matter that——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman be willing to eliminate the word "hereafter"?

Mr. LEVER. I was about to suggest that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that item, on page 18, line 11, after the word "and," by striking out the word "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 11, strike out the word "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For crop technological and fiber plan investigations, $19,770.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment correcting a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 5, strike out the word "plan" and in lieu thereof insert the word "plant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, $72,920.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph—lines 7, 8, and 9. This appears to be a new item.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no.

Mr. LEVER. This item has been carried in the bill for 10 years, I presume.

Mr. MOORE. Then I withdraw the motion and move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word, and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, on January 4 the House passed a bill known as the grain grades bill. We have had considerable grain legislation, and in each instance appropriations have been provided; but the bill passed on January 4 carried an appropriation of $125,000 for a purpose which seems to be entirely analogous to this. If this item of $72,920 stands, I would like to know why we are to appropriate $125,000 in the grain grades act.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit me, I think I can answer that very quickly, and get along with the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I do not rise for the purpose of delay. I want the gentleman to understand that.

Mr. LEVER. I thoroughly understand that the gentleman is seeking information. The committee discussed the very matter which the gentleman is speaking about, and I think if the Moss bill had become a law when this bill was being framed, probably there would have been some change in this item; but the Moss bill has not yet become a law, and it is very necessary that we carry on this work of standardization until we know that it is provided for somewhere else. And I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we reduced the appropriation in the Moss bill considerably.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may answer the question which I wish to ask. Why should we anticipate the passage of the law proposed in the Moss bill, which is the grain-grades act, providing for $125,000, by making an appropriation to accomplish the same thing in this bill at the sum of $72,920?

Mr. LEVER. My answer to that is this: The department has been endeavoring for a good many years—6 or 8 or 10 years probably—to establish grain grades. There has been no effort made until recently to make these grain grades compulsory when established. The original theory of this item was to establish the grades, and if the trade desired to accept them, very good; if not, there was no compulsion about it. We have not as yet completed the work covered by this item. The corn grades have been promulgated. Now we are working on wheat and oats and other grain, and we hope to have the wheat grades promulgated, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], in time for the next wheat crop.

Mr. MOORE. If it is to be done at all, I rather hope that will be the case.

Mr. LEVER. But that leaves considerable work to be done still under this item.

Mr. MOORE. But the very purpose of the Moss grain-grades bill was to consolidate the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to grain inspection, grain grading, standardization, and so forth, so that he might then proceed without question under the law.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] will answer for himself on that proposition

Mr. MOORE. Now, before the law is passed you are apparently making provision to enable the Secretary to go ahead, anyhow. That is what I am trying to find out about.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words; and in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] I should like to say that this item has been carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill for the last 8 or 10 years at the express request of the grain men themselves. There has been a voluntary effort by the grain people themselves to come to uniform grain standardization by resolution and concerted action. They have asked the Government to assist them in this work, the various grain organizations and farmers' organizations all recognizing the fact that it was desirable to have uniform standards, and that before uniform standards are possible there must be certain scientific information gathered. The Government undertook to gather that information, and the various organizations by coordinate action undertook to place this standardization into effect. Now, these various organizations admit that, while the desirability of this action is just as great as it ever was, they have not been able by voluntary action to secure the universal adoption of uniform grades or standards. So the grain-grades bill goes a little further than this appropriation and aims to make the standards compulsory when they shall have been promulgated by the department. This is one step which this provision does not contain, but the cooperation between the Government and these various organizations will proceed under this item.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell us whether we are making two appropriations here for the same purpose? I do not want to discuss the merits of the grain inspection or standardization bill, but I want to know whether we are appropriating two sums of money for one purpose—$72,920 for investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and in the Moss bill $125,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. No, Mr. Chairman, we are not. The estimate that the Department of Agriculture furnished to the Committee on Agriculture for the grain grades act was $375,000, which sum would be necessary in order to carry out the work that was contemplated in the grain grades act. But out of that sum they suggested that there should be deducted the amount carried in this bill. We passed the warehouse act, carrying an appropriation of $100,000, and that is a part of the work which was comprehended in the original scope of the grain act; we therefore reduced the amount appropriated for grain standardization to $125,000. All this work will be correlated and bring about a common result.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman mentions $375,000. The grading act appropriated $125,000.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. That was as it passed the House; but the estimates were for $375,000.

Mr. MOORE. But the $375,000 has nothing to do with the present discussion.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It had something to do with the question that the gentleman asked.

Mr. MOORE. Then that would make a third item of expense.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. With this appropriation it is proposed to carry on the voluntary cooperative work between the Government and the various grain organizations in the United States and to complete at an early day the work of establishing definite and uniform commercial grades for the principal grains of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the the testing of flax straw, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, $10,840.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 5, after the word "including," strike out the word "the."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what progress has been made in the matter of developing paper-making qualities of the fibrous plants for which this experimental appropriation of $10,840 is made. It has been carried in the bill for a long time.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will give me one moment to put my hand on the facts, I think I can give him an intelligible answer. But, in a general way, I can say to the gentleman from Illinois that as far as my information goes, and I made some inquiry about it in the hearings last year, although I have not this year, they are still studying and considering questions as to whether or not they can ever develop a plan by which we can manufacture paper out of flax straw. I understand that flax straw is a great by-product in the northwest country, and while the item has been in the bill a long time and perhaps money has been wasted, counting in dollars and cents, the committee feels that although they might spend a million dollars, apparently wasted, if we finally reach the discovery that solves it, we have not in fact wasted any money.

Mr. MADDEN. The bill has in the past carried appropriations for experimenting as to whether or not cornstalks could be used for making paper. What progress has been made in that direction?

Mr. LEVER. The department finally abandoned that item, and although it is studying it some under other items it is not extensive.

Mr. MADDEN. So they have concluded that paper can not be made of cornstalks?

Mr. LEVER. They can make paper from cornstalks, but the assembling of the cornstalks is so expensive as to make it prohibitive as a commercial proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. How much more costly is it to assemble cornstalks than flax straw? Is there a greater area of flax straw in the United States than cornstalks?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, of course not.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it more economical to assemble flax straw?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know; I never saw any flax straw in my life.

Mr. MANN. Flax straw makes a higher grade of paper.

Mr. MARTIN. And it costs less to assemble it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking entirely for information. The query occurred to me whether, if the department has found it unwise to continue the experiments in the cornstalk paper, they still believed it was wise to continue the experiments in the flax-straw proposition for paper making.

Mr. LEVER. The best answer to the gentleman's question is that the department has ceased to estimate for cornstalk work, but it has continued to estimate for flax-straw work.

Mr. BARTLETT. What do the gentlemen from the flax-straw country say as to the wisdom of continuing this appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not posing as an expert on the question of flax straw, but on the question of assembling it, it is almost unnecessary to say that it is cheaper to assemble it than it is cornstalks. It is unnecessary to assemble, so far as a particular field is concerned, for it is assembled when it is thrashed, whereas corn is used in the field. If you had to assemble the cornstalks at the factory it would be very expensive.

Mr. MADDEN. The same thing would be true of cornstalks; you can husk it by machinery and shred it by machinery, and when you are shredding it you can make a stack of it as easily as you could of flax straw.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it is not the usual method at all, and probably very expensive to adopt. On the other hand, every field of flax is all thrashed in a body, and the straw remains all close together, assembled; but, of course, it would have to find its way to market for manufacture.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me to suggest, neither flax straw nor cornstalks are assembled so as to be enabled to run a paper mill without very great expense.

Mr. MARTIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. MANN. They are only assembled at the thrashing machine now, and it takes a great deal of flax straw to run a paper mill during the course of a year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman the last report made to the committee from the officials of the department having charge of these matters——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The last report was to the effect that paper can be made from cornstalks—can be made successfully as a commercial proposition. That was their report, and they ceased their investigation for that reason. Now, whether their reason was right or not, or whether the conclusions they reached were right or not, I do not know. That came in in connection with the proposition offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], when he was a member of the committee, for a considerable appropriation for the construction of an experimental mill in his district in Kentucky, and the department made an unfavorable report on his suggestion, and the appropriation was not made, the department justifying its position on the ground that it had completed its investigation and found that paper can be made from cornstalks and that it can be made successfully and profitably as a commercial proposition.

Mr. MANN. Well, you can make paper out of any plant that has fiber.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You can make it out of anything that has fiber, but their conclusion was it can be made successfully and the business can be carried on successfully as a commercial proposition.

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure the gentleman is quite right in reference to that, but I will put in the RECORD the answer of Dr. Taylor on this proposition. Dr. Taylor, in the hearings last year, said:

> Dr. TAYLOR. It has been found possible to make excellent paper from several crop products, especially from cornstalks, but in competition with wood-pulp paper stock, as now available, the department is not able to hold out hope, under present economic conditions, of the profitable production of paper from any of these crop plants.

Mr. MANN. Now, flax makes a high-grade paper. Cornstalks make a low-grade paper and comes in competition with the paper made from wood pulp. The cost of assembling cornstalks is more than the cost of making paper other than paper out of wood pulp.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Several of these propositions last year came up together. The bill had carried an appropriation for investigating the making of paper out of cornstalks, had carried an appropriation for the investigation of making paper out of flax, had carried an appropriation for investigating the diseases of the sugar beet. The department made several recommendations; one that the appropriation for the investigation of the making of paper out of cornstalks be abandoned, another that the appropriation for the testing of the value of flax for paper be eliminated, because, by the change in the tariff law, paper was to be admitted free, and still another the elimination of the appropriation for investigating diseases of the sugar beet, because the duty on sugar was to be taken off and sugar was later to come in free. And then there followed the recommendation that $50,000 be appropriated for work in Louisiana, where the manufacturers of sugar cane will be impoverished by the removal of the tariff and they must be taught other lines of industry, other lines of agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. That was $100,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Well, it was made $100,000 by the Senate, and by a compromise with the House the amount was fixed at $60,000; a similar amount is carried in this bill. The Democrats told us that the people were to be saved an immense amount of money by the taking off of the duty on sugar; but sugar has not been reduced in price, and the entire sugar industry of the country has been destroyed, and it is necessary for the department to ask for an appropriation, and an appropriation is carried in this bill for establishing an experimental farm in Louisiana to provide and encourage lines of agriculture different from the cane-sugar industry, so as to give the people down there something to do and to save them from poverty as a result of the tariff legislation of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, as usual, has injected into this bill a discussion of the tariff for political purposes. Although I have been a member of the committee for 12 years I have never done so, because of all things on earth we want to do it is to keep the Agricultural Department of this Government nonpartisan and nonpolitical. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Michigan asserts as a positive statement that in the last year's estimates this item for breeding fibrous plants, including flax straw, in cooperation with the North Dakota agricultural college, which may be used for making paper, and so on, was dropped because the officials of the department said that on account of the duty being taken off paper that none of these plants could compete with foreign importation.

Now, the facts are—and I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will admit it when his memory is refreshed—that Dr. Taylor testified before the committee last year:

> The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you, Dr. Taylor, if you please, has anybody been growing flax in North Dakota for the purpose of making paper out of it?
>
> Dr. TAYLOR. The flax straw, Mr. Chairman, is a by-product—flax is grown for seed. It has been utilized as paper stock, but there are manufacturing difficulties which have not been overcome and which we do not see a reasonable prospect of overcoming on an economic basis.

So that the impression sought to be created by the gentleman in this regard is not borne out by the testimony before the committee. The gentleman has harped upon the Louisiana item in this bill in season and almost out of season, saying it is the result of the Democratic tariff act. I want to say to the gentleman that if the Democratic tariff act destroyed the cane-sugar industry, the cane-growing industry of Louisiana, if that industry did not have a right to exist, if it was necessary to hothouse it, if it was necessary to feed it out on a silver spoon, all the time out of the pockets of the taxpayers, then I, as one Democrat, have no apology for the result of that tariff act. The Democratic Party stands against the special privileges which have grown up under the Republican tariff system. You had as well, according to the statements of experts, attempt to grow sugar cane in Louisiana in competition with the world—it will cost as much to do it—as, to quote a distinguished ex-Member of this body, to grow oranges in competition with the world in the State of Maine. And I want to say to the gentleman once and for all on this one item that if all these facts are true, and the country knows the facts as they are in reference to the growing of sugar cane in Louisiana in competition with the world, I am satisfied the people will realize that they are being taxed to hothouse an industry which has no legitimate right for existence in this country, and will not blame the Democratic Party for anything that may happen to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

I have made no charges against these appropriations. I was simply offering to explain some of them, an explanation requested by other gentlemen on the floor, and I thought it was due to them that some member of the committee make such explanation as can be made. Now, it is a fact, whether the chairman of the committee is willing to admit it or not, that these changes in appropriations were suggested to the committee, and as it appears in the Book of Estimates and as it appears by the statement of the officials of the department who appeared before the committee, on account of changed economic conditions. When we asked officials of the department who appeared before us to tell what those changed economic conditions were they were loath to do it, and the truth was drawn from them as with a corkscrew, that the changed conditions grew out of the Underwood tariff law and the conditions resulting from tariff legislation by this Democratic Congress. So, if there is an question about the effect of the tariff legislation on the cane-growing industry in the South, we can justify the charge against that tariff law by statements of the men from that very section of the country, because the men who are the most insistent upon the appropriation for the benefit of those engaged in the sugar-cane industry in the South are the men from Louisiana.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] appeared before our committee several times and told us that the people down there are to be impoverished, that the sugar factories are abandoned and are falling into decay, and that something must be done for the relief of the people and to help them to engage in some other line of work; and it was on his insistent demand, supported by the gentlemen from the Agricultural Department themselves, a part of the administration

that had framed and put through Congress that very tariff law, that these appropriations were made. We have not talked very much politics in the Committee on Agriculture, but when the Book of Estimates contains a statement that a number of these appropriations are to be made and a number of the appropriations formerly carried are to be dropped on account of changed economic conditions, it is perfectly proper, it seems to me, for us to inquire what those economic conditions are and whether or not the officials making those suggestions are ready with the correct answer. And when gentlemen arise in their places on this floor and ask the real reason or true inwardness of items appearing in this bill, and why certain of them have been eliminated, it seems to me it is perfectly proper for us to give the real facts, even if they do involve some partisan politics.

In regard to calling the sugar industry a hothouse industry, if there had been a reasonable protection to the domestic production of beet sugar, if there could have been protection or assurance to those who were inclined to engage in that industry, that there would be protection for a reasonable time, free from the constant threat of unfriendly Democratic legislation, the increase in the production of sugar by the cane-sugar manufacturers and the beet-sugar manufacturers in this country would to-day very nearly supply the sugar consumed by our people.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. James Wilson, reported only a few years ago that there is, as far as he had investigated, land enough in this country suitable for the growing of sugar beets so that one year's production of sugar, at the rate it is now produced in this country, would supply sugar enough "to meet the demands of the entire world from the birth of Christ to the present time." [Applause on the Republican side.] And now to call it a "hothouse industry" is ridiculous.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken in saying that I said the sugar-beet industry. I said the cane-sugar industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, there is a motion pending to strike out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment unless some gentleman desires to speak to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. A motion to strike out is already pending. Did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] withdraw it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; I withdrew it unless somebody wanted to speak to it.

Mr. MANN. I understood the Chair as saying the gentleman withdrew it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman can not withdraw an amendment here without unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. The Chairman said without objection it would be withdrawn.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the very able and genial gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], whom we all respect and love, referred just now to the tariff as a matter of special privilege. The question of special privilege is not always easy to define. The whole Agricultural appropriation bill, in the main, is a matter of granting special privilege to some one. I notice that in the last monthly report of the publications issued by the Department of Agriculture, under date of December 31, 1914, they have a list of special circulars. It is stated, "By direction of the Secretary the following 'Special Circulars' have been prepared in certain bureaus for distribution among farmers in the cotton belt who desire to diversify their farming operations." At least this goes to the extent of being special. It is quite a special circular. Here is the list of special bulletins issued for the benefit of special portions of the country. I do not criticize it. I read:

By the Bureau of Animal Industry:
- Feeding Farm Cows in the South.
- Advantages of Dairying in the South.
- The Feeding and Care of Dairy Calves.
- Marketing Butter and Cream in the South.
- How Southern Farmers May Get a Start in Pig Raising.
- Horse and Mule Raising in the South.
- Producing Sheep on Southern Farms.
- Suggestions on Poultry Raising for the Southern Farmer.
- Making Farm Butter in the South.
- Shall Southern Farmers Build Creameries?
- Do You Keep a Cow?
- The Production and Care of Milk and Cream.
- Conveniences for Handling the Farm Cow and Her Products.

By the Bureau of Plant Industry:
- Permanent Pastures for the Cotton Belt.
- Sorghum for Forage in the Cotton Belt.
- Rye in the Cotton Belt.
- Winter Wheat in the Cotton Belt.
- Winter Oats in the Cotton Belt.
- Rape as a Forage Crop in the Cotton Belt.
- Hairy Vetch for the Cotton Belt.
- Soy Bean in the Cotton Belt.

I suppose no one would charge that these should be discontinued because they are matters of special privilege. I commend the Department of Agriculture for issuing these special circulars, all described in one bulletin as being publications for a special purpose, that of giving special consideration to farmers in the cotton belt in the South. I would not say that because it is special privilege it ought to be discontinued. But when this morning I noticed so many gentlemen voting against a mild appropriation of $5,000 for the Northwest, I wondered whether they differentiated between the North and the South, and thought that a whole lot of special work for the South was in order but that a little work for the Northwest was improper.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The statement has been made several times on the floor of the House carrying inferences that there was some sectionalism in this bill in the expenditure of the money carried by it. In order that the country may have the facts, I want to ask unanimous consent in this connection to publish some figures issued by the Department of Agriculture showing the expenditure of funds by sections (see p. 2266). I would not have done this except for the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who is usually so broad-minded and so liberal to me and my people, too, has rather intimated that there might be something in that proposition.

Mr. MANN. I have not intimated anything of the kind. I commended the Department of Agriculture. My criticism is leveled against gentlemen who take these things for themselves and then complain because somebody else, with a proposition equally meritorious, tries to get something for his section. I have no criticism for the department for doing this. I am glad they are trying to help the farmers in the cotton belt. I believe it is the right thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. Some one has said that there is a special order of the House to rise at 5 o'clock until 8.

Mr. MANN. There is.

Mr. LEVER. That being true, we are within a few minutes of the time.

Mr. MANN. We had better rise.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold that motion a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did the gentleman obtain unanimous consent to print the data that he said he wished to print, showing the distribution of these various appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. I beg the pardon of the Chair. I did ask it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to print certain data which he mentions. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina how the divisions referred to, in which this money is to be distributed, will be made.

Mr. LEVER. They are divided by sections of the country, groups of States.

Mr. MADDEN. Not by States?

Mr. LEVER. No; not by States. I think the information is very valuable.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Statement showing geographic distribution of funds expended by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1914.

Bureau, division, or office.	New England Division—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.	Middle Atlantic Division—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.	East North Central Division—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.	West North Central Division—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.	South Atlantic Division—(excepting Washington, D. C.), Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.	East South Central—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.	West South Central—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.
Office of the Secretary		$6,150.00	$1,500.00				$20,000.00
Weather Bureau	$62,485.99	141,230.80	231,558.04	$153,545.01	$172,424.46	$81,716.30	106,829.08
Bureau of Animal Industry	222,191.65	603,429.73	1,079,405.87	1,158,279.42	388,898.33	175,986.37	348,994.28
Bureau of Plant Industry	82,137.92	122,024.24	166,486.62	255,084.57	364,777.68	163,934.58	306,406.63
Forest Service	[1]						
Bureau of Chemistry	36,450.00	175,452.00	81,008.00	60,356.00	55,288.00	24,198.00	23,906.00
Bureau of Soils	453.30	11,764.32	16,002.31	24,105.90	42,297.01	16,430.21	32,408.03
Bureau of Entomology	279,953.70	24,157.75	20,171.41	14,084.00	43,407.13	24,700.00	35,471.50
Bureau of Biological Survey	421.37	2,873.60	2,793.69	11,842.19	6,874.51	3,864.76	1,961.48
Bureau of Statistics	6,655.57	4,687.69	9,690.41	17,925.39	15,701.85	10,979.89	13,615.75
Office of Experiment Stations	180,000.00	92,892.79	151,396.90	219,255.17	263,792.29	138,019.60	132,058.55
Office of Public Roads	9,008.10	2,282.49	7,667.16	21,357.19	79,747.52	35,814.18	12,478.29
Insecticide and Fungicide Board	498.00	3,316.68	2,090.75	892.78	13,115.83	630.15	771.48
Federal Horticultural Board	2,785.46	2,222.06	830.39	1,685.70	1,348.44	629.33	556.24
Office of Markets	1,651.82	1,529.45	1,352.23	1,116.41	2,708.64	778.67	2,020.40
Total, exclusive of Forest Service	885,692.88	1,194,013.60	1,771,953.78	1,939,529.63	1,450,381.69	677,691.04	1,037,477.71
Forest Service[1]	34,613.00	81770.00	151,045.00	152,509.00	72,733.00	12,382.00	84,089.00
Weeks law	588,050.93				208,289.52	36,275.44	
Total, inclusive of Forest Service and Weeks law	1,508,356.81	1,202,783.60	1,922,998.78	2,092,038.63	1,731,404.21	726,348.48	1,121,566.71

Bureau, division, or office.	Mountain Division—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada.	Pacific Division—Washington, Oregon, California.	Territories and insular possessions—Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam.	Total (excepting Washington, D. C.).	Washington, D. C.	Total (including Washington, D. C.).	Southern States—Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas.
Office of the Secretary				$27,650.00	$656,104.00	$683,754.00	
Weather Bureau	$100,371.72	$131,061.41	$9,735.10	1,191,957.91	324,116.21	1,516,074.12	$361,329.84
Bureau of Animal Industry	333,589.39	197,743.94		4,508,518.98	537,418.35	5,045,937.33	907,693.45
Bureau of Plant Industry	170,907.34	156,359.61		1,788,119.19	949,875.81	2,737,995.00	834,818.89
Forest Service	[1]						
Bureau of Chemistry	23,790.00	64,952.00	9,600.00	555,000.00	440,000.00	995,000.00	91,105.00
Bureau of Soils	11,084.70	18,597.84	7,401.09	180,544.71	147,151.29	327,696.00	90,698.20
Bureau of Entomology	78,098.64	56,573.74		576,617.87	128,214.00	704,831.87	114,717.12
Bureau of Biological Survey	39,895.21	23,139.99		93,666.80	69,009.71	162,676.51	12,636.08
Division of Publications					182,341.43	182,341.43	
Division of Accounts	8,000.00	4,000.00		12,000.00	90,645.26	102,645.26	
Bureau of Statistics	14,820.99	6,813.63		100,891.17	136,221.82	237,112.99	39,715.49
Library					43,149.48	43,149.48	
Office of Experiment Stations	308,945.45	112,903.23	105,000.00	1,704,263.88	169,163.17	1,873,427.05	503,226.84
Office of Public Roads	16,962.09	18,092.17		203,409.19	120,872.92	324,282.11	127,485.85
Insecticide and Fungicide Board	200.15	318.62		21,843.44	63,263.71	85,107.15	12,175.73
Federal Horticultural Board	1,047.23	2,585.74		13,690.59	19,815.64	33,506.23	2,523.01
Office of Markets	1,978.12	215.00		13,350.74	31,209.74	47,560.48	5,262.90
Total, exclusive of Forest Service	1,109,691.03	793,356.92	131,736.19	10,991,524.47	4,111,572.54	15,103,097.01	3,103,339.00
Forest Service[1]	3,046,572.00	1,709,880.00	48,895.00	5,321,488.00	443,715.00	5,765,203.00	169,204.00
Weeks law				832,615.89		832,615.89	244,564.96
Total, inclusive of Forest Service and Weeks law	4,156,263.03	2,503,236.92	180,631.19	17,145,628.36	4,555,287.54	21,700,915.90	3,517,157.96

Statement showing geographic distribution of funds proposed to be expended by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1915.

Bureau, division, or office.	New England Division—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.	Middle Atlantic Division—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.	East North Central Division—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.	West North Central Division—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.	South Atlantic Division (excepting Washington, D. C.)—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.	East South Central Division—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.	West South Central Division—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.
Office of the Secretary				$20,000.00			
Weather Bureau	$65,810.00	$148,440.00	$256,690.00	177,350.00	$158,850.00	$83,750.00	$122,680.00
Bureau of Animal Industry	237,191.65	643,429.73	1,266,333.60	1,345,207.15	459,731.23	244,811.46	392,800.97
Bureau of Plant Industry	138,763.82	177,496.25	234,816.94	331,824.26	589,801.60	259,367.73	419,922.29
Bureau of Chemistry	40,920.00	197,860.00	91,875.00	68,951.00	62,140.00	27,145.00	27,096.00
Bureau of Soils	453.30	11,764.32	16,002.31	24,105.90	42,297.01	16,430.21	32,408.03

Statement showing geographic distribution of funds proposed to be expended by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1915—Continued.

Bureau, division, or office.	New England Division—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.	Middle Atlantic Division—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.	East North Central Division—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.	West North Central Division—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.	South Atlantic Division (excepting Washington, D. C.)—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.	East South Central Division—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.	West South Central Division—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.
Bureau of Entomology	$315,781.00	$23,785.00	$22,900.00	$18,500.00	$70,462.00	$32,700.00	$11,530.00
Bureau of Biological Survey	3,700.00	6,000.00	10,800.00	39,600.00	16,300.00	7,800.00	21,100.00
Bureau of Statistics	6,318.00	6,063.00	17,772.00	24,456.00	21,348.00	12,852.00	15,114.01
Office of Experiment Stations	240,500.00	123,500.00	201,500.00	289,500.00	345,000.00	174,000.00	186,000.00
Office of Public Roads	80,000.00	15,000.00	137,000.00	48,500.00	174,139.55	104,493.93	90,125.00
Insecticide and Fungicide Board	674.93	1,989.54	1,879.82	1,198.71	15,131.23	866.22	904.81
Federal Horticultural Board	56,000.00	3,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	1,500.00	750.00	750.00
Office of Markets	4,300.00	3,600.00	3,100.00	4,300.00	6,500.00	2,900.00	3,800.00
Total, exclusive of Forest Service	1,190,412.70	1,361,927.84	2,261,669.67	2,395,493.02	1,963,220.59	967,866.55	1,364,231.24
Forest Service	47,090.00	7,787.00	159,009.00	155,788.00	92,213.00	18,511.00	85,278.03
Weeks law	188,741.00				2,504,426.00	979,676.00	
Total, inclusive of Forest Service and Weeks law	1,426,243.70	1,369,714.84	2,420,678.67	2,551,281.02	4,559,859.59	1,966,053.55	1,449,509.27

Bureau, division, or office.	Mountain Division—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada.	Pacific Division—Washington, Oregon, California.	Territories and insular possessions—Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam.	Total (excepting Washington, D. C.).	Washington, D. C.	Total (including Washington, D. C.).	Southern States—Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas.
Office of the Secretary				$20,000.00	$649,880.00	$669,880.00	
Weather Bureau	$118,960.00	$160,610.00	$8,740.00	1,301,880.00	365,390.00	1,667,270.00	$365,280.00
Bureau of Animal Industry	383,589.39	222,743.94		5,195,839.12	574,000.00	5,769,839.12	1,071,978.45
Bureau of Plant Industry	226,424.39	226,528.81		2,694,946.19	1,011,038.81	3,616,045.00	1,267,639.75
Bureau of Chemistry	27,000.00	73,994.00	10,600.00	627,581.00	450,000.00	1,077,581.00	102,569.00
Bureau of Soils	11,084.70	18,597.84	7,401.09	180,544.71	147,151.29	327,696.00	90,698.29
Bureau of Entomology	83,449.00	74,009.00		693,116.00	136,304.00	829,420.00	231,920.00
Bureau of Biological Survey	105,900.00	33,400.00		244,600.00	92,090.00	336,690.00	45,200.00
Division of Accounts					46,320.00	46,320.00	
Division of Publications					189,500.00	189,500.00	
Bureau of Statistics	20,670.00	10,832.00		135,445.00	140,135.00	275,580.00	49,000.00
Library					45,300.00	45,300.00	
Office of Experiment Stations	394,000.00	144,000.00	120,000.00	2,218,000.00	192,780.00	2,410,780.00	663,000.00
Office of Public Roads	14,000.00	18,186.96		681,445.44	124,560.00	806,005.44	300,958.48
Insecticide and Fungicide Board	271.25	431.81		23,348.29	71,651.71	95,000.00	17,972.15
Federal Horticultural Board	1,500.00	3,500.00		70,000.00	25,000.00	95,000.00	3,000.00
Office of Markets	3,300.00	2,400.00	500.00	34,700.00	205,300.00	240,000.00	8,100.00
Total, exclusive of Forest Service	1,390,148.73	989,234.36	147,241.09	14,031,445.75	4,466,469.81	18,497,915.56	4,223,316.04
Forest Service	3,149,727.00	1,712,295.00	49,377.00	5,477,075.00	465,108.00	5,942,183.00	225,678.00
Weeks law				3,672,843.03		3,672,843.00	3,484,102.00
Total, inclusive of Forest Service and Weeks law	4,539,875.73	2,701,529.36	196,618.09	23,181,363.75	4,931,577.81	28,112,941.56	7,933,096.04

SUMMARY.

Division.	1914 (excepting Forest Service and Weeks law).	1915 (excepting Forest Service and Weeks law).	1914 (including Forest Service and Weeks law).	1915 (including Forest Service and Weeks law).
New England	$885,692.88	$1,190,412.70	$1,508,356.81	$1,426,243.70
Middle Atlantic	1,194,013.60	1,361,927.84	1,202,783.60	1,369,714.84
East North Central	1,771,953.78	2,261,669.67	1,922,998.78	2,420,678.67
West North Central	1,939,529.63	2,395,493.02	2,092,038.63	2,551,281.02
South Atlantic (excepting Washington, D. C.)	1,450,381.69	1,963,220.59	1,731,404.21	4,559,859.59
East South Central	677,691.04	967,866.55	726,348.48	1,966,053.55
West South Central	1,037,477.71	1,364,231.20	1,121,566.71	1,449,509.20
Mountain	1,109,691.03	1,390,148.73	4,156,263.03	4,539,875.73
Pacific	793,356.92	989,234.36	2,503,236.92	2,701,529.36
Territorial and insular possessions	131,736.19	147,241.09	180,631.19	196,618.09
Total (excluding Washington, D.C.)	10,991,524.47	14,031,445.75	17,145,628.36	23,181,363.75
Washington, D. C.	4,111,572.54	4,466,469.81	4,555,287.54	4,931,577.81
Total (including Washington, D.C.)	15,103,097.01	18,497,915.56	21,700,915.90	28,112,941.56
Southern States	3,103,389.00	4,223,316.04	3,517,157.96	7,933,096.04

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is an order to take a recess at 5 o'clock until 8 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated, and that it be in order now to proceed with the consideration of the two pension bills which were made in order for to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the order for a session to-night be vacated, and that the pension bills be taken up and considered now. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that the possibilities are that it will require a quorum to pass those bills. I just want to give notice of the fact that I am inclined to think it will require a quorum.

The SPEAKER. To pass what bills?

Mr. HAMLIN. The pension bills.

Mr. COOPER. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that, in my judgment, after an order has been made, that there shall be a recess from 5 o'clock until 8, of which order practically a majority of the House are aware, many Members having gone home with the understanding that that is to be the order of business, it may be that some of them have objections to some features of the bill, and to take up the bill now instead

of at 8 o'clock would be unjust to them; and for that reason I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BARTLETT, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1320), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I shall call up this bill at the first opportunity, following the Agricultural appropriation bill if possible.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1520).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1915.*

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an excerpt from the recent message of Gov. Ferguson to the Texas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting an excerpt from the first message of Gov. Ferguson to the Texas Legislature. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE AT EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] to preside at the session to-night.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2337. An act to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER. Under the order the House stands in recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, at 8 o'clock p. m. the House resumed its session, with Mr. MURRAY in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement this evening session was set aside for the consideration of pension bills, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 21037 may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21037.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin will answer "aye" and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 3, answered "present" 1, not voting 229, as follows:

YEAS—192.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hill	Platt
Adair	Dillon	Hinds	Porter
Adamson	Dixon	Houston	Powers
Alexander	Donovan	Hughes, Ga.	Quin
Allen	Doolittle	Hulings	Raker
Anthony	Doremus	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Ashbrook	Doughton	Igoe	Reilly, Conn.
Aswell	Dupré	Jacoway	Rogers
Bailey	Eagle	Johnson, S. C.	Rothermel
Baker	Edmonds	Johnson, Wash.	Rubey
Baltz	Esch	Keating	Rucker
Barnhart	Fess	Kennedy, Conn.	Rupley
Barton	Finley	Kettner	Saunders
Bathrick	Fitzgerald	Key, Ohio	Shackleford
Beakes	Fitzhenry	Kirkpatrick	Sherwood
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Kitchin	Smith, Idaho
Bell, Ga.	Fordney	Lafferty	Smith, J. M. C.
Booher	Foster	Langley	Smith, Minn.
Borchers	French	Lee, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Brockson	Gallagher	Lever	Stafford
Brodbeck	Gallivan	Lieb	Stedman
Broussard	Garner	Lindbergh	Stephens, Miss.
Brown, N. Y.	Garrett, Tenn.	Lloyd	Stephens, Tex.
Browne, Wis.	Gill	Lobeck	Stone
Browning	Gilmore	Logue	Stringer
Buchanan, Ill.	Gittins	Lonergan	Sumners
Buchanan, Tex.	Goeke	McAndrews	Sutherland
Burgess	Goodwin, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Switzer
Burke, S. Dak.	Gordon	McGuire, Okla.	Taggart
Burke, Wis.	Gorman	McKenzie	Talcott, N. Y.
Burnett	Goulden	McLaughlin	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Maguire, Nebr.	Temple
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray	Mann	Ten Eyck
Calder	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Vt.	Mitchell	Thompson, Okla.
Caraway	Guernsey	Moore	Tribble
Casey	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, Okla.	Vare
Church	Hamlin	Moss, Ind.	Vaughan
Clark, Fla.	Harris	Mott	Vinson
Cline	Hart	Murray	Vollmer
Connelly, Kans.	Haugen	Neeley, Kans.	Walters
Connolly, Iowa	Hawley	Neely, W. Va.	Watkins
Cox	Hayden	Nolan, J. I.	Watson
Cramton	Hayes	Norton	Weaver
Crisp	Heflin	Oglesby	Whitacre
Curry	Helm	Park	Williams
Decker	Helvering	Parker, N. Y.	Wingo
Dershem	Hensley	Phelan	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—3.

Callaway	Kindel	Rayburn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

The Speaker

NOT VOTING—229.

Aiken	Deitrick	Hardy	Loft
Ainey	Dent	Harrison	McClellan
Anderson	Dies	Hay	McKellar
Austin	Difenderfer	Helgesen	MacDonald
Avis	Donohoe	Henry	Madden
Barchfeld	Dooling	Hinebaugh	Mahan
Barkley	Driscoll	Hobson	Maher
Bartholdt	Drukker	Holland	Manahan
Bartlett	Dunn	Howard	Martin
Bell, Cal.	Eagan	Howell	Metz
Blackmon	Edwards	Hoxworth	Miller
Borland	Elder	Hughes, W. Va.	Mondell
Bowdle	Estopinal	Hull	Montague
Britten	Evans	Humphrey, Wash.	Moon
Brown, W. Va.	Fairchild	Johnson, Ky.	Morgan, La.
Bruckner	Faison	Johnson, Utah	Morin
Brumbaugh	Falconer	Jones	Morrison
Bryan	Farr	Kahn	Moss, W. Va.
Bulkley	Fergusson	Keister	Mulkey
Burke, Pa.	Ferris	Kelley, Mich.	Murdock
Butler	Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson
Campbell	Floyd, Ark.	Kennedy, Iowa	O'Brien
Cantor	Fowler	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Hair
Cantrill	Francis	Kent	Oldfield
Carew	Frear	Kiess, Pa.	O'Shaunessy
Carlin	Gard	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Padgett
Carr	Gardner	Kinkead, N. J.	Page, N. C.
Carter	Garrett, Tex.	Knowland, J. R.	Paige, Mass.
Cary	George	Konop	Palmer
Chandler, N. Y.	Gerry	Korbly	Parker, N. J.
Clancy	Gillett	Kreider	Patten, N. Y.
Claypool	Glass	La Follette	Patton, Pa.
Coady	Godwin, N. C.	Langham	Peters
Collier	Goldfogle	Lazaro	Peterson
Conry	Good	Lee, Ga.	Plumley
Cooper	Graham, Pa.	L'Engle	Post
Copley	Green, Iowa	Lenroot	Pou
Crosser	Gregg	Lesher	Price
Cullop	Griest	Levy	Prouty
Dale	Griffin	Lewis, Md.	Ragsdale
Danforth	Gudger	Lewis, Pa.	Rainey
Davenport	Hamill	Lindquist	Reed
Davis	Hamilton, Mich.	Linthicum	Reilly, Wis.

Riordan	Slayden	Talbott, Md.	Wallin
Roberts, Mass.	Slemp	Tavenner	Walsh
Roberts, Nev.	Sloan	Taylor, Ala.	Webb
Rouse	Small	Taylor, Colo.	Whaley
Russell	Smith, Md.	Taylor, N. Y.	White
Sabath	Smith, Saml. W.	Thacher	Wilson, Fla.
Scott	Smith, Tex.	Thomson, Ill.	Wilson, N. Y.
Scully	Sparkman	Towner	Winslow
Seldomridge	Stanley	Townsend	Witherspoon
Sells	Steenerson	Treadway	Woodruff
Sherley	Stephens, Cal.	Tuttle	Woods
Shreve	Stephens, Nebr.	Underhill	Young, Tex.
Sims	Stevens, Minn.	Underwood	
Sinnott	Stevens, N. H.	Volstead	
Sisson	Stout	Walker	

During the calling of the roll the following occurred.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That motion requires a second of a majority of those present. As many as favor seconding the motion will rise and stand until they are counted. Evidently not a sufficient number.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no other side.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the roll call discloses that we are nearly 60 short of a quorum. I therefore move you that the necessary warrants be issued and the absentee Members be arrested and brought before the House.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman made an untenable point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I made a point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Constitution fixes that, and the point is overruled.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House adjourn. Those in favor of seconding the motion to adjourn will rise and stand until the Chair can count them. [After counting.] Seventy-five gentlemen have risen to second the motion, and there are 140 Members present. Those in favor of adjournment will say "aye"; those opposed will say "no."

The question was taken, and the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for public printing and binding for the Patent Office for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1516); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an item of legislation suggesting that it be inserted in the sundry civil appropriation bill for 1916 under the headings "Arsenal" and "Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill." (H. Doc. No. 1517); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Engineers, with a statement prepared from data received from officers in charge of the different engineering districts, showing the name of each civilian engineer employed between July 1, 1913, and June 30, 1914, in the work of improving rivers and harbors, the term so employed, the compensation, and the place at which employed (H. Doc. No. 1518); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting communication from the Commissioner of Fisheries submitting a report on the otter trawl fishery, in compliance with items in the sundry civil appropriation acts, approved August 24, 1912, and June 23, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 1519); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. OLDFIELD, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21137) to amend section 23 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1314), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20193) providing for the payment of assessments on Indian allotments benefited by the construction of State rural highways in the State of Minnesota, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1319), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15168) for the relief of Lyman D. Drake, jr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1315), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 926) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1316), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 5695) for the relief of the Southern Transportation Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1317), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3525) for the relief of Pay Inspector F. T. Arms, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1318), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21133) granting a pension to Ryan V. Eichelberger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21134) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 21156) to increase the number of the corps of cadets at the Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 21157) to place Thomas County, Ga., in the southwestern division of the southern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 21158) to repeal the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 21159) to amend section 4 of the act of April 21, 1910, entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21160) to incorporate the Pan-American Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the

United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 21162) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Beall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21163) granting a pension to Peter Francesco; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21164) granting an increase of pension to Brinkley Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 21165) granting an increase of pension to Lodemia E. Kingsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 21166) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 21167) granting a pension to Mary B. Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 21168) granting an increase of pension to Emily Thorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 21169) granting a pension to Lydia B. Coover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21170) for the relief of William H. Hackett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21171) for the relief of Revilow N. Spohn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21172) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 21173) granting a pension to Charles C. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21174) granting an increase of pension to A. T. Kreps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 21175) for the relief of William F. Still; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21176) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Vantreese, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21177) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. F. Hendrick, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21178) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel T. Newbill, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21179) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Goad, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21180) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. Meeks, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 21181) for the relief of the Twelfth Ward Building & Loan Association, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 21182) granting a pension to George W. Widener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of citizens of New Melle, Mo., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Troup County, Ga., protesting against the passage of House bill 20644, relative to curtailing the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAILEY: Memorial of 500 members of Patriotic Order Sons of America of Altoona, Pa., favoring passage of the Vollmer-Bartholdt resolution relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of D. J. Bolger, of Barnesboro; Rev. F. P. Corcoran, John S. Douglass, V. J. Kirkpatrick, F. C. Lantzy, Pius A. Lantzy, William Meehan, Henry Nagle, R. S. Sharbaugh, J. E. Weakland, Leo Whalan, John J. Whalan, Thomas Whalan, Richard Wilkins, Michael Byrne, and Albert P. Whyland, of Spangler, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the circulation through the mails of certain slanderous and defamatory publications relating to the Catholic Church; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of St. Clair County, Ill., protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 6865, for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of Gustav Brandt, of Pasadena, and 633 citizens of Alhambra, South Pasadena, Vernon, San Gabriel, Los Angeles, Huntington Park, Glendale, El Monte, Long Beach, Eagle Rock, and San Pedro, all of California, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the territory or any seaport of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also petition of Seventy-ninth and Castro Gymnasium Club (100 members), of San Francisco, Cal.; Pacific Association of Amateur Athletic Union of California and Nevada; board of supervisors of Solano County, Cal., favoring Hamill civil-service bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of Pasadena (Cal.) Audubon Society, against shipment of American horses to Europe for use in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petition of citizens of Decatur, Ill., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS: Memorial of citizens of De Witt County and of Victoria, Tex., relative to strict neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Rev. Edmund Huebner and 132 other citizens of Random Lake and vicinity, and 22 other citizens of Mayville, Wis., asking for the passage of S. 6688, or any similar measure to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARR: Resolutions adopted by Elenander Stokoski, Boswell; F. Mikolayek, Everson; Antoni Tiolkowski, Boswell; and St. Michaels Society, of Connellsville, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Italian Protective Association of Greensburg, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the proposed immigration restrictions requiring educations tests; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Jacob Jaky, Rev. M. Plass, John A. Davitz, and 10 others, all residents of Oakwood, Wis., urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Memorial of German Athletic Society of Elgin and citizens of Mankato, Ill., and vicinity, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Polish Alma Mater of Joliet, Ill., protesting against literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of Joint Penology Commission of Michigan, protesting against passage of the proposed law as to interstate shipment of prison-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the American Mining Congress, favoring the passage of H. R. 15869; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of St. John the Baptist Polish Society of New York City, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, relative to an appropriation for celebration of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Danbury, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of citizens of Deer Lodge, Mont., favoring increase in railroad rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial of citizens of Mankato and vicinity, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of John H. Holsapple and 65 other citizens and D. O. Heeter and 13 other citizens of Darke County, Ohio, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORMAN: Memorial of St. Joseph's Men's Society, of St. Martin's Parish, and 19 other societies of the third congressional district of Illinois, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago (Ill.) Teachers' Choir and Rev. M. P. F. Dovermann and 36 others, citizens of the third congressional district of Illinois, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Italian Protective Association of Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against the immigration bill in its present form; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of citizens of Mankato and vicinity, favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of Thomas L. Walker and 107 others, of Hancock County, Ind., relative to the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Longtown, and J. L. Diffenbaugh and others, of Chilton, Mo., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Petitions and letters filed by George M. Burkarth, Gerhard Wellman, John Hofses, B. Fahrenhorst, Henry Lorenz, Joseph Reb, John Ollinger, Dr. G. L. Mueller, Dr. G. Moser, the German Theater Society, and others, favoring the Vollmer and all similar resolutions which would prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations during the pending and future wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against interference with freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Joseph E. Donahoe and James R. Walsh, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the treatment of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Charles E. Everett and 65 others, protesting against exportation of war material from United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petitions of citizens of Norwich, Conn., and vicinity, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Italian Protective Association, of Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of House bill 21135, for the relief of Sarah A. Foss Farnsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of St. Kazimiers Society, No. 389, of Meriden, Conn., protesting against the passage of the immigration bill in its present form; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Lyric Singing Society and German-American Alliance, of Meriden, Conn., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of Polish National Alliance Associations of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Protest of L. C. Cutler and 224 citizens of Bloomingdale, Mich., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of George H. Abell and 19 citizens of Battle Creek; Charles R. Gorman, of Kinderhook; Mrs. Golda F. Hume, of Eaton Rapids; S. H. Dolph, of Litchfield; Elmer Losey, of Waldron; J. F. Bradley, of Hillsdale; E. E. Baughman, of Vicksburg; Nelson H. Barber and 61 citizens of Kalamazoo, all in the State of Michigan, against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 1,224 American citizens, favoring House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petitions of Staatsverbund, of Schenectady, and citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of St. John's Benevolent Society, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 26, 1915.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou are the one God whose glory filleth all the earth. Thou dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth. Thou dost fashion their hearts alike. We thank Thee that beneath all the storm and stress of time there is in the great human heart the common interest and passion of the common brotherhood, for Thou dost link us all together by the common interests of life. Thou dost speak to us not only from sea to sea but through all the spaces of all the ages. Through all the immense range of God's eternal kingdom Thou dost speak to Thy children upon earth. Thou dost bid us come into harmony with Thyself. Thou dost covenant with us and lead into peace and into eternal happiness.

Grant us grace to follow Thy divine commandments. May Thy presence go up with us this day into the duties that are before us. May Thy blessing abide with us and with all the people. For Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brady	Hitchcock	Oliver	Stephenson
Bristow	Hollis	Overman	Sterling
Bryan	James	Page	Stone
Burleigh	Johnson	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Pomerene	Swanson
Catron	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kern	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	La Follette	Robinson	Thornton
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Shafroth	Townsend
Culberson	McCumber	Sheppard	Vardaman
Cummins	McLean	Sherman	Walsh
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Shields	Weeks
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Shively	White
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Works

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] is detained by serious illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 2337) to create the Coast Guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

THE JOURNAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, January 15, 1915.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection. The Secretary will read the Journal.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the Journal, and after having read for some time,

Mr. LODGE. Let the Journal be read. I ask that the Journal be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair supposed the Secretary was reading the Journal.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the Journal, and after having read for some time,

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if it is in order, to avoid further waste of the valuable time of the Senate, when it is especially desired to transact morning business, I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is formal morning business, and I object.

Mr. STONE. I simply wanted to test the filibustering spirit of the other side.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. BORAH presented the credentials of JAMES H. BRADY, chosen by the electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 6121. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara and State of New York; and

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, and Mr. GALLINGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1520).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1915.*

Mr. BURTON. May I ask what disposition is to be made of that report? Is it to be printed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It appears that it has been printed.

Mr. BURTON. It has already been printed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. And the Chair presumes it will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BURTON. So that copies will be available for Members of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a query that the Chair can not answer. It ought to go to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and if there are no copies and it is desirable to have them a report to that effect can come from the committee.

The copy submitted seems to have been printed in New York.

Mr. BURTON. I trust a sufficient number will be available for the use of Members of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion to the Senator from Ohio. This print has not been made by order of the Senate, and Members of Congress will not be able to get copies of it unless they can get them from the corporation in New York. If Senators desire it to be printed, it ought to be ordered printed. I would suggest that in addition to referring the report to the committee that it be ordered printed, so that copies of it may be available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think the Chair has authority to order the report printed.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state, Mr. President, that under the law the committee has the right to have printed a thousand copies. If more than a thousand copies are desired, of course there can be an order of the Senate to that effect.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any doubt but that a thousand copies will be sufficient; but the committee will not have authority to make that order unless some step is taken by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; under the law they have the right to have printed a thousand copies.

Mr. NORRIS. Of the Panama Railroad Co.'s report?

Mr. SMOOT. Of any document that they desire, when it is for the use of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. But this is not a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not a public document. It is simply the report of the Panama Railroad Co., like the report of any other corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a Senate document, but it is a public document.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I beg the Senator's pardon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suppose that, like every other document, it would go to the committee, and if they want to have it printed they can order it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, last year the report was referred to the Committee on Printing, and it was reported favorably and ordered printed as a Senate document. I quite agree that the committee to which the report is referred can order it printed, if it desires, up to a thousand copies; but the practice has been, I think, for the Senate to order it printed as a public document. I know that was done last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Perhaps the Chair can settle this matter, if agreeable to the Senators. This report contains illustrations. The communication and accompanying report will be referred to the Committee on Printing. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

THE AMERICAN EPHEMERIS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of July 17, 1914, a supplementary report of the cost of preparing the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, which, on motion of Mr. JONES, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Labor requesting, pursuant to law, that authority be granted for the disposition of an accumulation of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the Department of Labor and which have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the Department of Commerce and have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying paper will be refered to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

MILITARY ESTIMATES (S. DOC. NO. 718).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, a report on the estimate prepared by the General Staff of the Army before the European war on the equipment requisite for a mobile army of approximately 460,000 men in time of war, which, on motion of Mr. LODGE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION RATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 18, 1914, a further statement relative to the increase in rates for ocean transportation since July 1, 1914, and other facts relating to ocean transportation which adversely affect American commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move that the communication and accompanying statement be printed in the RECORD and that it also be printed as Part 2 of Senate Document 673, to the limit of $500, for the use of the Senate document room. I do not know how many volumes that would give, but that is the limit the Senate can provide by resolution, and I think perhaps that will supply the number required. I do not know positively.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator what is the subject matter of the letter?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce in response to a

Senate resolution. I should like to have the Secretary state what it is.

The Secretary read as follows:

On the 26th of December we transmitted to the Senate, in pursuance of its resolution of December 18, 1914, a preliminary report concerning the increases in rates for ocean transportation since July 1, 1914, and other facts. We now have the privilege of submitting a further statement, as then promised.

Mr. FLETCHER. The report is made in pursuance of a Senate resolution dated December 18, which I can read if the Senator desires.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate. I simply wanted to ask the Senator whether it would be necessary to put all the matter in the RECORD and also to have it printed as a public document.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it is. It is very important. It comes from official sources and gives information on matter pending before the Senate. I think it ought to be accessible to all Senators, and for that reason I think it ought to go into the RECORD and also to be printed as a document.

Mr. SMOOT. If it were printed as a public document, every Senator could get it, and get it easier and handle it easier than to have it in the RECORD. I do not see why it should be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it ought to be printed in the RECORD, not only for the benefit of Senators but because it is information of great public interest and importance.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course it is on the pending legislation, and therefore I shall not object to the request of the Senator; but I do not believe it is a good thing, and I do not think it ought to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 25, 1915.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: On the 26th of December, 1914, we transmitted to the Senate, in pursuance to its resolution of December 18, 1914, a preliminary report concerning the increases in rates for ocean transportation since July 1, 1914, and other facts relating to ocean transportation which adversely affect American commerce. We now have the privilege of submitting a further statement, as then promised.

Since our previous report numerous letters have been received by the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce from American business men and manufacturers engaged in the export trade, which show clearly the extraordinary increase in ocean freight rates since the outbreak of the European war, the scarcity of tonnage now prevailing, and the serious effects of the high freight rates and scarcity of tonnage upon our export trade.

SERIOUS COMPLAINTS OF AMERICAN EXPORTERS AND MANUFACTURERS.

The following excerpts are made from said letters, the originals being attached hereto and marked "Exhibits 3 to 74":

Garcia & Maggini Co., general commission merchants, San Francisco, Cal., January 5, 1915:

"We beg to say that we ourselves have shipped in the last two months 500 or 600 tons of dried fruit to New York, through the canal of Panama, for reshipment to Scandinavian ports and also to Holland.

"To a great extent, these goods have been in New York for a long time, for the reason that our forwarding agents, Messrs. C. B. Richards & Co., could not get any space.

"Besides, freight rates have advanced over 300 per cent since the war broke out, and lately, and within 15 days, freights have advanced fully 100 per cent.

"It seems that whenever the Scandinavian American Line are asking higher freight rates, other lines do so too, and now even the Holland American Line is asking 100 shillings per 2,240 pounds, while only a few days ago this company asked 45 shillings per 2,240 pounds.

"These advances in freight rates are made without notice, and even previous engagements have not been protected, so that the shippers instead of making a small profit on their sales to European countries are losing money."

William Hans & Sons, manufacturers and exporters of "D" shovel handles, Houston Heights, Tex., December 28, 1914:

"For years our entire output has been disposed of abroad, but owing to the present prohibitive tariffs in ocean transportation we are unable to deliver our goods, consequently our plant will remain closed down until such rates are established as will enable us to market our goods. * * * In our judgment a Government merchant marine will solve the problem."

Charles E. Moore, president, Leaf Tobacco Association, Baltimore, Md., December 28, 1914:

"* * * I desire to file with your department an urgent protest against the unwarranted advance in freight rates on tobacco as recently established by the Holland American Line. Some of our exporting members shipping to Holland points have signed contracts with this company, expiring December 31, 1914, for a rate of $3.50 per hogshead of tobacco. This contract has been disregarded entirely and the rate increased first to $5.25, then to $6.85, and to-day a notice that it will be $7.50 until further notice. This, I repeat, in the face of the written contract for $3.50 per hogshead."

Gano, Moore & Co., coal, coke, iron, steel ores, Philadelphia, Pa., December 28, 1914:

"The shortage of vessels is so serious now that it is practically stopping the exportation of coal. We have several orders for coal, principally to South American ports, and it is impossible to secure vessels."

Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., manufacturers of Saylor's Portland cement, New York, N. Y., December 28, 1914:

"* * * It has been our experience that the rates have advanced so rapidly that our shipments have been practically suspended, due to the two facts above mentioned—scarcity of ships and increase in freight rates.

"Before the month of July, 1914, shipments of Portland cement to the Argentine Republic and Uruguay were possible at $2.45 per ton; to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, $3.60 per ton. These rates were advanced the early part of August 50 per cent, were subsequently reduced so that the advance was equivalent to 25 per cent for the July rates, and these rates have advanced since the latter part of September until now they are $6 per ton to Rio by some lines and $8.50 per ton by other lines; $6 per ton to the Argentine Republic; and notwithstanding these high rates there is no possibility of obtaining ships, transportation, or accommodation for our product. * * *

"We have experienced a great deal of trouble with the steamship companies in arranging freights, all of them claiming they do not want to carry cement at any price."

American Tripoli Co., "Tripoli" flour, Seneca, Mo., December 28, 1914:

"We have an offer of some orders from Barcelona, Spain, and the first two of the attached letters refer to our effort to get quoted us a rate from New Orleans to Barcelona; and you will see that the steamship company operating steamers to Barcelona refused to quote rates at all. In the first letter the reason given was that other commodities which permit of a higher rate are being carried, so that our material, which must have a lower rate, is not at all desirable, and they even refuse to quote rates at all. * * * The fourth letter, dated December 18, quotes us a rate of 49 cents per 100 pounds from New Orleans to Havre, France, and for comparison, will say that just previous to the European war, on July 3, 1914, we made a shipment at the rate of 18 cents per 100 pounds, a little more than one-third of the rate now asked. This high rate is, of course, prohibitive on a commodity such as ours."

David C. Reid, ship broker, New York, N. Y., January 4, 1915:

"* * * * The question of getting tonnage at the present time for transatlantic business is practically impossible. I have offered by cablegram up to 10/3 Government form per dead-weight ton and was refused by my London correspondents, who state that much higher offers must be made before tonnage can be procured. Under ordinary circumstances, these tramp steamers I made the offers for in good faith, could be secured at 3 shillings per dead-weight ton. Conditions with us are almost impossible. Tonnage is unprocurable at almost any, except the most extraordinary and prohibitive terms. I speak now of the cargo steamer for the general carrying tramp-steamer trade."

Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., importers and commission merchants, New York, N. Y., December 26, 1914:

"A short time ago we shipped some powdered cocoa to our friends in Denmark. When again, a short time thereafter, we had occasion to ship the same commodity, the freight charges amounted to about 280 per cent higher, and upon remonstration with the steamship company, we were told that this was the lowest rate that could be figured, and since then the steamship company has notified us that the next shipment will be charged a higher rate of freight."

Inman, Akers & Inman, Atlanta, Ga., December 28, 1914:

"We are paying ocean freight from Savannah to Rotterdam and to Bremen of $2, $2.25, to $3 per hundredweight. Formerly the rates to these places were about 35 cents per hundredweight on cotton."

W. B. Cooper & Co., cotton merchants, Wilmington, N. C., December 31, 1914:

"Please allow us to indorse the action of the administration in trying to secure boats for the movement of American products. We are frank to say that as a general proposition we are not anxious to see the United States Government get into too many lines of business, but when 3 cents per pound or more is to be paid freight on cotton across the water against 35 cents per hundred pounds six months ago, it is time something should be done, in our opinion."

(3 cents per pound equals $15 per bale; 35 cents per hundredweight equals $1.75 per bale.)

H. Frank Darrow, New York, N. Y., December 29, 1914:

"* * * I am a large exporter of grass seed, and in former seasons I have paid from 35 to 50 cents per 100 pounds on the French Line sailing from New York to Havre, while on steamship *Chicago*, sailing tomorrow, the 29th instant, I have been compelled to pay $1.50 per 100 pounds ocean freight, which I consider is prohibitive to the export trade."

Frank F. Fee, president Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., Dermott, Ark., December 28, 1914:

"* * * It is now a serious menace to our business by reason of our inability to get reasonable and in some cases our inability to get any ocean rates on our production of hardwood lumber. We usually ship through the port of New Orleans to British and continental ports. The writer has been to New Orleans personally and is informed by the steamship agents that they are receiving a tonnage of cotton and wheat and other commodities for the belligerents at such high rates and at such easier loading and unloading that they make tremendous profits for their vessels, and they do not want to take lumber tonnage. We can say that we have before us inquiries for many carloads of lumber which could be shipped immediately provided reasonable rates could be had. * * * Further, one of the steamship agent's commission for a single month was $25,000 for the month. We trust that there is some way in which our National Government can arrange whereby lumber traffic can be resumed at something like a reasonable rate."

T. F. Jenings, hardwood manufacturer, Marianna, Fla., December 28, 1914:

"I am exporting hickory lumber in bundles to Christiania, Norway, and freight rates have become so exorbitant that it is almost out of the question to ship. * * * Now I am compelled, under the circumstances, to shut down my business if this can not be rectified."

Funch, Edye & Co., steamship agents and ship brokers, in a letter to T. F. Jenings, Marianna, Fla., December 14, 1914, state: "We have no room to offer prior to the steamship *United States*, March 11."

J. McD. Price, secretary National Lumber Exporters' Association, Baltimore, Md., December 30, 1914:

"* * * I take the liberty of calling your attention to the enormous and what appear to be unreasonable increases in ocean rates on lumber and other forest products which have been made by the steamship companies since the outbreak of war. * * * To many of the ports steamship lines refuse to quote rates at all, as they claim that more tonnage is being offered than they can take care of."

M. B. Nelson, general sales manager, the Long-Bell Lumber Co., Kansas City, Mo., December 29, 1914:

"I inclose a quotation from ship brokers issued under date of December 26, showing rates have advanced more than 300 per cent. * * * We now have in pile at port a little over 9,000,000 feet of lumber, or an approximate value of $280,000, all of which is deteriorating and could be disposed of if shipping facilities would permit.

"There are many others in the same condition as ourselves, and we sincerely hope you can do something to relieve the situation."

Alphonse Weil & Bros., New York, N. Y., December 26, 1914:

"We intended to ship a large quantity of oats to the other side, but were prevented from doing so on account of the rate of freight advancing from 4s. per bushel to 6s. 6d. We are told that the reason of this advance is due to the fact that there are very few vessels available at the present time."

Pittsburgh Provision & Packing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., December 30, 1914:

"We are exporters of provisions, etc., to Hamburg, Germany, Rotterdam, Holland, London and Liverpool, England. Early in 1914 we signed contracts covering rates on export freight to London and Liverpool, via Atlantic Transport Line and White Star Line from New York, with J. D. Roth, general western freight agent of the above-named lines, in which we are named ocean rate of 20s. less 5 per cent per gross ton. These rates have been raised 10s. per gross ton since the beginning of the war, they claiming that their steamers are operating under greatly increased expenses. * * * At present it is almost impossible to obtain booking for London and Liverpool, the steamship company claiming that they are booked ahead."

Chattanooga Wheelbarrow Co., Chattanooga, Tenn., December 26, 1914:

"We have been endeavoring for about a month to get a shipment through some of the Atlantic or Gulf ports for shipment to Bristol or Liverpool. * * * We are still holding this carload trying to get booking through some of the various steamship companies, and in this connection would state, we have three more cars which we want to get out early in the year, provided we can get them handled from port."

H. F. Heilman, Treasurer, Levi Smith (Ltd.), Clarendon, Pa., December 31, 1914:

"We have had 390 barrels lubricating oil at Baltimore since last week in September and first week in October for immediate shipment, which are just now loading. We can not prosper and retain our patronage when shipments are held up three months before forwarding, besides the steamship company presented a bill the other day of $51.96 for demurrage charges accruing on this shipment while lying at Baltimore pier, which is a gross injustice. We have not been at fault in the least that goods have not gone forward. * * * Our export business with foreign countries has been quite heavy in past years, and Rotterdam was one of our principal ports, and generally made contracts with the Holland-American Line, at Baltimore, to cover all our shipments to this port during the year. When our contract expired in 1913 we did not think it wise to renew same at the then high rates, and held back, preferring to ship on the open market, but in March the Holland-American Line insisted on us closing a contract for the year 1914, or else pay the highest open market rate, making a difference of about 4 cents per hundredweight at that time, and, with great reluctance, we finally consented to cover our shipments to this port by another contract for the year. * * * Also, inclose copy herewith of their letter to us, dated November 4, notifying us of disregarding that contract and asking an advance of 50 per cent. * * * This contract rate was 22 cents per hundredweight for the year, whereas their latest advice (a few days ago) the rate had advanced for shipments of this commodity to Rotterdam to 70 cents per hundredweight, which is simply outrageous."

Brown & Adams, wool commission merchants, Boston, Mass., December 30, 1914:

"We have been unable to make shipments wool from Buenos Aires to Boston or New York since December 15. Very little chance securing freight room for next 30 days account scarcity of vessels. Have over $6,000 worth waiting shipment already paid for. Freight rates when available about 150 per cent increase over last year."

Ike Manheimer, green and dried apples, Rochester, N. Y., December 28, 1914:

"In connection with the Scandinavian American Line out of New York (Messrs. Funch, Edye & Co., agents), I have had so much trouble in securing space to Copenhagen and in getting the goods on board steamer, even after the space had been promised, that I was compelled to stop selling goods to Copenhagen. * * * The freight on fresh apples in barrels is almost equal to the value of the apples, and practically prohibitive.

"The Norwegian American Line (Messrs. Benham & Boyesen, agents) has until recently given me very satisfactory service out of New York to points in Norway, * * * but has now also advanced the rates to the above maximum quotations and notified me within a short time that no space is available until next April."

American Vulcanized Fiber Co., Wilmington, Del., December 28, 1914:

"* * * We have been experiencing considerable trouble in obtaining space on steamers going to Scandinavian countries. For example, we have been informed by the Scandinavian American Line that no space can be had on any of their steamers until the middle of March and April. * * * It seems to us that the shipping interests are taking advantage of the present disturbed times, which naturally will tend to hurt the American foreign trade."

American Glue Co., Boston, Mass., December 30, 1914:

"Within the past few days, having a shipment of merchandise to export from this port to Liverpool, we were informed by the carriers that they could not handle same at all, on account of having more freight than they could handle."

E. P. McBurney, vice president Empire Cotton Oil Co., Atlanta, Ga., December 28, 1914:

"* * * This company is experiencing considerable trouble in booking shipments of cotton-seed meal, cake, and linters to foreign ports. * * * In fact, the result of our inquiries along this line principally develops that shipowners have restricted their vessels, almost exclusively, to cotton by charter or at very high rates, one of my informants placing the charter price at $12 per bale."

Phoenix Iron & Steel Co., Galveston, Tex., December 26, 1914:

"* * * We are shippers of old rails and scrap iron and steel. * * * Steamship companies now either quote abnormal freights or refuse to quote at all, so it is impossible to ship any material, as the freights in some cases amount to three-fourths of the delivered price of the commodity."

Stengel & Rothschild, tanners and manufacturers of patent leather, Newark, N. J., December 29, 1914:

"* * * We are experiencing considerable difficulties with shipments of our goods to Italy. * * * The normal freight rate for patent leather in cases has been 50s. per ton, with possibly 5 per cent primage, but we have just been asked a rate of 120s. plus 5 per cent for the same class of freight. This certainly appears to be an exorbitant rate, and anything that can be done to get better shipping facilities will be highly appreciated by the business interests of this country."

L. & E. Frenkel, importers of electric specialties, New York, N. Y., December 31, 1914:

"We procured orders to ship gas coal to Italy, but on account of the high shipping rates we can not ship them."

J. D. Kremelberg & Co., Baltimore, Md., December 26, 1914:

"We are shippers of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia tobacco to Europe, and most of our shipments are consigned to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway, and Belgium. At present only shipments to Holland, Italy, and Norway are possible at prohibitive rates. In fact, the latter have become so high that now cable orders, 'Stop buying,' have been received.

"Although we have made a yearly contract with the Holland American Line—the only shipping opportunity from here to Holland—as per copy inclosed, this line has arbitrarily raised its rates 100 to 300 per cent, and even at the raised rates shipments can be booked for only 'for first available room.'

"Rates to Italy also have become entirely too high, i. e., from $4 per hogshead of Maryland tobacco to about $27, or nearly 3½ cents a pound, so that tobacco shipments have become out of question."

R. M. Bryan, eastern manager of the Black Diamond, New York, December 30, 1914:

"This business (coal industry) has been almost prostrated by the inability of shippers to secure vessels and upon terms that will permit them to make shipments."

McEwen Lumber Co., Azalea, N. C., December 29, 1914:

"Would say that for our part the present rates are practically prohibitive, as they have advanced 10 cents and 15 cents per hundredweight, and in many cases even these rates are not protected except for immediate acceptance and subject to confirmation by steamship lines. * * * It is our information that the steamship companies are giving other tonnage carrying higher freight rates preference, and in some instances are limiting their boats to a certain small amount of lumber tonnage."

Henry Lauts & Co., Baltimore, Md., December 29, 1914:

"The present rates charged by this line (Holland-American Line) are almost prohibitive and are a decided menace to the tobacco export industry of this country."

V. F. Holmes, estate of Victor Holmes, deceased, exporter of zinc oxide, Boston, Mass., December 28, 1914:

"Since the European war situation developed, this business has been very considerably hampered by a number of conditions. Among them the scarcity of freight vessels, exceedingly high rates of exchange, and what is more important, the freight outlook for 1915."

R. R. Dancy & Co., cotton, Houston, Tex., December 26, 1914:

"Last week brokers asked $17 per bale, freight to Germany (Bremen). Now $14."

John F. Bush, vice president, Hooker Electrochemical Co., New York, December 28, 1914:

"We have been endeavoring for the past three years to build up an export business on caustic soda. * * * Within the past month we have found a growing impossibility to procure rates which will permit of our moving our product to foreign ports in competition with the English transportation rates. We can not urge too strongly the necessity of procuring proper tonnage to carry commodities seeking a foreign outlet, and this tonnage should be available at once in order to benefit the United States manufacturer."

Industrial Lumber Co., Elizabeth, La., January 5, 1915:

"We have in the past exported considerable lumber to England, Holland, Germany, and some to France. Since the war, however, we have been unable to make any shipments, primarily because of the uncertainty of securing vessels; also on account of the excessive freight rates."

Danforth Geer, president, Walter A. Wood Mowing & Reaping Machine Co., Hoosick Falls, N. Y., January 9, 1915:

"We find, however, that the cost of getting goods to foreign ports and the uncertainty of proper shipping facilities is becoming a great menace, and will have a very serious effect on the business that we have in hand and wish to protect.

"* * * We can not but feel that the steamship companies are taking advantage of present conditions to exact rates which are all out of reason, and which are unjust and unfair.

"* * * It would appear to us that there never was a more opportune time for this country, either under legislative action or private capital, to create a merchant marine, for lack of which, in our judgment, this country has suffered for many years. We can only hope that some measures may be enacted, or some policy created, which will relieve the present situation, and in time to affect our business interests this year."

Meyer Hecht, commission merchant, dealing in skins and hides, New York, December 26, 1914:

"I, too, want to protest that they (steamship lines) are charging me two or three times as much as formerly, and then do not give me room for my shipments."

Dumee, Son & Co., cotton, Philadelphia, Pa., December 29, 1914:

"We wish to enter strenuous protest against the prohibitive freight rates being charged by the trans-Atlantic lines on cotton and cotton linters to European ports. * * * One year ago we paid a rate of 45 and 50 cents per 100 pounds on compressed and uncompressed cotton linters, respectively, from New York to Rotterdam. To-day we are asked $2.50 and $3 per 100 pounds."

Justus Ruperti, New York City, January 5, 1915:

"There is lack of freight room, both to and from South America. * * * There are not sufficient neutral steamers in the trade in spite of the high rates of freight to take the cargo from this country and bring it here, and we have constant complaints on that score from our customers in South America."

A. Gross & Co., stearic acid, candles, red oil, and glycerine, New York, December 26, 1914:

"Permit us, please, to lay before you our complaint against the scarcity of ships and the exorbitant rate of freight * * * which seriously handicaps our business. We therefore feel that something should be done by our Government to relieve the present situation."

Gabriel Nachman, wool stock, New York, December 28, 1914:

"We are large shippers of woolen rags * * * steamship companies have advanced their freight rates ¼ cent per pound to $1.10

per 100 pounds; and even at that rate they refuse to take rags; therefore have not been able to ship any for export in over four weeks."

G. Stallings & Co., Lynchburg, Va., tobacco exporters, December 28, 1914:

"There is a considerable scarcity of steamers flying the American or neutral flags, and unless more ships can be put at the disposal of shippers causing a general reduction of ocean freight rates, which are now unreasonable, excessive, and almost prohibitive, the export business of this country is bound to suffer greatly."

A. P. Husband, secretary Millers' National Federation, Chicago, Ill., December 29, 1914:

"We are attaching hereto a tabulated statement of ocean freight rates on flour, published by International Mercantile Marine, from several American ports to London, Aberdeen, and Liverpool. You will note that from July 18 to December 19 the ocean freight rates from all named American ports to ports in United Kingdom advanced over 100 per cent. * * * The sharp advances in ocean freight rates on flour have not been confined to the International Mercantile Marine, however. The Holland-American Line, controlling, as it does, the only available means of transportation to Holland, has increased its rates on flour to a point where it is interfering seriously with the ability of American millers to compete for business in Holland against British millers (who are grinding American wheat). * * * As you are aware the Government of the Netherlands recently reserved to itself a practical monopoly in all foodstuffs. Since that time (in November) a sharp and unprecedented advance in ocean freights will be noted. Not only has this company declined to give millers option on ocean space at a quoted rate when the miller has a bid from Holland, but has, in some instances, advanced the rate to the miller overnight, and the miller, having accepted business at the rate quoted the day before, is forced to take a loss, owing to this arbitrary attitude of the Holland-American Line, which, by the way, is contrary to all precedents, as a miller must have extended to him an option on ocean freight room at a given quotation for a time sufficiently long to cable his foreign correspondent and get a reply.

"Before the creation of a monopoly on foodstuffs by the Government of the Netherlands, however, the Holland-American Line declined to carry flour for which it had contracted (in some instances before the war), and millers were unable to get that company to move large shipments of flour which had been made by millers in good faith."

Markt & Hammacher Co., export agents, New York, N. Y., January 5, 1915:

"We admit and believe that it is necessary under the present trying conditions for the steamship companies to advance their rates to a certain extent, say, 25 per cent or even 50 per cent over normal rates, but when steamship companies are quoting and charging three times the normal rates, and in some instances even four times the normal rates, we feel that it is absolutely an imposition on the part of the steamship companies to demand such freight rates."

Panama Railroad Co., January 15, 1915:

"Our stock (of coal) has been reduced from 90,000 to 40,000 tons, and both the Earn Line and our company are scouring the charter market in the effort to secure sufficient tonnage to carry to the Isthmus the amount of coal it is imperative we should keep there."

ANALYSIS OF COMPLAINTS.

It appears from these statements of our business men and shippers that:

1. Ocean freight rates have been arbitrarily increased to an unparalleled height without regard to the interests of American trade.

(See letters of T. F. Jennings (hardwood manufacturer), Marianna, Fla., Exhibit 10; Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., Dermott, Ark, Exhibit 18; Phoenix Iron & Steel Co., Galveston, Tex., Exhibit 21; L. & E. Frenkel (gas coal), New York, Exhibit 23; McEwen Lumber Co., Azalea, N. C. Exhibit 28; Walter A. Wood Mowing & Reaping Machine Co., Hoosick Falls, N. Y., Exhibit 34; H. Frank Darrow (grass seed), New York, Exhibit 36; Stengel & Rothschild (leather), Newark, N. J., Exhibit 39; Garcia & Maggini Co. (fruits), San Francisco, Cal., Exhibit 42; William Haas & Sons (shovel handles), Houston Heights, Tex., Exhibit 43; Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., New York, Exhibit 44; American Tripoli Co. (flour), Seneca, Mo., Exhibit 45; Charles E. Moore (tobacco), Baltimore, Exhibit 48; J. D. Kremelberg & Co., Baltimore (tobacco), Exhibit 57; G. Stallings & Co., Lynchburg, Va. (tobacco), Exhibit 60; Millers' National Federation, Exhibit 62; Henry Lauts & Co., Baltimore (tobacco), Exhibit 63.)

2. High rates are not only restricting the general volume of our export trade but are actually stopping exportations in some lines. Some business plants have been shut down as a result of the exorbitant rates.

(See letters of Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., Exhibit 18; American Tripoli Co. (flour), Seneca, Mo., Exhibit 45; Gano, Moore & Co. (coal), Philadelphia, Exhibit 5.)

3. Shipowners in some instances are taking only those goods or commodities which will pay the highest rates of freight and are easily unloaded, and are declining to accept shipments of other commodities (such, for instance, as lumber) because the character of the shipments and the rates obtainable thereon make it more to the interest of the steamship owner to accept one class of goods than another. Such discriminations against different classes of American products and against certain lines of American business are both arbitrary and hurtful. If common carriers on land were to practice such discriminations against shippers, and adopt such arbitrary methods, they would be subject to criminal prosecution.

(See letters from Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., Dermott, Ark., Exhibit 18; McEwen Lumber Co., Azalea, N. C., Exhibit 28; Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., Exhibit 44; American Tripoli Co. (flour), Seneca, Mo., Exhibit 45.)

4. Despite claims that there is ample tonnage for the South American trade, there are letters to show that rates to South America have been greatly increased and there is a shortage of tonnage both to and from South America.

(See letters of Gano, Moore & Co. (coal), Philadelphia, Exhibit 5; Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., New York, Exhibit 44; Brown & Adams (wool), Boston, Exhibit 4; Justus Ruperti, New York, Exhibit 70.)

In this connection attention is invited to letter of January 15, 1915, from the Panama Railroad Co. (attached as Exhibit 77), showing the inability to get coal to the Canal Zone for the use of the Panama Canal.

5. The direct charge is made that the Holland-American Line has repudiated written contracts with American shippers and has increased freight charges without regard to their rights.

(See letters of Charles E. Moore, Baltimore (tobacco), Exhibit 48; Levi Smith (Ltd.), Clarendon, Pa. (petroleum products), Exhibit 3; J. D. Kremelberg & Co., Baltimore (tobacco), Exhibit 57; Henry Lauts & Co., Baltimore (tobacco), Exhibit 63.)

ENORMOUS INCREASES IN RATES.

In order that the increase in ocean freight rates since July, 1914, may be more fully appreciated, the following tables, made by the Actuary of the Treasury Department, and based upon the best obtainable information, are submitted:

Freight rates, New York to European ports.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 19.	Increase.
Grain (per bushel):			*Per cent.*
Liverpool	$0.05	$0.20	300
Rotterdam	.06	.60	900
Havre	.06		
Bremen	.0714		
Mediterranean	.0825		
Flour (per 100 pounds):			
Liverpool	.10	.40	300
Rotterdam	.10	.60	500
Havre	.18	.47	161
Cotton (per bale):			
Liverpool	1.00	5.00	400
Rotterdam	1.25	10.00	700
Havre	1.25	5.00	300
Meat and lard (per 100 pounds):			
Liverpool	.24	.36	50
Rotterdam	.28	.75	168
Havre	.30	.60	100

Freight rates—Baltimore.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 20.	Increase.
Grain (per bushel):			*Per cent.*
European ports	$0.03	$0.30	900
Mediterranean	[1] .05½	.32½	473
Flour (per 100 pounds):			
European ports	.14	.65	364
Mediterranean			
Cotton (per bale):			
European ports	1.75	12.50	614
Mediterranean			
Meats and lard (per 100 pounds):			
European ports	.27		
Mediterranean			

[1] September 1.

Freight rates—Philadelphia.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 21.	Increase.
Grain (per bushel):			*Per cent.*
European ports	$0.04	$0.20	400
Mediterranean ports	.06¼	.28½	318
Flour (per 100 pounds):			
European ports	.14	.41	192
Mediterranean ports	.187	.75	301
Cotton (per bale):			
European ports	1.15	5.00	335
Mediterranean ports	1.25	6.25	400
Provisions (per 100 pounds):			
European ports	.22½	.3937	75
Mediterranean ports	.321	.9640	200

Freight rates—Norfolk, Va.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 20.	Increase.
Grain (per bushel):			*Per cent.*
Liverpool	$0.06 to $0.07	$0.18	157 to 200
France-Atlantic	.067	.205	206
Mediterranean	.063	.27	329
Rotterdam		.2525	
Denmark	.135	.28875	114
Flour (per 100 pounds):			
Liverpool	.21	.40	90
France-Atlantic	.25	1.00	300
Mediterranean	.35	$0.55 to .70	57 to 100
Rotterdam	.25	.60	140
Denmark	.32	.70	119
Cotton (per bale):			
Liverpool	1.75	5.00	186
France-Atlantic	2.25	10.00	344
Mediterranean	3.25	5.00 to 6.25	54 to 92
Rotterdam	1.75	10.00	471
Germany	1.25	15.00	1,100
Provisions (meat and lard) per ton—large packages:			
Liverpool	6.05	8.50	40
France-Atlantic	8.00	12.00	50
Mediterranean	9.70	24.33	151
Rotterdam	7.60	12.00	58
Denmark	8.62	24.33	182

Freight rates on cotton from Savannah per bale.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 20.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Liverpool	$1.50	$5.25	250
Rotterdam	1.50	11.25	650
Bremen	1.50	15.00	900

No exports other than cotton.

Freight rates—New Orleans.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 21.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Grain (per bushel):			
Continental Europe, excluding Germany	$0.08	$0.31 to $0.50	300 to 488
Mediterranean	.11	.40	248
Flour (per 100 pounds):			
Continental Europe	.18	.70 to .78	289 to 333
Mediterranean	.22	.69	214
Cotton (per bale):			
Continental Europe	1.60	7.50 to 13.75	369 to 759
Mediterranean	1.90	8.75	360
Meats and lard (per 100 pounds):			
Continental Europe	.33	.84 to .95	155 to 188
Mediterranean	.34	.84	147

Freight rates—Galveston.

	1914, July 1.	1915, Jan. 21.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Grain (per bushel):			
Liverpool	$0.07½	$0.19½	174
Havre	.10½	.18	65
Barcelona	.12	.33	175
Genoa			
Cotton (per bale):			
Liverpool	1.30	6.00	361
Havre	1.50	7.00	366
Barcelona	2.25	7.00	211
Genoa	1.90	10.00	426
Bremen	1.40	16.25 to 17.50	1,061 to 1,150

No flour, meats, or lard now moving from Galveston.

MAXIMUM NOT IN SIGHT.

While this report is being written, information is received that rates are higher than those given in some of the tables herein presented, and that even at these extraordinary figures it is difficult to obtain cargo space for earlier sailings than March and April.

SUMMARY OF THE MOST STRIKING INCREASES.

From the foregoing tables it will be observed that ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour 500 per cent; on cotton 700 per cent.

From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent.

From Baltimore to European ports (excepting German) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour 364 per cent; on cotton 614 per cent.

From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton 186 per cent.

From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from $1.25 per bale to $15 per bale.

From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent.

From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

CONTROL OF RATE SITUATION BY STEAMSHIP INTERESTS.

Ocean freight rates are still rising and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other.

The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates; it can not, under existing law, protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice and upon the instant, and our business men are helpless. The steamship companies are their own masters and do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether.

(See letters of William Haas & Sons, Exhibit 43; Gano, Moore & Co., of Philadelphia, Exhibit 5; American Tripoli Co. (flour), Seneca, Mo., Exhibit 45.)

SCARCITY OF TONNAGE.

The scarcity of steamship tonnage is notoriously true. Every daily paper which publishes shipping news testifies to this incontrovertible fact. Attention is called to attached clippings from the New York Journal of Commerce of January 2, 1915, and the Wall Street Journal of January 1, 1915 (Exhibits 78 and 79), which show clearly the scarcity of tonnage.

But the conclusive evidence of the shortage of tonnage is the excessive and unparalleled ocean freight rates now prevailing. Such rates could not be maintained if tonnage was abundant.

BURDEN UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS.

Annexed hereto as Exhibit 1 is a summary of our sea trade and the estimated freight cost of handling it, from July to December, 1914, inclusive, prepared by the actuary of the Treasury Department.

From this it appears that our total exports by sea for July, 1914 (before the war), were $139,225,479, and the ocean freight cost was $7,833,482, or 5.63 per cent; the total of such exports for December, 1914, were $226,000,000 (estimated), and the ocean freight cost was $30,742,500, or 13.6 per cent—an increase over July of 141 per cent.

If the ocean freight cost on December exports had been at the same rate as July, viz, 5.63 per cent, the total freight charge on our exports for December would have been $12,723,800 instead of $30,742,500. In other words, the increased ocean freight tax arbitrarily imposed upon our farmers and business men for the month of December, 1914, only, was $18,018,700. If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915 at the December, 1914, rate and the ocean freight charges are the same as for December, 1914, the American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) increased freight charges above the normal rates, of $216,224,400, or more than five times the $40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the shipping bill to put into American ships for the protection of our foreign commerce.

In two months and seven days the increased ocean freight charges (above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914) exacted on our foreign trade at the December, 1914, rate, would amount to $40,241,761, or more than the total amount, viz, $40,000,000, which the shipping bill authorizes for investment in an American merchant marine.

In 12 months, as before stated, the total increase in the freight tax levied by steamship owners, mostly foreign, upon our export trade, at the December, 1914, rate, would amount to the sum of $216,224,400. If the same be applied to our import trade, there would be an additional increase of $95,640,000, or a total increased ocean freight charge on exports and imports by sea in one year of $311,864,400, or 141.6 per cent over the usual cost. (See Exhibit 2.)

Thus far we have been dealing only with the increased ocean freight charges over and above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914. Including these normal rates, and assuming that the December, 1914, total ocean freight charges, viz, $44,342,500, represent an average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade by sea for the year 1915 would amount to the enormous total of $532,110,000. (See Exhibit 1.) Almost the whole of this huge sum would be paid to foreign steamship owners and would have an important bearing upon our foreign trade balances; it might, in fact, turn these balances against us.

EFFECT OF HIGH OCEAN FREIGHT RATES ON AMERICAN FARMER.

It will be observed that the greatest increases in rates and the heaviest tax has been imposed upon the products in which the American farmer is most concerned, namely, grain and cotton. These commodities constitute the great bulk of our export trade and have the largest influence in throwing the balance of foreign trade in favor of this country.

While the steamship companies have imposed conscienceless taxes in the form of increased rates on grain, amounting, as already shown, to as much as 900 per cent to some ports, they have placed an even heavier burden upon cotton, where the increase in rates to some ports is as high as 1,100 per cent. This increase is particularly onerous upon the cotton producers of the South, because it comes at a time when the effects of the war have greatly reduced the value of cotton and when the southern farmers are least able to bear additional burdens.

Grain, cotton, and other commodities are usually sold "delivered" at the port of destination. When steamship companies raise the cost of delivery of grain from 6 cents to 60 cents per bushel, it makes a vast difference in the price the farmer receives for his product; and when ocean freight charges on cotton are raised from $1.25 to $15 per bale, the price at which the farmer sells his cotton is seriously reduced.

To show what the burden imposed on the farmers by these high ocean freight rates means, it is necessary only to bring out the fact that while the total freight cost on our exports by sea for December, 1914, was $30,742,500, the great commodities of grain, cotton, and flour bore $11,782,250 of this charge—or more than 36 per cent of the entire freight cost on all exports by sea for December, 1914.

AMERICAN PRIVATE CAPITAL INVESTED IN MERCHANT MARINE.

The Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce estimates the total value of all our ships in the foreign and domestic trade, and on the Great Lakes, including sail vessels, steam vessels, motor boats, canal boats, barges, etc., to be about $600,000,000. The Bureau of Navigation states that the approximate value of American ships engaged in the foreign trade, including steam and sail tonnage, is only $69,000,000.

It is argued by some that the Government should not do anything for the relief of our foreign commerce that will cause competition with this $69,000,000 of private capital invested in ships engaged in the foreign trade, but that it is a paramount duty of the Government to protect this shipping interest against competition even though by so doing we leave our foreign trade entirely at the mercy of foreign ship interests and the relatively small amount of American capital invested in ships engaged in the foreign trade.

Let us compare the actual amount or value of our export trade by sea with the value of our ships engaged in the foreign trade, and we find that the total amount of such trade for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, was $2,047,755,872, while the total value of American ships engaged in the foreign trade is $69,000,000. Our combined imports and exports by sea for the same year were $3,785,404,525.

It is pertinent to ask which of these interests is entitled to the superior consideration of the Government, the farmers and producers of the great grain States of the West and the farmers and producers of the great cotton and tobacco States of the South, the merchants, manufacturers, and business men throughout the entire country, whose combined activities represent our vast export trade, amounting for the last fiscal year to $2,047,755,872; or the owners of the comparatively few American steamships engaged in the foreign trade, whose aggregate investment is approximately only $69,000,000.

There would seem to be but one answer, and that is that our farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and business men, whose activities produce our great export trade, are entitled to first consideration, and that it would pay us many times over to invest the $40,000,000, as provided in the shipping bill, in an American merchant marine, and bring about as quickly as possible a restoration of normal ocean freight rates, with a saving to American business of more than $200,000,000 per annum.

In order to protect this $69,000,000 against competition, as suggested by the arguments of the opponents of the shipping bill, the Government would have to permit the owners of American vessels, as well as the owners of foreign vessels, which do the great bulk of our ocean-carrying trade, to continue to levy such taxes in the form of increased freight charges upon the $2,047,755,872 of our export trade, as these foreign and American steamship owners may determine.

Of course no one wants to injure or treat unjustly the owners of the $29,000,000 invested in American vessels engaged in the foreign trade. As we understand it the purpose is not to put the vessels that may be purchased under the shipping bill into any service where American vessels are furnishing sufficient facilities at reasonable rates.

OBTAINABLE TONNAGE.

It has been stated that if the shipping bill is passed additional tonnage for our foreign trade can not be quickly obtained. This is incorrect. While we have made no effort to test the market for ship offerings, we have been assured by no less an authority than Mr. Bernard N. Baker, of Baltimore, a man of the best character and standing, who developed to a high degree of prosperity the American Transport Line, of which he was for many years president, and who is thoroughly familiar with the shipping trade, that many suitable and admirable ships for the purpose can be promptly secured.

Some of these ships are already completed and can be had immediately, some are partially built and can be finished in a few months, and others can be bought and transferred from steamship lanes or routes where the demand for accommodations is not so great to the service of American commerce. Others can be secured in a reasonable time from American shipyards, which are well equipped to fill orders promptly.

It is not true, as alleged in some quarters, that only ships of German registry can be purchased. We do not know whether any of the German vessels interned in our ports can be secured or that they would be desirable, but we are convinced that suitable ships of various foreign registry are available if the means for purchasing them are provided. There is attached to this report as Exhibit 76 a list of ships offered by the Merchant Marine Agency, J. V. McCarthy, manager, Boston, Mass., from which it will be seen that there are 15 ships of English registry and 7 of German registry which he proposes to sell. Attention also is invited to Exhibit 75 showing that other ships are obtainable.

We are convinced that within a reasonable time after the shipping bill is passed enough ships can be secured to greatly relieve and assist our foreign trade.

PANAMA STEAMSHIPS.

In the course of our inquiries we have had occasion to look into the operation of the Panama Railroad & Steamship Co., in which the Government is the owner of the entire capital stock, because here is an instance where the Government has long been directly in the shipping business and has made it successful. The operations of the ships of this company offer no justification for the charge of "administrative and executive inefficiency," any more than the construction of the Panama Canal itself.

Reference to the annual report of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Co., soon to be issued, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and to Exhibit A connected therewith, and also to Exhibit V in a supplemental report carrying the results of operation down to the 31st of October, 1914, shows that:

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, there was a net revenue from the steamship line alone of $314,296.36, and in the four months ended October 31, 1914, there was a net revenue from the steamship line alone of $84,294.16.

These net revenues are truly net; that is to say, they are net after maintenance and depreciation, including extraordinary repairs, are charged against the property. This depreciation on the ships owned by the company is 6 per cent per annum, which is the practice of the best private lines and is in excess of the depreciation charged by many privately owned lines.

The Panama Railroad & Steamship Line is a conspicuous instance of successful conduct, under the supervision of the Government, of so-called "private business."

SHIPPING SITUATION HAMPERS EXPORT TRADE.

While it is true that there has been a great growth of our export trade in recent months, we are satisfied that this growth would have been much greater if there had been ample steamship tonnage and if ocean freight rates had been maintained at a reasonable level. We are satisfied that the removal of the oppressive restraints now exercised by foreign steamship companies upon our export trade will give it an extraordinary impetus, and bring to our country a period of enlarged and unexampled prosperity.

We are the one great agricultural, industrial, and mineral producing nation which is not only at peace, but is far from the menace of war. We are the only market in which orders can be placed with expectation that they will be filled in reasonable time. The leading nations of the earth are turning to us now as the most reliable source of supply.

The fact that our expanding trade shows, at the moment, favorable balances is no argument that our commerce moves freely and without injury or undue burdens. On the contrary, it is a fact that through scarcity of tonnage and the extortionate freight rates imposed upon our commerce by foreign-owned and domestic steamship companies our export trade is greatly hampered, and the most wonderful business opportunity ever presented to any country is put in needless jeopardy. We believe that the favorable trade balance in December of over $100,000,000 might have been doubled in January if sufficient ships had been available at reasonable rates, so that the orders which are pouring in upon us from every source could have been promptly filled.

The Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce are continuing to receive information about the shipping situation, and we assume that the Senate desires to have us submit further reports upon the subject of the Senate resolution if additional facts come to us while the shipping bill is under consideration by the Senate. We shall, therefore, take the liberty of communicating again to the Senate any other facts that may come to us which seem of sufficient importance to merit the attention of the Senate.

In the absence of the Secretary of Commerce, his signature, with his approval, is attached to this report by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Respectfully,

W. G. McADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury.
WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

EXHIBIT 1.

WASHINGTON, *January 21, 1915.*

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: The following tables show the sea trade of the United States, together with the estimated freight cost, by months, July to December, 1914, inclusive:

SUMMARY.

United States sea trade and estimated freight cost, July to December, 1914, inclusive.

Exports to Europe.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December (estimated).
Grain:						
Value	$19,027,744	$18,167,176	$33,383,176	$27,843,882	$29,976,000	$36,700,000
Freight cost	1,273,285	1,148,543	2,777,327	2,498,643	4,884,075	6,758,000
Per cent	6.7	6.3	8.3	9	16.3	18.4
Flour:						
Value	$1,634,244	$1,565,279	$3,769,548	$5,009,609	$5,915,170	$6,000,000
Freight cost	76,813	78,094	301,882	506,508	563,375	845,000
Per cent	4.7	5	8	10.1	9.5	14.1
Cotton:						
Value	$6,197,348	$1,019,681	$4,538,685	$16,421,278	$27,168,987	$35,709,000
Freight cost	140,958	18,232	126,308	861,834	2,222,391	3,979,250
Per cent	2.3	1.8	2.8	5.2	8.2	11.1
Meats:						
Value	$2,964,808	$2,925,566	$3,627,610	$3,098,068	$4,086,733	$4,500,000
Freight cost	54,528	48,763	92,051	79,988	106,964	115,550
Per cent	1.8	1.7	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6
Lard:						
Value	$2,037,073	$2,149,061	$2,288,640	$5,265,928	$4,556,234	$5,300,000
Freight cost	48,986	49,976	79,283	186,050	165,289	201,700
Per cent	2.4	2.3	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8
Other articles:						
Value	$58,829,308	$23,048,460	$41,920,425	$73,215,532	$73,034,655	$89,800,000
Freight cost	2,941,465	1,198,521	2,934,430	5,308,126	8,033,812	12,124,000
Per cent	5	5.2	7	7.2	11	13.5
Exports elsewhere:						
Value	$48,534,954	$30,445,543	$46,283,262	$43,548,618	$37,535,067	$48,000,000
Freight cost	3,397,447	2,131,258	3,471,244	3,483,889	4,504,208	6,720,000
Per cent	7	7	7.5	8	12	14
Total exports by sea:						
Value	$139,225,479	$79,321,775	$135,811,346	$174,402,915	$182,272,846	$223,900,000
Freight cost	7,833,482	4,673,983	9,782,525	12,925,231	20,489,031	30,742,500
Per cent	5.63	5.89	7.2	7.4	11.2	13.6
Total imports by sea:						
Value	$147,533,541	$115,823,908	$127,904,688	$124,721,414	$113,204,516	$100,000,000
Freight cost	8,305,307	6,822,204	9,209,138	9,242,231	12,678,905	13,500,000
Per cent	5.63	5.89	7.2	7.4	11.2	13.6
Total sea trade:						
Value	$286,762,020	$195,148,683	$263,716,034	$299,129,379	$295,477,362	$323,900,000
Freight cost	16,139,789	11,496,190	18,991,663	22,167,269	33,158,940	44,342,500
Per cent	5.63	5.89	7.2	7.4	11.2	13.6

EXHIBIT 2.

United States sea trade, freight cost, based upon the average ad valorem freight rate for July, 1914, as compared with that for December, 1914.

	Month of December.	12 months' period.
Exports:		
On December basis, 13.6 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	$30,742,500	$368,910,000
On July basis, 5.63 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	12,723,800	152,685,600
Additional cost to shippers	18,018,700	216,224,400
Imports:		
On December basis, 13.6 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	13,600,000	163,200,000
On July basis, 5.63 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	5,630,000	67,560,000
Additional cost to shippers	7,970,000	95,640,000
Total sea trade:		
On December basis, 13.6 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	44,342,500	532,110,000
On July basis, 5.63 per cent, as shown in Exhibit 1	18,353,800	220,245,600
Additional cost to shippers	25,988,700	311,864,400

An increase cost of 141.6 per cent.

That is, assuming that the total ocean freight charges for December, 1914, viz, $44,342,500, will be the average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade for the year 1915 will amount to $532,110,000.

Assuming that no state of war existed, and that the normal freight rates in force last July had remained in force in December last, and that the December freight cost, upon this basis, viz, $18,353,800, would have been the average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade for the year 1915 would have been $220,245,600, or $311,864,400 less than under existing conditions.

The basis of these tables are, first, the actual exports and imports of the United States as given in the Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, issued by the Department of Commerce; second, the country of destination of the exports where shown, and where not shown the most probable country of destination; third, the port of the United States exporting these goods, based where obtainable upon the actual export figures, otherwise estimated. The freight rates used are based upon the actual rates of contracts for carrying goods from certain United States ports to certain European ports, where at hand; otherwise, the rates are estimates based upon daily quoted rates in the New York shipping papers. The computations relating to the month of December are estimates.

After the average ad valorem freight cost of the enumerated articles is computed, it is assumed that the cost of shipping the other goods exported to Europe will be about the same ad valorem. It is known that the freight on general cargoes is practically the same as on provisions, with a rather low ad valorem, while that on bulky, low-priced goods is a higher ad valorem, making the average for the last six months very close to the average of the articles enumerated. The freight cost from the Atlantic seaboard to the Far East, Australia, and South America is higher than the trans-Atlantic cost, while that to Cuba, the West Indies, Mexico, and west coast of Canada is somewhat lower.

It is also assumed that the freight cost for our imports is about the same as for our exports.

Two factors modify the ad valorem freight cost—the unit value of the article and the unit freight rate. Since June both these values have fluctuated, the latter very much, as is shown in the following table. Freight rates are still advancing.

Increase in freight rates—Average for United States to Europe.

	Grain, per bushel.	Flour, per 100 pounds.	Cotton, per bale.	Meat, per 100 pounds.	Lard, per 100 pounds.
Estimated average:	*Cents.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents*
July	5.6	11.5	$1.15	25	25
August	5.7	13.6	1.15	24.2	25
September	7.7	22.3	1.26	36	36
October	8.7	26	2.10	36.7	38.4
November	16.1	26	3.39	37	38.8
December	22.1	35	4.57	37	39.1
Increase, July to December, per cent	294	204	297	48	56

The export price of wheat has increased from 91 cents per bushel in July to about $1.20 in December. Flour from $4.58 per barrel in July to about $5.30 in December. Cotton decreased from 12.4 cents per pound in July to 7.8 cents in October, since which time it has increased somewhat. Certain meats have increased from 13.9 cents per pound in July to over 15 cents in December. Lard has increased from 10.9 cents in July to nearly 12 cents in December. These fluctuations explain why the ad valorem and unit freight cost increase in different ratios.

Respectfully,

JOS. S. MCCOY,
Government Actuary.

EXHIBIT 3.

[Levi Smith (Ltd.), refiner of Pennsylvania petroleum products.]

CLARENDON, PA., *December 31, 1914.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Having noticed in the paper last night that you are gathering information from American exporters and manufacturers as to the advisability of the United States establishing their own steamship lines, wish to be put on record that we are most heartily in favor of such a proposition, as before the war we had a big export trade and have orders on our books for lots of goods, but parties have cabled us some time ago to defer shipments, as the excessive marine freight rates barred them from using the goods; besides steamers are not available to ship goods.

We have been in the oil-refining business for about 30 years, and before the war we could get about weekly steamers for Rotterdam, whereas at present we can not get a steamer once a month. We have had 390 barrels lubricating oil at Baltimore since last week in September and first week in October for immediate shipment which are just now loading. Shipment was consigned for Rotterdam, and while it was held up for a short time to comply with the shipping regulations for that port in getting a Netherland Government permit, this permit has been in the hands of the Holland-American Line since November 19 or 20, and have repeatedly urged forwarding this shipment, but the Baltimore agents claimed they had no steamers. We can not prosper and retain our patronage when shipments are held up three months before forwarding; besides the steamship company presented a bill the other day of $51.96 for demurrage charges accruing on this shipment while lying at Baltimore pier, which is a gross injustice, as we have not been at fault in the least that goods have not gone forward. Aside from this, the foreign steamship lines have such a monopoly of the business that they disregard all rights belonging to the American shippers and just fix matters to suit themselves. We know of but two lines from Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York for Rotterdam, which are Holland-American Line and Atlantic Transport Co., and they are practically one, as there is no competition between these two lines. As mentioned above, our export business with foreign countries has been quite heavy in past years, and Rotterdam was one of our principal ports and generally made contracts with the Holland-American Line at Baltimore to cover all of our shipments to this port during the year. When our contract expired in 1913, we did not think it wise to renew same at the then high rates and held back, preferring to ship on the open market, but in March the Holland-American Line insisted on us closing a contract for the year 1914 or else pay the highest open market rate, making a difference of about 4 cents per hundredweight at that time, and with great reluctance we finally consented to cover our shipments to this port by another contract for the year. Inclose copy herewith.

Also, inclose copy herewith of their letter to us dated November 4, notifying us of disregarding that contract and asking an advance of 50 per cent, and a copy of one of our letters of protest, dated November 10, but all without avail as they would not move the 390 barrels lubricating oil mentioned above without 33 cents per hundredweight, paid in advance, which we paid under protest some time last month. This contract rate was 22 cents per hundredweight for the year, whereas their lastest advice (a few days ago) the rate had advanced for shipments of this commodity to Rotterdam to 70 cents per hundredweight, which is simply outrageous.

Glad to favor you with original contract and letters if desired. Can give you other incidents of unfairness from steamship lines if desired. Have we no redress on Holland-American Line to compel them to refund amount overpaid against contract rate?

Very respectfully,

LEVI SMITH (LTD.),
H. F. HEILMAN, *Treasurer.*

EXHIBIT 3A.

[Levi Smith Ltd., refiner of Pennsylvania petroleum products, Clarendon, Pa.]

Baltimore freight contract No. 178, between Mr. Levi Smith, Clarendon, Pa., party of the first part, and the Holland America Line, parties of the second part, the following has been agreed upon:

1. The party of the first part agrees to forward all shipments of lubricating oil that he controls from Baltimore to Rotterdam during the period from January 1, 1914, to December 31, 1914.

2. The parties of the second part agree to carry such shipments from Baltimore to Rotterdam during the above-mentioned period at an ocean rate of 22 cents per 100 pounds.

3. It is understood and agreed that this contract is to be carried out under the terms and conditions of the bills of lading of the line. Steamers reserve the right to take grain in excess of their net register tonnage.

Clarendon, Pa., March 25, 1914.

(Signed) LEVI SMITH (Ltd.)
Per H. F. HEILMAN, *Treas.*

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 26, 1914.*

p. p. Dresel, Rauschenberg & Co., agents Holland American Line.
(Signed) JOHN SANDERMAN.

EXHIBIT 3B.

[Levi Smith (Ltd.), refiner of Pennsylvania petroleum products.]

CLARENDON, PA., *December 18, 1914.*

[Copies of our letter, Nov. 10, 1914.]

Messrs. DRESEL, RAUSCHENBERG & Co.,
Baltimore, Md.

GENTLEMEN: We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated November 7 (likely intended for the 9th), explaining that your people found it necessary to raise the contract rate 50 per cent owing to the enormous expense at which steamship lines were operating at the present time, and while it may not feel very good to do business at a loss, nevertheless your people invited those chances to gain or lose when you insisted on signing a contract or else pay the higher open rate.

We have sold a whole lot of goods on this contract rate of 22 cents per hundredweight, and you would certainly not consider it a fair proposition that we should pay this 50 per cent additional rate out of our own pocket. If the present earnings don't keep the profits on the right side of the ledger with your people, your line is not bankrupt, and will simply have to do like other people when they make bad contracts—charge it up to "profit and loss." We are not inviting any contracts, as we find it too much of a gamble, and quite frequently the other fellow likes to squeal when he gets hit; but we remember of some contracts we had made in the past years, on which we lost $1,000 per month toward the close. Well, we could not do business on that basis, but simply had to stand it and take it out of previous years' earnings.

We are not hard-hearted, but, as explained before, we can not pay the 50 per cent increased rate out of our own pocket, when we closed the deals with our customer on this 1914 contract rate with your people, and we simply have to ask you to carry out the contract between us, and entered into last spring.

Kindly advise your present sailing dates for Rotterdam covering a period of the next three weeks, and whether you can arrange to take two or three carloads on each steamer.

An early response will much oblige.

Yours, very truly,

LEVI SMITH (LTD.),
H. F. HEILMAN.

EXHIBIT 3C.

[Levi Smith (Ltd.), refiner of Pennsylvania petroleum products.]

CLARENDON, PA., *November 4, 1914.*

Messrs. LEVI SMITH (Ltd.),
Clarendon, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: We duly received your favor of the 31st ultimo regarding four cars of mineral colza oil that you wish to ship to Rotterdam under your freight contract with us.

We have no objection to taking this oil, provided, of course, we receive necessary permit from the Dutch Government through our New York office to do so, and we can not make any definite booking until this permit has been received.

As regards the rate of freight, please note that we have been instructed by our principals to advance all contract rates 50 per cent, so that the lowest rate that we can accept on any of your shipments now is 33 cents per 100 pounds. This is a general rule that has been put into effect at all ports and from which we can not deviate.

Our present sailings are as follows: Steamships *Socatdyk*, November 15; *Westerdyk*, November 21; *Randwyk*, November late—early December.

As regards the question of war risk, this is changing from time to time, and we think you would do better by waiting until the shipment is ready to go forward before obtaining any insurance figures.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) DRESEL, RAUSCHENBERG & Co.,
Agents Holland-American Line, Baltimore, Md.

EXHIBIT 4.

[Telegram.]

BOSTON, MASS., *December 30, 1914.*

WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of Treasury, Washington, D. C.:

We have been unable to make shipments wool from Buenos Aires to Boston or New York since December 15. Very little chance securing freight room for next 30 days account scarcity vessels. Have over $600,000 worth waiting shipment already paid for. Freight rates when available about 150 per cent increase over last year. Have difficulty getting marine insurance on sailing vessels at reasonable rates. Have placed $250,000 on American bark *Pilgrim*, 90 cents net. This is

a fair rate, but can not place more under $1.75 up to $2.25, which is extortionate. Of course, foreign companies not keen to assist movement American bottoms.

BROWN & ADAMS.

EXHIBIT 4A.

[Brown & Adams, wool commission merchants.]

BOSTON, MASS., *December 30, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wired you to-day as per confirmation inclosed, for the situation regarding shipments from Buenos Aires to New York or Boston is a most difficult one. Space by steamer is practically unobtainable at present. There is one Norwegian steamer, the *Sark*, which is expected to sail from Buenos Aires for New York or Boston about the middle of January. Our Buenos Aires representative cables us that he will be unable to ship anything during January except the small quantity, space for which he has reserved on this vessel, and whereas last year we paid freight at the rate of $4.50 per ton on steamers from Buenos Aires to Boston, the rate we shall have to pay per steamship *Sark* is $12 per ton. We chartered the American bark *Pilgrim* and sent her to Buenos Aires, owing to the fact that we thought some trouble of this sort might arise. Her capacity is 3,000 bales of wool—value, say, $750,000. We have been able to place marine insurance on this vessel to the extent of $250,000, at 90 cents net, but for additional amount the best quotations we can secure run from $1.75 to $2.25. As wired you, we have about $600,000 worth of wool paid for, waiting in Buenos Aires for shipment, and apparently very small chance of shipping within a reasonable time by steamer. When it comes to shipping under the American flag, we have to ship by sailing vessel, and the insurance companies charge a premium which is all out of reason.

Submitting the above situation to your consideration, we are,

Yours, truly,

BROWN & ADAMS.

EXHIBIT 5.

[Gano, Moore & Co. (Inc.), coal, coke, iron, steel, ores.]

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note in the newspapers considerable comment on the shortage of vessels to make shipments by American firms, and if there is any information that we can furnish you regarding this we shall be glad to do so.

The shortage of vessels is so serious now that it is practically stopping the exportation of coal. We have several orders for coal, principally to South American ports, and it is impossible to secure vessels, and coal firms who specialize in the exportation of coal have found it impossible to secure vessels of any description in which to make their shipments. Coal being an article which is always exported in large quantities, in full cargo shipments, the present situation is a very serious one for the coal firms, and if there is any assistance that you can give us, it will certainly be appreciated, not only by us, but by all exporters of coal.

Yours, very truly,

GANO, MOORE & CO. (INC.).

EXHIBIT 6.

[Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., importers and commission merchants.]

NEW YORK, *December 26, 1914.*

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: According to the article published in to-day's Journal of Commerce, you are calling upon the shippers for statements where freight charges are so high that American foreign trade is handicapped.

Just to show one instance, we respectfully beg to refer to the inclosed statement. A short time ago we shipped some powdered cocoa to our friends in Denmark. When again, a short time thereafter, we had occasion to ship the same commodity, the freight charges amounted to about 280 per cent higher, and upon remonstration with the steamship company we were told that this was the lowest rate that could be figured, and since then the steamship company has notified us that the next shipment will be charged a higher rate of freight. This naturally handicaps the export trade very seriously. It seems to us that this advance is absolutely out of proportion and out of all reason.

We merely write this, complying with your request to be furnished with such statements of overcharge in freight.

We beg to remain,

Most respectfully, yours,

STROHMEYER & ARPE CO.,
G. ROGERS, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT 6A.

[Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., importers and commission merchants.]

NEW YORK, *December 26, 1914.*

FREIGHT.

Steamship A, November 24, 1914:
40 barrels cocoa powder, gross 7,000 pounds $45.50
Steamship B, December 8, 1914:
106 barrels cocoa powder, gross 18,550 pounds 336.96

EXHIBIT 7.

[Inman, Akers & Inman.]

ATLANTA, GA., *December 28, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We notice through the papers request for information on the subject of foreign freights, and whereas you have doubtless received information from others confirmatory of this, we think it wise to add our mite to the general fund.

We are paying ocean freight from Savannah to Rotterdam and to Bremen of $2, $2.25, to $3 per hundredweight. Formerly the rates to these places were about 35 cents per hundredweight on cotton.

Coastwise steamers of the Mallory Line and Ocean Steamship Line are being offered for foreign freight service, induced by the extremely high rates prevailing.

Yours, truly,

INMAN, AKERS & INMAN,
By J. T. AKERS.

EXHIBIT 8.

[W. B. Cooper & Co., cotton merchants, owners Cooper Compress and Warehouse Co.]

WILMINGTON, N. C., *December 31, 1914.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Please allow us to indorse the action of the administration in trying to secure boats for the movement of American products. We are frank to say that as a general proposition we are not anxious to see the United States Government get into too many lines of business, but when 3 cents per pound, or more, is to be paid freight on cotton across the water against 35 cents per 100 pounds six months ago, it is time something should be done in our opinion.

Yours, very truly,

W. B. COOPER & CO.

EXHIBIT 9.

[Lesser-Goldman Cotton Co., cotton buyers.]

ST. LOUIS, MO., *December 30, 1914.*

Hon. WM. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From a newspaper clipping we note that facts are desired in regard to high ocean rates and scarcity of vessels to transport cotton and other products abroad.

The undersigned, the Lesser-Goldman Cotton Co., having been in the business of buying and exporting cotton for the last 40 years, are well able to express an opinion on this question, and we beg to submit the following:

Owing to the war, a great many steamers have been withdrawn from the carrying trade between North America and Great Britain and other ports in Europe, and freights for cotton have advanced steadily ever since the cotton season opened and have reached a point now where they compare very unfavorably with rates paid in former seasons.

We are giving you herewith a statement showing freights to various European ports from New Orleans and other Gulf ports, viz:

Freight on cotton per 100 pounds gross.

	September, October, November, 1914.	Present rates.	1913	1912
	Cents.		*Cents.*	*Cents.*
To Bremen, Germany			37	49
Liverpool-Manchester	57	$1.00	32	45
Havre, France		1.25	55	66
Genoa, Italy	86	1.25	46	56
Gottenborg, Sweden	90	2.00	80	80

In other words, for a bale of cotton weighing approximately 500 pounds the freight to Liverpool, at the present rate, would be $5 as against about $2.25 two years ago, and for freight to Gothenburg the present rate per bale is $10 per bale as against $4 per bale during the last two seasons. The rates mentioned above for the previous two seasons are average rates, as freight rates fluctuate like all other commodities and are subject to changes from day to day. However, the figures given above show the difference between freights paid on cotton exported to Europe in former years, when conditions of trade were normal, compared to present times.

As the quantity of cotton exported from the South runs into the millions of bales, the difference in freights on the volume of cotton exported is quite considerable and affects the price paid to the producer in the South to the amount of many millions of dollars.

In mentioning the freight rates from Gulf ports we will say that these rates are regulated by freight conditions in other ports from which exports of cotton are possible, and what we say about Gulf ports refers in equal manner to the Atlantic ports.

We trust that these data may be useful for whatever purpose this inquiry has been instituted, and the Lesser-Goldman Cotton Co. will be pleased to furnish any further information that might be desired by your department.

In addition, we will say that freight rates during 1912 and 1913 were comparatively high as against rates during prior seasons—in fact, previous to 1912 freight rates on cotton were as low as 30 cents and below per hundred pounds to Liverpool, and to other ports in proportion. Therefore, if comparisons are made of present conditions with those obtaining for a number of years prior to 1912, the losses which the producers suffer through the high freight rates amount to still greater sums than if we take only the last few seasons into consideration.

We take the liberty of inclosing herewith a copy of our letter addressed to the Hon. William J. Bryan, Secretary of State, touching upon the matter of delay in cables, as this matter also affects the export of cotton and therefore works to the disadvantage of the producers in this country. You will see from the contents of that letter that cables exchanged by us with neutral countries are subject to serious irregularities, and a great number of them are not delivered at all, probably owing to the action of the censors in foreign countries.

Yours, very truly,

LESSER-GOLDMAN COTTON CO.,
Per J. D. GOLDMAN, *President.*

[T. F. Jenings, hardwood manufacturer, "Switch Bud" brand, toughest on the market, second growth white hickory, oak, and ash, dimension stock a specialty.]

MARIANNA, FLA., *December 28, 1914.*

Secretary MCADOO, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Having noticed in a newspaper that data is requested of parties who are interested in the great advancement in rates on material exported to a neutral country, can give you the following information:

I am exporting hickory lumber in bundles to Christiania, Norway, and freight rates have become so exorbitant that it is almost out of the question to ship—for instance, a shipment I made on October 15 via Scandanavian from New York was 37s. per ton of 2,240 pounds, 5 per cent primage.

Inclosed please find two letters from the agents of this line which speak for themselves. The regular rate on this material before the war was around 30s., the rate on October 15 was 37s., their letter of November 24 runs it up to 75s. Within three weeks they again run this up as per their letter of December 14 to 100s.

Now I am compelled under the circumstances to shut down my business if this can not be rectified. Business is bad anyhow, but just such exorbitant charges as these are what is putting a stop to lots of business in this country.

I realize that steamers flying the American flag may be hard to get, but it seems to me that some arrangement should be made to protect such business as I am doing that is a benefit to this country and supplying labor with help during these difficult times.

I trust that you will be able to take such measures as will be necessary to alter these conditions, which appear to me to be caused by the steamship companies overstepping their rights.

Kindly give me what information you can, and when you are through with them, return the two letters I inclose.

If there is any other information you want that I can give, will be glad to do so.

Yours, truly,

T. F. JENINGS.

EXHIBIT 10A.

[Funch, Edye & Co., steamship agents and ship brokers, Maritime Building, 8–10 Bridge Street.]

NEW YORK, *November 24, 1914.*

Mr. T. F. JENINGS,
Marianna, Fla.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 19th instant duly received, and wish to advise that freight room has become very scarce and steamers hard to obtain. Our rate has been advanced on hickory lumber to 75/— and 5 per cent per 2,240 pounds, and we would be pleased to accommodate your shipment in the steamship *Hellig Olav* December 9. We will probably have a sailing between December 9 and January 2, but can not definitely state at present.

Kindly advise whether we should book your one car, and awaiting your further favors, we are,

Yours very truly,

FUNCH, EDYE & CO.,
Per J. M. SALZMANN.

EXHIBIT 10B.

[Funch, Edye & Co., steamship agents and ship brokers, Maritime Building, 8–10 Bridge Street.]

NEW YORK, *December 14, 1914.*

Mr. T. F. JENINGS,
Marianna, Fla.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 8th instant received, and in reply wish to inform you the present rate on hickory lumber from New York to Christiania, Norway, is 100 and 5 per cent per 2,240 pounds.

We have no room to offer prior to the steamship *United States*, March 11.

Yours, very truly,

FUNCH, EDYE & CO.,
Per W. A. SALZMANN.

EXHIBIT 11.

[The Long-Bell Lumber Co.]

KANSAS CITY, MO., *December 29, 1914.*

Mr. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In keeping with request made in the attached clipping from the Kansas City Times, I inclose you herewith a statement of our export orders now on file, showing name of customer where possible, stock, time of shipment, and port of sale. All of the stock is ready for loading, and in most cases the customer has needed the stock at the time it was purchased, but owing to their inability to secure tonnage the material is still at port deteriorating.

Just before the declaration of war we were able to charter vessels that would make a net rate equal to $7 per 1,000 feet to practically all of the European ports.

Also, for your information, I inclose a quotation from ship brokers issued under date of December 26, showing rates have advanced more than 300 per cent. For instance, the rate to Rotterdam before the war was 60 shillings per St. Petersburg standard; it is now 300 shillings. And it is almost impossible to get a small or parcel shipment of lumber to any port at any reasonable price. The prices now being demanded by the steamship companies are, in many cases, more than double anything I have ever heard of their making in the past, and I think the records will show that their present rates have never been equaled in the past half century at lease.

We have been advised by our representatives in England, Holland, Italy, and Germany that large volumes of orders for our lumber could be had at acceptable prices if we would quote c. i. f., but owing to the present condition of transportation facilities we are unable to make c. i. f. prices, and people who are buying from us f. a. s. our ports are unable to secure the lumber.

We now have in pile at port a little over 9,000,000 feet of lumber, or an approximate value of $280,000, all of which is deteriorating, and could be disposed of if shipping facilities would permit.

There are many others in the same condition as ourselves, and we sincerely hope you can do something to relieve the situation.

We also attach hereto a clipping from our representative in England, which will indicate to some extent the enormous profit being made by the British shipowners.

Yours, respectfully,

M. B. NELSON,
General Sales Manager.

Care of Mr. Ludwig Haymann, Hamburg, Germany; Mr. L. L. Chipman, Liverpool, England.

EXHIBIT 11A.

Statement of export orders requiring tonnage.

Buyer.	Stock.	Shipment.	Basis.
Rotterdam, Holland....	92,000 feet decking..	October to November.	F.a.s. Port Arthur.
Genoa, Italy.....	2,400,000 feet timber.	November to December.	Do.
Cable sale through our agents, Genoa, Italy.	1,200,000 feet timber.	January, 1915.	Do.
Do.....	1,215,000 feet timber.	.....do	Do.
Cable sale through our agents, Germany.	520,000 feet knocked down saps.	Before end March, 1915.	Do.
London, England.....	1,912,500 feet ties; 600,000 feet timber.	Before end September, 1915.	Do.
Liverpool, England.	20,000 feet timber....	November to December.	C. i. f. Liverpool.
Do.....	50,000 feet prime....	.....do	Do.
Do.....	50,000 feet prime....	December.....	Do.
Total.....	8,260,500 feet lumber and timber.		

EXHIBIT 11B.

[From the Liverpool Observer, Sunday, December 13, 1914.]

THE BOOM IN SHIPPING—RECORD PROFITS—HUGE SUMS MADE BY SHIPOWNERS—NOT EQUALED IN ANY PREVIOUS WAR.

[From a special correspondent.]

The British shipowning industry is to-day prospering as it has never done before. In every direction rates of freight have reached a level dreamed of only by the most sanguine.

At the outbreak of the war the outlook was not propitious. A strike of engineers—speedily settled in order to cause no embarrassment to the authorities—had resulted in a large number of steamers being hung up in our ports without employment. The attitude of Turkey over the closing of the Dardanelles rendered further trading in the Black Sea impossible, in addition to which Russia prohibited the export of grain. This market alone normally gives employment to a sixth of the vessels owned in Great Britain. There was thus a large quantity of shipping available for the transport of grain from the west, to which direction the belligerents turned for the supply of grain and other commodities. Canada and the United States were rejoicing in a bumper crop of wheat, and it was soon seen that they would have sufficient to supply all the wants of the allies

A large number of vessels were therefore sent across to America seeking for freights. Rates at first rose, mainly on account of the high war-risk insurance under the Government scheme. But the rush of steamers all into the same market, as might have been foreseen, gave rise to a congestion of shipping which resulted in an absolute slump. Rates of freight fell to as low as 2s. 6d. per quarter for the conveyance of wheat from North America to the United Kingdom or France. This could have been anything but a paying proposition to a shipowner whose insurance for war risk was so high under the Government scheme (which was then in its embryonic stage) and whose bunkers and stores were much enhanced in price.

The export of coal from this country had also been brought practically to a standstill owing to the "triple bond" which was established. This meant that the shipper had to deposit three times the value of each coal cargo exported as a bond that such cargo would not be sent to any other than the declared destination. There were other stringent regulations which bore even more hardly upon him, and great efforts were made to have all these disabilities removed.

THE RECOVERY.

The bond was finally withdrawn, and a demand sprang up for vessels to carry coals to the Mediterranean. This may be said to have been the point at which a general, though gradual, rise in freights had its inception.

Italy now came upon the scene with huge orders for coals for the Italian State railways. Her mobilization, though partial, was on a large scale, and large stocks of coal were essential. The outbreak of war almost seems to have caught her napping, for her supplies of coal and grain were very low indeed. She at once set about remedying the deficiency, and the resultant demand for steamers set up a competition with America. Rates of freight rose in September and October from 7s. 6d. to 11s. 6d. per ton, and many steamers were found whose owners considered it more profitable to run them out to Italy and home in ballast at this rate rather than run the risk of a loss in the American market.

Up to September and October shipments of grain from the Argentine were practically limited to maize, the wheat having been nearly all previously shipped. There was thus not much competition from this direction.

GERMANY OFF THE SEAS.

America by this time was beginning to feel the effects of the additional avenues of employment which were being opened up, and about the end of October a distinct scarcity of steamers was beginning to be manifest. It must not be overlooked that the German mercantile navy was nonexistent. In normal times their liners and "tramp" steamers did a large trade with America, which now reverted to British vessels. In addition, the British Admiralty were largely employing colliers and transports, so much so that at the present time they have over 1,500 vessels under charter, at a cost to the country of something like £2,500,000 per month.

The feature of the boom which has set in is the demand for grain and coal for Italy. To this may be directly traced the rise in freights which has reached such proportions to-day. It is difficult to say what it portends. While hundreds of thousands of quarters of wheat and oats have been bought and shipped for the use of the allies, the insistent demand for steamers to convey these commodities to Italy has resulted in the forcing up of rates of freight from the 2s. 6d. per quarter which has already been mentioned to 7s. 6d. per quarter for France and 6s. 6d. per quarter to the United Kingdom. For Italy the rates have risen from 3s. per quarter in October to 8s. 6d. to-day.

HUGE PROFITS.

The significance of these figures to the British shipowner may be grasped when it is pointed out that a steamer with a capacity of 6,000 tons before the rise made a gross freight of nearly £4,000, while now she would earn over £11,000. To Italy she would make a gross amount of nearly £13,000. Before the rise she would be barely paying her expenses, but with rates at their present level a 6,000 tonner is making a profit for her owner of £7,000 to £8,000 on every trans-Atlantic voyage. Such a steamer can make about five such voyages a year, so that at the present rates the owner will be making from £35,000 to £40,000 per annum. And the end of the boom is not yet. There is bound to be a huge demand for steamers to carry cotton. It is stated that America is this year in possession of the largest cotton crop she has ever grown, and already vessels are being chartered at rates which greatly exceed any previous records.

From Argentina the principal grain export consists of maize between May and November. Consequently, as Europe depends upon wheat for sustenance, the commencement of the war did not see a great amount of chartering from South America.

THE WHEAT SHIPMENTS.

The shipment of wheat commences from the end of December, however, and already many vessels have been chartered, the rates of freight for steamers which will be ready to load in January and early February rising within the last month or two from 20s. per ton to 37s. 6d. It is generally reckoned that a steamer carrying about 5,000 tons of cargo can pay expenses if her outward freight from this country and home from South America together amount to about 25s. The freight out from Cardiff to-day is about 16s., so that the gross freight of such a steamer would amount to 53s. 6d. Thus, on a round voyage, about 28s. 6d., or nearly £7,200, will be net profit. A steamer of this type could make about four voyages per annum, so that, running in this trade, the owner would net something like £28,000 to £29,000 a year.

The beginning of the season has not seen a large number of steamers chartered to Italy, but it is now stated that, in addition to the enormous quantities which are being imported from North America, the Italian Government has purchased some 400,000 tons of wheat and oats from the Argentine Republic for shipment from the River Plate.

STILL HIGHER FREIGHTS COMING.

This will require something like 80 steamers to transport and is bound to result in still higher freights for the shipowners. The demand for steamers to fill these additional requirements will draw vessels away from North America, which will cause freights from that direction also to rise. Further vessels will be required to carry coals to the Mediterranean, and the competition of these other markets will doubtless result in coal shippers having to pay still larger rates of freight to attract steamers in their direction.

Another remarkable aspect of the present boom has been the demand on the part of Italy for coal. She has not been content to import this commodity from this country alone, but has drawn largely upon North America. She has had to compete with the enormous freights which are being paid for grain; 8s. 6d. per quarter for grain is equivalent to about 39s. per ton. The rates paid for the shipment of coal from North America to Italy have risen from 13s. in September to the equivalent of 40s. per ton at the present time.

400 PER CENT RISE.

The most recent instance was the case of a steamer which has been chartered at 20s. per ton on the steamer's dead-weight carrying capacity for the trip across. This is known as "time charter" and is equivalent to the hiring of a cab by the hour. The charterers pay the entire expense of running the steamer and run all the risk of any delay which may arise in her loading and discharging. The normal rate for the chartering of a steamer for such a trip on this basis is 5s. per ton dead-weight—a clear rise of 400 per cent.

Coal rates from Cardiff to the Mediterranean have risen from about 7s. 6d. to 16s. 3d. per ton freight. An owner can pay the expenses of his steamer in this direction when he makes 8s. per ton. He can thus afford to run his steamer out with cargo and back in ballast, and at 16s. 3d. he will make about 8s. per ton profit. The round voyage occupies about a month. Thus, the owner of a 6,000-tonner running in this trade can make something like £34,000 per annum profit.

SHIPBUILDERS BUSY, TOO.

In every direction it will be seen that huge profits are to be made in the shipping industry. Nor are shipowners the only ones to feel the boom. The prosperity has created a demand for more ships. The price of steamers is rising daily, and shipbuilders are booking so many orders that their yards will be full for some years to come. Many shipowners also are selling off their old tonnage at prices which they never dreamed of before the outbreak of war.

Investigation goes to show that the present boom has been of a much greater nature than during other wars. After the Franco-Prussian war, for instance, the boom did not set in until some 12 months after the declaration of peace. By this time the nations had time to turn round, and finance was readjusted. And then the rise in freights was more gradual. It was not until 1882 that the top of the rise appeared.

It is interesting to note that the only rate approximating to present figures was paid to the Ben Nevis, a steamer with a carrying capacity of 7,500 quarters, or about 1,500 tons, which obtained 8s. 3d. per quarter from New Orleans to Rouen. So much have "tramp" steamers increased in size that anything nowadays with a capacity of under 25,000 quarters, or about 5,000 tons, is considered a small steamer, and a 1,500-tonner is thought to be far too small to cross the Atlantic.

EXHIBIT 11C.

[George Gerdes & Co., foreign freight brokers and forwarding agents.]

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *December 26, 1914.*

Since our circular last week our freight market remains practically unchanged. For some ports the scarcity of tonnage continues, and at the present time, January, room for nearly all ports have been filled.

All rates subject to confirmation before booking.

Rates quoted in cents per hundred pounds, shillings per standard, and dollars per thousand superficial feet.

Liverpool: Harrison and Leyland lines are not quoting at present. Elder Dempster for February are quoting 55 cents, on hardwood lumber.

Glasgow: Maclay Prentice Line, January-February, quote hardwoods, 50 cents; softwoods, 53 cents; cottonwood, 57 cents; pine, $20.

Dublin: Head Line, February-March, hardwood, 51 cents; medium woods, 54 cents; cottonwood, 58 cents; pine, $21.50.

Havre: February, French Line, freight prepaid, hardwoods, 70 cents; cottonwood and tupelo, 75 cents; pine, 19 cents.

Rotterdam: February-March, agents' option Holland-American Line prepaid, hardwoods, 95 cents; cottonwood and tupelo, 100 cents; pine, 300s.

Amsterdam: February-March, agents' option Holland-Amsterdam Line prepaid, hardwoods, 97 cents; cottonwood and tupelo, 102 cents; pine, 315s.

Genoa: Creole Line, February, hardwoods, 82 cents; cottonwood and tupelo, 87 cents; pine, 225s.

Christiana, Gothenburg: February, hardwood, 90 cents; softwoods, 95 cents; prepaid.

Yours, truly,

GEO. GERDES & CO.

Belfast: Head Line, February-March, agents' option hardwoods, 50 cents; medium woods, 53 cents; cottonwood, 57 cents; pine, $20.

EXHIBIT 12.

[Alphonse Weil & Bros.]

NEW YORK, *December 26, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We notice in this morning's New York Times that you would like to be informed with regard to advances in ocean-freight charges. We intended to ship a large quantity of oats to the other side, but were prevented from doing so on account of the rate of freight advancing from 4s. per bushel to 6s. 6d. We are told that the reason of this advance is due to the fact that there are very few vessels available at the present time.

Yours, respectfully,

ALPHONSE WEIL & BROS.

EXHIBIT 13.

[Pittsburgh Provision & Packing Co., beef and pork packers, Union Stock Yards.]

PITTSBURGH, PA., *December 30, 1914.*

HON. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are advised that a statement has been issued by you calling upon all shippers who have been affected by high ocean rates and scarcity of vessels to send facts to the Treasury or Commerce Departments.

We are exporters of provisions, etc., to Mamburg, Germany; Rotterdam, Holland; London and Liverpool, England. Early in 1914 we signed contracts covering rates on export freight to London and Liverpool, via Atlantic Transport Line and White Star Line from New York, with J. D. Roth, general western freight agent of the above named lines, in which we were named ocean rate of 20 shillings—5 per cent per gross ton. These rates have been raised 10 shillings per gross ton since the beginning of the war, they claiming that their steamers are operating under greatly increased expenses, such as coaling for the round trip and the high premiums asked in the matter of war insurance, etc., also claiming that a great number of their steamers have been requisitioned by the British Government. It is also necessary for us to obtain confirmation of space on a given steamer should we desire to ship for a special sailing. At present, it is almost impossible to obtain booking for London and Liverpool, the steamship company claiming that they are booked ahead.

On December 20 we endeavored to reserve space via the Holland-American Line for shipment of 75 tcs. oleo oil to Rotterdam, Holland, and received advice on the 26th inst. that there was no available room on Holland-American Line steamer clearing from New York on January 7, and that they were booked up to the latter part of January.

Several of our shipments via the Holland-American Line, consigned to Daniel Loeb, Rotterdam, Holland, have been held up by the British Government for a period, which has resulted in considerable delay in the goods reaching destination, although they were consigned to a neutral country.

As our goods are sold on an f. o. b. Pittsburgh basis we are not affected to any great extent by the increase in ocean rates, but are seriously handicapped by our inability to secure booking and by the requirements of the British and French Governments in reference to consignments to private individuals in Holland, a neutral country.

Yours, very truly,

PITTSBURGH PROVISION & PACKING CO.

EXHIBIT 14.

[The Fenton Art Glass Co., manufacturers and decorators of tableware and novelties.]

WILLIAMSTOWN, W. VA., *December 28, 1914.*

The Hon. WM. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We are just advised by one of our large customers in England that in trying to fix up a contract for ocean freight rate from Philadelphia to England for the year 1915, that he has received a cable from Philadelphia quoting him a rate that is 60 per cent higher than the contract he had for 1914.

We sell this customer from $25,000 to $40,000 worth of goods per year of a cheap line of ware that sells in England in the same class of stores as our American 10-cent stores are, so that if the rates are advanced to this extent it will practically take our ware out of that market.

Will you kindly do whatever you can to keep the rates down and within reason, and if there is any information we can give you along this line, we should be glad to have you call upon us.

Yours, very truly,

THE FENTON ART GLASS CO.
F. L. FENTON,
President and Treasurer.

EXHIBIT 15.

[Chattanooga Wheelbarrow Co.]

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *December 26, 1914.*

W. G. MCADOO,
Treasurer, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We see by press notice that you wish information from shippers who have been handicapped on account of high ocean rates and scarcity of vessels. This has affected us very considerably in getting shipments to England.

On November 17 we made carload shipment to Savannah for forwarding to Liverpool by the Strachan Line. Our customers, we understand, contracted on this for a 7½ cents per cubic foot rate. The boat on which space had been engaged was diverted from Liverpool to London and shipment was held until December 9 and our customers were forced to pay rate of 10 cents before they would agree to handle same at that time.

We expect to have a regular monthly movement to Liverpool to this particular customer. We have been endeavoring for about a month to get a shipment through some of the Atlantic or Gulf ports for shipment to Bristol or Liverpool. Customer originally had arrangements made to ship through Savannah by the Strachan Line on a 10 cents per cubic foot rate, but this was canceled. We then took the matter up and were quoted rate of 60 cents per 100 pounds by steamer *Adelina*, Spanish flag, from Pensacola, this 60 cents including transshipment from Liverpool to Bristol.

This data was given to our customers, but when it came to signing for space they refused to honor the rate quoted. We are still holding this carload trying to get booking through some of the various steamship companies, and in this connection would state we have three more cars which we want to get out early in the year, provided we can get them handled from port. The Head Line Steamship Co. from New Orleans are quoting February sailing of $1.25 per 100 pounds for Bristol. It is almost imperative for us to forward these through some of the southern ports owing to the fact that we are at such a disadvantage on inland rates to New York.

If you can give us any assistance or furnish us with any data as to the best manner in which to handle this with the various steamship lines operating out of Atlantic or Gulf ports, we will appreciate it very much indeed.

Yours, very truly,

CHATTANOOGA WHEELBARROW CO.,
By H. W. LONGGLEY, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT 16.

[American Vulcanized Fibre Co.]

WILMINGTON, DEL., *December 28, 1914.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have seen from newspaper reports that a statement was issued calling upon all shippers who have been affected by high ocean freight rates and scarcity of vessels to communicate such information to the Treasury.

We are now taking the liberty to inform you that we have been experiencing considerable trouble in obtaining space on steamers going to Scandinavian countries. For example, we have been informed by the Scandinavian-American Line that no space can be had on any of their steamers until the middle of March and April. Shipments via other lines are also very scarce, and no space can be had for a considerable time. The freight rates are also very high, and have been raised from 40 shillings to 65 and 70 shillings for shipments to Copenhagen.

While we are not experiencing any particular trouble with reference to shipping to England, we wish to state, however, that we have been informed a few days ago that the freight rate for vulcanized fiber from Philadelphia to London has been raised from 15 shillings to 30 shillings per ton. This is a raise of 100 per cent and, in our opinion, is not entirely justified. It seems to us that the shipping interests are taking advantage of the present disturbed times, which naturally will tend to hurt the American foreign trade.

If the Treasury Department could enlighten us in some of these points, we would indeed greatly appreciate it. We furthermore would be very thankful to the Treasury Department for any help which it may be able to give in connection with the adjustment of freight rates and shipping facilities.

All the aforesaid points make it very difficult indeed to keep up the established business relations with customers in neutral countries, and any action which would further the facilities of conditions necessary for the keeping up of the good relations between neutral customers and American manufacturers would be heartily indorsed by us.

If you have any information on the foregoing subject, we would indeed be glad to hear from you.

Very truly, yours,

AMERICAN VULCANIZED FIBRE CO.,
T. W. CAMPBELL, *Vice President.*

EXHIBIT 17.

[A. Gross & Co. (Inc.), stearic acid, candles, red oil, and glycerin.]

NEW YORK, *December 26, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of Treasury, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: Permit us, please, to lay before you our complaint against the scarcity of ships and the exorbitant rate of freight now being charged on shipments of our commodities to the various foreign ports, which seriously handicaps our business.

We therefore feel that something should be done by our Government to relieve the present situation, since it so seriously interferes with our foreign business.

Trusting that you may be able to take prompt steps to remedy this condition, we beg to remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. GROSS & CO.,
J. A. BURNS, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT 18.

[Fee-Crayton Hardwood Lumber Co., makers and exporters of quartered and plain oak, hickory, ash, and walnut.]

DERMOTT, ARK., *December 28, 1914.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as we have been seriously affected and our business very much handicapped by the high ocean rates on our shipments of harwood lumber, we are glad of an opportunity of coming to our big and benevolent policeman who is our Secretary of the Treasury.

We have had a good business with all these belligerent nations outside of Russia, and our trade has extended over a period of a quarter of a century, and we can say that it is now a serious menace to our business by reason of our inability to get reasonable and, in some cases our inability to get any, ocean rates on our production of hardwood lumber. We usually ship through the port of New Orleans to British and continental ports. The writer has been to New Orleans personally and is informed by the steamship agents that they are receiving a tonnage of cotton and wheat and other commodities for the belligerents at such high rates and at such easier loading and unloading that they make tremendous profits for their vessels, and they do not want to take lumber tonnage. We can say that we have before us inquiries for many carloads of lumber which could be shipped immediately provided reasonable rates could be had.

We had contracts last year for tonnage to Liverpool, London, Glasgow, Belfast, etc., ranging from 22 to 30 cents per hundred weight, and now on some of these ports the rates are from 50 to 50 cents and lumber values make these rates absolutely impossible. Steamship agents tell me that their bottoms are filled with grain, cotton, etc., for months to come. We are told that cotton brings $2 per hundred weight to Rotterdam, whereas rates last year were a maximum of 46 cents per hundredweight. Further, one of the steamship agent's commission for a single month was $25,000 for the month.

We trust that there is some way in which our National Government can arrange whereby lumber traffic can be resumed at something like a reasonable rate. We will be glad to receive information that will point out anything that we can do that will have a tendency to help us out.

Yours, very truly,

FEE-CRAYTON HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
FRANK F. FEE, *President.*

EXHIBIT 19.

[National Lumber Exporters Association.]

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 30, 1914.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice from press reports that you, in connection with the Department of Commerce, are investigating the matter of ocean freight rates, and I take the liberty of calling your attention to the enormous, and what appear to be unreasonable, increases in ocean rates on lumber and other forest products which have been made by the steamship companies since the outbreak of war. For your information I give you below rates from various United States ports to foreign ports that were in effect prior to the war and rates that are now being asked:

FROM NEW ORLEANS.

	July, 1914.	December, 1914.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
Amsterdam	25	97
Belfast	28	50
Christiania	33	90
Dublin	29	46
Genoa	30	82
Glasgow	29	50
Gottenborg	33	90
Havre	27	65
Liverpool	25	55
London	26	65
Rotterdam	23	95

FROM NEW YORK.

Aberdeen	22½	31
Glasgow	17	28
Havre	21	40
Hull	17	28
Liverpool	13	25
London	17½	27½

FROM BALTIMORE.

Belfast	22	35
Dublin	23	36
Glasgow	20	30
Liverpool	16	28
London	21½	30½

To many of the ports steamship lines refuse to quote rates at all, as they claim that more tonnage is being offered than they can take care of.

You will note from the above that the advance in rates from New Orleans is much more pronounced than from North Atlantic ports and, as a matter of fact, the New Orleans rates being asked are practically prohibitory.

If there is any further information you would like to have on this subject, I should be pleased, if possible, to give it to you.

Yours, very truly,

J. MCD. PRICE, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT 20.

[Empire Cotton Oil Co.]

ATLANTA, GA., *December 28, 1914.*

Mr. W. G. MCADOO, *Secretary of Treasury,*
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Agreeable to Governmental request, beg to advise that this company is experiencing considerable trouble in booking shipments of cottonseed meal, cake, and linters to foreign ports. In fact, we have been endeavoring since the 19th instant to find space for cottonseed meal and cake of approximately 3,000 tons to Liverpool and London, and the very best offer received up to the 24th instant was $8.50 per ton from Savannah to Liverpool, January-February sailing, and not exceeding 1,000 tons at that. However, in endeavoring to book this

lot to-day, the Strachan Shipping Co., agents, Savannah, have just wired as follows:

"Regret can not confirm thousand meal Liverpool eight fifty. Freight market advancing on firm offer to-day nine dollars. Feel sure can place January-February shipment."

To which the following is our reply:

"Your wire date. Best we can stand is eight fifty. Will book one thousand tons at that. Advise."

Further, it appears that the Strachan Shipping Co. are the only ones that have any space at all in sight for January-February for commodities other than cotton, they advising us on the 21st instant they are unable, at the moment, to quote a rate on meal or cake from either Charleston or Jacksonville and have but limited room from Savannah and Brunswick, going on to say that they can not assure us of January room from either of these ports at present. Also that the tonnage market is exceedingly strong and steamers scarce. Therefore, they are experiencing the greatest difficulty in securing boats to cover their actual January commitments, consequently would not care, at the moment, to quote a guaranteed shipment that month.

We are also advised by the Churchill Line, also by the J. H. W. Steele Co., of Savannah, as well as Street Bros., of Charleston, S. C., that they have no space at all, and to the further effect that just now tonnage, especially as regards neutral boats, is scarce and rates high.

In fact, the result of our inquiries along this line principally develops that shipowners have restricted their vessels almost exclusively to cotton by charter or at very high rates, one of my informants placing the charter price at $12 per bale.

The best quotation we have had from Norfolk is $8 per short ton, while the rates quoted us from Savannah, above mentioned, are for ton of 2,240 pounds.

So far we have been unable to secure quotations to London, Rotterdam, or any ports other than Liverpool.

Yours, very truly,

E. P. McBURNEY, *Vice President.*

EXHIBIT 21.

[Phoenix Iron & Steel Co. (Inc.), iron and steel, railway supplies.]

GALVESTON, TEX., *December 26, 1914.*

Secretary McADOO,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your call for information from shippers who have been affected by high ocean freights, beg to advise we are shippers of old rails and scrap iron and steel.

We have in the past paid various rates of freight, from 12s. to 18s. per ton; however, steamship companies now either quote abnormal freights or refuse to quote at all, so it is impossible to ship any material, as the freights in some cases amount to three-fourths of the delivered price of the commodity.

The Texas Transport & Terminal Co. have carried practically all of our material from New Orleans and Galveston to Genoa, Italy. This steamship company has now asked us 45s. per ton for January, February, and March, and the material itself is only worth about 60s. per ton delivered.

The above facts are given for your information, and in case you can suggest some remedy, or possibly would like to see the writer regarding other details of this matter, he would take great pleasure in seeing you in Washington at any time you may state.

Yours, very truly,

PHOENIX IRON & STEEL CO.,
LEONARD JOSEPHS, *President.*

EXHIBIT 22.

[Newburger Cotton Co., producers, buyers, and exporters of cotton.]

MEMPHIS, TENN., *December 7, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. McADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The cotton pool, raising money for the farmer to carry his cotton, is a splendid idea and has everyone's indorsement; but the real thing you want to do is to make a market for the farmers' cotton, so as he can sell it if he so desires.

I have on my desk several very important inquiries for cotton for Germany and feel satisfied that at least a million bales of cotton could be sold to Germany and Austria at once if freight room at a reasonable price could be secured and, above all, that the "war risk" would cover the shipments absolutely.

Now, can not you find a way for the Government to furnish us ships and guaranteeing the delivery of the cotton either at Gottenborg, Rotterdam, or Copenhagen? The importance of this move you can realize in a moment when you think that every bale of cotton that is held over and not spun becomes a weight on the market and reduces the chances of an advance later on that much. You can not grind the mill with the water that has passed, and when a spindle stops operating and the cotton is not being used it becomes a dead weight on the market, it matters not how much you advance against it.

Now, what we want is open markets and a chance to ship our cotton. If this can be done the cotton pool will only be used limitedly. The rate from New Orleans to-day to Gottenborg is $1.50 per hundredweight; and to Rotterdam $2 per hundredweight. This is three and four times the regular rate. Suppose a rate of $1 was effected and with a "war risk" of not over 50 cents per bale, this would enable you at once to take a million bales of cotton off of the market. Can't you suggest some outlet for these conditions?

A steamship loaded with 10,000 bales of cotton at $3 per hundredweight, or $15 per bale, realizes, gross, $150,000 for the cargo, when the vessel itself is not worth exceeding $125,000. For such conditions there certainly should be some remedy.

Yours, very truly,

JOS. NEWBURGER.

EXHIBIT 23.

[L. & E. Frenkel, importers of electric specialties.]

NEW YORK, *December 31, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY McADOO,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We notice in the papers that you would like to have some information regarding freight rates, and we herewith have much plasure in relating to you some experience we had lately.

We procured orders to ship gas coal to Italy, but on account of the high shipping rates we can not ship same. As you know, America has large, rich, coal mines; nevertheless, American gas coal could not be sold in Europe, owing to the fact that shipping from England is cheaper during time of peace. Through the war, England has raised the price of gas coal, and now Italy and France are asking for American coal, which gives America a good chance to introduce its coal on the European market, but the shipping rates have been raised from 11 shillings to 38 shillings, which is the approximate rate asked to-day; therefore, it is impossible to compete even with the high price of English coal.

The cause of these rates being augmented so is, to our belief, that England is protecting her coal business; therefore instructed shipowners to raise the freight rates.

The only way to compete with these high rates is to allow exporters of coal the privilege of engaging United States colliers at, say, a cost price, by guaranteeing with a certificate that the coal is for a neutral country. We know the United States is spending money to study why American coal can not be sold abroad, and we think this is the only way to help out the exporters and at the same time introduce American gas coal in Europe.

We are willing to engage any steamer at a moment's notice for twice the amount the gas coal is worth in America.

Trusting that something will be done in this matter soon, we are

Very respectfully,

L. & E. FRENKEL,
E. FRENKEL.

EXHIBIT 24.

[Klomatia Planter's Co. (Unincorporated), successors to S. J. Wright.]

KIOMATIA, RED RIVER COUNTY, TEX., *December 27, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM McADOO,
Secretary Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice from the press reports that you expressed a desire to learn something of the excessive ocean freight rates which are now being charged to foreign ports.

I have been requested to act as chairman of a marketing committee of the Northeast Texas District Farmers' Union, to try and market some of our cotton direct from the farmers to European spinners, and we would like to reach Germany and Austria with some cotton. The ordinary rate from Gulf ports to these points is about 50 cents per hundred pounds, but I have been informed that as much as $3 per hundred pounds has been charged on cotton.

We also find it will be difficult to secure a steamer.

I am advised that the United States Government has a number of transports which might be used as cotton carriers, and I am also advised that there are some German ships which could be purchased in some Gulf ports.

Is it possible for you to arrange so that we can secure a ship, and pay only a reasonable freight rate from here to Germany and Austria?

I would like this information as early as possible, as we will have to make arrangements to concentrate this cotton in either Galveston or New Orleans, and our ability to finance it will determine which port we will use.

I wish to state in advance this will be a transaction for and in behalf of the farmers who have been able to hold their cotton and not forced to sacrifice it at beggarly prices, which has been the fate of thousands of farmers in our State.

Awaiting your prompt advices, I am, yours, very respectfully,

R. D. BOWEN.

EXHIBIT 25.

[E. K. Victor & Co., leaf tobacco, strips, stems, and scraps.]

RICHMOND, VA., *December 28, 1914.*

His Excellency WILLIAM GIBBS McADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have seen in the Times-Dispatch, published in this city, that your excellency is requesting information regarding rates of freight which have been advanced since the European war started, and we take, therefore, the liberty to comply with this request. Our business, which is almost entirely export, has been greatly hampered owing to the advance in rates of freight as well as to the high rates of war insurance. Formerly we used to pay about 20 to 30 cents per 100 on leaf tobacco and tobacco stems ocean freight to Rotterdam; these have now been advanced to $1. We have orders to ship a lot of tobacco stems for Germany via Genoa, and we are asked a rate of freight of $1.50 per 100 from New York to that port, which is more than the value of the goods.

We have not made any shipments to Great Britain since the war started, but have kept our tobacco here. We understand, however, from one of our friends, that the rate of freight to Great Britain now is 1 cent per pound, against about 20 cents per 100 pounds in normal times.

We were charged 5 per cent war insurance from New York to Christiania, Norway. Our correspondent in Norway writes us that he is not willing to pay this, as he can cover the insurance there for 1½ per cent, and he has charged us with the difference; this insurance was covered in the Boston Insurance Co.

We have been trying, through the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, to get a statement from the French Government that they, as well as the British Government, would not interfere with shipments of tobacco nor tobacco stems in neutral vessels to neutral ports. So far we have been unable to obtain any such assurance.

We understand that the British ambassador has given assurance in Washington that his country would not interfere with such shipments of tobacco, but we hear now from our forwarding agent at New York, as well as from one of the steamship lines, with whom we are negotiating for freight, that we have to make out an affidavit that the tobacco or tobacco stems which we are shipping to Italy will not be reexported from there to any other country.

If we should make such an affidavit the Italian consul would know perfectly well that we were making a misstatement and the British consul would know also, as there is a tobacco monopoly in Italy and no tobacco can be shipped there unless it be consigned to the Italian Government or it be wanted for reexportation to some other country.

If it is true that no interference with tobacco or tobacco stems will be made it does not look reasonable that we should be compelled to make such an affidavit before the Italian and British consuls.

We are greatly hampered in our business, not only because the banks here do not seem to be disposed to loan out money in order to move the tobacco crop, but owing to these various restrictions and the almost prohibitive rates of freight, also the inability of selling foreign exchange.

Yours, respectfully,

E. K. VIETOR & CO.

EKV/G

EXHIBIT 26.

[Smokeless Fuel Co., miners and shippers New River and Pocahontas smokeless coal.]

NEW YORK, *December 29, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington.

SIR: As a matter of consideration at the forthcoming conference in relation to American shipping, it strikes us that, while waiving for the time the inability, insufficiency, and lack of desire of American shipping to cooperate with shippers of American coal to South American ports in competition with Cardiff, particularly—competition being almost solely a matter of transportation—it would be well to note the fact that our west coast is now open to and is already trading with Cardiff shippers under relatively favorable transportation rates, notwithstanding the haul is one and a half times that from Hampton Roads to, say, San Francisco. American shippers (not the United States Government) are prohibited the use of the advantage of competition of foreign-flag ships in the movement from the east to the west coast. It would appear that if American shippers are prohibited from availing themselves of the same character of competition that is enjoyed by the United States Government under similar conditions that some provision should be made for the protection of American shipping interests, that they may enjoy the willing trade of their compatriots, instead of using the canal to open up markets of the United States to Cardiff coal. Since American shippers of coal are willing and do make a decidedly lower price for their product than English competitors on similar grades of coal, it must be clear that the matter of transportation is "a nut to crack."

Respectfully,

J. A. RENAHAN.

EXHIBIT 27.

[The Black Diamond.]

NEW YORK, *December 30, 1914.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Noting the investigation being made by your department into the vessel and freight rate situation, the writer believes that you can obtain some very pertinent information on this question from some of the principal coal companies who are now engaged in exporting coal. This business has been almost prostrated by the inability of shippers to secure vessels and upon terms that will permit them to make shipments.

Under separate cover we are mailing you two copies of The Black Diamond of the issues of December 12 and 26.

In these two numbers you will find several marked articles that we believe would be of interest to you, inasmuch as they deal with transportation questions.

Very truly, yours,

THE BLACK DIAMOND,
R. M. BRYAN, *Eastern Manager.*

EXHIBIT 28.

[McEwen Lumber Co., manufacturers and dealers in hardwood and white pine lumber, hardwood flooring.]

AZALEA, N. C., *December 29, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to item in New York Herald indicating your desire for information concerning the effect of the present ocean rates upon business, would say that for our part the present rates are practically prohibitive, as they have advanced 10 and 15 cents per hundredweight, and in many cases even these rates are not protected, except for immediate acceptance and subject to confirmation by steamship lines, thus making it impossible for shipper to quote delivered prices with any certainty that the rates on which he bases his quotations would be confirmed. Further than this, it is our information that the steamship companies are giving other tonnage carrying higher freight rates preference, and in some instances are limiting their boats to a certain small amount of lumber tonnage. There is certainly a need of more boats and some method of obtaining reasonable and dependable rates which shall be protected long enough at least that we might be able to get quotations by mail to our customer on the other side and his reply.

As illustrative of the present situation, we quote you below from letters received from the Virginia Line, operating from Norfolk and Newport News, upon whom we are dependent for the larger amount of our export business:

"We further beg to advise that we will only be able to make contracts for a specific number of cars for shipment by one steamer. In other words, we will not be able to make contracts for a maximum and minimum number of cars for shipment over a period of time.

"You must not feel that this is an arbitrary position which we are taking, as such is not the case, and it is due entirely to circumstances over which we have no control. So many of our steamers have been requisitioned by the admiralty that we have not enough steamers to go around, and if you are at all familiar with the vessel situation you will know that there is an extreme shortage in vessel tonnage due to the fact that the British Admiralty has requisitioned about 25 per cent of the vessels under the British flag, and the further fact that all of the German and Austrian steamers are laid up. If conditions were normal we would have plenty of vessels to take care of all tonnage offering and would be only too glad to place the room at the disposal of our friends, but as our available tonnage has been reduced more than 50 per cent, it is simply a question of doing the best we can and apportioning our room as equitably as possible."

You will see from the above that we have no certain assurance of being able to forward our lumber, and all the charges, storage, trackage, etc., that might accumulate at seaport owing to the steamship lines' failure or inability to take the lumber would be at our expense.

Trusting that this letter may be of service to you, and that some relief may be obtained, we remain,

Yours, very truly,

McEWEN LUMBER CO.,

W. B. MCEWEN, *President.*

EXHIBIT 29.

[McEwen Lumber Co., manufacturers and dealers in hardwood and white-pine lumber, hardwood flooring.]

AZALEA, N. C., *January 8, 1915.*

Mr. A. J. PETERS,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging yours of the 5th instant and supplementing our letter of the 29th ultimo, we beg to quote below letter dated December 30 from Lunham & Moore, export freight brokers, Produce Exchange, New York City, written to us in response to our application for rates to Copenhagen:

"Your favor of the 28th instant to hand. Lumber rates are not very encouraging, and the best we can quote you to-day is as follows, which apply from New York only to both Copenhagen and Christiania: Oak lumber, 100 shillings and 5 per cent per 2,240 pounds; poplar lumber, 102 shillings 6 pence and 5 per cent per 2,240 pounds.

"All freight to be prepaid. *We quite realize that these rates are entirely too high to enable you to make shipments.* No room until March–April steamship agents' option."

From the above you will note the high rates asked for movement of freight. These rates amount on oak lumber to about $45 per 1,000 feet. On poplar lumber to about $35 per 1,000 feet.

Our last quotation on lumber moving from New York City to Copenhagen and Christiania just prior to the outbreak of the war was 31 cents per 100 pounds, as against the rate named above, which is equivalent to $1.14 per 100 pounds on oak lumber. Poplar in proportion. We mention this for your information, and if there is anything further that you wish to know along this line we will be glad to communicate further with you.

Yours, very truly,

MCEWEN LUMBER CO.

EXHIBIT 30.

[Hooker Electrochemical Co.]

NEW YORK, *December 28, 1914.*

Hon. WM. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We notice by the press that the Government desires information in reference to export rates and the difficulties which business is meeting with in regard to foreign trade.

We are manufacturers of caustic soda, with one of the largest electrolytic plants in this country, located at Niagara Falls, N. Y. We have been endeavoring for the past three years to build up an export business on caustic soda. Our main competitors are Brunner Mond & Co., and United Alkali Co., of England. Germany, also, just prior to the war, was exporting caustic soda. There is about 20 per cent overproduction of caustic soda in the United States which is seeking foreign markets. We have been gradually building up trade with Mexico, Cuba, Japan, and South America.

Within the past month we have found a growing impossibility to procure rates which will permit of our moving our product to foreign ports in competition with the English transportation rates. This applies especially to European ports, where rates have increased from 200 to 300 per cent since November 1, and even at these exorbitant rates it is impossible to get room for prompt shipment.

We can not urge too strongly the necessity of procuring proper tonnage to carry commodities seeking a foreign outlet and this tonnage should be available at once in order to benefit the United States manufacturer. If we are to take a position which we have never heretofore occupied in the markets of the world, we should do so immediately and this does not permit of delays necessary to build and construct vessels of considerable size to carry this tonnage.

It seems to us the only solution of the present difficulty would be for this Government to lease or purchase if possible, sufficient tonnage to relieve the present situation, or it might be possible for the Government to use a number of its transports and colliers in handling commercial freight.

We are in position to compete actively with British manufacturers of caustic soda on quality, price, and terms of payment to foreign buyers, but notwithstanding this position on our part and in spite of persistent and intelligent effort, we find our export business seriously limited by this lack of bottoms.

Anything this Government can do to increase the supply of vessels engaged in ocean transportation would be a help to us and to hundreds of other manufacturers in the same position as ourselves.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN F. BUSH,
Vice President.

EXHIBIT 31.

[Industrial Lumber Co., Calcasieu long-leaf yellow-pine lumber.]

ELIZABETH, LA., *January 5, 1915.*

Mr. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have recently noticed a dispatch in one of the newspapers to the effect that you desire information from shippers as to freight rates and scarcity of vessels for export shipments since the opening of the European war.

We have in the past exported considerable lumber to England, Holland, Germany, and some to France. Since the war, however, we have been unable to make any shipments, primarily because of the uncertainty of securing vessels; also on account of the excessive freight rates.

Formerly the freight rate on this character of shipment was about $8 per 1,000 feet, board measure. The best information we can secure now is that the vessels are asking from $18 to $20 per 1,000 feet, board measure. We have some small parcels of lumber at our port now ready for shipment, but are unable to make a sale, owing to the above-mentioned conditions. Some few cargoes have been forwarded

by other parties, but so far we have been unsuccessful in making sales under existing conditions.

We appreciate your efforts along these lines and sincerely hope that you will be able to bring about some relief to exporters.

Yours, very truly,

INDUSTRIAL LUMBER CO.,
R. M. HALLOWELL,
Vice President and General Manager.

EXHIBIT 32.

[Markt & Hammacher Co., American manufacturers' export agents.]

NEW YORK, *January 5, 1915.*

The honorable SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

Freight Charges to European Ports.

DEAR SIR: We notice in the daily press many articles concerning the exorbitant freight rates now charged by steamship companies taking cargo to the European countries, especially the neutral markets.

We further understand that it is the desire of your department to take up this matter in a very serious manner, investigating these conditions, which we personally believe are entirely uncalled for.

We admit and believe that it is necessary under the present trying conditions for the steamship companies to advance their rates over normal rates to a certain extent, say 25 per cent or even 50 per cent over normal rates, but when steamship companies are quoting and charging three times the normal rates, and in some instances even four times the normal rates, we feel that it is absolutely an imposition on the part of the steamship companies to demand such freight rates.

For instance, to cite one case, on ice-cream freezers our freight rates to either Naples or Genoa are 25s. plus 5 per cent per 40 cubic feet, or 2,240 pounds. To-day, upon application to one of the steamship companies for freight reservation on steamer sailing the early part of this month to Genoa, we are quoted on the same commodity a rate of 75s. plus 5 per cent primage per 40 cubic feet, or 2,240 pounds.

We submit the above to you, as we believe you are interested in knowing from actual shippers the rates now quoted and charged by the steamship companies, and hope that you will use your good offices in bringing about a fair ocean freight rate to the various ports of Europe, notably, of course, the neutral ports.

We are very large shippers of American industrial products to the Continent of Europe, and ship annually several thousand tons of goods to Europe. Owing to the war, however, our shipments have been considerably reduced, and we stand ready to give you any further information that you may require from time to time.

Thanking you in advance for ourselves and in behalf of our other friends in a similar line of business for any efforts that you will make, we are,

Yours, respectively,

MARKT & HAMMACHER CO.,
J. TINTSCHGER.

EXHIBIT 33.

[The Tuemler Co. (Inc.), exporters of lumber and timber.]

PENSACOLA, FLA., *Saturday, January 2, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Our attention has been called to a newspaper article wherein it is stated that you have invited shippers for an expression as to the increase in freight rates demanded for ocean traffic, with facts and figures.

We shall confine ourselves to freight rates from the Gulf, and on pitch pine wood goods especially, as we are exporters who deal in principally such lumber.

We have compiled from freight reports a list of steam and sail tonnage fixtures, which proves that freight rates at normal times, in July, were about 70s. to 75s. to the United Kingdom and 90s. to Italy for steamships. There were practically no charters made in August for prompt loading, as shippers were unable to sell owing to pending credit arrangements, which were necessary on account of the war. Deck loads can not be shipped to Great Britain from the Gulf for arrival after the 15th of October, and rates increased some 20 to 25 per cent, which is not unreasonable, as owners should be recompensated for the reason that deck loads to other countries, as in time of peace to Holland and Germany, were not available, owing to the European war. However, freights rose from 100s. to Great Britain late in September to 180s. and higher, which owners are asking for prompt loading to Great Britain, and 200s. to Italy; and even at these figures it is difficult to charter, as cotton and grain cargoes appear to be more desirable from the viewpoint of the owners.

The rates for full cargo steam tonnage are based on a certain form of charter—the Pixpinus charter.

Liners are asking 200s. from New Orleans and Mobile to Liverpool for lumber on liner bill of lading, which is equivalent to about 220s. on Pixpinus form.

Sail tonnage, late November, was about 100s. to the United Kingdom on basis of a charter called the "$2 form," and the last fixtures, late December, were at 150s. to the same destination and on the same charter form for vessels in the same position.

The increase in rates is said to be due to the elimination of the German and Austrian tonnage and part of the British mercantile fleet, which is being held at the disposition of the British Government. However, in our opinion, the enormous advance is not in line with the elimination of this tonnage; the list which we are inclosing shows that at the beginning of the war the increase in freights was only slight, even though at that time all the German and Austrian tonnage was practically eliminated; war risk can be covered at a reasonable figure, and could not be the cause for an increase in rates beyond a reasonable figure.

From our viewpoint it is hard to account for the exorbitant freight rates, which have proven such a handicap to exporters, especially to those in our line of business, and we are heartily in favor of Federal legislation which would encourage American capital to own vessels under the American flag and enable them to compete successfully with foreign owners.

Yours, truly,

THE TUEMLER CO. (INC.),
ROBERT TUEMLER, *President.*

EXHIBIT 33A.

List of pitch-pine charters, sail and steam, from the Gulf to the Continent, United Kingdom, and South America.

Reported.	Name of vessel.	Destination.	Loading time.	Freight rate.
1914.				
July 15	S. S. Rivulet	Rotterdam, Tyne.	July–August	76s. 3d.
July 4	S. S. Rose Lea	Holland, east coast.	July	73s. 9d.
Do	S. S. Penistone	West coast Italy.	do	87s. 6d.
July 22	S. S. Oceana	Italy	July–August	90s. 6d.
Aug. 5	Camerons [1]	Liverpool	Prompt	80s.
	S. S. Elfland	Holland	August	75s.
Sept. 9	Fides [1]	River Plate	October	$11.
	Oakhurst [1]	do	September–October.	$11.50.
Sept. 16	S. S. Parkhaven	do	October	120s.
	S. S. Brookwood	Hull and Tyne	September	95s.
	S. S. Veerhaven	River Plate	October	117s. 6d.
	S. S. Hyltonia	United Kingdom.	September	90s., 2 ports.
Sept. 23	S. S. Waltham	do	do	92s. 6d.
Sept. 30	S. S. Nevisbrook	do	Prompt	
Oct. 21	Blanca [1]	Rio de Janeiro	November	$11.
Oct. 17	S. S. Twilight	United Kingdom.	Prompt	87s. 6d., 2 ports.
Oct. 21	S. S. Eemdyk	River Plate	November	110s.
Nov. 14	S. S. Antigua	United Kingdom.	do	105s.
Nov. 18	S. S. Menapier	Genoa	December	155s.
Dec. 2	S. S. Yzerhandel	do	do	155s.
Dec. 9	Beatrice [1]	do	December–January.	120s.
	Bris [1]	United Kingdom.	do	120s.
	Doon [1]	do	do	110s.
	Ethel Boynton [1]	Genoa	Prompt	$15.
Dec. 23	Elise [1]	United Kingdom.	January–February.	135s., west coast.
	Collingwood [1]	do	do	Do.
	Haakon [1]	do	do	Do.
	Gantock Rock [1]	do	do	Do.
	Craigisla [1]	do	February	135s., west coast, 140s., east coast.
Dec. 26	Rosefield [1]	Cadiz	Prompt	$18.
	Glen [1]	United Kingdom.	do	140s., east coast.
Dec. 30	Benestvet [1]	do	February	130s., west coast.
	Dione [1]	do	do	125s., west coast.
	Annie [1]	do	January–February.	140s., west coast.
	Nordstern [1]	do	March	135s., west coast.
	Marga [1]	do	do	120s., west coast.
	Hudson [1]	do	Prompt	Do.
	Springfield [1]	Genoa	do	$17.25.

[1] Sailing vessel.

EXHIBIT 34.

[Walter A. Wood Mowing & Reaping Machine Co., general offices and works, Hoosick Falls, N. Y., U. S. A.]

HOOSICK FALLS, N. Y., *January 9, 1915.*

The honorable SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have noticed recently articles appearing in some of the New York papers in regard to the difficulty experienced by certain manufacturers who have orders for goods to be shipped abroad in making proper arrangements for such shipment under reasonable protection. I feel justified in writing you in regard to the situation of our company in connection with the handling of our foreign trade this season.

The Wood Co. has enjoyed for a great many years a very satisfactory foreign trade. We have had an office under our own management in London since 1857 and in Berlin since 1875, and have located in the different continental countries many agents, who have been selling Walter A. Wood machines from 30 to 40 years, and even, in some cases, 50 years. Quite considerably more than half, therefore, of our entire business is foreign. Of this foreign trade quite a large proportion comes from Russia, Germany, Austria and Hungary, and France, or countries within the war zone.

You can readily appreciate that the unfortunate war has had quite a serious effect upon our business this year. We can hope for very little, if any, business from Russia, Germany, Austria, or Hungary. It is quite probable, however, we may have some business with France. We have already received requisitions and orders for our product from our London office, which controls the trade in the United Kingdom, and also certain trade with Spain and South Africa, which is controlled from that office. We have also received orders from our Scandinavian agents, all of whom have been representing our company for from 35 to 40 years. Orders have also been received from our Italian agents and from certain South African agents who are dealt with direct from our home office.

Naturally we are anxious to protect these orders, and in such a way that we will at the same time best protect the interests of our agents and the trade controlled by our London office. We find, however, that the cost of getting goods to foreign ports and the uncertainty of proper shipping facilities is becoming a great menace, and will have a very serious effect on the business that we have in hand and wish to protect. At this time it is a serious question how we are going to be able to handle the orders which we have received from our Scandinavian agents. The freight rates to Scandinavian ports have been advanced enormously, from 2 to 250 per cent as compared with last year. Insurance rates are also very excessive; competition in our line in Scandinavia is very keen, for there are quite a few

manufacturers building harvesting machines and agricultural implements located in the three Scandinavian countries with whom our agents have to compete. The margin of profit at best is small. Under our contracts with these agents prices are based upon delivery f. o. b. New York City, so that the agents have to pay the cost of getting the goods from New York to their respective ports. If we are compelled to ship under the present freight rates to Scandinavian ports, plus the abnormal insurance rates, the increased cost to our agents will, we know, wipe out all the profit that they would hope to enjoy on the machines which they would have ordered of us this season.

This same situation affects, although not to so great an extent perhaps, shipments to other ports. All freight rates to United Kingdom ports have been considerably advanced. While it is possible to make contracts covering the next three months, the rates are all much higher than last year. If contract is not made and you ship only under the open rate, the difference between the open rates and the rates of last year is very great. To illustrate, under the best contract that we can now make on shipments to Liverpool and London, the freight rate on our different machines increases the cost of getting the machines or implements from New York to Liverpool and London $1.50 to $2 on mowers, $3 to $4 on reapers, $5 to $6 on binders. While there is some reason, perhaps, why insurance rates should be abnormally high, still we can not but feel that the steamship companies are taking advantage of present conditions to exact rates which are all out of reason and which are unjust and unfair. We know that unless something occurs to improve the present situation the result of our particular business will be that we will run the risk of having certain orders canceled from some of our foreign agents, and we will be subjected to additional expense in handling shipments to other agents and to trade controlled from our London office, which will practically take away all of the profit which we hope to enjoy. At very best, with a limited output, as compared with the average of the last few years, due to the war, to have to do what business can be secured under conditions which make such business hardly profitable, it seems a greater burden than we should be called upon to bear.

It would appear to us that there never was a more opportune time for this country, either under legislative action or private capital, to create a merchant marine, for lack of which, in our judgment, this country has suffered for many years. We can only hope that some measures may be enacted or some policy created which will relieve the present situation, and in time to affect our business interests this year.

I trust you will pardon, perhaps, the length of this letter, but it is difficult to put the situation as it affects us before you in any other way, and even now we have only treated with it in a very general way.

We are inclosing a short, rather concise memorandum, showing the comparison of rates to certain ports, which will illustrate to a small extent, at least, the effect on shipments that we have to these ports, and there are many others which are not included in the list.

Respectfully,

DANFORTH GEER, *President.*

Since dictating this, have received a cable from our Paris agents canceling orders on account of excessive freight rates.

EXHIBIT 34A.

[Memorandum in regard to foreign rates and shipping facilities under war conditions.]

All ocean freight rates have been largely increased, the increase ranging from 15 per cent in the case of certain United Kingdom ports to 400 per cent for certain eastern Mediterranean ports.

The following comparisons of rates will serve as examples:

	1914	Present rates.
Glasgow	15s. and 5 per cent.	17s. 6d. and 5 per cent.
Bristol	do	20s. and 5 per cent.
Liverpool	11s. 3d. and 5 per cent.	30s. and 5 per cent.
Rotterdam	6 cents per cubic foot.	20 cents per cubic foot.
Copenhagen	13s. 9d. and 5 per cent.	40s. and 5 per cent.
Stockholm	18s. 3d. and 5 per cent.	41s. 3d. and 5 per cent.
Bilbao (and other Spanish ports)	20s. and 5 per cent.	40s. and 5 per cent.
Havre	$2.25 net per 40 cubic feet.	$12 and 5 per cent.
Bordeaux	$2.90 net per 40 cubic feet.	$11 and 5 per cent.

NOTE.—Unless otherwise indicated rates are shown in shillings per 40 cubic feet.

There are comparatively few ships available to the ports listed above, and if we were shipping a normal amount of cargo, great difficulty would be experienced in securing space for it. As it is, our shipments frequently fail to make the steamer for which they are engaged, although no notification is sent to us until after the steamer has sailed. Sailing dates are irregular. The date on which a boat actually sails is from a week to six weeks after the original published sailing date.

(Signed) W. H. C.

JANUARY 5, 1915.

EXHIBIT 35.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 13, 1915.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO.

DEAR SIR: I had consigned to my order some freight to France the first week in November last and the rate was 52 cents a hundred pounds from St. Louis. I am paying now 98 cents a hundred pounds for same shipment. I have just returned from abroad. It does seem to me that this unheard-of advance in ocean freight rates should be investigated.

Yours, truly,

B. C. EDMUNDS.

EXHIBIT 36.

[H. Frank Darrow, wholesale importer of nursery stocks, hothouse plants, bulbs, seeds, rafia.]

NEW YORK, *December 29, 1914.*

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your request in regard to exporters making statements of overcharges on ocean freight rates to Europe, would say that I am a large exporter of grass seed, and in former seasons I have paid from 35 to 50 cents per 100 pounds on the French Line sailing from New York to Havre, while on steamship *Chicago* sailing to-morrow, the 29th instant, I have been compelled to pay $1.50 per 100 pounds ocean freight, which I consider is prohibited to the export trade, and I should therefore be very glad to have your assistance to relieve us from any further exorbitant charges of this kind if possible.

Thanking you in advance for the courtesy of a reply, I remain

Yours, respectfully,

H. FRANK DARROW.

EXHIBIT 37.

[The Wysham Co., manufacturers and importers baskets, woodenware.]

BALTIMORE, *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY OF UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg to call your attention to the excessive freight charges we were compelled to pay on last two shipments we received from Rotterdam. The Holland-American Line were the carriers. They advanced freights twice; the first advance was heavy but the second is very excessive.

Yours, etc.,

THE WYSHAM CO.
J. KEMP WYSHAM.

EXHIBIT 38.

[Ike Mannheimer, green and dried apples.]

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I refer to inclosed newspaper clipping, and am glad to see that you will investigate the high ocean rates and the scarcity of vessels. In connection with the Scandinavian-American Line out of New York (Messrs. Funch, Edye & Co., agents), I have had so much trouble in securing space to Copenhagen and in getting the goods on board steamer even after the space had been promised that I was compelled to stop selling goods to Copenhagen. From last year's rate of 35 cents per 100 pounds on dried apples and of $1 per barrel on fresh apples, this line advanced to 53 cents, then to $1, per 100 pounds on dried apples and to $1.50, and after that to $2 per barrel on fresh apples, so that the freight on fresh apples in barrels is almost equal to the value of the apples and practically prohibitive.

The Norwegian-American Line (Messrs. Benham & Boyesen, agents) has until recently given me very satisfactory service out of New York for points in Norway, such as Christiania, Bergen, Stavanger, Aalesund, etc., but has now also advanced the rates to the above maximum quotations and notified me within a short time that no space is available until next April. Hope that you will succeed in getting better and cheaper facilities, and I shall be glad to get notice from you to that effect in the near future.

Respectfully, yours,

IKE MANNHEIMER.

EXHIBIT 39.

[Stengel & Rothschild, tanners and manufacturers of patent enameled and fancy leather.]

NEWARK, N. J., *December 29, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice in the Journal of Commerce of December 26, that you ask for information regarding export shipping difficulties and high freight rates from American shippers, and we take this opportunity to inform you that we are experiencing considerable difficulties with shipments of our goods to Italy. We have been shipping these same goods to Italian clients for a number of years, and they are being shipped in regular order of business. We have, however, to obtain permission from the Italian consul against declaration made that the goods are for home consumption, and which declaration has to be approved by the British consul in New York. It is further necessary for the consignee in Italy to make another declaration to the same effect, which has to be approved by the British ambassador at Rome and forwarded to Gibraltar before arrival of steamer carrying the goods at that port.

It is very difficult to get shipping accommodation at all, the Italian steamers seem to be crowded with freight and the rates now demanded are exorbitant. For instance, the normal freight rate for patent leather in cases has been 50 shillings per ton with possibly 5 per cent primage, but we have just been asked a rate of 120 shillings plus 5 per cent for the same class of freight. This certainly appears to be an exorbitant rate and anything that can be done to get better shipping facilities will be highly appreciated by the business interests of this country.

Respectfully submitted,

STENGEL & ROTHSCHILD.

EXHIBIT 40.

[Extract from letter to Secretary of the Treasury from R. R. Dancy, cotton and cotton linters, Houston, Tex., dated Dec. 26, 1914.]

Last week brokers asked $17 per bale freight to Germany (Bremen), now $14. Surely the United States Government can and should control the situation and shipping and insurance to such extent that if only one steamer could be had her charter or freight charge should be in the limit of reason, controlled by the Government and not by sharks and sharps. Needs no probe, but action in distress.

EXHIBIT 41.

[California Fig Syrup Co.]

LOUISVILLE, KY., *January 15, 1915.*

Hon. W. G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCADOO: We beg to advise you that we do considerable foreign shipping to London, England, and Sydney, Australia, and it has recently come to our notice that the ocean freight rates now charged by the steamship lines to various ports have increased some 200 per cent. It was our understanding that there were sufficient vessels to carry cargo that was offered for shipment, and we are at a loss to understand why these excessive freight rates should be charged by the

various lines. We therefore wish to file a protest against the exhorbitant rates now made, and would very much appreciate your views on the subject and the reasons for these excessive rates.

Yours, very truly,

CALIFORNIA FIG SYRUP CO.,
H. H. AINSLIE.

EXHIBIT 42.

[Garcia & Maggini Co., importers and exporters of tropical and California fruits, general commission merchants, packers of dried fruits, nuts, dates, honey, beans, etc.]

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *January 5, 1915.*

The SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We read in the New York Times a special to that paper from Washington, in which it is said that your department would be glad to be informed regarding the difficulties the exporters are meeting for lack of space to European neutral countries.

We beg to say that we ourselves have shipped in the last two months five or six hundred tons of dried fruit to New York through the canal of Panama for reshipment to Scandinavian ports and also to Holland.

To a great extent, these goods have been in New York for a long time, for the reason that our forwarding agents, Messrs. C. B. Richards & Co., could not get any space.

Besides freight rates have advanced over 300 per cent since the war broke out, and lately, and within 15 days, freights have advanced fully 100 per cent.

It seems that whenever the Scandinavian-American Line are asking higher freight rates other lines do so too, and now even the Holland-American Line is asking 100s. per 2,240 pounds, while only a few days ago this company asked 45s. per 2,240 pounds.

These advances in freight rates are made without notice, and even previous engagements have not been protected, so that the shippers instead of making a small profit on their sales to European countries are losing money.

At the present time the freight rates from New York are so high that business will suffer a good deal through these high freight rates, at least as far as goods from this coast are concerned.

To England and France freight rates have not advanced to such an extent, but unfortunately British and French steamers seem to be unavailable for other countries than England or France.

It is greatly to be regretted that American steamers could not be had, because we think if only one regular line to Scandinavia could be established with American steamers at reasonable freight rates the situation would become more normal.

We beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

GARCIA & MAGGINI CO.,
Per A. ASHER.

EXHIBIT 43.

[William Haas & Sons, manufacturers and exporters of "D" shovel handles.]

HOUSTON HEIGHTS, TEX., *December 28, 1914.*

UNITED STATES COMMERCE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We respectfully call your attention to the paralysis of our business due to the exorbitant ocean freight rates now being imposed upon the manufacturers and producers of this country. For years our entire output has been disposed of abroad, but owing to the present prohibitive tariffs in ocean transportation we are unable to deliver our goods, consequently our plant will remain closed down until such rates are established as will enable us to market our goods. The majority of our shipments have hereofore gone via Liverpool and Manchester.

In our judgment a Government merchant marine will solve the problem.

Very truly,

WM. HAAS & SONS,
By WILLIAM HAAS, Sr.

EXHIBIT 44.

[Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co., manufacturers of Saylor's Portland cement.]

NEW YORK, *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The newspapers of our city advise that the Treasury Department are seeking information regarding the abnormal increase in ocean transportation rates and the scarcity of ships to accommodate export business.

While we are not direct shippers, and do the main part of our export business through commission firms of this and other cities, we are constantly thrown into relationship with the steamship lines, and it has been our experience that the shipping rates have advanced so rapidly that our shipments have been practically suspended, due to the two facts above mentioned, scarcity of ships and increase in freight rates.

Before the month of July, 1914, shipments of Portland cement to the Argentine Republic and Uruguay were possible at $2.45 per ton; to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, $3.60 per ton. These rates were advanced the early part of August 50 per cent; were subsequently reduced, so that the advance was equivalent to 25 per cent for the July rates, and these rates have advanced since the latter part of September until now they are $6 per ton to Rio by some lines and $8.50 per ton by other lines; $6 per ton to the Argentine Republic; and notwithstanding these high rates there is no possibility of obtaining ships, transportation, or accommodation for our product.

Among those who are able to give you direct information regarding the scarcity of ships and freight rates are: Mr. Connors, freight transportation manager, Paul Gerhardt & Co., 10 Bridge Street, New York City; Mr. William Gene, Lamport & Holt Line; Busk & Daniels, agents, Produce Exchange, New York City; Mr. P. Thield, Houlder, Wear & Boyd (Inc.), 24 State Street, New York City; Mr. Betz, Funch, Edey & Co., 10 Bridge Street, New York.

The scarcity of shipping seems to be directly due to the fact that the tempting charter rates furnished to the steamship lines to divert their steamers from the channels which they have followed has resulted in withdrawing a great number of their steamers from the South American trade to the European.

From all information that I can obtain there seems to be ample cargo furnished to more than take care of a very much larger amount of tonnage than is now being used in the South American trade. However, before the outbreak of the European war American business men were compelled to submit to the steamship freight rates which were arranged by committees in London or other foreign ports and forwarded to their agents in America. Now that the European war is going on, some steamship lines, probably acting upon orders from their English and other foreign owners, have diverted their steamers, one by one, so that they are at this moment practically unable to give any definite idea of their sailing dates.

I have heard that the charter rates are being advanced considerably. This is probably due to the danger ships encounter in mined fields and to the great demand for ships to carry supplies for the troops now in action abroad. Whatever the cause is, American business men and shippers for export in all lines of goods have been made to suffer. While I am personally unable to more than give you this information from conversations had with some of my customers who in turn have the information more direct from the companies themselves; also, some of my information, but not a great deal of it, does come from the shippers, the parties whose names I have mentioned can give you valuable information regarding the increase in ocean freight rates of the South American trade.

Yours, very truly,

ALBERT FARJEON,
Export Manager.

P. S.—I have heard that subsidies have been granted to some of the foreign steamship lines, one of the conditions being that one-third of the cargo would have to be heavy-weight material, such as cement, iron, etc. The steamship companies were therefore obliged to carry heavy cargo. We have experienced a great deal of trouble with the steamship companies in arranging freights, all of them claiming they do not want to carry cement at any price.

A. F.

EXHIBIT 45.

[American Tripoli Co.]

SENECA, MO., *December 28, 1914.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We clipped the attached item from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and although our export business is very small compared with the larger concerns of the country and alone would hardly count in the grand total of the country's exports, yet we believe that there are a great many small exporters like ourselves, whose total business would be quite an item in the total for the year; and we believe also that small concerns like ourselves are probably worse hurt by any and all adverse conditions, for the very reason that our business being small we do not get the consideration that a very large concern, whose business would be a large item in the business of any steamship line, would receive for two reasons: First, the business itself because of its small volume is not so desirable, and second because being small concerns the steamship company would feel that any complaint that we might make would receive but small attention.

This last may even be true in this case; but we believe that if all the small exporters whose business is very greatly affected by the present prevailing conditions would write to your department, their great numbers and the greater cause for complaint which the small shippers probably have would demand attention.

We attach four letters that we have recently received from the J. H. W. Steele Co., of New Orleans, who attend to the forwarding of our export shipments, and through whom we get quotations of rates, make contracts with the steamship companies for the transportation of shipments, etc.

We have an offer of some orders from Barcelona, Spain, and the first two of the attached letters refer to our effort to get quoted us a rate from New Orleans to Barcelona; and you will see that the steamship company operating steamers to Barcelona refused to quote rates at all. In the first letter the reason given was that other commodities which permit of a higher rate are being carried so that our material, which must have a lower rate, is not at all desirable, and they even refuse to quote rates at all. Thus we are not able to quote prices to the firm in Barcelona, even though conditions might be such that we could even pay a high rate of freight and still do business.

The letter dated December 10 refers to an effort to make a contract with the Harrison or Leyland Line covering our shipments for a period to Liverpool, so that we would be able in turn to make a contract with our English friends for a like term at a specified price. You will note that they had inclosed with this letter one from the Harrison Line indicating that "They are not inclined to make a contract at present." Not being able to make a contract with the steamship company operating to Liverpool, of course we can not make a contract with our English friends to supply them with our material.

The fourth letter, dated December 18, quotes us a rate of 49 cents per 100 pounds from New Orleans to Havre, France, and for comparison, will say that just previous to the European war, on July 3, 1914, we made a shipment at the rate of 18 cents per 100 pounds, a little more than one-third of the rate now asked. This high rate is, of course, prohibitive on a commodity such as ours.

This letter also replies to our inquiry regarding war insurance, and also states that "Further, rates are quoted to become effective within two weeks, and agents, therefore, would not quote rates on shipments moving in the middle or latter part of January." We take it that this clause means that rates are only quoted for two weeks in advance, and since it takes approximately 24 days to send a letter to Paris and get a reply back here, the rate would be ineffective before we could possibly quote prices to Paris, and get an order in reply, even though these high rates were not prohibitive.

The last clause of this letter again states that they are unable to get a rate quoted to Barcelona, though there are steamers making regular sailings for that port.

We hope that our testimony herein contained, together with all the other from larger shippers, will be such that some measure can be taken that will relieve shippers of these unprecedented and impossible conditions.

Kindly see that the attached letters are returned to us.

Yours, sincerely,

AMERICAN TRIPOLI CO.,
Per ROBT. ORNDUFF, *Treasurer.*

EXHIBIT 46.

[Extract from a letter to the Secretary of Commerce from David C. Reid, 18 Broadway, New York, dated January 2, 1915.]

For your information and guidance, the question of getting tonnage at the present time for trans-Atlantic business is practically impossible. I have offered by cablegram up to 10s. 3d., Government form per deadweight ton and was refused by my London correspondents, who state that much higher offers must be made before tonnage can be procured. Under ordinary circumstances these tramp steamers I made the offers for in good faith could be secured at 3s. per deadweight ton. Conditions with us are almost impossible. Tonnage is unprocurable at almost any except the most extraordinary and prohibitive terms. I speak now of the cargo steamer for the general carrying tramp steamer trade. Anything that can be done to put tonnage in the market should be done.

EXHIBIT 47.

[David C. Reid, broker for the sale and charter of American and foreign ships.]

NEW YORK, *January 4, 1915.*

HON. W. C. REDFIELD,
Secretary, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REDFIELD: Many thanks for your kind telegram. 45s. per ton was asked for coal freight to Italy this morning from Norfolk; London refused 10s. 3d. per month, time charter, on Saturday, and 13s. was bid this morning which, I believe, will also be refused on tramp tonnage Government form.

Conditions here are indescribable; everything possible should be done to get tonnage moving.

Very truly, yours,

DAVID J. REID.

Ordinary tramp rates about 3s. What are the poor people in Europe to do? How are they to live?

EXHIBIT 48.

[W. H. Moore & Co.]

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 28, 1914.*

DEPARTMENT COMMERCE, *Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: In the name of the Leaf Tobacco Association of Baltimore City, of which I am president, I desire to file with your department an urgent protest against the unwarranted advance in freight rates on tobacco as recently established by the Holland-American Line. Some of our exporting members shipping to Holland points have signed contracts with this company expiring December 31, 1914, for a rate of $3.50 per hogshead of tobacco. This contract has been disregarded entirely and the rate increased first to $5.25, then to $6.85, and to-day a notice that it will be $7.50 until further notice. This, I repeat, in the face of the written contract for $3.50 per hogshead.

Their explanation is the war conditions, claiming a war clause which some of our members claim is not in their contract. In any event, there is no war between the nations whose subjects are signers of the contracts, and we wish for your department to take some action to adjust this if possible; and we shall gladly furnish you with any further information which your department might wish to have.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHAS. E. MOORE.
President of Leaf Tobacco Association, Baltimore, Md.

EXHIBIT 49.

[Dumee, Son & Co., cotton.]

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *December 29, 1914.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to enter strenuous protest against the prohibitive freight rates being charged by the trans-Atlantic lines on cotton and cotton linters to European ports. This time one year ago we paid a rate of 45 and 50 cents per 100 pounds on compressed and uncompressed cotton linters, respectively, from New York to Rotterdam. To-day we are asked $2.50 and $3 per 100 pounds for compressed and uncompressed cotton linters, respectively, shipment between these two points. We should advise that all the freight rates from points on the eastern seaboard to other European ports have been advanced in proportion to the increase cited above. We feel that some relief should be arranged for the American exporters by your department.

Yours, very truly,

DUMEE, SON & CO.

EXHIBIT 50.

[W. W. Battle & Co.'s coal trade freight report.]

NEW YORK, *January 4, 1915.*

The freight market continues to advance, and, although a few steamers were chartered for export coal at high rates during the past week, none of these fixtures have been reported.

Occasionally we have steamers proposed for export coal that are willing to accept less than current market rates, and, consequently, we think it well for you to communicate directly with us whenever you have any inquiries for export coal, as the rates quoted below, under present conditions, are bound to be more or less uncertain.

We would quote freight rates on coal by steamer as follows: About $2 to Habana; about $2.50 to Cardenas or Sagua; about $2.50 to Cienfuegos; $2.75 to $3 to Port of Spain, Trinidad; $2.50 to $3 to St. Lucia; about $2.50 to St. Thomas; $2.75 to $3 to Barbados; about $2.50 to Kingston (small boats to Kingston $2.50 to $2.75); $2.25 to $2.50 and p. c. to Curacao; $2.50 to $2.75 to Santiago; $2.50 to $2.75 to Guantanamo; about $4.50 to Demerara; $2.40 to $2.50 to Bermuda; about $2.50 to Vera Cruz; about $2.50 to Tampico; 25s. to 30s. to Rio; about 25s. to Montevideo, Buenos Aires, or La Plata; about 40s. to a direct port in the Mediterranean not east of the west coast of Italy, Spain excluded, and about 20s. to Valparaiso.

EXHIBIT 51.

[John M. Harper & Co.]

PHILADELPHIA, *December 28, 1914.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We notice, according to the Journal of Commerce, of December 26, that the Secretary of the Treasury asked those shippers who had been obliged to pay high ocean freights to communicate with the Department of Commerce.

One of the lines which we handle is goatskins; the rate of freight on same, per the Philadelphia-Trans-Atlantic Line, from London to Philadelphia in June, 1914, was 35s. per ton, net; by the same line we have been obliged to pay this month 54s. 9d. and 10 per cent, which is equivalent to about 75 per cent increase.

The rates of freight from South Africa to American Atlantic ports in October had advanced 25 per cent, and we understand those rates have still farther advanced.

The rate from the west coast of Africa was 37s. 6d. per ton, now 55s.

The latest reports we had from China, freight rates had advanced 25s. (30 per cent).

We are safe in saying that the freight rates from the different ports of origin have advanced over last June from 25 up to 75 per cent. We can give you more definite information a little later on, if you desire, but you could get more positive information by appointing someone specially from your department and sending them to the Philadelphia and also New York customhouses, and look over the bills of lading of last June and July and the bills of lading recently to hand for similar goods. We might further add these increased freight rates, together with war risks and high premiums for insurance which the American importers are obliged to pay, it making business almost prohibitive in some lines.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN M. HARPER & CO.

EXHIBIT 52.

[Meyer Hecht, commission merchant, dealer in deer, goat, sheep skins, hides and calfskins.]

NEW YORK, *December 26, 1914.*

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have read that your attention has been called by exporters to the way the different steamship lines are treating the exporters. I, too, want to protest that they are charging me two or three times as much as formerly and then do not give me room for my shipments, which hinders my business considerably. I hope that you will be able to do something in this matter.

Very respectfully,

MEYER HECHT.

EXHIBIT 53.

[American Glue Co.]

BOSTON, *December 30, 1914.*

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to a request of the Senate that your department supply that body with information as to increased ocean freights due to scarcity of tonnage, and that data on these points is desired. Accordingly, we beg to report as follows:

On merchandise imported by us from Italy, rates in September and October were advanced 25 per cent. Since then, however, they have been restored to the normal figure.

On merchandise imported by us from the United Kingdom of Great Britain the rates have been increased 50 per cent and no immmediate likelihood of reduction.

Within the past few days, having a shipment of merchandise to export from this port to Liverpool, we were informed by the carriers that they could not handle same at all on account of having more freight than they could handle.

We certainly feel that we have been not only handicapped by lack of service, but also overcharged, all of which is a detriment to our commerce.

Yours, respectfully,

AMERICAN GLUE CO.,
J. D. HASHAGEN.

EXHIBIT 54.

[Minot, Hooper & Co., Manufacturers' Agents.]

NEW YORK, *December 30, 1914.*

Mr. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that you are to submit evidence before the Senate committee regarding increases in ocean freight rates since July 1, we beg to inform you as follows:

We are now paying on a shipment to Piraeus, via the Cunard Line, 100s. per ton of 40 cubic feet. The rate July 1 was 32s. 6d., and about two years ago we secured as low as 15s. and 20s. per ton on the Cunard and other lines. We engaged space on the Cunard steamship *Carpathia*, sailing to Piraeus January 5, 1915, at 75s. per ton. A week later, when we endeavored to engage more space, the rate had advanced to 100s. for the same character of goods. We tried to secure space on the Cunard steamship *Panonia*, sailing to Piraeus January 30, and were advised that the rate was 100s. per ton, all plus 5 per cent for primage. We gave the matter into the hands of our freight broker, who, upon informing the Cunard Line that the Hellenic-Transatlantic S. N. Co. would accept freight for March sailing at the rate of 80s., was told by them that they would meet the competition of the "Greek line" and give us an 80s. rate.

What we want to know is whether there is any redress to be had for having to pay these exorbitant rates, or must we pacifically submit to such "extortion." While we ourselves do not bear the cost of freight on our shipments—the customer assuming that burden—our export business is directly and materially affected, inasmuch as the uncertainty and increase of expense and hazard to our customer have a tendency to make him cautious and reduce or altogether terminate his orders.

Yours, very truly,

MINOT, HOOPER & CO.
E. T. PICKARD.

EXHIBIT 55.

[Gabriel Nachman, wool stock.]

NEW YORK, *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are large shippers of woolen rags to foreign ports, and find that the steamship companies have increased their freight rates from one-fourth cent per pound to $1.10 per 100 pounds; and even at that rate they refuse to take rags; therefore have not been able to ship any for export in over four weeks, and as yet don't know when they will take stock. They claim they are booked ahead on the same.

If there is anything that you can do to relieve the situation, would consider it a favor.

Yours, very truly, GABRIEL NACHMAN.

EXHIBIT 56.

[Gabriel Nachman, wool stock.]

NEW YORK, *January 6, 1915.*

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 30th ultimo, I find conditions just as bad regarding shipments to Europe. The fact is, I can not ship any stock, as some of the lines claim they have information from England not to take any rags.

You know it is impossible to ship rags on sailing vessels. Whenever you find that things look brighter, will be pleased to hear what can be done in the matter.

Yours, very truly,

GABRIEL NACHMAN.

EXHIBIT 57.

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 26, 1914.*

The DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Responding to your request for proofs of how shipments of American goods to Europe are handicapped or made entirely prohibitive on account of high ocean freight rates, we beg to submit the following:

We are shippers of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia tobacco to Europe, and most of our shipments are consigned to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway, and Belgium. At present only shipments to Holland, Italy, and Norway are possible at prohibitive rates. In fact, the latter have become so high that now cable orders "Stop buying" have been received.

Although we have made a yearly contract with the Holland-America Line—the only shipping opportunity from here to Holland—as per copy inclosed, this line has arbitrarily raised its rates 100 to 300 per cent, and even at the raised rates shipments can be booked only "for first available room."

Rates to Italy also have become entirely too high—i. e., from $4 per hogshead of Maryland tobacco to about $27, or nearly 3¼ cents a pound—so that tobacco shipments have become out of question.

The Holland-America Line, which raised the rates on December 7, 1914, has now again suspended them, indicating another raise.

Trusting that the aforegoing statement will interest you, we are, dear sirs,

Very respectfully, J. D. KREMELBERG & Co.

P. S.—The freight rates from Baltimore to Rotterdam were:

	On Maryland and Ohio tobaccos (per hogshead).	On Virginia and Kentucky tobaccos (cents per 100 pounds).
Aug. 1, 1914	$3.50	30
Dec. 1, 1914	5.25	82
Dec. 9, 1914	6.85	102

A hogshead of Maryland or Ohio tobacco weighs on an average about 800 pounds gross, and a Virginia or Kentucky hogshead about 1,650 pounds.

EXHIBIT 58.

NEW YORK, *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We herewith beg to state that our business as exporters of American tobacco is seriously affected by the present high ocean freight rates.

We are large shippers of Kentucky tobacco via New Orleans to Rotterdam, Holland, for which the ocean freight rate was 35 cents per 100 pounds before the war. Now $2.55 per 100 pounds is asked, which is practically prohibitive, particularly for the low-priced grades of tobacco.

The ocean freight rate from New York to Rotterdam was 25 cents per 100 pounds before the war; now $1.60 per 100 pounds is demanded.

The situation is all the more deplorable since prices for export tobacco have declined since the outbreak of the war, resulting in a corresponding loss to the growers in this country, but as the rise in freight rates more than offsets the decline in the prices of tobacco, the resumption of the export tobacco business, which business has been almost completely paralyzed since the outbreak of the European war, is seriously handicapped by the ocean freight situation.

Trusting that with Government aid the present abnormal situation referred to may be relieved, we remain,

Respectfully, yours, KREMELBERG & Co.

EXHIBIT 58A.

TOBACCO CONTRACT.

In consideration of the reduced rate of freight hereinafter mentioned, it is hereby agreed between the Holland-America Line of Rotterdam, Holland, running steamers between Rotterdam and Baltimore, parties of the first part, and Messrs. J. D. Kremelberg & Co., parties of the second part, to wit:

(1) That parties of the first part are to maintain from Baltimore to Rotterdam a service of steamers of the grade of 100 A–1 British Lloyds or equivalent, to sail weekly if possible, but not less than semimonthly.

(2) That the rate of freight on tobacco of the present approximate standard as to size and weight is to be as per rates on reverse side, United States gold, per hogshead to Rotterdam or Amsterdam.

(3) That the terms of this contract shall be from January 1, 1914, until December 31, 1914.

(4) That the parties of the second part herewith agree to above terms, and covenant, contract, and agree to ship all of the tobacco that they control by steamers of the Holland-America Line at the rate specified on reverse side.

(5) That if sailings are less than semimonthly—barring a reasonable delay caused by unavoidable accidents or dangers of the sea or other causes usually expected in contracts embracing carriage of goods by steamers—then the parties of the second part have the privilege of shipping by any other line, but the Holland-America Line shall not be liable for the difference in amount of freight charged by such other line.

(6) Penalty for nonperformance of this contract estimated amount of freight.

Signed at Baltimore in duplicate this 15th day of December, 1913, in behalf of the contracting parties.

Witness to signature of—

DRESEL, RAUSCHENBERG & Co., [SEAL.]
Agents Holland-America Line.
JOHN SONDERMAN.
p. pro. J. D. KREMELBERG & Co. [SEAL.]
W. ADDISON BAKER.
A. F. GIESEKE.

EXHIBIT 59.

[J. D. Kremelberg & Co., 313 South Charles Street.]

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 29, 1914.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, *Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: Referring to your esteemed letter of the 28th instant, we beg to report that since our last letter to you of the 26th instant the Holland-America Line has again raised its freight rates.

We inclose a statement showing the freight rates prevailing on August 1, 1914, and December 28, 1914, respectively, for tobacco, raw leaf and stems, which we trust will be of interest to you for your report to be made about January 10, 1915.

We are, dear sirs, very respectfully,

J. D. KREMELBERG & Co.

EXHIBIT 59A.

Ocean freight rates on tobacco, raw leaf and stems, from Baltimore, Md., to Rotterdam, Holland, as quoted by the Baltimore agency of the Holland-American Line, of Rotterdam.

Kind of tobacco.	Open freight rates prevailing—	
	Aug. 1, 1914.	Dec. 28, 1914.
Virginia, Kentucky, Burley, and North Carolina tobacco.	30 cents per 100 pounds	$1.25 per 100 pounds.
Maryland, Ohio, and Bay tobacco.	$3.50 per hogshead	$8.25 per hogshead.
Virginia stems	$5.06 per hogshead	$16 per hogshead.
Seed-leaf tobacco, in cases	$1.50 per case	$4 per case.
Loose-leaf tobacco, in burlap	$0.40 per 100 pounds	$1.25 per 100 pounds.

EXHIBIT 60.

LYNCHBURG, VA., *December 28, 1914.*

The SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Having seen in the newspapers that the Department of Commerce wishes to be informed about difficulties which shippers in the export trade experience as to making satisfactory freight engagements for shipments of merchandise to foreign countries, we beg to say that the different steamship lines having steamers running between home ports and neutral countries in Europe seem to be taking advantage of the fact that the number of steamers is not near sufficient to take care of the ordinary legitimate business with foreign countries and are constantly advancing freight rates, which now have reached such high figures as to be almost prohibitive to shippers as well as to producers (farmers). Our business is the buying of leaf tobacco direct from farmers and putting it in proper shape for export. Freight rates on leaf tobacco to Rotterdam, Holland, before outbreak of the war have been 30 cents per 100 pounds, and shortly thereafter the rate was raised to 45 cents; in November the same was advanced to 82 cents, beginning of December to $1.02, and now to $1.25 per 100 pounds. Rates to Liverpool are now quoted at $1 per 100 pounds, where we have been shipping before the war at about 25 cents per 100 pounds. Freight rates to Genoa, which is the port for shipments of leaf tobacco to Switzerland, have been about $5 to $6 a hogshead before the war, and have now advanced to about $25 a hogshead. We have been shipping some tobacco to Christiania, Norway, before the war at freight rates of about 40 cents per 100 pounds; during latter part of August we made a shipment at 65 cents per 100 pounds, and the same manufacturer now wants another lot shipped and we have not been able to secure a freight engagement so far, nor even a quotation at which this tobacco will be taken. Have just received quotation of $1.50 per 100 pounds.

There is a considerable scarcity of steamers flying the American or neutral flags, and unless more ships can be put at the disposal of shippers, causing a general reduction of ocean freight rates, which are now unreasonable, excessive, and almost prohibitive, the export business in this country is bound to suffer greatly.

Respectfully,

G. STALLING & Co.

EXHIBIT 61.

LYNCHBURG, VA., *December 31, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt of your communication of the 30th instant and beg to thank you for interest you are taking in finding means of transportation to Europe at reasonable rates.

Shipments of leaf tobacco are usually made in small lots of 10 to 20 hogsheads and seldom exceeding 100 hogsheads, and therefore it would require a combination of a good many shippers to charter a steamer and to secure enough tobacco to fill same.

If there are any steamers open for charter in Boston, they are either held at prohibitive rates or are not in good seaworthy condition. There are such demands for steamer room that it would not take long to fill same. I have now some 75 hogsheads of leaf tobacco in Baltimore, for which place has been engaged for shipment to Rotterdam about a month ago, and, though three or four steamers have sailed since that time for that port, the steamship agents have not been able to forward my tobacco, nor have they even made promises

when they will forward same, saying that they have a good deal of merchandise for which space has been engaged in November and which has not been forwarded. I have 120 hogsheads leaf tobacco in Norfolk also for shipment to Rotterdam, which I have been holding since middle of November and which has not yet been shipped, though I have promises that at least part of the tobacco will go forward very shortly. I have also tobacco in New York, for which place has been engaged in November to be shipped to Genoa, Italy, and thence to Switzerland, and I have at last received a promise that same may go forward by steamer sailing next week.

I have a shipment for Christiania, Norway, and the earliest sailing that has been promised me from New York will be some time in February, at a rate of $1.50 per 100 pounds, which is about $24 to $25 a hogshead, against the usual rate of about $5 a hogshead.

Such delays in shipment of merchandise to Europe are certainly a very serious handicap, and the only remedy I know of is to secure more ships, but an individual small shipper can, of course, do very little in that respect, and he is completely at the mercy of the big foreign steamship companies.

Very respectfully,

G. STALLING,
Of G. STALLING & Co.

EXHIBIT 62.

[Millers' National Federation.]

CHICAGO, *December 29, 1914.*

HON. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note that the Senate, in discussing the ship-purchase bill, on December 18 asked that the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury lay before it all available information regarding increases in ocean freight rates which have occurred since July 1, as well as all facts within their knowledge which may adversely affect American commerce.

We trust that in submitting this information to the Senate the sharp increase in ocean rates on flour will be given attention. We are attaching hereto a tabulated statement of ocean freight rates on flour, published by International Mercantille Marine, from several American ports to London, Aberdeen, and Liverpool. You will note that from July 18 to December 19 the ocean freight rates from all named American ports to ports in United Kingdom advanced over 100 per cent.

With splendid prospects for a revival of export flour business at the beginning of the present crop year, the American miller was encouraged to believe that the export flour business would speedily be developed again to its former basis; throughout this crop year, however, he has been handicapped by the differential between ocean rates on wheat and flour, in favor of the former. Unfortunately no ocean freight rates for wheat are published, each shipment being booked as a separate transaction, and we are inclined to believe that these ocean freight rates on wheat are subject to negotiation between the shipper and steamship company in each case, whereas rates on flour are "firm."

The effects of the differential in ocean freight rates as between wheat and flour, in favor of the former, is reflected in the exports of wheat and flour from the United States for 11 months ending November, 1914, as published in Department of Commerce Bulletin No. 5, series 1914–15. You will note by reference to page 2 of this bulletin that exports of wheat from the United States for 11 months ending November, 1914, were 144,371,088 bushels, as compared with 93,636,251 bushels for the same period of 1913. The exports of flour from the United States for 11 months ending November, 1914, were 10,806,818 barrels, as compared with 11,137,275 barrels for the same period of 1913.

This indicates that with conditions abroad that warranted an unprecedented demand for prepared foodstuffs the increase in the exports of wheat was sufficient to produce more than 10,000,000 barrels of flour, while exports of flour declined 330,457 barrels during that period. Unfortunately for the American miller, much of the wheat thus exported—under a low ocean rate—is purchased by millers abroad, who are thus placed in position to use the same wheat used by American millers, grown in America, and successfully sell flour in competition with American millers, with results as indicated above.

Perhaps it is pertinent to the subject to point out to you that in thus changing the character of the foodstuffs exported from finished product, flour, to raw material, wheat, that not only is there lost to American workmen the labor to manufacture the wheat into flour, but the loss is also felt by the industries allied to the milling business, the sack manufacturers, thus reducing our domestic use of cotton; the manufacturers of milling machinery, as production is curtailed, etc.; a very important factor is the loss to the country of the feed resulting from milling this wheat, which, if retained in this country, would be an important factor in increasing the raising of cattle; the loss of fertilizer resulting from a decrease in the number of cattle raised should not be overlooked, the whole subject having a bearing on the cost of living in this country.

The sharp advances in ocean freight rates on flour have not been confined to the International Mercantile Marine, however; the Holland-American Line, controlling, as it does, the only available means of transportation to Holland, has increased its rates on flour to a point where it is interfering seriously with the ability of American millers to compete for business in Holland against British millers, who are grinding American wheat. We are indebted to one of our members for the following quotations on flour (per 100 pounds), quoted by Holland-American Line for shipment to Rotterdam, Holland, from Newport News, Va.:

	Rate per 100 pounds.
Oct. 10, 1914	$0.27
Oct. 24, 1914	.27
Oct. 31, 1914	.27
Nov. 7, 1914	.29
Nov. 14, 1914	.32
Nov. 21, 1914	.34
Nov. 28, 1914	.34
Dec. 5, 1914	.43
Dec. 8, 1914	.53
Dec. 12, 1914	.58

As you are aware, the Government of the Netherlands recently reserved to itself a practical monopoly in all foodstuffs. Since that time (in November) a sharp and unprecedented advance in ocean freights will be noted. Not only has this company declined to give millers option on ocean space at a quoted rate, when the miller has a bid from Holland, but has, in some instances, advanced the rate to the miller overnight; and the miller, having accepted business at the rate quoted the day before, is forced to take a loss, owing to this arbitrary attitude of the Holland-American Line, which, by the way, is contrary to all precedents, as a miller must have extended to him an option on ocean-freight room at a given quotation for a time sufficiently long to cable his foreign correspondent and get a reply.

Before the creation of a monopoly on foodstuffs by the Government of the Netherlands, however, the Holland-America Line declined to carry flour for which it had contracted—in some instances before the war—and millers were unable to get that company to move large shipments of flour which had been made by millers in good faith. The situation became so acute that a committee representing the Millers' National Federation, waited upon Acting Secretary of State Lansing on November 7 and presented to him our complaints. Subsequent to this interview we submitted to the State Department details of shipments aggregating 90,000 sacks of flour of 50 kilos (110 pounds) each, a large proportion of which had been at seaboard for weeks, and had been declined by Holland-America Line, although ocean freight room had been contracted for in regular form when sales were made. Thanks to the good offices of the State Department nearly all this flour has now been shipped, but we submit that we should not have been compelled to bring pressure to bear from the Government in order to have this company live up to its contracts with our members.

The quotations on ocean freight room given herewith can easily be confirmed by your department, and we respectfully suggest that you secure the ocean rates under which wheat was carried on or about the same dates on which rates on flour are given; we think a comparison of these rates on wheat and flour will suggest to you that they greatly favor the port millers of Great Britain and foreign millers generally, placing them in a position to render it almost impossible for the American miller to extend his export trade, much as he desires to do so. We feel like tendering an apology for this lengthy letter, but it was necessary to give you some idea of the difficulties under which the American miller is laboring in his laudable efforts to increase the export flour business of the United States. We sincerely trust that something may be done to put us on a competitive basis.

Very truly, yours,

A. P. HUSBAND, *Secretary.*

Table of ocean freight rates on flour inclosed.

EXHIBIT 62A.

Rates on flour (per 100 pounds) published by International Mercantile Marine to ports in United Kingdom from American ports as named below.

	Week ending July 18, 1914.	Week ending Sept. 5, 1914.	Week ending Oct. 3, 1914.	Week ending Nov. 14, 1914.	Week ending Dec. 5, 1914.	Week ending Dec. 19, 1914.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
To London from—						
Boston	13	21	22	25	27	30
New York	13	21	22	25	27	30
Philadelphia	14	22	23	26	28	31
Baltimore	15	23	24	26	29	32
To Aberdeen from—						
Boston	19	27	28	31	35	38
New York	19	27	28	31	35	38
Philadelphia	19	27	28	[illegible]	36	39
Baltimore	20	28	29	32	37	40
To Liverpool from—						
Boston	12	20	21	24	26	26
New York	12	20	21	24	26	26
Philadelphia	13	21	22	25	27	27

EXHIBIT 63.

[Henry Lauts & Co.]

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 29, 1914.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having heard that an investigation is in progres at Washington over the shortage of ships to carry American products abroad and the excessive charges recently made by the steamship companies in forwarding such products to European ports we beg to inform you—

First. That the undersigned firm of Henry Lauts & Co. has a contract with the Holland-America Line for shipment of tobacco to Rotterdam and Amsterdam during the year 1914 at the following rates: Three dollars and fifty cents per hogshead for Maryland and Ohio tobacco, $5.06 per hogshead for tobacco stems, and 30 cents per 100 pounds for Kentucky and Virginia tobacco.

Since the outbreak of the European conflict now raging the line in question has raised its rates on three different occasions, and they are at present as follows: Seven dollars and fifty cents per hogshead for Maryland and Ohio tobacco, $15 per hogshead for tobacco stems, and $1.25 per 100 pounds for Kentucky and Virginia tobacco, although there is no clause in our contract justifying a change of rates on account of war and Holland is not at war.

The present rates charged by this line are almost prohibitive, and are a decided menace to the tobacco export industry of this country.

Second. That under our contract this company obligates itself to provide at least two steamers per month sailing from this port, which has not been done. During the current month we have only been able to ship 150 hogsheads of tobacco, whilst we have over 1,177 hogsheads awaiting shipment. By this great lack of facilities for shipping tobacco we are naturally subjected to serious inconvenience and loss.

If any relief to this unfortunate situation with reference to American shipping interests can be afforded by the Government, it will be greatly appreciated.

We have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

HENRY LAUTS & Co.

EXHIBIT 64.

[W. T. Selbels & Co., fruits and produce.]

NEW YORK, *January 14, 1915.*

SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding excessive through rate on barreled apples from New York to London via Liverpool on White Star Line:

On December 30 we forwarded by White Star liner *Adriatic* 400 barrels of apples to Messrs. Ridley, Houlding & Co., London, upon quotation of rate furnished by Lunham & Moore, ship brokers, Produce Ex-

change Building, New York, which quotation was 3s. 6d. per barrel to Liverpool. We and they both assumed that the customary land charge of about 2s. per barrel from Liverpool to London would be added to make up the through rate, and Lunham & Moore are positive that no intimation had been given them theretofore that the through rate would be figured on any other basis.

However, when shipment arrived in London a few days ago I received cablegram from Ridley, Houlding & Co. advising that the White Star Line had charged 8s. 5d. per barrel, being 2s. 11d., which is practically 75 cents per barrel, more than the amount should be.

Upon taking this matter up with Mr. Ryan, of the White Star Line here, their only excuse given for making this advanced rate is that they do not want to handle London business via Liverpool, and they refused to adjust it. Yet there would have been no question about billing these apples to Liverpool on the rate of 3s. 6d. per barrel, and then rebilling to London on the ordinary railroad rate. As a matter of fact, there were something over 50 barrels of the same mark of apples in the same shipment on the *Adriatic* which were sent as a sample under separate billing to a firm in Liverpool and which lot was forwarded at the rate of 3s. 6d. without question.

I am writing to you in the hope you may be able to offer some suggestion how we may secure redress against this high-handed practice and get the rate adjusted without having to go into court. These steamship lines seem to be a law unto themselves, and have taken advantage of nearly every opportunity brought about by reason of the European war to subject those handling export trade to all kinds of trouble and inconvenience.

While the amount involved in this transaction is only about $300, it will be a real hardship upon the writer to shoulder the loss involved by reason of the arbitrary, unreasonable through rate on this shipment, and in view of the fact that no notice or intimation had been given beforehand it would seem that some way ought to be open to force the White Star Line to bring their through rate in line with the sum of the ocean rate plus the land rate as above referred to.

For your information, will say that the reason shipment in question was billed via Liverpool was simply because we could get no space whatever on Atlantic Transport Line, running to London direct, during the week shipment in question was made. Shipment was billed order notify, bill of lading being handled through a New York bank. The writer did not examine the bill of lading to see what rate was specified, for it was not issued until nearly time for the steamer to sail and had to be rushed to get in the mail.

It is not our purpose to burden you with personal grievances, but the writer believes a transaction of this kind possesses elements which must commend itself to your consideration, and he hopes you may be able to offer some suggestion, not alone for our relief but to save other exporters from suffering by reason of such practice at the hands of these steamship people.

Awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience, and assuring you we shall be under lasting obligations for any suggestions or assistance you may be able to give, we are.

Yours, very truly,

W. T. SEIBELS & Co.,
By W. T. S.

EXHIBIT 65.

[W. T. Seibels & Co., fruits and produce.]

NEW YORK, *January 15, 1914.*

SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring further to excessive through rate on barreled apples from New York to London via Liverpool on White Star Line:

When writing you under date of January 14 we neglected to state that the through rate on apples to London direct on Atlantic Transport boats figures out 4s. 6d. per barrel; that is, the rate has been 4s. 6d. up until now. But we have just received advice that beginning February 1 Atlantic Transport Line is advancing their rates so that apples, ordinary, will pay 6s. per barrel. As a matter of fact, this line is endeavoring to exclude fruit shipments entirely, and it would seem that unless some efforts are made shortly we will be practically without shipping facilities for exporting fruit, except under rates that are absolutely prohibitory.

Yours, very truly,

W. T. SEIBELS & Co.,
By W. T. S.

EXHIBIT 66.

[Estate of Victor Holmes, deceased, exporter of zinc oxide.]

BOSTON, MASS., *December 28, 1914.*

SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have noticed in public prints that the Treasury Department has issued a statement asking all shippers who have been affected by high freight rates and scarcity of vessels to communicate with your department.

For the last 20 years Victor Holmes, and since his death his estate, has been engaged in the exportation of American zinc oxide to the Scandinavian countries.

Since the European war situation developed this business has been very considerably hampered by a number of conditions, among them the scarcity of freight vessels, exceedingly high rates of exchange, and, what is more important, the freight outlook for 1915.

In the year 1912 we were paying Funk-Edye & Co., freight agents for the Scandinavian-American Line, 17s. 6d. and 5 per cent primage for a long ton. During 1913 and 1914 this rate was increased to 21s. 3d. and 5 per cent, which is an extremely high rate for a commodity.

In view of the scarcity of vessels, we were obliged to stand this increase, and our freight brokers have been notified by Funk-Edye & Co. that the price for 1915 will be 50s. and 5 per cent, which rate of freight will entirely kill the business.

There is no competing line for this business to Copenhagen, to which point all of our shipments are made.

Since the outbreak of the war, however, several Danish shipping concerns have been sending steamers to New York and other American ports to take goods to Copenhagen. These have been more in the nature of charters, however, than catering for general cargo, and we have not been able to derive any benefit therefrom.

Funk-Edye & Co. have not refused to take any goods at our contract price of 21s. 3d. for this year, but we can cite one instance to you of where they have refused to accept contract goods and taken non-contract goods from us at higher rates.

On September 19 we asked for a shipment of zinc oxide to be made on September 23, or on the first sailing, which would have been either October 8 or 15. We were advised that these ships were full, but they would book the shipment for a chartered steamer, the *Bra Kar*, which was scheduled to sail about October 10. This steamer left October 22.

On September 24 we had an order for some dry white lead upon which we had no freight contract, and asked that it be carried on our regular zinc oxide contract, as it is less bulky, packed in larger packages and also stronger packages. We were told this could not be done, but that they would ship on October 15 or on one of the regular steamers at a price of 28s. 9d. plus 5 per cent primage, which was done.

From the above you will see we were able to get a later shipment made on an earlier steamer by paying a higher rate on a commodity which should have taken a lower rate.

I trust these facts will be of some service to you in your investigation.

Very truly, yours,

ESTATE OF VICTOR HOLMES.
By V. F. HOLMES, *Executor.*

EXHIBIT 67.

[Estate of Victor Holmes, deceased, exporter of zinc oxide.]

BOSTON, MASS., *January 6, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In further reference to my letter to you of December 28, and your reply of the 29th, would advise that I have just had occasion to get a freight-rate quotation on Copenhagen, and we are advised that Funk-Edye & Co. are asking $1 per 100 pounds on dry white lead to Copenhagen.

This is equivalent to $22.40 per ton, and with the ordinary rate of between $3.75 and $4.50, you will readily appreciate the absurdity of it.

Such a rate is, of course, entirely prohibitive, and we are unable to supply our Copenhagen customers on this account.

Very truly, yours,

ESTATE OF VICTOR HOLMES, DECEASED.
By V. F. HOLMES, *Executor.*

EXHIBIT 68.

[Farmers & Spinners' Cotton Co., cotton.]

CHARLESTON, S. C., *December 11, 1914.*

E. E. PROTT, Esq.,
Chief of Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your circular of the 5th has been handed to us in regard to shipments to Germany and asking us to state the nature of difficulties. The great difficulty in combining business, even with shipments to Gottenborg and Amsterdam, is the enormous increase in the freight rates demanded by the steamship lines. We consider this advance out of all reason and actually in restraint of trade. Within the last 10 days freights have more than doubled themselves, and where we formerly paid 85 cents per 100 the steamship lines are now demanding $2 to $2.50 for 100 pounds.

We think some attention should be given this matter, as it is seriously hampering the export of cotton.

Yours, truly,

FARMERS & SPINNERS' COTTON CO.,
CHAS. F. MIDDLETON, *President.*

EXHIBIT 69.

[Florida Power Co.]

OCALA, FLA., *January 9, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to place on file with you the name of Camp Phosphate Co., of Ocala, Fla. This company is very desirous of shipping phosphate to Rotterdam, Holland, as soon as they can secure ships for this purpose. The Camp Phosphate Co. has on hand a large tonnage of phosphate and also contracts. Our buyers are very anxious to get this phosphate, but on account of the high ocean freight rates we have not been able to get a ship up to date.

I take pleasure in referring you to my personal friend Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, United States Senator.

Yours, very truly,

R. C. CAMP.

EXHIBIT 70.

[G. Amsinck & Co., New York.]

NEW YORK, *January 5, 1915.*

Mr. CHARLES FERGUSON,
15 Grammercy Park, New York City.

DEAR MR. FERGUSON: In pursuance of your request made to me verbally yesterday, I am very glad to give you in writing the opinions expressed to you during our interview.

I think it is of the utmost importance that the United States should acquire at the present time steamers for our trade with the neutral countries. While I am not on principle in favor of Government-owned steamship lines, I believe in the present crisis only the Government is able to acquire a sufficient amount of steamers without much difficulty, and I see no reason why, after reestablishment of peace, the Government should not resell these steamers to American companies.

I shall take up first the South American field, because I believe it is to the greatest interest of this country to make use of this opportunity to secure as much of that trade as possible. There is a lack of freight room both to and from South America. The German steamers have naturally been withdrawn and the English steamers are being avoided as much as possible, both by shippers in South America as well as here, because their sailings are irregular, the higher rate of insurance, and because there is a feeling of uncertainty that all, or some of them, may be withdrawn at any time from the trade. There are not sufficient neutral steamers in the trade, in spite of the high rates of freight, to take the cargo from this country and bring it here, and we have constant complaints on that score from our customers in South America.

Of course it will be desirable, as pointed out by you, to acquire an entire going steamship line, with its perfect organization, but I do not consider this absolutely necessary as long as competent managers who have an experience in that trade are obtained for that line, and who

could, no doubt, at present engage sufficient experienced help to fill out their office and outside staff, while there is, as far as I know, no difficulty in obtaining competent agents in all the ports of South America, who would obtain cargo and give good advice on the subject of the line in their special territory.

A start should be made on a line running to Pernambuco, Rio, and Santos, in Brazil, and to the Argentine Republic. For the present only cargo boats could probably be obtained, and such should be acquired wherever possible. If the English are unwilling to sell their boats, as I understand, the United States should buy them wherever they can, and, if necessary, acquire German boats, even if there is English opposition, as long as the English are not willing to furnish the boats themselves, because it is absolutely essential, in my opinion, to make a start now. Later on it will be desirable to have a passenger and mail line from here to Rio and Buenos Aires, which could be profitably combined with the cargo of frozen meat from the River Plata, as this is a trade which is of vital importance to the United States, and will develop more and more; but such boats can not readily be acquired by purchase, but should be built.

I see no great urgent necessity of establishing a Government line to the West Indies, Venezuela, Colombia, and Central America, as sufficient American and neutral steamers are running there at present to fill the most urgent need.

There also seems to be no urgent need for an American line on the west coast of South America at present, since for cargo the merchant line is now under the American flag, and mails are carried by the Peruvian and Chilean steamships from Panama, both of which are under neutral flags.

A line to Italy does not seem necessary, as the Italian Government has sufficient steamers, if only the United States Government will stand together with the Italian to protect these steamers from constant and in many cases unnecessary interference and delay.

For Denmark, Norway, and Holland there is at present also not sufficient freight open, but there should be enough steamers of those countries—which have fleets of their own—to insure a sufficient traffic, if the United States will assist those countries also in maintaining a service which is not unnecessarily hampered and interfered with by the warring nations, as is done at present, where a great many commercial transactions for supplying those neutral countries with their requirements, and which are in no way affected by any articles of contraband of war or supplies for the fighting nations, are hampered and stopped.

Conditions in South America are rapidly improving, and with few exceptions merchants are paying regularly their bills to exporters from this country, according to our experience. It is, therefore, a splendid opportunity for the United States to obtain, during the disturbed conditions in Europe, a considerably larger share of the South American trade; but this can only be done by the immediate acquisition of at least 8 or 10 steamers to be put under the American flag.

Should you wish any further information I shall be glad to give it to you, and remain, dear Mr. Ferguson,

Yours, very sincerely,

JUSTUS RUPERTI.

EXHIBIT 71.

NEW YORK, *January 9, 1915.*

MR. S. C. MEAD,
Secretary Merchants' Association of New York,
Woolworth Building, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. MEAD: I have been requested by the traffic department to write to you on the subject of a report by the chamber of commerce in regard to a bill for acquiring steamers for the American Government now pending before Congress.

According to the report in the papers, the chamber of commerce finds that there is no lack of steamship facilities to South America. If the newspaper reports are correct, they arrive at this surprising result by consulting the steamship agents in New York City. It seems to me very queer to ask the steamship agents here if they would be anxious to have a new competing line, which might reduce freight rates. Wouldn't it be natural for any sensible person, making such an investigation, to consult the exporters and importers in New York, who would be the ones to benefit from any improvement in the shipping facilities? I have consulted, by telephone, with a number of large exporters and importers yesterday morning, and find that none of them have been consulted, and they seem to be just as indignant about the report as I am.

I inclose you copy of a letter which I have written at the request of a representative of the Department of Commerce and Labor, who came to see me, and, in addition, I wish to state that, without consulting anybody, the chamber of commerce could easily have found out that the tremendous advance of freight rates to Brazil and the Argentine Republic shows unquestionably a lack of freight room, because anybody is aware that the freight rates are governed by the rule of supply and demand. Anybody familiar with shipping will know that the withdrawal of the German tonnage all over the world, as well as the commandeering of a large amount of English tonnage by the British Government, has created a shortage all over the world.

But in regard to the American situation the position is rather curious, as I will explain to you herewith:

All shipments to Central America and Colombia are made by the United Fruit Co. or the Panama Railway Co., which are both now under the American flag, and since the outbreak of the war freights have not been advanced by these lines

The shipments to Venezuela are made by the Red D Line, also running under the American flag, and these rates have also not been advanced.

Shipments to the west coast of South and Central America are made from Panama by the Pacific Mail and the Peruvian and Chilean lines, also from here direct through the Panama Canal by the Merchants' Line under the American flag. On all these routes the freight rates have not been advanced.

To Santo Domingo, the Clyde Line, under the American flag, has also not advanced its freight rates, while the Dutch line, running to Haiti, Venezuela, and Surinam, advanced its freight rates at the beginning of the war 50 per cent, but finding that the American lines had made no advance, reduced it again to 25 per cent above the rates before the war.

In great contrast to these are the freight rates to Brazil and the River Plate, where there is only one American line running, which forms only a very small percentage of the steamers running to these countries, and this line is under the control of the United States Steel Corporation.

Freight rates to the Argentine Republic have advanced as follows: Turpentine was 25 cents case net, now 30 cents plus 25 per cent surtax; kerosene was 17 cents case net, now 21 cents case net; white pine was $10.50 per 1,000 feet net, now $12 plus 25 per cent per 1,000 feet; all other rates 25 per cent surtax.

And for lumber cargoes, which form one of the principal exports from this country to the Argentine Republic, the freight has advanced over 100 per cent. For instance, for pitch pine, steamers from the Gulf to the River Plate, would have been a few months ago 100s., while at present 225s. has been refused by the steamers.

We have received repeated complaints from our customers that they were unable to ship the freight contracted for in Brazil for this country on account of lack of space. I have no doubt that shippers on both sides avoid the English steamers as much as possible for fear of their withdrawal from the market.

I inclose a statement showing the advance of the rates in the trade to Brazil on different articles from June, 1914, to the present date.

Perhaps all these informations will interest you sufficiently to take up the matter with the different exporters and importers and present a report which differs from the one of the chamber of commerce and which may be of some interest to the Government in Washington.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, I remain, dear Mr. Mead,

Yours, very truly,

JUSTUS RUPERT.

EXHIBIT 71A.

NEW YORK, *January 9, 1915.*

Comparison of freight rates for Brazil.

Commodity.	Port.	June, 1914.	Jan. 9, 1915.
Rosin.....per barrel..	Bahia.....	$0.90	$1.50
Do.....do....	Rio de Janeiro....	.90	1.25
Do.....do....	Santos.....	.90	1.40
Lubricating oil.....do....	Pernambuco.....	2.52	3.00
Do.....do....	Rio de Janeiro....	2.52	3.00
Do.....do....	Santos.....	2.52	3.50
Turpentine.....case..	Rio de Janeiro....	.55	.60
Do.....do....	Santos.....	.61	.62½
Paraffin.....cubic feet..	.....do.....	.33	.45
Gasoline.....per case..	.....do.....	.17	.28
Refined petroleum.....do....	Pernambuco.....	.17	.28
Do.....do....	Bahia.....	.17	.28
Do.....do....	Santos.....	.17	.28
Cement.....per ton..	Rio de Janeiro....	3.60	8.00
Do.....do....	Santos.....	4.20	9.60
Bacon.....per cubic foot..	.....do.....	.32	.40
Lard.....per keg..	.....do.....	.45	.60
Flour.....per barrel..	Pernambuco.....	.60	.90
Do.....do....	Santos.....	.65	.90
Do.....per bag..	Pernambuco.....	.27½	.45
Do.....do....	Santos.....	.30	.45
Peas, barley, sago.....per cubic foot..	Rio de Janeiro....	14.40	14.00
Canned fish.....do....	Santos.....	.42	.45
Tobacco leaf.....do....	Bahia.....	.40½	.50
Chemicals.....do....	Rio de Janeiro....	10.00	16.00
Do.....do....	Bahia.....	13.20	18.00
Pharmaceutical products.....do....	.....do.....	.46½	.55
Do.....do....	Rio de Janeiro....	.36	.50
Hardware (builders').....do....	Santos.....	.25	.45

The rates of freight for all ports in north Brazil, namely, Para, Manaos, Maranham, and Ceara, remain unchanged, but a surcharge of 25 per cent has been imposed on all rates.

EXHIBIT 72.

THOMSEN & CO.,
New York, January 11, 1915.

MR. CHARLES FERGUSON,
Commercial Agent, Department of Commerce,
15 Gramercy Park, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our interview of last week, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity to express to you in writing my opinion in regard to the condition of our present shipping facilities, particularly to the east coast of South America. The business which has been diverted to this country in consequence of the European war is of such magnitude, or rather the opportunities offered are so far-reaching, that extraordinary measures should be taken at once to supply the necessary tonnage in order to develop a trade which may be of lasting benefit to our country. With the elimination of the German lines during the continuance of the war and the irregular sailings of the English steamers the export trade is greatly hampered, and I believe that under present abnormal conditions only energetic measures can be of any assistance. Although I do not indorse a permanent policy of ownership by the Government, I do believe that during the present critical situation only the Government can assist the development of the business by purchasing steamers suitable for the trade. With quick action the present difficulties can be overcome, as only increased freight room in neutral steamers is needed to increase the business, as shipments are now delayed from four to six weeks in consequence of the scarcity of freight room. A further advantage would be gained by the fact that shippers would be able to ship by American steamers, which being neutral would not be apt to be withdrawn or postponed and insure at lower war premiums than the English boats. Neutral freight room is exceedingly scarce in spite of the very high rates of freight both ways—from and to South America—and the irregular and insufficient service of the existing lines does a great deal of harm to the development of a new outlet of American goods.

I believe there are enough idle steamers at present which the Government could buy, put them under the American flag, and start at the shortest possible time a service which the exporters need so badly. We have a number of able shipping men in New York who are conversant with the South American trade, and under their advice and management a service could be inaugurated within a short period which would certainly be of immense benefit to the future of our export trade. I am not speaking of a steamer service to carry passengers, but solely to carry cargo; and there is no doubt in my mind that it would be easy to buy a sufficient number of suitable boats for that purpose and start with a line for the principal ports, say, Pernambuco, Rio, Santos,

Montevideo, and Buenos Aires. The west coast is fairly well covered by steamers under the American flag, and some neutral steamers.

Shipping conditions to Europe are, of course, unsatisfactory, on account of England's interference with the free movement of all neutral steamers, and the consequent delay of these boats in English ports has created a shortage of tonnage, which led to a considerable increase in the freight rates. Under ordinary conditions and after peace has been reestablished there are enough steamers to take care of the needs of commerce between here and Europe, but the growing trade to and from Brazil and the River Plate demands better facilities, and I hope that the Government will embrace the present opportunity and help the merchants now to increase the South American trade, a large part of which would surely remain with us after the war, provided sufficient shipping facilities are offered.

I remain, dear sir,

Yours, very truly, H. J. RIEDEL.

EXHIBIT 73.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Washington, January 2, 1915.

BOSTON MARITIME ASSOCIATION,
156 State Street, Boston, Mass.:

If any insurable American vessel available for charter carrying cotton Germany or Austria communicate Texas-Oklahoma Cotton Co., Fort Worth, Tex., immediately. These parties state unable to secure insurable American bottom.

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

EXHIBIT 73A.

JANUARY 2, 1915.

MY DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 31st ultimo is received.

Is it not the fact that the *Malden, Melrose,* and the *Everett* are colliers, taking coal from Norfolk to Boston? On what terms and how soon are they ready for charter for the foreign trade, and is insurance available for them in that trade to northern European points during the winter?

Is it not the fact that the *Peter H. Crowell* and the *Lewis K. Thurlow* have charters to carry lumber from the Pacific coast through the Panama Canal to the Atlantic coast? If so, when do these charters expire?

Is it not the fact that the *Middlesex, Suffolk, Hampden, Transportation, Coastwise,* and *Norfolk* are colliers for the coastwise trade? Are they running in that trade now? If not, on what terms are they open for charter, and is insurance available for them to northern European ports at this season?

Where are the steamships *F. J. Lisman, M. E. Harper, Seaconnet,* and *Penobscot* now, and on what terms are they available?

I have before me both letters and telegrams of the most urgent character, from which I quote this: "No insurable American bottom procurable for transporting cotton." And another: "Find it impossible to charter American steamer acceptable to marine underwriters. Can be big business, provided ships available."

If the vessels you mention are available for charter, as you say, how is it they are not taken at a time when anxious shippers are searching everywhere for bottoms?

Kindly let your letter be as detailed as practicable.

I have wired you to-day, as per inclosed copy. Please advise me the reply you make to the Texas-Oklahoma Cotton Co.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, *Secretary.*

MR. R. R. FREEMAN,
Corresponding Secretary Boston Maritime Association,
156 State Street, Boston.

EXHIBIT 73B.

[Boston Maritime Association.]

BOSTON, MASS., *January 4, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your telegram and letter of the 2d instant duly received. The following is the present disposition of steamers named in our list of December 9: *George Hawley,* left Falmouth Saturday for Copenhagen after detention of over a month; *Edison Light,* was at Shields, England, 31st, being bound from New York to Gothenberg with cotton; *L. V. Stoddard,* left New York 3d for North Sea port with cotton; *George E. Warren,* at Portland, goes to New York to load for Rotterdam; *Edward Pierce,* at Gothenberg or Copenhagen, with general cargoes from New York.

These steamers will probably go abroad again on their return. The *Peter H. Crowell* and *Lewis K. Thurlow* are under charter for Pacific trade, via Panama Canal, and charterers have option of about nine months more charter. The owners of last three steamers named have already contracted for a new 7,000-ton boat to be delivered in 10 months. The *Malden, Melrose, Newton,* and *Everett,* owned by the New England Coal & Coke Co., are used by them in supplying their coal trade. They have been open for charter from northern port to Europe, but so far owners have been unable to obtain conditions that would warrant them sending them to North Sea ports. The *Pacific* and *Atlantic* are still on the Pacific route, and I understand are in market for sale. The *Amalco* has been recently tanked and now engaged in oil trade. The *Middlesex, Suffolk, Hampden, Transportation,* and *Coastwise* are still running in the coal trade, but open for charter when conditions warrant. The *Lisman, Penobscot, Seaconnet,* and *M. E. Harper* are running coal under charters running for short periods.

None of the owners would consider sending their vessels to Gulf to load with nearly equivalent rates quoted from New York. The American iron ship *Vincent* was, I understand, sold to cotton people Saturday.

The insurance on all of the above steamers is largely placed in British and German companies, and for ports between Eastport and Rio, to go abroad, requires arrangements made to cover extra risk, and in nearly every case inquired into large amounts have been canceled, calling for placing of risks canceled in new companies and extra premiums. To obtain new insurance to cover steamer has been almost impossible, while extra premium and war risk becomes almost prohibitive. This in one steamer now in Europe amounted to $25,000, and she went to a neutral port in North Sea. On seven of the steamers quoted in our list the extra premium and war risk on hull alone amounts to about $40,000 per ship if bound to a German port. One of our largest shipping concerns have had their representative in England for a month with orders to buy a steamer. He can find none ready and could contract for none earlier than 1916 delivery.

I am sending the following telegram to-day to the Texas-Oklahoma Cotton Co., Fort Worth, Tex.:

"No Boston steamers offering Texas loading. Would you purchase new American steamer now due here, about 15,000-bale capacity, $600,000?

Yours, very truly, R. R. FREEMAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

EXHIBIT 73C.

[Furnished by Boston Maritime Association, 156 State Street.]

BOSTON, MASS., *December 9, 1914.*

List of tonnage opened for foreign trade owned in Boston.

Steamers.	Dead-weight capacity of tons.	Steamers.	Dead-weight capacity of tons.
Malden	7,300	Suffolk	7,500
Melrose	7,300	Hampden	7,500
Newton	7,300	Transportation	6,600
Everett	7,300	Coastwise	6,600
F. J. Lisman	3,700	Norfolk	5,500
M. E. Harper	3,700	Edison Light [1]	4,000
Seaconset	3,700	George Hawley [1]	4,000
Penobscot	3,700	L. V. Stoddard [1]	4,000
Edward Pierce	6,800	George E. Warren	4,000
Peter H. Crowell	4,900	Pacific [2]	8,500
Lewis K. Thurlow	5,100	Atlantic [2]	8,500
Amalco	5,000		
Middlesex	7,500	Total	140,400

[1] Now chartered for Europe. [2] Engaged in Atlantic-Pacific trade.

EXHIBIT 73D.

[Boston Maritime Association.]

BOSTON, MASS., *January 5, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Texas-Oklahoma Cotton Co., by wire, advise that they could not consider a steamer of size named them, requiring smaller tonnage, insurance available being limited.

Since writing you yesterday one of the large steamers named in my memoranda has been closed for Europe from New York, and others are considering charter there.

Yours, truly, R. R. FREEMAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

EXHIBIT 74.

[Rumsey & Co. (Ltd.), Seneca Falls Pump & Fire Engine Works.]

SENECA FALLS, N. Y., *January 8, 1915.*

The DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: It seems to us a shame that while a great many public-spirited concerns are doing their utmost to put our country ahead of the individual and to do all they can to help our country to get in strong commercially during this juncture, that some of the steamship companies should be taking exactly the opposite course and exacting the utmost that they can get in the way of rates, regardless of the effect that it has upon the future of the country. A comparison of freight rates prevailing before the war and those which are being asked at present shows many instances where the present rate is over twice what was previously asked, and the vessels leaving with all they can possibly carry. If we or any other manufacturer get in touch with a merchant, we will say, in Italy, who has been buying German goods, and he is now half inclined to buy the same goods from the United States, how great an obstacle steamship companies throw in the way of our inducing them to make the change, by their exorbitant rates. Can't the steamship companies be made to look at this matter in a broader way and do their part to help the country to win new customers and new markets instead of striving to exact the utmost toll simply because they have got for the moment the strangle hold?

Yours, very truly, RUMSEY & CO. (LTD.),
Per HAMILTON GAINNY.

EXHIBIT 75.

[Extract from telegram to Secretary of the Treasury from B. N. Baker, Baltimore, Md., Dec. 24, 1914.]

Have a cable from London this morning offering 4 new steamers, immediate delivery, one 12,000, two 11,000, and one 8,000 tons, dead-weight capacity, basis of $40 a ton and 4 guaranteed delivery within six months at same basis. All English or French built or building now, so there would be no difficulty in securing any amount of tonnage.

EXHIBIT 75A.

[Copy of cable received from B. N. Baker, Baltimore, Md., Dec. 22, 1914.]

CLT.

TARHEEL, *London:*

Can you offer sale several new steamers near delivery 10 to 12 thousand tons D. W. about 10 knots immediate cash Panama no chance.

BERNADINE.

EXHIBIT 75B.

[Copy of cable sent Dec. 23, 1914.]

CLT.

BERNADINE, *Baltimore:*

Can offer if unsold steamer completing St. Nazaire 12,000 tons eleven knots Lloyds class 100 A1 sister ship ready 6/8 months 90,000 each *Andreas* built Doxford 10,300 tons ten knots Returning maiden voyage New York Could deliver February 85,000 Would five 8,000 ton ten knots single deck building interest Might get them 75,000 each First about ready All delivered six months Feild

BERNARD N. BAKER,
Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

EXHIBIT 75C.

LONDON, *December 23, 1914.*

B. N. BAKER, Esq.,
Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

DEAR BERNARD: I confirm cable sent to-night, offering you the three boats, particulars of which I mailed you yesterday.

As stated in my letter yesterday, all available tonnage is in great demand here at present, and up to this evening I have been unable to get anything else to offer. At the same time, I shall continue my search.

I included in my cable an inquiry as to whether five 8,000-ton, 10-knot boats would interest you.

I know of five boats of these dimensions, which are being built for one company.

The first one is just completing, and they say all five of them will be completed within six months.

The builders inform me that they think they could get the owners to sell them for £75,000 each, and it occurred to me that possibly five sister boats, though they were 2,000 tons below the capacity you want, might be attractive to you, and I await your reply before further considering them.

Unfortunately, I learn that the steamer *Andreas* has already left New York, returning from her maiden voyage. She belongs to a Greek, who is simply willing to sell her for cash at something more than he paid for her. She, of course, is a new steamer, completed in November.

I was very much in hopes you could see her while she was in New York, but the owner has just informed me that she has left New York. She could be delivered on this side, however, in February, or possibly sooner, if she has finished discharging.

If you must have 10,000 tonners, she strikes me as being a suitable boat. She was built by Doxford & Sons, of Sunderland.

The two steamers which I offer you built at St. Nazaire ought to be attractive to you. They are not dear at £90,000.

The first one is about ready for delivery, and has been named *Ohio.* Her sister ship, they say, will be ready in about six or eight months.

There were three contracted for before the war. The contractor has failed, and the builder is offering them at a slight profit over the contract price.

The builders, Chantiers & Atteliers, are reputable people.

I hope in your letter you will give me some definite information as to what the ships are wanted for.

If they wanted to run from New York to Frisco, I think the Government here could easily be induced to allow them to go under the American flag. While if they are intended for regular tramp business, and possibly to carry cargo to belligerent countries, they might possibly place some difficulties in the way of the builders exporting them to a neutral country. At the same time I believe this difficulty might be overcome.

The possibility of this difficulty, of course, would not arise with either the French or the Greek boats.

I believe I can offer you any available boats to be had, and sincerely hope we may be able to do some business.

Of course, when it comes to final business, all of these prices might be subject to counter offers.

Owing to the condition of the market, however, owners will not make firm offers until they are satisfied it means business.

Yours, sincerely,

THOMAS L. FEILD.

EXHIBIT 76.

STEAMERS FOR SALE BY MERCHANT MARINE AGENCY, 1123 OLD SOUTH BUILDING, BOSTON, MASS., J. V. M'CARTHY, MANAGER.

[We can not make the prices or offers of the steamers as firm offers; they are subject only to being still available on receipt of your reply. We will not be responsible for errors in description.]

No. 1.—8,880 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 26½ feet draft. Built 1912 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 412 by 52 by 30½ feet; molded, cubic capacity, 535,000 cubic feet; 11¼ knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines, cylinders 28 inches, 46½ inches, 78 inches, by 54-inch stroke; 3 boilers, 200 pounds working pressure; water ballast in cellular bottom, peaks, and deep tank; 6 hatches; 11 winches; steam steering gear; 'tween decks, 9 feet high; bronze propeller; electric light; two decks laid, with complete shelter deck above same. Accommodations for a few first-class passengers. Bilge keels 170 feet amidships; Crompton's ash hoist; ventilators to each hold. Gross register, 4,863; net register, 3,109. Price, $420,000.

No. 2.—7,800 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 23½ feet draft. Built 1913 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 390 by 50.6 by 30.4 feet; molded, large cubic capacity; 10½ knots on 31 tons' consumption; triple engines, cylinders 26 inches, 43 inches, 71 inches, by 48-inch stroke; 3 boilers, 180 pounds' working pressure; water ballast in cellular bottom and peaks; 6 hatches; 10 winches; steam steering gear; 'tween decks, 8¾ feet high; powerful derricks; very complete specifications; 4 ventilators to each hold; telescopic topmasts, and special ventilators for perishable cargoes; two decks laid, with poop, bridge, and forecastle. Accommodations for a few first-class passengers. Gross register, 4,814; net register, 3,021. Price, $390,000.

No. 3.—7,300 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 23 feet draft. Built 1913 of steel, British corporation; dimensions 376 by 52 by 28 feet; molded, large cubic capacity; 10½ knots on 26 tons' consumption; triple engines, cylinders 25 inches, 41 inches, 68 inches, by 48-inch stroke; 3 boilers, 180 pounds' working pressure; water ballast in cellular bottom, peaks, and deep tank; 6 hatches; 10 winches; steam steering gear; shafting in excess of Lloyd's; exceptionally full specifications; 'tween decks, 8 feet high; powerful derricks; bronze propeller, electric lights, clear holds, deep bulb angle frames; two decks laid, with poop, bridge, and topgallant forecastle. Gross register, 4,411; net register, 2,834. Price, $350,000.

Above boats are under British registry.

No. 4 (withdrawn).—8,200 tons deadweight, including bunkers, on 24.6 feet draft. Built, 1914, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 400 by 52 by 30 feet; molded; cubic capacity, 440,839 cubic feet; 10½ knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 26 inches, 42 inches, 70 inches by 48-inch stroke; 3 boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast; 1,222 t.; 5 hatches; 10 winches; 2 decks; steam heating amidship; ice room; steam ash hoist; winch condenser. Gross register, 4,985; net register, 3,144. Price, $342,500.

No. 5.—8,700 tons deadweight, including bunkers, on 26.8 feet draft. Built, 1912, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 423.6 by 52 by 30.6 feet; molded; cubic capacity, 535,090 cubic feet; 12½ knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 28 inches, 46½ inches, 78 inches by 54-inch stroke; 3 boilers, 200 pounds working pressure; water ballast in cellular bottom, peaks, and deep tank; 6 hatches; 10 winches; steam steering gear; 'tween decks, 10.1 feet high; bronze propeller; electric light; three decks laid; shelter deck. Telescopic topmast. Net register, 3,095. Price, $350,000.

No. 6 (two steamers, duplicates).—9,000 tons deadweight, including bunkers, on 24.11 feet draft. Built, 1912, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 420.2 by 54 by 28.5 feet; molded; 531,630 cubic feet capacity; grain; 10½ knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 26 inches, 43 inches, 70 inches by 48-inch stroke; 2 double-end boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast 2,397 t. in cellular bottom, peaks, and deep tank; 5 hatches; 10 steam winches; 'tween decks, 8 feet beam; bronze propeller; wireless; 1 derrick for 3 t.; 10 derricks; 7-inch gun-metal liner on shaft; nautical draft-plate keel; 3 decks laid; shelter deck 8 feet high; steam steering gear. Two staterooms for 4 or 6 passengers. Net register, 3,173. Price, $375,000.

No. 7.—11,780 tons deadweight, including bunkers, on 28.3 feet draft. Built, 1913, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 470.4 by 58 by 34.10 feet; molded; cubic capacity, 645,000 cubic-feet bales; 12 knots on a moderate consumption; triple engines, amidship; cylinders, 26½ inches, 45 inches, 75 inches by 48-inch stroke; 2 boilers, D. E. tubular, 200 pounds working pressure; water ballast in cellular bottom 2,939 t., also in peaks and tanks; 6 hatches; 12 steam winches; steam steering gear; two decks laid; coefficient '75 nautical draft; side lights on poop, bridge, forecastle, and 'tweens; 14 derricks, those on main deck for 10 t., on bridge for 7 t.; electric light; wireless. Net register, 4,625 t. Price, $625,000.

Above steamers are under British registry.

No. 8.—10,570 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 26.9 feet draft. Built, 1903, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's special survey No. 2, 1911; dimensions, 455.8 by 55.2 by 33.10 feet; molded, cubic capacity, 605,045 feet; 10½ knots on 38/40 tons consumption; triple engines amidship; cylinders, 27 inches, 46 inches, 76 inches by 51-inch stroke; three boilers, S. E. tubular, 200 pounds working pressure, water ballast, 3,896 t. in cellular bottom; peaks and deep tank; 6 hatches; 11 steam winches; and 16 derricks; steam steering gear; electric light and wireless; two decks laid. Net register, 4,286. Price, $450,000.

No. 9.—8,200 tons dead-weight, including bunkers; 25.4½ feet draft. Built, 1913, of steel; dimensions, 380 by 53 by 28.6 feet; molded, cubic capacity 490,927 grain, 453,791 cubic feet bale; 10½ knots on 30 tons consumption; triple engines amidship; cylinders, 26 inches, 42 inches, 70 inches by 48-inch stroke; two S. E. and one auxiliary S. E. boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast; 1,297 t. in C. D. B. and peaks; 6 hatches; 10 steam winches; and steam steering gear; two decks laid, one of which is steel; shelter deck, part steel and part iron; plate keel; electric light; two main boilers; forced draft; side lights in poop; built propeller, with manganese-bronze blades; spare blades; 25 t. evaporator. Net register, 2,778. Price, $380,000.

No. 10.—8,000 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.6 feet draft. Now building; will be ready for delivery in February or March, 1915; of steel; dimensions, 401 by 52.1 by 30 feet; molded; triple engines; cylinders, 27 inches, 44 inches, 75 inches by 48-inch stroke; surface condenser; 10 to 11 knots. Price, $370,000.

No. 11 (withdrawn).—8,575 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.10 feet draft. Built, 1914, of steel; 100 A1 Lloyd's; dimensions, 385.6 by 53.6 by 36 feet to shelter; cubic capacity, 503,520 cubic feet; 9½ knots, loaded, on 25 tons consumption; triple engines amidship; cylinders, 25 inches, 42 inches, 68 inches by 48-inch stroke; three boilers, S. E. tubular, 180 pounds working pressure; 5 hatches; 10 steam winches; steam steering gear; steam windlass; two decks laid, one of steel, one of iron; shelter deck. Net register, 2,895. Price, $320,000.

No. 12.—10,320 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 26 feet draft. Built, 1914, of steel; class, British corporation; dimensions, 425 by 55.5 by 30 feet; molded; two decks laid; shelter deck; cubic capacity, 597,710 cubic feet; 10½ knots laden, about 40 tons consumption; triple engines amidship; cylinders, 28 inches, 45 inches, 75 inches by 51-inch stroke; three tubular boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; 10 steam winches; 10 derricks; also 2 small ones on poop; coefficient, '79. Most up-to-date steamer, with desking, telegraph, shifting boards, cargo battens, telescopic topmast, with crosstrees at top and tables at bottom. All holds inside coated with bitumastic enameled composite, etc. Net register, 3,500. Price, $400,000.

Above steamers are under British registry.

No. 13.—8,800 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.6 feet draft. Built 1913 of steel, class B. S., British corporation; dimensions, 402 by 54 by 27.6 feet; molded, cubic capacity, 540,442 cubic feet; 10 knots on 28 tons consumption; triple engines; cylinders, 26 inches, 42 inches, 70 inches by 48-inch stroke; surface condenser, 3 boilers, S. E. tubular, 180 pounds working pressure, water ballast, C. D. B., F. and A. P. T.; 7 steam winches, 1 deck, and shelter laid. Net register, 2,930. Price, $325,000.

No. 14.—8,036 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.5 feet draft. Built 1914 of steel, 100 A1 Lloyds'; dimensions, 385 by 52 by 29.6 feet; molded, cubic capacity 432,979 cubic feet; 10 knots on 28 tons consumption; triple engines, amidship; cylinders, 25 inches 40 inches, 68 inches by 48-inch stroke; surface condenser, 3 boilers, S. E. tubular, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast, 1,183 t. in C. D. B., F. and A., P. T.; 5 hatches, 10 steam winches, steam windlass, steam-steering gear; 1 deck laid, steel, 'tween deck, 7.6 feet; 12 derricks, 4 derrick posts; wood-grain divisions, coefficient, '783; steam heating, bilge keels; four 18-inch vents each hold; ice room; steam-ash hoist; Morrison 25 t. evaporator; F. water condenser, 1,500 gallons, etc. Net register, 2,955. Price, $315,000.

No. 15.—8,150 tons dead-weight, including bunkers, on 24.3 feet draft. Built 1913 of steel, highest British corporation; dimensions, 385 by 52.1 by 29.6 feet; molded, cubic capacity, 430,208 cubic feet

grain, or 409,047 cubic feet bales; 9.5 to 10 knots on 27 tons ordinary consumption; triple engines, amidship; cylinders, 25 inches, 40 inches, 68 inches by 48-inch stroke; surface condenser, 3 S. E. tubular boilers, 180 pounds working pressure; water ballast, 1,430 t., C. D. B. and peaks; 6 hatches; 10 steam winches; steam windlass; steam-steering gear; 1 deck laid, steel; 1 spare room for passenger accommodation; 12 derricks and tables; 4 derrick posts; grain divisions; spare propeller; shafts; evaporator and heater; also winch condenser. Net register, 2,954. Price, $340,000.

Above steamers are under British registry.

No. 16.—Steamship built of steel, to carry passengers and cargo; twin screw; built, 1894; engines, triple; indicated horsepower, 2,500; length, 383.4 feet; breadth, 46 feet; depth, 27.2 feet; registered gross tonnage, 4,761; electric light; sub. sig.; 12 knots; arranged to carry 16 first and second class passengers, 1,000 steerage. Price, $375,000.

No. 17.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 137 first and second class, 1,260 steerage; built of steel, 1894; twin screw; engines, triple; indicated horsepawer, 2,500; length, 383.4 feet; breadth, 46 feet; depth, 27.2 feet; registered gross tonnage, 5,640; electric light; sub. sig.; 12 knots. Price, $625,000.

No. 18.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 120 first and second class, 1,344 steerage; built of steel, 1899; twin screw; engines, triple; speed, 13 knots; indicated horsepower, 3,200; length, 428.9 feet; breadth, 54.3 feet; depth, 39.4 feet; registered gross tonnage, 7,414; electric light; sub. sig. Price, $625,000.

No. 19.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 35 first and second class, 206 third class, 2,144 steerage; built of steel, 1899; twin screw; engines, quadruple; 12½ knots; indicated horsepower, 5,500; length, 501 feet; breadth, 58.1 feet; depth, 36.7 feet; registered gross tonnage, 10,058; electric light; wireless telegraphy; sub. sig. Price, $1,125,000.

No. 20.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 210 first class, 224 second class, 1,343 steerage; built of steel, 1896; twin screw; engines, quadruple; speed, 16 knots; indicated horsepower, 7,000; length, 523 feet; breadth, 60.1 feet; depth, 34.8 feet; registered gross tonnage, 10,695; electric light; Stone Lloyd bulkhead doors; sub. sig. Price, $1,250,000.

No. 21.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 110 first class, 175 second class, 252 third class, 1,660 steerage; built of steel, 1896; twin screw; engines, quadruple; speed, 16 knots; indicated horsepower, 7,000; length, 526.4 feet; breadth, 60 feet; depth, 34.6 feet; registered gross tonnage, 10,915; electric light; Stone Lloyd bulkhead doors; sub. sig.; wireless telegraphy. Price, $1,250,000.

No. 22.—Passenger and cargo steamer arranged to carry 133 first and second class, 1,450 steerage; built of steel, 1901; twin screw; engines, quadruple; speed, 13 knots; indicated horsepower, 3,400; length, 429.3 feet; breadth, 54.3 feet; depth, 39.6 feet; registered gross tonnage, 7,524; electric light; sub. sig. Price, $812,500.

Above steamers are under German registry.

EXHIBIT 77.

[Panama Railroad Co., Panama Railroad, Panama Railroad Steamship Line.]

NEW YORK, *January 15, 1915.*

SIR: I confirm the following statement made to you this morning regarding our contract with the Earn-Line:

The Earn-Line Steamship Co. is an American corporation located in Philadelphia, and operates time-chartered tramp steamers in the West Indian trade.

It is under contract with us to furnish tonnage to transport from Hampton Roads to the Canal Zone all the coal we require for the operations of our company and the Panama Canal, and is similarly under contract with the Maryland Steel Co. to carry all its ore from Cuban ports to Sparrows Point. It is because of these contracts, giving its steamers full cargoes both ways, that the Earn-Line is able to carry our coal and the Maryland Steel Co.'s ore at lower rates than its competitors.

In the early part of September we had a large stock of coal on hand, and as the requirements of steamers passing through the canal had become considerably lessened we notified the Earn-Line that at least for a month or two we would not require more than 20,000 tons per month. There was no outward West Indian business to which these steamers could then be assigned, and the Earn-Line, figuring they could profitably employ some of their steamers in the European freight trade, and that there would be no question of their returning to this country the latter part of October, chartered four of them for European business.

These steamers arrived out with their cargoes were delayed in discharging because of lack of berthing facilities, labor, etc., were then taken over; first, by the English, and then by the French Governments for the carriage of stores, ammunition, etc., and are still on the other side with no immediate prospect of their return to this country until these two Governments release them.

In the meantime the demands for coal considerably increased and we call upon the Earn Line to furnish the tonnage required. Our stock has been reduced from 90,000 to 40,000 tons, and both the Earn Line and our company are scouring the charter market in the effort to secure sufficient tonnage to carry to the Isthmus the amount of coal it is imperative we should keep there. The usual charter rates for vessels of this kind range from 3s. 2d. to 3s. 9d. per dead-weight ton. The agents of the Earn Line have informed me that in some instances they have, by instructions of their principals, offered owners, all of whom are located in Europe, as high as 11s. per ton, and are at the present time making offers on all steamers that are open for business even at such high rates that the officials of the Earn Line know it will mean a severe loss to them if the vessels are secured, and might, if conditions do not improve, result in their retirement from business.

We have the right under our contract to go out in the market and charter any steamers we can secure in the event that the Earn Line does not furnish the tonnage we call for. We have this in view, but we know we can not make any better progress in this direction than the agents of the Earn Line and that our interference might simply result in increasing the present high rates by unnecessarily adding to the number of concerns that are seeking tonnage.

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed) T. H. ROSSBOTTOM,
Assistant to Vice President.

The SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT 78.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, January 2, 1915.]

ABNORMAL FREIGHT RATES FOLLOW TONNAGE SCARCITY—CHAOTIC CONDITIONS PREVAILED AFTER DECLARATION OF EUROPEAN WAR—FIRST SIX MONTHS OF THE YEAR WITHOUT STARTLING FEATURES—RATES MAINTAINED EASY LEVEL—LOSS OF GERMAN MERCHANT MARINE, COMBINED WITH EXPANSION IN FREIGHT MOVEMENT, BRINGS RECORD-BREAKING FREIGHT RATES.

Conditions in the steamship freight trade were at the two extremes during the year just ended. The year opened with freight business, both import and export, affected to a material degree by the internal depression in this country. During the first six months freight rates were easy and fluctuated within a narrow margin. The advent of the European war in August brought chaotic conditions, but out of the maelstrom there developed a period of high freight rates seldom, if ever, approximated in the annals of the shipping world.

During the early part of the year trade, both foreign and domestic, felt the heavy hand of depression. The pendency of the request for a 5 per cent advance in railroad freight rates, the assimilation of the new tariff, and the reorganization of the banking system of the country combined to lessen the volume of trade. The steamship lines faced a dull year. Aside from the movement of old-crop grain, which furnished good freight, the lines lacked the stimulating effect of an active movement in general cargo. Exports of manufactured articles and imports of supplies from Europe, the Orient, and South America dropped to a low level under the repressive conditions that obtained.

In March there was quite a flurry in freight rates, but the upward movement was only spasmodic. Rates soon dropped back to the level effective at the beginning of the year. How berth rates acted in the first five months of the year is shown in the following compilation of berth rates to the principal ports of Europe. The figures show the berth rates quoted by the lines on the first of each month from January to August.

LIVERPOOL.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	2 d.	2 d.	1½ d.	1½ d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	28 c.	25 c.	25 c.	20 c
Cottonseed oil	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.	4 s 6 d
Sack flour	14 c.	12 c.	12 c.	11 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	1½ d.	1½ d.	2½ d.	2½ d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	20 c.	20 c.	20 c.	20 c.
Cottonseed oil	4 s. 0 d.	4 s. 0 d.	4 s. 0 d.	4 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	10 c.	10 c.	12 c.	12 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

LONDON.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	2½ d.	2 d.	2 d.	1½ d.
Provisions	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cottonseed oil	5 s. 0 d.	5 s. 0 d.	5 s. 0 d.	5 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	15 c.	13 c.	13 c.	12 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	1½ d.	1½ d.	1½ d.	2½ d.
Provisions	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cottonseed oil	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	11 c.	11 c.	13 c.	13 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

GLASGOW.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	2 d.	2 d.	2 d.	1½ d.
Provisions	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cottonseed oil	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	17 c.	15 c.	15 c.	15 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	1½ d.	(1)	2 d.	2 d.
Provisions	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cottonseed oil	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	13 c.	13 c.	14 c.	14 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

[1] Nominal.

HULL.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	2½ d.	2½ d.	2 d.	2 d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	18 c.	17 c.	17 c.	17 c.
Measurement goods	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	1¾ d.	2 d.	2 d.	2¾ d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	15 c.	15 c.	17 c.	17 c.
Measurement goods	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.

HAMBURG.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain (pfennig)	32½	32½	32½	30
Provisions	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.
Cottonseed oil	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.
Sack flour	15 c.	13 c.	12 c.	12 c.
Measurement goods	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain (pfennig)	32½	35	30	[1]
Provisions	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.	
Cotton, compressed	35 c.	25 c.	25 c.	
Cottonseed oil	32 c.	32 c.	32 c.	
Sack flour	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.	
Measurement goods	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.	

BREMEN.

	Jan 1	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain (pfennig)	32½	32½	32½	30
Provisions	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cotton, compressed	22 c.	22 c.	22 c.	20 c.
Cottonseed oil	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Sack flour	16 c.	15 c.	15 c.	12 c.
Measurement goods	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain (pfennig)	30	32½	33	[1]
Provisions	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	[1]
Cotton, compressed	20 c.	20 c.	20 c.	[1]
Cottonseed oil	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	[1]
Sack flour	11 c.	11 c.	12 c.	[1]
Measurement goods	12 c.	12 c.	12 c.	[1]

ROTTERDAM.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	5½ c.	3¾ c.	4½ c.	3½ c.
Provisions	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Cotton, compressed	35 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cottonseed oil	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Sack flour	13 c.	13 c.	12 c.	12 c.
Measurement goods	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	3½ c.	3½ c.	3½ c.	6 d.
Provisions	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Cotton, compressed	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cottonseed oil	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Sack flour	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.	11 c.
Measurement goods	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.

COPENHAGEN.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	1 s. 10½ d.	1 s. 10½ d.	1 s. 10½ d.	2 s.
Provisions	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	40 c.	40 c.	40 c.
Cottonseed oil	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Sack flour	18 c.	17 c.	17 c.	17 c.
Measurement goods	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.

[1] Quotations withdrawn.

COPENHAGEN—continued.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	1 s. 10½ d.	1 s. 10½ d.	2 s.	2 s. 1½ d.
Provisions	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	40 c.	40 c.	40 c.
Cottonseed oil	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Sack flour	17 c.	17 c.	19 c.	20 c.
Measurement goods	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.

MARSEILLE.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1
Grain	3 s. 0 d.	2 s. 9 d.	2 s. 7½ d.	2 s. 6 d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	20 c.	20 c.	20 c.	18 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	2 s. 1½ d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 10½ d.	3 s. 1½ d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	18 c.	18 c.	18 c.	18 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

HAVRE.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	2 s. 9 d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 1½ d.
Provisions	30 c.	30 c.	30 c.	30 c.
Cotton, compressed	30 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cottonseed oil	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.
Sack flour	22½ c.	22½ c.	22½ c.	22½ c.
Measurement goods	$5	$5	$5	$5

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	2 s. 1½ d.	2 s. 1½ d.	2 s. 1½ d.	2 s. 6 d.
Provisions	30 c.	30 c.	30 c.	30 c.
Cotton, compressed	25 c.	21 c.	21 c.	21 c.
Cottonseed oil	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.
Sack flour	18 c.	18 c.	18 c.	18 c.
Measurement goods	$5	$5	$5	$5

GENOA.

	Jan. 1.	Feb. 1.	Mar. 1.	Apr. 1.
Grain	3 s. 0 d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 0 d.	1 s. 6 d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	30 c.	30 c.	25 c.
Cottonseed oil	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Sack flour	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.
Measurement goods	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.

	May 1.	June 1.	July 1.	Aug. 1.
Grain	2 s. 0 d.	1 s. 9 d.	2 s. 3 d.	2s. 9 d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	25 c.	22½ c.	22½ c.	22½ c.
Cottonseed oil	25 s.	25 s.	25 s.	25 s.
Sack flour	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.
Measurement goods	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.

CHAOTIC CONDITIONS WITH ADVENT OF WAR.

The disorganization of steamship services, the enforced withdrawal of the German and American merchant marines, and the cost of war risk on hulls chargeable to freight combined to send up freight rates to Europe by the regular lines. Advances ranging from 100 to 400 per cent were made in the period from September to the end of the year, with rates firm and still advancing when 1914 closed.

During the month of August absolute disorder replaced the perfect running and intricate machinery of the steamship trade. The big lines withdrew all berth-rate quotations and would not make rates on any other than actual freight offers. Rates changed from day to day; in fact, rates on same conditions differed each hour of the day, but throughout the movement was upward, and when after a month of chaos the steamship lines recast their services to fit in with war conditions, thus enabling the quotations of berth rates, it was noticed that the freight rates were fully double those quoted immediately before the advent of the war.

The English lines suffered from many causes. Early in August their best ships were requisitioned by the British Admiralty. The movement of troops from Dover and other channel ports to France forced the British Government to order the lines using London as their terminal to send their boats to Liverpool. The Red Star Line, with its impor-

tant service to Antwerp, operated its boats to Liverpool. Many other changes of a similar nature occurred, so that it took considerable time before order was evolved out of chaos.

With the conclusion of the period of readjustment the volume of freight, temporarily diminished, began to assume large proportions. The Governments of France and England placed orders with manufacturers in this country, and the movement of these war materials required considerable space. Munitions of war, hospital equipment, foodstuffs, and a host of other articles began to arrive at the seaboard about the middle of September, all seeking fast transportation across the Atlantic. The lines, hampered by the loss of their best vessels through naval requisitioning, were forced to bring out numerous of the small vessels, and while eventually the volume of sailings to Europe was equivalent to the tonnage movement before the war the amount of freight offered to the lines continued to exceed the supply of vessels.

ABNORMAL FREIGHT RATES FOLLOW TONNAGE SCARCITY—CHAOTIC CONDITIONS PREVAILED AFTER ADVENT OF WAR.

Forwarding houses perceived the freight space would eventually be at a premium, and later developments proved that their surmise was correct. During October and November the steamship lines received demands for freight space on vessels sailing far in advance of current requirements. Late in November and throughout December the efforts of forwarders to secure freight space for both prompt vessels and those sailing in January were without avail.

INCREASING TRADE WITH NEUTRALS.

The Holland-American Line and the Scandinavian-American lines chartered numerous additional vessels to take care of the volume of freight offering. The Norwegian Government established a buying agency in this country in order to insure the maintenance of low prices on food products. Many ships took cargoes of foodstuffs; in fact, it has been estimated by freight authorities that fully 80 per cent of the excess movement of freight to Europe over last year consisted of foodstuffs.

With the three principal food-producing nations in the throes of martial conflict, those smaller nations of Europe formerly dependent on Germany, Austria, and Russia for grain found their source of supply cut off. The unusually heavy grain crop garnered in 1914 in this country enabled the supplying of Europe without trouble. The export surplus of wheat just fitted in with the extra requirements of Europe, and the price of grain, instead of declining in face of the heavy crops, advanced on the steady export demand.

How berth rates on the leading export commodities advanced in the last half of the year just closed is shown in the table appended. Comparison with the rates quoted at the beginning of the year and those in force just before the outbreak of the war show that as the year drew to a close the rates demanded by the lines had increased from 200 to 400 per cent over those in force before the war.

LIVERPOOL.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	2 d.	2⅜ d.	3 d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	28 c.	20 c.	20 c.
Cottonseed oil	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 0 d.	4 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	14 c.	12 c.	20 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	4 d.	6 d.	6½ d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	35 c.	50 c.	60 c.
Cottonseed oil	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.	5 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	21 c.	24 c.	26 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

LONDON.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	2¼ d.	2½ d.	3½ d.
Provisions	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cottonseed oil	5 s. 0 d.	4 s. 6 d.	4 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	15 c.	13 c.	21 c.
Measurement goods	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	3½ d.	6½ d.	7½ d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	5 s. 0 d.	5 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	22 c.	25 c.	27 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

HULL.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	2¼ d.	2⅜ d.	4 d.
Provisions	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Sack flour	18 c.	17 c.	25 c.
Measurement goods	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.	15 s. 0 d.

HULL—continued.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	4 d.	6½ d.	7 d.
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	26 c.	28 c.	30 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

HAVRE.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	2 s. 9 d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 6 d.
Provisions	30 c.	20 c.	30 c.
Cotton, compressed	30 c.	21 c.	21 c.
Cottonseed oil	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.
Sack flour	22½ c.	18 c.	30 c.
Measurement goods	$5	$5	$5

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	2 s. 9 d.	4 s. 0 d.	4 s. 0 d.
Provisions	40 c.	40 c.	50 c.
Cotton, compressed	45 c.	60 c.	100 c.
Cottonseed oil	45 c.	45 c.	45 c.
Sack flour	25 c.	36 c.	40 c.
Measurement goods	$6	$6	$10

GENOA.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	3 s. 0 d.	2 s. 9 d.	.....
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	22½ c.	22½ c.
Cottonseed oil	25 c.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	40 s. 0 d.
Measurement goods	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	4 s. 0 d.	5 s. 0 d.	6 s. 6 d.
Provisions	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.	50 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	75 c.	80 c.	100 c.
Cottonseed oil	40 c.	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	34 c.	35 c.	50 c.
Measurement goods	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.

NAPLES.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	3 s. 6 d.	3 s. 0 d.	.....
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	30 c.	30 c.
Cottonseed oil	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	40 s. 0 d.
Measurement goods	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	4 s. 6 d.	5 s. 9 d.	6 s. 9 d.
Provisions	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.	50 s. 0 d.
Cotton, compressed	65 c.	80 c.	100 c.
Cottonseed oil	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	34 c.	35 c.	50 c.
Measurement goods	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.

COPENHAGEN.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	1 s. 10½ d.	2 s. 1½ d.	4 s. 6 d.
Provisions	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Cotton, compressed	40 c.	40 c.	40 c.
Cottonseed oil	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.	31 s. 3 d.
Sack flour	18 c.	20 c.	32 c.
Measurement goods	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.	21 s. 3 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	[1]5 s. 0 d.	[1]6 s. 0 d.	[1]6 s. 0 d.
Provisions	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.
Cottonseed oil	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.
Sack flour	32 c.	35 c.	55 c.
Measurement goods	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.	46 s. 3 d.

[1] Nominal.

ROTTERDAM.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	5½ d.	6 d.	.....
Provisions	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Cotton, compressed	35 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cottonseed oil	28 c.	28 c.	28 c.
Sack flour	13 c.	11 c.	20 c.
Measurement goods	10 c.	10 c.	10 c.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	11 c.	.....	.....
Provisions	38 c.	38 c.	38 c.
Cotton, compressed	.....	.....	100 c.
Cottonseed oil	35 c.	35 c.	35 c.
Sack flour	25 c.	27 c.	32 c.
Measurement goods	15 c.	15 c.	15 c.

MARSEILLE.

	Jan. 1.	Aug. 1.	Sept. 1.
Grain	3 s. 0 d.	3 s. 1½ d.	.....
Provisions	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.	30 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	30 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.	25 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	20 c.	18 c.	30 c.
Measurement goods	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.	20 s. 0 d.

	Oct. 1.	Nov. 1.	Dec. 1.
Grain	3 s. 3 d.	5 s. 6 d.	6 s. 6 d.
Provisions	35 s. 0 d.	35 s. 0 d.	40 s. 0 d.
Cottonseed oil	35 s. 0 d.	35 s. 0 d.	35 s. 0 d.
Sack flour	35 c.	37½ c.	45 c.
Measurement goods	35 s. 0 d.	35 s. 0 d.	35 s. 0 d.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE POOR.

The South American lines had a poor year throughout. Depression in Brazil, combined with poor crops in the Argentine, caused a heavy falling off in trade. Steamship lines maintained their regular sailings, however, but were often forced to fill cargo holds up with coal.

With the advent of the war the demand for coal from South America created quite a little activity among the regular lines. The big railroads and power companies that had contracts for Welsh coal placed orders with the Virginian producers, and steamers that formerly took coal as cargo simply to fill up now found fuel competing with general cargo for freight space. This condition did not last long, however, and toward the end of the year South American conditions again fell back to the inactivity that prevailed earlier in the year.

A FAIR YEAR FOR FAR EASTERN LINES.

Steamship lines operating to Australia, India, China, and Japan had fairly good business during the year just ended. The Australian market was especially brisk. China and Japan were good purchasers and the amount of freight forwarded compared favorably with that of 1913. Toward the latter part of the year the long-distance lines were placed at a disadvantage owing to the high cost of chartering steamers. Where tonnage could be secured at 4 shillings per ton per month on a dead-weight basis before the war the rate early in December was 12 shillings. Few vessel owners were inclined to place their steamers in the long-distance trades, even at the rate of 12 shillings, preferring to keep their vessels in the trans-Atlantic trades.

During the last week of December the long-distance steamship lines were seriously considering advancing freight rates in order to meet operating costs, and it is expected that some official action in the direction of increasing freight rates will be taken early in the new year.

EXHIBIT 79.

[Wall Street Journal, January 1, 1915.]

OCEAN FREIGHT RATES ARE SOARING STEADILY HIGHER—ALMOST UNPRECEDENTED SHORTAGE OF TONNAGE FOR PROMPT JANUARY AND FEBRUARY DELIVERY—BULK OF DEMAND FOR SHIPPERS OF COTTON, GRAIN, AND GENERAL CARGO FOR TRANSATLANTIC ACCOUNT—SEEKERS FOR SPACE COMPELLED TO GO INTO THE SAILING-VESSEL MARKET, WHERE SUITABLE TONNAGE IS SCARCE.

The almost unprecedented shortage of tonnage for prompt January and early February delivery has pushed rates to a level seldom reached in the history of steam navigation. At the same time it has placed a heavy check on chartering; in fact, so heavy has been this check in the past week or 10 days that chartering was actually at a standstill several times.

On the other hand, demand for tonnage continues unabated. If anything, the volume of current inquiry for prompt and early forward loading ships is larger than at any stage of the present rise of rates in the freight and charter markets.

The bulk of this demand is for trans-Atlantic account. This, in turn, is made up of grain, cotton, and general cargo, principally. Such cargo vessels as have arrived from England in ballast, to carry foodstuffs and miscellanies to Great Britain and Continental Europe, have not helped the situation on the western side of the Atlantic very much.

Spot freight rates at the close of the calendar year ranged from 40 to 160 per cent and, in several instances, to 200 per cent higher than they did just prior to declaration of war in Europe. Rates quoted with the concluding activities of the last day of the year compare as follows:

LIVERPOOL.

	Week ending—				
	Dec. 31.	Sept. 3.	July 30.	July 2.	June 3.
Grain, bushel	8½ d.	.....	2½ d.	2½ d.	1½ d.
Flour, sacks	35 c.	20 c.	12 c.	12 c.	10 c.
Provisions, ton	35 s.	30 s.	20 s.	20 s.	20 s.
Cotton, hundredweight	75 c.	25 c.	25 c.	20 c.	20 c.
Dimension goods	30 s.	.....	[1] 12 s. 6 d.	[1] 12 s. 6 d.	[1] 12 s. 6 d.

LONDON.

Grain	9 d.	4 d.	2½ d.	1½ d.	1½ d.
Flour	35 c.	21 c.	13 c.	11 c.	11 c.
Provisions	35 s.	30 s.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Dimension goods	30 s.	.....	11 s. 3 d.	11 s. 3 d.	11 s. 3 d.

GLASGOW.

Grain	.....	.....	2 d.	22 d.	1½ d.
Flour	30 c.	23 c.	15 c.	15 c.	14 c.
Provisions	37 s. 6 d.	32 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Dimension goods	35 s.	20 s.	15 s.	15 s.	15 s.

ROTTERDAM.

Grain	30 c.	.....	6 c.	3½ d.	3½ d.
Flour	55 c.	21 c.	11 c.	11 c.	11 c.
Provisions	75 c.	38 c.	25 c.	25 c.	25 c.
Cotton	200 c.	.....	25 c.	20 c.	20 c.
Dimension goods	[2] 20 c.	[2] 15 c.	[2] 10 c.	[2] 10 c.	[2] 10 c.

ANTWERP.

Grain	.....	.....	3 d.	1½ d.	2 d.
Flour	18 c.	.....	18 c.	18 c.	19 c.
Provisions	25 s.	.....	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.	22 s. 6 d.
Cotton	20 c.	.....	25 c.	20 c.	20 c.
Dimension goods	15 s.	.....	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.	17 s. 6 d.

HAVRE.

Grain	.....	3 s. 6 d.	2 s. 6 d.	2 s. 4½ d.	2 s. 1½ d.
Flour	40 c.	22½ c., 5%	.....	30 c.	30 c.
Provisions	40 c.	40 c.	30 c., 5%	30 c.	30 c.
Cotton	100 c.	45 c.	35 c.	25 c.	21 c.
Dimension goods	$10	[1] $5, 5%	[1] $5, 5%	[1] $5, 5%	[1] $5, 5%

[1] Per 40 cubic feet. [2] Per cubic foot.

In some instances holders of cargoes have been compelled to go into the sailing-vessel market to obtain space for their commodities. Charter rates in that market have risen accordingly. Chartering itself will be restricted there, however, by the scarcity of tonnage of a serviceable nature for trans-Atlantic carriage.

Among those who have been compelled to go into the sailing-vessel market are shippers of timber. These interests are absolutely unable to obtain steamers at rates which they are reported to pay, and charters are reported from the Gulf to West Britain at rates varying from 120s. to 140s. for January-February-March loading.

Freight rates to South America, as a whole, continue at about 25 per cent over the regular tariff on the east coast, while to the west coast rates remain unchanged. To Central America shipping men are quoting rates that are practically normal, excepting on a few commodities, on which the rates are a little higher, but not as a result of the war. To Australian points current rates range about 25 per cent over regular tariffs in consequence of a heavy movement of cargo.

West Indies business continues inactive, with no material changes. Coal charterers continue to have difficulty in obtaining tonnage on a rate basis and are offering 40s. to Alexandria or Spezzia for early January loading. There is a growing demand for tonnage to ports of Australia and also for the Far East.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Shadrack T. Harris *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 738);

Louisa Boles, daughter of Charles Heinz, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 737);

Joseph B. Harris *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 736);

Milton W. Henderson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 735);

William A. Duckworth *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 734);

Michael McNulty *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 733);

Edwin D. Haynes *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 732);

Robert B. Henchan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 731);

Peter K. Hessong *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 730);

Elmer Morningstar, executor of Henry Morningstar, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 729);

Isabella D. Fraley, widow of Henry Fraley, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 728);

Vienna B. French, widow of George W. French, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 727);

Edward Garland *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 726);
Charles L. Gallaher *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 725);
Ambrose J. Herron, brother of James A. Herron, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 724);
Charles W. Haskins, son and one of the heirs of Philo J. Haskins, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 723);
Frances L. Hanna, widow of James J. Hanna, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 722);
James M., Felix A., and Ida C. Blankenbaker, children, and Edwina J. Blankenbaker, granddaughter, sole heirs of Newton J. Blankenbaker, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 721);
James R. Brunner *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 720);
Hannibal A. Johnson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 719);
Laban A. Howard *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 755);
Eliza J. Houston, widow of John Houston, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 754);
Joseph W. Cope *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 753);
Eleanor R. Mintie, widow of Fergus L. Mintie, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 752);
Mary C. Huston, widow of Cunningham Huston, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 751);
John Cross *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 750);
John Deitrick *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 749);
Margaret Gustin, widow of John B. Gustin, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 748);
George E. Finney *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 747);
Cornelius D. Croley *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 746);
Mary A. Diller, widow of Alexander W. Diller, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 745);
David Kilgore *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 744);
Thomas B. East *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 743);
Benjamin F. Howell *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 742);
James W. Falls *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 741);
John M. Mitchell *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 740);
Zilpha J. Mills, widow of William H. Mills, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 739);
Alberta Duncan, widow of Titus Duncan, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 777);
Abijah Ford *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 776);
Hardin Montgomery, son of Samuel Montgomery, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 775);
Joseph W. McClellan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 774);
Sidney C. Gordon *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 773);
John Getchey *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 772);
Sarah F. Harper, widow of William Harper, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 771);
Leroy S. Groves *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 770);
Oliver E. Hawn, Bettie H. Steuart, Ada C. Overbacker, Elma C. Pritchard, and Mida C. Hawn, children of Emanuel R. Hawn, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 769);
John W. Watts *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 768);
Hamden Heatherington *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 767);
W. S. Grubbs, Elizabeth G. Olcott, Charles S. Grubbs, and Mary G. Fruit, children and sole heirs of William M. Grubbs, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 766);
Susan V. Marsh, executrix of the last will and testament of James Marsh, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 765);
William Keith *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 764);
Eudora A. Huffman, widow of John W. Huffman, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 763);
Ruth R. Robbins, daughter and sole heir of David T. Reed, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 762);
James Fields *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 761);
Lewis M. Jarvis *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 760);
Byron B. Comparet, son and one of the heirs of Theodore S. Comparet, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 759);
William W. Pate *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 758);
William J. Conley *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 757);
John T. Donahugh *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 756);
William Dixon *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 795);
Landon Seward Exum, brother of James T. Exum, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 794);
Chauncy G. Butterfield and Lucy A. Butterfield, children of Francis W. Butterfield, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 793);
Samuel R. Nissley *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 792);
Adoniram A. Keys *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 791);
Clara L. Brewster, widow of Robert E. Brewster, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 790);
John A. Bull *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 789);
Gavin E. Caukin *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 788);
Jacob L. Cotey *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 787);
Thomas T. Crittenden *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 786);
Arthur M. Knapp, administrator of John Cover, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 785);
Annie F. Martin and Mary F. Humm, daughters and two of the heirs of Henry Fissel, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 784);
Quincy A. Harper *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 783);
Adah H. Love, niece of James M. McClelland, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 782);
Alice E. Gunn, widow of William A. Gunn, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 781);
Charles Hammond *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 780);
Mary T. Gunther, widow of Arthur Gunther, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 779); and
Henrietta H. Hyatt, widow (remarried) of Edward J. Hazel, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 778).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions of the municipal council of the provincial government of Talisay, and the municipal council, provisional government of Kabancalan, Occidental Negros, P. I., praying for the passage of the so-called Jones bill, for the self-government of the Philippine people, which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a memorial of the National Board of Steam Navigation, of New York, remonstrating against Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the board of aldermen of New York City, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called immigration bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the creation of a rural credit system, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seward, St. Louis, Lincoln, Harbine, Hickory Grove, Wynot, and Battle Creek, all in the State of Nebraska, and a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of West Point and Monterey, in the State of Nebraska, remonstrating against the circulation of anti-Catholic publications through the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hays, Kirwin, Hillsboro, and Redfield, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ellis, Gaylord, and Logan, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of W. F. Peel, of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the uniform grading of grain, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Enderlin, in the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of munitions and arms to belligerents. The resolutions are very short and terse and present the whole subject. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD and properly referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions passed at a meeting of citizens of the United States held at Enderlin, N. Dak., January 17, 1915.

Whereas 10 nations of the Old World are now waging the greatest war of mankind and are not only exhausting their own resources, but are also drawing immense supplies and munitions of war from the United States of America; and

Whereas the armament and supplies that are being furnished by the United States tend to increase the military conflagration of Europe, multiply the loss of life, already appalling, and cause the destruction of property that is bringing nations to desolation and assist in the prolongation and continuance of this most dreadful of all wars; and

Whereas we as a people from our hearts lift our voices in prayer for peace, while as a Nation we are aiding in war and augmenting the struggle by emptying our private arsenals and war supplies onto the battle fields of Europe; and

Whereas our Government has proclaimed strict neutrality and thereby given assurance to American citizens of all races and to the belligerent powers themselves that we shall give aid and support to none, and by our acts as a Nation break no bonds of friendship with the countries with whom we are at peace and create no discord among our citizens here by discriminating against their fatherland; yet when we offer military supplies and equipments to any nations that choose to buy it is with the full knowledge that for 100 years England by her supremacy on the seas is the master of all contraband goods transported by water, and that she and her friends alone can benefit by our unholy commerce, and we are pursuing that course which diverges so far from strict neutrality that we injure our ancient friends—Germany and Austria—by every means in our power excepting the employment of armed force alone; and

Whereas this country has recognized the right of our Government to withhold war supplies from contending armies when she laid an embargo upon munitions of war when the feeble armies of Mexico were arrayed against each other, nevertheless she now offers her limitless supplies to the mightiest armies that were ever assembled in battle array; and

Whereas the United States is disloyal to itself when it promotes a foreign war by furnishing the sinews of war while the Nation is prostrate commercially and waiting for the dawn of peace to return to her former prosperity and achievements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, American citizens residing in Enderlin, N. Dak., in delegate meeting assembled, hereby declare that it is the imperative duty of the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary law forthwith that will enable the President of the United States to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war, saving and excepting foodstuffs alone, and thereby withdraw from the contending powers all aid and assistance of this Republic: And be it further

Resolved, That we are in strict sympathy with the Christian endeavor of this Nation to appeal to the God of Nations that peace may come and reject as hypocrisy and national sacrilege the commercial spirit of the country that is answering our supplications for peace by sending the instruments of destruction and death to the serried armies in struggle through the Empires of Europe: And be it further

Resolved, That we, citizens of the United States, who have contributed our full share to American peace, American Christianity, and American civilization, call upon all Americans to join with us in enforcing that strict American neutrality that will give aid and comfort to none of the contending powers, and that will withhold American resources from promoting destruction and slaughter among the friendly nations of Europe: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to our Representatives in Congress in the House of Representatives and Senate, to the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State of the United States at Washington, D. C.

Fred Zittelmann, Albert Zittelmann, Robert Zunnock, Johan F. Henkel, August Geitl, O. A. Culbertson, John Jacobs, Carl Lindemann, H. E. Pool, C. G. Doulins, W. Vossberg, C. Mueller, John Genz, Robert Lindemann, Carl Shumacker, Bernhard L. Biven, John T. Reiz, Emil Seelig, Lewis Altman, Philip Naker, F. F. Kuntz, Albert Nachtigall, Robert R. Froemke, Ernest Hanelt, Willie Nachtigall, Dan. Froemke, Edward Froemke, Albert Schumacher, Lewis A. Froemke, Fred. Chenzy, Gerald Buss, Fred. Kelm, Carl Krueger, E. Hofmann, William Lindemann.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Coffeyville, Kans., remonstrating against any change being made in the compensatory time law for postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mound Valley, Kans., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City and Quindaro, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. WORKS. I send to the desk a number of petitions, numerously signed by citizens of California, favoring legislation prohibiting the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations. I ask that one of these petitions, which is very short, the one signed by Jacob Price, be printed in the RECORD, that the others be printed in the RECORD without the signatures, and that the total number of the signers of these various petitions be stated in the RECORD.

Mr. STONE. Where we are sitting it is impossible to hear what is going on at that distance. I should like to have the request of the Senator from California stated in a tone sufficiently audible to reach all Senators.

Mr. WORKS. The petitions I have presented favor legislation prohibiting the exportation of arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In order to confirm by deeds the avowed peace-loving intentions of the great American Nation, a bill prohibiting the sale to belligerents of all war material has been introduced in Congress. Recognizing the fact that the refusal of the United States of America to permit the export to belligerents of munitions and all implements of war will facilitate the termination of warfare, we, the undersigned citizens of San Diego, Cal., give our hearty approval to this movement and urge our representatives in Congress to support the passage of House resolution 377 and Senate bill 6688.

JACOB PRICE AND OTHERS.

—

To Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The undersigned American citizens respectfully ask you to vote for and lend your active support to Senate bill 6688 or 6862, or any similar measure, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the territory or any seaport of the United States, so that it may pass the Senate at this session of Congress.

Signed by 1,325 citizens of the State of California.

—

To Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The undersigned American citizens respectfully ask you to vote for and lend your active support to Senate bill 6688 or 6862, or any similar measure, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the territory or any seaport of the United States, so that it may pass the Senate at this session of Congress.

Signed by 1,980 citizens of the State of California.

—

To Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The undersigned American citizens respectfully ask you to vote for and lend your active support to Senate bill 6688 or 6862, or any similar measure, prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the territory or any seaport of the United States, so that it may pass the Senate at this session of Congress.

Signed by 1,320 citizens of the State of California.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the Skagit County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Anacortes, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Government ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees; of Local Union, No. 1214, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; and of Local Union, No. 278, I. U. of U. B. W., all of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of El Paso, Tex., praying for the creation of a National Security Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MYERS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Great Falls, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hicks, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on Upper White River, Ark., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hammond, Decatur, Huntington, and Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Anderson, Ind., remonstrating against the circulation of anti-Catholic publications through the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce, of Kokomo, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the armament, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Federal censorship of motion-picture films, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the United Mine Workers of Princeton, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation for the extension of the Bureau of Mines, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Danbury, Taftville, Norwich, Meriden, Baltic, Lisbon, Norwalk, and Middletown, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 921), accompanied by a bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, the bill being a substitute for the following pension bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 354. Edwin B. Wright.
S. 940. Mary W. Gross.
S. 1019. Della E. Godfrey.
S. 1265. Thomas Buckley.
S. 1782. Samuel G. H. Whitley.
S. 2000. Joseph Johnson.
S. 2037. Marcus W. Bates.
S. 2267. Otto Kuehn.
S. 2363. Sarah H. Alldis.
S. 2869. Sarah E. Arnold.
S. 3186. Laura F. Lawton.
S. 3498. Daniel Hilliard.
S. 3750. Lovina J. Reeves.
S. 4013. Charles F. White.
S. 4050. Rose V. Stoops.
S. 4427. Julia F. Brewerton.
S. 4480. Mary Carpenter.
S. 4615. Isaac Nebbenburgh.
S. 4790. James Forsyth Harrison.
S. 5132. Benjamin Clark.
S. 5400. Jane E. Myers.
S. 5457. Vesta V. Holden.
S. 5514. Loucette E. Glavis.
S. 5518. John F. Miller.
S. 5590. Mary Healy.
S. 5599. Clara G. Branch.
S. 5672. Harriet M. Marks.
S. 5694. George M. Getts.
S. 5746. Horace Page.
S. 5777. Jessie A. Maxson.
S. 5781. Elizabeth C. Service.
S. 5782. James Tucker.
S. 5783. Ellen Twomey.
S. 5784. Julia F. Whipple.
S. 5785. Emily J. Williams.
S. 5856. John W. Sullivan.
S. 5879. Paul Philips, alias Duncan Dunbar.
S. 5898. Susan J. Flye.
S. 6003. William Henry Soule.
S. 6035. Mary L. De Mars.
S. 6088. Margaretta B. Benjamin.
S. 6104. Frances A. Rogers.
S. 6196. Cynthia Buel.
S. 6197. Cornelia S. Hitchcock.
S. 6209. James M. Watkins.
S. 6220. George M. Taylor.
S. 6221. Buril Caton.
S. 6226. William Hanoch.
S. 6243. Nelson E. Haskell.
S. 6307. George W. Boal.
S. 6377. Eli Reese.
S. 6378. John H. Tyson.
S. 6386. William T. Davidson.
S. 6390. John B. Doolittle.
S. 6407. Henry G. Dearmond.
S. 6408. Thomas Johnson.
S. 6410. Elizabeth Reed.
S. 6469. Katie M. Penfield.
S. 6508. Robert J. Martin.
S. 6517. Daniel W. Smith.
S. 6518. Charlotte A. Crowell.
S. 6527. Joseph P. Kridelbaugh.
S. 6531. Charles H. Lewis.
S. 6533. Frederick Hutton.
S. 6557. Sarah J. Crackel.
S. 6562. Jennie Jones.
S. 6591. Charlotte S. Manley.
S. 6605. George W. Read.
S. 6617. John H. Beatty.
S. 6626. William Braginton.
S. 6629. John G. Avery.
S. 6682. Susie E. Harris.
S. 6702. Walter Morrell.
S. 6703. James W. Jacobs.
S. 6704. John W. Rankin.
S. 6729. George Krone.
S. 6786. Jeremiah Adams.
S. 6806. George W. Cartwright.
S. 6811. Samuel Shaffer.
S. 6815. Warren J. Hazell.
S. 6819. Frank B. Gillespie.
S. 6838. William Bays.
S. 6842. Nancy J. Nicholson.
S. 6846. Samuel Roberts.
S. 6851. Charles S. Morse.
S. 6869. Sanford A. Herendeen.
S. 6877. William H. Brown.
S. 6911. Henry A. Smith.
S. 6929. George O. Miller.
S. 6933. Peter P. Chacey.
S. 6938. Eloise Warner.
S. 6954. George W. Case.
S. 6958. Emma Perkins.
S. 6960. John C. Simpson.
S. 6969. Aquilla M. Hizar.
S. 6976. Luther M. Blackman.
S. 6990. John J. Calkins.
S. 6992. Jennie O. Collins.
S. 6993. James L. Van Allen.
S. 6997. Clarence C. Tritle.
S. 6998. William Dickerson.
S. 7005. Joana Boone.
S. 7006. Fletcher N. Wilson.
S. 7017. Beulah C. Hicks.
S. 7033. A. Paul Horne.
S. 7034. Ellen C. Gardner.
S. 7036. Annie R. Jewett.
S. 7037. Ann Jolly.
S. 7061. Allen P. Gibson.
S. 7075. Rachel W. Carney.
S. 7076. Alie McGloughlin.
S. 7077. William A. Reames.
S. 7079. Delilah Lobenthal.
S. 7087. James Hammond.
S. 7089. Henry Walker.
S. 7092. Prudie M. Reynolds.
S. 7117. Fernando W. Moon.
S. 7127. Joseph Ludiker.
S. 7128. Jerome B. Wright.
S. 7134. Robert Conn.
S. 7137. George L. Neal.
S. 7138. Fernando Miller.
S. 7160. Anna E. Babbitt.
S. 7162. George W. Shoop.
S. 7182. Clifton Whittum.
S. 7191. George R. Davis.
S. 7219. Al Clark.
S. 7223. Charles F. Smith.
S. 7232. Louisa E. Catterson.
S. 7298. Arvilla B. Hammond.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 932) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4422) for the relief of John L. Sevy, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 935) thereon.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11318) authorizing the sale of lands in Lyman County, S. Dak., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 936) thereon.

Mr. SHIELDS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 6854) to incorporate the Boy Scouts of

America, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 937) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16738) to provide for the payment of certain moneys to school districts in Oklahoma, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 938) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6671) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 939) thereon.

Mr. JAMES, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18031) amending sections 476, 477, and 440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 940) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2854) granting an honorable discharge to William C. Chandler, to report it adversely, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3892. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Griffa (Rept. No. 930);

S. 5104. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain transportation to the Oregon Agricultural College cadet corps by a United States Army transport (Rept. No. 928);

S. 6217. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 924);

S. 7066. A bill for the relief of Amos Dahuff (Rept. No. 931);

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department (Rept. No. 923); and

H. R. 13123. An act for the relief of Charles H. Rayfield, alias Charles H. Czarnowsky (Rept. No. 927).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 6966. A bill to authorize the maintenance of organizations of the mobile army at their maximum strength and to provide an increase of 1,000 officers (Rept. No. 926); and

H. R. 16510. An act to provide for recognizing the services of certain officers of the Army and Navy, late members of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to extend to them the thanks of Congress, to authorize their promotion, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 929).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7046) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 925) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 7261) to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 922) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6510) to authorize the appointment of Duncan Grant Richart to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 934) thereon.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 7266) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River, and I submit a report (No. 933) thereon. I call the attention of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the report.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a bridge bill of great urgency. It will lead to no controversy at all, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with——

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES (S. DOC. NO. 717).

Mr. FLETCHER. On December 21, 1914, the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] presented to the Senate a pamphlet entitled "The National Archives: A Programme," by Waldo Gifford Leland, which was reprinted from the American Historical Review, and it was referred to the Committee on Printing. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution for its printing.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 523) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the pamphlet submitted by Mr. POINDEXTER on December 21, 1914, entitled "The National Archives: A Programme," by Waldo Gifford Leland, be printed as a Senate document.

PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

Mr. STONE. I ask that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 228) authorizing the President of the United States to extend invitations to Central and South American Governments to be represented at a conference looking to an improvement of the financial relations between the United States and these nations, reported by me from the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 20, and which is now on the table, be taken therefrom and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

VOTES ON FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On October 5, 1914, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] presented a statement prepared in the office of the Secretary of the Senate relative to the yea-and-nay votes of the Senate during the consideration of the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913, and it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The committee has had the matter under consideration, and I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the matter and that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

DISTRICT EXCISE BOARD.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In behalf of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with certain amendments, the Senate resolution 522, submitted by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], and I desire to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the resolution be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed by the President of the Senate to investigate the conduct of the excise board is hereby further authorized to investigate fully into the manner in which the excise law, so called, is being administered in the District of Columbia; and said committee is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to employ stenographers to report such hearings as may be had at a rate not to exceed $1 per printed page, and to have the testimony and proceedings of such hearings printed for the use of the committee. The expense of such hearings shall be paid out of the contingent expenses of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the said special committee. The said committee is also authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I hope there will not be any more requests of this kind until the morning hour has been completed. We have but a few minutes remaining, and we want to get in some bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the committee was, after the words "printed page," to strike out "and to have the testimony and proceedings of such hearings printed for the use of the committee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7403) for the prevention of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of such edible alimentary pastes as macaroni, spaghetti, vermicelli, and noodles, containing any added artificial coloring matter, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 7404) granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 7405) to amend section 1608–J of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act of

Congress approved February 23, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 7406) to enlarge, extend, remodel, and improve the United States post-office and courthouse building located at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 7407) to donate certain condemned cannon to the Gordon Institute, Barnesville, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Edward Dudevoire (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7409) granting a pension to Katherine B. Robeson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 7411) granting an increase of pension to James C. Baker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 7412) to appropriate $50,000 to erect an equestrian statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant at Georgetown, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 7413) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *General Garretson* to *S. H. Robbins* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7414) to amend section 2291, Revised Statutes, relating to homestead entry, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(By request): A bill (S. 7415) authorizing the appointment of Stephen R. Beard as captain in the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 7416) for the relief of John H. Fesenmeyer, alias John Wills; to the Committee on Military Affairs;

A bill (S. 7417) granting an increase of pension to Orlinda A. Edick; and

A bill (S. 7418) granting a pension to Mayme Chilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7419) granting certain lots to the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 7420) granting an increase of pension to Ziba Fry;

A bill (S. 7421) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Moulton; and

A bill (S. 7422) granting an increase of pension to Parsons B. Mix; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 7424) for the prevention of cruelty to animals transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7425) to reimburse the State of New Mexico for money advanced for the survey of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 7426) granting an increase of pension to Lazaro Sandoval (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 7427) prohibiting the use of the name of any Member of either House of Congress or of any officer of the Government by any person, firm, or corporation practicing before the Patent Office in advertising his business; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 7428) to authorize the appointment of George W. Sager as a first lieutenant on the retired list of the United States Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7429) granting a pension to Mabel Turton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 7430) granting a pension to John A. Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 7431) for the relief of Frances A. Bliss; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7432) granting a pension to James L. Swan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7433) granting a pension to Nellie H. Judkins (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7434) granting an increase of pension to Alva M. Titchout (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 7435) authorizing issuance of land patent to Lewis Montgomery; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(By request): A bill (S. 7436) to encourage private enterprise and capital in upbuilding the merchant marine of the United States and to promote commerce between the United States and foreign nations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7437) granting an increase of pension to William Dougherty (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7438) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Cole (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. PENROSE) (by request):

A bill (S. 7439) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a memorial bridge to the memory of William Penn and to provide for the erection thereof; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 7440) for the relief of Caleb Aber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7441) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vogel (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7442) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Fisher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7443) granting a pension to Laura Belle Ewing; and

A bill (S. 7444) granting a pension to Anna C. Gregory (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN:

A bill (S. 7445) granting an increase of pension to William Varnes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 7446) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Moody (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 7447) for prohibition of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7448) to appoint Roy K. Carson a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 7449) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Watson; and

A bill (S. 7450) granting an increase of pension to Marie Raum Moses; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7451) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Gardner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7452) amending section 26 of the act of Congress approved May 29, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to purchasers of Indian lands under any law now existing or hereafter enacted, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 7453) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. C. McNaught; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7454) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Seaman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7455) granting a pension to Mary Walls (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 7456) regulating the use of the mails relative to loans, etc.; and

A bill (S. 7457) regulating use of Postal Service by mail from foreign countries pertaining to loans, etc.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 7458) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Lowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

FOUNDATION FOR PROMOTION OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a bill to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 7410) to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the accompanying letter from the Solicitor for the Department of Commerce may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The communication was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, January 19, 1915.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the request of Secretary Redfield I herewith inclose you draft of an act, "To dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes," with the request that you introduce it in the Senate, you having introduced the original bill there creating the foundation. The preamble to the proposed bill was inserted in order to conform to the style of the act establishing the foundation, and also in order that the reasons for the dissolution might appear in the act dissolving it. As therein stated, no additions to the original fund have come to the foundation, and the accrued income from the original fund has been found wholly insufficient to enable the peace committee to carry out the purposes of the foundation. For this reason the trustees decided that it was best to have the foundation dissolved, and the money returned to Mr. Roosevelt or disposed of with his approval. With this in view, the chairman of the foundation wrote Mr. Roosevelt as follows on December 5, 1914:

"I am instructed by the special committee of the trustees of the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace to submit to you for your information a report which the committee contemplates presenting to the trustees it, as the committee hopes, the proposal contained therein shall commend itself to your judgment. It would be most unjust to the present board of trustees if you were to feel that, in making this suggestion, we are shrinking from a duty that we had undertaken to discharge because of any half-heartedness on our part in carrying out your wishes. The committee believes, on the contrary, that you will yourself appreciate that in the absence of any additions to the fund so generously given by you, the fund itself is too small to be successfully administered by a board so constituted. Under the circumstances, therefore, the committee hopes that you will be willing to have the trustees petition the Congress to permit the return of this fund to you, because in your hands the committee is sure that it will be much more highly useful than it can be under the care of any practicable board of trustees. If, however, you feel that a further effort should be made to administer the fund as now provided for by law, the trustees will endeavor to bring about only such minor changes in the law as are in any event necessary. We are entirely certain that you will not in any case misunderstand our motives in raising this question definitely in your mind."

Mr. Roosevelt wrote the chairman the following letters, on January 4:

"I have received your letter of December 5.

"I entirely agree with you. I especially agree in your statement that it would be most unjust to the board of trustees to feel that they have in any way shrunk from performance of the duty that, because of my action, was put upon them. On the contrary, the absence of any additions to the fund has completely prevented effective action by the board of trustees. The fund is altogether too small to be successfully administered by a board constituted as this one was. Its only usefulness was to serve as a nucleus for other gifts of the kind. These gifts have not been made, and I entirely agree with you that it is better to have the fund returned to me to be administered by myself. In this case I shall, of course, use it for purely philanthropic purposes.

"I thank you heartily for the proposal. I cordially approve of it, and I earnestly hope that Congress will act immediately on your suggestion. Such immediate action would enable me to use a portion of the fund this winter when the suffering among our own people is so severe."

"I think it preferable to have the disposition made by me, and to have me report the same to the trustees. With a sum as small as this, better work will be done by one person than by a board; and the reasons which made me desire to turn it over to be administered by a board, when it was to be a nucleus to which other sums were to be added, no longer obtain when only this amount is to be disposed of. The plan, through no fault of the trustees, has resulted in the talent being hidden in a napkin for eight years. My proposal is to have it used, and, if possible, some of it used this winter, when there is so much suffering; and I do not think it will be well to have it used by a committee."

At a meeting held in the presence of the Secretary on the 16th instant, at which there were present Mr. Chief Justice White, the Hon. Seth Low, and Mr. John Mitchell, the draft of the bill herewith submitted to you was approved. This action has also the approval of the other members of the committee—Mr. Secretary Houston and Mr. Marvin Hughitt.

I assume that the inclosed will furnish you all the information you desire in the matter. If, however, in addition to the above, you desire to look over the files of the department in reference to this foundation, I will be glad to submit them to you at any time.

Yours, very truly,

A. L. THURMAN, *Solicitor.*

PROHIBITION OF REVENUE FROM LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a short bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 7423) to prohibit the collection of revenue from dealers in intoxicating liquors and making sellers of liquors liable for crimes of persons while intoxicated by use of liquors supplied by them, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 7423) to prohibit the collection of revenue from dealers in intoxicating liquors, and making sellers of liquors liable for crimes of persons while intoxicated by use of liquors supplied by them.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act no license shall be issued to or tax levied against or collected from any person, corporation, or association selling, manufacturing, or in any other way dealing in or with intoxicating liquors in any State or portion of any State or in the District of Columbia, or any other Territory where the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquors is forbidden by law or the vote of the people, and all laws or parts of laws authorizing the issuance of such laws or imposition of such tax in so far as they apply or relate to any State, Territory, or locality where the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors is forbidden as aforesaid, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That from and after January 1, 1916, no revenue or other tax shall be levied against or collected from any persons, corporation, or association for or on account of the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors of any kind, and all laws or parts of laws authorizing the imposition or collection of any tax or the issuance of any license or permit to manufacture, sell, or otherwise deal in intoxicating liquors are hereby repealed, to take effect on said last-named date.

SEC. 3. That where any person shall be guilty of the commission of any crime while in a state of intoxication resulting from the use of intoxicating liquors obtained from any person, acting for himself or as agent of another engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquors, the person from whom he procured such intoxicating liquors shall be guilty as an accessory before the fact of the crime so committed by the person to whom such liquors were supplied, and punished accordingly.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS (H. R. 20189).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

He also (for Mr. LEWIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARDWICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were refered to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 for special experiments looking to the most practicable and cheapest methods of producing denatured alcohol, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500 to reimburse the State of New Mexico for money advanced the United States to secure the survey of lands granted to that State, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for the establishment and maintenance of an experimental station in central Washington and for carrying on field work in connection therewith, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. VARDAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8846, commonly known as the

omnibus claims bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Eugene E. Colburn (S. 640, 63d Cong., 1st sess.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Maryland, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 7848, 62d Cong.) for the relief of Henry A. Garheart be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

On motion of Mr. BORAH, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 625, 63d Cong.) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wells be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

On motion of Mr. SHIVELY, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill (S. 4642, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) granting a pension to Rose Schroeder be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 524), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as the committee may direct to be had, such stenographer to be paid at a rate not exceeding $1 per printed page, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

IOWA INDIANS.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 525), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 7293) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Iowa Indians," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 526), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to hold hearings and employ a stenographer at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings in reference to expenditures by the War Department for artillery and ammunition therefor, especially as to the use of high explosives; and the expenses thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE NAVY.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short communication from ex-Senator William E. Chandler, also ex-Secretary of the Navy, in relation to the increase of the Navy. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the letter of former Senator William E. Chandler presented by the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1915.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
United States Senator.

MY DEAR SENATOR PERKINS: I venture to advise you to refrain (1) from bringing politics into naval legislation or administration, (2) from making haste in naval construction or expenditure, (3) from weakening civilian control in the Navy Department, and (4) I urge you not to forget the duty that is from Congress to the taxpayers of the United States.

I.

Politics in dealing with the Navy: Abstention from any political motives or differences in connection with naval affairs is as appropriate as when dealing with foreign affairs. Besides, nothing from political complaints will result in Republican advantage.

Our opponents have been in national power less than two years. The Republicans had a reasonably sufficient Navy for the Civil War. But from 1865 down to 1883 they did practically nothing for the Navy. In that last year the available appropriations were $15,402,120 and the expenditures were $13,936,294. And at least $2,000,000 of the amount were wasted on a discreditable navy-yard establishment.

The naval ships, large and small, were 37 in number, all built of wood but 4, and those were of less than 1,400 tons displacement. All the ships were of low speed, their engines not modern, only 14 being compound, and their maneuvering and destructive powers were inferior to existing warships of other navies. It was officially then said that "with not 1 modern high-powered cannon in the Navy and with only 87 guns worth retaining, the importance of action for the procurement of naval ordnance seems apparent if the Navy is to longer survive," and so in 1883 the destruction of the old Navy and the beginning of the new took place.

With this record of naval nonconstruction continued for 18 years you will see that we can not make political capital out of any Democratic delay of naval construction and preparation during a period of about 18 months.

II.

Reasons for making haste slowly: There is a potent reason for not hurrying present naval construction. Until the present war in Europe is over we can not be at all certain in what direction large expenditures ought to be made. It is not to be expected that whatever may be revealed big battleships will be no longer built. But such is the terrifically destructive power of Zeppelins and aeroplanes and of submarines, that no more large warships should be built until every possible device is developed for the protection of the ships. One, two, or three more protective decks may be required; one, two, or three more ship's bottoms may be advisable. Who can now tell? It is the height of folly not to study questions like these before making vast additional expenditures. We can spend money enough in various ways upon submarines and flying machines, upon guns and explosives, to use up all the appropriations that can wisely be made within the next few years. It is not my purpose in this brief letter to discuss the question whether our country is in any danger of immediate war with any powerful nation. The blindest man can see our absolute safety till long after the present European war ends. During this period we should study the art of modern war with diligence and wisdom, and make sure that when we next spend vast sums for dreadnaughts we are as certain what we ought to do as investigation into a dreadful war all around the globe can make us. Already we are told that five of our battleships—the famous *Oregon* and the *Indiana*, *Massachusetts*, *Kentucky*, and *Kearsarge*—are obsolete and should be "replaced by new ships."

III.

We should strengthen instead of weakening civilian control of the Navy Department: There are in the Navy 3,388 commissioned officers, and there are, besides the ordinary clerical force, only two civilians—a Secretary and an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. But they represent the civilian President of the United States, who is in addition made by the Constitution "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

The Navy of our free Republic, to be governed by the laws of Congress and thus commanded by a President, aided by his Secretary and Assistant Secretary, should not be decorated by many special boards of naval officers, and by no such boards except such as are created by the President and disbanded whenever this is deemed wise by the Commander in Chief. There are established by law eight bureaus of the Navy Department, and such bureaus have existed since the beginning of the Government. The chiefs of these bureaus must be naval officers nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate and their terms end in four years. As a general proposition they are sufficient professional advisers and assistants for the Secretary and President, and are all that are needed to keep those two civilians from making mistakes in the exercise of their rightly bestowed power to command the Navy of the Republic.

But this is not all. The President and Secretary are under the constant surveillance of the two Houses of Congress, whose natural course of watching and legislating is aided by regular committees and may be strengthened by the assistance of other Members of special capacity and energy not possessed by the regular committees—if there are such superior Members, as some Members think they are. In view of all these provisions for securing perfect direction of the naval arm of our Government it would be a mistake to embarrass and weaken the present civilian control of the Navy Department.

IV.

Be sure and constantly keep in mind the duty that Congress owes to the taxpayers of the Nation: You have heard Senator Hoar say that every laboring man in Europe carries on his back a soldier armed and equipped as the law directs. The French Revolution was caused by the unequal taxation of the poor peasants and laborers and the evasion of taxation by the rich nobles.

In 1883 we were expending on the Navy $15,000,000 annually, and when destroying the old worthless ships and guns and beginning a new Navy we at first increased the annual expenditure to only $20,000,000. In 1913 our total ordinary expenditures were $682,000,000, of which $160,000,000 were military, $133,000,000 were naval, and $175,000,000 were military pensions, making $468,000,000 (or nearly 70 per cent of the $682,000,000) used to pay the expenses of past wars and in preparing for future wars, as Representative Tawney repeatedly reminded Congress.

It has hitherto seemed that the most important question in this country during the next 20 years would be that of keeping down national extravagance and taxation. The Democratic Party is to be thrust out of national power in 1916 largely because it fails to fulfill its promises of economy in expenditures and because of its reduction of tariff protection and of the wages of American labor. It behooves the Republican Party to go slowly in enlarging the appropriations of the late billion dollar Congresses. The European war is no excuse for haste in naval appropriations, but rather a reason for going slowly until

we are quite sure in what way and to what extent our naval construction and preparation are to be modified by the course of existing events. At all events we should wait before making vast expenditures until the next Congress meets and until we learn the result of the pending German Zeppelin expedition for the destruction of England.

There is not to be the slightest danger for years of the need by the United States of entering into a serious war with any formidable nation.

I trust you will be willing to receive my suggestions, even if they are not profound and wise.

Yours, truly, WILLIAM E. CHANDLER.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from California has decided to ask for the publication in the RECORD of the letter from former Senator William E. Chandler. Mr. Chandler sent me a copy of the letter to Senator PERKINS, and that explains why I am speaking on it. All three of us have had long service on the Naval Committee; Senator PERKINS more than either Chandler or myself. Senator Chandler has had a varied experience in naval affairs. He was Secretary of the Navy under President Arthur, and really began the construction of the new Navy. He was on the Naval Committee when I first came to Washington in 1896, and was at that time one of the ablest men in the Senate. Although he has recently entered his eightieth year his mind is still alert and vigorous. While he is a Republican and I am a Democrat, we have always been warm personal friends. Necessarily he is better posted on naval affairs than almost any man in Washington, not excepting even in the Navy Department itself. I attach great weight to his judgment on naval matters, and I am especially glad to see that his views and my own coincide in regard to the unwisdom of an extended and costly building program at this time. Right now the Navy needs many other things far more than it does battleships.

The war in Europe will undoubtedly explode a great many theories about battleships and submarines. Indeed it has already exploded many ideas on these subjects. The German 42-centimeter guns, the great surprise of the war so far, demolished the most scientifically constructed forts made of concrete and iron so easily, and almost instantaneously, that the best fortified city in Europe, Antwerp, was captured in less than a week. And the Germans, or some other nation, may be holding in reserve some devil's engine which will make superdreadnaughts as obsolete and useless for war purposes as an Indian canoe. No one knows what is going to happen. The demon of destruction, like a vulture, hovers over Europe with an insatiate appetite. Hell itself seems to have broken loose over there, and if the devil is not abroad his prototypes are devastating what eight months ago was the fairest and most prosperous corner of that Continent.

Why should we build battleships when every day may demonstrate their utter worthlessness? Let us wait until the war has shown what kind of craft we should construct. Time alone can teach us whether future sea fighting will be waged most successfully on, under, or above the water. The relative merits of the dreadnaughts, aeroplanes, and Zeppelins will be found out ere long, and we can reap the fruits of the experiments now going on without sharing any of the dangers of the conflict. We can wait and watch with perfect safety the lessons of the war; for the nations of the world are too busy destroying each other and wasting accumulated wealth of years; and all of them will be too much exhausted for at least 10 years to think of fighting us. The submarine in the future is bound to cut a great figure in naval warfare and possibly in harbor defense, too. Until, as Mr. Chandler says, we know what the Zeppelins are going to do, or can do, with battleships; whether bombs dropped from these air craft can destroy battleships unless they have two or three decks, or subdivisions, protected by armor; or whether the danger of torpedoes from below will require two or three bottoms to keep the ships from sinking, it would be the height of folly, in my opinion, to pursue any other course than to prepare to build battleships and have the plans drawn in anticipation of their construction; but wisdom compels us to wait before making contracts or expending money in any such way until we know what we are doing.

I am sure the Senator from California will agree with me in my estimate of Mr. Chandler's ability. His experience and intimate knowledge of naval affairs force me at least to listen when he speaks authoritatively, as he has done in this letter; and I for one shall not vote for any other policy at this time. It would be little short of a crime for the Naval Committee and for the Congress, too, if we rushed the construction of battleships until we know what lessons the war will teach and show to be wise. The appropriation bill which is now pending in the House carries many items for increase in the Navy for which, I notice in the papers, Secretary Daniels said he did not ask at all and does not think the Navy needs. How they got into the appropriation bill I do not know; and why they were put there is also a mystery. I find nothing whatever in the hearings or in the estimates in explanation.

It does seem to be time for Congress to go slow in expending these tens of millions of dollars because of some supposed necessity, or the desire on the part of some one to have ships constructed in certain navy yards or in certain places. I feel sure a half dozen or more battle cruisers, strong enough to put up a good, stiff fight and swift enough to catch anything afloat, or run away as wisdom may dictate, would serve the country's needs at this time far better. Just the type of battleship we ought to build, we do not now know. Therefore, I am sounding this warning. There never was any wiser utterance than Davy Crockett's motto:

Be sure you are right and then go ahead.

Already the fight between the fractions of the two opposing fleets in the North Sea has demonstrated one thing: That speed is of vital importance to any war craft we are to build, whether battle cruiser or dreadnaught. The swifter German cruisers got away from the British, but the slower, *Blucher*, although faster than any battleship we have, was sunk. And yet the General Board urges the construction of more battleships. The Naval Registers give the highest speed of any of our battleships at 22 knots.

If the contracts are once let for a specified form of ship, any change which, in the light of experience might be thought desirable, would be a very costly affair. Therefore, I earnestly urge and beg the Senate to consider carefully the amendment I am prepared to offer at the proper time, and which I now send to the desk, and ask to have read by the Secretary so it may get into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Senator from South Carolina sends to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which, without objection, will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975) to be proposed by Senator TILLMAN as a substitute for the building of two battleships:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to prepare and submit to the next Congress plans and specifications for building four warships of the type, power, and speed which, in his judgment, based on the knowledge gained from the prevailing war in Europe, are best suited for war on the sea; also to report, in the light of that war, the value and uses in naval warfare of aeroplanes, Zeppelins, and submarines."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and be printed.

EXTENSION OF THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I offer and ask to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Philadelphia December 29, by Mr. George W. Norris. It is a short address, comprising six pages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. I understand it is an address with reference to the shipping bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It has reference to the shipping bill.

Mr. JONES. I think it would be better if the argument were read to the Senate, as the bill is under consideration.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will ask that the Secretary be instructed to read it to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The question is, Shall the address be read? [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the Secretary will read the address.

The Secretary proceeded to read the address.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I ask that the address be published entire in the RECORD without further reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey requested that the address be printed in the RECORD and there was objection. He asked that it be read, and there was objection. Thereupon the Chair, in accordance with the rule of the Senate, put the question, and the Senate ordered that it be read. It can not now be withdrawn from being read without the consent of the Senate, and there is objection to its withdrawal.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think there was an objection to the withdrawal of the reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was an objection.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is a pertinent matter relating to important legislation now pending before the Senate, and I think it should be read.

Mr. KERN. As the Senator from New Jersey submitted a request that the reading be dispensed with, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the Senate directing that it be read be reconsidered.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I objected to unanimous consent. I think the reading can be finished in a very few minutes more. It is a pertinent matter, and if it is not read now it will be read at some other time. So we would gain nothing by dispensing with the reading.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. Let the reading proceed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The address has been ordered read, and the reading will proceed.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the address, which is as follows:

EXTENSION OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE.

[An address delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Philadelphia December 29, 1914, by George W. Norris.]

The subject which has been assigned to me for discussion this afternoon is "The extension of our merchant marine." With all respect, I would suggest that "The Revival of our Merchant Marine" would have been a truer and more appropriate title. By whatever name we may choose to call it, the subject is one of tremendous importance—of such importance that, while I am glad to have the opportunity of presenting it, I hope and trust that it may be discussed in many other forums; that my very imperfect presentation may be supplemented and improved; and that these discussions may go on until we reach a real and practical remedy for the present deplorable conditions.

One of the most notable of Sir Walter Raleigh's many notable aphorisms was his declaration, "Whosoever commands the sea commands trade. Whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself." That statement is as true to-day as it was when he made it. The converse of the proposition is equally true—that whosoever does not command the sea trades at the pleasure of others and contributes to the wealth of others, who will in time command the world itself. Never has the world had such an object lesson in the value of "command of the sea" as is afforded to-day, when the industries and commerce of England continue in an almost normal way in the midst of a war for national existence, while Germany's commerce has been banished from the seas and her vessels are tied up in all the great ports of the world, her exporters are idle, her looms are silent, and her people must economize in their use of foodstuffs to avoid the danger of ultimate starvation. You may say that this is a question of a navy rather than of commerce, but I would have you note that the two are inseparably related. An adequate navy must include colliers, transports, supply and hospital ships, and scout cruisers, as well as battleships, torpedo boats, and submarines. There must be shipyards for construction and repair work, and there must be a reserve of men trained to the sea to meet the added demands and losses of war, and unless there is a merchant marine you can not have these things. Shipyards can not live on the construction of battleships alone. Confine them to that, and war will find you without shipyards, without trained artisans, without an adequate supply of auxiliary ships, and without facilities for manning such ships as you might otherwise be able to put in commission.

Leave out the question of national defense, and look merely at what our position would be if, instead of an undisputed mastery of the sea by England, there was an even distribution of sea power, and England, France, Germany, and Austria were all preying upon each other's commerce, and goods could not be shipped with safety in the vessels of any of those nations. We produce about 42 per cent of the world's pig iron, nearly 25 per cent of its wheat, over 40 per cent of its coal, over 70 per cent of its corn, and 60 per cent of its cotton. A great deal of our production of these articles we export—two-thirds of our cotton and nearly a quarter of our wheat, not to speak of 32,000,000 barrels of petroleum annually—and with these exports we pay a large part of our annual charge of six hundred to eight hundred millions due to the rest of the world for interest, dividends, freights, and payments and remittances of various kinds. If there were no ships in which these goods could be exported, what pen could describe the financial and industrial chaos in which we would be plunged? Think of the point to which wheat would drop. Think of the iron furnaces out of blast, the mines closed down, the farmers ruined, and our gold supply exhausted, unless universal repudiation were enforced. The picture is too horrible to contemplate; and yet, like a drunken man dancing on a tight rope, we go on relying upon the providential mercy which has thus far preserved us from such a national catastrophe. This is no figure of rhetoric, or overdrawn picture. It is a self-evident peril, which stares us in the face and to which only fatuous folly will seek to close its eyes.

But have we no ships, you may ask? Oh, yes; if you will refer to the last issue of Lloyds' Register you will be gratified to find that the American merchant marine comprises 3,100 vessels of over 5,300,000 tons gross register, and these figures are the narcotic which has lulled to sleep so many of our statesmen and business men and economists. But if you will analyze these figures, and subtract the vessels which ply only upon our lakes, rivers, bays, sounds, or canals, and which are either absolutely imprisoned on our inland seas or otherwise unavailable for ocean transportation, you will have left only 361 vessels of a gross tonnage of 1,375,000 tons to represent our ocean-going American merchant marine, and even from that paltry remnant there should probably be a further deduction made on account of vessels which, owing to their limited size, are not commercially available. The available ocean-going marine is therefore just about equal in tonnage to the fleet of one single German company. Put in a different form, whereas in 1861 over 65 per cent of our foreign commerce was carried in American bottoms, in 1901 only 8 per cent was so carried. To-day our foreign commerce represents about one-eighth of the world's total, and not more than one-tenth of that one-eighth, or 1¼ per cent of the world's commerce, is carried in American bottoms. For the carriage of the other nine-tenths of our own foreign commerce it is estimated that we are annually paying to the shipowners of other nations in ocean freights and passage money from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 a year. This is a direct loss, and takes no account of the profits we might make if, like other nations, we engaged in the business of transporting goods other than our own. By the neglect of this business it is therefore evident that we are not only (a) losing these last-mentioned possible profits, and (b) paying this enormous and killing annual charge, but we are also subjecting ourselves daily to the frightful risk of an utter paralyzation of our whole foreign trade.

Having thus outlined present conditions, it may be pertinent to refer very briefly to the causes which have brought them about. In the early days of the Nation nearly all of our foreign commerce was done in American vessels—in 1821, for example, 89 per cent of it. Up to the Civil War there was a slow but steady decline, the proportion being 86 per cent in 1831, 83 per cent in 1841, 73 per cent in 1851, and 65 per cent in 1861 (fractions omitted). Then came a rapid drop—32 per cent in 1871, 16 per cent in 1881, 12 per cent in 1891, and 8 per cent in 1901. With all the tremendous increase in our foreign trade in the last 50 years, the American tonnage carrying it is now only 40 per cent of what is was 50 years ago.

What is the explanation? The size of vessels had been increased, and iron and steel had taken the place of wood in construction. Instead of being built in a sort of local cooperative way the construction of vessels had become a specialized form of industry. Construction had been subjected to the inevitable results of our protective-tariff policy, and operation had been subjected to both those results and to the effects of our navigation laws. We had made ships about 60 per cent more expensive to build in American than in foreign shipyards and from 20 per cent to 35 per cent more expensive to operate after they were built. Having thus bound a ligature around each leg of our merchant marine, we have watched the legs atrophy, and have for 40 years confined ourselves to eloquent regrets that our bound and shackled victim did not run and dance and to expressions of fervid hope that he soon would. We can maintain a monopoly of coastwise commerce. We can give a practical monopoly to a public-utility company or a limited monopoly to a line of land transportation, but on the lanes of the broad ocean, which is the highway of all the world, there can be no monopoly. There all comers meet, and "the race is to the swift, the battle to the strong." In that unrestricted competition the weak, the overburdened, and the handicapped can not even hope for success.

Is it not about time for a people as intelligent as the American people to alter their attitude upon this all-important subject? There are certain economic or industrial changes which could be made to advantage. I believe that the high cost of vessels built in American shipyards is largely due to the fact that they are finished with an unnecessary degree of elaboration, and that there is an utter lack of standardization. An ocean "tramp" built merely to carry bulk freight does not need to be highly finished. She should be strong and seaworthy, but neither speed nor appearance is material. Many of the modern freighters constructed abroad are mere steel boxes, pointed at the ends, with an engine, a propeller, and a rudder. Our Lake freighters are sometimes described as being "built by the mile and sold by the foot," but their effect upon transportation costs has been little short of marvelous. In the memory of living men it used to cost 32½ cents a bushel to bring wheat from Duluth to Philadelphia. Last fall it was brought over the same route for 6¼ cents a bushel. Grain has been moved from Duluth to Buffalo for 1 cent a bushel, and coal and ore between Superior and the lower Lake ports for 40 cents to 50 cents a ton. There is no reason to doubt that what these freighters have accomplished in Lake transportation and what a great Detroit manufacturer has done in automobile construction may be, to a great extent at least, duplicated in ocean transportation. Standardization is the secret, but standardization is only effective when it can be applied on a large scale; and what opening, it may be asked, is there for it when, as at present, there is practically nothing to standardize?

This brings me to a discussion of some of the remedies which have been suggested by individuals or organizations interested in the subject. Among these suggestions are the removal of duty on materials entering into the construction of vessels, the admission to American registry of foreign-built vessels, subsidies, and various modifications of the navigation laws. It is perfectly evident that, as President Wilson said in his last message to Congress—

"To correct the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country, to retrace the steps by which we have, it seems almost deliberately, withdrawn our flag from the seas, except where, here and there, a ship of war is bidden carry it or some wandering yacht displays it, would take a long time and involve many detailed items of legislation, and the trade which we ought immediately to handle would disappear or find other channels while we debated the items."

American shipbuilders are already handicapped by the higher cost of materials and higher wage scale which they have to meet, and to admit foreign-built vessels to American registry as a regular and permanent thing would probably be a fatal blow to the shipbuilding industry. The admission of shipbuilding materials free of duty would be wholly inadequate to meet the situation. Many people have argued for many years in favor of subsidies, which have been suggested to successive Congresses in many forms, sometimes undisguised and sometimes disguised as payments for carrying the mails, or as a guaranty of the bonds of private corporations or as a Government loan to a private corporation. It is a well-known fact that the Democratic Party is opposed on principle to subsidies, either disguised or undisguised, and as it was never possible to get any form of subsidy through a Republican Congress, it is scarcely worth while to consider the possibility of its getting through a Democratic Congress. Any attempt to modify the existing navigation laws will certainly be opposed by the seamen's union, supported by all the other labor unions and reenforced by the enthusiastic advocates of the "safety-at-sea" idea, whose cause has been so much strengthened by the series of startling marine disasters which have shocked the world within the last few years. It is therefore evident that any changes that will bring the cost of either building or operating vessels down to the foreign standard must be very radical changes, and will inevitably be opposed by very powerful interests. I do not mean to say that no attempt should be made to effect such changes. American ingenuity and adaptability has been able to make a success in many lines of industrial activity where foreigners had distinct initial advantages, and I believe that we would find means to overcome in ocean transportation some differences in cost of both construction and operation, and that changes might ultimately be accomplished which would make it possible to overcome the handicap. It is too evident for argument, however, that the accomplishment of any such result will be tedious and difficult, and that the present conditions should not be allowed to continue for the years that must elapse before such result could be reached.

The pressure of these facts and conditions has been felt in Congress, and at the last session several bills were introduced aiming at either the

development of the merchant marine or the provision of auxiliary vessels for the Navy, or both. There were hearings before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries at which these bills were discussed quite fully, and majority and minority reports were submitted from that committee. At the present session a new bill has been introduced by Senator STONE, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and has been favorably reported from that committee. This bill creates a shipping board, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce. Subject to the direction or approval of the President as to its more important functions, this shipping board is authorized to subscribe to any part, not less than a majority, of the capital stock of a corporation undertaking the purchase or construction and subsequent operation of merchant vessels to ply between ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America, and perhaps elsewhere as necessary to meet the requirements of commerce. It is further provided that Government bonds up to $30,000,000 may be issued for the purpose of purchasing or constructing vessels to be sold to such corporation, payment therefor being made in bonds of the corporation. This bill contains a further provision authorizing the President to lease or transfer to such corporation not only vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of the act, but also such naval auxiliaries as are suitable for commercial use and are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace. It is further provided that vessels purchased or constructed under the act shall be, as far as possible, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries and that the Government shall have the power to take them for naval purposes at any time.

This act and a similar one introduced in the previous session have been criticized in many quarters. Some persons regard them as "paternalistic" and others brand them as "socialistic." Some object to the idea of using public money to run steamship lines at a loss. Some persons given to seeing ghosts can only regard them as schemes to buy the German steamers tied up in our ports, while to others the specter assumes the form of "an entering wedge to Government operation of transportation by land as well as by water." Others oppose them because they believe the navigation laws should be changed. Others because they believe that the proper remedy is in subsidies to privately owned and operated lines. Both these last classes are unwilling that the patient should be cured by any other remedy than their own, although they will probably admit that there never was a time when the acceptance of either of these remedies was so unlikely as just now.

As to the idea that the adoption of such a measure would be a precedent for railroad operation by the Government or would in the slightest degree pave the way to any such result, I can imagine nothing more unlikely. The conditions which exist in ocean transportation and the theory upon which Government intervention must be justified are so wholly different from the railroad situation that there can be neither analogy nor comparison between the two. Moreover, as the governmental intervention would probably be temporary—ultimately yielding the field to private capital—and would probably show a balance on the wrong side of the ledger, opponents of Government ownership of railroads should rather welcome the experiment as likely to prove an illuminating object lesson.

The bill authorizes the shipping board to "purchase or construct" vessels. While much-needed orders would quickly be given to our shipyards, no doubt, pending construction, some vessels would be either purchased or chartered, to take care of the present trade emergency, and it is quite possible—perhaps likely—that some of these would be German. Does this detail condemn the whole proposition? The other objections—paternalism, socialism, and the use of public money in a probably nonremunerative enterprise—all involve the same principle. Men always have differed, and always will differ, as to just what functions Governments—National, State, or municipal—should undertake. Leaving out the extremists at both ends, I think it may be said that a very large majority of our people are of opinion that Government should provide all those things necessary to the health, safety, and comfort of the community which private capital does not and will not provide. Where private capital might do it on certain terms or where private capital is doing it, and there is a dispute as to the efficiency of the service or the fairness of the rates and terms, there is always and necessarily a wide field for argument. But where the thing is necessary, and private capital has not undertaken, and will not undertake, to supply it, there is substantial agreement that it should be supplied by the community itself, acting through its constituted authorities. I am not attempting to state this with scientific accuracy or in the phrase of the political economist. I am only endeavoring to state what I believe to be the plain opinion of the plain people. They have acted on this principle repeatedly, and in many localities. To take two conspicuous illustrations: It has brought about the construction of many miles of municipally built and municipally owned subways, and it has created harbor improvements whose cost has run into the tens of millions. Cities went into these enterprises, either alone or in association with private capital to which preferential terms were given, knowing that the direct return upon the investment would not be adequate for a period of years, if ever, but knowing also that they were essential to the health, comfort, and development of the community; that they must be provided; and that they could not be provided in any other way. I maintain that the entry of the Federal Government into ocean transportation is justified on exactly similar grounds.

Let me review the facts:

Fact one. We have, practically speaking, no vessels in which to send out our $2,500,000,000 of exports or bring in our nearly $2,000,000,000 of imports. Because of this fact, we are (1) destroying the efficiency in war of our Navy, (2) fattening the rest of the world by an annual payment of $200,000,000 or more, (3) hampering our manufacturers and exporters by compelling them to ship through their competitors, and (4) running the risk of an utter paralyzation of our foreign trade by a war to which we are no party.

Fact two. Under existing conditions it is capable of mathematical demonstration that private capital can not and will not supply such vessels.

Fact three. These conditions can not be materially changed without such radical and fundamental changes in our policies as could only be brought about, if at all, through an educational propaganda continued over a period of years.

Fact four. The Federal Government can fill the void at a direct cost which can not be more than a very minute fraction of the indirect benefit.

Believing in the absolute truth of these facts, I am strongly in favor of trying the experiment. I believe that the lines established by the Government will greatly aid our exporters, and thereby simplify the problems of our bankers; that their operation will develop trade to a point where, within a few years, it will be possible for private capital to take some of them over; that the facts learned and the experience gained will pave the way for such changes in the laws as will permit private capital to enter the field; and that thus there will come about, under governmental initiative, that general revival of the American merchant marine about which we have all been dreaming for a generation, but hitherto failing to translate our dreams into action.

CONVENTION WITH NICARAGUA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a brief paper relating to the so-called Nicaragua convention, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A STATEMENT SHOWING WHY THE PENDING NICARAGUA CONVENTION AS IT NOW STANDS SHOULD NOT BE RATIFIED BY THE AMERICAN SENATE, MADE IN THE INTEREST OF COSTA RICA AND ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN CITIZENS NOW CARRYING ON VAST BUSINESS ENTERPRISES WITHIN HER BORDERS AND EXTENDING INTO OTHER STATES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.

To the Senate:

The purpose of this statement is to show that the Government of Nicaragua has no power to make a valid grant for canal purposes across her territory to the United States, independent of Costa Rica, as is attempted in the pending treaty before the Senate. That the grant "for canal purposes," as expressed in said treaty, lies within the exterior territorial lines of the so-called Nicaragua canal route connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans on the line of the San Juan River via Lake Nicaragua, from a point near San Juan del Norte on the Caribbean Sea to Brito on the Pacific Ocean.

That there are well-established reasons why this canal route is to be considered and treated as an entirety, incapable of partition or sale in parcels, Nicaragua and Costa Rica as having coordinate relations of ownership therein, as the same have been already adjudicated and defined by a tribunal of competent jurisdiction, and as surveyed and delineated by commissions of engineers chosen by these two Governments and the Government of the United States.

And that this status of affairs comports not only with the principles of common-law rights, but rests in specific treaty stipulations made and entered into by Nicaragua and Costa Rica, influenced by some of their sister States and the mediation of the American Government, in the interest of peace, as a full and final adjustment of their adverse contentions over boundary lines and the rights of property pertaining to said route, which alone averted the horrors of war between these two nations.

That any attempt by the Government of the United States to acquire any part of this territory "for canal purposes," as is contemplated in the pending treaty, from the Government of Nicaragua, to the exclusion of Costa Rica, is in direct contravention of this adjustment and a radical departure from the pacific policy heretofore pursued by the Government of the United States in its intercourse with these Central American States.

The necessity of such an adjustment was more than indicated and doubtless stimulated by the letter of instructions given to J. Bozman Kerr, the American Chargé de Affaires to Nicaragua in 1851, by Mr. Webster as Secretary of State in the Fillmore administration at that time, in the case wherein a company of citizens of the United States, under the name and style of the "American Atlantic and Pacific Canal Co.," created under a contract made with Nicaragua, pursuant to a convention between the United States and Nicaragua, but not ratified, conditioned that the United States was to recognize the rights of sovereignty and property which Nicaragua possesses over the line of said canal and to guarantee the neutrality thereof, so long as it "shall remain under the control of the citizens of the United States." It will be observed that the territorial right embraced in this contract was coextensive with the entire line of the canal route as hereinbefore described.

In this letter Mr. Webster says: "It is well known that for some time past there has been a dispute between the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica respecting the boundary, and it is certain that until this shall be adjusted the United States could not undertake to guarantee to Nicaragua dominion over the line of the canal to it, impliedly at least, by deciding that dispute in her favor, and engaging to maintain that decision by force should that become necessary." He further says: "Mr. Molina is now the minister of Costa Rica at Washington. In his note of the 31st of March he states that his Government claims a right of dominion over the country lying on the south bank of the River San Juan, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Lake of Nicaragua, as well as all that portion of the aforesaid lake comprised between Fort San Carlos and River La Flor, together with the right to the joint navigation of the above-mentioned River San Juan and Nicaragua. If, therefore, the line of the interoceanic canal should be on the south side of the river or in the river bed thereof, a guaranty by us to Nicaragua of dominion over it would be in defiance of the claims of Costa Rica referred to."

"Under these circumstances," said Mr. Webster, "you will represent to the Government of Nicaragua that this Government can not undertake to guarantee the sovereignty of the line of this canal to her until the course which that work shall take with reference to the River San Juan and its terminus on the Pacific shall be ascertained and until the difference between Nicaragua and Costa Rica respecting the boundary shall be settled. You will suggest to them that it will be advisable for them to empower the minister of Nicaragua here to adjust the question of limits. If, however, the Nicaraguan Government should refuse to authorize Mr. Marcoleta to negotiate upon this subject, you will then intimate to her authorities that the United States will not regard with indifference any attempt on her part to wrest from Costa Rica any territory of which the latter State may now be in peaceful possession."

(See Book 15, American States Instructions, Department of State, p. 113.)

An adjustment of these differences was formally initiated and supposed to be concluded by the treaty of April 15, 1858, signed by Nicaragua and Costa Rica and San Salvador as a mediator, known as the "treaty of territorial limits," which was cordially ratified by the Presidents of Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the 25th day of April, 1858, "as conducive to the peace and prosperity of the two countries and reciprocally useful to both of them."

The said treaty of limits remained in statu quo until about the year 1870, when Nicaragua was the first to question its validity and to differ as to its interpretation, which condition of affairs gave rise to the treaty of December 24, 1886, known as the Costa Rican-Nicaraguan boundary treaty, by which these two powers agreed to submit to arbi-

tration the question as to the validity of the treaty of limits of 1858 and such points of doubtful interpretation as might require a decision in the event of the said treaty of limits being found valid, and further agreed that the arbitrator of these questions should be the President of the United States of America, His Excellency Grover Cleveland, who accepted the office, and on the 22d day of March, 1888, made his award therein, an award which will ever attest his high sense of justice and judicial ability. (See Foreign Relations, 1887, pp. 267–268.)

Inasmuch as the full text of this award appears in volume 2 of the History and Digest of International Arbitrations and in House Miscellaneous Documents, Fifty-third Congress, second session, volume 39, available for the use of Congress, only so much of the same is reproduced or referred to here as is deemed justly material to the purposes of this statement. The first question to be decided by the arbitrator was as to the validity of the treaty of limits of April 15, 1858, and this he decided to be valid. Findings 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the third clause of this award are, in their order, as follows:

"6. The Republic of Costa Rica can not prevent the Republic of Nicaragua from executing at her own expense and within her own territory such works of improvement, provided such works of improvement do not result in the occupation or flooding or damage of Costa Rica territory, or in the destruction or serious impairment of the navigation of the said river or any of its branches at any point where Costa Rica is entitled to navigate the same. The Republic of Costa Rica has the right to demand indemnification for any places belonging to her on the right bank of the River San Juan which may be occupied without her consent, and for any lands on the same bank which may be flooded or damaged in any other way in consequence of works of improvement.

"8. The right of the Republic of Costa Rica to the navigation of the River San Juan with men-of-war or revenue cutters is determined and defined in the second article of this award.

"9. The Republic of Costa Rica can deny to the Republic of Nicaragua the right of deviating the waters of the River San Juan in case such deviation will result in the destruction or serious impairment of the navigation of the said river or any of its branches at any point where Costa Rica is entitled to navigate the same.

"10. The Republic of Nicaragua remains bound not to make any grants for canal purposes across her territory without first asking the opinion of the Republic of Costa Rica, as provided in article 8 of the treaty of limits of the 15th day of April, 1858. The natural rights of the Republic of Costa Rica alluded to in the said stipulation are the rights which, in view of the boundaries fixed by the said treaty of limits, she possesses in the soil thereby recognized as belonging exclusively to her; the rights which she possesses in the harbors of San Juan del Norte and Salinas Bay; and the rights which she possesses in so much of the River San Juan as lies more than 3 English miles below Castillo Viejo, measuring from the exterior fortifications of the said castle as the same existed in the year 1858; and perhaps other rights not here particularly specified. These rights are to be deemed injured in any case where the territory belonging to the Republic of Costa Rica is occupied or flooded; where there is an encroachment upon either of the said harbors injurious to Costa Rica; or where there is such an obstruction or deviation of the River San Juan as to destroy or seriously impair the navigation of the said river or any of its branches at any point where Costa Rica is entitled to navigate the same.

"11. The treaty of limits of the 15th day of April, 1858, does not give to the Republic of Costa Rica the right to be a party to grants which Nicaragua may make for interoceanic canals, though in the case where the construction of the canal will involve an injury to the natural rights of Costa Rica her opinion or advice, as mentioned in article 8 of the treaty, should be more than "advisory" or "consultative." It would seem in such cases that her consent is necessary, and that she may thereupon demand compensation for the concessions she is asked to make; but she is not entitled as a right to share in the profits that the Republic of Nicaragua may reserve for herself as a compensation for such favors and privileges as she, in her turn, may concede."

The special attention of the Senate is respectfully called to Costa Rica's right of navigation in the waters of the San Juan River and its bearing upon the merits and validity of the pending treaty so far as it affects this right from the standpoint of its present status under treaty stipulations, the award of President Cleveland, and the law of nations. Article 6 is material in this connection, as it furnished the basis upon which the arbitrator considered this question. It is as follows:

"The Republic of Nicaragua shall have the exclusive dominion and sovereignty over the waters of the River San Juan from their issue out of the lake to their discharge into the Atlantic Ocean, but the Republic of Costa Rica shall have the perpetual right of free navigation in these waters from the mouth of the river up to 3 English miles below Castillo Viejo for commercial purposes. * * * The boats of either country may touch at any part of the banks of the river where the navigation is common without paying any dues except such as may be established by agreement between the two Governments."

(For the full text of said treaty see State Papers, vol. 48, 1857–58.)

In his interpretation of article 6, which is found in the second clause of the award, the arbitrator says: "The Republic of Costa Rica has not the right of navigation of the River San Juan with vessels of war, but she may navigate the river with such vessels of the revenue service as may be related to and connected with her enjoyment of the purposes of commerce accorded to her in said article 6 or as may be necessary to the protection of said enjoyment."

And to safeguard this right from encroachment by Nicaragua was the object of finding 9, by virtue of which Costa Rica "can deny to the Republic of Nicaragua the right of deviating the waters of the River San Juan in case such deviation will result in the destruction or serious impairment of the navigation of the said river, or any of its branches, at any point where Costa Rica is entitled to navigate the same," and holding the same to be a natural right in the light of the common law and as belonging exclusively to Costa Rica, limits the power of Nicaragua in specific terms from being a party to any grant for an interoceanic canal in any case where the construction thereof will involve an injury to this natural right in Costa Rica, without previous consultation with her upon the subject, without her voluntary consent thereto, and without the recognition of her right of compensation for any concessions she may be willing to make in the premises.

The liberty and right of navigation and commerce, then, which Costa Rica possesses upon so much of the waters of the River San Juan as "lies more than 3 English miles below Castillo Viejo" is without question paramount to all other rights under consideration to the same extent as that sanctioned by the English and American courts and as recognized by the Congress of the United States over the navigable rivers within their jurisdiction. (See American and English Encyclopedia of Law, vol. 16, p. 260, and cases there cited.)

To give practical effect to this award, a third treaty was concluded between Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the 27th day of March, 1896, whereby the contracting parties agreed each to name a commission composed of two engineers or surveyors for the purpose of properly tracing and marking the boundary lines between them pursuant to the award, and for the appointment of a third engineer by the President of the United States clothed with the power to decide any question of difference that might arise between the two said commissions in conducting said survey, and whose decision should be final as to the same.

The engineer appointed by President Cleveland was Gen. E. P. Alexander, an American, learned and distinguished in his profession, who fulfilled with great care the duty assigned him, as is evidenced by his exhaustive report to the Commission of Limits of Costa Rica and Nicaragua of September 30, 1897. (See House Documents, vol. 1, 55th Cong., 2d sess., 1897 to 1898.)

It may be said by way of illustration that the territorial relations of Costa Rica to the south bank of the San Juan River is analogous to that of the United States to the south bank of the River St. Lawrence.

The Government of the United States holds the reciprocal right and liberty of commerce and navigation upon the St. Lawrence and the intervening lakes in the interest of peace under treaties of long standing with Great Britain.

By muniments not less binding and defensible Costa Rica holds a corresponding reciprocal liberty and right of commerce and navigation with Nicaragua upon the waters of the San Juan, qualified only as provided in the second clause of the award.

It is not necessary to comment upon the attitude that the United States Government or Great Britain would assume toward each other if their said treaty rights were not mutually respected.

It is important to note in this connection that the action taken in 1851 by Mr. Webster as Secretary of State in relation to the "American Atlantic and Pacific Canal Co." has been observed as a rule of action by that department until the advent of the present treaty convention with Nicaragua now pending before the Senate.

It is equally important to note the good faith which has been observed by the Government toward this award up to the present time, touching any negotiation for obtaining this canal property. This good faith was manifested by President Harrison in his message of December 9, 1891, in which he says: "Grave complications for a time seemed imminent in view of supposed conflict of jurisdiction between Nicaragua and Costa Rica in regard to the accessory privileges to be conceded by the latter Republic toward the construction or work on the San Juan River, of which the right bank is Costa Rican territory. I am happy to learn that a friendly arrangement has been effected between the two nations."

Again, it was manifested through the action of Mr. Hay as Secretary of State in procuring the protocols of agreements between the Governments of the United States, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica of December 1, 1900, as the basis of negotiations for the acquisition of this property and naming the amount of compensation to be paid to each for the same.

(See House Documents, vol. 110, 57th Cong., 1st sess., 1901–2, pp. 23–25.)

Again, as appears in the act of June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," wherein Congress shaped its provisions, so far as it related to the acquisition of the Nicaraguan Canal property, upon the lines of the award and as a unit of ownership.

(U. S. Stat., vol. 2, pt. 1, sec. 4, p. 482.)

Against the approval of the pending convention the Government of Costa Rica, through her accredited minister, in April, 1913, made her remonstrance to the Department of State, according to the custom of nations in such cases, upon good and substantial grounds, as appears from the same now on file in the archives of the State Department, and deemed worthy of the consideration of the Senate, in which she especially complains that this convention was negotiated with Nicaragua without her knowledge, or without imparting to her its nature or its provisions; that the knowledge of its terms, so far as it affects her rights, came through indirect sources and not from the Government of Nicaragua, as it should have done, and therein praying for a hearing and an investigation by that department of her rights as presented in said remonstrance, which was denied to her, and as a last resort she therefore comes to the Senate, where the treaty-making power is supreme under the Constitution, to renew her remonstrance against the ratification of this convention. She comes not under the surveillance of this or any other Government. No battleships are required to patrol her shores or ports to enforce contracts or treaty obligations. No foreign marines to occupy her territory and regulate by force her internal affairs. She comes, on the contrary, as a free, independent, and self-governing sister Republic to make this protest, confident in the belief that she will receive upon the merits of her cause the same consideration as if she were of equal rank and power with the Government of the United States. She comes not as an obstructionist to any reciprocal measures or policies that the United States Government may desire to enter upon and promote in full regard and respect for the honor and rights of independent States and the common welfare of herself and the people of the States of Central America.

The pulsations of this great artery of international commerce, if constructed and put in operation, will not be confined to the Republics of Costa Rica and Nicaragua alone, but go as well to stimulate the commerce and growth of all the States of Central America.

The distinguished arbitrator says in his award in finding 10 of the third clause "that the Republic of Nicaragua remains bound not to make any grant for canal purposes across her territory without first asking the opinion of the Republic of Costa Rica, as provided in article 8 of the treaty of limits of the 5th day of April, 1858."

This inhibition upon the granting power of Nicaragua grew out of the fact that the arbitrator had ascertained from the evidence before him in the case, as the fact is, that the property interests of the two Republics were so distributed, ramified, and intermixed throughout the territory and navigable waters of the canal route as to absolutely preclude any grant by Nicaragua alone "for canal purposes across her territory" without affecting the natural rights in lands and navigable waters and other rights pertaining thereto of Costa Rica, of which she was in actual possession and exclusive ownership.

The well-known purpose of this convention so far as it affects the rights and interests of the Nicaraguan Canal problem is not withheld from the public knowledge. It is well-known to the public that its purpose is not to construct and operate the canal, but to tie up in the strong hands of the Government of the United States its absolute control that it may not be utilized by any other interest in competition with the Panama Canal.

It is no more nor less than an attempt to effect this purpose through a convention with Nicaragua alone, negotiated with her, if not under duress, at least in the constructive presence of hostile military forces of the United States then occupying her territory, and by what amounts in law to an usurpation of the rights and interests of Costa Rica in the canal. In the light of the award it is no more nor less than a stroke of arbitrary power on the part of the American Government.

The Senate, we think, may well pause at this juncture of affairs to measure its evil effect, if consummated, upon the people of Costa Rica and of the States of Central America, and not less upon the vast American interests already established therein and dependent for their continued prosperity upon the amity and good will of these peoples.

The situation now before the Senate, as it may be briefly summarized, is as follows: At the Capitol of the Republic of Costa Rica has been erected a stately temple under the joint auspices of this Government and the Republics of Central America, within whose courts the Goddess of Peace holds the scepter. This was done to solidify and give permanent effect to the preexisting policy of peace and amity between these nations as a tribunal of civil procedure in the adjustment of controversies that might lead to war.

To the honor of Costa Rica, this sentiment has been kept alive through the administrations of the six distinguished citizens now living who have served the Republic as president in constitutional succession, and is still faithfully cherished and maintained by the present able and illustrious executive of that Republic, Don Alfredo González.

It was this sentiment that inspired the confidence of Costa Rica and Nicaragua in this Government to invoke its mediation, through President Cleveland, to secure a settlement of their pending contentions in a mutual bond of everlasting peace.

To ratify this treaty in disregard of the rights of Costa Rica would be in violation of this plighted faith, and would inevitably reopen with increased fury the old feuds and put the Republic of Costa Rica upon the offensive and the defensive in the maintenance of her rights as "nominated in the bond."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOHN N. POPHAM,
GEORGE C. HAZELTON,
Representing the American Business Interests in the Republic of Costa Rica.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 19, 1915.*

FOREIGN NATIONAL-DEFENSE SYSTEM (S. DOC. NO. 796).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present three papers, the first relating to the officers training corps of Great Britain, the second being on the Australian system of national defense, and the other the national-defense system of Switzerland. I ask that the three papers be printed as one document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday, January 28, 1915, I shall address the Senate on the unfinished business, and with particular reference to the question of the transfer of the flag from belligerent to neutral vessels.

DISTRICT EXCISE BOARD.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to be relieved from service upon the special committee appointed by the Vice President to investigate conditions in the District of Columbia with reference to the action of the excise board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

ANILINE-COLOR INDUSTRY.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may lay before the Senate Senate resolution 520.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 6856. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the Chair may lay before the Senate Senate resolution 520. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. Let it be read.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not object if——

Mr. POMERENE. It is simply a resolution calling on the Secretary of Commerce for certain information.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not desire to have it displace the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business was laid before the Senate at 1 o'clock, and it is now before the Senate. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution, and the Chair will see if there is objection to its consideration.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 520, submitted by Mr. POMERENE on the 14th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate as fully as possible as to the facts relating to the supply of dyestuffs for American textile and other industries, the sources of such supply, the extent and nature of the supply, the movement of prices, the available materials for the manufacture of such supplies in this country, the possibilities, if any, as to the stoppage of such supply by reason of the existing European war, and any and all such other facts as will bring the existing conditions in the aniline color industry fully to the knowledge of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the consideration of the resolution displace the unfinished business?

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. Is there any objection to the consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution considered which is familiar to everyone in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 250 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if there is any necessity for that at this time?

Mr. OVERMAN. We are putting out a new edition of the manual now, and we want to have authorization for it. If we do not have the authorization, we can not get it out until the next Congress. This is the customary resolution which has been introduced here for 20 years.

Mr. SMOOT. I have always thought that in the past we printed too many editions of the manual. I do not see why we should print a new edition for this session.

Mr. FLETCHER. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection to the consideration of the resolution, and the unfinished business is before the Senate.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. As directed by the Committee on Commerce, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 6856, the ship-purchase bill, presented on January 6, 1915, and to offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the original bill and all amendments heretofore reported thereto from the Committee on Commerce, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right and the amendment will be received, printed, and ordered to lie on the table.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the original bill, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been carrying around with me for several days some valuable thoughts on the pending bill hoping that I would have an opportunity to present them, but apparently there has been a disposition on the other side of the Chamber to keep me from doing so. On Saturday last a recess was taken covering the entire day, so as to permit our Democratic friends to hold a caucus, and this morning a great deal of extraneous matter has been submitted which has consumed two hours of valuable time.

Mr. President, in view of the apparent purpose of the Democratic majority to make it appear to the country that they are deeply solicitous to rehabilitate the American merchant marine, and that the bill under consideration is designed to accomplish that purpose, I beg to call attention to certain votes which have been taken in the Senate on the subject during the past 10 years. In addition to the instances that I shall cite, other efforts have been made by the Republicans to secure legislation on the subject which were either defeated in the Senate by Democratic votes or in the other House by a solid Democratic vote and the votes of a few Republicans from the Middle West. The votes to which I wish to call attention are the following:

Senate bill 3739, passed the Senate July 12, 1890. The yeas were 28, the nays 16; Republicans, yeas, 27; nays, 1; Democrats, yeas, 1; nays, 15.

Senate bill 1348, passed the Senate March 17, 1902; yeas, 42; nays, 31. Republicans, yeas, 41; nays, 8; Democrats, yeas, 1; nays, 22; Populists, nays, 1.

Senate bill 529 passed the Senate February 14, 1906. Yeas 38, nays 27; Republicans, yeas 38, nays 6; Democrats, yeas 0, nays 21.

Senate bill 28 passed the Senate March 20, 1908, upon which there was no roll call, the Senate by a viva voce vote voting unanimously for the bill, which failed in the other House.

Senate bill 6708 passed the Senate February 2, 1911, yeas 39, nays 39. Republicans, yeas 39, nays 13; Democrats, yeas 0, nays 26. The Vice President voted in the affirmative and the bill was passed.

On another occasion a bill passed the Senate, was slightly amended in the House of Representatives, and the amended bill returned to the Senate. An effort was made to agree to the House amendments, but the bill was filibustered to death by Democratic Senators.

At a later date Mr. President, I may present some data relating to the matter of so-called filibustering in the Senate, which has been discussed more or less during the past few days.

Since I came into the Senate this morning I have had placed on my table an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill which we are now considering. It is marked "Confidential," but I believe it is the same amendment the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] submitted an hour ago, having withdrawn all amendments which had been previously offered. So, as I understand the matter, this amendment is now the bill of the majority, and it is to be considered as the committee bill.

Owing to the fact that this substitute amendment has been submitted this morning, which I believe is the third or fourth substitute that has come from the committee during the time we have been debating this measure, it occurs to me it has been a very fortunate circumstance for the majority that we have insisted upon full and free debate on this great question, because, Mr. President, if we had been forced into a vote at any time prior to the present moment we would have been voting upon a measure that the Democratic majority does not now sanction. For that reason the minority has rendered not only the country, but the majority of this body, a real service in insisting that this matter should be fully debated before action was taken upon it. We have given them opportunity to reconstruct their bill several times.

I repeat, Mr. President, in view of that fact the minority have rendered the majority a real service in debating this bill until they could have time in their various caucuses to give this matter the consideration which has at last resulted in the substitute that is now before us.

In glancing over this new bill I notice two or three things that are of interest. I will merely call attention to them at the present time in a word, possibly taking them up later on when we have progressed further in this debate, and then consider them at greater length.

In the last session, Mr. President, the American merchant marine over seas having been practically wiped from the oceans of the world, foreign nations having taken control of the commerce of the seas to the practical exclusion of American shipping, certain Senators were very anxious that those foreign vessels should be put into the coastwise service of the United States so that that magnificent fleet of coastwise steamers which has been built up by private enterprise and by private energy and by private capital should have as competitors the fleets of the other great maritime nations of the world. That matter was discussed at length. When a vote was taken the proposition was defeated by a vote of 2 to 1. It is now proposed in this new draft that the ships which are to be built under the provisions of this law shall be put into the coastwise service of the United States. In other words, Mr. President, defeated in their purpose to open the coastwise shipping to foreign nations, they now propose to get the camel's nose into the tent by admitting into the coastwise service these vessels which are to be built ostensibly for the foreign commerce of our country. It is a dangerous proposition and one, Mr. President, that I feel sure will be resisted with a great deal of force and energy on this side of the Chamber.

They have also reconstructed the shipping board, and in that respect I think they have acted wisely. I am glad that the minority of the Senate gave them an opportunity to do this, listening as they doubtless have to the protests of the press and the utterances of public men against putting the shipping of the United States into the hands of three cabinet officers, making it a political machine, as the Reserve Board has been made a political machine by the present administration and the majority in Congress.

They propose to do another somewhat remarkable thing in this bill. Turning to page 7, I read:

> All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States, heretofore made or published, by authority of law, shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall as provided hereby take the place of those now in existence.
>
> The Shipping Board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the Shipping Board.

It will be observed, Mr. President, by the language of the bill itself that the rules and regulations which it is proposed to modify and annul were adopted by authority of law. But it is now proposed to throw them aside and give this Shipping Board authority to make rules and regulations governing the commerce of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. That particular provision of the new substitute just offered attracted my attention this morning when I read it. I should like to have the Senator, if it will not divert him from his line of argument, to explain briefly the present shipping rules, stating what are the principal objects, and so forth. It is a subject which was not touched on, as I remember it, in the prior substitutes of this bill. Some of us do not understand just exactly what is the object of this particular new section of this substitute.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that matter will be discussed by me, and doubtless it will be discussed by other Senators a little later on. It is impossible for me off-hand to give the rules and regulations that are now in vogue and which have been enacted by authority of law. I shall take occasion, as I had intended to do, to call upon the department to supply me with all those rules and regulations as they now exist, and when they are before me I shall see that they are presented to the Senate. They will then become a proper subject of discussion and we shall be able to determine whether or not it is wise in this bill to annul all those rules and regulations and put in a shipping board authority to make other rules and regulations. I do not know how serious the matter is, and I call attention to it to-day simply in passing as a question that may be of very great importance and one that ought to be looked into very carefully before it is agreed to.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to say, regarding the provision which is referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire, that I am rather glad I am able to assume responsibility for fathering that provision of the bill. I had assumed that the Senator from New Hampshire would be in hearty accord with an effort which I might make to reconsider and revise the present shipping rules and regulations. Though my service in this body does not entitle me to speak with certainty, I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire has been most earnest in his efforts to provide for a reconsideration and a revision of all our shipping laws, as well as the rules and regulations which have been made by various bureaus, located in Washington chiefly, under the authority of existing laws.

The provision to which the Senator has referred, and of which I can not now tell whether he approves or disapproves, I believe will be one of the great means of reforming the system under which we are now living. There are laws regarding our shipping and there are rules and regulations made pursuant to laws by certain officers of various bureaus. It is the object of this provision, so far as those rules and regulations now apply, to force a reconsideration by a body of men who will reconsider them and promulgate new rules in lieu of them, or, if they consider them good, readopt the existing rules, so that our shipping and navigation laws may be up-to-date and not obsolete, preventing a great deal of commerce, when by a change in a very few simple matters there might be a considerable increase in commerce.

I think upon consideration the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me that a provision of this character is very

desirable. I shall try at some future time during the debate to give instances with which I imagine the Senator from New Hampshire may be familiar where the present rules and regulations militate against the shipping of the United States, particularly our coastwise shipping.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. STONE. I will ask the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. Does he consider the interruption he permitted by the Senator from Delaware to have been made to ask a question or to make a speech?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Vice President yesterday ruled that an interruption of this kind might be allowed without imperiling the right of a Senator having the floor to continue. I presumed that that was understood. It certainly is in accordance with the custom that has always heretofore prevailed in the Senate.

I will say in reply to the Senator from Delaware that I have not been in any propaganda nor have I been over-anxious to have the navigation laws of the United States entirely overhauled. I have thought that there were some laws relating to navigation that might well be amended and perhaps some of them might well be stricken from the statute books. As to the rules and regulations I am not prepared to speak with any degree of authority or with any degree of knowledge. I notice that they were enacted, according to the amendment, by authority of law. I observe that now without authority of law we are to have a new set of rules and regulations made by a board. It may be wise. I say frankly to the Senator from Delaware that I shall certainly be delighted to hear him on that subject, and I will endeavor to acquaint myself with the facts before I come to vote upon the proposition.

I do not want the Senator from Delaware to think that I am in unyielding opposition to the proposition, because I am not. I simply called attention to it as apparently a radical departure from existing conditions, and for that reason it occurred to me that we might well pause before committing ourselves to it, and give it careful consideration, with a view to taking enlightened action when we came to cast our votes.

Mr. ROOT and Mr. SAULSBURY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and to whom?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wanted simply to correct an apparent misapprehension into which the Senator falls. The rules and regulations, of course, which are referred to in this section are those which have been adopted under existing laws. If this amendment shall pass, and the shipping board be given authority, of course the shipping board will have the same authority to adopt new rules that the former officers had to adopt the existing ones.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand the matter. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I want to make a suggestion at this point which it occurs to me may be useful in the future. I can put it in the form of a question if it is considered necessary, but I shall not trouble to do that unless it is deemed necessary. It is this: This new provision, which, of course, none of us who are not caucus members have had an opportunity really to consider, and which has been presented here this morning, vests in the shipping board the power to make regulations. The bill also vests in the shipping board power to carry on business through a corporation. If the establishment of that new business through the shipping board is not to drive out all other American merchant marine, there will then be competition between the business carried on by the shipping board through this District of Columbia corporation and the business carried on in private enterprise by owners of American ships, and we ought to be pretty careful before we put into the power of one competitor the making of rules that are going to govern the other competitors. There ought to be a very definite statement of what is to be the scope of the quite indefinite authority that is proposed to be given by this new provision.

Mr. GALLINGER. I fully agree with the Senator from New York on that point.

Passing from that question, I venture to suggest, Mr. President, that the remarkably able and persuasive argument made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], one of the ablest jurists of the land, on yesterday, might well have concluded this discussion, but evidently the proponents of the bill are still intent upon pressing it, without reference to its consequences upon either national or international interests. As a consequence those of us who see grave peril in this proposed legislation must continue the discussion, to which I will now endeavor to make a contribution, even if what I say or the manner in which I say it may not meet the approval of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], or the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

First, I would like to ask when a perfected bill, representing the views of the majority, may be expected?

Mr. President, I wrote that on yesterday, and I presume the answer would be that I have a perfected bill now before me. I am glad that after this long period of incubation the majority has presented what they doubtless regard as a perfected bill—perfected until the next draft is presented to the Senate.

The truth is, we are having a moving-picture exhibition day by day, the screen each morning displaying a different view from the one we looked on the day before. When will this kaleidoscopic performance cease so that we may know what kind of a bill the majority stands for? As already suggested, the third edition of the bill proposes to put these ships built for the foreign trade into the domestic trade—a new and dangerous proposition.

I would also like to ask what routes are contemplated beside those to Central and South America? What are the "and elsewhere" routes? Are they to be across the North Atlantic, across the Pacific Ocean, or where? We are entitled to know, and we ought to know precisely what is contemplated in that respect.

We are also entitled to know why the appropriation bills—the supply bills of the Government—should not now be taken up and considered. One great appropriation bill is now ready to be reported and others are practically ready. Why are those bills held back? What is the purpose of the majority in this respect?

I trust, Mr. President, that it may not become necessary for Senators from time to time to move to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from the further consideration of appropriation bills, so as to pass them before this session ends.

I was gratified to observe, by an observation from the Chair yesterday morning, that questions such as I suggest may be propounded and answered without the Senator propounding them losing the floor, as had been heretofore hinted would be the result. This gives us hope that after all we may have some debate on this bill before the physical powers of the minority are worn out by long hours and unusual legislative procedure.

It is only natural that there should be some speculation as to the reason why so strong an attempt should be made to force this bill through Congress. The mere fact that the President declared himself in favor of the proposition—apparently before he had fully considered it—furnishes no reason why he should refuse now to change his position and insist on having his way. This seems especially so in view of the President's attitude at the time he was urging Congress to reverse itself by repealing the provision of the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from payment of tolls. In his message at that time the President said:

> The large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood.

The present instance seems to afford a splendid opportunity for the President to practice what he preaches, and that, too, without repudiating a plank in the Democratic national platform.

The Senator from New York has eloquently registered his protest against the methods being employed in this body. But we are not alone in this. The newspapers of the country are protesting and the people of the country are loudly protesting against it. Here is an illustration which has come to my personal attention. A distinguished Democratic Member of the House of Representatives in conversation on Saturday last said:

> Never in the history of the world has there been an organization or any body of men so weary, worn, and so completely spent as this present Congress of ours.
>
> Never in the history of our country or in that of any country under the sun have the people been so tired, disgusted, and sick of the doings of any legislative body as are our people in this country right this minute.
>
> We are worn and weary, thoroughly fagged. We are irritable among ourselves, and we can not legislate properly, even if there were any need whatever for further legislation. The people for whom we are assuming to legislate want nothing further forced upon them. They are sick of us. We are all pretty tired, but we must go on.

I wonder why we must go on?

What I have quoted recalls the nine days' bloody fight in Mexico City when the then President was importuned by

his cabinet and advisers to resign, as other countries were threatening to intervene and stop the orgy, and Mexico would lose her independence. Mad Madero returned the answer:

The spirits of Bonaparte and Cromwell are directing me, and they say "fight on"—so I say "fight on." We will fight on until not a stone is left in Mexico City and until every Mexican soldier lies dead.

So they fought on, as the administration is fighting on, and heaven only knows what the result will be either in Mexico or here. Again I ask why not pass the appropriation bills and stop? Why must we continue to go on considering this bill? The legislative judgment is against it. Why not follow our convictions on the subject?

Mr. President, our Democratic friends keep us absolutely in the dark as to what has been going on in their daily and nightly caucuses, and as a result we must look to the enterprising represenattives of the press for information. Turning to the Washington Post of a few days ago I find on the front page an article with the following headlines:

PLEDGED BY CAUCUS—SENATE DEMOCRATS ENTER PACT TO STAND BY SHIP BILL—HALF A DOZEN UNYIELDING—FIGHT OVER LEGISLATION LIKELY TO BE THE BITTEREST IN YEARS—ADMINISTRATION HAS DECIDED TO THROW OVER ALL THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN ORDER TO DRIVE SHIP-PURCHASING MEASURE THROUGH—REPUBLICANS STAND READY TO EMBARRASS WHENEVER POSSIBLE—KERN CONFIDENT OF VICTORY.

The article, for the absolute correctness of which I do not vouch, reads as follows:

By a vote of 37 to 3, Senate Democrats in the caucus yesterday made the administration ship-purchase bill a party measure and passed a resolution binding every Democrat to its support. Senators HOKE SMITH of Georgia, BRYAN of Florida, and THOMAS of Colorado voted against the resolution, but after being defeated joined in to make the action unanimous.

The resolution was offered by Senator FLETCHER. It provides, first, that it is the sense of the caucus that the ship-purchase bill shall be enacted into law; second, that it shall be made and kept the unfinished business of the Senate until concluded; third, that the Democratic Members of the Senate hereby pledge their full support to the measure.

The vote cast for this resolution was more than two-thirds the majority membership in the Senate. Several years ago the Democratic caucus, under the leadership of former Senator Blackburn of Kentucky, decided that a two-thirds vote in caucus was binding upon every member of the party. That action has never been set aside.

While administration leaders assert that no Democrat can vote against this bill and escape the charge of bolting his party, it is understood the following Democrats will not support it unless materially amended:

I omit the names of those Democratic Senators, and continue to quote:

Senator VARDAMAN said last night that no caucus action could bind him to support a bill in which he did not believe. Senator HARDWICK said he would not be bound by the caucus action, having made a promise to his constituency against Government ownership. He will fight the measure on the floor, and his skill as a parliamentarian is counted on by the opponents of the bill.

The newspaper article then gives the names of certain Senators on the Republican side who will support the bill and also the denial of Republican Senators that more than one of the minority will vote for the measure. The article then proceeds to say:

An important amendment agreed to yesterday accomplished in a measure what was unsuccessfully attempted in the Panama Canal Act. This amendment will permit any ship built in the United States under the provisions of this act for the over-seas trade to also engage in the coastwise trade.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this enterprising newspaper man several days ago had definite information as to what was to be presented this morning in the shape of the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. The article continues:

This amendment * * * was offered to section 5 of the bill which prohibits foreign ships acquired from engaging in the trade with Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, Guam, and Tutuila.

To the extent, at least, of opening the coastwise trade to ships hereafter built in this country, regardless of their intended use in ocean commerce, the caucus by this amendment has struck at what Democrats have always characterized as the "coastwise shipping monopoly." The only opposition grew out of the fact that the present emergency related to our foreign trade and not coastwise, and the fear that the adoption of this amendment might bring the coastwise trade shipping lobby into the fight against the measure. It was agreed to, however, without serious opposition.

As perfected in caucus, the bill provides for a shipping board to consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and three civilians, to be appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate.

Again, Mr. President, that shows how accurate this enterprising newspaper man was in getting the proceedings of the Democratic caucus on this great question.

The only other amendments to the original bill of material nature was one to incorporate the proposed ship corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia, and another to provide that the original capital stock of $10,000,000 can be increased at any time only to the extent of $10,000,000 more.

All indications now point to the most determined and relentless battle waged over an important piece of national legislation since the Aldrich-Vreeland currency act was adopted.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that that filibuster against the Aldrich-Vreeland currency act was carried on by the Senators on the other side of the Chamber and not by Republican Senators; and it was a filibuster that has had few parallels in the history of our country.

The administration has decided to throw overboard all the appropriation bills and permit them to become flotsam and jetsam on the congressional seas in order to drive the ship purchase bill safely into port. Republican opponents will attempt to embarrass Democrats by urging the passage of measures in which the proponents of the bill are deeply interested, such as the river and harbor bill and the war-claims bill.

There are two bills that are very dear to the Democratic heart. Just think of how the mail of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] must be burdened with demands upon him to put through appropriations for the rivers and creeks of that State. Just think how the Senators from North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Kentucky, and other Southern States must be importuned at the present time to pass the so-called omnibus claims bill appropriating money almost exclusively for those States.

The article from which I have been reading, and which is so illuminating and authentic, because it foreshadowed exactly what the committee has done, continues:

Sessions of the Senate lasting eight and ten hours will be resorted to before long to "expedite" passage of the bill. Finally, as a last resort, the device of a continuous session will be tried in order to exhaust the filibusters.

"We shall keep the bill before the Senate until it is passed," said Senator KERN, chairman of the caucus. "There is no disposition to displace it with any appropriation legislation. We will urge it as rapidly as possible, giving every opportunity for discussion. Whether we shall hold night sessions or continuous sessions has not been determined. Much will depend on the future course of the opposition."

Here are the grounds on which the opposition is conducting this fight:

That the bill is the opening wedge of Government ownership.

That, Mr. President, is largely the ground upon which I am opposing this bill and which I will discuss when I reach it.

That it is socialistic and may lead to Government control of other instruments of trade and industry.

Of course it will; that is the purpose of it.

That it threatens serious international complications because of the administration's anticipated purpose to buy ships of belligerent nations and enter them in the foreign trade during the present European war.

The country believes that, whether the majority of this body believes it or not, the economists of the country believe it; the newspapers of the country believe it; and I shall show that there is a protest, loud and deep, against our taking any chances in the purchase of belligerent ships during the terrible war in Europe that may drag us into war with one or the other of those nations at some time.

That there is no necessity for the Government buying ships to put them in the South American trade, since there are more ships now plying on these trade routes than are sufficient to accommodate the business offered.

I will endeavor to show, Mr. President, at the proper time, that so far as present commerce is concerned, there is an abundance of ships plying between the United States and Central and South America. I am in favor, however, of legislation that will enable the Government to put some fast mail ships on those routes, a proposition for which I have argued in season and out of season during the past 10 years, and which I think, after the war closes, if not before, would be exceedingly wise and beneficial legislation. The article concludes:

That for the Government to purchase ships will paralyze existing shipping corporations, since they will be unable to compete with the Government on any route which the Government enters.

Of course, that will result. No private party can compete with the Government with the funds of the National Treasury at its command, and with $40,000,000 in this bill, with which to make a commencement, what private individual or what private corporation will undertake to compete with the Government on any route that may be selected if this bill shall pass?

Mr. President, I approach the discussion of this question with some trepidation, for has it not been said from the "seats of the mighty" that those of us who oppose this bill are either misguided, blind, or ignorant; and has it not been further said, that no matter what position the ignorant, minority of this body may take the bill is to be passed? And has it not also been said that we have the termerity to oppose this bill without going to the other end of the avenue, and telling the head of a coordinate branch of the Government why we dare do such a thing? Probably the President thinks, in the language that has recently been incorporated in a bill which passed this body, that most of us are suffering from "constitutional psycopathic inferiority," or something of that kind.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the suggested inhibition of individual thought and independent action on this great

question, I propose to deal with it as I think best, unhampered by the views of others, and undismayed by the criticisms of those in high authority.

We are asked where we get our credentials to stand in the way of the proposed legislation, and we answer that we get them from the same source that elected President Wilson to make recommendations to the Congress, and to administer the laws, but not to dictate legislation. Where is the clause of the Constitution to be found that takes from the Congress the freedom of legislative action, the right to amend or reject bills, or the right to originate legislation without let or hindrance? It is well that this should be understood. That it has been lost sight of to a large extent is no excuse for its continuance.

Verily, Mr. President, we have fallen on strange times if the voice of the minority is to be stilled by either Executive declaration or manifesto from the majority. Others may subscribe to that doctrine, others may agree to the charge that the Republican Party has not had an idea in 30 years, but for myself I repudiate it. The history of the Republican Party for the last 30 years is replete with splendid achievements and magnificent results, and the Republican Party will soon return to the power that was temporarily wrested from it by conditions that do not exist to-day. The one great legislative achievement that the Republican Party failed to accomplish was the enactment of a law that would have put American ships on the great overseas routes of trade; and that failure was almost entirely due to Democratic filibustering. The senior Senator from Missouri, lifting his eyes and assuming an attitude of reverential distress has told the Senate that he has already seen indications of filibustering on this bill, but the Senator from Missouri has not to look far back in the past to discover real and successful filibustering on another merchant marine bill, which procedure received the approval of the Senator from Missouri, if, indeed, it did not receive his valuable and influential support. Probably the Senator from Missouri has forgotten the day when 39 calls for a quorum were made in the interests of the Democratic minority, using more than one-half of the calendar day in that way, followed by 20 calls on the next day. The Republican majority protested then, but in vain; but now the minority is to be run over rough-shod if the well-known plans of the leaders of the majority prevail.

So, Mr. President, let us be fair with each other. Everybody knows that the bill under consideration is a far-reaching measure, full of doubts and uncertainties. Everybody knows that it proposes to overthrow the traditions and policies of our Government, and venture out upon an untried sea, without chart, compass, or the results of experience to guide us. Private enterprise, private initiative, and private genius are to be supplanted by governmental activities in an experimental field, where profit is impossible and failure a practical certainty. Can it be expected that those of us who do not believe in Government ownership of the means of transportation should sit dumb while what we conceive to be false and disastrous economic theories are being put in operation? Can this be expected of us, even in response to the dictum of the captain of the Democratic team, to use the words of the captain himself?

Mr. President, the great and overwhelming proposition contained in this proposed legislation is that of Government ownership, and to that I propose to address myself at some length. I remember when the great Democratic orator, who had twice been a candidate for the Presidency, returned from a tour around the world, and was greeted by an admiring throng in Madison Square Garden, what a shock he gave to his Democratic hearers when he advocated Government ownership of railroads. You all remember it. From all sides came the declaration that the utterance would bar their great leader from the Presidency. What has since then come over the spirit of the dreams of the Democracy to work this change? Or am I well informed when I say that I do not believe a majority of the proponents of this bill really believe in it, but are being driven by the force of party discipline and Executive power to support it? That may be denied, but nevertheless I believe it to be a fact. The Democratic leader in the White House demands that all Democrats shall work together along the line marked out by him, and he warns his party that unless they work together they are to meet with his disapproval.

As I have said, Mr. President, the most vital and far-reaching point in this discussion is the matter of Government ownership, and it will be my endeavor to show, before taking up the shipping part of the argument, that the proposition is quite generally condemned in the country, and wherever tried has proved anything but a success. Theorists see nothing objectionable in the proposition that the Government shall buy and operate the railroads. To them the fact that the purchase price would be five or six times as much as all the money in circulation throughout the country is a matter of little consequence. Their vision does not extend beyond the fact that they want the Government to engage in business enterprises to the sure destruction of private enterprise and private capital.

Let me call attention to the storm of disapproval that has burst forth since the proposition to put the Government in the water transportation business of the country has taken shape.

Mr. F. G. R. Gordon, a leading labor representative, delivered an address before the National Civic Federation in New York City last December on the question of Government ownership of telegraph lines, which is so replete with wisdom that I will quote it, although I do so, Mr. President, with a feeling that some Senators will doubtless think that I ought not to consume the time of the Senate in presenting to them the views of this very able labor representative, who is also a well-recognized economist. Mr. Gordon said:

> The most common argument made in favor of the socialization of the telegraph and telephone is that under private ownership they are a monopoly, operated for profit, with high rates and poor service, and that by having the Government own and operate them they can become a part of the postal system with large economies in operation, and in turn supply the people with cheaper rates, good service, and higher wages to the men and women who operate the lines, and, lastly, provide a surplus for the Government.
>
> I shall prove just the opposite of all this glittering dream; I shall prove that wherever the telegraph or the telephone have been socialized there is extremely poor service, with large financial losses, low wages for employees, and rates that, on the whole, are fully as high as they are in this country and in many instances higher.
>
> Nearly all the nations of Europe, as well as New Zealand and Australia, own and operate both telegraph and telephone systems and have done so for many years.
>
> The alleged "success" of our Post Office Department is used as an argument for the further extension of the socialization of the means of communication. But as a matter of fact, there are fundamental differences existing between the social function of the post office and the work of the telegraphs and telephones. The mail service is universal; it requires mostly only the simplest character in its operation; its work is to a great extent performed by private common carriers. But, despite its comparative simplicity and ease of operation, our post office has not been a financial success from any standpoint. All the gains, where any have been made, have come from the private-ownership features of that business.
>
> The Hon. DAVID J. LEWIS, author of the bill to nationalize the telephone system, asserts that 1.85 per cent of the business of the post office is franked, and that but for this free transportation and the further fact that 29.24 per cent of the business pays only 5.19 per cent of the revenue, our Post Office Department would have paid an annual profit each year since the Civil War. This is merely a half truth and assumption, and in this case the half truth is pretty bad. In the first place, if that 1.85 per cent of franked mail were not free, three-fourths of it would not be sent through the mails at all, so Mr. LEWIS is 75 per cent wrong there. And the same thing is true of at least half of the 29.24 per cent which he says pays 5.19 per cent of the revenue. Congressman LEWIS is either not very familiar with these facts, which are self-evident, or he is merely a dreamer of strange dreams. And as for the franking privilege, he ought to know that the Post Office Department is the recipient of large favors from Uncle Sam which rightly are a part of the expense of conducting the business, but which are paid for by the Treasury Department.
>
> The most striking example of this last statement is that the Postal Department does not build or care for the public buildings which it occupies. While the post office does an annual business, on both sides, of about $600,000,000, it has only five or six million dollars of capitalization for the entire Nation. Even some of the salaries of the staff are paid out of the other departments; the Postmaster General, Assistant Postmaster General, the Assistant Attorney General, and the subsidiary general officials connected with these officials are not paid from the postal revenues. The expenses of this character, as shown by an examination of the appropriation act of March 4, 1913, will amount in 1914 to $1,913,350. In the appropriations for the Treasury Department we also find that for the office of Auditor for the Post Office there was appropriated for salaries for postal savings system and other expenses the sum of $766,620, with an additional sum of $18,000 for the postal savings banks and $5,000 for the Department of Justice for the Attorney General for the Post Office. This figures up a total of $2,702,970 of expenses that legitimately belong to the Post Office Department, but which are met by other departments. It is quite pertinent to ask Congressman DAVID J. LEWIS, public-ownership advocate, why he failed to give us this information.
>
> Vastly more important than these expenditures are those for public buildings and their repairs and care. In the 12 months from July 1, 1911, to June 30, 1912, the total cost for public buildings and their care amounted to the great sum of $22,660,212.85, and at least 75 per cent of this outlay legitimately belonged to the post office, and was paid by the Treasury Department. Keeping in mind the statement of Congressman LEWIS that but for the franking system, etc., the post office would have paid every year since the Civil War, I point to the fact that the entire revenue of the postal system from 1865 to 1913 was $3,775,838,529, and the total gross expenditure was $4,055,106,045. This shows a direct loss of $279,267,516 in these 48 years. The indirect losses were millions more. For instance: The public buildings used exclusively for the post office had cost for construction, sites, and extensions and alterations the sum of $58,991,738.42 up to June 30, 1912. And other buildings which were jointly used by the post office, customhouse, etc., had cost $127,080,549.68. If we allow but 75 per cent of this last cost to the postal service, then we have a total up to June 30, 1912, of more than $153,000,000 as a capital investment which properly belonged to the post office to pay interest upon, though it paid not a cent. The annual interest charge at 4 per cent would amount to $6,000,000. When Congressman LEWIS was using the post office to bolster up his argument for a socialized telephone he did not give us this very valuable information. Take this interest charge and the cost for salaries paid by other departments which should be paid by the post office, amounting to nearly $3,000,000, and the care for the public buildings, their extension and repairs, we have a total annual deficit of more than $14,000,000 on the average for every year

since 1865! Here is a grand total loss of $672,000,000 in 48 years, and this is what public-ownership advocates call a "success."

Just now these advocates are boasting of the wonderful success of the parcel post. The alleged facts about that much-praised system are simply mere half truths. The mails are weighed once in four years, and the railroads are paid on this basis for the succeeding four years. Nearly every railroad official in the country is complaining of inadequate pay for this service. Some statistics will tell why the postal revenues for 1907 were $183,585,000 and for 1912 they were $246,744,000, or an increase of $63,159,000. The railway mail pay in 1907 was $51,008,000, and in 1912 it was $50,703,000. In other words, while the mails were increasing several hundred million pounds the railway mail pay was decreasing. This was before the parcel post was established, January 1, 1913. The service was inaugurated with a weight limit of 11 pounds, and for the first six months the railroads received no compensation whatever for this greatly increased business. On July 1, 1913, all the railroads which did not have a weighing in the spring of 1913 were allowed an increase of 5 per cent for mail transportation. A month later the Postmaster General increased the weight limit to 20 pounds, and on January 1, 1914, a further increase was made. This naturally produced a large increase in the volume of traffic, which the railroads were forced to carry absolutely free. It was estimated that the parcel post would carry 600,000,000 packages for this year (1914), and that it would yield a revenue to the Post Office Department of $60,000,000. This is how Uncle Sam makes money on the parcel post.

If a shoe manufacturer had free rent and heat for his plant and paid only 75 per cent for the cost of transportation for 100 per cent of service, is there any reason why he should not make a howling success while his competitors all about him were failing? As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department is underpaying the railroads to-day to the extent of from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 annually, and at the same time is losing about $14,000,000 every year on the average, if we take all the facts into consideration. It's about time that the enthusiasm directed upon blindly lauding the Post Office Department be concentrated upon a constructive effort to overhaul the system and remedy its glaring defects. It is the worst managed big business in this country, and talk of its success simply encourages the growth of the socialistic idea in other lines, and more especially as to railroads, telegraphs, and telephones. Uncle Sam pays the railroads less than 20 per cent of the total expense of the Postal Service, while the British Post Office pays 24 per cent in general and 55 per cent on the parcel-post business.

Fortunately for us, other nations have socialized both telegraph and telephone systems, and therefore comparisons between private and public ownership can be shown. In both Europe and Australia the publicly owned telegraph and telephone has passed far beyond the experimental stage. I propose to show by facts and statistics that Government ownership of these means of communication has resulted in failure. In the first place, let me point out the foolishness of attempting to socialize the telephone and leaving the telegraph under private control. Governments of Europe which had public ownership of the telegraph socialized the telephone just as soon as it was demonstrated that it could carry conversation, for the very reason that they did not dare to face competition, and, likewise, if we are to socialize the telephone we must also own and operate the telegraph or else suffer a competition that Uncle Sam can not successfully meet. It is assumed by the advocates of public ownership that the telegraph and telephone can be consolidated with the Post Office and thus save large expense in operation. It is, however, the general outcome in the administrations of the several nations of Europe that this does not work out in practice and that the supposed economies do not materialize.

TELEGRAPH RATES COMPARED.

A great deal of loose talk and misstatement has been made regarding rates on the publicly owned telegraph systems of the world. A very important fact in connection with this is that in Europe the address and signature are both counted as a part of the message. Take the telegraph system of Great Britain as an example. It looks like a very cheap service when we hear that a 12-word message is sent over the wires of Great Britain for 12 cents. But if you send a message from London to Liverpool, you will naturally give the city and street address and the names of sender and receiver. This will consume at least 10 words, leaving only 2 for the text, or in reality 6 cents a word, as compared with the method in this country where the address and signature are not counted. The following table shows the different rates in Europe for a 10-word message, with address and signature, allowing 10 words for address, etc.

France	$0.193
Norway	.268
Belgium	.116
Sweden	.268
New Zealand	.200
Great Britain	.200
Germany	.238
Italy	.212
Denmark	.268
Austria	.244
United States	.250 to $0.300

The corresponding rates for 10-word messages, allowing 5 words for address and signature, are as follows:

France	$0.102
Norway	.201
Belgium	.096
Sweden	.201
New Zealand	.15
Great Britain	.15
Germany	.179
Italy	.164
Denmark	.201
Austria	.183

For the preferred rates we find that several countries in Europe actually charge from two to three times higher than we pay in this country, allowing 10 words for addresses and signature. In Germany, for example, the rate is 71.4 cents; in New Zealand it is 40 cents; in Italy, 63.7 cents; in Austria it is 73 cents. In Great Britain there is no urgent rate. Urgent or preferred rates in the United States are on the above basis—25 to 30 cents. Allowing only 5 words for address and signature, the preferred rates for 10 words of text would be: Germany, 53.6 cents; New Zealand, 30 cents; Italy, 49.2 cents; and Austria, 54.9 cents.

With the exception of Russia, all the countries of Europe are small compared with the great territory of this country and Canada. The trade and commerce of Europe may be compared in practice with that of the different States or Provinces of this hemisphere. Thus the international messages all over Europe are numerous, as is natural among more than 300,000,000 people living mostly within 2,000 miles of one another. Twenty-seven per cent of the telegraph messages in France are domestic noncommercial and international inward and transit telegrams; 50 per cent in Norway; 44 in Sweden; 51 in Switzerland; 24 in Germany; 25 in Italy; 40 in Austria; and 10 in Great Britain. An ordinary message of 15 words, which includes the address and signature, sent from Belgium to France costs 35.7 cents, but if the same message be preferred or urgent the cost is $1.071. The rates from Belgium to Germany are the same. A like message from France to Germany (ordinary) will cost, ordinarily, 43.4 cents; urgent, $1.303. A 15-word message from Great Britain to France costs 60.6 cents; from Sweden to France, ordinary, 72.4 cents; urgent, $2.171. From Switzerland to France, or to Germany, the rate is, ordinary, 38.6 cents, and urgent, $1.158. For the distance from Stockholm to Paris, 1,000 miles, the rate for a 15-word message, address and signature, is 72.4 cents. From New York to Chicago, about the same distance, the rate for a 10-word message, address and signature free, is 50 cents. And this 72.4-cent rate is not far from the average all over Europe. For "urgent" everywhere in Europe the rates are much higher than in this country. Thus we see that in Europe, on the whole, the international rates are double the domestic, and it is the international rates that should be compared with the rates in this country, because the distances are more nearly even.

We should not lose sight of the fact that what is known as "ordinary" service on the socialistic telegraph lines throughout Europe is a service that is so poor, so utterly incompetent, that it would not be tolerated in this country.

Some of us personally know that the system is, as Mr. Gordon well says, so utterly poor and incompetent that it would not be tolerated for a minute in the United States.

The "preferred" service is the only kind that corresponds with the average service on the telegraph lines of this country, and the cost in Europe is very much higher than for the same service in the United States.

Advocates of government ownership of telegraph lines submit tables of rates in Europe which to a considerable extent are misleading, owing to the fact that on messages passing through two countries a single message is counted as two and the cost split; if it passes through three countries, it is made to count for three messages, with a one-third rate. There is no more justification for this "splitting up" of a message than there would be for our counting a message from Smith of Massachusetts to Jones of Pennsylvania as three messages and dividing the cost, making it one-third per message the real rate because it happened to pass through three States.

From Paris to Vienna is about 650 miles, and the cost for a 15-word message is 57.9 cents, as against only 40 cents in this country for the same distance. But Mr. LEWIS would divide the message between Paris and Vienna into three and split up the cost, and thus demonstrate that rates are higher here than in Europe.

The following table shows the great difference in the area of this country and the different countries in Europe:

	Area in square miles.	Per cent of United States.
United States	[1] 3,026,789	100.0
Austria	115,800	3.8
Belgium	11,400	.4
Denmark	14,800	.5
France	207,000	6.8
German Empire	208,800	6.9
Great Britain	121,400	4.0
Hungary	125,600	4.1
Italy	110,700	3.7
Netherlands	12,600	.4
Norway	124,100	4.1
Sweden	172,900	5.7
Switzerland	16,000	.5

[1] This area excludes Alaska, the Canal Zone, and the island possessions.

This table gives you at a glance the tremendous differences in distances within the boundary lines of these countries. The average telegraph haul in the United States is about 570 miles, and the average for the night letters is 1,025 miles. In Belgium the average haul for domestic telegrams is only 42.5 miles, in Great Britain 150 miles. Thus, measured by the distance served, the average cost for telegraph messages in this country is far cheaper than in Europe. As for service, everyone who has lived in Europe, or who has taken the trouble to investigate, knows that the telegraph service of this country is far superior to that of any other country.

WAGES.

Another point which public-ownership advocates seem to know nothing about, or they ignore it, is the difference in wages in the several countries compared. Facts show, however, that the wages paid to telegraphers in this country will average about two and one-half times those of Europe.

DEFICITS.

Deficits is another thing that the public-ownership fellow seems to forget about. Nearly every government-owned telegraph system in the world is run at a loss. In 1870 the British nation completed the ownership of the entire telegraph systems. It is reported that the profit under private ownership was an average of $1,600,000 annually. The Government had only fairly got started when the deficits commenced, and they have ever since been growing. For the last few years the annual loss on the system has been over $5,000,000. For the 12 months ending March 31, 1913, it was £1,175,347, or $5,723,940. The year before, according to a statement made by a socialist leader to the official organ of the Socialist Party of this country, it was $6,196,285. These losses include the interest charges upon £10,867,644, or $52,925,426, of capital. It has been stated by several writers, who assert that they have the facts, that this $52,925,426 does not, however, represent the full cost of the system, and that some $30,000,000 additional

capital should by right be included in the capital cost. Sydney Brooks places the loss since 1870 of the socialized system at $200,000,000. We are told by the socialists that this loss is more than offset by the cheaper rates. This is not true; but if it were, where would it leave us? The system would be in the position of taxing all the people in 43 years some $200,000,000 in order that the dukes, the lords, the rich bankers, merchants, and manufacturers might have their telegraph rates cut in two. In other words, it would be taxing all the people in order that less than 10 per cent of them might have "cheap" rates. Ten per cent of the population send 90 to 95 per cent of the messages. And, as already explained, the rates are not so cheap as they appear in the reports. The cost of 12 cents for 12 words sounds pretty good until one understands that the address and signature are charged for. John L. Jones, 3 Lane Street, Liverpool, counts 7 words, and A. T. Smith 3 more, making 10 out of the 12 used for address and signature, which shows about how much of a message one can send for 12 cents. Each additional word is charged 1 cent, so that 12 words with the foregoing address and signature would cost 22 cents, and not 12, as we are told by those who want our aid in giving the people of this country more socialism. In 1901, which is the latest available figure in regard to telegraph losses in that country, the government telegraph system of Germany lost $3,500,000, while that of France lost $1,880,000 in 1905, the latest figure available. In Australia in 1912–13 the loss was $799,206, and in New Zealand the telegraph and telephone service for 1912–13, $313,212. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that the publicly owned telegraph and telephone pay no taxes. The taxes which they would pay were they in private hands would have to be paid by the people under other forms.

No thoughtful man can imagine that the great telegraph system of this Nation can be operated anywhere near as cheaply under Government ownership as under the present system. Public ownership everywhere has increased the cost of operation and almost always lowered the standard of efficiency. If we were to socialize the telegraph system to-morrow, in less than two years we would add 25 to 35 per cent to the cost of operation; we would overstaff the system, hedge it about with red tape, and in time make of it what our postal system is, namely, the worst-managed big business in the Nation.

Publicly owned telegraphs and telephones are everywhere characterized by wretched service, low wages to employees, use by but a small percentage of the population, and large annual deficits.

Where the Government does own both the telegraph and telephone, it is not the masses, but the classes, that mostly make use of them.

Many men who think they are not socialists are advocating Government ownership of the telegraph, the telephone, and the railroads, but they fail to see that the socialization of these services is but a step toward the socialization of all the means of production and distribution. The Government-ownership advocate is a socialist, though he may not know it, and in supporting Government ownership of the railways, the telegraph, or the telephone, is indirectly, if not directly, working for the Government ownership of your store, your farm and shop, and, most important of all, the Government ownership of your labor.

Mr. President, it may be said that I have wasted some time in reading that somewhat extraordinary address by Mr. Gordon, a distinguished labor representative, a man whom I know has made a most profound study of this question. I venture to say that the statistics that Mr. Gordon presents can not be successfully controverted by anyone. If it be true, as this gentleman asserts, that the government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines in the countries where the experiment has been tried has proved not a success but a failure, how absurd it would be for us to follow the advice of one Republican Postmaster General and one Democratic Postmaster General and place the entire telegraph system of the United States in the hands of the Government! And if the statistics here presented are true, as I assert them to be, how unwise it will be for us to turn the water transportation of this country into the hands of the Government, and allow the Government to become a competitor with the private individual and the private corporation which are now transacting that business!

I am so thoroughly imbued—and in this respect I may be called, as I am frequently called, a "standpatter" or a "reactionary"—with the feeling that we ought to give serious pause to this question of adopting to any extent the principle of Government ownership that I am taking more time in its discussion than I otherwise would take. With me it is a profound conviction. I believe it is going in the wrong direction. I believe, though it may not come in my time, that if we adopt the doctrine laid down in the bill that is under consideration at the present time, inevitably, by the force of sentiment that will be developed in the minds of many people in this country, the agitation for the ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, as well as the public utilities of the various municipalities of the United States, will gain great impetus; and I want to do my part toward preventing that consummation, which I feel sure would be disastrous to the best interests of the country.

The article I have read has impressed me very profoundly; and I want to emphasize the fact, as stated by Mr. Gordon, that the British post-office department has recently made a report of its operations for the year ending March 31, 1914, in which it estimates the loss from the telegraph service for the year at £1,230,965, or nearly $6,000,000. If our Government should acquire the telegraph lines, who can estimate the loss that would result? And if steamship lines are acquired, why not telegraph lines, and if telegraph lines are not profitable, why shall steamship lines be?

The experience of Great Britain in the matter of government ownership of the telephone is equally discouraging. Here is an editorial from the London Daily Mail on that subject, entitled "Why and Because." I will say that this extract I myself clipped from the London Daily Mail, a copy of that paper having been sent to me by a friend now resident in Paris, so that the extract is authentic, and I assume that it states the exact facts. Listen to it:

Why is it that Government ownership and management of the telephone is practically always a failure? Why is it that for every thousand Europeans there is only one telephone, while for every thousand Americans there are 15? Why is it that the country which has done most to improve the telephone, both technically and commercially, and to popularize its use is the country in which its operation and development have been and still are exclusively the work of private enterprise? Why is it that not one of the innumerable discoveries that have transformed the telephone industry in the last 30 years has emanated from a department of state; that European Governments have been the last to adopt them, and that the verdict which experts are obliged to pass upon them, with perhaps two partial exceptions, is that they have not learned their business? Why is it that there are great and famous towns in Europe at this moment where methods and machinery that were abandoned 20 years ago in America are still in use? Why is it that throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain and the Continent hardly a single efficient long-distance service is to be found? Why is it that in New York one can invariably get the number one wants, and get it at once, while in London one has often to wage a prolonged and embittering battle with a slow operator, insufficient lines, and a conversation—if any conversation ensues—that is only audible when it is interrupted.

The broad answer to all these questions is that the alertness and enterprise that are essential to telephone development can not be expected from a Government department. The characteristics of the bureaucratic mind and temperament forbid it. The organization of a Government office, with a virtually irremovable staff, forbids it. The spirit of officialdom, with its traditions of subordination, its narrow professional outlook, its unwillingness to concentrate responsibility, its insensible stifling of initiative, forbids it. A Government department can not raise and discipline its staff to the same level of efficiency as a commercial company. It can not act with the same freedom and directness as a private board. It can not pursue a business object without deference to a hundred influences and considerations that have nothing to do with business. It can not advertise with anything like the same boldness. It naturally seeks efficiency through economy instead of economy through efficiency. It has to think of politics and political reactions. Its whole constitution prevents it from proving as enterprising as private initiative, as prompt to discard obsolete methods and apparatus, as quick to adopt new inventions, as skillful and aggressive in gathering in subscribers.

As we all know, to our cost, we have Government ownership and operation of the telephones in Great Britain. We shall never have a telephone system worthy of the name so long as the post office remains in undivided and despotic control. Sooner or later that authority must be modified or delegated if our telephone system is ever to attain an even passable standard of efficiency.

Every American who has had experience with telephones in either England or Germany has a lively recollection of the wretched service. Some Members of this body have had the same experience that I could recount, and I assert most emphatically that the condition so vividly set forth by the London Daily Mail is a fact, that the condition is about as bad as it can possibly be.

In this connection I quote a letter written by Mr. A. G. Hagedorn, of New York, under date of March 25, 1914, to the editor of the Market World and Chronicle, as follows:

Referring to the editorial in your issue of March 21, on the Annual Report of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. and on the arguments advanced by the Postmaster General, in a recent report, in favor of the governmental ownership of the telegraph and telephone lines, my own experience with governmental telephone service in Germany may be of some interest to you. Let me add that this experience extends over a period of years, the more recent dating back some two years.

At that time I was a visitor in a home situated outside of Wiesbaden, at a distance which was easily covered by automobile in 20 minutes. Whenever it became necessary to telephone to or from Wiesbaden, it was a rare occurrence if a connection could be established in less than 15 or 20 minutes, and often the time required was much greater. I remember very distinctly an occasion when our party was delayed at Wiesbaden and it was desired to notify the friends at home. Some one suggested a telephone message, but those who knew the service advised against it, saying it would only mean additional delay and we might reach home, if we proceeded, about as quickly as we could get a message through.

To telephone to Frankfort on the Main, which we could reach by auto in less than one and a quarter hours, was an undertaking which was even more trying. If this was done during the morning hours, we could easily count on an hour's time for the operation and very frequently on much more than that. The procedure was this: You called up the local operator and gave him the call. He would inform you that the same had been noted and that you would be notified when the line was ready for you. How long this would take was entirely dependent on the number of calls that had come in ahead of your own. During banking and exchange hours, particularly in times of activity in the commercial world, the delay would be very trying. Business concerns recognize this, and, I was told, usually put in their calls for the following day during the day preceding.

I have telephoned to other cities from the home mentioned above and recall in particular the experience had in establishing a connection with the city of Bonn—an affair of about two hours.

It is needless to add any comment to the above. Anyone who has had the experiences I have related, and then compares such service with our own prompt and efficient service, can have but one opinion on the

question whether government ownership and control of the telephone system is to be preferred to private ownership and control.

I dwell upon this matter, Mr. President, for several reasons. I am not indifferent to the movement that is going on in this country in favor of government ownership. It exists in the District of Columbia and it exists elsewhere. If it can be established that the experiment tried elsewhere has been disastrous rather than successful, I shall feel that any contribution I make to it is not time lost during this discussion.

One of the most significant and powerful arguments ever made against the government ownership of railroads, and as I have before said, if we have government ownership of steamships why not of railroads, is contained in an address delivered by our erstwhile associate in this body, the Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., before the National Civic Federation of New York City, on December 4, 1914. I hope Senators will listen to the philosophy and sound reasoning of our friend Mr. Bourne.

I wish, Mr. President, that I might have had time to summarize this extremely able and interesting argument, but like some other Senators, and like most Senators, my time has been greatly occupied of late in the consideration of other matters, and particularly in that of appropriation bills and hence I am constrained to give the address in full. Mr. Bourne said:

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Civic Federation:

The desideratum of all government should be the protection of its citizens and only such restraint of individual action as is absolutely necessary to insure the desired protection of all its citizens.

That, Mr. President, is a maxim that no one will take issue with.

The limit of the individual's restraint should be clearly expressed by law, and not left to the whim or fancy of an executive, a commission, a department, or a bureau.

A government of rule and regulation, a bureaucratic government such as ours is rapidly trending toward, can not long endure.

I am strongly opposed to Government ownership of railroads because of the following three objections:

First. The fundamental objection that it would be absolutely destructive of popular and representative government.

That is an objection, Mr. President, which ought to engage the attention of every thoughtful man. If it tends to the destruction of popular and representative government, it ought to be resisted at all hazards and on all occasions.

Second. The unanswerable objection that Government ownership necessitates Government regulation; that the failure of Government regulation necessitates the failure of Government ownership; that the success of Government regulation eliminates the necessity or desirability of Government ownership.

Third. The economic objection that Government ownership would be more dilatory, less efficient, and far more costly to the people of the country.

I imagine Mr. Bourne has had experience in Europe with the telephone and telegraph systems of those countries, and that his experience there led him to the observation that Government ownership would be more dilatory and less efficient, which it certainly is.

All government, society, and business are composed of human units and directed by the forces controlling human action. Hence in approaching governmental problems we should carefully analyze these forces. Where any individual is called upon for immediate action many forces, such as sentiment, love, passion, or hatred, may determine the action. I am convinced that every deliberated action of any individual in his primary capacity is controlled or influenced by the individual's opinion as to the effect such action will have upon his own personal selfish interest. If this be true, then the least power delegated to single individuals in government the better for the interests of those governed.

There are no two people in the world exactly alike, and probably there never will be. Hence each individual has a different viewpoint as to what constitutes his own selfish interest. Under community action no individual can secure gratification of his own selfish desire, but must rest content with what the majority of the community believe to be for the best interest of all. Therefore the more you force the people to act collectively, the more you can distribute governmental power, the better the general welfare of the community governed.

Mr. President, that paragraph is worthy of former Senator Bourne, the man who discovered the "composite" citizen, and it ought to attract the attention of the Senate.

In all organized society there are three great forces continually struggling for supremacy—the police force of government, the religious force, and the commercial force. The best government would be correlated action between these forces, but with domination of the police force over the religious and commercial forces.

The people as a whole and not any individual should constitute the police force of government. No individual should constitute a government. Our whole political organization is founded on this idea; and yet the present trend of this country, or at least of the present administration and some previous ones, has been toward centralized government, with practically plenary powers in the hands of the Executive or department or bureau heads.

The evil results of the police force, commonly called the State, being represented or dominated by a single individual are to-day most forcefully and horribly illustrated in the European situation, where one man by virtue of his occupancy of a throne has involved 400,000,000 people in a continental war, resulting in the slaughter of millions of men, the destruction of billions of dollars' worth of property, and cessation of industrial activities with resultant economic waste beyond human comprehension. Had the policies of European nations been left to legislative bodies rather than to individual monarchs the situation which now exists could not have been developed.

Selfishness and ambition so generally control human action that great delegated power must always be a menace. It is certainly axiomatic that centralized power in an individual or commission can only produce results commensurate with the integrity, ability, experience and unselfishness of the individual or individuals constituting the commission.

Returning to my first objection to Government ownership of railroads, I assert that it would be absolutely destructive of popular and representative government. The ownership of railroads would be quickly followed by ownership of telegraph and telephone lines, express companies, water transportation companies, and electric railways doing an interstate business. I am opposed to Government ownership of any of these public service corporations.

I present herewith a table I have prepared giving the number of employees, for the years specified, of the United States Government and of the different public service corporations, showing a total of 3,054,988 employees.

1914, number of Government civil employees	469,000
1912, telephone and telegraph employees	220,656
1913, railway employees	1,815,239
1912, electric and street railway employees	282,461
1906, water transportation	188,348
1907, express employees	79,284
Total	3,054,988

Reflect over these figures, Senators.

Says Mr. Bourne:

Remember that in the last 10 presidential elections the President has been chosen by a plurality varying from a little over 7,000 to about two and a half millions. Can any person familiar with the politics of this country doubt the correctness of the assertion that, under Government ownership of these public-service corporations, with the resultant addition of over two and a half million employees to the Government pay roll, those employees and their friends would inevitably control the Government under our political machinery? The tendency would be more pay and less service in governmental employment, resulting in ceaseless efforts on the part of outside labor to secure Government employment because less onerous and more remunerative, with cumulative dissatisfaction and irritation in all private enterprise.

In the past, Presidents have been able to dictate the nomination of their would-be successors, either themselves or others, because of subservience to the Executive of the great number of Federal officeholders. While it is true that universal adoption of presidential primaries would minimize the possibility of repetition of this misuse of power in the future, yet even under a primary system, the existence of over 3,000,000 employees, subject to removal, promotion, transfer, or demotion by Executive order, would give a political power that should not be delegated to any single individual if the Government is to last.

Advocates of Government ownership urge that the taking over of the railroads by the Government would eliminate them from politics. In my opinion it would have the opposite effect, throwing them into politics.

The assertion that the railroads are now a positive factor in politics is untrue. Undoubtedly there was a time when railroads and other large corporations exerted a very large and very effective influence upon State and National politics, but that time has passed. The direct primary has overthrown the power the corporations had under the old convention system, and the people have the power to-day not only to select between candidates, but to choose the candidates as well.

Government ownership would be followed by organization of Government employees for the promotion of their own interests. These employees would immediately become an organized factor in every campaign. Their influence would be exerted, not primarily for the promotion of the best interests of the country, but for the promotion of their own interests. Their influence would be thrown with the party or candidate that promised most for the fulfillment of their desires.

So long as the party in power kept on good terms with the 3,000,000 Government employees, it would have their support, and the support and cooperation of their relatives. While it would be absurd to argue that any such body of men would act as a unit at all elections, it is altogether probable that a sufficient number of them would so act as to make them a formidable political organization.

An administration backed by an active organization spread throughout the length and breadth of the country would thereby have a tremendous and practically overwhelming advantage over the party seeking to supplant it.

The establishment of classified civil-service rules and regulations would not remove the menace to truly representative government. Even though appointments be made in part in accordance with competitive tests, the fact that chief officers of the party in power have control over promotions, demotions, transfers, and removals, would make the individual governmental employee subservient in politics, except where practically the whole body of employees acted in accordance with prearranged plans for the benefit of the employees themselves.

Our Government was founded upon the principle of distribution, rather than centralization of power. The framers of the American Constitution provided for three branches of government, the legislative, executive, and judicial. The legislative branch, composed of a large number of individuals, was designed to be the dominant branch, for it was vested with the lawmaking power. The judicial branch was designed to interpret and the executive branch to execute the laws enacted by Congress.

But in practice we have drifted far from the principles adopted when the Government was founded. Ours is a representative form of government, generally conceded to be the best thus far evolved by the brains of men, because it is a government of, for, and by the people. Yet, especially in the past two years, our tendency has been, in my opinion, entirely contradictory of the theory upon which our Government was constructed, and, unless checked, must result in absolute destruction of representative government.

Some political leaders seem to have gone commission mad. Every social and economic problem, in their view, calls for the creation of a new bureau or department or commission, with power to make rules and regulations for the government of the American people. Congress, the legislative body of the Constitution, is becoming but an instrumentality for the creation of bureaus and commissions vested with the real lawmaking power. The citizen of to-day who wishes to know what he can or can not do within the law, consults not

merely the statute books, but the latest pamphlets of rules and regulations adopted by some department or bureau head or commission.

While I believe the Interstate Commerce Commission has accomplished, and is accomplishing, much good; have favored its receiving the power to regulate railroad rates; yet I realize that it is yet to be demonstrated whether the powers it already has should be enlarged or curtailed, and I am appalled at the realization that the legislation of the past two years has so centralized government as to place the interstate business of this country practically in the hands of 19 men, or possibly of 11; the Interstate Commerce Commission, consisting of 7 members, or a majority of 4, practically determining rates affecting the welfare of the whole Nation; the Federal Reserve Board, consisting of 7 members, or a majority of 4, practically determining currency expansion or contraction affecting all business of the country; the Trade Commission, consisting of 5 members, or a majority of 3, that will practically dictate the policies of 160,000 of the large corporations of this country, with the inevitable result that attempts will be made to use these boards as political machinery for the advantage or disadvantage of some administration, and ultimately of some individuals.

Proceeding now to a consideration of my second objection:

It is strange that the advocates of Government ownership, who assert the failure of Government regulation, overlook the fact that Government regulation is just as essential under Government ownership as it is to-day. If the Interstate Commerce Commission must be charged with the duty of regulating rates, supervising provisions for protection of life, and guarding against favoritism and discrimination, surely all these duties must be performed under Government ownership.

The conflicting interests of competing shipping points would exist under Government ownership, just as they exist to-day.

Every section of the country and every industry would be before the managing board of the Government railway system asking for reduced rates on certain commodities, or between certain points.

Every community would be before the board asking for improved service, improved equipment, and extension of lines.

Where the Interstate Commerce Commission has one problem to solve now, it would have ten under Government ownership.

It can not be expected that discrimination will be elimnated under Government ownership. Those who anticipate any such reform need only recall the serious differences that have arisen already in the Federal Reserve Board over the effort of the Secretary of the Treasury to extend special favors in financial matters to one section of the United States.

Another proof that we would have discrimination—unfair discrimination—under Government ownership may be found in the records of the Post Office Department, where such discrimination has been practiced. In 1910 Postmaster General Hitchcock ordered the establishment of what is known as the "blue tag" service, under which certain publications were ordered transported on freight trains, while rival publications of very similar character and competing for the same trade were continued in the mails.

Please remember that although these magazines which were ordered transported on freight trains paid exactly the same rate of postage and were admitted to the mails under exactly the same laws as those that were continued on fast mail trains, yet they received, under the Postmaster General's deliberate order, a far less efficient character of service.

When such a discrimination can be made in the Postal Service, who can doubt that there would be similar discrimination under Government ownership and operation of the railroads.

Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines would result in intermittent press censorship and continuous press subservience to the administration in power, thereby utterly destroying our zealously guarded "freedom of the press."

Discriminations no doubt exist to some extent to-day, but they have been reduced to a minimum. The point I wish to impress upon your minds is that Government ownership would not relieve the country of the necessity of Government regulation.

If Government regulation is a failure to-day, we have no good reason to believe it would be a success under Government ownership. We can not hope to secure for the management of a Government-owned railroad system men who are more honest or more capable or more aggressive in the performance of their duty than are the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the officers of the Department of Justice.

If they can not succeed in enforcing the law and in preventing discrimination, we can not expect them to establish and maintain equitable service under Government ownership.

If a member of the President's Cabinet will undertake to favor one section of the United States in the operation of a currrency and banking law, some other member of the President's Cabinet would attempt to favor some section of the country in the management of Government railroads under his control.

Therefore, I assert again that if Government regulation is a failure, Government ownership will be a failure, and if Government regulation is a success, the reason for Government ownership is eliminated.

The economic objection to Government ownership is the one I deem of least, and, in fact, of very slight, relative importance. I am not one of those who think that Government ownership would lead to financial disaster, or ruin of the transportation service, or the destruction of internal commerce. I have no doubt whatever that the Government could acquire the railroads, operate them with a fair degree of success, inaugurate some reforms and save some waste through the elimination of duplication. But I am also convinced that while the Goverment, as the owner and operator of the railroads, would likely inaugurate improvements in some respects, these would be more than offset by deterioration in the service in other ways, and that the economies accomplished by elimination of duplication would be more than counterbalanced by increased expenses in other respects.

It seems to me to be absurd to argue ,as some gentlemen do, that the Government could take over the railroads, provide better equipment, install the most up-to-date and expensive appliances for the protection of employees and passengers, increase the wages, and reduce the hours of employes, and at the same time give service as good as now rendered at a less cost.

That every practicable precaution should be taken for the protection of life, no one will question. This, as I understand it, the Interstate Commerce Commission now has the power to require. I have no doubt whatever that it has ordered the installation of protective equipment as rapidly as it is deemed practicable

Undoubtedly there is some waste in the present system of management, because competing roads maintain more frequent train service than is necessary between certain points, through an effort on the part of each to secure as large a share as possible of the traffic. The elimination of some of the trains would mean a somewhat reduced service, a correspondingly reduced cost, and a consequent saving. I can not agree, however, with those who believe that this reduction in service, due to the elimination of competition and reduction of supervisory organization in the management due to the consolidation of all the railway systems into one, would effect any economy whatever, when allowance is made for the increased number of employees incident to Government ownership. That it costs the Government more to perform service than it does a private concern is so generally recognized that it requires no demonstration.

Under present conditions passenger and freight rates are practically uniform on competing lines, and the only competition is in the matter of service. The effort of the managers is to secure a larger portion of the traffic by providing superior facilities and rendering superior service. With the elimination of competition under Government ownership, this incentive would be entirely removed. At the present time every employee is urged by his superiors and compelled by his own desire to retain his position and secure promotion by demonstrated ability to put forth every effort to secure business for his company by offering the traveler and the shipper the best service practicable. Under Government ownership that incentive would be removed. The employee would perform his routine service with faithfulness, no doubt, but without putting forth unusual effort.

One of the arguments made in behalf of Government ownership is that it would mean increased compensation to railroad employees. That this result would be realized no one will question, nor shall I assert that it ought not to be realized. What I do contend is that the advocates of Government ownership who base their arguments upon economic reasons err in their contention that the Government can both increase compensation of employees and reduce the cost of transportation to the shipper.

The average compensation of the present railway employee is about $723 per annum. The lowest salary paid to the railway mail clerk during the first year of this employment, when he is performing practically unskilled service, is $900 per year. The average compensation of the railway employee is therefore below the least compensation of railway mail clerks in the employ of the Government.

If the average compensation of railway employees should be increased one-third, which is a very conservative estimate of the increase that would be experienced under Government ownership, the total addition to the compensation account would be $400,000,000 annually, the present pay roll of the railroads amounting to over $1,200,000,000 in round numbers.

My assertion that Government ownership would be less efficient is based to a large extent upon a personal experience I had some four years ago. On December 21, 1910, by the adoption of a resolution which I introduced, the Senate called upon the President to inform the Senate as to the total number of officers and employees of the Government, exclusive of enlisted men of the Army and Navy. Sixty-five days elapsed before the information was transmitted to the Senate, it being received on the evening of February 24, 1911.

While waiting for the receipt of this information, I became curious to know how long it would take large corporations to supply similar information regarding their own service. I therefore addressed letters to the Standard Oil Co., United States Steel Co., and the Western Union Telegraph Co. asking them how long it would take them to supply the information. The Standard Oil Co. replied that it could supply the information in three days; the Western Union could supply it within a few days. I received no response from the United States Steel Co.

It was a cause of great surprise to me that it should take the departments of the Government, all located in Washington, 65 days to inform the Senate as to the number of their employees, when all appointments are made from Washington and all pay rolls audited there.

The Post Office Department and its service is frequently lauded, especially by Postmasters General and their assistants, for its efficiency and economy. Let us analyze: Mail is deposited by citizens in post offices and letter boxes, picked up by postal employees, carried to assembling points, routed for destinations, delivered to privately owned railroads, transported by them all over the country; received by postal employees and distributed in post-office boxes or by carriers to the addresses. Could this service be performed without the privately owned railroads? Is the Post Office Department entitled to sole credit for this activity? Are not the railroads entitled to some credit for safe and expeditious transportation all over the country, especially when public opinion compels them to carry the mail, and at rates which I am satisfied after two years' special study of the subject are too low?

I have no desire to minimize the credit due the postal mail collectors, clerks, and distributors, yet comparison with large mail-order houses, where I have known a mail order for 12 different articles from 8 different departments to be filled, with the packages on the platform at the car within four hours from the time of the receipt of the letter containing the order, shows an efficiency and organization in the mail-order house that does not exist in the postal department, because of better executive direction in the former than exists in the latter.

The head of a mail-order house or other large business establishment engaged in distribution devotes his time to increased efficiency, better service, and intelligent economies, while a Postmaster General's time is too apt to be consumed in an effort to build up a political organization by the distribution of nearly 60,000 post offices among the faithful followers of the administration.

Successful private business is run on the merit and promotion plan, while we are prone to run the Government on the demerit and demotion basis.

In this discussion I make very little use of statistics, for it has been my observation and experience that statistics are very unreliable and are very likely to be misleading, even when used with the best of intentions. Statistics are quite frequently derived from a prejudiced source and usually selected and used to support preconceived ideas.

Let me elaborate a little on my statement that I have found statistics unreliable.

You will all remember that the Postmaster General of the last administration declared in his last annual report that he had succeeded in placing the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis and had a surplus of $219,000 as proof. The first report of his successor, the Postmaster General of the present administration, challenged this statement and asserted that the apparent surplus was produced by a "faulty method of accounting," and that instead of a surplus there was in reality a deficit of $732,000.

I shall not take your time to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of the two assertions, which involve a difference of $951,000. It

is sufficient to know the indisputable fact that one of the Postmasters General was wrong. The incident serves to illustrate not only the unreliability of statistics but the probability that Government statistics are manipulated to suit the purposes of the management of the department.

Just as it was to the interest of the Postmaster General of the last administration to make a bookkeeping showing of a surplus in the management of the department of which he was the head, so it is to the interest of the management of Government-owned railroads of every country in the world to make the record show successful management. Because of the personal interest of those in control, the statistics which they make public should be viewed with care and accepted as true only after most thorough scrutiny.

It is not necessary that statistics be inaccurate or used with dishonest intent in order to be misleading. Correct figures may be used with the utmost good purpose and yet lead to erroneous inferences.

For example, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post of June 6, 1914, Gov. Stubbs said:

"During the year 1913 the railroad companies of the United States received in revenue $3,171,000,000. There are in this country approximately 20,000,000 families of 5 persons each. The average cost of living for these families last year was approximately $625 each. Railroad transportation cost each of these families an average of $158.50, or a quarter of its total expense."

Later Mr. Stubbs refers to this railroad revenue as a "tax." While Mr. Stubbs does not say in express words what conclusion he wishes drawn from his use of these figures, the unexpressed inference is that each family was mulcted to the extent of an average of $158.50 during the year.

In reply to the Stubbs article, President Ripley, of the Santa Fe, presented what he termed a reductio ad absurdum, in which he enumerated nine items of family expense which totaled $12,848,000,000, or an average of $642.35 per family. These items did not include food, clothing, or rent, yet they exceeded the total average cost of living.

The thought that occurs to me in connection with the manner of presentation which Mr. Stubbs has adopted is this:

If a computation of the average revenue of the railroads per family is pertinent to a discussion of Government ownership of railroads, why is it not also pertinent to compute the average railroad expenditure per family? If the railroads are to be charged with the revenue collected, why not credit them with the money expended?

I have not at hand the documents from which Gov. Stubbs secured his statistics as to the total revenue of the railroads of the United States. I have here, however, the text of the 1912 report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, covering the financial operations of 246,828 miles of roads that reported to that body. The report does not state the amount of the total income of the railroads, but by addition I ascertain that the report shows for this mileage of roads a total income from all sources of $2,995,596,275, or an average of almost $150 per family, assuming that there are 20,000,000 families in the United States. These same roads paid out for wages, supplies, taxes, interest, and dividends a total of $2,942,682,321, or an average of over $147 per family. The remainder of the income was spent for additions, betterments, new lines, extensions, and reserves.

In this connection the following table on ton-mile revenue and distribution may be interesting to some:

	Cent.
Average receipts per ton-mile	0.744
Distributed as follows:	
Wages	.321
Materials and supplies	.200
Taxes	.030
Rentals (net)	.012
Interest (net	.108
Balance for stockholders, to cover adjustments, improvements, dividends, and surplus	.073

The average rate of dividend on all railway stock in 1912 was 4.64 per cent.

The average rate of interest accrued on all railway funded debt in 1912 was 4.22 per cent. This represents interest legally accrued and charged by the railways to their income account, whether the interest was actually paid to the bondholders or not. In other words, this covers interest defaulted as well as interest paid. If the amount of defaulted interest could be ascertained and subtracted from the total amount of accrued interest, this rate would unquestionably be somewhat smaller.

Personally, I see nothing pertinent in the computation of the average railroad revenue per family, but, if there is any force in the presentation of the figures as to income, I submit that the average railroad expenditure per family is just as pertinent and the averages are so nearly the same as practically to counterbalance.

In 1879 Congress directed the Postmaster General to secure from the railroad companies transporting mail certain information relative to operating receipts and expenditures, the purpose being ascertainment for proper compensation for railroad mail transportation. Intermittent attention was paid to this congressional direction, and in 1907 a departmental commission of five was appointed by Postmaster General Cortelyou. Over 140 questions were prepared and propounded to the 795 steam railroads then carrying mail.

It cost the railroads $250,000 to furnish the information and the Government a direct out-of-pocket cost of $19,423 for tabulation of the information contained in the railroads' answers, which is set forth in Document No. 105, Sixty-second Congress, first session, and reported to Congress August 12, 1911. Accompanying said document was a suggested draft of a bill indorsed by Postmaster General Hitchcock, accompanied by a letter conveying the impression that the result of the adoption of such legislation would be a saving to the Government of about $9,000,000 in the railway-mail pay.

Here we have a concrete result of four years' research work in a department at a total expense of practically $270,000—a good investment if the many departmental examples of pitiful vacillation, unreliable data and estimates cause Congress to check all departmental figures and decline to follow blindly departmental suggestions.

Study of the bill showed that Mr. Hitchcock and his assistants had failed to realize that rights of way, road beds, track, equipment, and terminals were necessary prerequisites in the operation of mail cars, for in his method of payment, he had made no allowance whatever for capital charges, recommending that the Government only allow 6 per cent on the ascertained cost to the railroad companies for carrying the mail, and his predicted $9,000,000 saving to the Government was based entirely on this premise.

Fortunately Congress had created a joint congressional committee, which made an exhaustive study of the subject. With tardy realization of the absolute fallacy and injustice of his first suggested plan, Postmaster General Hitchcock, on January 23, 1913, submitted a second draft of bill for regulation of railway mail pay. Study of this plan by the joint congressional committee soon demonstrated that the plan was practically unadministrable and certainly undesirable.

On February 12, 1914, a third plan, in the nature of a tentative draft, was submitted, and the joint congressional committee was soon satisfied that same was unscientific and most undesirable, giving unnecessary and dangerous powers to the Postmaster General and containing rates, which, if adopted, would be absolutely confiscatory.

The joint committee's demonstration and the ultimate realization on the part of the department of its mistake in its third bill resulted in the submission to the House of Representatives of a draft if what is known as H. R. 17042, introduced in the House of Representatives on June 4, 1914, sections 13, 14, and 15 of which cover "compensation for the transportation of mail." The joint congressional committee again demonstrated the department's suggested rates under its new plan to be absolutely confiscatory.

Here we had four departmental plans suggested and urged for enactment within a period of three years, each differing from the others in fundamental features, but all seeking further dictatorial and plenary powers for the Postmaster General. Do you expect successful Government ownership of railroads under such a vacillating management as that?

During the nearly two years' study made by the congressional joint committee the department presented estimates of annual overpayments to the railroads to the amounts of $9,000,000, $10,531,792, $1,615,532, $319,832, and $221,832. Many other instances of very inadequate and unreliable statistics furnished by the Post Office Department during this investigation could be cited.

Very similar was the experience of a congressional committee between 1898 and 1901, when the department submitted statistics that the railroads were paid on an average of 6.58 cents per pound for transporting mail, averaging 40 cents per ton-mile, with an average haul of 328 miles, whereas a special weighing demonstrated that the average payment was, in fact, 2.75 cents per pound, averaging only 12.56 cents per ton-mile, with an average haul of 438 miles.

Commenting upon these statistics, Congressman Moody, afterwards a justice of the Supreme Court, said:

"In other words, we were not paying one-third as much as the Post Office Department had led the people of the country to believe we had been paying."

The commission appointed in 1911 to investigate the subject of postage on second-class mail matter, of which commission Justice Hughes, of the Supreme Court, was chairman, had a similar experience. It repeatedly found the statistics submitted by the Post Office Department to be erroneous, and the department changed its figures when compelled to do so by demonstration of their inaccuracy. So glaring and numerous were the errors that the commission commented upon them as follows:

"It seems hardly worth while to include subsidiary tables from which these results are taken or to criticize the details, as the commission has little confidence in their accuracy."

I have made frequent references to the Post Office Department, not through any desire to specially criticize that department, but because the Postal Service is the only Government activity which corresponds with the Government ownership and operation of railroads, and furnishes the only demonstration based upon experience of what we might expect under Government ownership of railroads and other national public utilities.

I recognize the fact that evils exist in every line of human activity and that remedies must be provided. My own theory is that government should leave as large opportunity as possible for individual enterprise and industry, holding out as an incentive the assurance of enjoyment of the rewards of legitimate endeavor. In order that opportunities may be equally open to all, wrongful acts must be prohibited by criminal statutes, which should impose penalties so severe and make punishment so certain that violation will be extremely rare. This assurance of a large degree of liberty, and also definite restriction upon improper action, should not depend upon the varying whims or prejudices, or even the sound judgment, of bureau heads, but should be prescribed by act of the law-making body established by the Constitution, so that every citizen can read in the plain language of the statute the extent of his rights and the limitation upon his liberty.

No one will condemn more severely than I the wrongful acts of corporation managers who have pillaged their stockholders or wrecked the institutions over which they had control. Deeds of such character should be made criminal by law, if not already so defined, and prison doors should swing open to receive and confine the culprit who is unfaithful to his trust.

But eradication of evils of this kind does not require Government ownership. There is no need to stifle individual enterprise, ambition, and energy in order to prevent repetition of wrongful acts. Advocates of Government ownership propose a remedy worse than the disease. In the misguided effort to cure evils in railroad finance they would fasten upon the Nation evils far more serious, far more insidious, more deeply affecting the welfare of present and future generations, striking at the very vitals of truly representative government.

For my part, I have not lost confidence in government by law. I am not convinced that the crooks in railroading so far outnumber the honest men that elimination of the dishonest is hopeless. The day is not near so dark nor the prospect so gloomy as some would have us believe. There is still a preponderance of good among the American people, and we have not yet reached the time when we must write upon the pages of our history the declaration that we shall buy the railroads because we can not control the crooks.

I am not satisfied that efficiency goes with Government employment. I am not ready to give my approval to a plan which means the establishment of a political machine composed of 3,000,000 Government employees and their relatives and friends. I have the utmost confidence that if Congress will take its magnifying glass off the White House and relieve itself of the delusion that a citizen becomes an omnipotent statesmen as soon as he has become President by virtue of the votes of 42 per cent of the electorate, we shall be able to solve a considerable number of the problems that now confront us, and without placing a check upon that marvelous American enterprise which is justly the admiration of the civilized world. I believe the American people still have confidence in representative government, and that when they realize the trend of public affairs they will rebuke the effort to establish one-man government with dictatorship from the Executive Mansion.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question if it will not embarrass him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. My question is this: Has the Senator from New Hampshire figured how much suitable and available tonnage for shipping purposes could be secured for the $40,000,000 proposed to be provided by this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, in reply to that question, that the report of the Merchant Marine Commission specifically states that the cost of a swift vessel built as was contemplated in the bill that was then presented to Congress for service to South America and the Orient would be about a million dollars. The Senator from Minnesota can, therefore, see that even if we have the $40,000,000 which is proposed in the pending measure—the $30,000,000 that is directly proposed to be appropriated in the bill and the $10,000,000 contingent—we probably would not get more than 30 steamships at the outside. We would get more, of course, if cheap freighters were built; but there is to-day a superabundance of ships of that type ready for employment.

Mr. NELSON. Is there not an estimated rule in respect to freighters; for instance, a given figure per ton, for which they can be built?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. What is the usual figure?

Mr. GALLINGER. About $50 a ton.

Mr. NELSON. What would be the price per ton of a combination ship, a freight and passenger ship? That would be higher, would it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. That would be much higher, particularly if we built them as was contemplated in the bill recommended by the Merchant Marine Commission, according to the plans and specifications of the Navy Department, so as to make them auxiliaries to our Navy in time of war. They would undoubtedly cost much more.

Mr. NELSON. We could not, then, under the provisions of this bill, as I understand, hope to secure more than from 30 to 40 fair-going ocean freighters?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think not.

Mr. NELSON. Not beyond that?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should think it would be even less than that.

Mr. NELSON. What proportion does that bear—I ask the question of the Senator from New Hampshire because I know that no Senator is more familiar with the subject than is he—to the aggregate amount of tonnage engaged in the trade between this country and Europe?

Mr. GALLINGER. It would be negligible.

Mr. NELSON. Would it amount to 5 per cent?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should think it would be nearer 1 per cent than 5 per cent. Some people talk about building a merchant marine sufficient for transacting the ocean carrying business of the country so far as our imports and exports are concerned, but testimony has been presented by some one—and I think I will refer to it before I get through—who is an expert on this matter, that we could not possibly go into a project of that kind without expending $600,000,000. We are talking now about acquiring 30 or 40 ships. England has 4,000 or more, I believe—some say twice that number—so that the ships which could be provided under the pending bill would be a mere drop in the bucket as compared to the shipping of the British Empire and of Germany.

Mr. NELSON. Assuming the largest number—40 ships, say—and assuming that they would be fairly distributed amongst the leading ports of this country, such as Galveston, New Orleans, Savannah, Charleston, Newport News, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, would there be more than four or five ships to a port?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think very much less than that. In addition, the Senator might mention Seattle, Portland——

Mr. NELSON. I am not including the Pacific coast, but the Atlantic coast only.

Mr. GALLINGER. As to the Atlantic coast, not more than that number at the outside.

Mr. NELSON. Even if the ships were all for the use of what may be called the "cotton belt," sailing from such ports as Galveston, New Orleans, Savannah, and Charleston, there would be but a few ships for each port?

Mr. GALLINGER. Very few, indeed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question for my information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood the Senator to say that a ship suitable for the trade contemplated by the bill would cost about a million dollars?

Mr. GALLINGER. A mail ship of proper speed and proper construction.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And with proper cargo-carrying capacity?

Mr. GALLINGER. With proper cargo-carrying capacity at the same time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. About what, does the Senator think, would be the tonnage of a million-dollar vessel? It seems to me that it is of some consequence to know how much tonnage may be carried by the ships proposed to be acquired under the pending bill, at $50 a ton, if the Senator is correct about that——

Mr. GALLINGER. Fifty dollars a ton for a cargo vessel. Vessels of what may be called a combination type would cost more per ton, and a first-class mail and passenger ship would cost still more.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Taking a cargo vessel alone, if it costs in the neighborhood of $50 a ton to build such a ship a million-dollar ship would have a tonnage of 20,000 tons. Is not that a very large vessel?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a large vessel.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator think 20,000-ton ships fit for the business in which they are intended to be used could be bought for a million dollars each?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should say not. But they would not be 20,000-ton ships. The kind of vessels contemplated would cost more than $50 per ton. They would cost something like $100 per ton.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have in mind the steamers owned by the Panama Railroad Co. which operate between New York and the Canal Zone. The two larger steamers were the *Ancon* and the *Colon*, as I remember their names. They were 10,000-ton ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A ship of twice their cargo-carrying capacity would be an enormous ship, and I rather doubt if a millions dollars would buy such a ship.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should think it very improbable that that amount of money would buy a ship of 20,000 tons, and I do not apprehend that ships of that size will be constructed—certainly not cargo ships exclusively.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to inquire if the Senator has considered about what tonnage a proper type of cargo-carrying vessel should have?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have not made any figures along that line. I take it that, if this bill passes, we will have not only cargo carriers, but likewise mail and passenger ships, will we not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; I think that is true; but some suggestion has been made about acquiring larger ships. I can not imagine what we would want with 56,000-ton ships, or even with many 20,000-ton ships, if any. I have read some authority on that subject, a British work, to the effect that the ideal cargo carrier was a ship of between seven and eight thousand tons. I did not know whether the Senator had investigated that matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree with the Senator that that would probably be the ideal tonnage of a cargo carrier. Of course, Mr. President, in estimating the cost of these ships we are laboring under a disadvantage in not knowing exactly what is contemplated to be done under this bill. We are told that these ships are to be for trade with Central and South America "and elsewhere." If the ships are to enter into the trade to the Orient and Australasia, of course they ought to be large and swift ships to carry the mails and also passengers. Such ships, of course, would be expensive and would be of a much greater tonnage. I do not know that that trade would require ships of 20,000 tonnage, but they would approximate that; and, of course, they would be very expensive; but I do not know on what routes these ships are to be put; we are left in the dark as to that. I suppose the proposed shipping board will determine that question, and after a while, if this bill passes—and I trust it may not pass—we will get more definite information than we possess at the present time. For myself, I should like some Senator to tell, if he knows, precisely where

those "and elsewhere" routes are to be. Perhaps the Senator from Florida knows.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will be glad a little later on to make some suggestions along that line in answer to some 14 questions propounded by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, it delights me to learn that the Senator from Florida is going to discuss this question further. I think he ought to do so. He is able to do so; we should like to listen to him, and would be glad to have him illuminate the subject to a greater extent than the report does or than does the preliminary statement of the Senator from Florida, which was very interesting as far as it went.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is now discussing a very interesting question and one upon which I confess I have very little information and would like to have more; that is, as to the cost of different kinds of ships. I assume that some of these ships would be combination passenger and freight ships, while some might be freighters alone. I was going to ask the Senator if there was any material difference in the cost of a combination ship and a freighter?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, Mr. President, there is the same difference that there is between a $1,000 house and a $5,000 house—the same difference there is between the cost of marble and brick or between pine boards and mahogany.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not quite sure, but I am under the impression that the majority of the vessels engaged in carrying cotton from the southern ports run from about 1,200 to 2,500 tons. Has the Senator any idea of what those boats would probably cost? I think they are purely freight boats.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not, Mr. President. I think that tonnage is inordinately low, and I should think it would be very expensive to transport any product such as cotton in vessels of that type. They must be very slow and inefficient. But I frankly admit to the Senator that I have nothing to warrant a definite opinion in answer to the question the Senator puts.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator and myself traveled across the ocean, I believe, in the *St. Louis*.

Mr. GALLINGER. We traveled the other way in a much more expensive and luxurious boat than the *St. Louis*, as the Senator will remember.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; going one way, but coming the other.

Mr. GALLINGER. In other words, we traveled in a German ship going across (a ship now interned in New York) and an American ship coming over. The Senator knows the difference between those two ships, and the relative cost.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I inquire whether there was any specific reason for the Senator's coming back in a more economical boat than the one in which he went over? [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMMONS. We had a very economical chairman and auditor, and the appropriation was getting a little low, I expect. That, I think, is a boat of about 10,000 or 12,000 tons. According to the Senator's estimate of $50 a ton, that would be about $500,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. My estimate of $50 a ton was for a pure freighter, which the *St. Louis* is not. The *St. Louis* is considered a most excellent ship.

Mr. SIMMONS. What I wanted to get from the Senator was whether his estimate was based upon freighters or passenger vessels.

Mr. GALLINGER. A pure freighter of the lowest type.

Mr. President, I am conscious of the fact that some criticism will be made because I have placed in the RECORD the opinions of a former Member of this body on the question of Government ownership; but, as I said before, to me that is the crux of this whole situation. To me the question as to whether we are to inaugurate Government ownership in a great industry such as transportation across the oceans of the world leads me to give more attention to it than I otherwise would. I would have been glad to have simply discussed the bill, as I shall discuss it in a little while, from a maritime standpoint, and endeavor to show that our country has been very unwise in its legislation and that this attempt is but another unwise one to solve a problem that, in my judgment, can not be solved in this way. No doubt I shall likewise be criticized for giving, as I shall now proceed to give, the opinions of individuals and the editorial views of some of the great newspapers of the country against the bill that is now engaging our attention.

The matter of municipal ownership of public utilities is making a rather poor showing these days, Mr. President; and municipal ownership is not any different from Government ownership. It is Government ownership; and if it is not doing well, if it is not making a success, it ought to cause us to hold our breath and give pause to legislation that is to extend that principle. Everywhere municipal ownership seems to be suffering from depression, possibly "psychological," and we may expect to be told that it is manufactured to endanger the prospects of success of a bill which provides for the municipal ownership of the street railways and other public utilities of the District of Columbia. I do not know whether it was by accident or design, and I make no criticism that would be invidious or distasteful to anyone, but it is rather a remarkable circumstance that during the present administration every man appointed to the position of Commissioner of the District of Columbia is in favor of Government ownership. One of the first announcements he makes is that he is in favor of the Government taking over the public utilities of the District of Columbia—the street railways, the gas plant, the electric-light plant, and other utilities, if there are any. I want to show—and I shall be as brief as I can in discussing this phase of the matter—that municipal ownership where it has been tried has not been a success. A leading newspaper says:

> Following closely reports from Seattle telling of financial loss from municipal operation of the street cars come advices from three Canadian cities, which have been proudly pointed to, showing dismal failure in two and a most extraordinary "success" in the third—success consisting of a deficit as yet not estimated and a service so precarious that "many people would rather walk to and fro," so it has been asserted.
>
> Our municipal-ownership crusaders pose with expanded waistcoats and fondle unctuously the theory that they are the people's friends, the abnegating champions of the wage earner against the bondholder; so it may be they will not hastily reject the evidence of the failure of municipal ownership in Canada, notwithstanding it is published in and vouched for by the Union Labor Advocate, official organ of the Washington Building Trades Council, affiliated with the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor.
>
> This reliable publication, it appears, sought information from its official correspondents concerning the operation of municipal ownership in Canada, solely for the reason that such an experiment was being discussed in Washington. Their responses appear in the current issue of the Union Labor Advocate. Coming from a source which can not be accused of prejudice against municipal ownership, they are worthy of careful consideration.

I shall not quote them all, but shall give one or two illustrations.

From Edmonton, Alberta, J. Hanning, secretary, sends the following astonishing summary of the situation:

> It is an utter failure in Edmonton. The street car system is the poorest of five cities I have lived in—Toronto, Vancouver, Portland, Winnipeg, and Edmonton—and the fares are equal to the highest—straight 5 cents.
>
> The reason for the failure of municipal ownership to compete, or even compare, with private ownership in this city is because the spoils system entirely eliminates all chances of getting competent men to run it. Every year the administration changes, and with it the entire staff goes, too. Always incompetent men are given the jobs, their ability lying in their power to get votes. * * *
>
> It is true they have lost $40,000 since its inception, and it looks as though they will lose more. The city owns the electric-light system and sells the street car service power at 2 cents per kilo, robbing Peter to pay Paul. Residents pay as much as 8 cents per kilo.
>
> The city sells its railway the necessary power at one-fourth the rate it charges the residents, and the road loses $40,000.

A recent French publication by Yves Guyot, translated from the French, entitled "Where and Why Public Ownership Has Failed," is a document of much interest and value. Perhaps a more suggestive title would be, "Where Has Public Ownership Not Failed?"

> According to M. Guyot the successful instances are practically undiscoverable. In an exhaustive fashion he cites the experiences of all the civilized countries of the world in the experiment of ownership or operation of what have come to be known as public utilities. It has been uniform. Expensive and unsatisfactory service are shown beyond question to be the unbroken rule, and though in some instances an apparent success from a financial view has been made in some countries in some directions and at some time, the happy experience was short lived and due entirely to the methods of bookkeeping in use; that is to say, allow for the amortization of the original cost of the plant and of its renewals or extensions and only a loss can be figured from State ownership. An abundance of minute and carefully tabulated statistics are furnished and the whole field of governmental monopolies from railways to alcohol and from Belgium to Russia is covered.
>
> For this uniformity of experience there must be a reason. M. Guyot finds it in the mainspring of human action, which, until now and probably forever, have been and will be the same. High office, money decorations, rank, and homage are things men strive for, and with the certainty that such things are not obtainable for the individual through successful conduct of a business for the State, interest is lost or even never aroused in the enterprise. And without that failure is certain. The Socialist declares that national or municipal undertaking is more economical than private, because no dividend need be paid upon capital. But interest and sinking fund authorization must be provided for, consequently the margin of economy is merely the difference between the two, and experience has taught uniformly that the poor service due to poor management by salaried public officials tends constantly toward diminished receipts and so toward the reduction of the margin of economy.

A careful perusal of M. Guyot's work will well repay anyone who is interested in this subject which is now being seriously

agitated in this country. The standing of M. Guyot as an economist gives assurance as to his method and accuracy, and if there be any virtue in profiting by the experiences of others we will do well to realize that the path of innovation is not necessarily the path of wisdom.

The proposition that the Government shall invest $40,000,000 in the purchase and building of ships, to be operated by the Government, is almost universally condemned by the press and by thoughtful business men. Rear Admiral Stockton writes as follows:

> They (the belligerents) will quietly take the vessels put under the American flag to evade capture and condemn them as legitimate prizes—a condemnation which is not only justified by the law and usages of the sea, but by treaties which we have entered into.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask the Senator if that is the same Admiral Stockton who was one of the delegates of the United States to the conference of London?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand so.

Mr. ROOT. And who signed the declaration of London in behalf of the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. He did.

Mr. ROOT. And who was at one time the head of the Naval War College at Newport?

Mr. GALLINGER. He was.

Mr. ROOT. And a very distinguished authority on questions of international law and naval law?

Mr. GALLINGER. A man of great distinction along those lines. I want to repeat what Admiral Stockton says:

> They—the belligerents—will quietly take the vessels put under the American flag to evade capture and condemn them as legitimate prizes—a condemnation which is not only justified by the law and usages of the sea but by treaties which we have entered into.

Mr. James McLoughlin writes to me from the Aldine Club, New York, as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1915.

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a college graduate, have been a licensed master of vessels, and have been and am still a shipper of merchandise by sea for the past 35 years. I conceive, therefore, that I have a right to be heard in the discussion of the question of the registry of ships of belligerent powers in the United States at the present time and the organization of a company, with the Government as a stockholder, to own such ships.

It appears to me to be the most crazy proposition which has so far emanated from an eccentric administration.

If we do these things, England daring, we will soon be at war with her.

If we do them, socialism and paternalism will have set a new limit and private property will be driven from the high sea so far as the American flag is concerned

I hope you will do all you can to delay and prevent this obnoxious thing. There is no limit to which you can go which will not be patriotic and a fulfillment of your obligation to the State and country you represent.

Here is a letter from Wallace Downey, director-treasurer of the United States Marine Association, New York City, which is worthy of careful consideration:

> We are against Government ownership on general principles and emphatically against it owning and operating merchant vessels competing with private-owned foreign ships. Government ownership within the limits of the Nation is bad enough, but it is our own affair. Government ownership of vessels competing with private-owned foreign vessels in foreign trade would certainly create foreign and domestic jealousy, international friction, and ultimately war. All this in addition to stagnation of private interest and adequate development and tens of millions of Government money lost in investment and operation for an inefficient and paltry service. Ship subsidy, with all its faults, would be twenty times cheaper annually, twenty times more effective and productive of necessary results, and one hundred times safer internationally.

I also call attention to the following letter from Dr. Royall J. Miller, of Atlanta, Ga., which shows that the people of the South are taking an active interest in this question:

Senator GALLINGER, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty of inclosing you a clipping from the Atlanta Georgian, January 20. The proposed amendment to buy ships and lease or sell them to private parties or corporations is a most pernicious one. It more closely approaches a direct subsidy than any measure recently proposed. Those who reversed themselves on Panama tolls because they claimed that was a subsidy are now proposing this plan of investing Government money in ships for individuals or corporations, charging only 4 per cent for the money.

Very truly,

ROYALL J. MILLER, M. D.

Mr. President, the hearing upon this bill in another place was a very meager and unsatisfactory one, and no hearing whatever was given to the people of the United States in this body. In the other House two Members of that body made addresses, and the Secretary of the Treasury gave his opinion concerning the measure at very great length. No business man was called, no shipping man was called, no merchant was called, no expert was called, nobody was called except the three gentlemen I have named; and that hearing occupied a small part of two days. I wondered then that they did not call some of these experienced men, some of these practical men who know something about this subject from the practical viewpoint. I wondered that Capt. Dollar, of San Francisco, a man who owns ships that are engaged in both the foreign and the domestic trade, was not asked his opinion. I wondered why Capt. Crowley, who is likewise the owner of ships in both the foreign and the domestic trade, was not called to express his views. I speak of those two men as representative of a class of men who have definite, positive, personal knowledge of this subject. And I also wonder that James J. Hill, that great master of transportation, was not asked to give his opinion.

Two or three days ago, and without any solicitation on my part, I received a letter from Capt. Crowley, which I shall read. He is known to a great many Members of this body. He is known to all the Members, I doubt not, of the Committee on Commerce. He is a man who has the confidence of every man who knows him in Boston or elsewhere. He says:

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to note by the papers that our New England Senators are putting up a strong fight on the Government ownership bill, and I hope and trust they will succeed in defeating it. If it should go through I can not understand where the Government will be able to purchase or build ships, as I have had a man in England for five weeks trying to buy or charter ships, but it was impossible to do so, and could not get a ship built there under any guaranty of delivery.

I wish every Member of the Senate might have heard that sentence as I read it, as it is a pretty direct and conclusive answer to the suggestion that all we have to do is to go out and buy these ships, or all we have to do is to go abroad and have them built and go into the business of transportation.

> I would also state that the shipyards in this country are now practically full of work, and they can not guarantee to build or deliver any ship inside of 12 to 18 months.
>
> My company has just contracted with the New York Shipbuilding Co., of Camden, N. J., for two large ships, to run in the Atlantic and coastwise trade, and we can not get these ships within a year's time.

And yet, Mr. President, that private company represented by Capt. Crowley, having contracted for two large ships to be built by the New York Shipbuilding Co., of Camden, will have their ships afloat just about the time the Government goes into the business in competition with private shipowners, provided this bill passes, and Capt. Crowley's ships will be sent to the scrap heap, in my opinion, because neither he nor any other private shipowner or shipbuilder can possibly compete with the Government under the conditions of this bill. Capt. Crowley concludes:

> I note there has been much talk about high ocean freight rates, which is no fault of the shipowners of this country, but is the fault of foreign shipowners, and of course it is only natural that American shipowners should follow. It is not only ocean freights that have gone up, but all commodities, such as cotton, wheat, etc., which is on account of the war. As soon as the war is over freight rates will go down to their normal prices, and there will be plenty of ships in the market.
>
> My company are still in the market for ships, but as we are unable to buy any abroad and can not get any delivered in this country inside of 12 to 18 months, it would be no use for us to go ahead and contract for more ships, as there will probably be a great change in prices and freights before the ships can be delivered.
>
> I am inclosing you several clippings in regard to Government-owned ships. Trusting you will be successful in defeating this bill, I am,
>
> Very truly, yours,
>
> COASTWISE TRANSPORTATION CO.,
> J. G. CROWLEY,
> *General Manager and Treasurer.*

Under date of January 16 I received the following letter from the Boston Chamber of Commerce:

> The board of directors of the Boston Chamber of Commerce at their meeting on January 14 unanimously adopted the report of the chamber's special committee on merchant marine, in which it recommended that the chamber oppose the bills now pending in both Houses of Congress (H. R. 18666 and S. 6856), providing for Government ownership and operation of vessels engaged in foreign trade, for the reasons set forth in the report, a copy of which is sent you herewith. The committee also makes specific suggestions as to the preferable methods of creating a strong and enduring merchant marine.
>
> In arriving at its conclusions the committee not only carefully considered the proposed measures now pending in Congress, but invited JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER, chairman, and Congressman E. W. SAUNDERS, of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine, and ex-Congressman J. Sloat Fassett, who addressed the members of the chamber at a public dinner and presented the arguments for and against the proposed measures. This was done in order that the chamber should not take action until it had been fully informed upon the different phases of the question.
>
> After careful consideration of the arguments presented the board of directors are unanimous in their opinion that the present bills for Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels would discourage private capital and personal initiative, and deter the development of an American shipping industry, so vital to the commercial progress of Boston, of New England, and of the whole United States.

As a substitute for the plan proposed by the Government the chamber makes six specific suggestions for creating an American merchant marine, which they believe to be much preferable to Government ownership.

We sincerely hope that you will carefully consider the recommendations and suggestions set forth in the chamber's report, and that you may see your way clear to oppose the bills providing for Government ownership and operation of our merchant marine.

Very truly, yours,

E. J. BLISS,
President.
JAMES A. MCKIBBEN,
Secretary.

The report of the committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce relative to the pending legislation is as follows:

To the Executive Committee and Board of Directors:

There is some precedent in the practice of other nations for Government ownership of railroads; there is none whatever for Government ownership of a merchant marine.

Such experience in this direction as exists is either an accident or a fragment. The United States bought a small steamship line from New York to Colon as a part of the assets of the old French Panama Canal Co., and has operated that line as an incident of canal construction (statement of Mr. E. A. Drake, vice president Panama Railroad Steamship Co.) at a nominal bookkeeping profit of about 2 per cent for 10 years, with insurance, depreciation, and interest disregarded—imperative charges of a regular steamship concerns which, if paid by the Government line, would have involved a huge deficit and bankruptcy. The Government of western Australia has owned and operated a small coastwise steamship line for two years (report of attorney general of western Australia), with a loss of $114,000 the first year and of $96,000 the second. It is believed that this enterprise will be abandoned.

This is the net experience in Government ownership which the world affords—two lines, both of them financially failures. Yet the ocean-steamship business as a whole in private hands is and has been reasonably prosperous—as prosperous, on the average, as other industries, or it could not have procured capital for its great and constant growth. Twenty-five years ago the tonnage of all nations recorded by Lloyd's was 22,151,000; 10 years ago it was 36,000,000; now it is 49,089,000.

There has been almost no increase in the overseas tonnage of the United States in this period, but the causes are well known. This is not the place for their discussion at length, and they can not be remedied by a mere expedient of Government ownership. Steamers of a Government-owned line would, if built in the United States, cost more than competing foreign-built ships, or if bought abroad would cost no less than such competing ships, and would cost considerably more to operate. They would, of course, equally with private-owned American ships, be debarred from the subsidies of foreign Governments. A half a century of actual trial proves that under such conditions and with only such exceptions as serve to prove the rule, American ships can be maintained in overseas commerce only at an annual loss that finally becomes prohibitive.

MORE COSTLY THAN A REGULAR SUBSIDY.

This inevitable loss under these bills will have to be made up out of the Treasury of the United States, through appropriations for the maintenance of the Government-owned steamship service. There is no proof or suggestion that a Government-owned line under the American flag can be operated at any less expense than a private-owned line. In fact, the expense of a Government-owned line would certainly be greater, for it has been established again and again that the Government can not conduct any business so economically as private individuals trained from youth in that business and dependent on it for profit and livelihood.

Experience has shown that it costs about 20 per cent more to build battleships in Government navy yards of the United States than in private yards, under like systems of accounting, and it is a fair assumption that there would be at least an equal contrast in the cost of ship operation. Therefore it is a reasonable expectation that if a subsidy of a given amount were required for the profitable maintenance of a private-owned merchant marine, a Government-owned merchant fleet would demand a subsidy at least 20 per cent, and probably much more than 20 per cent, greater, in the form of appropriations from time to time for the Government steamship corporation, of whose stock the Government holds 51 per cent while private capitalists may own the remainder.

Without entering on a consideration of the expediency or justice of a subsidy system, it is indisputable that this Government-ownership project involves a particularly wasteful form of subsidy expenditure, inasmuch as trained and responsible private shipowners would be able to provide a given service at a lower cost, or for the same amount to render a more efficient and comprehensive service.

SHIP OWNING A SPECIALIZED BUSINESS.

The proposed bills hold that the Government-owned merchant marine shall be managed by a shipping board, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce—

This was written before the third edition of the bill was presented to the Senate—

not one of whom, probably, would have had the slightest experience in or knowledge of the ocean shipping business, which is a profession by itself, complex and difficult, requiring intense application and exceptional aptitude. It is not to be expected that Cabinet ministers, even of the highest general abilities, could compete in this highly specialized calling with men who had made it the one thought and effort of their lives.

The Panama Canal line is a conspicuous case in point. Its president is and has been Col. George W. Goethals, the distinguished builder of the canal. This Government line, though favored in the transportation of officials and employees, supplies, and materials, has failed to earn a sum equivalent to its insurance, depreciation, and interest, which must be regularly met by all private steamship companies.

DOES AN EMERGENCY EXIST?

It is said that an emergency exists because of the great European war, and that this emergency justifies a disregard of all precedents and demands immediate and extraordinary legislation. We deny that there is any such extreme emergency. Chartering is active; vessels long idle are being employed; freight rates have advanced. But these higher rates are due in chief part to risks incident to the war, to higher insurance rates, and to an increased cost of coal, supplies, and wages. Shipowners and merchants who have been questioned state that there is ample tonnage offering in the world in general for the reduced amount of trade that is being transacted. In South American commerce, especially, on which stress is laid by the proposed bills, there are said to be more ships than cargoes. A widespread business depression, due to the war and other causes, has suddenly reduced the purchasing power of the South American Republics. A new American freight steamship line has recently been established to Brazil. Other American steamships naturalized under the new free-registry law are scheduled to sail at frequent intervals for Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and Peru. There is and long has been an American line to Venezuela, and there are two or three American lines, one the Government-owned service, to the Isthmus of Panama, aside from the six American lines regularly plying through the canal in the coastwise trade between the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards. The managers of the lines to the farther countries of South America state that because of the prevalent business dullness they are finding it difficult to load their ships and maintain their sailings, without the additional handicap of having the Government of the United States as a competitor.

A note is appended which says:

The United States & Brazil Steamship Line, under the auspices of the United States Steel Corporation, operates three American freight steamers from New York to Rio de Janiero and Santos. Norton, Lilly & Co. operate three American freight steamers from New York to Montevideo, Buenos Aires, and Rosario. W. R. Grace & Co. (Merchants' Line) and the New York-South American Line both operate American freight steamers from New York to Chile and Peru. The Red D Line operates four American mail, passenger, and freight steamers under ocean mail pay to Venezuela. The United Fruit Co. operates several American mail, passenger, and freight steamers from New York to the Isthmus of Panama and Colombia. The Panama Railroad Steamship Line operates several American mail, passenger, and freight steamships from New York to the Isthmus of Panama, connecting at Balboa for ports on the west coast of South America.

The report continues:

AS TO THE LACK OF COTTON SHIPS.

There is some difficulty in securing a sufficient number of ships on the route from the southern cotton ports to Bremen; but it should be understood that because of mines and other conditions this is an extra-hazardous service. British and French ships, of course, are not available for the carrying trade to Germany, and the German Government has stipulated that cotton shall be brought to German ports only in ships of American register, which are also preferred for the export of German dyestuffs and chemicals. Twelve or more American steamers from the coastwise service have accepted charters in the Bremen cotton trade during the few weeks since that trade was opened.

The information of the committee is that the real difficulty in the Bremen trade is not lack of ships but lack of marine insurance on hulls and cargoes. A Federal war insurance board has already been instituted for temporary service through the European war. Proposals to extend the authority of this board so that it can assume marine risks for the time being, while conditions remain as abnormal as they are now, are already before Congress. Such an expedient would solve the problem without any need of resort to the costly and dangerous expedient of Government ownership. If proper insurance can be had more ships will be available. There are still suitable American steamships not yet chartered. From this fleet, with return cargoes practically assured, enough tonnage should be had to carry all the cotton required for direct import by Germany. In addition to these steamships there is a large fleet of seagoing sail vessels, capable of carrying cotton or other cargoes with reasonable safety if insurance can be had. Indeed, several American sailing craft have been chartered in the past few days for lumber freights from the Gulf of Mexico to the Mediterranean.

A HAZARD TO NEUTRALITY.

There are large considerations of national prudence why any American ships employed to carry cotton or other goods to German ports should be private-owned ships, instead of the property of our National Government. Hon. Robert Lansing, the counselor of the Department of State, recently emphasized before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs the grave risks that would be run in the transportation of conditional contraband to a belligerent port in a public ship of the United States. Raw cotton is regarded as noncontraband, but the very appearance of a national-owned ship in belligerent waters is fraught with a peculiar hazard to neutrality that does not attach to the voyage of a private-owned vessel.

An accident or affront to a Government-owned ship would be a vastly more serious affair than a similar happening to an ordinary commercial vessel not of a public character. A Government-owned merchant marine, created in the stress of war, would be a potent agency for the embroiling of the United States in the terrible catastrophe now convulsing Europe.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP WILL NOT INCREASE TONNAGE.

No considerable increase in the amount of tonnage actually available for the carrying of our over-seas trade in any direction can be anticipated from this proposed expedient of Government ownership. All the American ships and all the neutral ships that could be bought and utilized for this purpose by the Government can be had equally well for charter for export at current rates on application to their present owners. Government ownership has no magic power to increase the tonnage of the world. New ships can not be constructed in either American or foreign yards in a period less than 7 months—9 or 10 months or a year would be required for the largest cargo vessels. The British Government, on December 23, proclaimed an embargo on the transfer of British ships to foreign flags without the assent of the British Board of Trade, which in present circumstances would hardly be forthcoming. Dutch, Scandinavian, Spanish, Italian, and other neutral steamers are in such active demand and are earning such unusual rates of freight that it is not probable that our Government could purchase them now without the payment of inordinate prices. A scheme of Government ownership and operation, hazardous and difficult at any time, could be effected at the present juncture only by a prodigious expenditure.

Thirty or more German steamships, some of them of large tonnage, are interned at present in ports of the United States. The Hamburg-American Co., the larger of the concerns owning them, has recently declared that its ships were not for sale. Moreover, last August, a rumor that these German steamers might be bought by the American

Government immediately drew a notification from both Great Britain and France that the purchase and operation of these belligerent vessels under the American flag would be regarded as an unfriendly act and as a violation of neutrality.

The committee is deeply interested in the real revival and restoration of the American merchant marine in over-seas trade, but is profoundly convinced that an ambitious scheme of Government ownership would discourage and delay and not promote this great object dear to the hearts of the entire Nation. Shipowners and shipbuilders state that the introduction of these proposed bills has had the unfortunate result of halting private enterprise and defeating important plans for the extension of steamship services and for new construction. No business man, no business corporation, however resolute and resourceful, desires to have as a possible competitor the Government of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield with the understanding that he does not yield the floor except for the purpose of an executive session?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Colorado if after the executive session a recess will be taken?

Mr. THOMAS. Not until late. The purpose is to go back into legislative session.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well, Mr. President, I am quite willing to take a little rest, and I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 37 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, it was the desire of the majority, and I might say the intention of the majority, that the session should continue until about 9 o'clock this evening, in order that the business of the Senate might be facilitated. I understand, however, that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who has the floor, is somewhat indisposed, on account of having spoken some two and a half or three hours, and would prefer that he be permitted to go on to-morrow morning, not desiring to have the continuity of his remarks broken.

While in the opinion of a majority a filibuster is in operation, and as a filibuster is supposed to be a test of physical endurance that might not be a sufficient excuse for the majority to abandon its purpose and intention, we are not unmindful of the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire is, in point of service, the oldest Member of this body; we all have a kindly feeling for him personally; and we are not inclined to hold the Senate in session to any later hour than 6 o'clock.

I think, however, it is fair that notice should be served upon Members on both sides of the Chamber that it is the purpose of the majority that there shall be night sessions hereafter throughout this week, and that hereafter, in case of one Senator becoming exhausted, it will be necessary that some other Senator shall be prepared to take his place; otherwise, a vote will be insisted upon.

I give this notice in all kindness.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think it is due to myself to say that I am not indisposed, and I have not made any such claim. Senators upon the other side very kindly said to me that if I preferred to go on to-morrow, it could be arranged. I deeply appreciate any courtesy that is extended to me; but I do not want it to go out, even into the corridors, that I am a sick man, because I am not.

Mr. KERN. I only know what has been told to me by Senators on this side of the Chamber; and I assumed, from what they told me, that the Senator expressed a preference to be relieved from further work to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. When consulted I did express a preference, just as we have done hundreds of times in the past, that it would be more agreeable to me to go on in the morning; but, of course, I am subject to whatever program the majority has in mind. I want to repeat that I do appreciate deeply any expression of kindness or any act of courtesy on the part of the majority, and that it would be more agreeable to me to go on in the morning; but if it is thought otherwise, I shall not insist upon it, and I have not insisted upon it.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. In view of the preference expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire, and in view of the fact that word has been passed about that the session to-day would not be continued later than 6 o'clock, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment that I may submit a report?

Mr. KERN. I withhold the motion for that purpose.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent to submit, in behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], a favorable report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1915.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Henry Clay Hall to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin S. Wertz to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Jonas T. Amis to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Raymundo Harrison to be receiver of public moneys at Fort Sumner, N. Mex.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. De Witt Coffman to be a rear admiral.
Capt. William F. Fullam to be a rear admiral.
Commander Edward L. Beach to be a captain.
Lieut. Commander Gatewood S. Lincoln to be a commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ralph C. Needham to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard T. Keiran to be a lieutenant.
Asst. Paymaster Smith Hempstone to be a passed assistant paymaster.
Second Lieut. Charles L. Austin, United States Army, to be an assistant paymaster.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

J. A. Theobold, Breckenridge.

CONNECTICUT.

Edward M. O'Brien, Waterbury.

FLORIDA.

James F. McKinstry, Gainesville.

GEORGIA.

General M. Kilgore, Loganville.

INDIANA.

John A. Cody, New Albany.

MINNESOTA.

George E. Crow, Walker.
Edwin L. Gove, Madelia.
Charles E. McAllen, Chokio.
Charles W. Mobeck, Center City.

NEW YORK.

Frank P. Bagg, Barneveld.
Sylvester R. Deyo, Kingston.
Edgar H. Jolliffe, Congers.

OHIO.

William A. Ault, Wadsworth.
Andrew H. Austin, Ravenna.
John S. Gossett, Dennison.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles B. Duff, Ford City.
Glen S. Hamilton, Falls Creek.
Michael F. Lawler, Jessup.
William Leslie, Parkers Landing.

VIRGINIA.

A. B. Buchanan, Tazewell.
William H. Maffett, Vienna.
John L. Pulley, Ivor.
C. F. Ratliff, Floyd.
T. W. Richardson, Bedford (late Bedford City).

WEST VIRGINIA.

A. L. Hatfield, Matewan.
James A. Pyles, New Martinsville.

WISCONSIN.

Edward Cody, Antigo.
John Coppes, South Kaukauna.
William F. Gruenewald, Oshkosh.
Alexander W. Horn, Cedarburg.
E. J. Jacquot, Hortonville.
Frank H. Kellner, Denmark.
Levi Lane, Oconto Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 26, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Make us tractable, O God our heavenly Father, to the heavenly vision revealed unto us in the life, character, and teachings of the Jesus of Nazareth, that with unselfish devotion, patience, zeal, efficiency, we may do the tasks whereunto Thou hast called us, and thus be the instruments in Thy hands for the furtherance of good government and the betterment of mankind. In His name, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RUSSELL, for two days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CARY, for 10 days, on account of death in his family.

The SPEAKER. Both these requests should date back to yesterday; but last night, when the House failed to obtain a quorum, they were not submitted.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 20415, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that there is a motion pending to strike out.

Mr. ANDERSON. That amendment was defeated.

Mr. LEVER. As I recollect it, that amendment was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] objected.

Mr. MANN. That amendment was defeated, and I then moved to strike out the last two words, and I withdraw that pro forma amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. A vote was taken after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] objected, and that amendment was defeated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out the word "straw," in line 6, and the words "which may be used for paper making," in lines 7 and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "with a view to increasing the oil content of flaxseed."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the debate last evening very thoroughly demonstrated the fact that the work under this item is not being directed toward a very feasible or practical end, and the purpose of my amendment is to redirect the work under the item to a somewhat different field in the same general line. In other words, the amendment does not prevent the appropriation being applied to flax, but applies it in the direction of increasing the oil content instead of experimental work in the direction of its usefulness for paper making.

The North Dakota Experiment Station has been carrying on experiments with flax for a long time. Practically 90 per cent of all the flax raised in the United States is raised in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana. The reason for that is that there has been a very general opinion among farmers that flax could not be raised two, three, or four years in succession. So it has been almost exclusively a pioneer crop. The North Dakota station in its experiments has ascertained that where flax is raised for three or four or five years in succession a certain parasitic growth appears which attacks the roots and results in a kind of wilt. The North Dakota station has also been carrying on certain experiments along the line of the rotation of crops and the treating of the seed to eliminate this parasitic growth and has developed resistant varieties of plants and seed. But what I desire with this amendment is to direct the work under the item toward the increasing of the oil content of the flaxseed. In this country flax is raised almost entirely for the seed, and as the value of the seed depends almost entirely upon its oil content the work under this item, if it could be directed toward the testing of flax so as to increase the oil content of the seed, would be very much more valuable than it can possibly be when directed as it now is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that there is much force in what the gentleman from Minnesota says in regard to the value of the flaxseed and the uses to which it is or may be put and the desirability of investigation along that line, but I think the amendment he offers ought not to be adopted just as he has framed it, as it will stop altogether experiments that are being made to learn if flax straw can be used profitably in the making of paper.

When the matter was considered by the Committee on Agriculture some doubt was expressed as to the wisdom of continuing the appropriation, but, as I recall, the officials from the department who spoke concerning it said that the work had been carried on very satisfactorily and that it has not yet been finished, but the provision as it appears in the bill was retained largely as a result of the statement made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN], a member of the committee, who in a very clear and convincing manner told of the value of the work the experiment station in North Dakota is doing.

The gentleman's statement convinced the committee that the work ought not to be abandoned; and while I have no objection to the bill containing an appropriation to enable the department to make investigations as to the use of the flaxseed, I think it would be unwise at this time to eliminate altogether the provision in regard to experiments with the flax straw; and if an amendment is to be made, I think the experiments regarding straw ought to be continued, although the provision may well be extended perhaps to include the experiments respecting the seed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say to the gentleman that I had drawn a paragraph proposing a new item covering the work I had in mind, but in view of the general attitude of the committee and the desire to keep this bill within reasonable limits and to exercise economy, I thought it better to direct the money already provided by the bill to the new use than to increase the expenditure by preparing new items; but if there is any real opposition to discontinuing the work under the item I shall offer the proposition as a new paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That would be my suggestion to the gentleman—that he so broaden the language as to permit the department to make experiments and investigations respecting the use to be made of flaxseed. I do not know what the chairman of the committee may do, but if the suggestion is made to increase the appropriation, as far as I am concerned, I should rather have it increased than amended, as first suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I was about to suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota to add a proviso making it read something in this way—provided that $5,000 of this amount may be spent in the direction indicated in the gentleman's amendment. I think I would have no objection to that. That would take about half of it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would not the gentleman be willing to increase the amount by $5,000 so as not to interfere with the other work?

Mr. LEVER. I should rather not, for I have not considered this matter, although the gentleman's statement is very clear.

It is clear to my own mind that we have about reached the point where we ought to close up this investigation, although I would not want to cut it right off at once. It seems to me that $5,000 of this appropriation could be used to start the gentleman's investigation and at the same time leave one or two men continuing their investigations of the paper-making possibilities of flax straw. I would be very glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the paragraph, line 8, page 30, insert the following: "*Provided*, That $5,000 of this amount may be used in testing and breeding flax with a view to increasing the quantity of oil contents of flaxseed, including rotation experiment and demonstration."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the breeding and physiological study of alkali-resistant and drought-resistant crops, $22,280.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday in the discussion of this Agricultural appropriation bill there was some little discussion in connection with the sugar industry and its decline. I want to say something about the lumber industry. I find in the report of the Chief Forester, dated December 23, 1914, the following statement in regard to forest management in the national forest:

FOREST MANAGEMENT.

Timber sales on the national forests supply demands from two sources. The first is local use by railroads, mines, and communities in the vicinity of the national forests. This demand requires from 30 to 40 per cent of the annual cut. It is comparatively stable. The second demand is from the general lumber market.

The amount of timber cut and the receipts from sales thus depend in large part upon trade conditions in the lumbering industry. A consistent effort has been made by the Forest Service to make the annual volume of business more stable both by increasing local sales and by encouraging sales for varied industries, such as the manufacture of pulp and paper and of wood distillates, whose demands are less affected by trade conditions. While substantial progress has been made in this direction, no large increase in the volume of timber sales is possible except in connection with good business conditions in the lumber trade of the United States.

Now I call attention to the following paragraph:

Last year was for the greater part one of weak lumber markets and curtailed production. Lumber manufacture was active and trade conditions good from August, 1912, to May, 1913.

That last is the month and year that the House of Representatives passed the Underwood tariff bill and sent it to the Senate. The report continues:

This period of good times in the industry was reflected in the large timber-sale business reported for the fiscal year 1913. Since then, however, the demand for lumber has fallen off to a marked degree. Many of the mills operating in national forest regions, including purchasers from the forests, have been forced to carry excessive stocks, particularly of low grades. There has been a drop in lumber prices of from $1 to $4 per thousand feet on various grades. Possible purchasers, including a number who had previously applied for blocks of national forest stumpage, became very cautious. While the cut under outstanding sale contracts has been well sustained and exceeds that of the preceding year by 131,000,000 board feet, new sales for the general lumber market have fallen off materially.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that yesterday afternoon a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee was rebuked by the Chairman for injecting a tariff discussion into this bill. Does not the gentleman fear that he may come under the disfavor of the Chairman and be likely to be rebuked by the Chief Forester?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no fear, unless some one should undertake to show that the report of the Chief Forester is merely psychological; that it does not state the situation. Here is the Forester making a report intending to show that the sales and the business in the great forest reserves in the United States are kept up in such a quantity as to warrant the expenditure of five and a half million dollars to take care of this matter. And yet he is, on page 8 of this statement, forced to make the statement that timber conditions are already declining, that there is a fall in the market, and to give the date of the beginning of that as May 8, 1913, in spite of the special reports of Secretary Redfield that the lumber industry was good at that time.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Forester does not attribute it to the Underwood tariff law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps not; but I do.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I know that the gentleman does; but I do not.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not due to a lack of efficiency? Does not the gentleman think that if we had more careful bookkeeping, as recommended by the Secretary of Commerce, the Forester could show better business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Here is a great agricultural bill carrying $22,000,000, and a quarter is for the Forestry Service. A great change in the form for the distribution of the fund is contemplated, which will go over without much consideration.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman think that more "efficiency" in the service would give more work to the unemployed who are now wandering over the country seeking jobs?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wish that that might be so.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. On lines 9 and 10, page 20, is an item for the breeding and physiological study of alkali-resistant and drought-resistant crops, $22,280. Will the gentleman state what success has been made in that direction?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that the item covers investigations of the function and structure of crop plants grown in the arid part of the United States in order to determine why different species and varieties differ in their resistance to alkali and drought, and in order to furnish a physiological basis for plant breeding, variety testing, and investigations of cultural methods; an investigation of the native vegetation of arid regions with a view to its use as an indicator in classifying land upon the basis of its crop-producing capabilities; investigations to secure more drought-resistant strains of field crops adapted to dry-land agriculture; investigations to obtain by introduction and breeding drought-resistant and alkali-resistant varieties of pomegranates; the securing of varieties of Egyptian cotton yielding fiber of superior quality growing under irrigation in the southwestern part of the United States; and the investigation of the effect of alkali and unfavorable moisture conditions upon this crop.

One of the results of this investigation has been the development of the fact that Egyptian cotton can be grown very successfully in that country, with the result that quite a little industry has been built up at this time.

Mr. GOULDEN. What success have they met with in raising cereal crops under the system known as dry farming?

Mr. LEVER. The success has been somewhat indifferent, I take it, but they are continuing to investigate in the hope of finally finding some way of doing it that will secure the industry in the country.

Mr. GOULDEN. How long has Congress been appropriating for this particular purpose?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I could not tell.

Mr. GOULDEN. Well, a matter of 10 years?

Mr. LEVER. It has been a matter of 8 or 10 years.

Mr. GOULDEN. I remember it was some time ago, but I know that in traveling over the West I discovered a good many dry lands where they were endeavoring to cultivate them, and I wondered what success the department had met in helping to solve that question or assisting in solving it.

Mr. LEVER. It was encouraged by its own success, and I think the members of the committee feel that perhaps that feeling of encouragement is hardly justified by the facts, but we feel they ought to be permitted to continue this work.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have no fault to find with the recommendation of the department or the committee. I only wanted to know for my own information, as well as the Committee of the Whole House, what success has attended the efforts, if any. I have no doubt but that the Committee on Agriculture have acted wisely.

Mr. LEVER. I am glad to give it to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, $70,380.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee how many appropriations are made in this bill for the investigation of the semiarid lands?

Mr. LEVER. It is only the item under consideration now and an item which we have just passed a moment ago, and then there is one in the irrigation project carried in the back of the bill.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman know how much money is appropriated now by these different paragraphs for this investigation of semiarid crops?

Mr. LEVER. I would say, offhand, it was $250,000.

Mr. BOOHER. What has been the result of this experimental work by the bureau of the department?

Mr. LEVER. I will read from my report of last year on this subject. I have not gone into this this year as I did last year.

Mr. BOOHER. I want the chairman and the committee to understand that I am not finding fault, but I want to know if results are being obtained thus far.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will permit, I can give him some information——

Mr. LEVER. I will read from the report of last year to the gentleman:

This work includes an investigation of the agricultural conditions in the irrigated regions and adjacent regions of western United States for the purpose of discovering and recommending the best methods of crop production in those regions and to provide facilities for the various cooperating specialists of the Bureau of Plant Industry to work out the agricultural problems which come within their special fields. Special attention is also given to the production of long-staple cotton in the irrigated Southwest, particularly in Salt River Valley, Ariz., and the Imperial Valley, Cal.

Now, the gentleman from Arizona, my friend will recall, last year gave the committee a very succinct idea of the work being done in reference to long-staple cotton, and quite an industry has also grown up in the Imperial Valley of California due to this investigation.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the chairman know how much money has been expended by Congress on these investigations?

Mr. LEVER. I could not tell the gentleman without going back over the reports, and I have not them at hand now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman's estimate of $250,000 apply only to the expense in the field, or does it also include the expenses for examinations here at Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I think it includes the expense in the field, although I have not looked into that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have two items which aggregate some $250,000. Certainly that does not include the expenses in the field and also of these sensitive experts who are employed down here in the bureau at Washington.

Mr. LEVER. I assume a portion goes to administration expenses and a portion to traveling expenses and a portion to salaries. It is expended like any other item in the bureau.

Mr. BOOHER. It can not possibly go to the payment of salaries, because we appropriate for salaries in another place.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I am trying to point out to the chairman. The expenses of salaries of officials employed in Washington and used in this work is in addition to the appropriations here provided.

Mr. LEVER. These salaries carried on the statutory rolls for this work here in Washington would be in addition.

Mr. BOOHER. Does part of the salaries for these people come out of the appropriation we are now discussing?

Mr. LEVER. I think not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not clerical salaries.

Mr. LEVER. I meant clerical salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For horticultural investigations, including the study of producing, handling, and shipping truck and related crops, including potatoes, and the study of landscape and vegetable gardening, floriculture, and related subjects, $56,080.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this item I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 21, at the end of line 18, by adding the following: "And, in addition, $50,000 to reimburse potato shippers for the amount assessed upon them on account of Federal inspection of potatoes offered for shipment."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment I have offered to provide $50,000 to reimburse shippers of Maine potatoes for the charge imposed on them on account of this Federal quarantine, I wish to say this: The Government declared in 1914—to take effect August 1, 1914—a quarantine on all the potatoes in the State of Maine, as what was called "powdery scab" was found in a few potatoes near the Canadian border.

The declaration of the quarantine against all Maine potatoes was a great hardship for a time to Maine potato growers, and is still a burden to them. It not only prevented shipments from the State but it advertised injuriously one of the chief crops of the State through the country when, as a matter of fact, Maine potatoes have always been unusually sound and healthy—almost entirely free from the suspicion of disease—and 99 per cent are to-day. This is due, no doubt, to the fact that the soil and climate of Maine are particularly adapted to the production of sound potato stock; more so, perhaps, than any other part of the country.

If that quarantine had gone into effect without an appropriation to carry it out, it would have locked up the great potato crop in the State last year. An amount was appropriated—something like $50,000. One hundred thousand dollars was recommended. The $50,000 has proved insufficient. The organization necessary to inspect a crop of thirty to forty million bushels involves a large expenditure of money. The department was obliged to send a superintendent to Maine to take general charge of the inspection. He organized a force which, under his direction, began the inspection, and in addition to his regular salaried assistants he employs a force of from 80 to 150 men under a per diem arrangement to inspect potatoes. This force varies according to the volume of shipments. The $50,000 last year, I understand, has been practically all placed; that is, it has been paid out in part and the balance will be required for the salaries and expenses of the permanent organization during the balance of the fiscal year and to carry on the general expenses of the inspection. Now, a great proportion of the crop is still unshipped, and there is not money to pay for the extra men—the per diem men—who would be required to make the inspection, with the result that the department, in order to continue the inspection, has assessed the shippers $2 per car on every carload of potatoes inspected for shipment, and will continue to do that throughout the balance of the fiscal year 1915. Up to the 1st of December I understand that the department paid all the expense of the inspection; since then it has not been able to, as I have stated, owing to the insufficiency of the appropriation and the expense of its regular organization.

In order to bring to your minds the work involved in the inspection of potatoes in Maine, I will state that in September last 1,908,515 bushels were shipped out of Maine; in October, 2,229,395 bushels; in November, 1,784,630 bushels; in December, 1,610,692 bushels; and there will have to be inspected for shipment more than 2,000,000 bushels per month for several months to come until the crop is sold; and, as near as I can tell, the $2 charge per car on the shippers will amount to fully $50,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. What does the State of Maine do in connection with this matter? Is it bearing any of this burden?

Mr. GUERNSEY. The State of Maine has made no appropriation, and I feel it ought not to be called upon to do so, as the quarantine was imposed by the Federal Government for the benefit of the whole country. My attention was called by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the other day to a fact in connection with this matter, that the Government whenever it undertakes these inspections does not in all cases impose the burden upon private individuals.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that we are making appropriations at this time to investigate various diseases, and are making other kinds of inspections without asking appropriations from the States?

Mr. GUERNSEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. MOORE. In the matter of the cane-sugar growers in Louisiana, we are making a direct appropriation for their benefit without asking for any return from the State?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true with regard to the work of exterminating the boll weevil, for which we make Federal appropriations constantly? We do not ask any cooperation from the States, but treat it wholly as a Federal matter?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely mistaken as to that. I can show by figures that I have here that the States have contributed more for that work in the South than the Federal Government has contributed to it. The policy of the department is to compel cooperation from the States.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman say that that is done in the matter of the cattle tick and other things of that kind?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. My State has contributed exactly what the Federal Government has contributed. I went before the State Legislature of South Carolina a year ago and urged the State legislature to make an appropriation. I will not say that the result of my speech was the $30,000 which the State appropriated, but the legislature did appropriate the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Let me ask the gentleman from South Carolina this: What amount are we appropriating this year for the treatment of the boll weevil?

Mr. ANDERSON. $666,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. The total appropriation for the boll-weevil work is $666,000.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell me what the State of South Carolina appropriates to match that?

Mr. LEVER. I will put it in the RECORD. I do not happen to have the figures here. But the State of South Carolina has appropriated more for that object than the Federal Government has appropriated.

Mr. ANDERSON. South Carolina has appropriated——

Mr. LEVER. The college makes an appropriation, I will say to my friend.

Mr. ANDERSON. The State of South Carolina, including the college, appropriates $52,000.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell us where most of the money appropriated for the treatment of hog cholera is expended?

Mr. LEVER. Most of it is expended in the Northwest. I do not think a dollar of it is expended south of the Potomac River.

Mr. MOORE. How much do the States appropriate for this hog-cholera work?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman as to that. That is a new item.

Mr. ANDERSON. Some of the States that are getting the benefit of this hog-cholera appropriation are making large appropriations on their own account. They are also making appropriations for serum plants and are providing part of the serum that is used.

Mr. LEVER. I think the State of Ohio has expended $400,000 in building a number of serum manufacturing plants.

Mr. MOORE. In these cases the States act voluntarily in the matter, whereas in the State of Maine the Federal Government actually established a quarantine to prevent the potato growers and potato shippers from getting to their market.

Mr. LEVER. That is done in South Carolina with respect to other things. You can not ship a steer out of an infected area in South Carolina, except under certain regulations. There is no difference between this proposition and that one.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Maine yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. Replying to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], I will say that the State of Missouri has contributed $75,000 for the work of eradicating hog cholera. Less than that in proportion is received from the Federal Government, and it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the States, and in nearly every instance the States are contributing a proportional part, not only for the eradication of hog cholera but everything else.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us about the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. LEVER. I will say with reference to the foot-and-mouth disease that the States and the Federal Government do cooperate and pay half and half the expense.

Mr. GUERNSEY. In the inspection of the shipment of beef by the packing houses is the expense divided, or is it paid wholly by the Federal Government?

Mr. LEVER. That is a statute which has been passed by Congress. There is a permanent appropriation of $3,000,000, and the Government is bearing the total expense of inspection.

Mr. GUERNSEY. That is what I thought; the Government, in order to protect the country as a whole, pays the entire expense of the inspection of beef. Now, in order to protect the country as a whole from a disease which it was claimed existed in the Maine potato, they caused a quarantine on all of the potatoes of Maine—locked up the crop—and except for the money provided by the Congress for inspection that crop would have stayed in the State, as no one would have had authority to inspect it for shipment but Federal inspectors, and without money provided by Congress they could not have been sent to Maine to do the work. Now, in view of the fact that Congress has not appropriated enough to move the whole crop, it seems to me the Government should make good and appropriate now an additional amount, so that the growers of potatoes and the shippers shall not be burdened. The potato shipper is entitled to as much favor as the beef packer; both are handlers of food products in interstate shipment. To a very large extent the quarantine is absolutely unnecessary, as it is probable that 99 per cent of the potatoes covered by the quarantine were absolutely free from disease.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Maine be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the tax of $2 a car which is being imposed on shipments of potatoes from Maine, to pay the expense of this quarantine, was placed on the shipments at the suggestion of the people of Maine themselves?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I do not understand that it was, unless the department informed them that they had not money enough to carry on the inspection, and that without inspection the crop could not leave the State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I just want to read to the gentleman the testimony before the committee:

Mr. HAUGEN. Did I understand you to say the shippers are to be taxed $2 a car for this inspection?

Mr. MARLATT. Yes. They are very willing to pay it; it is their own suggestion. Potatoes must be inspected before they can move.

Mr. HAUGEN. That flows into what treasury?

Mr. MARLATT. Into the treasury of the State of Maine.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then the State of Maine is not doing anything?

Mr. MARLATT. The citizens of the State of Maine?

Mr. HAUGEN. I mean the State itself.

Mr. MARLATT. No; the State is not appropriating anything.

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding last year was that if we would appropriate this amount of money Maine would take care of itself after the first year. Was that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not recall that that was the exact understanding. I do recall having a telegram from the governor to the effect that the State of Maine would bear some portion of this burden. I do not recall just what the telegram was, but I have it in my files.

Now, of course, the fact of the matter is that the Government in the exercise of its authority prohibited the exportation of potatoes from Maine unless they were inspected, and if it desired it could impose upon the people of Maine the entire cost of this inspection. Whatever is contributed by the Government to the inspection is contributed altogether as a gratuity rather than as a matter of right.

Mr. GUERNSEY. In reply to the gentleman I will say that it ought not to be so, as the potatoes of Maine are, as a whole, practically unaffected, and only in two or three very small sections have they discovered any disease whatever, so that 99 per cent of the potatoes burdened by the quarantine were free from disease, but were held up by the action of the Federal Government. For that reason I believe the Government should pay the whole bill.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that this 99 per cent of healthy potatoes are subject to this inspection, and that the farmers who dig them and the shippers who send them to market are practically assessed that $2 a carload in getting them to market, which condition does not obtain anywhere else in the country?

Mr. GUERNSEY. The gentleman is right. The farmer is taxed. Their price is reduced just so much.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not also true that this appropriation was made at the suggestion of the Representatives from the State of Maine on the representation that an appropriation would be provided at the next session of the Maine Legislature to cover the expense?

Mr. GUERNSEY. This was the situation: The crop was locked up by the quarantine, and the Senators from Maine and the Representatives did make a request for a Federal appropriation to move the crop, and very likely some one did suggest that perhaps the Legislature of Maine would make an appropriation or contribution; but my contention is that neither the State nor the shippers ought to be obliged to contribute.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am free to say that my understanding was that the appropriation was made last year to meet an emergency, and that the State of Maine was to take care of itself after the first year; but I find this year it comes in here and asks for another appropriation, which we have recommended. Now, is it the wish of the gentleman that the appropriation be stricken out?

Mr. GUERNSEY. No; I think it should be increased.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman thinks the Federal Government should take care of it entirely?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he sits down?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that this quarantine prevents the shipment of potatoes out of the State of Maine until they are inspected?

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. And that the potato grower has to pay $2 a car for the inspection?

Mr. GUERNSEY. That is paid by the potato shipper and indirectly by the grower.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has not the Legislature of the State of Maine appropriated money to aid that purpose?

Mr. GUERNSEY. It has not up to this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. The tax, then, whatever it is, is borne by the grower, in conjunction with the officers of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. GUERNSEY. That is the situation at the present time.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] have stated the case of the committee as strongly as I could possibly state it without taking up too much time, and I am therefore compelled to make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for five minutes?

Mr. LEVER. I have already reserved it for 15 minutes. The gentleman understands that he can get time on the next paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I do not want to cut the gentleman off, but we have had 15 minutes on this item. If the gentleman insists, I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will withhold it for two minutes it is all I ask.

Mr. LEVER. I will do so.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine ought to be considered, although the gentleman from South Carolina has the right to make the point of order, and it may be sustained. The situation in Maine is peculiar. The farmers there are remote from the market. It costs more, possibly, to get Maine potatoes into the market than it does to get them from the Middle West. It costs more to bring them from Maine to a market like New York than it does to bring them from Bermuda and across the water. They are seriously handicapped in other ways. They are directly up against the Canadian border and the tariff which protected them against the Canadian potato was taken off, then there came a great rush of Canadian potatoes which threatened the whole industry of Maine. This of itself would have been sufficient to destroy the market for Maine potatoes, but suddenly the "scab" was discovered and the quarantine was put on. That since has served as a tariff, minus the revenue.

Now, more than 99 per cent of the potatoes of Maine are unaffected by the "wart" or "scab," and the great bulk of the territory is untouched by it. These Maine farmers go about the business of raising potatoes in the usual way, and it seems to be a great injustice that all of them should be made to pay for this inspection when only so few are affected. We do not treat all our farmers that way.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $252,540. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seed the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry, and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 14, after the word "stated," strike out "and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much debate there will be on this proposition, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I object to that, but will withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. LEVER. There are several that want a little time on this side, and I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It seems to me that this is rather early to have debate limited on a matter of so much importance. There is no telling how many may want to speak on this side.

Mr. LEVER. How much time does the gentleman desire himself?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Very little, because I had some time the other day.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, as I had 20 minutes during the general debate upon this bill three days ago and there are only 30 minutes agreed upon at this time for the discussion of this amendment, I do not propose to take very much time. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture might be trusted to spend the money and make the seed distribution according to its best judgment rather than to be tied down by the words contained in the bill that I have moved to strike out, which provide that the distribution is to be largely confined to vegetable and flower seed.

As I mentioned while the matter was under discussion a few days ago, these seeds which are sent out from year to year are not of any superior quality or of new varieties. They are just the kind of seeds any farmer can buy at the nearest village or town for a few cents. We are not furnishing him with anything new. I do not think anybody is being fooled by sending out the seeds from year to year, except possibly some of the Congressmen. The farmers who get them—or the most of them—know what they are worth and how senseless the whole proceeding is, and I think it is about time for us to cut out this farce. There is nothing so belittling to Congress as this annual seed peddling. If a farmer in my district would propose to spend $250,000 so foolishly as is proposed in this paragraph of the bill, he would be suspected of insanity. I strongly favor

permitting the department officials to use their discretion in the selection of seeds. If such discretion is given to them, they will undoubtedly confine the distribution to new and rare varieties of seed for the purpose of introducing new crops to increase the income or preserve the fertility of the soil. The farmers are being told to mix some brains with their farming. It might be well for Congressmen to mix some brains with their agricultural legislation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to follow a precedent I have made for several years of making an attempt to eliminate this item. I think I know when I have been defeated, and I have found out, as far as the House of Representatives is concerned in regard to this item, that "Ephraim is joined to his idols," and there is no possible hope as long as this distribution is placed in the hands of Members of Congress of defeating the appropriation on the floor of the House.

I do not desire to provoke the annual speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], and I very much hope, as much as we delight in it and as much pleasure as it gives the House of Representatives, that in the interest of time and orderly procedure we may escape it, and I am going to say nothing to provoke it.

I want, however, to say that I have not changed my mind or my attitude toward this appropriation as being a waste of the public money. It is no better now than it was in the preceding bill or any bill that has gone before it; but recognizing what I said in the beginning, of the uselessness of making a fight against it here, I shall not pursue it, although I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the distribution of seeds by the Government, and I am in favor of that from personal experience; and I feel that a great deal of good has been accomplished by the distribution of these seeds. It is the province of this great Department of Agriculture to advance the interests of the farmers of this country, and I disagree with my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE]. I believe that it confers a greater benefit the longer we continue to disseminate these seeds. Mr. Chairman, I live in one of the largest agricultural sections in Georgia or the South, and to show the interest of the people of that section in these seed distributions I have more applications for the seeds than is my pro rata share. I want to give one or two experiences of my own and those of my neighbors. There are two diseases that are most destructive to the cotton plant. One is known as the black root or rot and the other is anthracnose, and wherever these diseases attack the cotton it is as fatal as the boll weevil or any other destructive insect. There is a pea known in Georgia as the cow pea or the red pea, which pea has a great amount of vine, and that pea has been a great favorite in Georgia from the fact that no pea we have ever used seemed to benefit the land more than this. But it was discovered that where this pea was sown and followed by cotton that almost always this terrible root rot was the result.

The farmers therefore felt that they would have to discontinue the use of this great fertilizing pea in order to save their cotton. In the meantime, however, the Government began to disseminate what was known as the iron pea. It has not been yet used to any very large extent, but this was found to be the fact, that the seed has the same fertilizing properties given to the soil as the red pea, and at the same time, where the iron pea is used, it seems to prevent this fearful black rot or root. And the same case with the anthracnose. There is cotton sent out by the Government, sent in small packages, which was a resistant cotton seed to the fearful disease. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say Georgia and the entire South have planted more small grain—rye, oats, and wheat—a great deal more this season than ever before. There is a determination that cotton shall not be the only moneyed crop in that State and in that section. They desire to procure the very best seed, and when those seed are disseminated they take the small packages and they put them upon a plat, and finally get sufficient quantity with which to plant their crop, thereby selecting such seed as are adapted both to soil and climate.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the South are determined to enter into the growth and the production, more than ever, of live stock, and in order to do that they must sow to grasses, and the grass seed is in great demand, and I only wish that we had more of those seed which we could send to the farmers with which they could experiment and get the very best grass possible. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote in favor of the amendment to strike out the paragraph. I realize what I may say will have no practical influence with Members, because this is one of the few subjects which come before the House which every Member knows about already. We all get the seeds and we know what the seeds are and we know how they are distributed. Judging from my own experience, I think a large part of the seed are wasted and never get into the ground. Even if every seed was used, I do not think the Government should be in the business of distributing ordinary, everyday kind of commodities, which can be bought in any city store and any country store, any more than it should distribute pins or needles or fertilizer or food. I wish to say that in my State, which is quite an agricultural State, the Farmers' Grange, which is the one big organization which includes all the farmers of the State, adopted unanimously, without any opposition, a resolution at its last State convention condemning and disapproving the free distribution of garden seed by the Government. Let me say, further, that any man who is a real gardener and takes much interest or pains in his garden will not plant any Government garden seed to rely upon, but will get standard seeds, which he knows to be true to name and of real value.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that every seed that is sent out by the Department of Agriculture by this congressional seed distribution is tested and required to come up to a certain standard of vitality and must be true to type?

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Well, I have no doubt the seeds have vitality, but they are the ordinary garden seed, just as you can buy in any country or any city store or in any grocery store through New England; and anyone who wants special brands—unusually good seeds—he buys them from an established recognized seed house, and he does not have those sent out by the Government or by anybody else.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They are tested by the Government, and if the Government is competent to test them they must come up to standard; every one is tested.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. I want to say the seeds which were given to me consisted of radish, lettuce, carrots, and beets, not one of which was a rare or unusual kind or was of any particular value over the seeds which we buy in our local stores at 5 and 10 cents a package.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reading the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I find that he proposes to strike out "vegetable and flower seed suitable for planting and culture in various sections of the United States." That being clearly a discrimination against the urban-ite, of course I would have to oppose the amendment. Why vegetable and garden seed should be stricken out I can not understand.

If the purpose of the amendment is to please the farmer and cut out those who cultivate gardens, it is unquestionably a discrimination, and a very unfair one.

These vegetable and garden seeds, it may be contended, have no place in a great city. But that idea is erroneous. I represent a district that does not have a full acre of unimproved ground in it, and yet there are many people there who look regularly for those seeds. To take away the vegetable and garden seed from the city people, and leave all other seed to be distributed elsewhere, would mean that a very large proportion of our population would be deprived of one of the real pleasures they now have in life As to many of my own constituents, the distribution of the seed means a little sunshine within the brick walls; it means a little blossom, a little perfume to homes that are far removed from the free, pure air of the country, and where that wholesome atmosphere is sorely needed. It may be thought by some who come from the country districts that we have no use for those seeds, but let me say that the man or the woman or the child who lives in my district and who watches the growth of the plant——

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MOORE. I do.

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania what the real purpose is in contributing garden seeds?

Mr. MOORE. Apparently it is to bring the blessings of sunshine and the aroma of flowers to all the people, including the farmers and the dwellers in the cities. [Applause.] It may be educational. I think it is. There are gentlemen on that side who can explain that feature of it better than I can. I am simply saying that if seed are to be distributed, they ought not to be distributed in only one section or to one class of our people; and in respect to garden or vegetable seed, I was trying to inform the House that every package of them which goes into a great congested district like mine does actually bring a little

ray of sunshine, a little bit of cheer, into a home or into a school where it did not exist before. [Applause.]

Mr. CLINE. I was asking the question of the gentleman for the purpose of securing information. I did not understand whether it was for the purpose of bringing sunshine into the homes or——

Mr. MOORE. I think a Government that fails to bring sunshine into the homes of its people would be a failure. I think this is the time of year and this the time of all times when it would pay to bring a little sunshine into the homes of our people, for some of them are sorely distresed. These seed go into the schools of my district; they go into the houses of the poor in my district; and here they appear in a little box in some tidy window in a mere bucketful of earth. They are stuck outside the windows of our dwellings or on the fire escape or in the balconies of our schools. They are a delight to our housewives and an object lesson to our children in the joy and the pride of cultivating nature. Take away the garden seeds from the city districts and you will remove some of the few remaining beauty spots in the already congested centers. We have recently encouraged the children, and the grown persons, too, to cultivate the vacant lots. The work has interested many of our poorer families, who have little opportunity to go out and get the pure air of the country. They are too closely confined to the restricted and congested areas, from which there seems to be no escape, and the cultivation of these garden spaces helps.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana. I wish we could add more of his areas to our section. We helped to build up the State of Indiana. Philadelphia has contributed some of its best blood to that State, and we are proud of the progeny of the people from Philadelphia who settled there. Some day we hope to connect up with them by means of the gentleman's canal right across from Toledo. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLINE. I wish to remind the gentleman, too, that the Government sends out alfalfa seeds and other seeds of that kind.

Mr. MOORE. Well, having no further time at my disposal, I would refer that proposition to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], who is an expert on the subject. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this section of the bill as it has been written by the committee. I see no reason why this Government should not continue to furnish flower and vegetable seeds to the farmers of the country as it has done in the past. They are entitled to them. Take, for instance, the question of pensions. This Government appropriates annually for the pensioners of this country in the neighborhood of $180,000,000. That costs practically every man, woman, and child in this country $2 a year. Upon that basis every man who is the head of a family of five contributes to that expense, of his substance, $10 a year.

I am not complaining of that. Take, for instance, the river and harbor appropriation, which averages annually about $40,000,000. The money so expended peculiarly benefits those who live around the harbors and on the navigable streams of the country. Most of the farmers live away from them. The farmers throughout the land are not the ones peculiarly benefited by such appropriations, yet they help to foot the bill. Again, take the money expended on public buildings throughout the country. Most of this money is expended on the public buildings in the towns and big cities of our land. The farmers of our country help, out of their means, to make up these various appropriations. The farmers of our land are taxed like other people to help defray the running expenses of this great Government all along the line. They are its strength in time of peace, its bulwark in time of war. It is nothing but just, it is nothing but fair, it is nothing but right that the farmers in return should get some little benefit from the Government they so loyally support.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Does not the gentleman believe that if we propose to do something of real value for the farmer we ought to send them seed that will have some special value to them, either on account of the fact that they can not buy it at the nearest market town or on account of the fact that it is a new variety, a new kind of seed, that he otherwise would not be able to get? Does not the gentleman believe that the department itself should be given the discretion to send out that kind of seed rather than be forced by law to send out these almost worthless vegetable and flower seeds?

Mr. POWERS. I think the gentleman, usually right as he is, has entirely the wrong idea of this section of the bill. As I understand it, the Department of Agriculture has the power, and it is its duty under this law, not only to furnish good seeds of the best varieties it is capable of buying, either at public or private sale, but it is its further duty to send to the various sections of this country that character of seeds which is adaptable to that particular section. I think the gentleman has the wrong idea and the wrong notion of what the law actually is, and is intended by this bill to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Seven minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed to use that time.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to speak, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have submitted a request for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi would be entitled to control the time.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] that the amount involved here will make no difference, so far as what he has to say is concerned, because his speech this time will have about as much effect as the speeches usually made upon this floor in opposition to this appropriation, and that is no effect at all. If you will look into the situation, you will find in the gentleman's home city, where he lives, one public building that cost more than the amount of the distribution of these seeds for many years combined. Still he complains about sending a package of seeds to the farmers of this country. He prefers palaces for city people to seeds for farmers. [Applause.] I did not believe it necessary to say anything, but the chairman [Mr. LEVER] insists that I do so, and therefore I will submit a few remarks. I am glad my friend from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] did not desire to provoke me into saying anything, although I know everything I ever said upon this subject has been very entertaining to him as well as to everybody else on the floor of this House. [Laughter and applause.] If it was not entertaining I would not have so many urgent invitations to address myself to this important subject. During the past few days I have been invited by many Members on the floor of this House to be sure and submit some of my brilliant remarks upon this question. [Applause and laughter.] It always affords me pleasure to accommodate my many good friends—Democrats and Republicans—and it makes me happy to stand up for those things that are for the welfare and the prosperity of the people, and especially of those who make a living by digging it out of the ground. [Applause.] If there are any people on earth whom I desire to help and to sustain and to make happy and prosperous, it is that class of our citizenship who stand behind this great Republic in time of peace and who stand at the front with those who defend it in time of war. They are the people who live close to nature and hear the birds sing and see the flowers grow and produce the wealth of this country and plant these seeds which we send them and produce from the ground sustenance which helps to sustain their lives and the lives of their beautiful, bright-eyed, rosy-cheeked children who grow up in close touch and association with nature in its beauty, to the honor and glory of this great Republic. [Applause.]

I am glad that my friend from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] finds that all the efforts he has made in the past have been ineffective to prevent this appropriation, and that, therefore, he is willing to cease his opposition to it; and when my friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is now "young," grows older and has remained here as long as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] has been here he will find that his efforts are ineffective, and he will cease to waste his time in trying to prevent the people receiving this little remembrance from "Uncle Sam" which we send them year by year. [Applause.] So I beseech you all, my fellow distinguished Members, in the days which are to come to let the people alone in the reception of those things which are good for them and bend your energies to bring greater happiness and prosperity to them, to their homes, to their wives and their children. I commend my distinguished and good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] for the beautiful sentiments which he has uttered today, and I am glad he has announced himself upon this occasion as one of the advocates of this appropriation and one of the

friends of the lovely children and beautiful ladies in his district who write to him for these packages of seeds, which he promptly sends as tokens of his interest in their welfare. He serves his people with great ability and fidelity here in this and all other great matters and merits and receives their and our commendation. [Applause and laughter.] May he, with us, continue the good work, and may prosperity ever enlarge and expand until all the people of this great Republic will be made happy in the reception of these splendid seeds, which will blossom forth into beautiful flowers and wholesome food, to the gratification and delight of the citizens of this glorious country. [Great applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) there were—ayes 25, noes 68.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. PAGE of North Carolina and Mr. GORDON) there were—ayes 29, noes 66.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused, not a sufficient number seconding the demand.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I make the point of no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five Members present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

Salaries, Forest Service: One forester, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, $2,500; 7 district fiscal agents, at $2,000 each; 1 forest supervisor, $2,700; 1 forest supervisor, $2,600; 8 forest supervisors, at $2,400 each; 20 forest supervisors, at $2,200 each; 48 forest supervisors, at $2,000 each; 66 forest supervisors, at $1,800 each; 5 forest supervisors, at $1,600 each; 1 deputy forest supervisor, $1,800; 4 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,700 each; 28 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,600 each; 31 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,500 each; 18 deputy forest supervisors, at $1,400 each; 10 forest rangers, at $1,500 each; 22 forest rangers, at $1,400 each; 78 forest rangers, at $1,300 each; 287 forest rangers, at $1,200 each; 650 assistant forest rangers, at $1,100 each; 80 forest guards, at $1,100 each, for periods not exceeding six months in the aggregate; 1 clerk, $2,100; 4 clerks, at $2,000 each; 19 clerks, at $1,800 each; 20 clerks, at $1,600 each; 9 clerks, at $1,500 each; 21 clerks, at $1,400 each; 8 clerks, at $1,300 each; 112 clerks, at $1,200 each; 88 clerks, at $1,100 each; 51 clerks, at $1,020 each; 30 clerks, at $960 each; 107 clerks, at $900 each; 2 clerks, at $840 each; 1 compiler, $1,800; 1 draftsman, $2,000; 3 draftsmen, at $1,600 each; 2 draftsmen, at $1,500 each; 6 draftsmen, at $1,400 each; 4 draftsmen, at $1,300 each; 9 draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 2 draftsmen, at $1,100 each; 3 draftsmen, at $1,020 each; one draftsman, $960; 4 draftsmen, at $900 each; 1 artist, $1,400; 1 artist, $1,000; 3 map colorists, at $900 each; 1 map colorist, $720; 1 photographer, $1,600; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 photographer, $1,100; 1 lithographer, $1,200; 1 lithographer's helper, $780; 1 machinist, $1,260; 1 carpenter, $1,200; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each; 1 carpenter, $960; 1 electrician, $1,020; 4 laboratory aids and engineers, at $900 each; 1 laboratory aid and engineer, $800; 1 laboratory helper, $720; 1 laboratory helper, $600; 1 packer, $1,000; 1 packer, $780; 4 watchmen, at $840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $960; 3 messengers or laborers, at $900 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at $840 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at $780 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 6 messengers or laborers, at $660 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $600 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $540 each; 3 messengers, or messenger boys, at $480 each; 3 messengers, or messenger boys, at $420 each; 12 messengers, or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 charwoman, $540; 1 charwoman, $480; 1 charwoman, $300; 11 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $2,335,580.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I notice that there have been some changes in the phraseology in the item under consideration from that of last year, particularly as to the designation of assistant forest rangers to forest guards. I believe the explanation of the department is that it is the desire to take these officials out from the civil service.

Mr. LEVER. The explanation is this: The designation "forest guards" is substituted for the designation "assistant forest rangers" hitherto used to designate the 80 six-months places provided in the present appropriation. The change is made to accommodate these positions to the rules of the Civil Service Commission, the designation "forest ranger" being reserved for employees in the permanent force on the national forests, whereas the employment of men for periods not exceeding six months is temporary in character, and such men are not necessarily drawn from the civil-service register. The only effect of this change is to avoid the difficulties experienced this year in filling these positions on short notice during the fire season.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether under the old practice, in describing these men as assistant forest rangers, they were not obliged to take a civil-service examination.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; under the old designation that is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the effect of the change is to remove from the civil service appointees who were formerly on the classified list.

Mr. LEVER. The statement is:

The employment of the men for the purpose is not exceeding six months, and is temporary in character and not necessarily drawn from the civil service.

So my former statement is incorrect.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman positive about that?

Mr. LEVER. I am quoting from the hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. The language is ambiguous. I know it has been stated that they should be lifted from the civil service, and the argument is that they are only to be employed six months at a time, whereas the forest rangers proper are to be employed during the year. The language does not convince me that these assistant forest rangers are not obliged to take the civil-service examination.

Mr. LEVER. As I gather, the civil service has reserved for itself the title "forest rangers." Now, "assistant forest rangers" would be an encroachment on the other title, and the purpose of this redesignation is to get rid of the difficulty. That is the explanation given to us.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that if a person is employed only six months in each year it would not necessarily follow that they should be removed from the civil service.

Mr. LEVER. My idea is, from the recollection of the situation and reading the language, that the Forest Service has been under no necessity of taking these temporary men from the civil-service list.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Are not these what they call temporary appointments?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under existing law the temporary appointments are made with the consent of the Civil Service Commission and not necessarily from the eligible list.

Mr. LEVER. That is the language and the explanation—not necessarily drawn from the eligible list.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Postal Service sometimes has a large number of temporary employees, and they are drawn from the eligibles on the civil-service list. These forest guards are temporary in one sense, and in another sense they are permanent. They are temporary only for a portion of the year, but permanent because they are appointed for each succeeding year.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. According to the report of the department, they are employed six months each year.

Mr. LEVER. That might be true, but there are different seasons of the year, and they may be different individuals.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are employed for six months each succeeding year in the same forest reserve.

Mr. LEVER. But not necessarily the same individuals.

Mr. STAFFORD. That might be, if you had them on the permanent roll.

Mr. LEVER. If you had them on the permanent roll, that would be true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does this mean 80 forest guards at $1,100 each for six months?

Mr. LEVER. No; it means at the rate of $1,100.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would not there be confusion between the legitimate forest guards in the Indian Service and the regular forest rangers?

Mr. LEVER. I would not think so.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Washington addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order pending against the paragraph. I desire to inquire of the chairman in reference to the provision, "One chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, $2,500."

Mr. LEVER. What line and page?

Mr. FOWLER. Page 25, lines 14 and 15. I desire to know how that got into the bill.

Mr. LEVER. It has been in the bill ever since I have been handling it.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he is mistaken.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from South Carolina knows better than the gentleman from Illinois; it was in last year's bill.

Mr. FOWLER. That is true.

Mr. LEVER. Last year was the first year I handled the bill, so that my statement is correct after all, is it not?

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman has handled it twice, has he not?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not the gentleman been chairman of the committee during the preparation of two bills?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; this is my first term as chairman.

Mr. FOWLER. This is the gentleman's second bill?

Mr. LEVER. This is my second bill, and that is the reason why I am modest and shaky.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman is exceedingly modest because he is so strong.

Mr. LEVER. No; this has been in the bill ever since I have handled it.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought the gentleman meant since he had been on the committee. But in the bill for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, it does not carry this provision at all, and in that bill it is provided that all salaries fixed in this bill should be the fixed sum.

Mr. LEVER. That may be, and yet it would not make this subject to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I am asking the gentleman how it got in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. It came in the bill probably by a transfer from the lump-sum fund, but I can not recall it two years back; the gentleman ought to know that, with a bill of over 1,000 items in it.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman is so resourceful he would lead everyone to believe that he knows everything connected with the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I really can not tell the gentleman how it got into the bill. I can get some information for him, if he will give the Clerk a little time to run back over the hearings and find out. There is no change from last year's appropriation, and hence I have no information prepared.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I apprehend that the way this position and the salary attached thereto came into this bill and the former bill was through a lump-sum proposition wherein the head of a division is given the authority to employ men as far as necessary in his bureau. In consequence thereof he gave to some of his friends or some of the employees a very low salary and others he employed at a very extravagant salary, and then he came in with the extravagant salaries and asks the Committee on Agriculture, or any of the rest of the appropriating committees as far as that is concerned, that they be incorporated in the appropriation bill as fixed positions and fixed salaries in the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that would amount to a comedy if it were not for the fact that its effect upon the Treasury is a tragedy. Really I can not say whether this position is needed or not. One thing I do know is that so far as my investigations have been made that it is injected in here for the second time. Now, the rule of parliamentary procedure is that unless an office is fixed by organic law a point of order when interposed will be sustained against it. There is no law fixing this office in the organic statute. It will not do, Mr. Chairman, to say that this position came from the lump sum, and for that reason it found its way into this bill as a permanent office with a fixed salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order against it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair desire to hear from me on the point of order? The point of order is so badly taken I do not desire to take up the time of the committee to argue it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman whether there is any existing law authorizing this.

Mr. HAWLEY. Can not the committee understand what the point of order is—what line and page?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time the point of order was made.

Mr. LEVER. It is page 25, line 14, "one chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, $2,500." I want to call the attention of the Chair to section 169, which I have quoted here so many times:

Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

I find also, I will say to the Chair, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that this officer was transferred from the Division of Accounts last year. As I now recall, my recollection having been refreshed, he was transferred from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements to the Forest Service, which the gentleman will see in the hearings. But notwithstanding that, it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, if it be true that a power was conferred upon the Department of Agriculture to make a rearrangement of the different bureaus so that they might conform to the best interests of the Agricultural Department, then I grant that under the organic statute the Secretary of Agriculture might make such transfers as he deems proper not in violation of the statute. But the organic law creating the Department of Agriculture, which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has just read, does not serve his purpose, because it gives the heads of the department the right only to employ at such wages as they may deem proper sufficient force to carry out the duties of the various bureaus.

Now, they can do that this year under the organic law, and they can do it next year under the organic law, but that does not justify the Committee on Agriculture in placing it in this bill as a fixed office at a fixed salary. To say that the organic law creating the Department of Agriculture and conferring upon the chiefs of the various bureaus the right to employ a force to discharge the duties of the various bureaus justifies the creation of an office by Congress which has not heretofore been in existence is contrary to the legislative practice of Congress, and it can not be sustained, because the rule is that if a position has not been created by organic law, then it has no place in the bill and is subject to a point of order.

Now, if the gentleman is correct, Mr. Chairman, that this position had previously been authorized and inserted in another bureau and was transferred to the Bureau of Forestry for convenience, then, Mr. Chairman, I concede that that might have been done. As I recollect, Mr. Chairman, that position did not have its existence in the bill when the Committee on Agriculture secured the passage of a little paragraph of two and a half lines covering in all of the great irregularities of the past back from time immemorial or from the time the Department of Agriculture was established. I say if it did not have an existence at the time this little clause was passed 18 months ago for the purpose of covering in everything, as a hen hovereth over her brood in time of storm, then, Mr. Chairman, it ought not to have any place in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in the current law, upon the recommendation of the committee, acting under the provisions of the Dockery Act, which requires that the accounting in each bureau shall be done in that bureau, and in the interpretation of that act by the Department of Agriculture and by a later statute, also, the central division of accounts and disbursements was almost dismantled. I read from my report accompanying the current law last year:

There is a decrease in the above appropriation—

Referring to the Division of Accounts and Disbursements—

of $43,050, as indicated by the following table.

Then, I give the places transferred and the offices from which they were transferred, and in that list I find places transferred to other bureaus, among them the Forest Service—one chief, Office of Accounts, and fiscal agent, $2,500—so that this is nothing more nor less than a transfer under the present law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ADAIR). Let me ask the gentleman from South Carolina, Was this same item carried in the bill last year?

Mr. LEVER. It was—and in the year before that it was in another place in the Department of Agriculture—in the Division of Accounts and Disbursements.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ADAIR). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of opinion that under section 169 that has been read and under the privilege given the department to employ such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, laborers, and so forth, as are necessary the point of order is not well taken, and is therefore overruled. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for

the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed $650; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State, Territory, or the District of Alaska in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services, and other assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the committee has engrafted a new idea on this paragraph in extending the aid given to the forest force, not only in giving them supplies for medical treatment, but also giving them professional services. Here we have an item that has no limitation whatsoever on the amount that may be expended. The forest superintendents might go to the extreme of spending unlimited amounts of money for the care and treatment of employees injured in the Forest Service.

I am in sympathy, I may say to the gentleman, with the idea of providing medical services, so that in case of injury the amount of compensation that might be recovered will be reduced by immediate medical attention. But I will put this query to the gentleman: Whether or not he does not think there should be some limitation on the amount that might be expended in any one case by these subordinates in the field? Otherwise some subordinate official in a forest reserve might run up a very large bill for medical services, and it would be paid without the cognizance of any bureau chief, and certainly without that of the committee having this matter under their direct scrutiny.

Mr. LEVER. That matter was put in the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, at the urgent request of the Chief Forester, Mr. Graves. The cross-examination of Mr. Graves was made by Mr. HAWLEY. I read:

Mr. GRAVES. On page 79 there are a few changes in language. You will notice in the middle of the general introductory clause there are a few words added, "and for medical supplies and assistance." The words "for" and "assistance" are added.

Mr. HAWLEY. Should not that be "attendance"?

Mr. GRAVES. Last year we got the authority to purchase medical supplies, but we have not had authority to employ medical aid in case of injury to our men in fighting fires, and when we have——

Mr. HAWLEY (interposing). It says "assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans." Should not that word "assistance" be "attendance"? Do you not mean medical attendance?

Mr. GRAVES. The word "assistance" was designed to cover both the attendance and such expenses as, perhaps, for taking a man out. At the present time, if a man breaks his leg and is taken out from the forest to the nearest headquarters or town, it is impossible for the Government to pay the expense of transporting him.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GRAVES. And a number of instances have occurred where the forest officer or the ranger has had to pay $25 or $30 to transport men who have been injured, and a number of times they have had to pass the hat around for that kind of assistance.

Now, we have the authority here not only for providing him with medical supplies but the authority to pay some man who would take him out on a litter and take him to some place where he could be restored to health.

Mr. STAFFORD. No. The result of this amendment will be to pay for professional services so long as the injury continues. That is the way I read the report of the Chief Forester.

Mr. LEVER. That is not the way I read the statement of Mr. Graves. I have only the statement of Mr. Graves, which I have read to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is reading from the hearings?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the language found in the note to the draft copy of the supply bill, where it is much more specific as to the purpose intended by this amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Please read the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. It says:

Under this legislation the Forest Service appropriation becomes liable for the payment of salaries or wages of employees of the service injured while engaged in hazardous employment, during the period of disability, but not exceeding one year from the date of disability. From the frequently hazardous nature of their duties, the employees of the service are peculiarly liable to injuries, and it is in the interest not only of the humane treatment of employees injured in the course of their employment but also in the economy of expenditure in the public funds that such injuries be given adequate medical treatment immediately, thereby reducing the period of disability for which the Government becomes liable under the compensation act.

I said I was in sympathy with the purpose to be attained by this provision, but I put this query to the gentleman: Whether, with the unlimited thousands of dollars at the disposal of these subordinate officials in the field, there should not be in each instance some limitation placed as to the amount that may be expended for medical services in the treatment of an injured employee?

Mr. LEVER. Probably the gentleman is right; but how could we anticipate 12 months in advance just how much would be necessary? Suppose there should be a tremendous outbreak of forest fires, such as we had in 1910, when a great many men were injured and some killed, I believe. How could we anticipate that?

Mr. STAFFORD. You could readily anticipate it by saying that in no one instance should there be expended more than $200 or $300 in the medical treatment of any person injured by reason of accident incurred in the service.

Mr. LEVER. You would limit it as to the individual?

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course; so that these subordinate officials in the field, who have not any too great regard for Uncle Sam's Treasury in the matter of putting their hands into his pocket, would be limited in the expenditure which they could make.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is one of the leaders on that side of the House, and ought not to indulge in any such language.

Mr. STAFFORD. I respectfully disavow holding any such place.

Mr. LEVER. I do not believe the gentleman thinks that these men would put their hands in the Treasury to spend money unnecessarily.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do believe that they are not as careful in the expenditure of public money as they would be in the expenditure of their own funds.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know but what that is true of all Government officials, including Members of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. And that is why I believe there ought to be some limitation placed here.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to answer a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. MANN. This item, as I understand it, is only for immediate relief.

Mr. LEVER. For immediate relief, of course.

Mr. MANN. The language does not contemplate that the Government shall pay for the medical attention to somebody who is injured, except for the immediate relief.

Mr. LEVER. As I gather it from Mr. Graves's testimony and from his statement to me, it refers to a case of this kind: A man is hurt in the forest—in a forest fire, or otherwise. He is 10 miles away from headquarters. There is somebody in the neighborhood who has a horse and wagon; they pick him up and put him into the wagon and carry him to headquarters, and give him medical attention; but there is no authority in law to pay the man for his service in carrying the injured man to headquarters. That is all there seems to be to it.

Mr. MANN. As a matter of practice now, where we furnish medical supplies for immediate relief is that intended to cover hospital supplies for six months?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is a good one, if it will work out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct attention to the fact that the language recommended by the committee is not the language recommended by the department. This language is capable of a different construction to what the gentleman suggests. The language recommended by the department is as follows:

And for medical supplies and assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers—

And so forth. You will notice that the language recommended by the committee is:

And for medical supplies and services, and other assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers—

And so forth. Under the phraseology as recommended by the committee the department would have the right to pay for the entire expenses of medical treatment of any injured employee until he recovered.

Mr. LEVER. It says—

For immediate relief.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. LEVER. Well, but I can read. It says—

Necessary for immediate relief.

Mr. MANN. The comma ought to be stricken out.

Mr. STAFFORD. The comma is most potential in the authority which will be given to these officials.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman means the comma after the word "services"?

Mr. STAFFORD. After the word "services."

Mr. LEVER. If that will cure the situation, we have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not sure that would cure it.

Mr. MANN. If we should fix a limitation of $200 in each case, would not that be considered by the department as authority to expend that sum of money in each case?

Mr. LEVER. That would be my fear.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman ought to know that in every case where there happened to be a little injury they would not spend that much.

Mr. MANN. I am not speaking of a case where there is a little injury.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there was a little injury, then they would be subject to severe criticism if that amount was expended for that purpose.

Mr. LEVER. Here is a man who has his leg cut off. Would they put him in a hospital and keep him until he got well?

Mr. MANN. Or a man is badly burned in a forest fire.

Mr. LEVER. If gentlemen desire the comma to be stricken out, I will offer the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire why the committee did not adopt the language recommended by the department?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection is that the testimony before the committee upon a close examination of a witness by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] brought out the suggested change. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why do you want the words "other assistants" here? Does not the phraseology meet all conditions to say "medical supplies and services"?

Mr. MANN. You want to cover the case of medical supplies. There might be some doctor there who ought to be employed to protect the man who has been badly burned.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would come under "medical supplies."

Mr. MANN. The language in the bill is a little more explicit.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 20, strike out the comma after the word "services."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Before we go on, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that that comma was a typographical error.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, on page 28 it has been suggested that the words "or the District" should be stricken out It reads:

And the Secretary of Agriculture may in his discretion permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forest to be exported from the State, Territory, or the District of Alaska.

Alaska is a Territory and not a District, and the courts have so held.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that a point of order is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have not withdrawn the point of order. I reserved it, but I shall not make it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, line 8, after the word "State," insert the word "or," and, in line 9, page 28, after the word "Territory," strike out the words "or the District of Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I would like to ask in regard to the proposed medical attendance for the relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees. Does that mean peculiarly and distinctively the employees of the Forestry Service?

Mr. LEVER. In the field service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In case of a fire in a forest reserve, when all the citizens within reach are called upon, as they are under the law, to help fight the fire, they do not receive pay, and if they are burned or hurt, will they receive medical attendance under the wording of this bill?

Mr. LEVER. No; they do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. So the forest rangers are to have one more advantage over the people.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The testimony before the committee showed that persons temporarily employed to fight the fire would be given the assistance in case they were injured.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The chairman of the committee says no.

Mr. LEVER. Then I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. HAWLEY. If a large fire should break out in some forest, and in order to fight it an additional force of 20 men were employed to fight it, if any of them were injured during the work they would likewise be afforded the assistance provided here.

Mr. LEVER. I think they would then be employees and be entitled to compensation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But suppose 200 citizens are called upon and some of them are injured, and some even become temporarily insane; is there no medical attendance for them?

Mr. LEVER. We are taking care of people in the governmental employ, and we are not taking care of you or me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The law requires any person called upon to fight fire in the forest to comply regardless of pay.

Mr. LEVER. I did not know there was any such law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have to fight the fire with the rangers.

Mr. LEVER. Under what law are they compelled to fight the fire, National or State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not sure. Perhaps it is a State law. I think the rangers have the right to call upon a man to drop his work, wherever it is, and assist in fighting the fire.

Mr. LEVER. That must be a State law, for I know of no Federal law.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think if there is any such law it must be a State law and not a Federal law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How do the forest rangers get the authority to call upon men?

Mr. HAWLEY. They have authority from the central office to have additional assistance when a fire breaks out, but I do not think they can compel anybody to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The fire is fought in connection with the employees of great corporations, by the Weyerhaeusers, for instance, and they employ for the occasion all they can pick up.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman would not want the Government to pay for injuries to the employees of the large timber corporations, would he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No, indeed; and there is the great hole in the whole Forestry Service right now.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's suggestion would do that very thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It would not. The poor people who are trying to make homes in these far-off forest reserves, when they are taken from their homes and put on horses and made to ride 20 or 30 miles to assist the Government in fighting a fire and come back home with their clothes torn off and frequently out of their heads for a week, are not treated as well as these forest rangers who hibernate in the winter in $3,000 houses at the expense of the Government. And if you would take the time and look into it and find where the five and a half million dollars——

Mr. LEVER. But the gentleman would have some poor devil employed by the Federal Government who has been severely burned 15 miles away from home suffer agonies for lack of attention, medically and otherwise, because the gentleman is against the forest policy of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; the proposition that is now up to which I call attention is a proposition to pay these forest rangers and employees——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask for five more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, he wants to go further, because the suggestion, as I understand, is that he is willing to give to some farmer in the community who has been hurt in a forest fire——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Some poor unfortunate who has undertaken to make a living on the hard terms imposed by a beneficent Government.

Mr. LEVER. Now, the gentleman wants to take care of some "farmer," but some poor devil employed by the Weyerhauser Corporation, who happens to be hurt, and he would make a distinction as to him, and he would not give any attention at all——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The distinguished chairman of the committee is doing me an injustice.

Mr. LEVER. The corporation has not suffered from the fire, it is the poor devil who has fought the fire who happens to be an employee of that corporation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the chairman of the committee is doing me an injustice which I am sure he does not wish to do. I charge that the corporations have run over many of the forest reserves, that they assist in the management, and that they have cost the United States Government millions which should not have been expended. These poor men for whom I am speaking try to help the United States Government to fight fire. They are the men who have gone there to try to make homes; they want the locality to prosper, whereas these other men, these rangers and agents, who like to live in the open, have taken employment in the forest reserves, apparently for the purpose of harassing the settlers, and seem to enjoy making it hard for them to live. Only last fall on one of these reserves I met a man who was insane who had been taken by one of these rangers without one cent's pay and driven out into the front line of the fire and made to fight the fire. In that community are 10 to 15 forest employees living in a $3,000 headquarters building, whereas the law provides only for a $650 building.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the forest ranger has authority to go to any citizen of the United States and say to him that he must go and fight fire?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think he has authority to commandeer a citizen in the vicinity of the fire.

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish the gentleman would look it up and find out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. At any rate he does it. He assumes authority, anyhow. I assure you the power of a forest ranger is quite beyond the belief of half the men on this floor.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alamo National Forest, N. Mex., $3,578.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. If a Member wishes to inquire about the receipts and disbursements of these forest reserves, whether it should be done at the beginning of the reading of this paragraph, or after all the items have been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman can exercise his own judgment. At the end of any paragraph the gentleman has the right to take the floor for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. There are about 155 of these forest items. I think the Chair heretofore has ruled that each of these is a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is undoubtedly so.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me that a Member could tie up the House in a short session of Congress on these forest items if that ruling is to be maintained. It seems to me that it is practically in the same category as the statutory roll, and that all of these several units ought to be considered as one paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on the contrary, all these paragraphs have been greatly changed. There is a reduction in every single one of them, and some paragraphs providing funds for new forests, and that reduction leads to the proposition later on in the bill to banish the so-called 15 per cent distribution of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks each of these items is a separate paragraph, and will be so construed.

Mr. LEVER. All right.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I do not propose to discuss each one of these items, or any one except the one just read. I notice in the report of the Chief Forester in the hearings before the committee that the Forest Service last year contains a greater deficit than the year before. Is that correct?

Mr. LEVER. I will answer the gentleman I am not sure the gentleman is correct about that, but I will have it in a minute.

Mr. BOOHER. The reason I ask that question is I have been unable from the reading of the report and of the hearings to determine that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When the gentleman says "deficit" does he mean actual deficit from the receipts of the Forest Service?

Mr. BOOHER. I mean how much more, if anything, it cost the Government to run the Forest Service than the receipts.

Mr. LEVER. The total expenditures of the national forests are as follows:

The national forests.

SUMMARY.

[Area, 187,505,627.]

Total expenditures	$4,163,493.81
Outstanding liabilities Aug. 31	26,294.21
Total allotment	4,189,788.02
Distributed among the several subactivities approximately as follows:	
Ordinary current expenses	3,237,017.59
Land classification	38,670.45
Survey of land	20,799.93
Cooperative fire	3,717.16
Fire and other emergency	146,168.05
Planting on national forests	147,148.93
Forest management	2,209.65
Forest products	109.44
National range investigations	144.49
Improvements	343,687.57
Roads and trails for States	250,114.76
Total	4,189,788.02

RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES.

Timber sale	$1,243,195.37
Timber trespass	12,981.19
Timber settlement	39,927.11
Grazing	997,582.47
Grazing trespass	4,765.12
Fire trespass	7,949.89
Occupancy trespass	157.64
Special use	68,615.52
Water power	62,535.90
Total	2,437,710.21

Totaling $2,437,710.21, this makes a difference which the Government must bear of $1,750,000 in round numbers, but this does not include scientific, technical, and other lines of work carried on by the service. My recollection is that the receipts this year have slightly increased over those of last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What was the difference that the Government would bear?

Mr. LEVER. One million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars in round numbers for the individual forests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There must be something wrong in that, because we are appropriating $5,500,000.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman must understand that these receipts are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and become available for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us take this particular reserve—the Alamo. I read:

Alamo National Forest, N. Mex.

[Area, 941,790 acres.]

Total expenditures	$13,053.85
Outingstanding liabilities, Aug. 31	46.16
Total allotment	13,100.01
Distributed among the several subactivities approximately as follows:	
Ordinary current expenses	$12,308.30
Fire and other emergency	97.00
Improvements	507.71
Roads and trails for States	187.00
Total	13,100.01

RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES.

Timber sale	$1,937.69
Timber trespass	68.75
Grazing	5,077.47
Grazing trespass	22.50
Special use	1,132.10
Total	8,238.51

That forest reserve is 941,000 acres in the State of New Mexico. It seems to have received for roads and trails $187. I take it that is under the 10 per cent fund?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I presume so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then, the counties in which the reserve lies will receive out of the United States Treasury one-fourth of the income, which was $8,000, or $2,000 in round numbers; so that the State of New Mexico has received from

the income of that forest reserve, comprising almost a million acres, $2,000 in lieu of taxes, and $187 to be expended as the bureaucracy of the Forest Service may decide, for the building of trails in some other reserve. Is that correct?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, I will give him the figures. The area is 941,790 acres. The total expenditures were $13,053.85. The outstanding liabilities August 31 were $46.16. The total allotment was $13,100.01. This is distributed among the several subactivities approximately as follows: Ordinary current expenses, $12,308.30; fire and other emergency, $97; improvements, $507.71; roads and trails for States, $187; total, $13,100.01.

The receipts from national-forest resources were: Timber sales, $1,937.69; timber trespass, $68.75; grazing, $5,077.47; grazing trespass, $22.50; special use, $1,132.10; a total of $8,238.51.

That has been turned into the Treasury. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to some figures in the hearing, in the report of the Chief Forester, which do not agree with the figures he read a moment ago. The report shows a total cost of the Forest Service of $5,000,000——

Mr. LEVER. What page is that?

Mr. BOOHER. The Forestry Service hearings, page 284.

Mr. LEVER. That is last year's hearing. The gentleman is evidently reading from the wrong hearing.

Mr. BOOHER. You sent me the wrong hearing, then.

Mr. LEVER. I am reading from the official figures.

Mr. BOOHER. I have the wrong book, then. But anyhow there is a large deficit between the receipts for the Forest Service and the expenditures, and there is no reason why it should be so.

The Chief Forester says that if the Forest Service is put on a commercial basis, whatever that is, it will pay the expenses.

Now, why should it not be put on a commercial basis? I will read from the hearings of last year, because I presume what is stated there as to last year would be true this year. Outside the Forest Service pasture for sheep per head costs 3.6 cents per month. In the Forest Service the Government receives 1.4 cents per month per head.

Now, why that should be I can not understand, unless what they charge outside would be putting the Forest Reservation on a commercial basis. Can there be any objection to doing that? Let us see. I will read from the hearings of a year ago, as I have not those of this year. The chairman of the committee asked Mr. Potter, an employee—I think the chief assistant of the Forest Service—this question:

The CHAIRMAN. You have not stated, Mr. Potter, the fees received from grazing.

Mr. POTTER. About $1,000,000 is the total revenue from grazing at the present time.

Mr. REILLY. Why should not the same rule for the sale of timber be followed in the sale of forage—to the highest bidder?

Mr. POTTER. Mainly for the reason that it would work against the bona fide settler.

Mr. REILLY. I mean, after taking care of the bona fide settler, why should not the cattlemen who want the privilege of using the forest reserves pay for that the same as they do for timber?

Mr. POTTER. It is entirely a matter of policy, sir, as to what should be the basis of the charges. If it is desirable to increase the revenue and place the grazing on a commercial basis, that would be the proper way in which to do it.

Now, he was asked another question a little further on in this examination. He was asked this question by Mr. MAGUIRE, and he did not answer it, for what reason I do not know. I read:

Mr. MAGUIRE. Are there any bona fide reasons why the forage privilege sold to people not settlers should not be put on a commercial basis?

He did not answer that question at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course the gentleman knows that since those hearings were had those rates were increased?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Missouri is mistaken. It is increased 20 per cent for sheep and other animals.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is 25 per cent.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read from the statement furnished me by the Forest Service:

The fee charged for grazing cattle on the national forests is from 48 cents to 72 cents per head per annum, depending upon the advantages and locality of the forest, the average rate being 56 cents per head. If the range is to be used during only a portion of the year, the rate is reduced accordingly, but in no case below 20 cents per head for any short period. The fee charged for grazing sheep is 25 per cent of the cattle rate, or an average of 14 cents per head per annum. Fees for short periods are fixed the same as for cattle, with a minimum rate of 5 cents per head. The fees for grazing horses are 25 per cent more and the fees for grazing swine 40 per cent less than the cattle rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I read further:

These differences in ratio are all due to the relative amount of range required or degree of damage done in grazing the different kinds of stock.

Before the transfer of the national forests to the Department of Agriculture no charge was made for grazing; neither was any charge made for this use of the lands before their inclusion in the national forests.

So that only since the national forests have taken over these lands have there been any fees whatever.

Mr. BOOHER. But is it true also that before that time the Government was not paying out $5,000,000 a year to look after them?

Mr. LEVER. I read further:

Therefore in the initiation of a grazing fee it was based upon the proposition that on account of the special advantages enjoyed by the stockmen using the national forest ranges over those on the outside ranges and the protection given them it was no more than fair that a reasonable fee should be paid for the grazing privileges, which would go toward helping to meet the expense of administration and protection of the forests.

A study of the charges made for the use of other grazing lands of similar character and in private ownership indicates that the commercial value of the grazing privilege on such lands averaged about three times the fee charged by the Forest Service; but owing to the many restrictions which must be imposed upon the stockmen using the national forests and the desirability of reserving the right at all times to exclude live stock whenever it appears that damage is being done to the forest by their presence, or that such action is necessary in reference to areas which are to be reforested, it was deemed undesirable to place grazing on a commercial basis.

This is a frank statement from the Forest Service.

Heretofore the rate for grazing sheep has been 20 per cent of the rate for cattle, but owing to the adoption of better methods in handling sheep and the reduction in damage by this kind of stock the rate has been changed to 25 per cent of the rate for cattle, and the change will be made for the coming season by an increase of 20 per cent in the rate charged for cattle. This will produce an increase of about $100,000 in the total revenue.

The rate has been increased 20 per cent for cattle. This will produce an increase of about $100,000 in the total revenue. Now, if the gentleman will permit further, I will read him another statement prepared by the department:

The second largest source of revenue is from grazing. This is now nearly a million dollars. The number of stock will be gradually increased, but any large increase must come from requiring a larger fee for the use of the forest ranges. At present the average fee is 56 cents for cattle and horses and 14 cents for sheep. This rate of charge is less than the actual commercial value of the forage. The national forests were formerly grazed free of all charge. The establishment of range regulations over some 100,000,000 acres of land, involving some 9,000,000 head of stock, many of them owned by ranchers and small settlers, requiring restrictions to prevent injury to the forest and to conserve the range, necessitated at first a moderate charge only and not a full commercialization of the resource merely to secure revenue. Ultimately grazing receipts should be increased 50 to 100 per cent.

Mr. BOOHER. Ultimately—when does he mean?

Mr. LEVER. I asked the Forester that question, and his answer was that these fees should not be raised abruptly 50 or 100 per cent, but that there ought to be a gradual raise in the fees, as rangers more and more understand the best use of the range.

Mr. BOOHER. He is not giving the reason that he gave a year ago when he was before your committee. Here is what he said about it then:

Mr. TAYLOR. You would have better control, would you not, over these men that graze their cattle on these lands if you charged a very small fee? In other words, they would not be so anxious to get everything out of it?

Mr. POTTER. We get better cooperation from them, unquestionably, under the system of small fees than we would if we charged every cent the grass was worth.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is true.

Mr. BOOHER. If you give your property away to a man, of course, he will be more friendly than if you asked him a decent price for it, and that is the way they are proceeding here.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that is true at all.

Mr. BOOHER. I do.

Mr. LEVER. That is no contradiction of Mr. Graves's statement.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, let me see—

Mr. TAYLOR. If you charged every cent the grass was worth, they would want to graze it down close?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Now, do you mean to tell me that if you charged what it was worth an animal grazing on the range would eat the grass down

any closer than if you charged less than what it is worth? That may be good theory, but it will not work out in practice.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not understand the theory.

Mr. BOOHER. When you charge only one cent and a quarter a month for each sheep, will it eat less than when you charge 4.4 cents a month? I should like to see that breed of sheep, because it would be a very economical kind to raise in a country where pasturage is high. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELGESEN. If you were paying all the grass was worth, you would put more sheep on per acre, and they would crop the grass closer.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no. The Forest Service can provide by regulation how many sheep per acre can go on the range, just as you would provide how many sheep should be turned onto your land, if you rented your pasture, and that is what they do. The Secretary of Agriculture has said how many head of sheep and how many head of cattle and horses and other stock shall be pastured on these ranges. He has fixed the number, so that there is no danger from that source. It is simply a lack of business sense that permits the forest reserves of this country, year in and year out, to go on in this way, with the expenses growing and growing above what the receipts are. Nobody can give a reason why the forest reservations of this country should be a tax upon the people, while the forest reservations just across the line in Canada year after year turn a surplus into the treasury of the Dominion, as is shown by the reports. That is a fact, that they get from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 a year into the Dominion treasury from their forest reservations, according to their reports, and we have a deficit every year of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. That is the difference in management.

I can not see why these forest reserves should not be put on a commercial basis. I do not know what they mean by that; they can provide in their rules, just as the Secretary of Agriculture has done, that only so many head of sheep or so many head of cattle shall be pastured on these forest reserves. When that is done that is the end of it, and you are not putting so many sheep on it that they destroy all the grass or anything else. It is all a matter of regulation, and they ought to pay what the property is worth. The Government is keeping these forest rangers there to protect the property and the people using it, and they are not paying enough for the pasturage to pay the expenses of taking care of it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are just such regulations as the gentleman states limiting the number of animals permitted to graze on a particular piece of property.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to ask the gentleman if he can give any good reason why it should not be put on a commercial basis and a reasonable charge made and the money go into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The charges are made, and those who make them consider them reasonable, and the money collected is turned into the Treasury.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; the money is turned into the Treasury; but outside of the forest ranges there is the same class of forage and the same class of pasture land, and these same stockmen pay 4.4 cents for pasturing stock outside and inside only 1.4 cents. Why it is, I can not understand.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know what charges are made for the use of land outside the forest reserves, but I know there has been a good deal of discussion as to the rates of grazing inside of the forest reserves, and those making the charges for inside consider them reasonable and proper. I think the charges within the national forests are less than charged outside.

Mr. BOOHER. Just about one-third.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And at that a great many contend that the charges within the national forests are higher than they ought to be. That grows out of the fact that formerly they had the use of this grazing land without any charge at all, and the feeling had developed that they ought to be used without any charge.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, I understand that; in every new country that is true. When the owners began to fence up the lands for farming purposes cattlemen tore down the fences and claimed that their cattle had the right to run over the land. Now the Government has fenced the forest reserves. Let me read what was said in the hearings last year about this matter:

Mr. HAWLEY. Does that comparison include the value of the area for grazing purposes?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir. It only included lands on the outside which were grazed under comparatively the same conditions as the lands within the forests.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course, the comparison would be valuable if the same kind of forage grew on one acre as grew on another. If it did not, it would not be.

Mr. POTTER. These were comparisons with comparatively the same kind of land and used under practically the same conditions.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the same amount of forage per acre?

Mr. POTTER. Practically the same amount; yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. And in contiguous or neighboring territory?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir; in neighboring territory to the national forests. We found as to sheep that the average price per month which was being paid for outside land was 3.6 cents per head, as compared with a charge on the national forests of 1.4 cents per head per month. Compared with the use of practically the same kind of lands outside of the national forests and under practically the same conditions, the stockmen were voluntarily paying three times as much money for privately owned land as for the Government lands. So we concluded that our fees or charges were very reasonable.

Now, I call your attention to the fact that the same kind of land, with like pasturage and under the same conditions, outside of forest reserves rents for three times what it does inside the forest reserve.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the cattlemen and sheepmen pay 4 cents a head outside the forest reserve and only 1.4 cents inside of the Government forest reserves, I would like to know if the gentleman from Missouri can tell us how they determine which cattlemen or citizens shall have the benefit of the cent and a quarter pasturage while his neighbor pays 3 or 4 cents outside?

Mr. BOOHER. I can not tell; I only know what I read in the hearings, and they do not explain the situation fully.

Mr. McKENZIE. How do they avoid favoritism?

Mr. BOOHER. I suppose they divide it among the different cattle and sheep men.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] has just suggested to me a possible explanation for a part of this. He says that these privately owned ranges, or places where the sheep go, are fenced and leased for a long period, whereas in a forest reservation they require a herder to go out and take care of the sheep, and that it lasts for only one year. It requires men to attend the sheep or cattle, while in the other instance they are fenced, and it does not require the herders.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that Mr. Potter in testifying before the committee said that it was under practically the same conditions and the same kind of land.

Mr. COOPER. But one is fenced and the other is not.

Mr. BOOHER. There is nothing of that kind in Mr. Potter's statement.

Mr. COOPER. The private property is fenced and does not require as many men, under the circumstances, to take care of the sheep, and that seems to me a plausible statement.

Mr. BOOHER. But it was not given by the forester when he was before the committee.

I find in the hearings on this bill before the committee the following questions and answers, which do not bear out the statement that the outside range is fenced. On the contrary, it appears that the fencing is in the forest reserves.

Mr. HELGESEN. For how long do you lease the range?

Mr. POTTER. Only for one season.

Mr. HAWLEY. But a man who is satisfactory is sure of getting his lease the next year?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir; but under our regulations we provide for renewals unless it is necessary to reduce the range to stop damage or to provide for bona fide new settlers. As new settlers come in we take care of them by reducing the permits of the larger stockmen and issuing small permits to the settlers.

Mr. HELGESEN. It is absolutely on a license basis, then?

Mr. POTTER. Entirely on a license basis; yes, sir.

Mr. HELGESEN. And they are not allowed to fence it?

Mr. POTTER. They are allowed to construct such fences as are necessary for the control of the stock. That is one of the advantages that comes from grazing on the national forests over grazing on the outside range.

Mr. HELGESEN. How can they fence for one year?

Mr. POTTER. They fence on the one-year permit, because they feel sure of the renewal, except for these two conditions, and they are perfectly willing to go ahead and construct fences on that basis.

It seems to me that the statements of Mr. Potter quite fully answer the fencing proposition.

Mr. LEVER. The Forester could not tell all that he knew in the short time he was before the committee, and the gentleman from Missouri could not tell all he knew in five minutes.

Mr. BOOHER. No; great man as I am, I could not tell all I know in five minutes. But I know what I read in the hearings, and I know when the Forester was before the Committee on Agriculture he was there to give the committee all the information he had, and when he was asked the questions by Mr. SLOAN to explain that situation he ought to have explained it. He had the explanation that the gentleman from Wisconsin says that he has got from somebody else.

Mr. COOPER. Let alone what the Forester ought to have done, I gave the gentleman what the gentleman from Oregon

says is the explanation, and he is a practical observer of the actual conditions.

Mr. BOOHER. What the gentleman from Oregon says about the situation would appeal to me, but we ought to have got it out of the Forester in the hearings, where we could have read it. Because the Forester says it is practically the same for the same kind of land, that it has the same kind of forests. Now, this matter was discussed a year ago. Nobody ever thought it was because somebody had gone out and fenced a great lot of this outside land. I would like to know what kind of fence they put around it. We have great areas of land, large tracts; who put a fence around it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. No; I have not the time. The Forester said that if we put this on a commercial basis that we could get more money for it. Now, if you want to put it on a commercial basis——

Mr. COOPER. What does he mean by "commercial basis"?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not know.

Mr. COOPER. A self-sustaining basis?

Mr. BOOHER. I read what the Forester said about it.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman understand by "commercial basis"?

Mr. BOOHER. It is not what I understand, but it is what the Forester said and understands.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman understand the Forester understands?

Mr. BOOHER. If the gentleman wants me to state what the Forester meant, I am not going to try to do it.

Mr. COOPER. Is the gentleman arguing something that he does not understand himself?

Mr. BOOHER. No; I have got an idea of what commercial basis means. I would say, a paying basis.

Mr. COOPER. But the gentleman was defending the proposition, and now he can not define it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Just a word in conclusion; just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Missouri having one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, if the gentleman will let me conclude. I would like, for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin, to define what the Forester meant, and I respectfully suggest that he hunt up the Forester and get it from him. He has not told the committee what he meant. He has not told anybody that I know of. I think what he meant was that he would rather rent this for a cent and a quarter an acre than to get what it is worth. I am trying for the benefit of the committee to see whether or not we want him to put it on a commercial basis, which would mean a paying basis. I do not know of any other basis that the word "commercial" would mean. Now, are we to wait for this to go on from year to year, with greater taxes every year upon the people, or are we going to instruct him to put these reserves on a commercial basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make some observations about placing the forests on a paying basis.

Mr. BOOHER. Do not use the word "paying," but use the word "commercial," which the Forester used, and tell us what he meant, for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWLEY. I prefer to use the word "paying," if the gentleman will permit me. The great resource of the national forests is the timber on them. While at the present time the amount received from grazing, including grazing trespass, is a little over a million dollars, and the amount received from timber sales, with timber trespass added, is a little over a million and a quarter dollars, the amount received from grazing can not be very greatly increased, in my opinion. It may be in some places increased a little, but, generally speaking, the grazing is selling for about what it ought to sell for under conditions now existing. With a hundred million acres of land within the national forests, of which there are 16,000,000 acres in Oregon—and I use the State of Oregon as an illustration, because I am more familiar with conditions there, on which there are more than 200,000,000,000 feet of timber—the solution of the problem of making the reserves a source of income to the Government lies in increased sales of timber, and the Committee on Agriculture has been urging, ever since I have been a Member, that we should increase our timber sales. Years ago we used to sell in small quantities. The amount included in each sale was comparatively small, seldom exceeding a million feet. No lumberman, no logger, can do business on a million feet of timber, especially when they have to build logging roads and open up the way to get the timber out. The sales have increased in size recently until a hundred million feet or more may be sold in a body. Sales are increasing to some extent, but the cut does not yet equal the actual deterioration of the forest; that is, there is a great deal of timber overripe, deteriorating, and becoming worthless.

Now, the thing to do to put the Forest Service on a paying basis so it will be a resource instead of an expense to the Government is to give the Forest Service legislation, if necessary, to enable it to put the timber on the market in quantities sufficient to induce commercial operators to buy, build roads, and build mills. We should sell a large enough contract so that they can cut timber sufficient to make it commercially profitable, and then we will get back from the forest all that it is necessary to pay for its care, which will be a very small amount in proportion to sales, and yield a considerable net revenue. That is a solution of the problem—to put these forests on a basis of paying revenue instead of remaining as an expense to the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the amount of timber limited by law that they can cut on one of these reservations, or is it simply a regulation of the Forest Service?

Mr. HAWLEY. The amount to be included in any sale is determined by the service.

If we are going to put the Forest Service on a paying basis and make it a source of revenue, we must authorize large sales, and if legislation is necessary, enact the necessary legislation, so that the sales can be made in large enough bodies to pay the operators a reasonable return.

And no one will buy timber on a national forest and pay the Government price—and they usually get the highest stumpage price in the market around them—unless they have an opportunity on a reasonably well-managed property of making a profit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am much interested in the statement in advocacy of large sales on the part of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. The Forester in his report calls attention to four large tracts which contribute greatly to his aggregate of money received for sales of lumber. Then, he goes into a page of description and argument, advocating small sales, for, as I read this morning from his report, his policy is to encourage the nighborhood and small sales in order to secure some stable income.

Now, it may be a very fine policy to enter into those large contracts. It is perhaps a good policy, except where the Government goes into a deal covering from 15 to 25 years' time, with some subsidiary branch of a great railroad for the taking off of millions and millions of feet of timber, where the only payment is the payment of $8,000 or $10,000 down, the rest to be paid in installments years apart and at the conclusion of the contract, the Government receiving no interest whatever, and the bulk of the timber being paid for at the conclusion of that great length of time. That is what is making the trouble with the lumber and the timber business in the West.

Mr. Chairman, we are coming in a moment in this bill to the appropriation for the Kaibab National Forest Reserve, the one that has been attracting so much attention recently in the magazines, and of that the Chief Forester says:

> In addition to these contracts the sale of seven large areas was approved during the year, following an estimate and appraisal of their stumpage. The most important of these is a body of 1,000,000,000 feet of western yellow pine on the Kaibab National Forest, in northern Arizona, adjoining the northern rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. The exploitation of this area will require the construction of approximately 200 miles of railroad unless further developments in trunk-line construction in this region bring the forest nearer to rail facilities.

Then he goes into a discussion of a page or so in the hearings on the present bill, as to the advisability of building 200 miles of railroad to get to a great stand of inaccessible timber, and intimates, but will not say outright, that the Government should build the road. Then, if you will turn again to the annual report, you will find the Forest Department congratulating itself on two contracts for a million feet of sawed timber in the Olympic Forest, in the State of Washington, in the district which I have the honor to represent, which they say marks the opening of this vast forest.

Now they want to get these great sales in territories that can not be reached by roads, and at the same time if you will turn and examine this detailed statement of expenses for the

reserve and calculate the amount that is allowed or given for cutting out the roads and trails you will find that the sums are so small as to be of no consequence in connection with the work.

Now turn to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture made this year and read the hope that is held out to the settlers in the reserves. The Secretary of Agriculture says:

In regions where timber is the chief income-producing resource absence of demand for it often works a serious hardship upon those who have entered the region as the advance guard of civilization and are seeking, in the face of many difficulties, to establish homes. There are counties in which a sparse local population of pioneer settlers find themselves surrounded by a wilderness largely consisting of national forest land, which is almost idle so far as any form of present use in concerned. In other words, a great, if not the greatest of the potential sources of wealth in such counties, held in trust by the Government for the benefit of the public, not merely contributes nothing now to the upbuilding of the communities which will give value to the forests, but actually adds to the burden which these communities must assume.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for another five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object, but I am going to plead with gentlemen on both sides of the House and say that it is absolutely necessary that we pass this bill by Thursday night. I hope the gentleman will help me get along with the bill. I am not going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I had the intention of hurrying along, Mr. Chairman, but——

Mr. LEVER. I am not going to object to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes more——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But whenever a man wants to ram a Weyerhauser knife into me I resent it, and I propose to take up as much time as I choose this afternoon in the discussion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I was reading a moment ago from the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he points out how these large communities are suffering from the want of taxes. He says:

Were the forests private property they would pay their fair proportion of the cost of road development, public schools, and other public activities through taxation. The Government, unlike the private owner of timberland in such regions, is holding the timber, not in order to make a profit later by its advance in value, but in order to make it promote the public welfare. That it should be made to serve the local as well as the national public welfare has been definitely recognized in the provisions of law for the use of 35 per cent of all gross receipts from the forests for local public purposes.

To carry more fully into effect this already established principle a further step should be taken. It should not be necessary to wait until the period of hardest struggle is past before these public resources begin to assist local development. Before the national forests begin to yield large incomes, as well as after, they should be made to participate in the work of building up the country and giving value to all its resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have here a statement showing the cost of this service since 1906, up to and including 1913, showing a greatly increasing appropriation every year, and showing also an increasing income from products of the forest reserve—for grazing, trespass, fines, the sale of timber, and so on—absolutely out of proportion, however. The policy changes apparently every few years. It is impossible for anyone to keep track of the disbursements and expenditures and how the amounts go for roads and trails or for school funds; and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, ever since the year 1906, when this subject came up, there has been an insistent desire to hurry it along. Only a few pages of committee hearings are devoted to the Forest Service. In spite of the fact that this bill appropriates five and one-half million dollars, the entire hearings on the subject are comprised in not to exceed 10 pages, and those 10 pages might just as well be summed up in the oft-repeated words of the Forest Service itself—"administrative supervision." That is all there is to it. You have your chief, you have your supervisors in the seven districts, and their subofficers out in the reserve, commanding an array of rangers. Fifteen or eighteen men have charge of each of the larger reserves, exercising all of the authority of the courts of law, priding themselves every time they can soak a $10 fine on a poor ranger in a heavily forested country when his cow or his few sheep have gone over an imaginary line; scowling and spying around the country raking in these fines. And here is a great bureau of the Government, grown up to such a point that I boldly make the statement that this great Committee on Agriculture, composed of as intelligent men as there are in this House, and as hard-working men, do not pretend to follow or know anything about the forest reserves, which comprise, as I have just said, from one-third to more than one-half of all the territory in the 11 far Western States and much territory in other States as well.

There was limited general debate on this bill. I was unable to get any of the time, and the moment anyone who comes from the edge of one of these reserves undertakes to say something for the homesteaders who have gone in there and are struggling against conditions more onerous than ever existed in the pioneer days of Kentucky, Illinois, or Missouri; the moment a man dares to stand up and say a word about conditions there, some gentleman on this floor wants to know where the Weyerhaeusers come in in the matter.

Mr. LEVER. I wondered what the gentleman was referring to. This is the second time that he has used the word "Weyerhaeuser." I certainly did not thrust Weyerhaeuser at the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I sincerely hope the gentleman did not intend to do so, but I am getting a little tired of being asked about Weyerhaeuser every time I say a word in the hope of calling serious attention to many Forest Service inequalities. There are a large number of settlers as good citizens as there are anywhere in this country who have gone out into these reserves and settled, and it is in their behalf that I am making these remarks.

Mr. LEVER. I think my conduct on the floor of the House will compare favorably with that of the gentleman for courtesy. I should like to know what remark I have made to which the gentleman took umbrage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that he have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington have three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I said at the time that I hoped the gentleman did not mean any discourtesy by his question. These pioneers, farmers and ranchers, many of them do not see so much as $500 in cash in a whole year. I was asking if, when they were forced to go in and fight these fires, they should not have the same protection and the same surgical assistance that is being given to the rangers, and the gentleman asked me if I would have the Weyerhaeuser agents paid, or something of that kind.

Mr. LEVER. No; I did not; and the RECORD will show I did not. I said, suppose an employee of the Weyerhaeuser Co. should suffer the same trouble that the farmer suffered, that the gentleman spoke of, would the gentleman have that poor man suffer, 15 miles from headquarters—would the gentleman have him suffer the tortures of the burned because he happened to be employed by a corporation? That is what I said, and if that hurt the gentleman's feeling, I am sorry. I would not have the gentleman think I would wound his feelings knowingly for anything on earth. That is what I said, and the RECORD will show it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It seems a pity, however, that between the corporations on the one hand and the United States Government operating almost as a corporation on the other hand, when we get down to the real problem of these forest reserves so little attention should be paid to the settlers and pioneers out there. Gentlemen on the floor of this House, if you will read these hearings, where an appeal is made for the use of timber for ships, and in another place where an appeal is made for a Government railroad for 200 miles, and then if you will consider these ship-purchase bills and other bills of that kind that are coming before this Congress I leave it to the good judgment of gentlemen on this floor if it is not about time we gave some attention to the Forestry Service and its plans and what it is coming to.

Mr. LEVER. But the gentleman would not make that a reason for making an unkind reference to me when I have had no intention of being discourteous to anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I shall be very glad to withdraw that. I meant nothing of the kind, I am sure.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I move to strike out the paragraph for the purpose of getting a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I presume some of the criticism the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is making is

proper enough, but gentlemen of the House ought to know that every regulation made in relation to the national forests and their use is for the benefit, first, of the people who live and own property in the vicinity of the national forests. In the matter of the use of timber settlers are permitted to use a certain amount of the timber without any charge whatever. They are permitted to use timber, a further quantity of it, at a very moderate charge, less than is demanded of those who would buy in large quantities or for commercial purposes.

In the matter of the use of forests for grazing, the settler is permitted to use a certain amount of a forest reserve in the vicinity of his home without any charge whatever, and in every case the actual settler is preferred, when he wishes to use the grazing lands within the forests, to those who would use them for commercial purposes.

I wish to say that it must be a source of relief and satisfaction to the people of the United States to know that finally the authority of the United States is exerted for the protection of these great forests. We hear about men being arrested for trifling infractions of the law—some men who go on a forest reserve and take a little timber or a little wood. Possibly those cases actually arise, but I am inclined to believe that the gentlemen who tell them are drawing on their imagination in their effort to break down and discredit the Forestry Service. But rules and regulations are made to apply to everyone, and they must necessarily apply alike to the big man who would deliberately evade the law or knowingly violate it in important particulars and to the small man who might unintentionally violate it or transgress in some minor particular. I say it is encouraging, to say the least, for the people of the United States to know that their forests are being taken care of and that everybody, large or small, regardless of who or what he is or what his influence is or heretofore has been, is now amenable to the laws which Congress has enacted for the protection of our forests.

The gentleman from Washington has referred to the fact that timber for the use of the Government for the construction of railroads has been refused. It is true that it was suggested when this bill was in process of preparation that the officials whose duty it will be to construct the railroad in Alaska should be permitted to take from the national forests, without any charge whatever, all timber of all kinds that they might wish or need in the construction of that railroad.

That matter was fully considered and discussed by us in the meetings of the committee, and we determined to recommend to this House that no such provision should be put into this appropriation bill. Congress has appropriated money for construction of a railroad in Alaska, sufficient for the purchase of material of all kinds, and there is no reason why that money should not be used. The Forestry Service is attacked in this House every time a bill is presented more vehemently than any other provision of the appropriation bill. The Forestry Service is, and always has been, more savagely attacked than any other in the Department of Agriculture. The amount of money necessary to carry on the service is criticized, and if we were to permit the adoption of this provision, if we were to recommend the incorporation in this bill of a provision which would permit the timber from the forests to be taken for other branches of the Federal Government without payment, we would be recommending the use by other departments of the proceeds and the assets of the forest reserves while we were continuing all the expenses of the service, expenses which are so closely scrutinized and so severely criticized.

If the Forest Service is to be criticized, as in former years, for expenditures necessary to carry it on, then it is entitled to all the revenue that can possibly be secured and to all revenue arising from use or sale of its property, and any other branch of the Government wishing to use timber from the forest must pay for it, or wishing to avail itself of any privilege or advantage of use of the resources of the forests ought to be charged with the cost or value of the same. The Forest Service ought not to be criticized because of large appropriations made in its behalf and be denied the right to realize on its resources, or be asked to separate itself from its property without receiving payment or even being credited with the value of the property. That is the reason why the committee has refused to permit the incorporation in this bill of the provision for the use of the timber from the forests for the construction of railroads or other branches of the Government without payment to the Forest Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman go further and say that the money taken from the forest reserve instead of being turned into the Treasury should be used to develop the building of roads through the reserves?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. All revenue received for sale of timber and for use of forest reserves is turned into the Federal Treasury; a portion of the money so paid into the Treasury is turned back or paid to municipalities in which the forests are located. In my judgment, the percentage that the local treasuries are getting is more than they ought to have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that $1,000 out of 1,000,000 acres is too much for road building?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Oh, I do not know anything about particular cases; but I know, as a general proposition; or, I will say, that in my judgment as a general proposition, the percentage of receipts from the national forests turned back from the Federal Government into local treasuries is fully as much as, if not more than, they are entitled to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that out of 1,600,000 acres, $25.35 as one county's share of the 25 per cent of the sale in lieu of taxes is too much, and that the county which receives it is on the highway to prosperity?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman wants to open up that proposition and advocate an increase of percentage that the local treasuries shall receive, let him bring it before the House, and let it be fully discussed, and he will find out what the temper of the House is, and learn something that he does not now know about the administration of the forests and the use of the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We all confess to a great lack of knowledge about the whole proposition. In fact, I find in the hearings that the gentleman from Michigan asked seriously if the people are permitted to go on forest reserves to reside. Of course he asked it innocently and for information.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir; and I will say to the gentleman that I have myself favored the proposition as suggested that certain kinds of use and occupation by private parties should be permitted in the national forests, for certain uses of the national forests or in a way that will benefit the people or add to their comfort, and at the same time that will not injure or endanger the forests or interfere with their proper administration. I favor anything that can be done without injury to the forests or without departing from the policy of maintaining and protecting them. A bill of that kind, providing things of that kind of use, was up here on unanimous-consent day—a bill introduced by my friend from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], and I was heartily in favor of it, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], exercising his right, objected to it; and it was not considered, and the gentleman from Wisconsin will remember I talked with him afterwards and suggested to him that, in my opinion, he made a mistake, and I believe he now thinks he did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall only take but a minute or two to correct a misapprehension on the part of the committee, which may have been created by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER]. He directed his remarks to the proposition that the Forest Service did not charge as much for the grazing of animals within the forest reserves as was charged by private individuals or private corporations for private grazing lands, and wanted to know why the Government could not require the same payments as were required by private corporations. Now, there are certain sound fundamental reasons why the Government can not make the same charge as would be made by private corporations. In the first place, the Forest Service in the public interest is required to make certain restrictions which private corporations are not required to make. In the public interest the Forest Service can only make a lease for a single year, whereas private corporations make leases for a term of years. In the public interest the Forest Service limits the number of sheep which can be grazed on a definite area, a restriction which is not ordinarily made by a private corporation. In the third place, it makes certain restrictions with respect to the building of fences. It does not permit the building of fences except under certain conditions, while private corporations permit and, in fact, encourage the inclosure of certain areas. In my opinion, it will not be possible to put these grazing areas upon anything like a commercial basis until some satisfactory grazing law is enacted by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arkansas National Forest, Ark., $11,930.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Executive orders and proclamations setting forth and reserving certain lands in the State of Arkansas, known and designated as the Ozark National Forest and the Arkansas National Forest, as forest reserves be, and they are hereby, suspended, vacated, set aside, and held for naught as to all public lands now included in said reserves lying and being situated within the State of Arkansas, and that all public lands therein be, and they are hereby, excluded from said forest reserves and are hereby restored to the public domain, the same as though said orders and proclamations had not been issued.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman desires me to reserve it, I will do so. I thought probably he had in mind another amendment. Of course, the gentleman recognizes this is not in order.

Mr. WINGO. I think it is in order.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, it is true it is a change of existing law, but it plainly reduces the expenditures of the Government $11,930. As a matter of fact, it will reduce expenses and is plainly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion the point of order is well taken. Unless the gentleman can convince the Chair he is in error he will certainly sustain it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks clearly it is a change of existing law, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. The performance we have just witnessed shows how difficult it is to reach institutions like these forest reserves when once they get established. I have always been opposed to these two reserves, and have been doing everything in my power since I have been a Member of Congress to have them abolished, and I shall not be content with my efforts here to-day, but I intend to press this matter until these lands are thrown open to entry to the settlers and home builders of this country.

There is not a person who has an intelligent opinion with reference to these two reserves in my district, but admits that their creation was a mistake. No man of intelligence can go to these reserves and ride through them without being forced to the conclusion that the lands in them should not be included in a forest reserve, but should be left to the agricultural development of the settlers who desire to enter them under the homestead laws.

Originally, when they established these forest reserves, they included in them nearly everything. They included nearly one whole county, with the exception of 77,000 acres—one of the oldest counties in my State, where the Government owned altogether only 26 per cent of the lands of that county. Of course, that seemed ridiculous, and they early began eliminating lands, and have been eliminating ever since. Only last April they eliminated several tracts of land in those reserves.

I want to call your attention to the character of land which was eliminated. Why they were eliminated and why agricultural lands were retained I have not been able to ascertain.

The department admits that the lands that were eliminated were "chiefly mountainous." This description is stated in a letter signed by Mr. C. M. Bruce, under date of April 28, 1914. I will not read all of the letter, because I was calling for specific information as to how many acres in the elimination were located in two particular counties, and the letter furnished that specific information, and the writer added that they were "chiefly mountainous."

That was no information to me, because I knew personally the lands; and I say to you, gentlemen, that, possibly, with the exception of 12 per cent of the lands in those reserves, the lands that are left in those reserves are better agricultural lands than those that have been eliminated.

Why is there a forest reserve around the timber in that forest reserve? Does the Government own any timberland there? Only a part. Who owns it? Less than a year ago it was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture that those of us who were interested in those reserevs should meet him in a conference. We met, and he stated his reasons very frankly—and he was correct about it—and I think if the Secretary of Agriculture could ever ride through that forest he would abolish the whole thing. In a letter he says:

At present the alienated lands intermingle with the Government lands in these forests in such a way as to make it difficult to secure protection from fire and introduce permanent measures of forestry. The cleared lands are of low agricultural value and constitute small fields of from 5 to 50 acres. Roads and railroads are lacking, and it is difficult for the settlers to develop satisfactory community life.

To a man who is used to the character of land that the Secretary is used to, it is indeed of low market value. But he admits that the farmers have gone in there and have fields of from 5 to 50 acres. A few years ago it was 50 to 75 miles from a railroad, and yet many people preferred that land on which to make their homes, and they have made a success of farming, and they have developed farms there, and, in fact, in that area are some of the oldest settled lands in the Southwest. Some of the best men in the world have come out of those communities, reared upon just such hill farms as the Secretary regards of low value. Then the Secretary says:

Several questions arise. Can we not eliminate portions of the present forests which have a large proportion of agricultural lands, and which are difficult to administer, and exchange lands in the portion eliminated for lands held by settlers in the portion which it is proposed to retain? In the Ozark Forest, for instance, which has a gross area of 963,300 acres, it is suggested that we retain approximately 488,000 acres and that we increase the Government ownership of lands within this retention area by such exchange as I have indicated, and that the area retained be closed against further alienation.

He says, further:

A considerable part of the land in the area proposed to be retained is held by nonresidents and by the railroads.

The Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Carl Vrooman, writes me under date of October 9, 1914, as follows:

The Paul D. Rust Lumber Co. claims, approximately, 103,000 acres lying in a comparatively solid body on South Fourche Lefave and on Dry Fork. The Graham Lumber Co. owns between thirty and forty thousand acres on Mill and Johnson Creeks.

Then he goes on to say:

Within the proposed permanent boundary of the Ozark National Forest the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railroad claims lands in the following sections:
R. 17 W., T. 10 N., secs. 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35.
R. 18 W., T. 10 N., secs. 25 and 27.
R. 19 W., T. 10 N., secs. 7 and 9.
R. 20 W., T. 10 N., secs. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11.
R. 20 W., T. 11 N., secs. 17, 19, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35.
R. 21 W., T. 10 N., secs. 1, 3, 5, and 11.
R. 21 W., T. 11 N., secs. 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35.
R. 22 W., T. 11 N., secs. 1 and 13.
R. 22 W., T. 12 N., secs. 17 and 35.
R. 23 W., T. 12 N., sec. 13
And all of the odd sections within the proposed permanent boundary in Rs. 27 and 28 W., T. 12 N.
Of the balance of the patented lands lying in the proposed permanent boundary of the Ozark National Forest, it is estimated that approximately 50 per cent are held mainly for speculation, and mostly by alien nonresident owners.

Now let us see about some of the other holdings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question while he is there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WINGO. In just a moment. I want to conclude that statement. I want to quote from the letters themselves, so as to avoid error. After he has named these railroad holdings he says:

Of the balance of the patented lands——

Mr. FORDNEY. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he would permit me——

Mr. WINGO. With pleasure.

Mr. FORDNEY. Has the gentleman any knowledge of what portion of these private holdings were originally patented to the railroad company and then sold to private individuals? The odd sections of land were originally conveyed to the railroad company.

Mr. WINGO. I am referring to land held by the railroad company.

Mr. FORDNEY. But orginally a great portion of these lands now held in private ownership were patented to the railroad company and by them sold to private holders.

Mr. WINGO. That may be true, but I call attention to the fact that the railroad holds these grants, and in addition other lumber companies hold large amounts, one company 103,000 acres and another 40,000 acres, and of the balance in smaller

holdings about 50 per cent, so the Secretary says, are held for speculative purposes by nonresident owners.

Now, why should the Federal Government undertake to protect these holdings when it is not claimed by anyone that there are more than just a few small tracts of Government timbered land left in that territory? Is there any man who is in favor of conservation and who believes in the Forestry Service who will say that is a practical thing to do? It certainly is not.

Now, I started out on the theory that the department itself had recognized that there was something wrong there and that they were going to begin to eliminate it, and I have the assurance that a great deal of it will be eliminated, for the reasons that they themselves have given in this correspondence, because they are bound to recognize that these lands are more valuable for agricultural purposes than for anything else, and every time there has been a dispute out there between the Forest Service and an entryman, and a ranger has made an adverse report on the homestead application, when a special agent of the Land Department has been sent there, in a great majority of cases they reported that the land was valuable chiefly for agricultural purposes, and upheld the right of the entrymen to make the entry.

I have been through the Arkansas National Forest myself. I know the character of its lands. I know that measured from the standpoint of the Forestry Service itself it is ridiculous that the Arkansas National Forest is retained there, because all the principal holdings of valuable timber have long since passed into the hands of the railroads and these large lumber companies. Now, under the proposed elimination plan in my own congressional district they propose to eliminate a large amount. The area of Government land to be retained in one reserve was reported at 364,000 acres, and the private land to be retained in that area was 182,000 acres. Now, that is under a proposition that has not yet gone through, simply a tentative suggestion made by the department something like a year ago, which has not yet been acted upon.

Well, we will take some of the other items. In the Ozark National Forest, in my district, there in one county they proposed to retain Government land to the amount of 2,672 acres; private land now within the area to be retained, 8,177 acres. By reason of the investigations that have been made as to the agricultural character of these lands the Secretary of the Interior has tentatively suggested that certain eliminations should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. I do not want to take up any more time than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want to discuss this proposition?

Mr. WINGO. I have already asked for five minutes, and I have another amendment that I intend to offer.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it an amendment to the same paragraph?

Mr. WINGO. I will not object, if it is desired to close the debate.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. I object to closing the debate on this paragraph in 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. How much time does the gentleman want? I realize that the chairman of the committee is absolutely helpless in this matter on this item and others like it, but I must appeal to gentlemen to help the committee get along with the consideration of the bill as rapidly as possible. I will ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FLOYD] how much time he desires?

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. I do not know yet.

Mr. LEVER. I am perfectly willing to come to an agreement if gentlemen will suggest how much time they desire.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. A colleague of mine who is not in the room now desires some time, and I should not like to agree to a limitation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to closing debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto in 10 minutes?

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FLOYD] objects. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that it is hard to get the attention of the House upon a matter of this kind. I personally know the facts about which I am talking. I am not going to discuss the question of conservation or forest reserves. I know that these lands are valuable chiefly for agricultural purposes. Of course there is a little ridge here and there of which that is not true. In some of the counties there are small tracts here and there that may be said not to be fit for agricultural purposes, but wherever you find a piece of land in either one of these reserves that is not fit for agricultural purposes the timber on it is scrubby and not fit to be conserved. The Secretary says that the cleared lands of these small farmers are in tracts of from 5 to 50 acres. That may be true. It is true that this is in a part of Arkansas where the holdings of home owners are not large. I want to say frankly, without any feeling of ill will toward the plantation owner, because some of the best friends I have are the plantation owners in my district, but among the best citizens in my district, and that is true in every farming district in this country, are the small farmers, the small landowners who live upon small farms of from 40 to 120 acres, each with his little orchard, with his bottom fields, with his hill fields, and with his pasture. The great majority of them are hard-working, law-abiding, and God-fearing men, who pay their honest debts and to the best of their ability educate their children and train them up to make useful citizens. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if these lands are thrown open to settlement and taken up by men of this type, so that on each 40 of this reserve one of them will have his little home, more direct benefit will flow not only to Arkansas but to the entire country than can be derived from all of the forest reserves in this Nation.

The small farmer is the most valuable farmer from the standpoint of citizenship you have in this country. And because, forsooth, he has not been able to carve from the wilderness more than 50 acres of land in one field, can it be the part of wisdom to class such land as unfit for agricultural purposes and retain it in a forest reserve? That is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman. I have not the slightest doubt but that if you could ride through the Arkansas National Forest one day you would say that it is agricultural land, and that it is a farce as a forest reserve, and that it should never have been established.

Now, let us abolish these two reserves and thereby save the Government $77,000 a year. The farmers are willing to take it. I have here a statement of the number of people who it is claimed have evidenced a desire to enter the land within these reserves. There have been 2,580 men who thought that the land was sufficiently valuable for farming purposes, and for that reason desired to make homestead entries in them. These people were from Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, Colorado, New York, and nearly every State in the Union, and they would be glad to homestead these lands if permitted to do so. Even those who have been permitted to enter lands that the Forestry Service admitted were agricultural lands have had their applications held up and have been so annoyed and harassed as to defeat the objects of the homestead law, and their experiences prevent a great many others from entering who would like to do so.

Only to-day there came to my office a letter from a widow, who writes how she and her husband went down there in 1911 from one of the far Northern States to homestead a piece of land. She states how they filed on 160 acres, 6 miles from the county seat of the county; how they made improvements; and how, after considerable time had elapsed, their filing fee was sent back to them and they were told that the place was in the forest reserve. After considerable correspondence, they were finally advised that they would have to homestead under the act of June 11, 1906; that is, through the Forestry Bureau. Finally the husband died, after he had put in a year and a half's effort to procure land which he, as a farmer, knew was agricultural land. Finally his widow applied through the Forestry Bureau, and she writes that the forestry people came and surveyed 160 acres for her and that afterwards she was told she could only get 40 acres. She states that she lived alone the balance of the required time—one and a half years more—and finally she had to get out and seek work, and while she was gone her home burned and she lost everything she had. She spent several hundred dollars on the place and cleared and put under hog-tight fence a 16-acre field. She states that when she writes to the department she receives a stereotyped reply—that if she has complied with all of the homestead laws and lived on the land with a special use permit, no reason could be seen why she could not prove out at once on her second application, which she made a few months ago. But she only had a verbal permit from the forestry people, and this good woman wants to know if this verbal permit is sufficient. I do not know anything about the merits of this particular case, but I shall investigate it; but I do know that in the past my attention has been called to cases

where the records show such a systematic course of petty annoyance that I am convinced that instead of trying to carry out the spirit of the homestead laws of this country, everything was being done to drive proposed settlers away. There is barely a week passes but that some one calls my attention to some complaint that some bona fide settler has made.

I know the character of the land in the Arkansas National Forest, for I have driven through it, and I know that the great bulk of the timbered lands of these reserves are held by the railroads and large timber companies, and that practically all of the Government land that is left is suitable for agricultural purposes and is of the same type of land as that upon which a great many settlers in these very communities have made their homes during the past 50 years. It is true that they are not homes of wealth and splendor; it is true that the farms are not level, large plantations. They are just the typical hill farms to be expected in a country of that kind, and good men have tilled such lands, made their homes, brought up their children, and given to the country the development with which it is now blest.

Mr. Chairman, it is with such people and in such humble homes as these that real patriotism is born. Patriotism does not always abide in palaces, but can always be found in the woods and fields, by the lakes and streams, among the humble farmers, who love their homes and fear and serve their God and are devoted to their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were 16 ayes and 24 noes.

So the motion to strike out was rejected.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Executive orders and proclamations setting apart and reserving certain lands in the State of Arkansas, known and designated as the Arkansas National Forest and the Ozark National Forest, as forest reserves be, and they are hereby, suspended, vacated, set aside, and held for naught as to all public lands now included in said reserves which are suitable for agricultural and fruit-growing purposes, and said public lands be, and they are hereby, excluded from said forest reserves and are hereby restored to the public domain as though said orders and proclamations had not been issued.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between this amendment and the former amendment. The gist of this amendment is that all public lands within a public reserve suitable for agricultural purposes shall be eliminated from the reserve. That is the only way you are going to carry out the law now existing—by a special declaration by Congress eliminating the land from the reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman if he does that will he not change existing law?

Mr. WINGO. No; it would be enforcing existing law by eliminating certain lands which the law has said the officers shall eliminate and which they have not done and which they admit they have not done. It is not change of existing law; it is a declaration directing administrative officers in a specific case to enforce the general statute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I ask the gentleman a question? Of course the Forestry Service or no other Government official would be authorized to issue a patent for these lands or take any action which would take the title of the lands out of the United States without legal authority, which I take it this amendment tends to give, and if it does, then it changes the existing law.

Mr. WINGO. No; here are certain lands admitted to come within the act of 1906 with reference to the elimination of agricultural lands in the reserve. It is admitted that certain lands within those forest reserves are agricultural lands. All my amendment does is to change the present status; it does not change the present law, but the present status. They are not open to entry until the administrative officers charged by law with the duty formally by an order eliminate them and carry out the law. Then they are open to entry. Now they have not made that formal order. This is an instruction to the officers in certain specific cases to carry out the law.

Mr. LEVER. Does not the gentleman admit that under the act of 1906 the discretion of elimination is lodged in the Secretary of Agriculture? In this amendment it takes away from him that discretion, and therefore changes existing law.

Mr. WINGO. No; this does not do that; the discretion is to determine whether it is agricultural land. He has no discretion as to elimination, but once it is determined that the land is agricultural, under the act of 1906, it is his duty to eliminate it. This does not undertake to take away the discretion that requires him to exercise his discretion. It requires him to carry out the result that would naturally flow from the exercise of that discretion. He admits they are agricultural lands, and this says that you must eliminate the agricultural lands, because the law says that they shall be eliminated. It does not change the law. It says that you must carry out the law in a specific case.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair pleases, it seems to me from the very statement of the gentleman from Arkansas that this amendment is subject to a point of order. Under the act of 1906 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to investigate to ascertain if certain lands are agricultural or nonagricultural. When he has made a determination of that fact it is within his discretion to certify that fact to the proper authority. Now, by this amendment we undertake to take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion in the premises, and to that extent it is a change of existing law. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands, not having the act of 1906 before him, Congress gave to the executive officer the right to withdraw certain lands as forest reserves. Now he has that right under the law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to make an additional point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph. The paragraph merely appropriates money for a specific purpose. It is, as I understand it, to care for this particular forest, while the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas is a very different proposition.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, upon that point the public records show, to which I have called the attention of the committee, that if this law is carried out and my amendment adopted it will absolutely eliminate the expense embodied in this item. It will eliminate the amount carried there, because the public records show that the lands are admittedly and confessedly agricultural lands, a great majority of them, and it does not require any far-fetched conclusion that if you eliminate the greater part of the reserve you reduce the expense of the reserve from this item which is under consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not contend that to an item that has for its object the expense of maintenance it is germane to offer an amendment that required the opening of this land to settlement?

Mr. WINGO. It would if it reduced expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not at all. Under the Holman rule the amendment must be germane.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I read the law. On page 137 of the Laws Applicable to the Department of Agriculture we find the following:

That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, and he is hereby authorized, upon application or otherwise, to examine and ascertain as to the location and extent of lands within permanent or temporary forest reserves, except the following counties in the State of California, etc., which are chiefly valuable for agriculture, and which, in his opinion, may be occupied for agricultural purposes without injury to the forest reserves, and which are not needed for public purposes, and may list and describe the same by metes and bounds, or otherwise, and file the lists and descriptions with the Secretary of the Interior, with the request that the said lands be opened to entry in accordance with the provisions of the homestead laws and this act.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. The present law is permissive to the Secretary and invests a discretion in him.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. HAWLEY. The proposed amendment is mandatory and takes away his discretion of the former law, and therefore changes existing law.

Mr. LEVER. That is the position I have been taking all the while.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair was proceeding to state a while ago when interrupted. It seems to the Chair under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to withdraw such lands as in his opinion comes within the provisions of this statute. Now, the amendment provides that certain lands which in the opinion of some one else might be agricultural lands shall peremptorily be withdrawn or excluded from the withdrawal heretofore made by the Secretary of Agriculture——

Mr. LEVER. In his discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. In his discretion; and it appears to the Chair it would be a change of existing law. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally arose; and Mr. HENRY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, and Mr. GALLINGER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chelan National Forest, Wash., $6,260.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking if I may insert as a part of my remarks a statement in regard to the receipts and expenses of the Chelan National Forest, Wash., and all the other forest reserves of that State.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington to inserting the matter which is indicated? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Also a large table showing the receipts and expenditures in the entire service for the last five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object to the last request, does the gentleman mean to embody in the RECORD a statement of the expenditures of the forest reserves as included in this statement from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For several reserves in the State of Washington only.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Michigan National Forest, Mich., $3,081.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to say a word in reference to the Michigan National Forest. The statement has been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] that the amount received by the States for roads and trails is too large. I desire to call attention to the expenditures for the Michigan National Forest:

Michigan National Forest (Mich.).
[Area, 131,928 acres.]

Total expenditures	$9,014.29
Outstanding liabilities, Aug. 31	11.21
Total allotment	9,025.50
Distributed among the several subactivities approximately as follows:	
Ordinary current expenses	$6,437.23
Fire and other emergency	327.66
Planting on national forests	1,385.15
Improvements	873.15
Roads and trails for States	2.31
Total	9,025.50

RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES.

Timber sale	$113.20
Occupancy trespass	140.00
Special use	61.50
Total	314.70

There is one case where the tremendous amount of $2.31 is set aside for roads and trails in a reserve comprising 131,928 acres.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to ask the chairman a question. I have lived in the State of Michigan for 45 years and I have never heard of a national forest reserve in that State. Where is it?

Mr. LEVER. Which line is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Line 19, page 32, is an appropriation of $33,081 for Michigan National Forest.

Mr. LEVER. I really can not tell the gentleman what part of the State it is in.

Mr. FORDNEY. I never heard of one in the State before.

Mr. HAWLEY. It has 132,000 acres.

Mr. FORDNEY. That acreage extends from the middle of the southern peninsula of the State to the extreme northwestern part of the upper peninsula. There may be 40 acres of land here and there on a lake or fraction on a river bank, but there is not 160 acres of Government land in any single body in the State that is worth a penny an acre.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nebraska National Forest, Nebr., $5,897; and to extend the work to the Niobrara division thereof, $5,000: *Provided*, That from the nurseries on said forest the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish young trees free, so far as they may be spared, to residents of the territory covered by "An act increasing the area of homesteads in a portion of Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904, $10,897.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the character of the extension work on this Niobrara branch of the Nebraska National Forest?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to my friend from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], who is responsible for that item being put in the bill many years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was not aware of the fact that my very distinguished friend from Nebraska was a member of this committee.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. I am not. I thank the gentleman for his undeserved compliment.

Mr. STAFFORD. It could not be undeserved.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. There are two national forest reserves, or two units of the Nebraska National Forest Reserve, and they are a considerable distance apart—say 150 miles. Now, at one of them, the Halsey unit, a pine-tree nursery has been maintained for a number of years, and young pine trees have been furnished free from it to the settlers who will plant them.

The administration of the Department of Agriculture under the direction of Secretary Wilson adopted the idea suggested by me that it would be economical to allow settlers to grow trees, as this would result in a reduction in expenditures hitherto made in tree planting by Government employees; consequently for several years settlers have been planting the young trees furnished them by the Government nursery operated on the Halsey unit. This extension is for starting a nursery for the growing of pine trees on the Niobrara unit of the Nebraska National Forest Reserve, which is situated over 100 miles from the Halsey unit.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the purpose of the $5,000 appropriation to establish nurseries?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Yes. That is to establish a nursery, and it is to save the expense of transporting trees from the south part of the State, where the Halsey Reserve is, to the northern part of the State, where the Niobrara unit is.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the need of having two nurseries in the same State for the same purpose?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. The object is to grow trees in a nursery on the Niobrara Reserve whereby to reforest the area of 125,000 acres contained in the tract. Trees will be planted on this reserve and by settlers in the country tributary thereto the same as trees have been planted on the Halsey unit and its vicinity farther south.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that there has been no merchantable timber cut on this forest reserve within the memory of man?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. No; there was but little timber in the first place, but the purpose here is to experiment on the forestry of the sand hills of Nebraska, where mostly no trees were formerly grown.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it expected that there will ever be any merchantable timber grown there in the memory of man?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Yes; it is; and a fine showing is already being made. The indications are that it would be a very good long-time investment for the Government to make to grow trees in this way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish the gentleman would direct his remarks to the need of establishing another nursery on the sand hills and sand plains of Nebraska.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. I answer the gentleman from Wisconsin the economy will consist in the saving of transportation cost of shipping young trees from the south part to the north part of the State. The roundabout way the railways run makes the distance about 800 miles, besides having to haul a considerable distance from railway stations to the Niobrara unit. It will not cost as much to establish and maintain the nursery as it would to transport the trees from the other nursery—the trees that are demanded for planting on that reserve and in its vicinity by settlers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman tell me the maximum amount of expense that will be required to maintain this nursery?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. The expense will be very much reduced after the work has been started.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much money will be required to be invested to establish this additional nursery?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. The amount proposed will be adequate, it is believed, and that will erect buildings which will be permanent, and hereafter the expenses will only be for operating the nursery, and will be greatly reduced below the present amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I understand the maximum expense for this additional nursery in Nebraska will be $5,000 for the construction of buildings. Thereafter it will occasion how much expense to maintain it?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. It will be very much less, I apprehend. I think it will not be more than $2,000 after that, and even that amount may be reduced gradually after that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that they certainly need trees out in Nebraska. I have been out in these Western States and have seen some of the tree claims in the Dakotas. I am quite skeptical as to whether they will ever be able to grow trees there. But I take the word of the distinguished gentlemen, who has done so much to make a garden spot of the sand spots of Nebraska, and give him the benefit of the doubt, and therefore I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I notice that last year the planting of trees on the Nebraska National Forest cost $13,936. Does not the gentleman think that an additional nursery will cost that much more in the next bill?

Mr. KINKEAD of Nebraska. Oh, no. That cost was chiefly for buildings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will it not be necessary to place mosquito netting and wire netting there to protect seeds and trees?

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oregon National Forest, Oreg., $12,963.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Inasmuch as I am familiar with the Olympic Forest Reserve, it being one of the three large reserves in my district, I want to call the attention of the House to the expense and distributions in this reserve, where it is conceded there is the heaviest body of standing timber in all the United States:

Olympic National Forest, Wash.

[Area, 1,652,000 acres.]

Total expenditures	$29,485.65
Outstanding liabilities, Aug. 31	25.09
Total allotment	29,510.74
Distributed among the several subactivities approximately as follows:	
Ordinary current expenses	$23,864.73
Land classification	48.82
Fire and other emergency	463.28
Improvements	5,133.91
Total	29,510.74

RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES.

Timber sale	$8,659.67
Timber settlement	2,400.00
Grazing	6.50
Special use	521.00
Water power	86.00
Total	11,673.17

Mr. Chairman, in the arguments which are used in supporting this bill great stress is always laid on the sums to be spent for land classification—that is, the effort to find homestead and agricultural land which will be good for settlers. The promise has been made to the people in the Olympic Peninsula for a great many years that they would not only have roads through this great reserve, which obstructs travel in every direction, but that they would have land classification.

The area of this reserve is 1,600,000 acres, fully as large as some New England States. The expenditures last year on this great reserve were $29,400, divided as follows: Ordinary current expenses, $23,000—that is, for rangers and other agents in a little kingdom not subject to any of the laws or rules that govern the United States outside, not controlled by the governor of the State or the legislature of the State. For land classification, concerning which so much is said in the hearings, there was spent $48; for fire and other emergencies, $463. And I should like to say that this is one of the reserves where we do have forest fires; and in spite of the trails that are made by the rangers to shut off the fires, the flames often leap half or three-quarters of a mile and start a fire in an entirely different locality. It only cost the Government $463 for fire protection. For improvements the sum of $5,133 was expended. The improvements, I presume, consisted of erecting telephone lines, maintaining pack trains, and building ranger stations, lookout stations, and so on. Not one cent of the 10 per cent fund which is supposed to go to the State to be spent for roads and trails in the forest reserve was spent for that purpose in this reserve.

There was received from sales in that reserve $11,600. That reserve covers a good portion of four very large counties. Under the 25 per cent distribution the four counties would have received altogether not as much as $3,000 in lieu of what they might have received from settlers coming in and from the taxation of the property and the growth and improvement of a locality that has been choked and starved.

It is interesting to note that under this 10 per cent fund there have been constructed, according to a report issued a year or so ago, in the State of Idaho 9 miles of roads and 37 miles projected; in Montana, 59 miles constructed and 96 miles projected; in North Dakota, 1½ miles constructed and 1½ miles projected; in South Dakota, 14 miles constructed and 14 miles projected; in the State of Washington, with 11,000,000 acres in reserve, 1½ miles constructed and 13 miles projected; in Colorado, 40 miles constructed and 73 miles projected; in Kansas, 1¼ miles constructed and 4 miles projected; in Michigan, nothing; in Minnesota, 4 miles projected; in Nebraska, 1¼ miles constructed and 2¾ miles projected; in South Dakota, 5 miles constructed and 35 miles projected; in Wyoming, 13 miles constructed and 60 miles projected.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Can the gentleman tell why they have constructed no roads on the Michigan forest reserves?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I presume that with a forest reserve stretched over the entire two peninsulas the road would have to be pretty thin under the 10 per cent that is allowed for construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The general table of receipts and disbursements in the forest reserves to which I have referred follows:

Statement of receipts and disbursements, all national forests in the United States, fiscal year beginning July 1, 1905, and ending June 30, 1913.

	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913
National forests resources, net receipts	$763,533.01	$1,530,321.88	$1,788,255.19	$1,766,088.46	$2,041,181.22	$1,968,993.42	$2,109,256.91	$2,391,920.85
Paid to Arizona and New Mexico for schools					815.48	30,434.16	36,087.75	45,547.30
Paid to States for roads and schools, 10 and 25 per cent of receipts	75,510.19	152,665.04	444,379.00	438,702.81	505,990.87	474,767.64	506,603.58	586,593.39
Roads-and-trail fund							207,304.66	234,638.68
DISBURSEMENTS—FORESTS.								
Administration and use	573,437.82	918,287.27	1,622,413.17	2,093,781.68	2,791,275.62	3,395,730.77	2,933,453.55	3,057,546.38
Improvement	23,521.28	74,672.55	551,938.00	564,105.06	571,242.72	265,981.87	994,921.78	812,256.78
Fire	16,322.72	10,583.69	11,536.10	71,579.33	71,056.84	1,059,590.89	240,490.74	95,867.16
Total on national forests	613,281.82	1,003,543.51	2,185,887.27	2,729,466.07	3,433,575.18	4,721,303.53	4,168,866.07	3,965,670.32
Inspection, etc., properly chargeable as national-forest cost	343,717.85	534,875.80	932,379.94	825,429.96	917,577.37	888,217.86	1,048,961.44	1,049,961.44
Forest investigation	233,428.76	281,693.88	328,609.73	357,974.44	343,439.71	310,418.57	312,332.05	333,517.36
Total for Forest Service work	1,190,428.43	1,820,113.19	3,446,876.94	3,912,870.47	4,694,592.26	5,919,939.96	5,530,219.56	5,348,325.81

The Clerk read as follows:

Ozark National Forest, Ark., $9,030.

Mr. JACOWAY. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 33, by striking out line 18.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will detain the committee the full time allotted me under the rule, but I have some observations I want to submit. I believe that if the people living within the Ozark and Arkansas reserves were allowed to vote upon this proposition 90 per cent of them would cast their vote in favor of abolishing both of them. Ever since I have been a Member of this body I have been in favor of abolishing both the Arkansas and Ozark reserves. One of the first bills introduced by me had for its purpose the repealing of the law creating these reserves. At each succeeding Congress I have reintroduced this bill, hoping the committee would report it favorably. There have been extensive hearings on this question, as will be shown in House reports. These hearings were had May 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24, 1910. If Congress will avail itself of the opportunity to read these hearings, I feel morally sure it will be unerringly drawn to the conclusions I entertain on the question. At this time I wish to add that my colleague [Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas] on February 11, 1910, introduced a bill to abolish the Ozark National Forest. He has at each subsequent Congress introduced bills for the same purpose, and has a bill pending now before the Public Lands Committee. He and I have worked assiduously at all times for the abolishment of both the Arkansas and Ozark National Forests. It is my purpose to continue these efforts, fully believing that soon the Congress will give the people who have their homes in these reserves, and those that are desirous of homesteading, the relief that they seek and which justice demands they should have.

When I state to the committee that I am constantly in receipt of letters from people who reside within these reserves reciting how in the administering of the policy of the forestry reserves they are harrassed and bothered and various and sundry injustices done them, I state that which is in every sense absolutely true. I will not encumber the RECORD nor trespass upon the patience of the committee by giving at this time a detailed statement of all these many complaints; my time will not permit. However, for the benefit of the committee I ask to read a dramatic instance bearing directly upon this matter and that occurred in the United States Federal Court, at Fort Smith, Ark.:

A DRAMATIC INCIDENT IN FEDERAL COURT ROOM.

A dramatic incident occurred in Federal court Saturday in the trial of the case in which the Government sought to recover damages from Thomas A. Johnson on a charge of removing timber from a homestead. The incident was one in which every homesteader in the district and every person interested in the work of the Government foresters is interested.

Thomas A. and Thomas H. Johnson, of Scott County, were both tried during the week on the above charge; and the two cases have taken up the larger portion of the court sessions for the week. Saturday the defendant was on the stand and his counsel was asking questions for the purpose of getting before the jury the history of defendant's homestead.

When reprimanded by the court for the indirection of queries, the counsel reminded the court that he was following the line of questioning assumed for the Government, when Judge Rogers sharply questioned the methods of counsel on both sides, declaring that counsel had consumed the time of the court for a day and half when witnesses might have told all they knew of the case in two hours; and the judge then took the defendant in hand himself.

It was evident that the defendant, a young farmer, was innocent of any knowledge of court procedure and somewhat in awe of his surroundings; but the judge quickly relieved him of his embarrassment and within half an hour had drawn from the witness an outline of his homestead history.

It was a picture of a young man with wife and child, who started out to make a home for himself by taking up a homestead near the home of his father. Clearing the timber little by little; his young wife and baby living with him in the little log house from period to period as the work of putting the tract in cultivation progressed; frequently going back to father's for short periods; father helping son on the homestead and son helping father at other periods. Small crops and timber exchanged for fence wire, team, wagon, and implements from time to time as exigencies permitted, always with the aim to build a home. After a struggle extending through three years $200 was paid to the Government and $15 fees out of money the young man had accumulated, pieced out with loans borrowed from father.

After the judge had drawn out the whole story, the judge remarked: "That is all. Has the defense any further questions?" Defendant's counsel had the wisdom to see that the court had made his case for him and rested. The prosecuting attorney asked permission to cross-examine. After two or three questions on other points, the witness was asked:

"What did you do with the brush on the land from which timber was cleared?"

"I burned part of it and part is still in piles."

"Is it not a fact that you did not pile and burn any brush until ordered to do so by the forester?"

The witness replied that it was not; but the proceedings were instantly halted by the remark of the court:

"The forester had no business to give any such orders. Homesteaders are not in the keeping of the Forestry Department; nor has that department anything to do with this suit. It is in charge of this Federal court district."

The court also made some sharp comments upon forestry-law complications and the institution of "pestiferous suits" which harass families actually seeking to make homesteads, who are entitled to the support and assistance of the Government; and called attention to the fact, that in the case at bar, the evidence showed that the making of that homestead has been held up for nearly three years, while the Government has retained the $215 the defendant had paid, and has hampered the defendant in his effort to make a home for himself, wife, and child.

Both prosecution and defense quickly announced their case closed, and the court laconically remarked: "Go to the jury."

The jury were out of the room just four minutes when they returned a verdict of not guilty. In discharging the jury, the court said:

"I feel that it would not be doing justice, to close this case without saying that, for the Government to forfeit this man's homestead under the showing made here, would be a fraud and an injustice. This case should never have been brought into this court. It has cost the Government fully $1,000 in jury and witness costs and in holding back other cases with their witnesses for the larger part of the week; and if it had been brought on adequate grounds the Government could have won a verdict of not over $200. There should be distinction made between the man who deliberately undertakes to take advantage of the homestead laws for his own profit and the man who, with honest intention to secure a homestead, may technically violate some of the timber provisions. The Government is solemnly bound in duty to aid the man who, under the homestead law, seeks to establish a home, and not, instead, to harass and hamper him."

This pathetic story is but one of many.

I desire to further call the attention of the committee to the privately-owned lands in the Ozark Reserves. Every alternate section of land in the counties of Stone, Van Buren, Cleburne, Pope, Yell, and Perry is owned by the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., except in those instances where the railroad company has sold it. To give the committee fuller information I will read a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

OZARK NATIONAL FOREST.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 9, 1910.

SIR: In compliance with the provisions of House resolution of March 7, 1910, by direction of the President I have the honor to submit the following data relative to lands in the Ozark National Forest, in the State of Arkansas:

First. The number of acres of land embraced within the exterior boundaries of the said national forest—1,526,481.

Second. The total number of acres included therein, the title to which has passed to private ownership—779,615.

Third. The total number of acres held therein by claimants under the land laws—222,806.

Fourth. The number of entries, the acres included therein, within the said national forest which have been suspended, the reason for the suspension, and the sources from which adverse reports in regard to the entries have been received, and whether or not adverse reports of the Forestry Bureau have been accepted as sufficient to warrant the suspension of entries and, in any case, conclusive as to their invalidity; also for what length of time entries have been suspended or patents denied, and what steps have been taken to determine the rights of entrymen thus questioned:

	Number of entries.	Acres.
Total entries of all kinds affected by adverse reports since creation of forest	167	24,011
Entries in which final proof was never submitted by the entrymen	107	14,120
Entries in which proof was submitted and certificate withheld pending investigation	30	5,861
Entries in which proof was made and final or commutation certificate issued and patent withheld pending investigation	30	4,060
Total	167	24,011

Adverse reports by forest officers	149
Adverse reports by special agents of this department	18

Entries against which this department directed proceedings on adverse reports charging lack of residence or cultivation, or both, and in a few cases also that entries were made for timber, as follows:

Entries, no proof made	84
Proof made, certificate withheld	10
Final or commuted entries	19
Mineral applications (charge lands not mineral in character)	4
Total (16,641 acres)	117

Status of above 117 entries:

Canceled for failure to deny charges and apply for hearing	27
Relinquished by claimants	19
Pending report from local officers	60
Hearings had, local officers' decisions adverse to claimants	9
Decisions of local officers in favor of entrymen	2
Total (16,641 acres)	117

Entries against which no proceedings have been ordered, as follows:

Adverse reports—entries relinquished by claimants before proceedings were ordered	6
Adverse reports—entries canceled for failure to make proof within statutory period	7
Adverse reports—entries held for cancellation on face of proof—reports not invoked—pending register and receiver's reports	7
Canceled on face of proof, reports not invoked	3
Forest officers' adverse reports insufficient—pending further report from Forester	4

Final entries and entries in which proof has been made, awaiting report from Forester	11
Forest officers' adverse reports—to special agent to investigate	2
Adverse reports pending office action	9
Suit against patent	1
Total (7,400 acres)	50

The Forest Service has the privilege of investigating every entry within a national forest to determine its bona fides, if it so desires, and proofs and entries when protested by that bureau are held without action awaiting report. Its adverse reports are not conclusive as to the invalidity of an entry, but such reports are considered by this department in connection with the entry record, and if the reports are deemed sufficient action is taken against the entries thereon. If the reports are found insufficient, the Forester is so advised, and that favorable action will be taken upon his failure to submit sufficient adverse report.

The final and commutation proofs and the final and commutation entries above set forth in detail, 60 in all, were in nearly every case submitted and made during the years 1908 and 1909. One of the proofs was made in 1906 and 2 in 1907, while 1 of the final entries was made in 1905, 2 in 1906, and 6 in 1907. All of the final and commutation entries were protested within two years from the date of final certificates.

When proceedings are ordered against an entry on an adverse report, the entryman has 30 days within which to deny the charges and apply for a hearing. If he takes this action, a hearing is duly arranged, and if testimony is submitted a decision is rendered thereon by the local land officers. Their decision and the testimony are then transmitted to the General Land Office and decision rendered on the record. If the decision of the General Land Office is adverse to the entryman, he has the right of appeal to this department.

Fifth. "What information, if any, your department has of any applications which may have been made for listing any of said lands in said national forest as agricultural lands, what applications have been acted upon, and what granted or refused?"

The Department of Agriculture has, to date, filed with this department 48 lists of agricultural lands within the Ozark National Forest, listed under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat., 233), embracing a total of 1,670 acres. Forty-four of these lists have been opened to entry under said act, representing 1,550 acres. Action has not yet been taken on the remaining 4 lists.

The matter of the examination and listing of lands under said act is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and applications for such listing being made to the Forest Service, the Department of the Interior has no knowledge as to what percentage of such applications is allowed.

Sixth. The number of acres of lands in private ownership, the number covered by claims, and those unentered under the land laws embraced within the boundaries of said national forest lying within each of the counties of Stone, Van Buren, and Cleburne, in said State:

Stone County:	Acres.
Lands in private ownership	147,964
Lands covered by claims	60,621
Restored under act of June 11, 1906	60
Withdrawn for use of Forest Service as administrative site	160
Unappropriated lands	102,261
	311,066

Van Buren County:	
Lands in private ownership	152,281
Lands covered by claims	37,276
Restored under act of June 11, 1906	551
Withdrawn for use of Forest Service as administrative site	160
Unappropriated lands	85,272
	275,540

Cleburne County:	
Lands in private ownership	37,149
Lands covered by claims	17,673
Unappropriated lands	20,428
	75,250

Very respectfully,

R. A. BALLINGER, *Secretary.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

As stated in this letter, we find that these 1,526,481 acres of land are embraced within the exterior boundaries of the said national forests. Out of this number 779,615 acres have passed to private ownership. The total number of acres held therein by claimants under the land laws is 222,806 acres, leaving 524,060, or about one-third of the total number of acres embraced within the exterior boundaries of this national reserve.

Can it be honestly argued that the Federal Government has any jurisdiction over the land in these forest reserves the title to which has passed years since from the Government to private individuals? Yet in a most decided sense does the Forestry Bureau arrogate to itself this unwarranted function. Again, can it be contended that there is any duty devolving upon this Government to look after, protect, and conserve the many thousand acres of land owned by the Missouri Pacific Railway Co. even should it be the desire of this corporation? I think not. The people who live in these reserves and who know of these conditions, and who are as honest and reliable as any citizenship, in great numbers say that these are the conditions. To a most marked degree these facts are borne out in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior which I have just read.

In my judgment the administering of the forestry laws, in so far as Arkansas is concerned, is a dismal and signal failure, and the law should be repealed, and at once.

I feel that the bills seeking to abolish the Arkansas and Ozark Forest Reserves should be favorably reported and speedily passed by Congress.

ARE THE FOREST RESERVES IN ARKANSAS A BUSINESS PROPOSITION?

The agricultural bill as it passed the House in 1910 carried an appropriation of $32,960 for the Arkansas National Forest and $29,961 for the Ozark National Forest, making a total of $62,921 for maintaining these two reserves. As shown in a letter from Hon. Willis L. Moore, Acting Secretary Department of Agriculture, we find that the total income to the Government from these two reserves for the year 1910 was $6,346.98. Under the law 25 per cent of this amount went to the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the forest reserve is situated. In other words, out of the total revenues of $6,346.98, $1,586.74 went to the credit of these funds, leaving a balance of $4,760.34 to go to the credit of the Federal Government. In other words, it cost the taxpayers of this Government $58,160.66 more to maintain the Ozark and Arkansas Forest Reserves during the year 1910 than the Government secured from all sources in these reserves; that these forest reserves, in so far as Arkansas is concerned, are failures; that the Forest Service as administered in them is annoying and harrassing to the people residing therein. Attention is again called to the hearings bearing directly on this question.

I know many of the gentlemen connected with the Bureau of Forestry and regard them as high-grade men. I have no quarrel to wage with them on any of their policies as affecting any other portion of this country except in my own State. I am not informed as to conditions in other States. Neither, Mr. Chairman, would I stand upon this floor and try to impede, hobble, or trammel any movement that is of a progressive nature. I had rather lend my limited ability to the processes of construction than those of destruction.

In the counties of Franklin, Johnson, Pope, Yell, and Perry, as well as in other counties affected by these reserves, are a class of people just as honest, just as capable and progressive as will be found anywhere. These people are longing for the day to come when they can be rid of the rules, regulations, and laws governing these reserves. The honest homesteader wants to found his home upon these lands that are withheld from entry in so far as practical purposes are concerned. The State of Arkansas invites this class of citizenship to make their homes within her boundaries, and to this end this Government should repeal the law creating these reserves and to permit a development for Arkansas to move forward unimpeded that is now denied her as a result of creating these two reserves. Again, I say, I have no war to wage with the Forestry Bureau as to their general policy as it affects other portions of the country, but in so far as Arkansas is concerned I take serious issue with this department, and measure my words when I say that in so far as the Forestry Service as administered in the Ozark and Arkansas reserves is concerned it is a dismal and signal failure, and on account of the very nature of things can never be made otherwise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. JACOWAY) there were—ayes 22, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary miscellaneous expenses incident to the general administration of the Forest Service and of the national forests specified above.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of securing some information. We have now finished up the forest reserves, with some of which I am familiar. The amount appropriated here, as I understand, is the gross amount. How much revenue is there to offset that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there is.

Mr. GOULDEN. Approximately about how much?

Mr. LEVER. About $2,400,000. That goes into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. GOULDEN. And is therefore a credit against the amount appropriated to maintain the forest reserves?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Of what do those receipts consist; what produces them?

Mr. LEVER. Sales of timber and grazing mostly.

Mr. CARTER. Do any of the proceeds go to the different States?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; I think about 40 per cent, now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Twenty-five per cent is returned from the United States Treasury to each county, according to its proportion in the reserve where the sales have been

made, and then 10 per cent of the forest-reserve receipts is set aside for use in some reserve or reserves in the State where the money originated. This is controlled further by the forest-reserve management. There are eight reserves in my State. Ten per cent of all the receipts in all the reserves can be spent for roads in any one of the reserves.

I said a moment ago that in the Olympic Reserve of the sales amounting to $12,000 there would come back $3,000. I should have said that that $3,000 is to be divided among four counties.

Mr. CARTER. The four counties get how much back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the $12,000 sales from timber and grazing and fines, the four counties altogether, 25 per cent. That, of course, must be divided among the four counties. It will average about $900, but it may run down in the case of one county to $300 and in another up to $1,200. It runs down so small that it is not the equivalent that it should be for taxes, considering the enormous area involved.

Mr. CARTER. How much land is there in the reservation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One million six hundred thousand acres, and 33,000,000,000 feet of timber.

Mr. CARTER. So the four counties get $3,600?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; $3,000. And that must be divided among the four counties. The hope is held out every year that it is going to something worth while, but it never is.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Can the gentleman tell how much this particular forest service costs the county?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Year before last it cost the county $100,000 to build a trunk wagon road that the United States Government would not build, and I never have been able to figure out why the people in my State and county should have built it.

Mr. LENROOT. Was it built for the benefit of the reserve?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It was built for the benefit of a handful of settlers that went there before the reserve was established.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a table of school, road, and trail money for States from receipts' fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the matter referred to:

SCHOOL, ROAD, AND TRAIL MONEY FOR STATES FROM RECEIPTS' FUND.

Under existing law, besides the 10 per cent of the gross receipts which is made available for expenditure by the Secretary of Agriculture in building roads and trails for the benefit of the public, another 25 per cent of the gross receipts is paid over to the States by the Federal Government for the benefit of county schools and roads. The amounts available under both the 10 per cent and the 25 per cent clauses of the law during the fiscal year 1914 and the amounts that will be available during the current year from the receipts of that fiscal year are shown below:

Amounts available for States from forest receipts.

State.	School and road moneys paid to States, fiscal year 1914.	School and road moneys payable to States, fiscal year 1915.	Road and trail moneys expendable by Secretary of Agriculture, fiscal year 1914.	Road and trail moneys expendable by Secretary of Agriculture, fiscal year 1915.
Alaska	$13,126.08	$14,692.09	$5,250.43	$5,876.83
Arizona	74,659.49	63,398.34	29,863.80	25,359.34
Arkansas	12,854.02	9,983.19	5,141.61	3,993.28
California	74,541.55	65,001.84	29,816.62	26,000.73
Colorado	54,922.64	56,340.42	21,969.05	22,536.17
Florida	3,250.51	3,959.41	1,300.21	1,583.76
Georgia		108.44		43.37
Idaho	78,163.90	59,227.81	31,265.56	23,691.12
Kansas	1,148.84	1,207.72	459.53	483.09
Michigan	65.43	78.68	26.17	31.47
Minnesota	201.63	538.72	80.65	215.49
Montana	65,238.15	93,586.06	26,095.26	37,434.42
Nebraska	3,098.59	1,064.38	1,239.43	425.75
Nevada	16,556.89	16,894.47	6,622.76	6,757.79
New Mexico	31,284.15	33,743.49	12,514.99	13,497.40
North Carolina		206.31		82.52
North Dakota	67.72	74.83	27.09	29.93
Oklahoma	673.20	638.87	269.28	255.55
Oregon	55,950.72	61,606.59	22,380.29	24,642.60
South Dakota	11,436.70	14,469.77	4,574.68	5,787.91
Tennessee		20.64		8.26
Utah	34,902.14	37,601.15	13,960.85	15,040.46
Virginia		613.00		245.20
Washington	33,109.69	35,637.54	13,243.88	14,255.02
Wyoming	21,341.35	28,578.50	8,536.54	11,431.40
Total	586,593.39	599,272.17	234,638.68	239,708.06

The States of Arizona and New Mexico received additional shares of national forest receipts for their school funds on account of school lands included within national forests, as follows: To Arizona, paid in the fiscal year 1914 from the receipts of 1913, $36,226.65, and payable from the receipts of 1914, $30,730.58; to New Mexico, paid in the fiscal year 1914 from the receipts of 1913, $9,320.65, and payable from the receipts of 1914, $9,890.94.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the District of Columbia, $131,970.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday I submitted an inquiry to the chairman of the committee as to the amount of money that was to be paid from the lump-sum appropriation for this service here in Washington. According to the statement of expenditures in 1914 it amounted to $154,000. He stated that he did not have the data at hand, but would have it when the item was reached. Here we have a total in addition to the amount expended out of the lump-sum total of $498,000 for administration expenses; and then, just prior in the bill where you provide for draftsmen, photographers, artists, and so forth, an appropriation running into hundreds of thousands of dollars. I wish to inquire specifically if the chairman has the total amount appropriated or expended in any year for administration in connection with the Forestry Service?

Mr. LEVER. Heretofore that amount has been about 15 per cent of the total fund, exclusive of the statutory roll. Under the arrangement we have provided in this bill the total amount for administrative expenses will be the sum of these seven items under consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not catch the question. We have here a total appropriation of $498,000 for administration expenses.

Mr. LEVER. Where does the gentleman get that?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the total of the six or seven items just read. Then previous in the bill we appropriate I do not know how many hundred thousand dollars in detail for draftsmen, artists, and various other administrative purposes. In other parts of the bill we have expenses for administration out of the lump-sum appropriation. What I want to know is what is the total amount for administration expenses in this branch of the service, both in the city of Washington and outside.

Mr. LEVER. I thought I answered the gentleman correctly before when I stated that heretofore the amount had been about 15 per cent of the total appropriation, exclusive of the statutory roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the total expense from the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. I am sorry I can not give that to the gentleman offhand. I may be able to get it right here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman had it. Does it not approach a half a million dollars?

Mr. LEVER. The administrative expenses will probably be about 10 per cent of the total, running up to about $500,000, both in Washington and outside.

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman mean by administrative expenses?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I mean not salaries, not equipment, or things of that kind.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I have a statement here in which it says:

Under administrative expenses are included the supervisory work, inspection work, general expenses connected with the accounting, and general expenses connected with legal work outside of the salaries of the law officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER (continuing)—

In addition to that there is a considerable amount of concentration of routine processes at the headquarters, such as drafting and computing work, which are more cheaply done at one point than when scattered in the national forests. Those are what we include under the general heading of "General administration." This seems to be in the nature of supervisory work and accounting work.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the total amount of the appropriation for the Forest Service?

Mr. LEVER. About $5,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. What are the receipts?

Mr. LEVER. I have answered about $2,400,000.

Mr. MADDEN. So there is still a loss of about $3,000,000?

Mr. LEVER. The excess of expenditures over receipts, as I recall it, is about $1,750,000 for the forests themselves, exclusive of scientific, technical, and other lines of work.

Mr. MADDEN. If the appropriations are $5,000,000 and the receipts are about $2,400,000, there is $3,000,000 difference.

Mr. LEVER. One million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be the difference between the expenditures on the forests and the receipts from the forests.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not see how that is calculated, even with an appropriation of $4,800,000, and the amount only received is $2,400,000; that would still be $2,000,000 difference.

Mr. LEVER. The reporters took my book away, but I recall now that the $1,750,000 is the difference between receipts from the forests and the expenditures on the individual forests. The difference for the whole of the Forest Service is about $3,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that all the expense connected with the Forest Service—the kind of expense suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin? That is managerial expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was first trying to ascertain how much clerical expense was involved in the administration of the Forest Service here in Washington and in the field. I find here in the statement of expenditures for 1914 a total of $998,000, nearly a million dollars, for salaries which I assume to be for clerical expenses. I do not know whether it is clerical or not.

Mr. LEVER. It would be clerical expenses both in Washington and outside and at the different headquarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that amount there is an item of $154,000 paid out of the lump-sum appropriation for salaries here in Washington. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity of allowing such a large amount as that to be paid out of the lump-sum appropriation rather than placing these clerks on the statutory rolls when they are employed here in Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I assume, as I have answered several times on this proposition, that those men are carried on the lump-sum roll because they consider them more nearly scientific men, or temporary in their tenure, than clerks and permanent in their tenure.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to anticipate consideration of the next item, which is directly related to what we are now considering. I wish to inquire, Why is it necessary, in view of the appropriations for administrative expenses for these respective districts, to have the total appropriation interchangeable to the extent of 10 per cent, so that there could be at least 10 per cent of nearly $2,000,000 applied to any one item?

Mr. LEVER. That is an important question, and I am very glad to answer the gentleman. The gentleman knows heretofore 15 per cent of the total general expenses for the Forest Service has been available for administrative purposes. The committee thought that that was an unwise provision, and that they had better set out the administrative expenses in detail in this bill, which we have done. Now, the Forest Service urged upon the committee the necessity of having some leeway in the appropriation for these 155 various units, and this 10 per cent is to give them that leeway. For instance, it might be impossible for the Forest Service, in making up these estimates, to anticipate the exact amount necessary for fire protection or some other unforeseen emergency, and this 10 per cent is put in there to meet that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think the provision reported by the committee carries out that purpose. I do not care about anticipating, but the gentleman will see that the discretion given to the department has been an interchangeable item of 10 per cent on the total appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Let us read the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. It reads:

Provided further, That the amounts so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

That is on line 3, page 37. That would enable the Forest Service to appropriate 10 per cent of $1,811,000 to any one item in the bill, and would not restrict their discretion in any way whatsoever.

Mr. LEVER. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; I am not mistaken. I think that is the only construction which that language will bear. If you strike out the word "all" and say "of the amounts appropriated for each item herein," then you would restrict them to 10 per cent of those items. This limitation does not restrict them at all; in fact, it gives them greater liberty than they had before.

Mr. LEVER. In order to allay the apprehensions of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I might be willing to accede to his proposition.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HAWLEY rose.

Mr. GARNER. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is recognized.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have a remark to make, but I will yield until the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has concluded.

Mr. GARNER. I was trying, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, to elicit from the chairman of the committee a general idea as to the possibility of reducing the expenditures for the forest reserve. I have noticed some criticisms of that in the magazines and newspapers. I am free to say that I know very little about it; but it has occurred to me that there ought to be some method by which the permanent expenditures in taking care of the forest reserves of this country shall be reduced. Therefore, while I am not making criticism as to the expenditure of the money, I would like to see the expenditures reduced.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that it is my opinion that for the present there is not any great possibility of reducing the expenditures, but there is a strong probability of increasing the revenues from the Forest Service. I believe that as soon as the lumber market gets into good condition it will be safe to say that we can increase our revenues from the national forests anywhere from $250,000 to $400,000 a year. I confidently believe that, although that is entering the field of prophecy, and I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from South Carolina to say that the lumber business is in bad condition?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In spite of the reports of Secretary Redfield to the contrary?

Mr. LEVER. I am not talking about the reports of Secretary Redfield. I think the gentleman knows why, and I think I know why the lumber market is not now in good condition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman believe that with the building of good roads and automobile roads in the forest reserves in the Appalachian and eastern mountain ranges there will be any prospect whatever of reducing the cost of the Forest Service?

Mr. LEVER. I am not familiar with the Appalachian forests; but I would like to know from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE] or the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], who are on the Forestry Commission, if it is true that any automobile roads are being built on the national forests that we recently acquired under the Weeks law?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not that I know of. There was one constructed on a forest in North Carolina when we obtained it, and there were some automobile roads on other portions of land that we obtained, but they were on the land when we obtained it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then these magazine pictures showing forest rangers working on good roads are not true pictures?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say to the gentleman that they maintain roads and construct wagon roads for the purpose of hauling supplies in to the ranger stations and for the purpose of opening up the forests, to give means for going quickly from one forest to another for the administration of the service; but there are no automobile roads for the purpose of ordinary travel.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One thing more. The Forest Service puts in its tabulated statement of receipts and disbursements an item for "administration and use," beginning with $573,000 in 1906 and increasing year by year until it was more than $3,000,000 for the year 1913.

Mr. LEVER. The expenses of the Forest Service are set forth in detail in the papers I hold in my hand. This is the statement of expenditures. The committee has not been acting entirely without information on that subject. Here are detailed statements by districts, covering page after page, with the utmost detail.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have presented a consolidated statement of receipts and expenditures, furnished by the Forest Service.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to get a candle some night and make a light on it and read about these expenditures for the Forest Service. That is what I am directly interested in as a Member

of the House. Can the gentleman tell me where I can get this information? I will procure the candle.

A MEMBER. Let it be a big one. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. I want to know whether we are conserving public jobs or conserving the Government property.

Mr. LEVER. We are conserving 160,000,000 acres of Government property.

Mr. HAWLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment that is pending. That is, to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well. I will wait until the gentleman from Oregon is through. Then I want to ask some questions.

Mr. HAWLEY. Questions were asked about the proportion of the appropriation which will be expended for personal services in connection with the Forest Service as compared with the amount expended for other services out of the five million and one-half dollars appropriated for this service. The amount for salaries in the city of Washington, for salaries at the headquarters of the several forest districts, for salaries of forest rangers, timber cruisers, and those in charge of timber sales, and for all work of that kind in each forest amounts to the greater proportion by far of the entire appropriation. The amounts for rent in Washington and equipment and for rent in the several national forest districts, and for the equipment of offices and forest rangers' cabins, and for field equipment constitute a very small proportion of the entire amount appropriated by the bill for this service. The amount of money appropriated by the bill used for the payment of personal services in carrying out the law for the care and maintenance and protection of national forests is by far the greater part of the appropriation for this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give some definite figures as to the amount of money appropriated in this bill for the Forest Service that is used exclusively for clerical services here in Washington and in the field, both that paid out of the statutory roll and out of the lump-sum appropriation? Does it not aggregate nearly a million dollars?

Mr. HAWLEY. For the payment of expenses here in Washington?

Mr. STAFFORD. For clerical services connected with the administration of the Forestry Service, in Washington and in the field, including those paid out of lump sums as well as those on the statutory roll.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me see if I have the gentleman's question straight. The gentleman wishes to know the amount paid for clerical services in Washington and in the field?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have not that information at hand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does it not approximate a million dollars?

Mr. HAWLEY. For clerical services?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; for the cost of administration, of a clerical nature.

Mr. HAWLEY. It would be just a guess, which I prefer not to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] reserved a point of order. Does the gentleman desire to make it?

Mr. FOWLER. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the preservation of our forests, but I do want to make a few observations in the way of criticism upon the plan set forth in this bill, not at all criticizing the members of the committee, because the matter is presented to them by men in charge of the Bureau of Forestry in such a way that they can not contradict it.

A few years ago, when Senator Carter of Montana was a Member of the Senate, an additional appropriation was asked for by the Bureau of Forestry for that department, and a committee was appointed, of which, as I now remember, Mr. Carter was the chairman. I have read the report of that committee. The committee was requested to make an investigation as to how the money appropriated for that department from the time of its origin up to that date had been expended. As I remember the report now, $25,200,000 had been appropriated for that bureau up to that time, and of that sum $18,000,000 had been spent for advertising and only $7,200,000 for actual services, or money paid out for the employment of foresters and office work. Out of a total of $25,200,000 the sum of $18,000,000 had been spent for advertising, when Gifford Pinchot was chief of that department.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the character of the advertising?

Mr. FORDNEY. The report stated that it was chiefly to further the interests of Gifford Pinchot as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Here is an appropriation of $5,553,000 for the maintenance of our forests, for the employment of men in the field and in the office.

I want to offer this as a suggestion, because I know what I am talking about: One hundred dollars per acre will purchase to-day the choicest forest that stands in either of the five great forest States of this country—Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California, where, according to the estimates of the Government, 54 per cent of all the timber in the United States stands. One hundred dollars per acre will purchase the very choicest of the forests in either of those States; and if this money, instead of being spent in this extravagant way for the maintenance of our forests were appropriated for the purchase of those lands, 700,000 acres of land could be purchased for that sum of money, land containing from 30,000,000,000 to 40,000,000,000 feet of the choicest timber that stands under God's sun.

I want to criticize this manner of spending the public money in the employment of great armies of men—doing what? I know some of the foresters employed by the Government to-day, and, in my opinion, if some of them were set down in the middle of a forest they would have a mighty hard task to find their way out except on a trail. They know but little about estimating timber. To-day the Government is offering timber for sale, and I once asked Gifford Pinchot, who was then Chief of the Bureau of Forestry, "Why are you offering for sale the timber of the Government in forest reserves? Why are you disposing of the timber? What is the purpose of a reserve?" He said, "Why, my dear sir, the Congress of the United States will not appropriate a sufficient sum of money for us to employ men in the field, and we are selling timber to get money for that purpose."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I know very little about the Forestry Service, and I am afraid that there is no one on the floor who knows much more about it than I do; but I do know that we are losing $3,100,000 every year in the management of the service.

Some five or six years ago, when this service was in its infancy, we were told that at the end of three years the Government would be receiving an income largely in excess of the expenditures; but every year the loss grows greater. Now, it seems to me that there ought not to be any reluctance on the part of the House to do the thing that is necessary to obtain the information as to why this service is being so extravagantly managed. It is not more extravagantly managed now than it was under previous administrations, I feel sure of that; but it is extravagantly managed, and the men who manage it either do not know or will not tell why it is being so extravagantly managed. That is obvious, for the great Committee on Agriculture, in charge of the bill, is unable to tell anybody why so large an amount of money is being expended in the service and so small an amount received in return. It seems to me that there is only one way to get the information that we have tried in vain to get, and that is to appoint a committee of the House whose sole duty it shall be to investigate the conduct of this Forest Service. The appointment of such a committee could be no reflection upon anyone. The information ought to be obtained. The heads of the departments and bureaus connected with the service ought to be put on the witness stand by some committee of the House authorized to ask them questions, and they should be kept upon the witness stand long enough to compel them to answer all the questions that are necessary to obtain the information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have we not a committee on expenditures in each one of the various departments, which committee has exclusive jurisdiction to investigate into the expenditures of that department?

Mr. MADDEN. We have.

Mr. STAFFORD. And does not the gentleman recall that in a former Congress, when Mr. Charles E. Littlefield was a Member of this House and chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, he made a very exhaustive investigation of that department, although at that time the Forest Service was not under the Agricultural Department?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department could employ its

time very profitably in ascertaining why we are running behind so much every year in conducting the Forestry Service. This committee could do no better service to the American people than to obtain the information which will give everybody who wants to read an intelligent conception of how this Forestry Service is being conducted, and why it is that instead of making money as we said we would we are losing $3,000,000 every year.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not hold any brief for Gifford Pinchot. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, one of the largest lumbermen in the country, I think, made his talk on the assumption that Mr. Pinchot was the National Forester. As a matter of fact, he has not been in the Forestry Service for the last three or four years.

The present Forester was appointed by President Taft. I do not know his politics, and I do not care what it is. But I do believe that he is not only an honest man but that he is a capable man.

It is a very easy matter, I will say to my friend from Illinois, who has just taken his seat, to leisurely stroll in on the floor occasionally during the day and accuse members of the committee of having no information about the work at hand. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman can not yield at present; I want to continue my statement. With the exception of the chairman of this committee, I believe that the membership of the Agricultural Committee contains as highly intellectual men as the average of this body. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Higher than that.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois says "higher," and as chairman of the committee, excepting myself, I accept his amendment. [Laughter.] I am sure that there is no committee in this House, certainly not the committee of which the gentleman from Illinois is a member, that devotes the time to looking into the details of its business more than does the Committee on Agriculture. But I would have him understand that this bill contains—I have not counted them—a thousand different items carrying appropriations ranging from $500 to $5,000,000, and it is almost a physical impossibility for any man, no matter how bright he may be, no matter how earnest he may have been in gathering facts, to anticipate every question, sensible and not sensible, that may be asked on the floor of the House by men who have never read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, by men who are not interested enough to read the reports of the various bureau chiefs—and from that the gentleman from Illinois could have got the information he was seeking a moment ago, and which if I had not loaned my report I could have given him—these gentlemen who have not taken the time to read the bill even, these gentlemen who have not taken the time to read the report of the committee—I say it is easy to stroll in occasionally, after having had a good smoke, and two or three of them during the day, and accuse somebody of not knowing what he was doing. [Applause.]

I want to say for the committee over which I have the honor to preside that I can present as high a range of intelligence and hard work and attention to duty as any committee in the House.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. DIES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has promised to recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentlemen of the committee that all the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has said about that committee is true, and all that the gentleman from Illinois has said about the Forestry Service I have no doubt is equally true.

If the American people ever expect to get anything out of trees growing in the national forest, the American people will be disappointed. The people never get anything where the Government manages the business, except the privilege of paying the bill. All of the trees located upon the national forests will eventually be sawed up into planks, sold, and there will not be enough left to pay for the hands that look after the bugs on the trees and keep the fires out of the woods, and who draw thousands of dollars in salary looking after the service.

The Government as a manager of business, gentlemen, is a failure. When it goes into operating the railroads in Alaska there will be a failure, and when it begins to operate the ships we are going to buy there will be no profit, and when the employees of the ship lines and the Forestry Service and the Alaska railway service come here and ask for more pay and more pensions you will do just as you have with the rural carriers of the South and the pension getters of the North—you will get down on your dewclaws and make obeisance and give them all they ask. [Laughter.]

That is Government ownership; that is the effect of the new propaganda that is driving public opinion into hysterics. The Government as an employer of labor is a failure, and the Government as a conductor of business is a failure. I say if there is an American citizen living to-day that expects anything out of the forests of this country except to pay taxes to make up the deficit they will be badly disappointed. They will never get a cent; but it will all go to pay the high-salaried people that run it. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, felt called upon to deliver a lecture to men on the floor of the House, charging them with walking onto the floor of the House occasionally, and then undertaking to dictate what should and what should not be done.

I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina, that I am on the floor of the House 99 per cent more of the time than he is. I am here all the time—every day—no matter what bill is under consideration, and the gentleman from South Carolina is rarely on the floor except when the agricultural bill is under consideration. Now, I do not undertake to tell the Committee on Agriculture what they ought to do and what they ought not to do. I think there is no committee in the House so deserving as the members of this committee. They are all hard-working men; they are all devoted to the interests that come under their jurisdiction; they work night and day to determine as best they can what ought to be done; but I am sorry to say that they have not been able to develop, or rather to get the department heads to develop the information which they are continually seeking. The gentleman from South Carolina said that it could be easily obtained what the deficit in the Forest Service was, if that question were put to him. Well, I asked the gentleman a short while ago, and he said the loss was $1,700,000 a year, and then I figured up how much the appropriations were, what the receipts are, and I concluded it was $3,100,000 a year; so that the information obtained from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is not very accurate. I am not denying that the amount of the appropriation is $5,500,000, and neither will he deny that the amount of receipts is $2,400,000; and if I can calculate the difference between those two figures it will leave the result of $3,100,000.

I have no criticism to make of any man on the Committee on Agriculture. I have no right to criticize them. They have done their work as best they knew how, and they have a high order of intelligence on that committee. I will admit that the order of intelligence in the committee is higher than that of any other committee in the House [laughter], and that no man in the House possesses the qualifications of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; that he is not only a genius in figures, but a gentleman as well as a man, and he has the good of the country at heart. He is a patriot, and he works in season and out of season to obtain information which is covered up by the heads of the bureaus in the department over which his committee presides.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I yield to his genius and to his ability, but, with all his genius and all his ability, he has thus far been unable to obtain the information which will give the Members of the House an intelligent conception of how the Forest Service is being conducted. I do not blame him; I know he has done the best he could. I do not blame any member of the committee, because they have all done the best they could; but what I do suggest, and did suggest, is that the committee charged with the responsibility of making the investigation—namely, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture—ought to do its duty. I know it is not the duty of the Committee on Agriculture to do what I suggest and I am not complaining because they have not assumed that duty, but I do complain because the committee charged with the responsibility has failed to perform its duty and bring to the notice of the House and the country the information to which we and the people of the Nation are entitled. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the specified national forests, $1,811,148: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for the necessary expenditures for fire protection and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided further*, That the amounts so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is a matter of some gratification——

Mr. MANN. I would like to have this point of order disposed of. We would like to get through with this bill at some time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the paragraph is new legislation in making available interchangeably the various amounts heretofore appropriated for a specific purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all the gentleman desires to say?

Mr. STAFFORD. That it is new legislation, and for the further reason it affects the discretion that the executive heads may have in the expenditure of these various amounts.

Mr. LEVER. This item is nothing more or less than an appropriation.

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly plain to anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Strike out, in line 2, page 37, the words "the aggregate" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any item," and in line 3, strike out the word "of" and also the letter "s" after the word "amount," so as to read:

Provided further, That the amount so interchanged shall not exceed in any item 10 per cent of the amount so appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 2, strike out the words "the aggregate," and in line 3, same page, strike out the word "of" and strike out the "s" after the word "amounts."

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman to explain that. I would like to hear an explanation, because I did not understand very well the reason the gentleman gave.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to granting to any executive head the right to utilize an entire appropriation for any other item. That is what this proviso would do to the extent of 10 per cent, if it stands as it is. I will say to the committee that just this kind of phraseology was the basis of the Post Office frauds which were unearthed some 12 years ago, whereby Beavers and Machen, through the interchangeable 10 per cent appropriations for the bureaus of the Postal Service, covered up their peculations so that nobody could detect just how much money was being used. The amendment I propose is to restrict the 10 per cent of appropriations to the respective items, so that 10 per cent of the total of $1,811,000 can not be utilized for any one special forest.

If we are going to achieve anything by the policy adopted by the committee this year in restricting the amount that may be expended in the various forests, it ought to be done in some such way. Under the proposal in the administration of the service the 10 per cent of the various amounts of expenditures for the respective seven districts, ranging in various amounts from $12,000 to $60,000, could be utilized in those respective districts in addition to those amounts. I think that the amendment should be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, just one word. After what has been said I think it is due, in justice to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to say that no Member of this House devotes his time to official duties with more assiduity and greater industry than the distinguished chairman of the committee. [Applause.] The Committee on Agriculture probably gives more time to the consideration of the bills under its charge and to hearings than any other committee in this House, and, of course, a committee that gives hearings from 10 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock in the evening for weeks and months in the year, its members are necessarily so busy attending to matters coming before their committee that it is impossible for the chairman and members of that committee to be always present here on the floor of the House.

Now, then, as to the Forest Service, it is true that we have turned over to that service 160,000,000 acres of land—the timber, the grazing, and the water powers on it—and now, as I understand from the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], it may be necessary to build railroads and possibly boats in order to dispose of the timber. We are disposing of it as well as we can. We were promised some years ago that this service would be made self-sustaining, but we find that after years of efforts to make it such we are short several million dollars. By applying economy and business methods undoubtedly the Forest Service could, or can be, made self-sustaining; but, as has been pointed out, that is foreign to the administration of Uncle Sam's affairs. If favoritism and discrimination referred to is true, it is not confined to the Forest Service or the Department of Agriculture. It may have been a mistake to undertake the task; but, gentlemen, if so, we should remember that that was due to an act of Congress. The Committee on Agriculture has been doing its best to carry out its instructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the selection, classification, and segregation of lands within the boundaries of national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the homestead laws applicable to the national forests, $100,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOULDEN. I do so for the purpose of securing an explanation. I think I will appeal to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], if the chairman of the committee will permit me. We have heard a number of serious charges made here on the floor to-day, particularly by the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO and Mr. JACOWAY], as well as by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], with regard to the difficulty of homesteading in the forest reserves. This is an item, it seems to me, that applies especially to the matter of opening up the forest reserves for entry under the homestead laws.

These charges have been heard by Members on the floor to-day. They have impressed me with the idea that the settlers who have attempted to locate upon these forest reservations were harassed, and in some cases fined, and, in fact, it was next to impossible for any man to successfully homestead in one of these forest reserves. That is the charge, repeated and reiterated again and again, by the gentlemen from Arkansas, as well as by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEVER. The answer to it is this provision and the one following.

Mr. GOULDEN. I simply wanted to know what foundation there was in the charges, and if that is so, what steps have been taken to remedy it. I know nothing about the truth of these charges, but having been through the West many times and having seen these reservations, I noticed homesteaders and settlers who looked to me as though they were on the point of starvation, and it prompted in my mind the idea that there might be something in the charges made to-day of the difficulty of homesteading on account of the management of these forest reserves by those officially in charge of them. I simply rose for the purpose of securing information.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman understand that this is the only bill that carries a provision for this purpose?

Mr. GOULDEN. No. I will say to the gentleman that I am aware of the fact that it is not. I have heard these charges before.

Mr. MANN. I have heard them, too, but I have never taken them seriously.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am inclined to take them seriously, inasmuch as they come from the gentleman from Washington and from the gentlemen from Arkansas, because they live in those particular sections and are supposed to know whereof they speak, and I think they do.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Let me state this: Assuming that the Forest Service is sincere and honest and square, yet, like the average man, they have become fanatics about their own work. They look at a piece of land from the standpoint of the Forest Service. The homesteader, on the other hand, looks at it from the standpoint of the original intent of the homestead act, for the purpose of building a home. There is where the irreconcilable conflict comes. That is the conflict that Congress has got to settle, whether you are going to turn the public domain over in every instance to the official determination of men who are daffy on their particular theory, or whether Congress is going to undertake to balance and settle the conflict between the two irreconcilable forces.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman agree that this section and the following section will remedy the evils that are complained of, as claimed by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. WINGO. I do not think they will, especially in the case of the Arkansas national forest reserve. The gentleman from Illinois does not take us seriously, because he has not been down there. If the gentleman would ever spend one day on the

Arkansas national forest reserve, he would be disgusted with the idea that those lands were ever included in a reserve.

Mr. GOULDEN. I certainly was very much impressed with the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], and that is why I call up the matter. I want some explanation, if possible. I have no doubt that what the gentleman from Arkansas says is true; and if the gentleman from Illinois and myself traveled through the gentleman's district, which I understand is quite a prosperous one, and saw the homesteaders struggling for an existence, I think perhaps we might agree with him.

Mr. WINGO. After my experience to-day, I think about the only hope I have is to get the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to go down with me and visit that reserve, and I now invite them to do so.

Mr. GOULDEN. I accept the gentleman's invitation, and I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will do the same.

Mr. MADDEN. I am going down, too.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the survey and platting of certain lands, chiefly valuable for agriculture, now listed or to be listed within the national forests, under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 233), and the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stats., p. 1095), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913, $85,000: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance of an appropriation of $85,000 to be expended "for the survey and platting of certain lands, chiefly valuable for agriculture," etc., provided by the act of June 30, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," be, and the same is hereby, continued and made available for and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso from line 15 down to the bottom of the page as new legislation. I do not care to argue the point of order at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I question whether that is legislation. It is merely making a reappropriation of the unexpended balance.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman certainly will not question the fact that the money could not be used with a reappropriation, which is legislation.

Mr. MANN. As far as that is concerned, all the appropriation bills, especially those coming from the Committee on Appropriations, properly contain many items of this character——

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit me there——

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will let me finish my sentence, there are constant reappropriations of the unexpended balances of appropriations for prior years for the same purposes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is true, but the gentleman also knows that the Committee on Appropriations have charge of the bill making appropriations for deficiencies.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; but this is not a deficiency.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. This is not a deficiency——

Mr. MANN. A deficiency would be for the balance of this fiscal year. This is making an appropriation for the next fiscal year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; but of money appropriated for the last fiscal year presumably unexpended.

Mr. MANN. No; of money appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I mean the current fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Which will be unexpended on the 30th of June.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Reappropriating it for the next fiscal year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. That is not a deficiency.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. Is there any difference between appropriating money that is now in the Treasury, that has already been appropriated for the current fiscal year, and appropriating any unexpended balance that may be in the Treasury for the coming fiscal year?

Mr. MANN. I can not see any difference at all.

Mr. GARNER. I can not see any difference at all. I do not see any reason why the committee has not the right to appropriate money already in the Treasury, as much as it has to appropriate money that may be in the Treasury.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will call the attention of the chairman to the fact that this is a change of law. Here is the statute under which this appropriation is made, recited in the paragraph itself.

Mr. LEVER. That was an appropriation act.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand what the gentleman's point is about that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That this is legislation, and that it is a change of existing law.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the form of this language is not the very best for an appropriation. Instead of saying "reappropriated" it says "continued and made available"; but it means the same thing. Now, if they had said "reappropriated," it would clearly be in order, because we have the right to appropriate for the next fiscal year any sum in the Treasury. This takes effect as to the next fiscal year, and affects only the unexpended balance for this fiscal year that remains in the Treasury on June 30.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I grant that that statement of the gentleman is true; but that fact does not keep this from being legislation. It is not an appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly it is. Appropriation and reappropriation are the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am perfectly willing that the Chair shall rule.

The CHAIRMAN. There seems to be no question that the item for which the appropriation is sought to be made is in order and authorized by law, and the present occupant of the chair feels that there is no difference between a straight appropriation of a certain sum of money and a reappropriation for the same purpose of an unexpended balance, and in support of that opinion the Chair finds a precedent.

On February 12, 1897, the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when this paragraph was read:

The Postmaster General is authorized to apply to the payment of the salaries of letter carriers for the fiscal year 1897 the sum of $23,000, being an unexpended balance of $13,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for street letter boxes, posts, and pedestals, and an unexpended balance of $9,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for package boxes.

Mr. Orrin L. Miller, of Kansas, having made the point of order, the Chairman ruled:

The Chair is of opinion that this is simply in the nature of an additional appropriation for letter carriers. There can be no question as to the authority of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to report an appropriation giving an additional amount to letter carriers. The provision in this bill has simply the effect of a new appropriation. It proposes merely to use for this particular purpose an unexpended appropriation in the bill of last year. This appropriation is applied to an object already provided for by law—the payment of letter carriers. The Chair overrules the point of order on the ground that the provision is simply the application of a previous unexpended appropriation to a purpose contemplated by law.

It seems to the Chair that that precedent is on all fours with this. For that reason the Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter all moneys received toward cooperative work in forest investigations or in the protection and improvement of the national forests or in the survey, examination, and appraisal of lands and timber, the exchange of which shall have been or hereafter may be authorized by Congress for the purpose of eliminating private holdings in national forests or of consolidating lands of the United States therein, shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the payment of the expenses of said work and of refunds to the contributors of amounts heretofore or hereafter paid in by them in excess of their share of the cost of said work: *Provided*, That annual report shall be made to Congress of all such moneys so received as contributions for such cooperative work. And hereafter in lieu of requiring purchasers of national-forest timber to dispose of the brush and débris resulting from cutting operations the Secretary of Agriculture may require them to deposit in the Treasury such sum in each case as he may consider necessary to cover the cost to the United States of such work, and the moneys so deposited shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, to enable the Secretary to pay such cost and to make refunds of any amounts deposited by such purchasers in excess of such cost.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Against the whole paragraph?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I make it against the whole paragraph, for I do not see how you can separate it. There is a part of a provision at the first of the paragraph and the latter part at the end.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation at the top of the page is probably unnecessary, but it is now existing law.

Mr. LEVER. The first part is carried in the present law.

Mr. MANN. It is carried in the existing law.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The first part of the paragraph is now existing law.

Mr. LEVER. And the latter part is new legislation.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 there is a change in the language.

Mr. LEVER. But it does not change the meaning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture more effectively to carry out the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat., 961), entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," $15,000 of the moneys appropriated therein shall be available for the employment of agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor, and for the purchase of supplies and equipment required for the purpose of said act in the city of Washington.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The $15,000 that you propose to appropriate for work in the city of Washington is in reference to the act which requires the purchase of the forest reserves in the Appalachian and White Mountain ranges.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. And I will yield to the gentleman from Oregon who is a member of that commission.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the purchase of the land by the Forest Reserve Commission under the law the Forestry Service is directed to conduct an investigation as to the value of the land, the soil, the amount of timber on the land, the value of the timber, and as to all other questions connected with the physical valuation of the property. That work is done in the field, and all the expenses of the field work are paid out of the $2,000,000 appropriation made annually, which is a fixed appropriation. But when these reports are sent to Washington to be worked up here in the office, and the reports digested and the data collated for the use of the commission, under the present law such work must be paid for out of the appropriation carried in the bill for the maintenance of the Forestry Service. We have asked for this legislation so that the $15,000 could be used out of the $2,000,000 annual appropriation for working up in the Washington office of these reports from the field, and so that we might know accurately what the land bought by the commission cost per acre, including every item of cost.

Mr. MANN. It just saves $15,000 a year, because this charges it to the permanent appropriation; otherwise we would have to appropriate for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report of the official commission for 1914, of this commission to purchase the forest reserves. It is a very brief report.

Mr. MANN. How long is it?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. About 16 pages, but that includes two maps, which we will omit.

Mr. MANN. Is it printed as a document?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. It is printed as a Senate document.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to its being printed, although I doubt if anybody ever reads an article printed in nonpareil type.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. It preserves it, and I should like to have it go in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The following is the document:

[Senate Document No. 661, Sixty-third Congress, third session.]

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF WAR, TRANSMITTING THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1914.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1914.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat., 961), I have the honor to transmit herewith report of the National Forest Reservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

Inasmuch as there is considerable demand for information as to the lands being acquired and the procedure adopted, it is requested that in addition to the usual number of copies printed there be printed an additional 1,000 copies.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War, President.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1914.

The act of March 1, 1911, which created the National Forest Reservation Commission and authorized the acquisition of lands by the United States on the watersheds of navigable streams, appropriated for the fiscal year 1910, $1,000,000, and for each of the fiscal years 1911 to 1915, inclusive, $2,000,000. Inasmuch as these moneys were appropriated by fiscal years and were not made available until expended, the appropriation for the year 1910 never became available. Owing to the limited time during which the appropriation for the year 1911 was available nearly all of that year's appropriation reverted to the Treasury. Appropriations for the years 1912 to 1915, by amendment to the act, have been made available until expended.

The lands approved for purchase by this commission to June 30, 1914, aggregate 1,104,529 acres. These were approved at an average price of $5.03 per acre. The total amount involved in the purchases is $5,560,202.21, exclusive of the costs of examinations and surveys. In the fiscal year 1912, 287,698 acres were approved, at an average price of $5.65 per acre; in 1913, 425,717 acres, at $4.71 per acre; and in 1914, 391,114 acres, at $4.96 per acre.

Purchases have been made in 15 localities or purchase areas in the States of Georgia, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Purchase areas have also been designated in Alabama, Maine, and Maryland, but no purchases have as yet been approved within these States.

The following table shows the program which has been undertaken and the results accomplished. Part I, consisting of the first four columns, gives information concerning the areas in which purchases are being made. Part II gives the acreage approved for purchase within each State, the average price paid, and the total amount involved, with detailed information with respect to each county, watershed, and purchase area. Part III pertains to the lands which have been acquired and paid for. The acreage, the amount paid, and the average cost are shown, as well as the location of the lands by States, counties, watersheds, and purchase areas.

Information as to purchase areas and lands being acquired under the act of Mar. 1, 1911.

Part I.—Location of purchase area.				Part II.—Approved for purchase.			Part III.—Acquired.		
State and county.	Name of area.	Watershed.	Acres.	Acres.	Average price.	Amount.	Acres.	Average price.	Amount.
ALABAMA.									
Lawrence	Alabama	Warrior	90,733						
Winston	do	do	62,227						
			152,960						
GEORGIA.									
Fannin	Georgia	Toccoa	49,893	34,655	$6.48	$224,585.25	26,851.84	$7.11	$191,112.24
Gilmer	do	do	1,358	60	7.00	420.00	59.60	7.11	426.76
Habersham	do	Chattahoochee	30,627						
Lumpkin	do	do	29,145	2,555	7.00	17,885.00	2,106.60	7.11	14,977.93
Rabun	do	Savannah	93,611						
Do	Nantahala	do	2,193						
Do	Savannah	do	96,893	36,380	6.67	242,720.45	231.60	6.00	1,390.14
Towns	Georgia	Hiwassee	84,472						
Union	do	do	116,952	22,915	6.09	139,487.75	1,984.85	7.11	14,112.29
White	do	Chattahoochee	53,103						
			558,247	96,565	6.47	625,098.45	31,234.58	7.10	222,019.36
MAINE.									
Oxford	Androscoggin	Androscoggin	65,900						
Do	White Mountains	do	15,667						
			81,567						

Information as to purchase areas and lands being acquired under the act of Mar. 1, 1911—Continued.

Part I.—Location of purchase area.				Part II.—Approved for purchase.			Part III.—Acquired.		
State and county.	Name of area.	Watershed.	Acres.	Acres.	Average price.	Amount.	Acres.	Average price.	Amount.
MARYLAND.									
Garrett	Youghiogheny	Monongahela	80,259						
NEW HAMPSHIRE.									
Carroll	White Mountains	Saco	169,728	4,368	$12.00	$52,416.00			
Coos	Androscoggin	Androscoggin	56,532						
Do	Kilkenny	do Connecticut	87,347						
Do	White Mountains	Androscoggin Saco	172,723	72,871	6.66	485,615.50	72,212.69	$6.32	$456,681.05
Grafton	do	Connecticut Merrimac	339,968	56,323	5.64	317,863.00	8,875.01	12.05	106,916.40
			826,298	133,562	6.41	855,894.50	81,087.70	6.95	563,597.45
NORTH CAROLINA.									
Buncombe	Mount Mitchell	Tennessee	58,681	11,731	10.60	124,294.00			
Do	Pisgah	do	21,366	14,994	5.00	74,970.00			
Burke	Boone	Catawba	62,024						
Caldwell	do	do	117,199						
Do	Yadkin	Yadkin	34,592						
Cherokee	Nantahala	Hiwassee	85,015						
Clay	Georgia	Savannah	16,738						
Do	Nantahala	Hiwassee	68,012						
Graham	do	Little Tennessee	184,322						
Haywood	Pisgah	Tennessee	64,664	1,345	5.00	6,725.00			
Do	Smoky Mountains	do	90,915						
Henderson	Pisgah	do	22,717	20,325	5.00	101,625.00			
Jackson	do	do	159,953						
Do	Savannah	Savannah	39,457	2,369	8.19	19,403.00			
McDowell	Boone	Catawba	28,894						
Do	Mount Mitchell	do	86,016	42,612	5.41	230,352.75	13,707.85	5.82	79,748.94
Macon	Nantahala	Little Tennessee	126,660	34,822	8.91	310,410.25	24,717.46	10.14	250,689.75
Do	Savannah	Tennessee	76,121	32,439	8.04	260,834.00	100.60	8.00	804.80
Madison	Unaka	do	72,133						
Mitchell	Boone	Catawba	16,806						
Do	Mount Mitchell	Tennessee	17,265						
Do	Unaka	do	59,036						
Swain	Nantahala	Little Tennessee	30,063	2,151	6.09	13,097.75			
Do	Smoky Mountains	Tennessee	248,786						
Transylvania	Pisgah	do	108,060	50,036	5.00	250,180.00			
Do	Savannah	Savannah	43,462						
Watauga	Boone	Tennessee	6,725						
Do	Yadkin	Yadkin	30,856						
Wilkes	do	do	129,048						
Yancey	Mount Mitchell	Tennessee	69,051	11,870	10.94	129,900.00			
Do	Unaka	do	38,208						
			2,212,845	224,694	6.77	1,521,791.75	38,525.91	8.60	331,243.49
SOUTH CAROLINA.									
Oconee	Savannah	Savannah	100,683	23,561	5.49	129,427.25			
Pickens	do	do	42,266						
			142,949	23,561	5.49	129,427.25			
TENNESSEE.									
Blount	Smoky Mountains	Tennessee	143,650	33,713	3.69	124,447.50			
Carter	Unaka	do	120,042						
Do	White Top	do	37,452	19,511	4.12	80,394.00			
Cocke	Smoky Mountains	do	25,916						
Greene	Unaka	do	31,831						
Johnson	White Top	do	65,572	22,623	3.96	89,654.50	1,510.00	3.50	5,285.00
McMinn	Cherokee	do	2,283						
Monroe	do	do	47,206	1,280	4.40	5,632.00			
Do	Nantahala	do	95,648						
Polk	Cherokee	(Alabama-Tennessee)	172,569	122,854	4.73	581,319.15			
Sevier	Smoky Mountains	Tennessee	183,635	25,500	5.15	131,250.00			
Sullivan	White Top	do	29,962	12,762	5.37	68,496.00	650.00	3.50	2,275.00
Unicoi	Unaka	do	122,843	19,756	4.64	91,764.00			
Washington	do	do	29,440						
			1,108,049	257,999	4.55	1,172,957.15	2,160.00	3.50	7,560.00
VIRGINIA.									
Amherst	Natural Bridge	James	83,719						
Augusta	do	Potomac	21,494						
Do	Shenandoah	James Potomac	105,769	78,401	3.08	241,554.00			
Bath	do	James	32,460						
Bedford	Natural Bridge	Roanoke	33,303	15,175	6.38	96,850.20	8,118.76	6.80	55,207.57
Botetourt	do	James	29,866	21,520	7.12	153,188.00	1,420.16	6.80	9,657.09
Frederick	Potomac	Potomac	11,245	8,278	1.97	16,343.36			
Grayson	White Top	Ohio	79,545						
Highland	Shenandoah	James	29,469	6,800	3.25	22,100.00			
Nelson	Natural Bridge	do	32,805						
Page	Massanutten	Potomac	35,753	16,389	1.85	30,311.79	1,734.03	1.20	2,092.30
Rockbridge	Natural Bridge	James	60,877	16,265	6.74	109,639.00	15,115.68	6.80	102,786.62
Do	Shenandoah	do	816						
Rockingham	Massanutten	Potomac	34,139	11,287	1.25	14,108.75			
Do	Shenandoah	do	133,426	19,433	3.27	63,582.50			
Shenandoah	Massanutten	do	73,620	31,653	2.39	75,551.91			
Do	Potomac	do	48,311	29,986	2.87	85,936.50			
Smyth	White Top	Tennessee	52,474						
Washington	do	do	29,337	11,969	3.50	41,891.50	11,358.38	3.50	39,754.33
Warren	Massanutten	Potomac	9,434	3,700	1.39	5,137.40			
Wythe	White Top	Ohio	25,283						
			963,145	270,856	3.53	956,194.91	37,747.01	5.55	209,497.97

Information as to purchase areas and lands being acquired under the act of Mar. 1, 1911—Continued.

Part I.—Location of purchase area.				Part II.—Approved for purchase.			Part III.—Acquired.		
State and county.	Name of area.	Watershed.	Acres.	Acres.	Average price.	Amount.	Acres.	Average price	Amount.
WEST VIRGINIA.									
Hampshire	Potomac	Potomac	1,992	995	$5.50	$5,472.50			
Hardy	do	do	78,686	35,410	2.88	102,154.70			
Pendleton	Shenandoah	do	76,991	18,000	3.49	62,750.00			
Pocahontas	Monongahela	Monongahela	21,754						
Preston	do	do	57,969						
Randolph	do	do	352,399	28,087	3.13	87,961.00			
Tucker	do	do	250,194	14,800	2.74	40,500.00			
			830,985	97,292	3.07	298,838.20			
Grand total			6,966,304	1,104,529	5.03	5,560,202.21	190,755.20	$6.94	$1,333,915.27

It will be noted from the figures in the table that the acreage acquired is small as compared with the acreage approved for purchase. This is due to the delay in settlement incident to the survey and title examination of the tracts and to the time required to put the titles into shape to be acceptable to the United States or to carry through condemnation proceedings when such are necessary.

After lands are approved for purchase every effort is made to complete the transaction as quickly as possible on account of the hardship to the vendor should he have to wait unnecessarily long for his money. With as little delay as possible the Secretary of Agriculture enters into a purchase agreement with the vendor and thereafter the survey and title examination are made. On June 30, 1914, surveys had been completed for 624,229.53 acres. Surveys were nearing completion on 145,976 acres more. Title examinations by the field title attorneys were in progress on 112,165 acres and had been completed on 368,614.21 acres, of which 190,755.20 had been acquired, 2,780 acres had been approved by the Department of Justice and were awaiting settlement, 60,665 acres were under condemnation.

The procedure is now so shaped that tracts which are free from title defects or nearly so can usually be paid for in from 6 to 8 months after approval for purchase. Longer delay in settlement in almost all cases is due to defects or condition of title which in some instances can only be overcome by condemnation proceedings. It has been urged that the Government should pay interest in cases where settlement is much delayed. We believe it would be highly undesirable to do so. To pay interest in such cases would put a premium upon defective titles and work out chiefly to the advantage of the owner who gives no assistance toward putting his title into good condition or hastening the conveyance.

CHARACTER OF LANDS WHICH ARE BEING ACQUIRED AND METHODS OF VALUATION.

Of the 1,104,529 acres which have been approved for purchase, 342,061 acres, or 31 per cent, are virgin timberlands. The forest consists of a mixed growth of hardwoods with pine and hemlock in the Southern Appalachians and hardwoods and spruce in the White Mountains. Much of the timber is now saleable at stumpage prices fully equal to those paid. Cut over and culled lands comprise 535,845 acres, or 48 per cent. On some of these the merchantable timber has been completely removed. On others only the more valuable kinds and sizes of trees have been cut, leaving much valuable material. The merchantable timber has been reserved for limited periods by the vendors on 118,533 acres, or 11 per cent. In all such cases a limit of size has been fixed below which trees shall not be cut and regulations have been agreed to which will preserve the young timber and protect the tract from fire and other damage. The approved lands include altogether 18,353 acres, or 2 per cent, of abandoned farm land. Some of this land has been abandoned for years and is slowly reverting to forest. Most of it is so steep that it never should have been cleared, but here and there are small tracts suitable for farming or grazing. The only remaining class of land is that which is barren or covered by a nonmerchantable growth of timber. This class includes 89,737 acres, or 8 per cent of the total area, and consists mainly of mountain tops or high rocky ledges

In valuing tracts to determine the prices to be offered for them the procedure in all cases has been to carefully cruise the timber and appraise its value, taking into consideration quantity, quality, distance from market, and cost of operation. A separate appraisal is made of the land. Improvements have been valued only where they were considered to be useful to the Government, and mineral rights only when it was considered inadvisable to leave them outstanding. No value has been placed upon water power or intangible elements, such as scenery or prominence of situation.

In the period during which purchases have gone on land prices have varied but little. Cut-over lands of similar condition and location were acquired at approximately the same price in 1914 as in 1912. There appears to be no reason for much variation in this class of land except as it may be valuable for grazing, fruit growing, or some other use. Land that has been seriously damaged by fire is to be had at about $1 per acre less than land which has not been burned.

Neither have stumpage prices varied much for the classes of timber which have been acquired. They were slightly higher in 1913 than in 1912, but in 1914 dropped back to about the 1912 level. Most of the large bodies of valuable timber are strongly held and are not to be purchased below their real value.

An objection which was at one time raised to this policy of acquisition by the Federal Government was that the Government could not acquire land at reasonable prices; that it would find that the land had been picked up in advance by speculators whose interference could not be eliminated. This difficulty, although encountered to some extent at the start, was overcome by adhering strictly to the policy of buying only at reasonable prices and refusing to buy tracts held under option for an advance in price.

RESTRICTION OF PURCHASES.

The underlying purpose of the act of March 1, 1911, is the acquisition by the Federal Government of sufficient areas of mountainous nonagricultural lands on the watersheds of navigable streams to be influential in protecting those watersheds from the bad effects of forest fires and the unwise timber cutting and clearing. The purpose of the law restricts materially the activities to be carried on. Even in the mountainous sections of the country conditions exist which limit the areas of land to be acquired. In some localities it is the presence of farm land. Again the prevalence of coal and other minerals removes from the possibility of purchase millions of acres of mountainous or hilly lands the surface of which is necessarily held to facilitate mining operations. The policy of some of the States to acquire and hold for forest purposes their wild mountain lands makes it unlikely that the Federal Government will ever be permitted to purchase lands in those States, since under the Federal statute no purchases may be made until the State in which the land lies has given its consent through legislative action. It is the policy of many corporations, companies, and individuals to hold permanently large bodies of mountain land for their timber or other resources. These conditions taken collectively are so extensive as to restrict within somewhat narrow limits the lands available and desirable for purchase by the Federal Government.

From the beginning of purchases in the Appalachian Mountains the plan has been followed of restricting purchases to localities of especial strategic importance. The 21 purchase areas named in the table on pages 6–8 are based on many years' study by the Geological Survey and the Forest Service and include very important sections of the principal watersheds of the Appalachian region. These purchase areas are shown on the maps which accompany this report. It is not intended, nor would it be advisable, to acquire all the lands within these areas. It will be sufficient to acquire tracts of suitable size as units of forest administration. These will become demonstration forests and centers of influence for forest protection and proper utilization. Although comparatively small in total area their influence will be far reaching, and we believe they will lead to forest conservation over very large areas of land held in private ownership.

Purchases have been begun in 15 of the areas. By purchasing in a number at the same time it has been possible to make greater headway and to secure better prices than if purchases were limited to one or two. In any particular area there are times when little headway can be made and other times when it is possible to make great progress. Only by having a number of areas can fairly steady progress be made. Another great advantage of carrying on purchases in a number of areas at once is that competition and better prices can be secured. The lack of purchases in six of the purchase areas is due to the fact that until now it has not been possible to obtain lands in the acreage wanted and at prices considered reasonable.

IMPROVEMENT AND USE OF ACQUIRED LANDS.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to protect and administer the acquired lands as national forests. Bearing in mind that the protection of the mountain watersheds can best be accomplished by maintaining a thriving forest upon the land, it will be the purpose to keep the timber growing permanently upon all portions which can not otherwise be utilized without permitting erosion or in other ways menacing the flow of the streams.

The virgin timber which is being acquired contains many trees that are overmature and becoming defective, the stands partially cut over have remaining certain kinds of timber that were not utilized at the time of lumbering. These lands, where there is sale for the timber at fair prices, will be given an improvement cutting which will remove this deteriorating material as well as such mature growth as can be spared from the forest without impairing its protective influence. Where cutting is to be done the timber will be sold on the stump to the highest bidder and cut under the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The full development of the forest will require the construction of roads, trails, and telephones on the lands owned by the Government, to connect with those supplying the general public. Already the work of constructing these improvements has begun. Ninety-two miles of roadway, 520 miles of trail, and 25 miles of telephone line have been constructed. This work can be still further extended as soon as proceeds from timber sales begin to come in, since 10 per cent of the proceeds of such sales is specifically set apart by law for road and trail construction.

Roads, trails, and telephones will greatly facilitate the protection of the Government's land from fire. Fire causes such damage in the regions where lands are being acquired that the purposes of the Government for developing a maximum forest can not be carried out until fires are entirely controlled. Great progress is being made. On the lands purchased or under contract during the fiscal year 1915 only 3,600 acres were burned over, whereas it was not uncommon in past years for 10 to 20 per cent of such areas to burn over a season.

With the Government lands being developed for intensive timber production other forms of use become possible in larger degree. The range can be more completely utilized, the water resources will be more readily available to the public, and the general use of the mountains will be increased. The public greatly appreciates the opportunity to go into the highlands for health, pleasure, and recreation. Many of the tracts which are being acquired present very attractive scenery and afford delightful places in which to travel or rest. Some of the most attractive spots being in remote situations have been inaccessible, but the roads and trails which are being built will make it easier to reach them. Opportunity for camping is increased. Those who desire permanent camp sites may obtain them on payment of reasonable annual fees. Other special uses which do not injure the forest are like-

wise permitted. Demands for such uses have already started in considerable volume and are being encouraged.

ADVANTAGES OF GOVERNMENT FORESTS TO THE REGION AND COUNTRY.

Since the uses of the acquired lands are beginning to take form it is becoming clear that the forests are to serve the region in a number of important ways. By definite plan they have been widely distributed over the mountain region. Perhaps their greatest use is in the control of forest fires. Every effort is made to suppress fires on the Government lands. All improvements and all the force employed are in part or wholly for this purpose. The Government force in any community is also ready to cooperate with the State and local officials and other landowners where they can do so without expense to the Government in keeping fire out of entire communities. A great number of landowners are now coming to believe in fire protection and they welcome the Government's aid in a program that they themselves would not be able successfully to carry out.

The forests are also to serve as practical demonstrations of forestry or the production of successive crops of timber. The methods of forestry are new and demonstrations are necessary in this field as in all branches of agriculture. Certain timberland owners are beginning already to follow the example of the Government in limiting the cut so as to save the young trees and in requiring clean utilization so as to leave the stand in good growing condition.

Government ownership and management of extensive forest areas in the eastern mountains will further benefit the region in providing encouragement and aid for the mountain people in rightly using the resources of the region. The Government's undertaking is such that its representatives must mingle largely with the local people and have constant dealings with them. Of some it is buying land, others are employed in constructing trails and telephones or as forest guards. Still others are becoming timber contractors, buying small quantities of timber and cutting it under Government supervision.

The manner in which the Government forests will be handled will call for numerous small timber contractors living near at hand and working in the timber business all or a portion of the year. Some of these may desire to live on Government land, in which case they will be given every opportunity to develop comfortable homes and use the available cleared patches for their gardens and crops. The forest will thus be made permanent and thriving forest communities will be built up.

In considering the advantages of these forests to the local communities it should be remembered that 25 per cent of the proceeds goes back to the counties concerned for school and road purposes and that an additional 10 per cent is to be spent on roads and trails within the forests under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The aid thus secured must in the future be of large assistance in those counties which will contain extensive areas of Government land.

Of the advantages here pointed out some are local, others regional or national. But if the results are to be as stated there will come to the Nation the added advantage of a large and important region turned to its natural use and made permanently productive. This should be true of the Appalachian region in so far as it is chiefly adapted to the production of forest. The soil will be held in place on the most critical portions of the watersheds, giving navigable streams a large measure of protection. So far as the watersheds comprise agricultural lands there can be little or no protection to the streams under this program. Soil on fields which are to be farmed permanently must be kept in place by proper methods of tillage. The program here considered covers only the areas that need to be retained in permanent forest.

WHAT WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH THE PRESENT APPROPRIATION AND WHAT SHOULD BE DONE.

There remains unexpended from the appropriation for 1914 an estimated balance of some $95,655, which, with the appropriation of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1915, is available for additional purchases. With this amount it will be possible to acquire at least 300,000 acres, giving a total to be acquired with present appropriations of some 1,400,000 acres. Had it been possible to use also the $3,000,000 which was appropriated for the fiscal years 1910 and 1911 the area acquired would have amounted to about 2,000,000 acres.

The commission profoundly believes that the practicability and wisdom of this policy of land purchases by the Federal Government has been fully demonstrated. Experience has proved that it is entirely practicable for the Government to acquire lands of the character desired at the headwaters of the navigable rivers and that they may be obtained at reasonable prices and in areas of sufficient size for successful administration as national forests. By the employment of condemnation where titles are defective a safe title may be vested in the United States.

The wisdom of the Government's acquiring and permanently holding for forest purposes extensive bodies of land at the headwaters of the great rivers is becoming more and more clear. Far-reaching good will result in safeguarding the streams from erratic flow and in protecting the watersheds from destructive erosion to which they are subject when unwisely cleared. A basis will be afforded for permanent industries in regions which otherwise are in danger of ceasing to be productive and of becoming a menace to the navigable rivers and to the communities situated upon them.

The appropriations which were made have been sufficient to start the work and make very substantial progress. Through the care exercised in making purchases the lands acquired are so well situated for administration and use that even should appropriations cease considerable good would be accomplished. But the program should not cease at this point. It should go further. However, the commission does not look upon the program as being indefinite as to appropriations, but rather as requiring appropriations through a number of years. In a report to Congress December 11, 1907, the Secretary of Agriculture expressed the opinion that by the ownership of 5,000,000 acres in the southern Appalachians and 600,000 acres in the White Mountains the Government could lead the way to the right management and use of the southern Appalachian and White Mountain regions. The commission, after an experience of more than three years in making purchases, regards that view as being entirely sound. We do not now believe it will be necessary to acquire larger areas to accomplish the purposes of the act in the southern Appalachian and White Mountains. In the view of the commission the acquisition of these areas should be considered as the present working program.

Although to this time purchases have been limited to the southern Appalachian and White Mountains, experience indicates the advisability of undertaking purchases before long in the Ozark Mountains in Arkansas, and possibly in certain other mountainous sections. Such purchases, however, would be on a small scale as compared with those in the Appalachian region.

HOW THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE WORKED OUT.

It is the judgment of this commission that the work can best be done under appropriations covering periods of five years each, the appropriations becoming available annually and remaining available until expended, as is now the case. Experience has shown that it is entirely impracticable to attempt to do this work under appropriations which expire with the fiscal year. That plan was fully tried and it had to be changed through an amendment to the act. It is likewise of the utmost importance that appropriations be continued through periods of not less than five years. Regularity of appropriations, which in this work is of the utmost importance, can best be secured in that way. When this work was begun its requirements were such that well-trained men were not available. A force of timber cruisers, title examiners, and surveyors had to be assembled and trained as experts, a task which required some two years. It would be most unfortunate to have to disband this force in case funds were not appropriated for any given year. If purchases were suspended during any year it would also require much time and expense to get under way again the negotiations that would be broken off. Many of the cruises and examinations which would have been made and which would not have resulted in purchases would have to be made over again. From every point of view it is highly desirable that appropriations continue without interruption.

It is to be emphasized that the Congress established this project upon the basis of an appropriation of $11,000,000. Instead of hastening into purchases in order to utilize an annual appropriation, which would have been unbusinesslike and resulted in loss to the Government, the commission adopted the more conservative policy of making purchases only after full information had been secured in regard to each tract and reasonable prices had been obtained. By so doing it established the work upon a sound basis, but $3,000,000 of the money which had been appropriated reverted to the Treasury. This $3,000,000 will have to be reappropriated if the work is to be carried as far as the Congress intended under the first appropriation.

In the judgment of the members of the commission the work should be carried forward in a steady, systematic way until the program is completed. Since the existing appropriations cease with the fiscal year 1915, it is accordingly recommended that action be taken by the Congress during the present session to extend the appropriations at the current rate of $2,000,000 per year until and including the fiscal year 1920.

EXPENDITURES.

The following statement shows in detail the expenditures incurred in carrying on operations under the Weeks law during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914:

Appropriation: "National Forest Reservation Commission"		$25,000.00
Expenditures for fiscal year ended June 30, 1914:		
Salaries	$150.00	
Equipment	60.00	
Furniture	270.40	
Freight, express, and drayage	.77	
Total		481.17
Unexpended balance Aug. 31, 1914		24,518.83
Outstanding liabilities Aug. 31, 1914		0
Balance to revert to Treasury		24,518.83
Appropriation: "Acquisition of land for protection of watersheds of navigable streams"		$2,000,000.00
Unexpended balance from fiscal year 1913, available July 1, 1913 (see report of the National Forest Reservation Commission for the fiscal year 1913, S. Doc. No. 307, 63d Cong., 2d sess.)		3,002,563.26
Repayments to the credit of the appropriation during the fiscal year 1914		118.63
Total available for fiscal year 1914		5,002,681.89
Expenditures during fiscal year 1914		839,653.59
Unexpended balance available for further disbursement July 1, 1914		4,163,028.30
Against the unexpended balance of July 1, 1914, there were existing liabilities in the form of executed contracts for the purchase of lands amounting to	$3,321,100.43	
Lands which had been approved for purchase but for which the contracts for purchase had not been executed June 30, 1914, amounted approximately to	746,271.88	
Total outstanding encumbrances		4,067,372.31
Available balance for encumbrances in fiscal year beginning July 1, 1914		95,655.99

Analysis of expenditures during fiscal year 1914.

Classification.	Forest Service.	Solicitor's Office.	Geological Survey.	Purchase of lands.	Total.
Salaries	$118,254.16	$28,820.84	$191.67	.....	$147,266.67
Travel, station, and field expense	33,850.21	9,071.47	205.76	[1]$44.85	43,172.29
Equipment	13,167.94	.....	.....	.....	13,167.94
Stationery	.....	64.75	.....	.....	64.75
Rent	84.20	126.00	.....	.....	210.20
Telegraph, telephone, and postage	261.80	5.80	.....	.....	267.60
Freight, express, and drayage	4,109.51	4.44	1.50	.....	4,115.45
Miscellaneous supplies, services, etc	20,791.79	200.24	42.73	.....	21,034.76
Options	108.00	.....	.....	.....	108.00
Lands	.....	.....	.....	610,245.84	610,245.84
Total	190,627.70	38,293.54	441.66	610,290.69	839,653.59

[1] Expenses of Division of Accounts and Disbursements in connection with payments for lands.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter as much of the act of March 4, 1913, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, as relates to reimbursement of "owners of horses, vehicles, or other equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business," shall be extended so as to provide reimbursement to officers and employees of the Forest Service for loss, damage, or destruction of horses, vehicles, or other equipment necessarily used by them in fire fighting or in unforeseen emergencies, to be paid out of appropriations made for meeting the expense of such fire fighting or emergencies.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. MADDEN. I will reserve it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, on March 4, 1913, an act was passed providing that where horses, vehicles, equipment, and so forth were employed by the Forest Service in fighting fires, in case the equipment was lost or destroyed, the owner might be reimbursed; and an appropriation was made for the purpose, or a method was provided by which the loss might be paid. The comptroller, however, has rendered an opinion to the effect that regular employees, the rangers in the service, can not recover for the loss of their property; that the act does not cover them. It was the opinion of the committee after very careful consideration of this matter that that should be remedied.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Do the regulars furnish their own horses and equipment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They furnish their own horses and equipment; and in the ordinary, regular work they take their chances. If their property is lost or destroyed or damaged, there is no recourse; they have no way of recovering for that loss or injury. But in emergencies, where awful fires occur, where there is occasion for extraordinary work on the part of the rangers and the exposure of their persons and their property to great danger, it is the opinion of the committee that when they suffered loss they ought to be reimbursed, the same as the owners of private property hired and engaged by the Forest Service to perform or assist in this dangerous work. It seems to the committee that when a fire occurs the statute providing for reimbursement should be made to cover the property of the rangers in this extraordinary work.

Mr. MADDEN. How many cases of this sort have taken place?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know; but not very many. But there are a great many fires, and there is an opportunity for the exercise of a great deal of skill and bravery and heroism, and all that, and it seems to us that the men engaged in that work, when they are called upon to perform that dangerous work, ought to be taken care of.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, upon such terms as he may deem proper, for periods not exceeding 20 years, permit responsible persons or associations to use and occupy suitable spaces or portions of ground in the national forests for the construction of summer homes, hotels, stores, or other structures needed for recreation or public convenience, not exceeding 5 acres in area to any one person or association.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman desires to take up the time of the committee, I will reserve it.

Mr. LEVER. I want to ask the gentleman if he is going to make the point of order, explanation or no explanation?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; I am going to make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Then I do not think there is any use of taking up the time.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will withhold it as a courtesy to the gentleman, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to the members of the committee that if the situation is understood there will be no objection to this. There are 150,000,000 acres of forests set apart as reserves. The property can not be purchased and, except as provided by law, there can be absolutely no use of these immense areas—a hundred and fifty or a hundred and sixty millions of acres. One of the principal objections to the entire national-forest proposition is that these lands are withdrawn from purchase or settlement; that the people in the localities where they lie have no use of them, can not avail themselves of any privileges in connection with them; and it seems as though the authority ought to be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harmless use of some of the places within the forests, that he ought to have authority to make leases on such terms as he pleases for a harmless, temporary use. In many parts of the forests there are places suitable for summer resorts, little parks where the people could get together for recreation and for amusement, perfectly harmless, without danger to the forests, altogether under the regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture. All these people are excluded absolutely from the forests. It seems to me and it seems to the committee, and they considered it very carefully, this language being carefully drawn, that, as we safeguard the forests and protect them in every respect, something of this kind ought to be in the law, and the Secretary ought to have the authority this provision would give.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt in the world these hotels and summer resorts and other places would be very convenient, indeed, for the purposes of these numerous employees under these forest reserves to resort to in their days off, and at other times, but I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. We concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Forest Service, $5,553,256.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have endeavored to take up no more time than necessary this afternoon in discussing what I consider to be the most important of all the Government activities—certainly the only activity where the Government holds great physical resources and hopes sometime in the far-distant future to have an income. I am glad to note a disposition on the part of quite a large number of Members to pay some attention to this great service. I note also that most Members confess freely that they know little about either the receipts or the expenditures or the form of the organization that rules supreme over a territory as vast as that of any 10 or 12 States one might name. This interrupted debate, covering perhaps two hours' time, gives some idea of the magnitude of the proposition. Does anyone suppose that Chief Forester Graves has an easy time? Why, the domain over which he reigns is larger than several of the kingdoms now at war across the sea.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to join others in paying a compliment to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. LEVER] and to all of the members of that committee. This bill, which they have prepared, covers every form of agricultural investigation from the smallest germ that infests some tiny seed up to the roving ranger, who glories in his title and who—paid by the Government—is the last of his type on the frontier.

Mr. Chairman, the work embraced by the Committee on Agriculture covers, as shown by this bill, the greatest possible range of activities, and I hope I have been able to show that the receipts and expenditures and general supervision of the Forest Service are not correctly lodged in the Department of Agriculture or in the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The forest-reserve expenditures are one-fourth of all the money appropriated in the name of agriculture. They are one-eighth as much as it is proposed to expend this session for river and harbor improvements.

Manifestly, it is impossible for any member of the Agricultural Committee to know as much as he would like to know about a great bureau which controls 154 separate reserves. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the handling of the forest reserves and their appropriations should be in the hands of a committee devoted to that purpose alone. In fact, inasmuch as the Forest Service handles the potential resources of the United States, and will soon deal with water-power leases and other great matters, the time is here when that great service shall be a department of the Government itself, backed up by a separate committee of the House of Representatives. I submit—as one member of a district, a very large part of which is comprised of neglected forest reserves, and where the activities of the rangers are most onerous—I have been within my rights in calling the attention of this committee to what has been promised to us, and what small returns we are receiving as our share of an expenditure of considerably more than five millions of dollars.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Chemistry: For all necessary expenses, for chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, for the employment of such assistants, clerks, and other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary for the purposes named, in the city of

Washington and elsewhere, in conducting investigations, collecting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such investigations; and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may furnish, upon application, samples of pure sugars, naval stores, microscopical specimens, and other products to State and municipal officers, educational institutions, and other parties and charge for the same a price to cover the cost thereof, such price to be determined and established by the Secretary, and the money received from sales to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, for carrying out the investigations and work herein authorized, as follows:

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the chairman what the purpose of this is, what is really to be done?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Alsberg, when before the committee, made this statement:

We have received a considerable number of requests from public-health laboratories where bacteriologists are employed for samples of pure sugar, which can not be obtained in commerce but which the Bureau of Chemistry has made from time to time for its own purposes. Those sugars are necessary for the study of bacteria—for the identification of such bacteria as the organism that produces typhoid. We have had no authority to aid these public institutions by giving them small quantities—an ounce or two—of these very rare sugars, which we get as a by-product in some of our work. We felt that they should not be given free but that they should be paid for, in order that their value might be appreciated.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. I see the committee put in language in reference to illustrating the results of such investigation.

Mr. LEVER. The statement of the chief on that proposition is this:

That is for the purpose of giving us authority to make illustrations of an educational nature. An example of that is the production through the past year of an egg-candling chart, of which I have a sample here. In the course of our investigations on the shipping and marketing of eggs, studies on the candling of eggs were made. We had these drawings made [indicating drawings]. We had no authority to publish that kind of a chart. Fortunately, the State of Missouri wanted those illustrations for a bulletin; so the State of Missouri had the stone made and the lithographs prepared, and the Department of Agriculture bought a certain number of those charts from the publisher.

Mr. FOSTER. It is simply to make that use of the investigations?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. Not for the purpose of putting them on moving pictures or anything of that kind?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all; just simply to illustrate what the department is doing for educational purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Not these other purposes?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all; there is no such intention in the minds of the committee, and I do not think in the mind of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and testing the chemical and physical properties of leather and tanning materials, and for the study of tanning processes, and the utilization of tannery by-products, $8,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. It is new legislation. I do it, Mr. Chairman, for a purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. This is starting up a new work in the Department of Agriculture that is now being done by the Bureau of Standards. We have built up the Bureau of Standards to do all this testing for the Government, and even for private individuals, and for that reason I make a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure it is subject to a point of order, but I will not argue the proposition.

Mr. MANN. Of course it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $139,680.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the total should be corrected.

Mr. LEVER. I shall ask unanimous consent at the close to correct the totals.

Mr. MANN. You had better ask unanimous consent now.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the totals of this bill may be corrected by the clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all totals in the bill may be corrected by the clerk to the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the food and drugs act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, and rent outside of the District of Columbia; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and development of methods of analysis, $635,161.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the language beginning on line 21, after the words "District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. To what does the point of order refer?

Mr. FOSTER. I make the point of order on the language on line 21, after the words "District of Columbia."

Mr. MANN. We have official representatives on the board which revises the Pharmacopœia, an annual revision being partly made and a decennial revision being quite completely made in the Bureau of Chemistry. I do not know how often this item or a similar item may come in, but these people are compelled to do this work. The Pharmacopœia is an official document under the pure food and drugs act, and it is desirable, certainly, to have the officials who have to enforce the pure food and drugs act to help in revising the Pharmacopœia. That is all this contemplates.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to that.

Mr. MANN. We have always provided for this in some way.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a private matter, and private capital pays for it and gets what profit may come from it.

Mr. MANN. Of course private capital pays for the publication of the Pharmacopœia, but it is not revised at the expense of private capital at all. It is revised by the scientific associations of the United States, and in that revision the Government officials are represented as officials of the Government.

Now, we make the Pharmacopœia the official statement under the pure food and drug act, as a matter of convenience, it is true, and yet these people ought to be represented in making up this Pharmacopœia, because they are obliged to follow it all the time in the enforcement of the law. The expense is very nominal, of course, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. I judge the expense would not be large.

Mr. MANN. The authority ought to be granted, surely.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state to the gentleman that we have tried to get some other pharmacopœia of the United States adopted by Congress. In times past such an effort has been made, and we never were able to succeed.

Mr. MANN. I would be willing to argue the question with the gentleman any day and undertake to convince him that it is impossible to make two standards of medicine at the same time of the same medicine. Of course, I know that the proposition has been to make the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia official by the Government, and nobody has any objection to that except in those cases where one pharmacopœia gives a statement as to the formation of a remedy in one way and another pharmacopœia gives a statement of its formation in another way, and nobody can enforce the law where you have two definitions of the same thing.

That has been the only objection to it. But if my friend is objecting to this because he is a homeopathist, of course I have nothing further to say.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I say if the gentleman is objecting to this because he is a homeopathist, I shall have nothing further to say.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. I supposed it was that way when the gentleman put it on the ground that the homeopathic pharmacopœia had not been made official.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman remembers that when this was in the bill a year or so ago it went out on a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would not dispute with the gentleman if he says that is the case, but I do not remember it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not referring to this particular item, but to the other matter that the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. MANN. I made a point of order, having had it under consideration in my committee for years, and having said to gentlemen interested in the publication of a new homeopathic pharmacopœia as against an existing pharmacopœia that nobody had any objection to making either one of the pharmacopœias official as to these things that were not duplicated. You can not enforce a prosecution against a man when you can not define what the crime is.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is partly right and partly wrong in his statement. However, in this case I will withdraw the point of order and let it go. But I do not think it is fair treatment.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when I was chairman—and the same is true now—never had the slightest desire to be unfair in the treatment of homeopathists, but always greatly respected their opinions and their pharmacopœia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the examination and classification of agricultural lands in forest reserves, in cooperation with the Forest Service, $20,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a matter that I am taking up with the department on this subject, and I shall be prepared to speak on it when the bill is taken up for consideration the next time. I do not want to occupy the time of the committee now, and I ask unanimous consent that this item may be passed, to be taken up when the committee next meets.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to pass this paragraph. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman want to do?

Mr. RAKER. I want to see if an amendment can not be presented which will come within the Holman rule, so as to permit a man in the Forest Reserve, who has obtained, say, 30 or 40 acres of land, lived on it, and then before proving up has obtained 10, 15, or 20 acres more, to make proof on the whole tract, and obtain his patent all at one time without making two or three bites of it.

Mr. MANN. This committee would not have jurisdiction of a matter of that sort. That belongs to the committee of which my distinguished friend from California [Mr. RAKER] is a very active member.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman recognize that this legislation was originally placed upon an appropriation bill, providing for these very things? I do not want to take the time of the committee, and it will take but a moment. If my amendment is not in order, of course that will end it.

Mr. MANN. If it were in order, it would take some time to discuss it. I think the gentleman ought to rely upon his own committee for that legislation. We are getting to a pretty late point in the session, where we have to dispose of things as we go along.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but I have not brought the correspondence here, and do not want to delay the committee if I can avoid it. I do not want to take the time of the committee without results.

Mr. MANN. I know. It is very seldom that the gentleman does.

Mr. RAKER. I have taken very little time of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Of which committee—the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. ADAIR. Any old committee.

Mr. RAKER. This particular committee at this time. I want simply to say that there are many complaints from actual bona fide homesteaders who apply for agricultural lands in the forest reserves. The complaint is that when a man makes his application there may be 100 acres for which he applies, and he is cut down to 40 acres and the tract zigzags in the survey, and on a full showing later more land is added; but the procedure is one which leads to great delay, and I was hoping that this matter might be regulated by giving the department further power if necessary, to the end that the homesteader might obtain title all at one time and so build up the country. I am asking this in the interest of homesteaders who are not seeking timberlands or mineral lands, but actual homes.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the homesteaders are very properly seeking to get good land wherever they can find it, if they do not have to pay for it. I do not blame them for that; but they had just as lief take advantage of the Government as anybody else. We could not properly perfect legislation of that sort on this bill. I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing spread of moths, Bureau of Entomology: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as he shall deem best, in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $310,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is being done and what progress is being made in the effort to control the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth?

Mr. LEVER. The information we have from the chief of the bureau on that subject is, I think, quite encouraging. They have lately introduced a parasite which is handling the situation pretty well and which the chief of the bureau thinks will probably control it in time.

Mr. MANN. Of course if they are going to eliminate or control one or both of these moths by a parasite which lays eggs that develop in the body of the moth it ought not to entail any very large amount of expense after they get started.

Mr. LEVER. Of course the introduction of the parasite is quite recent, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MANN. I do not know how far it has been successful. I know they have been introducing the parasite for a number of years, and sometimes they have been able to find it again in a locality where they have introduced it, but usually they have not.

Mr. LEVER. Heretofore the parasite has not been very satisfactory, but recently they have introduced a parasite which they think is going to be very valuable in keeping down the moths.

Mr. MANN. Of course we appropriate quite a sum of money. How far are they successful in preventing the spread of these moths in New England?

Mr. LEVER. Let me read the statement of Dr. Howard:

Dr. HOWARD. The work is going on very satisfactorily. The conditions in the infested territory are better than they have ever been, but there have been one or two outside outbreaks. Last winter, after I appeared before this committee, a colony of the moths was found at Mount Kisco, N. Y. The State authorities came down and borrowed some scouts from us, and by vigorous action they outlined and treated the colony, and I think this year they are on their way to actual extermination. Then, within the last two months, a colony was discovered at Rutherford, N. J., and the State of New Jersey, together with our scouts, are trying to wipe that out.

Upon the whole, I think the reports of the department are very encouraging.

Mr. RAKER. I move to strike out the last two words. Before making my statement, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not under this provision the department is making any effort to prevent the spread of these two pests by packages that are sent through the parcel post? Would this provision permit the department to take action in that particular?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, undoubtedly. Nothing can pass out of these quarantined districts that has not undergone the inspection of the department.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose a parcel is sent from a point in the Eastern States where these pests exist, and the parcel goes to California and is there in the post office. How are you going to get this package out to determine whether or not it is inspected before it is delivered to the consignee?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman candidly that that would be a pretty hard proposition. I imagine that it could be done under some regulation of the department. I do not know what regulation they may have on that subject. I do not know whether they would do anything at all under such circumstances.

Mr. RAKER. If it is not done and can not be done, does not the gentleman believe that while we are permitting plants and bulbs to be issued by parcel post, and we have a law in regard to quarantine on infected plants, that there ought to be some method by which the further spread of these diseases should be prevented and have the parcel-post articles inspected at the point of destination.

Mr. LEVER. I would not commit myself to that as a policy, but the gentleman's statement is very persuasive, at least.

Mr. RAKER. If there is no law on the statute book against it, and a State permits the inspection, does not the gentleman believe that under this appropriation the Government, in connection with the State, would be able to inspect the plants? In other words, could the funds provided for in this bill be used?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know as to this particular fund, but there are funds in the bill that could be used for that purpose.

Mr. RAKER. For these two particular moths?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. RAKER. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $3,500; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, $1,800; 1 administrative assistant, $2,250; 1 financial clerk, $1,600; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 5 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks at $900 each; 1 preparator, $1,200; 1 messenger, $720; 1 photographer, $1,300; 1 game warden, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $900; 2

messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 1 laborer, $600; 1 charwoman, $240; in all, $34,470.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment to correct a typographical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 1, after the word "clerks," insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey: For salaries and employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, furniture, supplies, traveling, and all other expenses necessary in conducting investigations and carrying out the work of the bureau, as follows:

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of having inserted in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by both branches of the Indiana Legislature about 10 days ago concerning the quarantine of the foot-and-mouth disease in the State of Indiana.

It clearly shows the people of that State were dissatisfied with the manner in which this matter was being administered. The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution pertaining to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Whereas there exists a modified quarantine by the Federal Government against 67 counties within the State of Indiana in which foot-and-mouth disease has not and does not at the present time exist, said modified quarantine prohibiting shipments of cattle, sheep, and other ruminants and swine for interstate shipment for any purpose other than immediate slaughter; and also a quarantine against 25 counties within the State of Indiana in which no known cases of foot-and-mouth disease now exist, 7 of the 25 counties adjoining counties where outbreaks of said disease occurred, but in which no outbreaks of said disease have existed at any time; and prohibiting interstate shipments from said quarantined counties unless inspected by Federal inspector before shipment, and also requiring that said shipments be made to quarantined sections of public stockyards at the point of destination or to abattoirs where Federal meat inspection is maintained, and prohibiting the same and the shipment from said point of destination, except to abattoirs within the State and for immediate slaughter only; and

Whereas the stockmen and farmers living within the counties under Federal quarantine are compelled to ship their live stock to quarantined sections of public stockyards and suffer heavy financial losses, amounting to from $40 to $100 a car because of shrinkage in weight of live stock, the result of delay in unloading cars and improper facilities for handling live stock, and because of the lower prices paid for all live stock in the quarantined section of said stockyards, due to lack of competition; and

Whereas farmers and live-stock breeders living in the State of Indiana are prohibited from shipping cattle, sheep, and swine interstate for purposes other than immediate slaughter, thus seriously interfering with the production of meat and the business and operations of the breeders of pure-bred stock; and

Whereas we believe that the control of foot-and-mouth disease is well in hand in the State of Indiana, and that there is a general and urgent demand for immediate relief by the farmers and live-stock men: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we respectfully request that the United States Senators and Members of Congress from the State of Indiana in the Congress of the United States call on the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture at an early date to request that reshipment of live stock be permitted from quarantine sections of stock yards now under a Federal quarantine to stock yards or stock markets in other States for immediate slaughter, and that the quarantine area which includes the counties in which the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred, and the infected animals have been slaughtered, and certain adjoining counties, be immediately changed to include the 5-mile zones surrounding premises where infection has existed; and that live-stock breeders and farmers located in the State of Indiana be allowed to ship, interstate, animals for breeding purposes from sections outside of the said 5-mile zones upon inspection by Federal or State quarantine officers; and further, that it is not the purpose or intention of this resolution to interfere with or hamper in any way the stamping out of the present outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease by the Federal and State authorities, which we believe is necessary to the live-stock industry of this country; and that we sincerely believe the relief asked for in these resolutions is reasonable and will not endanger in any way the live-stock interests of this or any other State; and that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana in the Congress of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some reference has been made about the quarantine of stock because of this disease in Indiana. I take it the work on this subject in that State was not so very satisfactory or the legislature would not have deemed it necessary to adopt this concurrent resolution. It was adopted about 10 days ago by a unanimous vote in both branches of the legislature, and was introduced because of the practical unanimous demand of the farmers and stock breeders to be relieved from what they felt and knew was operating as an injustice to them. They knew the manner in which the quarantine was enforced discriminated against them unjustly and ought to be modified so that the injustice would be removed. They felt it so keenly and knew it so well that the legislature recognized the merit of their contention and acted promptly in the premises as far as it could go. It would seem that a Government official with nothing but the good of the public at heart should not have permitted the matter to go on until the people were compelled to protest through their legislature. It occurs to me, and doubtless to each Member, that there was urgent necessity for this action on the part of the legislature or it would not have been taken. Public requirements demanded it take notice of the matter, and it did so. This clearly demonstrates that in the administration of this matter in that State the people have not been satisfied, and hence the expression was made of their objection in this public and official way.

Complaints of the wrongs done because of the manner in which it has been administered have been many and emphatic, and as the matter has been brought to the attention of the department in an official manner, I hope it will take proper notice of it and see to it that the party responsible for it shall be brought to justice and dealt with properly. This will not repair the injury done the innocent who have suffered because of it, nor will it repair the losses suffered, but it will admonish those who are intrusted with a similar public duty hereafter that such duty must be efficiently performed and the rights of the public preserved, which has not been done in this instance, as it most clearly appears.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, $110,000: *Provided*, That of this sum $15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests and other public lands: *And provided further*, That of this sum not more than $5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not know whether this paragraph is an illustration of how difficult it is to ever stop an appropriation after it has once started, or whether it is an illustration of the natural and proper extension of the work. We started in to appropriate a certain amount of money for the destruction of ground squirrels in the national forests, assuming that when they got those all destroyed we would quit making that appropriation. But possibly—I do not say that it is so—gentlemen who hold the job, when they run out of squirrels in the national forests, still like to continue the work, so they have got the committee to insert "or other public lands," and we now have entered on a project of killing all the ground squirrels on all the lands in the West.

If we commence to kill the ground squirrels in all the lands of the United States and my recollection as a boy is any good, it is quite a task that we have entered upon. What harm do the ground squirrels do the Government on the public lands?

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think we have also spent a considerable amount of money destroying them in California to prevent their carrying diseases.

Mr. MANN. Yes; that is carried in another bill.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Illinois direct his inquiry to me?

Mr. MANN. To anybody who is willing to respond.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is thoroughly familiar with the proposition, and I appeal to him.

Mr. MANN. He is young and tender on the committee, and I suppose that is the reason that he dares to rush in to defend it. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not defending anything. I will read what was said before the committee:

Mr. HENSHAW. That is the case, Mr. Chairman. The new language as it appears in these estimates reads, "and adjacent public lands," but since that would limit our work to national forests and lands contiguous thereto, we now would like to change that again so as to read "national forests and other public lands." There are public lands more or less remote from national forests where we are very anxious to carry on demonstration work for the benefit of neighboring farmers, but our present authority is not sufficiently broad to permit that. If the words were changed to "and other public lands," that would enable us to do the needed work.

And so I take it that the change of language is designed to permit demonstration work for the benefit of settlers.

Mr. MANN. I do not know how accurate the gentleman is in other respects, but he is wholly inaccurate in his statement that this appropriation does not permit demonstration work on public lands as to ground squirrels, because this item is "for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry." That permits the demonstration work on public lands in reference to ground squirrels.

Mr. ANDERSON. The proposition of the gentleman before the committee was that that only permitted demonstration in the forest reserves.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman in charge of the work does not know what the appropriation is. It is first $110,000 for demonstration work destroying animals injurious to agriculture. Then there is a provision that $15,000 of this shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels in the national forests. That is a mandatory provision. I say here is a man with a job. The squirrels have run out; the money must be expended; so that the man has to extend the scope. He can not find squirrels on the national forests, so he wants to extend it and find them on the public domain. But he already has authority to make experiments in the way of demonstration work in any place in the national forests or on the public domain, or in New York City if he can find squirrels there. There is no limitation. But now he wants to be forced to destroy the squirrels on all the public domain. Why, that is an immense undertaking and ought not to be entered upon. If we enter upon it we will be asked to destroy all noxious animals in the United States before we get through if this gentleman continues to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. And could not get a reply.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., 847, 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, $50,000.

Mr. CULLOP. I find a great many complaints concerning this legislation, and only yesterday I received a letter from the game warden of Indiana complaining about the operation of the law there, and inquiring if a test case had been made.

Mr. LEVER. A test case has been made.

Mr. CULLOP. Among other things, saying that the lawyers had advised the warden that the act itself was invalid and that it worked great hardships. A few hunters are living in the country yet in many places, and they desire to exercise the privilege of enjoying this sport, but that they are denied the pleasure on account of this law. The letter is interesting, and I here submit it for the benefit of the committee:

INDIANA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION,
Indianapolis, January 21, 1915.

Hon. W. A. CULLOP, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CULLOP: Under the Federal law of 1913, providing for Federal control of migratory game and insectivorous birds, waterfowl, including brant, ducks, geese, and swan, may be killed from September 1 to December 15, inclusive. Woodcock may be killed from October 1 until November 30, inclusive, and jacksnipe or Wilson snipe, black-breasted and golden plover, and greater or lesser yellow legs may be killed from September 1 to December 1, inclusive.

It so happens that the open season provided by said law for killing the above game birds is the very time that there are none of these birds in Indiana to shoot, and the sportsmen of this State feel that the law is a very unjust one, and they are up in arms against it. Practically the only duck shooting we have in Indiana is in the early spring, as the birds linger a few days in their flight to the north, and our sportsmen, under the Indiana law, can shoot ducks, geese, etc., until the 15th day of April, which gives them a few days of duck shooting in the spring months. The Federal law takes away the only duck shooting our sportsmen have. These same conditions exist as to the shooting of woodcock, snipe, and the other game birds mentioned above. The open season fixed by the Federal law for shooting them is the very time when there are none in Indiana to shoot. Our sportsmen view the Federal law as purely a rich man's law. These birds are protected by law in their flight from the south to the north and are then slaughtered in the summer months in Canada, and, really, the only sportsmen who have any opportunity to enjoy shooting these birds are those who are wealthy enough and have sufficient leisure to spend their winters south and their summers north.

I am informed that the Federal law is not being enforced and that the Government has not the men available to enforce it, if it so desired. It seems to be the opinion of a great many of our best lawyers that the said law is unconstitutional. I am also informed that an article was published in Field and Stream to the effect that certain parties in the State of Kansas had violated the law and invited the Federal authorities to arrest them, in order to test its constitutionality, but that the Federal authorities refused to make the arrests. What are we to do? Shall we go ahead and observe the Federal law or shall we disregard it and observe only our State laws?

The Fish and Game Commission of Indiana is vitally interested in this matter, not only because it seems to be unjust to our sportsmen, but for the further reason that our commission derives its funds from the sale of licenses, and if our sportsmen are deprived of this shooting, there is no reason why they should pay out their money for the privilege.

I should be very glad to have you take this matter up with the proper authorities and give me your advice as to what action this department should take in regard to the observation of the State law.

Yours, very truly,

E. C. SHIREMAN, *Commissioner.*

Was it the real purpose of this law when it was enacted in regard to the migration of game from one part of the country to another to protect it, or was it to give some hunters an advantage over others?

Mr. LEVER. It is to protect migratory game. That answers the question in one sentence.

Mr. CULLOP. And not in the interest of the hunters of any particular section of the country. I must confess it looks to me as if it was in the interest of certain classes of hunters.

Mr. LEVER. Not that I know of.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, it is plain from this letter of the game warden that these birds and ducks go over into Canada, and the rich sportsmen of this country go over there during the summer months and have a good time hunting, while the poor fellow at home, because of this legislation, is denied that right. I think there is something in this contention in reference to it. They go over into Canada and spend the summer touring around a month or so enjoying themselves and killing the game that goes out of the United States, while the ordinary fellow in this country, on account of this legislation and who is not so well fixed financially, can not visit Canada and the northern part of the country, and hence has no opportunity to have his sport and kill game here at home. The same amount of game, it is claimed, is killed every year, but they go out of the country to kill it; but it is in all probability the same game that passes from this country into the northern country. Now, if this be true it would seem the legislation was enacted for the benefit of the rich and to the detriment of the poor. I am opposed to it.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Indiana will permit, as I said a moment ago, an appeal of this case is before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CULLOP. I would ask if the gentleman can give the title of the case? I do hope the decision of the lower court will be sustained, and let the poor hunter have a chance.

Mr. LEVER. I do not happen to have the title, but it is a decision of Judge Trevor, of Arkansas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say that I put that decision in full in the RECORD last Congress when it was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized. I desire to ask the gentleman if he can give me some information as to how much of the $50,000 appropriated last year has been expended in the enforcement of this law up to this time?

Mr. MANN. The year is not up yet.

Mr. LEVER. It will be impossible to tell the gentleman how much we have spent of the $50,000 up to this time.

Mr. MANN. We appropriated $50,000 in the last bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The House appropriated $10,000 and the Senate made it $50,000; and, as I recall, the $50,000 at that time was all that the Department of Agriculture asked for and all they thought they could expend, but it was stated by the then Secretary of Agriculture, or the chief having in charge this provision, that they did not propose to endeavor to enforce the law and spend much money until the question had been decided as to the right of Congress to enact any such law; and, if I recall, the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, then stated that that $10,000 was all that was needed and all that the department asked for, and, on account of the doubtful constitutionality of this law, the department did not think that they would spend it. However, it went over to the Senate and, with the same information, the Senate put it up to $50,000; and it is important to know whether the department has spent the $50,000, or calculates expending it, or again contemplates expending this sum.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman it would be impossible for me to get the data he wants at my hand at the moment. I have no information at hand on that proposition.

Mr. MANN. They are spending money now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, they can expend the money. They can throw it at the birds.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman asked if they were doing it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not doubt that they will spend it if you give it to them.

Mr. MANN. Permit me to say that there have been a good many prosecutions brought under this law, and the Government has been successful in every case except the Arkansas case.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not remember about that.

Mr. MANN. I read about the case officially the other day.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course we have got to appropriate for this provision as long as it is the law.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of the $50,000, $7,000 is expended here in Washington for necessary clerical services and other work and $43,000 is expended for the hiring of persons, either alone or in

cooperation with associations in the States, for the protection of water fowl and game birds and insectivorous birds.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman means it has been allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture to be expended?

Mr. HAWLEY. It is being expended now for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not doubt but that he would expend twice as much if you gave it to him.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, this law is supposed to be a national law, affecting all States alike. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how it happens that in every State in the Union except three Southern States this law goes into effect on the 1st day of February? Why are the three Southern States excluded?

Mr. LEVER. I can not answer that question, because I do not know that it is a fact.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the law is in effect everywhere.

Mr. BARTON. I am so informed by the department.

Mr. LEVER. The chairman evidently has in mind something about the open and closed season?

Mr. BARTON. Yes; the open and closed season.

Mr. LEVER. That would be affected by the climate where they are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Division of Accounts and Disbursements, $44,920.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. We have now come to the Division of Publications, and I think we shall be able to finish this bill easily on Thursday and then have some time to spare.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will pardon me a moment, I suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that there is absolutely no change in the Division of Publications.

Mr. MANN. It will not take any longer Thursday than to-night.

Mr. LEVER. I am anxious to get to that Bureau of Crop Estimates.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think the gentleman will be in great luck to get to the Bureau of Soils, on page 47. We are now on page 55, and we have read about 30 pages to-day.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman give me five minutes? It remains five minutes until 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. I am going to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. CROSSER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of the serious illness of his father.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1324), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves all points of order.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Thursday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock Thursday morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the ship purchase bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the ship purchase bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed a speech delivered by Carl Schurz on peace and war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Carl Schurz. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that speech must have been printed and pretty widely distributed years ago. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is only a very short speech, Mr. Speaker, and it is not included in his printed speeches.

Mr. BORLAND. What is it about?

Mr. BARKLEY. Peace and war. It was made soon after the Cleveland Venezuela message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how long a speech is it?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would take about 10 minutes to read it.

Mr. MANN. That depends upon how fast a man talks. How much space would it take in the RECORD?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not take more than half a page. I ran across it in a newspaper. It is not printed in the collected speeches, and it so impressed me that I would like to have it printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for transporting and caring for interned Mexican soldiers and military refugees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1522), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20977) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1323), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (S. 3419) admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing George Edward Lerrigo, of the city of Topeka, in the State of Kansas, reported

the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1321), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WITHERSPOON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18174) to transfer Capt. John Calvin Leonard from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1322), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20261) granting a pension to James G. Caldwell, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 21183) to amend section 212 of the Penal Code; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 21184) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 21185) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. GITTINS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the President to invite the nations of the world to participate in a conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 21186) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Philpott and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 21187) granting a pension to Maggie Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 21188) granting a pension to Abraham Branadum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21189) granting a pension to Henry Steinmetz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 21190) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin N. Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 21191) granting an increase of pension to Savilla Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 21192) for the relief of the Orvil Cooperative Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 21193) granting a pension to Charles C. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 21194) granting a pension to John C. Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21195) granting a pension to Mary White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21196) granting an increase of pension to Sherman L. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21197) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Batsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21198) granting an increase of pension to William E. Stukey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21199) granting a pension to Lilla Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 21200) quieting and confirming the title of the Methodist University of Oklahoma in and to certain tracts of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Mississippi Choctaw Indians, favoring the passage of House bill 19213, for the relief of Mississippi Choctaw Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of A. B. Wiltse, Ritzville, Wash., relative to fourteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Cincinnati (Ohio) Branch, National German-American Alliance, favoring embargo on contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Louis Brickenberger and other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Otto Pippart, Martin Rosch, Adam Buckreis, C. J. Pfeffer, C. E. Lamade, Michael Foeldery, George Pielmeier, George A. Scheeler, Carl Willnecker, H. Sabathne, K. Kumpf, John C. Schomberg, George Breisacher, Edward A. Gromiller, Matthew Hauser, Karl Wolke, Francis Weidlich, Richard Siegel, Peter Bey, George Schottdorf, George Nickola, Adam H. Brede, Joseph Murl, August Hauser, August Noll, George Funk, John Gieg, Fred Apple, Louis Wiesinger, Albert Staerk, Adolph Koehle, Adolph Benzel, Fred Nickola, John B. Ritter, Hugo Weissflog, Robert Schroeder, Adam Schauer, Jacob Haller, John George Schmidt, and Anton Steckeler, all of Altoona, Pa., for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the exportation of arms and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Italian Protective Association of Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 472, United Mine Workers of America, favoring passage of the Kern-Foster bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of Woman's Literary Club, First Baptist Church, First Presbyterian Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, First Church of Christ (Scientist), Markham Air Rifle Co., Daisy Manufacturing Co., and 9 citizens, all of Plymouth, Mich., protesting against the shipment of American horses to countries now at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Fred Engel, president, and Joachim Schwieger, secretary, Arbeiter Bund of Dundee; Rev. F. Bauer and 45 citizens of Riga; J. Fred Schaeberle and 37 citizens of Ann Arbor, all of the State of Michigan, in opposition to the shipment of arms to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring S. 3672, providing for exchange between Federal Government and State of New York for certain waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARR: Memorial of St. Kagimier Society, of Windber, Pa., protesting against immigration restrictions; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of Board of Supervisors of Solano County, Cal., favoring old-age retirement of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring bill to prohibit export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of John Sul, of Hoboken, and William Biskorcsanys, of Guttenberg, N. J., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of directors of the Racine (Wis.) Commercial Club and directors of the Racine (Wis.) Retail Merchants' Association, asking that combined passenger and package freight steamers on the Great Lakes be exempted from the provisions of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of C. F. Pfefferkern and 63 other citizens of Elroy, Wis., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GITTINS: Petition of citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring bill to improve the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Lewiston, Me., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of Polish National Giuini, of Mount Pleasant; Polish Lodge, Z. N. P., of Jeannette; St. Joseph's Society, Lodge 88, Polish Alliance; St. Stanislaus Lodge, B. & M., 364; Society of Gorali Polskich, all of Mount

Pleasant; Branch 1380 of the National Polish Alliance, and United Groups of the National Polish Alliance, of Jeanette; H. M. B. Stanislaus Group, No. 1143, of Forbes Road; National Polish Alliance, No. 791, of East Vandergrift; 78 members Knights of the White Eagle, of Mount Pleasant; and National Polish Alliance of Monessen, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of Carl Hermann and other citizens of Oconto, Lawrence, and Brown Counties, and citizens of Marinette, Wis., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of John Gwozdz, Thompsonville, Conn., relative to Smith-Burnett Immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of National German-American Alliance, of Lewiston, Me., favoring the prohibition of the sale and export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of sundry citizens of Plattsmouth, Elmwood, Alvo, Greenwood, and Murdock, Nebr., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring S. 3672, providing for exchange between Federal Government and State of New York of certain waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Littlefork and Hibbing, eighth district of Minnesota, favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of National German-American Alliance, of Oswego, N. Y., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Cazenovia, N. Y., relative to world federation for the adjudication of international disputes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of branch of the Polish Alliance of America, Oswego, N. Y., protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens and organizations of Connecticut, against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petitions of 305 and more citizens of Kentucky, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of sundry societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of St. Samalaw Br My Society and Pulaski, Washington, and Kosciusko Society, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petitions of the Eleventh and Fifteenth Ward Branch, Socialist Party, Newark, N. J., protesting against treatment of striking workingmen at Roosevelt, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of citizens of Cohocton, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 27, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	James	Page	Smoot
Bryan	Jones	Perkins	Stone
Catron	Kenyon	Pittman	Thornton
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Clapp	La Follette	Root	Townsend
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	White
Fletcher	Nelson	Sheppard	Williams
Gallinger	O'Gorman	Sherman	

Mr. JAMES. I was requested to announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. HOLLIS, Mr. LANE, Mr. MCLEAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. THOMPSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. NORRIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PENSION BILLS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may take up the bills granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War. I will state to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] there are only about a half dozen of those bills on the calendar, and it will not take very long to pass them. I believe that this would be a very good time to take them up, if there is no objection. Some of them are Senate bills and I know the other House is waiting to make up an omnibus pension bill, and they ought to be given an opportunity to do so in order that they may be passed upon at this session of Congress. I ask the Senator if he will not allow this to be done. I do not mean general legislation, but simply the bills granting pensions and increase of pensions to the soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not to affect the status of the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Not to affect the status of the pending bill, of course.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I would not like to do that now. I think it is very important that we should proceed with the pending bill. The Senate yesterday did not sit as many hours as it might have done, and I hope the Senator from Utah will not ask me to yield now. One thing leads to another and we do not know how much time we would lose. I feel constrained to object at present. It may be that at some later time we can arrange it.

Mr. SMOOT. Would the Senator object to simply taking up the Senate pension bills at this time so that they can be sent to the other House?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not feel justified in consenting to any variation from the regular order at this time. I am sorry, but I must ask for the regular order.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 5614) for the improvement of the foreign service.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 6856.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when I yielded the floor on yesterday for a motion to go into executive session I was presenting the report of the directors of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, one of the most instructive documents that has been issued on the subject now before the Senate. Before concluding the reading of the report I beg to inquire what the question before the Senate is at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the original bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the amendment be read, as I may want to address myself to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That no vessels shall be purchased under this act which are the property, in whole or in part, of or which are in any manner controlled or subsidized by any of the nations now at war, nor shall

any vessels be purchased under this act which are the property of any of the subjects or citizens of said belligerent nations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I made the inquiry for the reason that I wanted to ascertain whether the amendment now under consideration is embraced in the new draft of the bill reported on yesterday.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I will say to the Senator that it is not included in the substitute that was reported yesterday.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have just discovered that fact.

Now, Mr. President, I will conclude the reading of the report of the Boston Chamber of Commerce:

The proposed bills profess, in general language, to provide Government-owned ships only for "the foreign trade," but this profession is thrown to the winds by an amendment adopted in the Senate Committee on Commerce which includes Hawaii among the regions to which a Government-owned fleet shall operate. Hawaii is not a foreign country. It is not a dependency like the Philippines or Guam. It is a regularly organized Territory of the United States, and its ports are ports of the United States, exactly as are Boston and New York and Philadelphia and San Francisco. Trade with Hawaii is and has been since 1900 American coastwise trade, in which none but American vessels may lawfully participate. There has not been a word of suggestion or complaint that the war in Europe affected in any way the transportation of merchandise between Hawaii and the American mainland, for which a large, new, and increasing American fleet is available. The inclusion of Hawaii among foreign ports in foreign trade is without a shadow of excuse; all interested in the American merchant marine will rightfully regard it as an ugly menace, as an "entering wedge" to Government competition in the entire great coastwise commerce of this country, reserved for more than a hundred years to American ships and American owners, and now employing a vast shipping of upward of 7,000,000 tons. Any plea that the help of the Government is needed in this mighty trade is wholly baseless and indefensible.

Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted to the Senate on yesterday proposes to do to a certain extent precisely what the Boston Chamber of Commerce feared would be done in the matter of this legislation. It opens, to a certain extent, the coastwise trade to these ships that are to be built by the money of the Government, breaking down the laws that relate to the coastwise trade of the United States which have been on the statute books for over a century, and to my mind, next to the matter of Government ownership, that is one of the most serious conditions which confront us in this proposed legislation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I would inquire of the Senator if the Hawaiian line—I do not recall its corporate name——

Mr. PERKINS. The American-Hawaiian Line.

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator if the American-Hawaiian Line is not one of the most prosperous steamship lines that we have in this country?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is one of the most prosperous and one that, perhaps, does more credit to the American merchant marine, such as it is, than any other line now in operation. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], sotto voce, asks me if they are able to supply the demand. There has never been any suggestion that they need additional ships between the ports of the United States and Hawaii, and there is not any excuse for breaking down the coastwise laws, so far as Hawaii is concerned.

The report concludes as follows:

The amendment added to the bill in the Senate Committee on Commerce authorizing the Government to charter, lease, or transfer its ships to private corporations is a frank recognition of the force of the criticism which the original plan has met with everywhere from the representative mercantile bodies of the United States. But this modified proposal also is essentially unsound. So long as merchant ships cost more to operate under the American flag than under foreign flags no Government-owned ships will be chartered by experienced shipowners unless the amount of this additional cost of operation is subtracted from the charter price, leaving that price merely nominal. Under such conditions the Government, of course, will actually be paying a concealed subsidy, which might much better be a frank, open, and stated one.

The committee on merchant marine of the Boston Chamber of Commerce therefore disapproves the bills pending in both Houses of Congress (H. R. 18666 and S. 6856) for Government ownership and operation of vessels in the foreign trade for the following reasons:

(a) It is a sound principle that the Federal Government should not engage in a business which, under suitable conditions, can be conducted to equal or better advantage by private enterprise.

(b) Such an undertaking would be an unwise departure from the traditional policy of the American people, would involve a wasteful expenditure of public money, and would imperil our neutral position in the great European war.

(c) No present emergency justifies the Government in embarking in the ocean shipping business; increased governmental facilities for marine insurance will largely solve the immediate problem of the cotton trade; Government ownership could not immediately add to the number of ships afloat upon the seas; and wherever there is a real need for vessels they can be as easily supplied by other means without resorting to this unsound and hazardous experiment.

(d) The proposed legislation would discourage private capital and personal initiative, and thereby indefinitely defer the development of an American ocean shipping industry, so vital to the commercial progress of Boston, of New England, and of the whole United States.

We make the following suggestions as to methods for the creation of a strong and enduring merchant marine, which would be preferable to Government ownership and operation as proposed in the pending bills, and urge their consideration by Congress:

SUGGESTIONS.

1. The establishment in the Department of Commerce of a shipping board of five members, after the example of the British Board of Trade and similar organizations of other maritime governments, such a shipping board to be composed of the Commissioner of Navigation, a representative of the ship-owning interests, of the shipbuilding interests, of the shippers in water-borne trade, and an expert in marine insurance, this board to have general supervision of the American merchant marine.

2. A prompt revision and modernizing of our navigation laws and regulations, so far as they unnecessarily increase the cost of operating American ships as against foreign vessels.

3. An amendment of the ocean-mail law of 1891 so that the compensation now paid to 20-knot ships to Europe can be paid to ships of less speed—of the second class—suitable to establish regular mail, passenger, and fast-freight services in naval reserve ships on the longer routes to South America, Australasia, and the Orient.

4. In place of an investment of $40,000,000 in Government ownership and operation a Federal fund of the same amount, to be administered by the shipping board above referred to for the purpose of guaranteeing mortgages examined and approved by the board or for careful loans upon shipping built or purchased for over-seas trade and fitted for auxiliary naval service.

The sum of $40,000,000 devoted to ownership and operation of a Government-owned fleet would produce only a relatively small fleet, but a proper use of a Government fund in the manner indicated would provide a large one, of far greater value to the commerce of the Nation.

5. Annual retainers of a proper amount to citizen officers and men of merchant vessels of the United States, after the practice that has proved so successful, particularly in the British mercantile marine, and special compensation to steamships not under contract for carrying mails, but built on designs approved by the Navy Department and pledged to the service of the Government as fuel ships, supply ships, or transports, so that the Government may be able to control an adequate American auxiliary fleet and a naval reserve of officers and men in time of need.

6. To meet a present condition an extension of the powers of the existing Bureau of War-Risk Insurance to cover marine insurance on hulls and cargoes, with the understanding that this bureau shall be discontinued when the war is ended.

Respectfully submitted.

ELWYN G. PRESTON, *Chairman*,	THEODORE JONES,
EDWARD E. BLODGETT,	WINTHROP L. MARVIN,
L. A. COOLIDGE,	ROBERT S. PEABODY,
PAUL E. FITZPATRICK,	GEORGE F. WILLETT,
FREDERICK FOSTER.	

The special committee on the American merchant marine in the foreign trade of the Chamber of Commerce of New York has submitted an interesting and instructive report. It is in line with the declaration of almost every commercial body of the country, and conclusively proves that the business interests of the United States are absolutely and unreservedly opposed to the proposed legislation.

On that point, Mr. President, I desire to say that, so far as the commercial bodies of the United States are concerned, I know of none—unless we except the dispatch which came here from a citizen of Chicago the other day, who stated that the executive committee of the Chicago Board of Trade had passed a resolution in favor of this legislation—I know of no other body that has passed resolutions of that kind, while, on the other hand, from the Atlantic to the Pacific the boards of trade and commercial organizations, representing the business interests, shipping included, have passed strong and forceful resolutions condemning it unreservedly.

The report of the special committee on the American merchant marine in the foreign trade of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, to which I have referred, is as follows:

To the Chamber of Commerce:

The war in Europe has centered attention in this country upon our lack of a merchant marine. The problem, while present in the public mind to some extent for years, had not been brought home forcibly to all parts of the country as has been done by the partial tying up of the commerce of the world, and the consequent inability of this country to find neutral tonnage to carry its products to foreign markets. This sudden shortage of vessel tonnage resulted in an abrupt advance in freight rates, making it possible for the first time in years for American vessels to engage profitably in foreign trade.

The conditions to-day are recognized by all to be abnormal, and to some extent unsafe as a permanent basis for the reestablishment of our merchant marine; but they are certain to continue, so long as a state of war exists in Europe, and probably, because of the wastage of vessel property during the conflict, for several years after it ends.

The return to normal conditions in Europe must be gradual. Industries, to-day prostrate, must be reconstructed. Cities which have been laid waste must be rebuilt. The products of Europe will not equal the demands of that Continent; and the cost of shipbuilding which has already advanced 20 per cent in England, will continue for some time upon a higher level than has been normal in the past. It seems, therefore, that the immediate future affords an opportunity that ought to be availed of to reestablish our foreign merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry of this country.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator in regard to the report of the New York Chamber of Commerce from which he is reading? I take it that is the report which was submitted some days ago to the Chamber

of Commerce, in which the committee recommend as a remedy for the present situation the guaranteeing of bonds issued by private concerns that might engage in the shipping business. That is the remedy proposed, as I understand, in the report from which the Senator is quoting.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is the report of the special committee on the American merchant marine in the foreign trade of the New York Chamber of Commerce. I propose to read it with some care, and the Senator will be able to ascertain exactly what the special committee recommends. I have not as yet examined it, and hence am not familiar with its recommendations; but whatever they are, they are worthy of our consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. The reason I was inquiring was because I think there was a subsequent report, although I am not certain about that, and I did not know from which one the Senator was reading.

Mr. GALLINGER. The report continues:

The problem under the most favorable conditions is difficult; but it is rendered less difficult by the unusual conditions which now exist. That a merchant marine is to-day desired by the American people can not be denied. There are some who, while recognizing all of the difficulties, believe that our shipping should be reestablished by Government aid, no matter what the cost may be. There are others who think that the industry should be left to work out its own future and be reestablished only if it can be done without Government aid. A third element, representing perhaps the greater part of the people of the country, believe that reasonable Government aid should be extended to reestablish so important an industry, and are willing that substantial Government assistance be extended during the development period, if a wise method can be suggested.

Your committee, while sharing to the fullest extent the desire of all citizens to see the American flag and American shipping again upon the high seas, recognizes that the problem is one of business; and that an American merchant marine to be permanent must justify itself in competition with ships of foreign nations. Your committee believes that American shipping can justify itself upon this basis, once the development period has been passed, and feels that advantage should be taken of the present exceptional opportunity to place American vessels in competition for the commerce of the world.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the methods which seem practicable, we desire to place ourselves on record as opposed to Government ownership and Government operation of vessels. We do not base our opposition to this principle upon the ground that a Government department can not operate vessel property as cheaply as private owners, although we have grave doubt of the ability of the Government to meet the economic standards of successful private enterprise. We base our objections on the much more fundamental principle in this instance that Government competition in this field of industrial effort will, in our belief, defeat the ends which it is sought to attain.

The American people desire not only to see the American flag upon the high seas, but to see American commerce restored to a position of supremacy. England alone has over 4,000 steamers engaged in foreign trade.

Some estimates have placed the number at twice that figure—

and to meet and ultimately outdistance competition of this character will require an enormous investment of American capital and energy. It is impossible to conceive that Government ownership and operation can be successfully extended to cover so vast a field, and the moment it is invaded by the competition of public capital American private capital and energy, so essential to the successful restoration of our merchant marine on any adequate scale, will decline to enter the field. We have in New York City an example of the operation of this principle. The municipality has begun the construction of wharves and piers for the accommodation of freight vessels. Private enterprise has refused to meet the competition of public capital and untaxed property, and the construction of wharf property through private effort has ceased. The city has been unable to keep pace with the demands of shipping, and commerce is already beginning to suffer from a shortage of pier property.

Certain officials in Washington who are deeply interested in the experiment of Government ownership and operation of vessel property reply to all objections with the statement that private capital has failed to take substantial advantage of the amendments already made to the shipping laws, and that unless American ships are forthcoming from private capital they conceive it to be the duty of the Government to secure them by the use of public credit. It may be urged in reply to this statement that American ships have not been produced by private capital at this juncture, both because the finances of the world have been in deadlock since these amendments have been passed, so that capital investments have not been made in ships or anything else and also because this temporary legislation has only partially paved the way for the investment of American capital in vessel property.

The steamship man must obtain his capital for American ships from American investors. The American investor knows little of the value of securities of steamship companies beyond the repeated statements in the public press that it costs 40 per cent more to operate an American vessel than one owned abroad, and that, consequently, competition is impossible without a heavy subsidy.

These statements are not calculated to attract American capital to vessel securities. The recent difficulties of the railroads in securing capital for needed extensions illustrates the importance of maintaining public confidence in the value of securities which must be sold to provide the transportation facilities vital to the welfare of this country, and it seems pertinent to ask how it can be expected to interest private capital in vessel property if public competition be substituted for public regulation.

In the olden days of sailing ships the cost of a vessel was comparatively small, and it was the custom to divide the ownership among the members of a community. The captain, perhaps, owned a thirty-second, some one else a sixty-fourth, and those who had money to invest took the balance in accordance with their means. The larger capital requirement of modern business has brought into existence the corporation, and to-day all important enterprise is financed by the sale of stocks or bonds secured by the property owned.

At the outset it must be recognized that one of the most important parts of this problem is to satisfy the investing public that they can safely buy bonds secured by vessel property. Otherwise the steamship man is helpless, and can do little to restore our shipping, no matter what inducements may be held out to him.

Your committee will, therefore, first address itself to suggestions for a solution of this portion of the difficulty. A suggestion which has frequently been put forth is that the Government guarantee the bonds of steamship companies. This the committee does not favor, for if a Government guaranty be extended to all owners public credit will be employed to an extent to cause grave concern to conservative men; and, on the other hand, if the guaranty be limited to the bonds of a few individuals or corporations a feeling is sure to exist that favoritism has been shown. Whatever form of guaranty is offered it should be available to all whose character and standing entitle them to it and a distinct limit should be placed upon the extent of the obligation assumed by the Nation.

The present administration has suggested that $30,000,000 be invested in Government-owned vessels. If this be done, a small fleet will be created, but the feeling that the Government may from time to time add to this fleet and enter more extensively into competition for the ocean-carrying trade will prevent the participation of private enterprise in solving this problem.

Your committee submits that the same sum, if set aside as a guaranty fund and invested in Government bonds or other income-bearing securities, to be administered by a central board, having the same fostering relationship to the building up of our commerce and shipping as the Federal Reserve Board has to our finance and banking, will accomplish infinitely greater results. This guaranty fund could be administered along lines which have been in successful operation in a different field for a hundred years, namely, in relation to mortgages upon real estate. The Credit Foncier in France and other companies which guarantee mortgages upon property in Argentina, Canada, and elsewhere are well known, but the best illustrations for local purposes are the various mortgage guaranty companies of this country. A loan is perhaps made at 5 per cent. The mortgage is guaranteed by the company and sold upon a 4½ per cent basis, the guaranteeing company making one-half of 1 per cent annually upon each mortgage as a compensation for its guaranty and its services. Its services consist in collecting the interest, seeing that taxes and assessments are paid, and that the insurance is maintained.

An example of the successful operation of such a company is the Bond & Mortgage Guaranty Co. of this city. That company began its operations 22 years ago with $1,000,000 capital and a small surplus. It has guaranteed within that period about $750,000,000 of mortgages, many of which have, of course, been paid off. It has outstanding approximately two hundred and fifty millions of guaranteed mortgages. Its present capital is $5,000,000 and the combined capital and surplus exceeds $10,000,000. It has paid its own way, made good some losses, and added more than $5,000,000 to capital and surplus from earnings of one-half of 1 per cent upon mortgages guaranteed. In addition it has occupied a useful field of enterprise. An occasional loss is of course made, but the income from invested capital, together with the percentage set aside annually out of the interest rate, makes good all losses and, under conservative management, leaves a satisfactory margin of profit.

As applied to the construction of a ship, the guaranty would, of course, cover only a part of the vessel's cost, and a guaranty fund of $25,000,000, conservatively administered, could safely guarantee several hundred million dollars of steamship bonds, and thus do far more to reestablish our shipping than would be the case if a similar amount was permanently invested in vessel property. If this plan be adopted, an attractive security can be offered to the public; the responsibility of the Government can be limited, the Government would be paid for its guaranty, and a central board having supreme authority over shipping matters can be established. Such a board could approve construction plans, much as the building department of New York approves building plans, and approve the standing and character of the men behind a steamship enterprise, much as the Federal Reserve Board approves indorsers of notes and bills of exchange. It could be useful in many ways and should assure a high grade of public intelligence in charge of this important department of public welfare.

Notwithstanding the objections which many advance to public commissions, your committee has developed by inquiry among steamship men that such a commission would be welcomed by them as an aid in eliminating difficulties which now exist in shipping matters. The board should be made equal in dignity to the Federal Reserve Board, and it should be considered a high honor to serve upon it.

Your committee will not attempt to take the time necessary to do more than outline the general functions of such a board, and to affirm its belief that the suggestion offers a practical method of enabling steamship men to secure a substantial part of the money necessary to reestablish our shipping at a rate of interest much lower than is available at present, while at the same time safeguarding the public credit and fostering shipping in the interest of public welfare.

All shipping matters should be placed under the control of this board, and there is now pending in Washington legislation, which, if enacted into law, will require the most careful supervision of men of high intelligence who should devote all of their time to the work. This legislation covers the general field of governmental regulation of steamship rates, government license of ocean carriers, and many other measures designed to safeguard public welfare, but which, as applied to ocean commerce, are untried, and about which there exists a radical difference of opinion among many people.

Among other items which should receive its consideration is the maintenance of standards for the personnel of the officers and men of the merchant marine. The school ships maintained by Massachusetts and New York are educating officers for the merchant marine. They are doing a most useful and necessary work. Thousands of young men throughout the country are ready for the call of the sea, and are animated by the same spirit which filled the forecastle and quarter-decks of the American vessels 50 years ago. Other ships of this character should be established and the course of training amplified to make the graduates fit, both for the merchant marine and the Navy. There are discharged from the Navy each year about 4,000 young men who have enlisted from all parts of the country. These men have had a most valuable training in the Navy and should be encouraged to go into the merchant marine service. Many foreign nations encourage the creation of such a naval reserve by paying a small additional wage to men honorably discharged from the Navy, who continue a seafaring life and hold themselves in readiness as naval reservists. This practice is worthy of serious consideration.

The second step in reestablishing our shipping consists in creating conditions which will attract steamship men to make use of the credit

machinery thus established, and to create the vessel property so urgently desired. This again divides itself into two parts; regular lines carrying passengers and mails, and freight steamers.

We will discuss the regular lines. Public attention seems centered at the moment upon trade with South America, and we will, therefore, take lines to that part of the world as a type for consideration, although a similar service may be established to many other countries with the same class of vessel.

We desire first to point out that there has been a general misunderstanding of the added cost of operating American vessels as compared with the same vessel under a foreign flag. It has been frequently stated and generally accepted that the operation under the American flag will cost from 40 to 50 per cent more. We believe this percentage should be applied to wages alone, for the cost of fuel, supplies, insurance, and upkeep is substantially equal for the same vessel in the same trade, regardless of flag.

On passenger ships, where the wage item may be a larger percentage of the total operating cost, the difference in favor of foreign vessels is somewhat greater; but with strictly freight carriers your committee is informed that the disadvantage under which American tonnage must labor is 5 and 10 per cent of the total operating cost. Even in passenger vessels of a type suitable for South American trade, the disadvantage probably does not greatly exceed 10 per cent. These estimates take no account of the difference in interest, if the American vessels be constructed in this country, for that subject will be treated under a separate heading.

This difference in operating cost, while less important than has been generally understood, is still sufficient to discourage the operation of American ships, and is frequently the margin between profit and loss. Your committee therefore is of the opinion that it is idle to expect that American lines of passenger and mail steamers can be established, even though credit machinery, to make easy their financing, be created, without some measure of Government aid. It must be borne in mind that the new lines must enter into immediate competition with long-established foreign-owned lines, with experienced agents at ports of call, and with contracts which can not be easily disturbed. The new lines must fight their way into the trade.

It seems desirable that as few changes in existing laws be made as is possible. The present ocean-mail act permits the payment of $4 per mile to mail vessels of 20-knot speed. A speed of 20 knots is in excess of any yet established in the South American trade and beyond present reasonable requirements. The cost of maintaining such speed upon long voyages is to-day prohibitive. A vessel capable of making 16 knots, and running regularly at 15, will meet all requirements and be slightly better than competing lines under foreign flags. In services of this character it is not so much extreme speed which is required, but regularity of service.

We therefore suggest that the requirements be reduced to a trial speed of 16 knots and the compensation be left as at present. There are many countries to which an even less speed will answer all purposes, and we suggest that the speed requirements for vessels of the second class be reduced from 16 knots to 12 knots and the subvention of $2 per mile left in force. It must be remembered that these subventions are not payable to all vessels, but only to lines operating under contract a service asked for by the Government. We have been assured by steamship men of experience and standing that if this be done, there can be no doubt that advantage will be taken of the credit machinery before outlined and a number of lines established.

A reason for the extreme speed heretofore provided for has been the desire of those connected with the Navy to see constructed vessels of sufficient speed to be of use as commerce destroyers in time of war. Your committee would point out that if such vessels are necessary, it is not a sound economic policy to operate them in a trade for which they are not suited at a large annual loss. They should be either constructed for the trans-Atlantic service, where such speed is necessary, or built and maintained by the Government for naval uses. Your committee expresses no opinion as to the necessity for such vessels, for it is not considered a part of the economic question under consideration. We desire to point out, however, that there is only one line of American mail steamers between this country and Europe. These steamers are approximately 20 years old and are rapidly wearing out. The time is not far off when the service must be discontinued or new vessels provided. If commerce destroyers are a necessity, it may be desirable to arrange for new vessels for a trans-Atlantic service. If this be done, your committee sees no other method to adopt than to provide for the payment of a sufficient subsidy to maintain in service such vessels as the Government may require. The construction of such vessels would assure the Government an American mail service to Europe, gratify national pride, and meet naval requirements. They are not, we repeat, a necessary part of the present problem.

In making these suggestions we are not unmindful of the apparently deeply rooted objection in the minds of many of the citizens of this country to the payment of subsidies. It is a practice susceptible of such abuse that we suggest, rather than recommend, the only method which seems to promise the immediate construction of passenger and mail steamers and at the same time conform to economic standards.

Your committee desires to make clear that it has endeavored to avoid the pitfalls of recommending radical legislation. It recognizes that there is a wide difference of opinion as to the best method to be employed to reestablish our merchant marine. It has given consideration to all methods which have been suggested, and the creation of preferential duties, under which our merchant marine flourished during the first half of the nineteenth century, has been carefully discussed. A preferential duty of 5 per cent has been authorized by Congress, and the question of the legality of the measure is now before the Supreme Court of the United States. In due course a decision will be rendered, and it seems useless to discuss such a measure until such decision has been handed down. We have also given earnest consideration to the arguments of those in favor of the Alexander bill as it now stands (Jan. 1). We recognize that this bill is considered an administration measure and has been approved by President Wilson. For this reason we have endeavored to convince ourselves of its merit, but have been unable to agree that a sufficient crisis exists to warrant the enactment of a law which departs from established economic standards and may do grave injustice to those citizens who already own vessel property. It is stated that the people of this country are against taxing themselves in order to provide subsidies for steamship lines, and it is suggested that they tax themselves to operate Government-owned lines admittedly at a loss. We fail to see the difference, except that the latter plan carries with it evils far worse than a lack of American ships on the sea.

Government ownership of ocean lines can not bring to our aid a single vessel except by building. Every steamship in the world is working to-day except those interned in neutral ports. If these can be transferred to our flag without international complications, there will be no difficulty in financing the transfer of those suitable for freight carrying, for their earnings will justify the purchase. If they can not be transferred without trouble with England and France, it is certain we do not wish the United States to become their owner.

The construction of vessels designed to carry freight only is, we believe, attended with less difficulty than the establishment of regular passenger and mail lines. As we have pointed out, the item of wages on vessels of this character represents a smaller percentage of the total operating cost, and the disadvantage under which American vessels labor is in the neighborhood of 5 per cent of the total operating cost. Under conditions existing in the past even this difference would prevent the engaging in foreign trade of American tonnage, but it is the conviction of your committee that conditions will not again be normal for a number of years, and that if credit machinery be created to enable the steamship men to finance American steamship enterprise, sufficient inducements will exist to assure the construction of a substantial tonnage of freight vessels without the payment of subsidy.

In any event, it is the opinion of your committee that it is not necessary at the present time to provide subsidies for freight vessels. Their earning power, so long as the war continues, will be more than ample, and the slight disadvantage in operating cost is at least partially offset by economies in interest made possible through an application of our plan to guarantee steamship bonds. There is, of course, a wide divergence of opinion as to how long the war will last and of the probable condition of foreign shipping at its close. A large tonnage has already been destroyed, and it is the opinion of some experienced steamship men that the operating cost of foreign vessels will be higher than it has been in the past, for years to come.

Your committee has been advised of plans for the establishment of certain freight lines, which are already under consideration, without subsidy. The difficulties which lie in the way of the immediate carrying out of these plans are twofold: First, fear of Government competition; and second, the difficulty in interesting American investors in the securities. If these two difficulties are removed, we feel confident a beginning will be made, and the consideration of any subsidy for freight vessels may be safely postponed for a year, at least, when the matter can be again taken up and judged from the standpoint of conditions existing at that time.

You will note that no reference has been made as to whether the proposed tonnage should be constructed in American or foreign yards. Discussion of this matter has been omitted for two reasons: First, amendments have already been made in shipping laws, permitting the acquisition of foreign-built tonnage for a limited period; and second, it is quite possible that a condition may arise in the near future which will make competition for vessel construction by the yards of this country much less difficult. If a substantial tonnage is to be created, it is idle to suggest that it be entirely constructed in this country, for the facilities do not exist for the work. The building up of a shipbuilding industry, like the construction of a fleet, will require time. If a large tonnage built abroad is placed under the American flag, the necessary repair work will be an important aid in establishing American yards upon a basis where they can compete with foreign shipbuilders. The inability of the American shipbuilder in the past to compete with foreign yards has been partially due to the fact that there has been but a limited demand, and only for vessels of special construction.

The American manufacturer in many fields of industry has shown his ability to compete with and outdistance the foreign manufacturer of any article which can be standardized and produced largely by machinery. The automobile industry is a recent illustration of this principle. The raw materials needed for ship construction are all available, and it is the opinion of your committee that if a demand arises for the construction of a large number of freight vessels more or less of the same general type, and, therefore, standardized in character, the American shipbuilder will have less difficulty in competing for ship construction, the foreign cost of which, as we have already pointed out, is 20 per cent higher than at the beginning of the war.

Your committee is not unmindful of the fact that this view may be unduly optimistic, but, in view of all the circumstances surrounding the present situation, we are inclined to recommend that the specific provision that part of the tonnage to be operated under the American flag be constructed in American yards be deferred until the immediate future can be more clearly foreseen and we approach the time limit set by the recent amendments permitting the acquirement of foreign-built tonnage.

Many other phases of this question have also been considered and discussed by the committee, but we have kept always in mind our desire to present only practical suggestions for taking a substantial step forward.

Mr. President, that is a most interesting presentation of the subject. It opens up a new field of inquiry and investigation. It is a matter that I apprehend not a single Senator has given serious thought to, and it ought to be considered before any permanent legislation on the question of the American merchant marine is adopted by the Congress of the United States. I feel that the time I have taken in presenting that document to the Senate has been justified, and I commend it to the careful and serious consideration of Senators who feel an interest in the pending legislation.

Mr. President, I have said already that this proposed legislation is condemned by the best thought of the country. It is condemned almost universally by commercial organizations, it is condemned almost universally by the business men of the land, and it is condemned almost universally by the great newspapers of the United States. There probably never has been a measure presented to Congress involving a great public question such as this that has met with so little support and such almost universal condemnation as has this bill.

In this connection, for the purpose of justifying the statement I make, I propose to read some editorials from prominent newspapers scattered throughout the land, showing precisely

how those great purveyors of news, those great newspapers which enlighten public opinion and blaze the way to a large extent for legislation, feel on this subject.

An article has already been read into the RECORD from the Chicago Tribune, one of the greatest papers in the United States, published in the second city of the United States, carrying a weight of influence that can scarcely be estimated, and for that reason speaking with authority to a certain degree as to the sentiment of the community in which it is published. This morning I was handed a copy of the Chicago Tribune of date January 25, only a few days ago, in which is another editorial which the Senate ought to give heed to and which I propose to submit. The caption of the article is "The case against the shipping bill." It says:

The Democrats have decided to let the opponents of the shipping bill do all the discussing and "debating" on the floor of the Senate. They are charging a filibuster, which is absurd—since there has been no real discussion of the bill in Congress—and thus furnishing an excuse for their silence.

Whom do they expect to deceive? The case against the bill is so strong and so conclusive that the silence of its sponsors can but be construed to mean sheer inability to defend it or to meet the many objections that have been raised against it by business bodies, by leading newspapers, including Democratic organs, and by sound thinkers in and out of public life.

Let us briefly state some of these objections.

The bill spells serious complications with foreign powers, seizures, and captures that may lead to perilous war agitation. It is a "purchase" bill, and it is plain that ships now in profitable use can not be purchased and ought not to be purchased, for they would add nothing to available facilities, and the cost of purchase would be excessive and abnormal because of the war and the ill-timed appearance of our Government as a purchaser of ships. On the other hand, to buy idle, interned ships is to offend certain powers and to invite seizure, delay, strife, and hazard. It is to take a leap into the dark zones of international law and belligerent policies. The French, for example, have never recognized the right to sell or buy an interned ship during progress of a conflict.

The bill is neither an emergency measure nor a permanent one. It has the faults of both kinds of crude shipping legislation and the merits of neither.

It is based on a misrepresentation of the facts. There is no "lack of carrying facilities." What difficulty there is is due to the war, and that can not be magically removed by a Government line of ships.

As to trade with Latin America, what is wanting is credit, banking, advertising facilities, knowledge of Latin needs and tastes, and the wherewithal to pay for our goods. If we had cargoes to carry there and back, the ships would be forthcoming.

The bill does not remedy a single defect in our navigation laws. It can not develop a merchant marine, because it falsely diagnoses the trouble and prescribes the wrong and futile remedy—nay, it prescribes a remedy that would aggravate the trouble. The bill has discouraged and, if enacted into law, would handicap and stop private enterprise where the great need admittedly is the fostering and stimulating of such enterprise. Private capital can not compete with the Government, as the latter neither counts cost nor keeps books properly and pays deficits out of taxation.

Should the war end soon, the "emergency" theory of the bill would fall to the ground, while the "permanent" theory would simply fail to stand up and take its place. The Government would find itself in a business for which it is not fitted, and politics and spoils would prevent its letting go and acknowledging its egregious blunder.

This is the worst of all possible times to plan or legislate for "permanent" upbuilding of a merchant marine. Everything in foreign trade and shipping is abnormal and artificial, and "the wisdom of Congress" is grotesquely unequal to the task of separating the accidental obstacles from those attributable to our own laws, our safety standards, our wages, our financial conditions, our national habits, and ideas of investment and profit.

Ever since the President declared his purpose to recommend and press legislation of this kind the newspapers of the country have criticized and condemned it. I have extracts from newspapers dating back as far as August last; but naturally we are more interested in the observations of those papers of recent date, and so I read from the Boston Transcript of January 23 a most interesting editorial. The Boston Transcript is one of the old, conservative, and reliable papers of New England. It treats of business and finance in a conservative and intelligent way, and when it utters a voice of warning it is always safe to give it careful thought. The caption of the article is "Not 'Government ships or nothing.'" The Transcript says:

It is a counsel of weakness and folly that it must be "the Government ownership bill or nothing"—that there is no other way in this world war crisis to enlarge our merchant marine. Such a plea, the last desperate resort of the advocates of the administration scheme, would not, we think, except in loyalty to the President, receive the sanction of our neighbor, the Springfield Republican. Who outside the ranks of the Socialists urged Government ownership and operation of ocean steamships as the only method to secure such ships before the present war? And it was no nearer to being the only method then than it is now. Three principal expedients advanced before August last to restore our ocean shipping were: (1) Preferential tariff rates on goods imported in American ships—the "policy of the fathers"; (2) free ships, with a revision of our navigation laws; (3) ocean mail subventions. The first two were distinctively Democratic plans; the last the Republican method. Under this administration the two Democratic plans have been embodied in law.

The Simmons-Underwood tariff allows a discount of 5 per cent of the duties on imports in vessels of the United States, provided this does not abrogate or impair treaties with foreign Governments. Secretary McAdoo, speaking at Chicago January 9, cities the Attorney General as holding that these treaties make the plan "unworkable"; it has never been enforced.

At this point, Mr. President, I may be pardoned for observing that the Merchant Marine Commission took into most careful consideration the question of differential or discriminating duties, a majority of the commission at the outset being in favor of that plan; but after carefully considering it, looking at it from all angles, the commission decided that it was an unworkable plan and called attention to the very thing that has obstructed the enforcement of the provision in the Underwood-Simmons tariff law. It was that we had entered into thirty-odd commercial agreements with foreign nations—unwisely, as some of us thought—which, unless they were abrogated, would stand in the way of carrying out that doctrine of the fathers which worked so well in the early days of the Republic. The enforcement of the provision in the tariff law has been held up on that ground alone, and I understand that the question as to whether or not it can be enforced, regardless of those conventions and treaties, is now before the Supreme Court of the United States. It seems to me that we can not hope to get any relief in that direction.

The editorial continues:

Free ships for foreign commerce were provided in the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912. The plan proved an utter failure. Not one foreign-built ship was added to our fleet before the war. An emergency act of August 18, 1914, exempted foreign-built ships from the requirement of carrying American officers and of complying with our inspection and measurement laws. About 100 vessels of a total gross tonnage of 400,000 have sought our flag since—nearly all of them were American-owned before the war opened. This small result is confessed by the Democratic leaders to be an utter disappointment. In other words, the Democratic doctors "have tried two prescriptions"; both have failed. Now they invoke the new and desperate remedy of Government ownership. Can they reasonably expect the country to heed and follow them again? Why should it be "Government ships or nothing"?

About the Republican plan of ocean mail and other subsidies there is nothing strange. Like the gold standard, such subsidies are the common practice of the mercantile world. The Bureau of Navigation has lately shown that $45,000,000 annually was being expended in mail and other subsidies and bounties by foreign Governments—about $10,000,000 by Great Britain alone. Our own expenditure is a little more than $1,000,000 annually under the almost forgotten but useful ocean mail law of 1891. This ocean mail law is responsible for almost all of the regular steamship service in foreign commerce under the American flag. It has undeniably worked well so far as it goes. At a cost of about what the British Government gives to a single line this American legislation provides a line to Europe, two or three to the West Indies, and one across the Pacific to Australia. Why not take immediately the estimated profit on our foreign mail service of between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 a year and apply this at once to the creation of more services?

Later on, Mr. President, I shall call attention to the fact that a bill is now before the Committee on Commerce, introduced by me, which proposes to accomplish precisely that result. We have an average profit of about $2,000,000 a year from our ocean mail service, and it has seemed to some of us that that amount of money, or a less amount of money perhaps, in addition to what is now granted, might well be invested in ocean mail pay, so as to create a larger fleet than we have at the present time operating under the provisions of the act of 1891.

The editorial concludes as follows:

But the ships would have to be built? Not all of them would have to be built. Some large coastwise steamers could temporarily be utilized. Under the Panama Canal act, if proper foreign steamships were available, they could be purchased. All these vessels, accepting the subsidy, would be under contract with the Government. As to routes and regularity of sailings they could be utilized where they were needed most. This would provide every possible advantage of Government control without any of its perils and embarrassments. It would be a saving of time and money both. Trained steamship organizations already existing could secure the ships and undertake the service. Because of superior knowledge, efficiency, and economy, they could do this at far less cost than any semipolitical Government board that would have to build up an organization beforehand.

Great Britain has 30 subsidized steamship services to all quarters of the globe—the backbone of her merchant marine. There is no reason why the United States should not have as many, and it can get them more quickly and cheaply by cooperation with private capital and enterprise than by any groping amid the darkness and dangers of Government ownership and operation. Requirements of high speed can be temporarily waived in favor of capacious tonnage, and if it is necessary Congress can go a step further and grant naval retainers to thoroughgoing cargo ships suitable for fuel and supply ships after designs approved by the Navy Department.

How many recall that proposed Republican subsidy bills, which were merely an extension of existing ocean mail law, were defeated only by a political filibuster once in the Senate and by a margin of a few votes in the House of Representatives? There can be no doubt that if the same Congresses were to vote on the same legislation now, in the illumination which this war gives of the need and value of an American merchant marine, the bills would be enacted by a huge majority. But it is a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration, making professions of hate of subsidy and yet providing in this Government-ownership scheme for the hugest and most extravagant subsidy of all. Both Massachusetts Senators have ably exposed the economic folly and the foreign menace that merge in this measure. Next week Senator ROOT will prove its conflict with the law of nations. Meantime the protests of Great Britain, France, and Russia show the world's attitude toward this trouble-bearing scheme.

The New York Times is a newspaper which carries tremendous weight throughout the reading world. It is not a Republican newspaper; it never has been a Republican newspaper, but in dealing with great public questions it takes a broad and con-

servative view. I wish to read a brief editorial from that paper under date of January 23, only a few days ago:

Senator HOKE SMITH is reported as saying of the rural-credits bill and the shipping bill: "These two measures will be passed and appropriation bills be allowed to go over to an extra session." That is a perfect program for those who think these bills are good for them and are indifferent to the protests against the enactment of one of them on the merits or of both of them in preference to the passage of the bills for the support of Government.

At the other end of the Capitol there is another sentiment. Members are appealed to by their leader to avert an extra session by diligence at this session. "If I am any judge of public opinion, the last thing the people want is an extra session of Congress," said Mr. UNDERWOOD.

I have no doubt that that great leader of Democratic thought [Mr. UNDERWOOD] expresses the feeling of ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Democratic Party in the country, and I am also impressed with the feeling that he represents the real feelings of a majority of the Democrats in this body. The Times editorial continues:

That is certainly true of this Congress and may be taken as true of the next Congress. It is because the people have had too much of this Congress that there is so little enthusiasm for taking a chance on a change of Congress. The more Congresses change the more they are just the same. The idea that Congress could earn thanks by letting things alone has not yet dawned at the Capitol or at the other end of the Avenue. The idea that the more Congress does the worse off the people are is more general among the people than among the Congressmen.

The country's bills must be paid, but what popular sentiment is there for writing "must" on any other project of legislation? To put the Government shipping bill before the appropriation bills is to substitute the opinion of Washington for the opinion of the country. To force an extra session is something abhorrent to the sentiment which shrinks from new laws as a psychological obstacle to optimism. "Let us have peace" is the weary cry, as was proved by the applause which from both sides of the House greeted Leader UNDERWOOD'S remarks. Pass the appropriations and quit is all that the country wants Congress to do.

The shipping bill was not dreamed of when this Congress was elected, and it will be forgotten before the next Congress meets.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It was not in the Baltimore platform, either.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Michigan, who always makes wise observations, suggests that it was not in the Baltimore platform, either; but even if it had been it would probably have been disregarded by the party in power and by the President, as most of the other planks in the platform have been.

The editorial concludes in these words:

The rural-credits bill has merits, but the farmers can worry along with their $10,000,000,000 of new wealth at least as well as they have in harder years than this. The country will forgive the past if it is not asked to forgive any more. Congress will best commend itself to the country by doing as little as possible beyond passing the appropriation bills.

How wise that advice is! As I said a day or two ago, there is one great appropriation bill ready to be reported to the Senate; there is another great appropriation bill which will be ready to be reported in a day or two, so I am informed; other appropriation bills have come over from the House and are now before the committees of the Senate under consideration. In all the history of the Government I venture to say that no such spectacle as this has ever been presented; that in a short session of Congress the appropriation bills are thrown aside for the consideration of a controverted question, which, in all probability, will consume the entire time of the session in its consideration. The minority is not responsble for it; the minority echoes the expression of the New York Times, that the country is demanding what the majority of this body is opposing.

The New York Journal of Commerce, under date of January 8, a great trade paper, has this to say about the pending bill:

Alba B. Johnson, president of the American Manufacturers' Export Association and head of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, of Philadelphia, when asked for his opinion as to the attitude of the exporters of the country on the Government ship-purchase project yesterday, said that the association at its recent annual convention adopted resolutions condemning the proposition, and practically as a unit the 300 members which the organization has are vigorously opposed to the plan. The feeling of the exporters, Mr. Johnson explained, is that for the Government to embark in a field which belongs strictly to the private commercial interests of the Nation at this time is neither commercially wise nor reasonably sure of success.

Mr. Johnson said that the provisions of the bill are such that if enacted into law they will provide a formidable weapon for political use with which to create great havoc among legitimate existing shipping interests. The advocates of the measure, he continued, advance the theory that shipping facilities for the transportation of our exports abroad under existing conditions are inadequate, but they apparently overlook the testimony of experienced and practical men that the present situation is due mainly not to any extensive lack of vessels, but to the present unstable foreign exchange operations, scarcity of foreign labor for handling commerce, and particularly the high cost of marine insurance, and that with relief in these directions greater activity will follow and the present and future requirements of our commerce, if properly encouraged through a satisfactory revision of the American navigation laws, will be amply met by private enterprise.

The pending bill in Congress which provides that our Government invest the sum of $50,000,000 in merchant ships, Mr. Johnson said, has many vicious features, not the least of which is that no private enterprise, however capably and economically managed, where the management is accountable to stockholders, can compete with the Government in the same industry. Furthermore, he pointed out, the bill would create a shipping board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General, which could subscribe to the capital stock of any existing steamship lines for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, and operating a fleet of merchant vessels to any part of the world or in the port to port traffic of the North American and Central or South American coasts; that under our elective system of government the personnel of the offices is subject to change every four years, and it is not likely, therefore, that with such flexible and uncertain management the public could be expected to invest its capital in an enterprise in the control of which it can for all time hold only a minority interest. Such a proposition is hardly a feasible one for the President of the United States to stand for at this time, judging from the commercial outlook for success, he added.

A practical suggestion for the American Government to adopt in the ship-promoting activity which it has apparently determined upon, Mr. Johnson continued, is that the $50,000,000 which it intended to use for the direct purchase of the lines which the Government proposes to operate should be loaned out to private American steamship interests at a similar small interest rate to that exacted by the British Government, thus permitting the private and more experienced companies to buy up and operate all available steamers under the direct supervision of the Government. This plan of bringing about an adequate American merchant fleet to cope with the needs of the time in the trans-Atlantic trades, Mr. Johnson maintained, would come as near to insuring the success of the Government's venture and purpose as any plan which could be adopted at this time. It would likewise overcome the danger that under the pending bill for Government owned and operated ships that lines would be established where they would most likely prove unprofitable and even unnecessary, and avoid the dangerous and unwarranted interference with the existing privately owned and operated American lines.

The British marine credit plan, which Mr. Johnson declared he favored for adoption by our Government in place of the pending ship-purchase measure, by an interesting coincidence was also put forth by Charles M. Muchnic, foreign manager of the American Locomotive Co. Mr. Muchnic has just returned from Europe after a two months' business trip. When asked for his opinion as to the desirability of the Government embarking in the operation of a fleet of ocean freight carriers, he asserted that from what he had learned of the proposition thus far he was absolutely opposed to any such plan.

I have already read an article from the New York Times of recent date. I now want to read a brief article from the same paper published a little time ago. It is as follows:

The proposal to put $25,000,000 into Government merchantmen bristles with puzzles for those who like to back their Government through thick and thin. Would Americans in general prefer to have the project fail or succeed? If it succeeded, of course there would be an end of any other sort of American merchant marine, and the various other proposals with that end in view should be abandoned. No one is going to compete with the Government in anything, and no more in steamships than in railways in Alaska. An attempt is made to justify this venture by analogy with the Panama Railway. The suggestion is unfortunate from the viewpoint alike of the Government steamships and of those who would have to use them in default of any others. The operating cost ratio of the Panama Railway began to rise from the day the Government took control. It costs nearly twice as much to operate the easily managed Panama Railway as to operate the Pennsylvania, which has more difficulties than any other. The operating cost being high, necessarily the rates are high. They are five times higher than the rate on the average private railway. It would cost $33 to send a ton of freight from New York to Chicago on the scale of the Panama line. A shipper who would like to see the arguments for Government ownership realized must shudder when he thinks of what would happen to him if he were committed to the tender mercies of Government steamships or railways, or perhaps both. He could hope for no relief from any regulating commission. Uncle Sam allows no such interference with his affairs.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, just there will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. I always yield to the Senator from New Jersey with pleasure.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not want to take the Senator off the floor——

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not allow the Senator to do that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But in reference to the Panama Railroad, the Senator from New Hampshire refers to the private ownership and the present Government ownership. Is the Senator not aware that under the private ownership of the Panama Railroad passengers were charged $25 apiece for first-class passage and $10 apiece for second-class passage to cross the Isthmus, the distance being, I think, 47 miles; and the freight charge was 50 cents a cubic foot? Is not the Senator also aware that under those charges the Panama Railroad, under private ownership, declared on an average 25 per cent dividends; that, in addition, there were frequent stock benefactions to stockholders, and that the stock of the railroad stood at 385? Is he not further aware of the fact that since this railroad has been taken over by the Government and operated under Government ownership, instead of the charge for a first-class passage across the Isthmus being $25, as was the case under private ownership, under public ownership the fare is $2.40, and the freight rates have been reduced as well? There is the condition which prevails under Government ownership, so that the statement which the Senator has quoted, it seems to me, falls flat in comparison.

I say the passenger fare of $2.40 under Government ownership is an extravagant charge, even yet, for it amounts to about 6 cents per mile, and there is no railroad in our land charging as much as that. So, even at that rate, the Government is charging an enormous rate, but far less than the $25 which was charged for passage across the Isthmus when the railroad was under private ownership.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I am not well versed in the affairs of the Panama Railroad when it was under private ownership.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I happen to have known in days gone by both the president, Mr. Hoadley, who is now dead, and the secretary and treasurer, Mr. Charles Smith. Those facts have been well established and are easily gotten at, being matters of record.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know, Mr. President, as a matter of history, what the trials and tribulations may have been of those who built that road or how expensive it may have been to construct. Very likely that fact might throw some light on the subject and modify the statement the Senator from New Jersey has made.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But the fact that the stock of that railroad stood in the market at 385 and that 25 per cent dividends were declared upon it can not be controverted nor gotten away from.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that may be so. It is a small and insignificant railway, at best.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. True.

Mr. GALLINGER. And if it had remained in private ownership, it would have, in the nature of things, very soon have gone out of commission because of the building of the Panama Canal.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only cite it because the Senator brought it to mind.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do know, Mr. President, that the freight charges on that road are enormous at the present time.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The freight charge was 50 cents per cubic foot under private ownership.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that, if the charges were reduced to the point the Senator from New Jersey thinks they ought to be, there would doubtless be a loss to the people of the United States.

The editorial from the New York Times continues:

The public aspect of the enterprise is no more alluring. It is a proposal in the interest of peace, but it is peculiarly adapted to embroil the United States with every belligerent. It would be obnoxious to have a Government vessel compelled to submit to an examination regarding its cargo, and it would be embarrassing to the last degree if a piano should turn out to be machinery for war against the nation making the discovery. A cargo of food might become cause for hostilities, and goods which were innocent when laden might become contraband on the voyage. The taking of a Government merchantman into a prize court would be a novelty without attractions for those who like a quiet life. As this is a "hurry-up" measure, it follows that this $25,000,000 can not be used for the encouragement of American shipbuilding. The money must be spent for foreign-built vessels, of which the best offering are German. For the Government to buy such boats might offend our friends among the allies opposing Germany. The $25,000,000 which seems so considerable is a mere drop in the flood of expenditure that would gush through the opening thus made. Terminals would be necessary, costing as much more at least, and the building up of a freight business is a matter of years. Only the inexperienced could dream of starting a steamship business on a commercial basis with $25,000,000, a small fraction of the capital of each of many private companies.

A worse time for such an adventure could not be chosen. The ocean passenger trade for either tourists or immigrants is prostrated, and the freight business is worse. There will be no incoming freight on any attractive scale, and the glut of outgoing freight will not be enduring. When the emergency is over what will have become of the $25,000,000, and what will be done with the remnant, if any? If Americans can not compete with foreign vessels, how much less can the Government do so? And what a horde of embarrassing questions are suggested by competition between vessels of the United States and private ships of other countries, whose Governments may be trusted to defend them against the aggression of our Government freighters and passenger boats. The idea was debated in the House before it was launched by the President, but none of the speakers showed the least appreciation of the practical aspects of the question, so enamored were they with their patriotic dreams.

The New York Journal of Commerce, from which I have already quoted, treats the subject further under the head of "Stupid shipping legislation."

War has caused a sharp awakening to the deplorable situation of our mercantile marine. According to a statement carefully prepared by this paper, not less than 5,800,000 gross tons of ocean-going ships have been withdrawn from service since the war began. About 3,500,000 tons represent German and Austrian shipping and 1,700,000 tons British vessels chartered by that Government. In addition, over 600,000 tons are known to have been destroyed or captured. This sudden withdrawal of such a vast amount of tonnage, approximating 13 per cent of the world's total, has created a temporary ocean freight famine. This is one of the exigencies of war that can not be avoided, and would have occurred even had we already possessed a respectable merchant marine. The difficulty, though temporary, is a real one and warrants any rational and effective means of relief that can be devised.

One of the most puerile proposals that has yet been offered is that of Government ownership. A bill has been introduced at Washington, which the administration is expected to support, authorizing the creation of a $10,000,000 shipping corporation, of which the Government shall own a controlling interest. The Government is also authorized to issue bonds to the extent of $30,000,000, making a total available capital of about $40,000,000.

How much relief would a plan of this sort afford? There is good reason for estimating the cost of building a 10,000-ton ship in the United States at about $425,000, compared with $325,000 in an English shipyard. At present the cost of building in a British yard ranges from $45 to $75 per ton. If we take $50 per ton as the cost of a good freighter, this would allow investment in about 800,000 tons, or about 23 per cent of the amount already withdrawn. But where are these 800,000 tons of ocean vessels to be procured? It would be sheer folly to attempt to build such a fleet, even in part, because the war would probably be over before such ships could be put into commission, and they would enter the market at a time when transportation would be depressed by exhaustion from the war and when the supply of tonnage would already be excessive. In other words, if the Government built such ships it could not provide the relief immediately needed, but would only aggravate a bad situation later on, not to speak of incurring a heavy loss to the Government. The only means of relief possible would be for the Government to purchase foreign vessels now lying idle in various portions of the world. This involves grave risks, risks that private capital is not willing to undertake, and that, if assumed by the Government, might easily involve us in serious international disputes. Besides, the German ships are probably not for sale. The whole proposal of Government ownership in ships is so visionary, inadequate, and dangerous as to be utterly unworthy of an intelligent administration. The situation does not warrant such paternalistic and socialistic methods. As a precedent it is highly dangerous, and as a cure for a bad situation it can only be classed as stupid.

There is still a lamentable amount of ignorance about American shipping. The urgent necessity for its revival is beyond question, and when Congress repeals the laws which deny American shipowners a fair chance and prevent them from entering the business under the same terms and conditions as their rivals, then we may expect a genuine and permanent restoration of our prestige on the seas, and not before.

The Boston Herald, an old-established and influential newspaper, circulating all over New England and possibly other portions of the country, has this to say about the bill:

President Wilson has felt the weight of public criticism of a Government-owned merchant marine. The plan of his message is a modified and diluted plan. "It," he declares, "is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw."

The same reasoning would have justified and forced the Government years ago, when iron mills and cotton mills and woolen mills were few, to create such mills by direct Treasury appropriations, and to operate them until they could have been sold out to capitalists. And the same thing would have been true of the construction and operation of railroads. We should then have had a delightful state of socialism, with the Government conducting all the main activities of life. Could such a step have been retraced and all these activities turned over to private ownership?

Asking this question is to answer it. A Government-owned merchant marine in the beginning would inevitably mean a Government-owned merchant marine in the end. And let us remember that, counting in our vast coastwise fleet, we have already, without Government ownership, the second greatest merchant shipping in the world. On June 30 last, according to the Navigation Bureau report, the United States had a merchant tonnage of 7,928,000.

There is manifestly no lack of American ships where American laws have established just conditions. If there is a lack of American ships on certain routes, which the President particularizes as "to our neighbor States of America," may there not be a cause for it that can be overcome without the rash expedient of Government ownership? Indeed, as the Herald showed the other day, American steamers are already appearing on the routes to Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Peru, where a preferential war risk affords the equivalent of subsidy. Now the President of the United States proposes to put the Federal Government into competition with the enterprise of private owners—and, of course, to drive them off the seas.

The zeal of the President for a merchant marine is splendid. No Republican Executive has spoken on this theme with keener emphasis. But Mr. Wilson has chosen the wrong road to the right goal. Government ownership will not be necessary if we treat our ships as England and France and Japan and Germany and Spain and Italy have treated theirs. Even Norway and Sweden have recently put lines of their own on South American routes by direct State aid to experienced and responsible shipowners. Why not follow the sound, proved policy of the world instead of an expedient that has only failure written on it?

Our so-called Government line to Panama—an incidental result of the canal purchase—earned only 2 per cent a year in 10 years, without allowing a cent for interest, insurance, or depreciation, which would have turned that small profit into an enormous deficit. The Government line of Western Australia lost $114,000 the first year and $96,000 the next. These are the sum of such experiments up to date, and both disastrous.

President Wilson has already modified his Government-ownership project from a permanent scheme to a brief, temporary device. Why not take one more step and abandon it altogether?

To vary the reading somewhat, I have here an editorial from the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, which I will read. It is very brief:

The welcome report comes from Washington that there is no expectation of the passage of the ship-purchase measure. Even in an hour of panic following the paralysis of commerce caused by the first shock of the European war the country was startled by the proposition of a Government-owned merchant marine, and, in view of the continually improving conditions that have followed, it is no surprise to hear that the unpopular measure has been practically abandoned.

The ship-purchase measure being hopeless, a proposition of Government aid to persons going into the shipping business will be pressed, it is stated. The Democratic leaders of the past have been opposed to ship subsidies, and undoubtedly there are objections to the policy, but there can be no question that it is greatly to be preferred to that of a Government-owned marine.

The New York Herald, under the heading "Is Government ownership impending?" says:

Forecasters of the President's forthcoming message to Congress agree in predicting that he will strongly advocate the Government going into the business of buying and operating merchant steamships.

In an interview published in the Herald Mr. James A. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation, said of the shipping situation:

"At present there is no lack of shipping facilities, as there are more ships than cargoes to all parts of the world. We are now sending ships from one port to another in ballast, because we can not get cargoes for them. We need more trade, not more transportation."

If this is the situation—and surely Mr. Farrell should know the facts—what possible reason can there be for Government ownership of steamships? With the burden of taxation already too great, where is the wisdom of adding to more taxation for doubtful experiments.

If the Government is to take a plunge into the mercantile-marine business, what steamships is it going to buy? German steamships now interned in American ports? Can the President be sure there would be no danger in such purchases?

With every legitimate effort to build up our mercantile marine the American people will sympathize, but it seems improbable that they will support a policy of Government ownership.

The Davenport (Iowa) Times has this to say:

A comparatively few shipowners have availed themselves of the privilege of American registry under the recent emergency act. As a result of this, President Wilson is reported to be considering the advisability of urging again his plan for a Government-controlled merchant marine.

There is need for a merchant marine under the American flag that will blaze the way for an expansion of American commerce with South American countries. Merchant ships are missionaries of commerce. They develop trade. But if trade with South America is to be developed rapidly a number of ships will be required. At the beginning the business they could get probably would not make their operation a paying project. Possibly that is why we do not now have such a fleet of ships.

Any plan by which the Government would own the ships or 51 per cent of the stock in such ships would be likely to result in the operation of the ships at the beginning at a loss, which the Government would be expected to make up, either in payments for mail contracts above present costs or in the form of waiving returns on capital invested.

But such a plan would be a form of ship subsidy. Why not try a direct subsidy, and know what the exact cost of developing a merchant marine is from year to year? If the Democrats are opposed to subsidy, they are likely to oppose the other plan as well.

The Muncie (Ind.) Press has an editorial headed: "Of All Sad Words." It is worth listening to:

Every schoolboy is familiar with that famous couplet which John Greenleaf Whittier put into "Maud Muller" to the effect that "of all sad words of tongue or pen the saddest are these: 'It might have been.'"

These words, which were penned first as the melancholy climax to a little love scene, have now become applicable to the condition of a great Nation—our own country, the United States.

Never in all history have we been better qualified to use the phrase "it might have been" than at present. We stand a great, united people, a hundred million strong, blessed with every facility that science, education, and nature have to give. Figuratively speaking, we have the world, or at least the markets of the world, at our feet.

The great nations of the world are engaged in a titanic struggle for mastery and perhaps even for existence. Practically all manufacturing and commerce in Europe has stopped. It is up to the United States to feed the people of the Old World and to provide them with all the necessities of life.

And yet we are about as well prepared to do this as a German dirigible is prepared to fly to the moon. The crisis has caught us unawares. We have no merchant marine, no way to send our products abroad. To-day our principal seaboard cities are glutted with shipments for which cross-ocean transportation is not available.

In the past every effort toward building up the merchant marine of the United States on a scientific basis has been rejected. There has always been some little demagogue to spring up with a yell of "special privilege" and "graft." Now, when the golden opportunity has come, we have a special privilege indeed, and that is the privilege of kicking ourselves for having been so improvident in the past. And so at a time when we ought to be the busiest and most prosperous nation on earth, through a mistaken policy at home and abroad we find ourselves down at the heel, with half of our factories closed and the other half working men three days a week.

But, although the great opportunity found us asleep at the switch, the terrible struggle in Europe has at least benefited us in one way. It has cut off competition from abroad that ere this, under the present tariff law, would have driven us out of our own markets had not the general conflagration abroad shut off the production in the belligerent nations.

Even this elimination of European competition, however, has not been enough to offset entirely the result of the free-trade administration. Things began to slip badly before the European war, and they are not yet righting themselves with any degree of certainty.

Worst of all, of course, is the realization that we have overlooked the greatest opportunity that ever came to a civilized nation in the way of trade expansion. But unless some twentieth century necromancer can conjure a fleet of phantom ships out of the night there does not seem to be any help for it.

The Providence (R. I.) Bulletin treats of the subject as follows:

The supposed dire necessity for ships which inspired the Government ship-purchase idea proves with a little waiting to be nonexistent. Judged by his adherence to the proposal that the Government buy and operate merchant ships, the President's "single-track" mind extends straight out to sea. The metaphor may now be changed to "steering a straight course." But Mr. Wilson should tack. Great Britain's merchant marine has not been driven from the sea. If vessels can be operated under foreign flags and laws between this country and foreign ports our Government can not order American over-seas commerce to be carried in its own bottoms, for this is a matter of international trade. Probably foreign shipowners can compete with our Government as operators of merchantmen; their experience counts for much. But American shipowners will not compete with Washington.

The proposal to stifle private enterprise is the more intolerable because it is directed at the use of the sea, the gift of nature equally to all mankind. As an excuse for the restraints placed on private railroad operations the fact is pointed out that a railroad exists by virtue of the favor of right of eminent domain. No such argument applies to shipping.

This is not the only objection to the engagement by the Government in the furnishing of marine transportation. The resultant public debt will be burdensome. The business world will not be better served. The laws which the Government enacts for private shipowners do not bind it in its own operations. There is no Government department or service the efficiency of which would lead the shippers of the world to expect it to make a striking success of the merchant-marine business financially or in the facilities that it may be expected to furnish.

The Rutland (Vt.) Herald speaks as follows:

The greatest merit of the message delivered yesterday to Congress by President Woodrow Wilson is its brevity. As against a ponderous, unreadable document running into pages of a newspaper the President has written less than the equivalent of five columns of type, all readable, fairly timely, and couched in the Chief Executive's well-nigh faultless English.

Apart from the absorbing topic of national defense, evidently written as an afterthought, the next characteristic recommendation deals with the need of a merchant marine. Admitting, as everyone must, the sincerity of the President's purpose, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the President has set his heart with a stubbornness almost childlike on a line of ships owned by the United States.

That was written more than a month ago; and from what we read in the press and what we have listened to from the other side of the Chamber it is very evident that the President's purpose is equally as insistent as it was when it was first broached.

The Herald and the great majority of the press of the United States will not be in accord with the President on this question. If the need of ships is as imperative as it seems from the message, the solution lies not in the handful of Government-owned vessels proposed in the pending bill but in a frankly subsidized merchant marine to restore the American flag to the seven seas.

The President, in fact, points the way to this consummation himself. He says:

"The case is not unlike that which confronted us when our own continent was to be opened up to settlement and industry, and we needed long lines of railway, extended means of transportation prepared beforehand, if development was not to lag intolerably and wait interminably. We lavishly subsidized the building of transcontinental railroads. We look back upon that with regret now, because the subsidies led to many scandals of which we are ashamed."

Mr. President, I think the scandals, great as they were at one time, were more than offset by the benefits that came to the people of the United States in the construction of those great transcontinental lines.

Naturally President Wilson is opposed to subsidies, but there is nothing in his reference to this great topic which contravenes the position of many practical students of the problem, which is that subsidies are practical and nationally profitable, the best and quickest means of getting results, and just as easily safeguarded from scandal as any other Government enterprise.

The Boston Post is one of the most aggressive and unrelenting Democratic newspapers in the United States. It is also one of the most prosperous and possibly the most largely circulated newspaper of New England. A month ago that paper said:

One of the two moot points in the President's message for which the Post said that there was by no means general approval in the country, and not even agreement in the Democratic Party, was that which repeated Mr. Wilson's approval of his plan for Government purchase and operation of merchant vessels.

The President has modified his scheme somewhat. The Federal ownership of the merchant marine is to be temporary, not permanent—"when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance the Government ought to withdraw."

But it is difficult to see how private capital can be stimulated to go into the merchant-marine venture in the face of Government competition, no matter if that is announced as to be only temporary. The President declares that the Government should "make certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable"; that is to say, the Federal lines can afford to and will lose money on the venture. What earthly chance, then, would private owners have to get into the game at all? It is futile to suppose that they will engage in the business solely for recreation.

In speaking of the Boston Post, Mr. President, as one of the influential, widely circulated Democratic newspapers in New England, I did not mean to exclude from the calculation the Boston Globe, which is a long-established and potential Democratic paper, unflinching in its advocacy of Democratic principles, and giving its support without stint to the present administration, with the exception of the proposition embodied in the bill before us that the Government shall go into the purchase, ownership, and operation of steamships. Under date of January 6, this great Democratic newspaper, under the caption, "Not the time now for Government-owned merchant marine," published the following in its editorial columns:

The "Government" has its teeth so firmly set in the idea that it should own and operate merchant ships that it will not let go.

One of the first effects of the war in this country was to bring home to the American people, as years of agitation on the platform and in the press have not brought home, the vitalness of our merchant-marine problem.

The public knew in a general way that our foreign shipping had been falling behind year after year until only a very small fraction of the American foreign trade was carried in American bottoms. Just what this meant in practice it did not understand, and, as there appeared to be plenty of foreign ships for our imports and exports, it did not much care.

Still less did the public understand the reason for the decline of our shipping, though the prevalent idea was that our strict navigation laws and the high cost of shipbuilding in this country were to blame.

With the outbreak of the war, however, the problem became acute. The shipping of England's foes was driven from the seas, and a large part of British shipping was summoned to the service of the Government. Needed imports did not come to port; goods for export piled up on docks and in warehouses.

Then arose a loud cry for relief, especially in the form of admitting foreign ships to American registry. That, it was confidently believed, would save the day, since foreign owners must be only too glad to put their endangered or useless vessels under the safe American flag.

A long step toward "free ships" had been made in the Panama Canal act of 1912, and last August this act was enlarged to admit to registry for the foreign trade foreign-built ships without distinction of age. They were, moreover, exempted from compliance with American measurement and inspection laws and from the requirement that the officers should be Americans.

But as the first act had had no results, so the new one had very little. No real increase was made in our foreign shipping, and nearly all the ships that were brought under the American flag had been previously owned by American corporations. The proposed wholesale purchase of German liners found vigorous opposition from Germany's foes.

Yet still the need of more ships and better service continued, and a new expedient was proposed—that the Government should control and operate steamship companies, leaving a minority interest for private investment. Since the Government could not induce its citizens to become shipowners, it would become a shipowner itself for the public good.

It can not be denied that some good results could be secured in this way. There undoubtedly would be new American ships, possibly new trade routes and better service for exporters. There would be the needed auxiliary fleet in time of war.

The real question, however, problems of constitutionality aside, is whether the gain would be worth the cost and whether that method of attaining the desired end is the best.

American capital, estimated at from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000, is invested in the ocean trade under foreign flags, where a reasonable profit can be counted on. It has not been invested in American ocean trade evidently because it is not profitable.

The reasons are the higher wage level, certain restrictions imposed by our laws, and the fact that American shipping must compete against the subsidies and aids granted by foreign Governments to their liners.

Where private business can not make a profit, the Government certainly could not do so. When the Government enters business, it is to render services which the public requires and can not otherwise get, and to render them whatever the cost. Nobody expects Government operations to be economical; if they result in a deficit, the public accepts it because the public benefits by the service.

It is highly probable that Government ships, if they were able to get the trade, would handle it only at a loss. But it would not be for a service rendered to the whole people, but to the exporters and importers; in practice it would be taxing the whole people for the good of a part.

That sounds, Mr. President, like a subsidy. We have heard it iterated and reiterated that if we give any aid to the shipping industry of the United States we are going to tax the rest of the people for the benefit of the shipowners. So it seems, according to the view of this great Democratic newspaper, if this scheme goes through it will be for the benefit of the exporters and importers, not for the people at large.

More than this, it would force private enterprise out of foreign shipping instead of drawing it in, and so would defeat its own ends. The outcome would be a Government merchant marine, uneconomically managed, and nothing else. From any viewpoint the question of Government ownership of ships could not be fairly tested at this time.

Here, Mr. President, is a declaration from this leading Democratic newspaper that is worthy of serious consideration. The Globe concludes:

Better than this now is an open policy of Government subsidy. Better still a tariff discrimination in favor of American-carried goods. Either or both, coupled with free ships, should see a speedy growth in our shipping. And, if less speedy than the acquisition of a Government fleet, it would be of more enduring value.

I have already quoted from the Boston Transcript one editorial. That is a newspaper of such high standing, such is its acknowledged conservatism and as a purveyor of valuable information it is so reliable that I am going to quote an additional brief editorial:

The annual address of the President before Congress to-day is the longest delivery of his administration. In style it will not suffer by comparison with his previous utterances. The phrases of his alluring rhetoric lose little of their charm, familiar though they have become through frequent use. His cheerfulness of tone betrays, however, a chastened spirit upon which the verdict of the congressional elections was not wholly lost. Instead of combating that verdict we find him gracefully refusing to play the part of historian toward the record of the Congress now in its closing session, and, with an optimism equalled only by astuteness, suggesting that "our thoughts are now more of the future than of the past." If only the people could thus easily dismiss from their minds the hard times and the heavy taxes which constitute thus far their main inheritance from the present Congress they could more nimbly ascend the heights of the President's optimism, and view the future with his enthusiasm. Theirs, however, is not the task of the historian, and they, unlike the President, can not wish away the stern problems of the present.

That reminds me, Mr. President, that the Chief Executive at one time, when some business men called on him to point out the sad condition of the industrial affairs of the country, said to them: "It is purely psychological; business is looking up." Promptly a bright newspaper of the country retorted, "The President is right, business is looking up. It is flat on its back, and it can not look in any other direction." Yet the President continues to have his optimism both as to the business of the country and as to the great advantage which is to result from this proposed shipping legislation, and he is wrong on both propositions. The Transcript continues:

To the pending shipping bill which provides for the purchase and operation by the Government of a merchant marine, we have on several occasions expressed our opposition, and so far from modifying that the President's discussion of the measure we believe will have the effect of confirming and strengthening previous criticisms. He favors the Government ownership of our merchant marine for a limited period only; in other words, long enough to destroy the nucleus that has survived and to discourage private business from making any other attempt to restore our flag on the seas. We hope the Nation will not be slow to speak its mind against any such ruinous nostrum. It lacks the advantages of Government and private ownership of shipping and combines the disadvantages of both.

Well, Mr. President, the Nation has not been slow to speak its disapproval of the bill we are now considering, and if by any misfortune it shall become a law the Nation will not fail to voice its disapproval of the political party that enacted it.

The Springfield (Mass.) Morning Union speaks as follows:

In his message to Congress President Wilson again urges governmental ownership as a means of developing an American marine and attempts to stem the agitation for an inquiry into the national defense by assurances that our military provisions are adequate. In neither case does his course of argument carry conviction. As regards the merchant marine he virtually concedes that governmental ownership is the only alternative to the granting of substantial subsidies and he contends stoutly for governmental ownership. "The Government must open these gates of trade," he says, "and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw."

But in this the President fails to give us any hint as to how governmental ownership is going to prepare the way for successful private operation. By what magic will the Government so arrange matters that, after operating ships for a season, it may step aside and enable private concerns to compete successfully, though enjoying no subsidies and paying good wages for a reasonable amount of work under comfortable conditions, with carriers of other nations, liberally subsidized and operating at a cost incompatible with the maintenance of an American standard in respect to labor? That is the problem.

The President does not go into the causes that have reduced our merchant marine to its present low estate, possibly because he feared to make his message too long. But he ought at least to investigate those causes carefully himself before urging a remedy; and if he had done this with any thoroughness he would have seen the fallacy in his reasoning. The problem met with here is different from that involved in the building and operation of a railroad or a telephone system. In respect to these latter it is fair to anticipate that the developing agent will be able to hold the business it has created. Franchises can be refused to concerns desirous of building competing lines. But in the case of foreign shipping there are no such natural and artificial restrictions. No costly tracks or wires are required for ocean commerce, and ships can be shifted readily from one route to another if trade conditions so dictate. Competition involves foreign agencies over which our Government can have no direct control. So that, even if the Government should build up a large shipping business and turn it over to private concerns that, unlike the Government, could not do the business at a heavy loss to itself, there would be no assurance that such business would not quickly be lost to the ships of other countries when the artificial props were removed. The President, in fact, gives us no basis for thinking otherwise than that this would be the natural and inevitable result.

Moreover, the President errs in assuming that to provide ships will of itself assure the speedy rehabilitation of our merchant marine. In order to make a successful merchant marine these ships must do a large business, and the acquisition of such business is one of our problems. This will require time, even with foreign shipping hampered as it is by the war, for foreign capital, buttressed with governmental support, has been years establishing this business, and it will take years, probably, to win it to the United States even if we can meet our rivals on an even footing. As a short-cut, quick-cure provision, the President's plan does not appear to be at all sound, when viewed as a device for getting permanent results. There remain other objections that the President ignores. He does not show wherein governmental ownership is more effectual than subsidized private lines in getting results. If the Government can not serve this field better than private capital can with reasonable assistance from the Government, why extend the Government's operations? Why extend them in any direction unless there is a good and urgent reason for it? It so happens, moreover, in this case that the policy of governmental ownership would involve special and unusual risk, particularly with foreign nations at war. Government vessels charged with carrying freight, and more or less of a contraband nature, would afford a peculiarly grave menace to our neutrality. Why incur this peril? Is it necessary? Is it practical as an economic remedy? The President has not demonstrated that it is.

Another brief editorial from the Boston Herald, under the caption "Boston does not like it," is as follows:

Boston shipowners have pronounced against President Wilson's shipping bill. The Boston Maritime Association, "whose members own the bulk of steam and sail tonnage in Massachusetts," protests to Congress against the measure as "entirely foreign to the purpose for which the movement exists," and as "distinctly a move toward general Government ownership."

This is the judgment of experts, who know their trade, and rightfully object to the United States Treasury as a competitor. Whatever present difficulty there may be in securing tonnage, these practical ship managers say, is due mainly to inability to obtain insurance on cargoes or on ships, particularly if sent to mined and dangerous waters. As to South America, the business depression there, due to the war, has brought about a condition in which there are, temporarily at least, more ships than merchandise to fill them. These Boston shipowners have given to Secretary Redfield a list of ships representing over 200,000 tons of dead-weight capacity, which could be chartered foreign if there were sufficient business to employ them.

This Government-ownership bill is having a particularly bad effect upon Boston's maritime prosperity. For several years our Boston merchant fleet has been steadily increasing. Among the new ships are 24 steamers available for foreign as well as coastwise trade, embodying an investment of upward of $8,000,000. Four of these ships are now on the routes to Europe and four more on the Pacific. But since the war began and President Wilson launched his Government-ownership project it is significant that Boston capital has turned from and not to the sea, building has ceased and no more new ship contracts have been awarded.

If the bill on which the President in his message insists with so much emphasis were really helpful to the merchant marine, no one would see and welcome it more eagerly than the alert and ambitious shipowners and builders of New England. But they are unitedly against it. So, apparently, are the actual shipping men all along the Atlantic and Pacific. One maritime or mercantile association after another condemns the administration plan, and not one upholds it from the great commercial States of either seaboard.

This, presumably, is the reason why the Government-ownership bill was "jammed through" the Senate Committee on Commerce without the accustomed courtesy of public hearings. The promoters of this unprecedented measure were afraid of the verdict of the men who know.

Mr. President, I have had several bills relating to the American merchant marine before the Committee on Commerce during my service in this body and in every instance hearings were accorded to the friends and to the opponents of the measure, but it happened for some reason or other that this particular bill was reported out of the committee without any hearings, and as a result the only means that the business men, the industrial interests, and the newspapers of the country have to protest is through the medium I am now employing.

A little time ago the esteemed Washington Post, under the caption "Government steamships—the danger of complications," had an editorial which I read with a good deal of interest at the time and which I think is worthy of reproduction. The Post said:

The present controversy with Great Britain is a warning against the enactment of the administration bill providing for Government-owned steamship lines.

A strong protest has been made, and it will be reinforced if necessary, against the unwarranted interference with American commerce. Some of the American cargoes are in foreign bottoms and some of them in ships under the American flag. The controversy is over the cargoes and not over the ships. But what would the situation be if Great Britain were to seize ships owned and operated by the United States Government? An acute quarrel would ensue, and the nations would be fortunate if they escaped war.

The ships owned by the United States under the proposed law would not be commanded by officers of the United States Navy, it is true, but they would be Government vessels, nevertheless. The United States could not permit such vessels to be stopped and searched on the high seas without a loss of self-respect. It would be compelled to resist such attempts. The people would expect any administration to defend the flag, and would assert themselves in no uncertain manner if the Government weakly yielded to a foreign power.

The entry of the United States Government into the ocean-carriage business would be an unfortunate mistake. The Government was not organized for money-making purposes.

It can not enter any commercial field without competing with its own citizens. Private steamship lines would have to go out of business, go under a foreign flag, or be absorbed by a Government monopoly. Instead of promoting a healthy, permanent merchant marine under the American flag the Government-ownership plan would kill off the existing merchant marine and make individual enterprise in that field impossible. At the same time, complications with foreign Governments would be inevitable. The Government ships would have to submit to search and possible seizure or refrain from carrying cargoes during war time. Therefore the establishment of Government lines at this juncture, when practically all the world is at war, is most ill-advised.

At a later date, that of January 6, the Post had another editorial headed "Government ships would be dangerous in wartime and costly in time of peace." Just think of it, Mr. President! We are going to enter into a policy that it is asserted would be dangerous in wartime and costly in time of peace, and I have no doubt that that assertion is fully justified by the facts. The Post said:

The minority report on the Government ship purchase bill is well worthy of serious consideration by the administration. At this juncture, when complications with Great Britain regarding the treatment of neutral cargoes remain to be settled, it is prudent that the United States should very carefully investigate conditions before it commits itself to the plan of purchasing foreign ships to be owned and operated by the Government, or under its auspices.

There is no shortage of ocean vessels. Very few of them have been destroyed. There are many tied up, particularly those under the German flag; but if the United States Government should purchase German ships and attempt to operate them it would find itself in hot water immediately. International law presumes that transfers of flag during hostilities are not made in good faith, but are merely a subterfuge to relieve vessels of a belligerent from the consequences of war. Of course the United States would not be a party to fraudulent or colorable transfers of ownership. The transfer would be genuine; but, nevertheless, Great Britain would raise objections to any plan that would release the German vessels. These vessels are put out of commission by war, greatly to the damage of Germany. This is a legitimate advantage enjoyed by Great Britain, which she would not forego for the sake of assisting the United States to build up a competitive commerce.

In fact, Mr. President, to this intelligent editor's statement that Great Britain would resist the purchase of German ships by our Government because Great Britain is enjoying an advantage from the fact that they are interned in American ports he might have added that the entire history of the British Government has been to do everything possible to prevent the upbuilding of an American merchant marine. Great Britain has not been overcareful of the agreements she has made with the United States in that regard, and if Great Britain has failed to discover any means by which she could cripple the American merchant marine it has escaped the attention of some students of that subject. So Great Britain will have a double purpose in objecting to the purchase of these ships by our Government, one purpose being that she is crippling Germany by keeping them in our ports, and the other that she is unwilling to have us, by the purchase of ships from belligerent or neutral nations for that matter, which will tend to build up our merchant marine, thus become a competitor with her on the ocean.

The Post continues:

"Every craft set afloat by the Government would add one more risk of our being drawn into the present war," says the minority report. This is unquestionably true.

As for the operation of Government-owned ships after the war, how would they be made to pay? Since American vessels can not compete with foreign ships in the overseas trade, how long will Congress be willing to meet losses incurred by the Government lines? Is Congress willing to pay big sums for the sake of seeing the American flag on the seas, when vessels under other flags will carry American cargoes cheaper than our own vessels?

The more the Government ship-purchase bill is studied, the more serious appear to be the obstacles in the way of successful operation of Government-owned ships. It is a piece of paternalism that is dangerous in time of war and ruinously costly in time of peace.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the date of the editorial which the Senator from New Hampshire has just read?

Mr. GALLINGER. That was under date of January 6, 1915.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, if the Senator will take the trouble to refer to an editorial of a few days ago, he will find that the Post then expressed a very different view upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was probably written by a cub reporter, while this was written by the real editor of the Post. I was once connected with a newspaper in an editorial capacity. While I was away from home for a few days the office boy wrote an editorial which appeared in that issue, very much to my dismay when I returned. If an editorial of different tone has appeared in the Post it may be accounted for in the same way.

I want to say that I deserve the thanks of the majority of the Senate for not introducing more protests from the newspapers of the country against this bill. I have a bundle of them in my committee room which I might use, but I feel that what I have quoted ought to be a sufficient education for those who are unwise enough to advocate the passage of this measure.

Coming now directly to a consideration of the merchant-marine question I beg to call attention to the fact that whenever demands have been made to pass remedial legislation, such as enlarging the postal subventions to American ships, we have been met with the suggestion that the adoption of differential duties would solve the problem, and when the impossibility of securing relief from that source has been pointed out then the claim that the amendment of the navigation laws so as to admit of the purchase of ships abroad would be a panacea. The Merchant Marine Commission pointed out clearly that free ships would in nowise solve the problem, and for the purpose of testing it no opposition was made to incorporating in the Panama Canal act a proposition along that line. The discriminating-duties proposition is a part of the existing tariff law, but that has proved the failure that some of us pointed out it would, and no effort is being made to enforce it.

If the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be searched during the past 10 years it would be found that whenever an effort has been made to pass a bill that some of us believed would tend to rehabilitate the American merchant marine, we have been met by two objections from our Democratic friends. One was, that all we had to do to reestablish the American merchant marine, without the payment of a subsidy or subvention from the Government, was to return to the discriminating-duties policy of the fathers—Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. When that argument seemed to fail, then we were met with the other proposition—that if we would amend our archaic navi-

gation laws and allow the citizens of the United States to go into foreign countries, purchase foreign-built ships and put them in our overseas service the problem would be forever set at rest.

Well, Mr. President, neither of those propositions appealed to me, because I did not think that either of them would accomplish the desired result. The Merchant Marine Commission, which was composed of fairly good men, members of this body and of the other body, gave a great deal of time to the consideration of all these matters and reported on them. Here is what the Merchant Marine Commission said about the free-ship question——

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator give us the number of the report from which he is about to read?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am quoting from Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session, on page 56, entitled "The Free Ship Question." I have an impression that this particular statement may not be found in full in the report of the Merchant Marine Commission, although I am not certain as to that. That it received the concurrence of that commission, or at least a majority of them, I assert with confidence. This article says:

To repeal our century-old registry laws and allow shipowners to buy or build at low prices abroad the ships needed for our commerce seems at first glance an easy and inexpensive way of securing a large mercantile marine.

But it meets only one-half of the question. American ships now cost more to build than foreign ships, chiefly because American shipyard wages are higher, and only in very small part because of the cost of materials, which are free anyway for vessels for the foreign trade.

During the discussion of this matter it was rather interesting to find that very few public men understood that all the materials for shipbuilding, under the laws of the United States, could come in absolutely without the payment of duty; so that the materials themselves were free. As I say, that was not generally understood. The report continues:

But American ships also cost more to run after they are built, because of the higher wages on shipboard, and often, also, because foreign ships not only have low wages, but receive bounties from their governments.

"Free ships" would not solve this difficulty; they would not touch it.

Suppose two steamers, identical in size and cost, were built side by side in a British yard and sold, one to an American, the other to a British company, for the trade to South America. The steamer flying the British flag could procure its officers and crew at Liverpool for wages about 30 per cent less than the steamer flying the American flag could at New York or New Orleans.

This is a serious handicap, but the British steamer, carrying the British mails, would receive some thousands of dollars in subsidy, while the American steamer would receive either nothing at all or at most some few hundred dollars of United States mail pay.

Perhaps the British subsidy would be large enough to guarantee a handsome dividend on the British steamer, which could thereby carry freight at cost, while the American steamer, without the help of a subsidy, would either have to ask higher freight rates on American goods or forego a dividend altogether.

This illustration will show that "free ships," even if the policy were adopted, would not solve the shipping question; that there would still be left the difficulty of the higher American shipboard wages, and in some cases also of the foreign subsidies.

It would be very much as if a policy of free trade were adopted, for example, in the machinery of woolen mills. Of course, the immediate result of the entire removal of the protective duty would be to kill the manufacture of such machinery in the United States and reduce a number of skilled mechanics to idleness and want. But the woolen mills could import their machinery free of duty, and doubtless would get it for a somewhat lower price.

If, now, a protective duty were kept on woolen goods, it is probable that a great deal of "free" foreign machinery would be bought and operated. But if there were no protective duty whatever on woolen manufactures—just as there is now no protection for ships—it is probable that foreign woolens made with low wages would overwhelm our mills, and that even with machinery "free," very little, if any, machinery would be purchased.

In the matter of shipping, this is no mere conjecture. It is exactly what has happened in the maritime experience of the world. In the years between 1840 and 1860 the crisis of the transition from sails to steam and from wood to iron in shipbuilding, the British Government gave generous subsidies to steamship lines; at this date the chief part of British steamship tonnage was subsidized. One result was to give iron shipbuilding and steam-engine building such an impetus in British yards that no nation could compete with them. Foreseeing this, the British Government for the first time passed a "free-ship" law, shrewdly hoping that all other nations, especially the United States, would follow, and that soon all the ships of the world would be built of British iron by British workmen.

But the United States did not follow. After a time, however, France did, and Germany and Italy and Norway and other nations.

The result in France was that in 1881, after a long trial of the privilege of buying "free ships" in Great Britain, the French people found themselves with fewer ships (914,000 tons) than they had in 1870 (1,072,000 tons), while French shipbuilding had so nearly disappeared that it was difficult to get new battleships for the national defense without going to England for them also.

Of course, this weakening of the French navy was one of the results which British statesmen had sought when they gave their first subsidies to steamships and encouraged their neighbors across the channel to adopt a "free-ship" policy.

In despair at the disastrous consequences of the "free-ship" policy, and realizing how Great Britain had tricked her, France now adopted an elaborate plan of subsidies to French shipping, steam and sail, and bounties to shipbuilding. The French subsidy system in many respects was a blundering one, though it has been much amended and improved.

But with all its faults of detail it has established French shipyards fit to build the heaviest armor clads; it has created a large naval reserve of merchant officers and sailors, and finally it has increased French tonnage (which shrank steadily under "free ships") from 914,000 in 1881 to 1,760,000 in 1904—very nearly double.

Germany also tried "free ships." Her merchants were allowed to buy all their seagoing vessels in Great Britain, but while this expedient increased German tonnage scarcely any (only from 1,098,000 in 1873 to 1,243,000 in 1881) it did smother German shipbuilding so effectively that there was not a yard in the Empire that could construct a man-of-war to protect the coasts, and the few armor clads which Germany possessed were bought of British builders.

In 1881 Bismarck appealed to the Reichstag to put an end to this and to give subsidies to German steamship lines after the British example. A subsidy of $1,047,500 was given to the North German Lloyd for a service to Japan, China, and Australia, and of $214,000 to another company for a line to Africa.

But the Reichstag would have no "free ships" for those new lines. It required, significantly, that the subsidized ships should be built in German yards, as far as possible, of German materials. Thus, these subsidies created the German shipyards that are now building Kaiser Wilhelm's battle line, and have built the monster *Deutschland* and other Atlantic flyers.

German shipping, which had made no notable increase under "free ships" alone, has grown wonderfully since Bismarck led the way for imperial encouragement. Besides these generous mail subsidies, the German State railways haul material at nominal rates for shipyards—a virtual bounty on shipbuilding—and these same State railways grant favorable rates on goods exported by German steamers.

That is a point which has been overlooked to a large extent in the discussion of the American merchant marine question. Germany, owning the railroads, carries materials for shipbuilding to German shipyards at a lower cost than it carries other commodities, and also makes more favorable rates on goods exported by German steamers than by other steamers. Germany's great wisdom in these matters is shown by the fact that a letter mailed in Washington for Germany will require a 5-cent stamp if it is not designated in writing on the envelope that it is to go by a German steamer. If it is to go by a German steamer, it will cost 2 cents. Germany in every way looks out for the upbuilding of her industries, and especially of her shipping facilities. Of course I am speaking of conditions existing before the war, and conditions which will exist after this horrible war comes to an end, which heaven grant may be before long.

The German merchant marine interests are fostered in every possible way, and though a "free-ship" policy still exists, relatively few German steamers are now bought abroad.

German tonnage, which was 1,243,000 in 1881, is now 3,393,000.

This was written in the year 1905. We talk about the free-ship policy of England. When the great steamships *Maurctania* and *Lusitania* were built in England, not only did the Government put up $13,000,000 to build them, to be paid back through mail subventions, but the contract provided that they should be built in British shipyards. So that even England has not fully lived up to the free-ship policy which has been so often referred to in connection with that country.

Norway at first made best use of the "free-ship" experiment. The Norwegians are born sailors, and they work for almost the lowest wages. Between 1870 and 1880 Norway bought a great many American and British sail vessels, sold at a low price because they could no longer compete with steam, and Norwegian tonnage rose rapidly from 1,022,000 to 1,650,000.

But there it seemed to stop. While France, with very much less aptitude for the sea, increased her tonnage by help of subsidy from 1,104,000 in 1890 to 1,760,000 in 1904, Norwegian tonnage has scarcely gained at all, or only from 1,650,000 to 1,779,000.

But now Norway, though she is very poor and small, has followed the other nations in showing her dissatisfaction with "free ships" alone, and has begun to give small subsidies to regular mail lines and bounties to native shipbuilding.

Italy tried "free ships," as France and Germany did, with exactly the same experience. Her ships did not increase, and her shipyards vanished. Finally Italy also, to save her shipping trade, was forced to adopt a comprehensive system of subsidies to all ships, including bounties on construction.

The Italian merchant fleet has grown rapidly of late years, from 860,000 tons in 1894 to 1,259,000 tons in 1904.

Japan, too, has followed the same course. She tried "free ships" persistently, with the result that as late as 1894 she had only 200,000 tons of shipping of all kinds, and almost no shipyards.

The war with China in 1894 taught Japan a sharp lesson of the value of a merchant marine. She turned now to subsidies and bounties on a liberal scale, developing steamship lines and native shipyards, and possessed a merchant fleet of 830,000 tons in 1904, sufficient for her needs of transports and auxiliary cruisers in the greater war with Russia.

To sum up, therefore, it may be said that all the maritime nations of the world have tried "free ships" in the past, and, disappointed with the results of this expedient alone, have now all turned to some form or degree of subsidy, bounty, or subvention.

Even Great Britain has so little faith in "free ships" as an economic principle that her recent mail contract with the Cunard Line requires specifically that the subsidized steamships shall be "built in the United Kingdom."

That is a matter to which I have already referred.

Thus the "free-ship" idea is conspicuously flouted, though not formally abandoned, by the British Government.

Other governments, as a rule, do not actually forbid a "free-ship" policy, but they do all they can to encourage their merchants to build their ships at home, and not add further to the maritime dominance of Great Britain.

European bounties on shipbuilding are, of course, a direct discouragement to "free ships" and a powerful protection to native industry. If the United States Government were to pay ten to twenty dollars a ton on every ship built in the United States, something might be said for the free registry of British-built vessels in America; but to practice "free ships" without any aid or encouragement to home building is something which is done now by not one of the maritime nations.

Even if the "free-ship" policy were applied in connection with a subsidy policy in the United States, the "free-ship" principle would be of very dubious advantage. If out of 100,000 tons of steamships subsidized and added to our merchant fleet in a single year 50,000 tons were built in this country and 50,000 tons bought in Great Britain, the 100,000 tons would undoubtedly cost less than if they were all of American construction.

But, on the other hand, to the extent of 50,000 tons we should then have developed the shipyard resources of the United Kingdom and should have deprived American yards of 50,000 tons of that experience which must be had before American ship prices can be reduced, as they must some day be reduced, to the level of our formidable competitor.

American shipyard wages are the highest in the world. But they are no higher than the wages in American locomotive works and bridge works, and American locomotives and bridges are competing in cost with similar British articles.

How, with our high wages, have we been able to bring down the price of American locomotives and bridges? Why, by keeping these works constantly employed to their full capacity, by standardizing their product, and by maintaining steadily an enormous volume of production.

To manage to do the same thing with our shipyards is finally to reduce the price of ships, and it is the only sure way in which this can be accomplished, except, indeed, by a reduction of American shipyard wages, which nobody would advocate.

But to buy ships in Great Britain under a "free-ship" policy instead of building the ships, even at a temporarily higher price here, is to hamper this process of industrial evolution and play directly into the hands of our great antagonist.

This fact is clearly seen by our British rivals. As the London Engineer not long ago said:

"Free ships would be a good thing for our English shipbuilders, for whether at first or at second hand the vessels purchased would be of English build for the most part. The development of a native American shipbuilding industry can be of advantage to neither builders nor owners here."

This is also the expert view of the practical ship merchants of America. Nearly all of the experienced shipowners of this country engaged in foreign trade testified in the course of the recent long and careful inquiry of the Merchant Marine Commission.

These practical men were asked: "Do you desire 'free ships'?" "If Congress changed our law and enabled you to buy ships abroad and run them in the foreign trade, would you do so?"

With only one or two exceptions these practical men emphatically replied that they did not desire "free ships"; that they could not buy foreign vessels and run them under the American flag at the American wage rate against the cheap wages and often the subsidies of their foreign competitors; that "free ships," if adopted, would prove to us, as to others, a delusion, and would be of no advantage whatever toward the real development of an ocean fleet in the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to ask the Senator a question. This may not be the proper place in his remarks to do so, but I should like to ask him if it is not a fact that the ocean rates on exports from this country are high because of the fact that the imports have fallen off to such an extent that vessels coming from the other side to this country get little or no freight, comparatively speaking, and they have to earn enough on the passage out to Europe to pay them for the round trip? Is not that one of the chief causes, in addition to the war risk and insurance rates, that has tended to increase rates?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator has undoubtedly made a wise suggestion in that regard. A great problem in establishing American lines across the oceans of the world has been to try to connect with ports where a return cargo could be secured. It would be disastrous for an American line of ships to go into the business when, although there are goods to be transported from our country, there are very few goods to be brought back, and no wise shipping man would engage in an enterprise of that kind.

In addition to the cause which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has suggested as a reason for high rates, there is one other cause which might be stated, and that is that the European war has made labor so difficult of procurement that the wages of the men on the docks and in the warehouses, as well, have been largely increased, even if labor can be procured at all. That is one reason why we hear it said that American goods are lying at the ports of foreign countries without being unloaded.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield further.

Mr. NELSON. Would not an investigation disclose the fact that the rates on imports to this country by way of the ocean have not increased anywhere near as much as have the rates on exports?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that to be so.

Mr. NELSON. Is not that due to the fact that imports are comparatively slight and that vessels which ply to Europe are glad to get anything in the shape of a return cargo, and hence there has been little or no increase in that kind of traffic?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that to be a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not also a fact that, on account of the great number of ships that, because of the war, have been withdrawn from actual service, the law of supply and demand is now working and the shipowners themselves are getting every dollar out of the trade that it is possible to get; so that they have increased rates sometimes 500 and 600 per cent, for the very reason that the ships are not procurable to carry the amount of exportations demanding shipment? Of course freights have advanced greatly, but the mere fact of the United States purchasing 30 ships from some other nation would have no effect whatever upon the ocean-freight rates charged the commerce of the world.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Florida with pleasure, always.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he claimed that the shortage of cargoes coming to this country would in any wise occasion such advances as are reported—that vessels are getting $40,000 per month where before the war they were chartered for $5,000 a month?

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not fully account for it. It accounts for it in part. The fact is that our people are not different from the other people of the world in matters of business. The opportunity has presented itself for shipowners of all the nations of the world to advance their rates. On certain routes there is ample reason why they should do so, because the hazards are great. On other routes very likely they have advanced them inordinately. I assume that to be true. But that the purchase or the construction of 30 or 40 ships by the Government of the United States could by any possibility have any great influence upon reducing the rates upon the 4,000 or more British ships which are traversing the ocean is beyond my comprehension.

In this connection I may use the simile of our friend and former colleague who stood directly behind me for so many years and guided the legislation of this body as few men have, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Hale], who used to say that "You might as well have painted ships on a painted ocean." I think you might just about as well put a fleet of painted ships on a painted ocean and expect them to reduce to any substantial degree the increased rates that are now charged as to expect 30 or 40 ships under the American flag to accomplish that result, even if we could get the ships. If we propose to buy them, where are we to get them? If we build them, we can not get them built in American shipyards to-day and I doubt if we can in foreign shipyards under 12 or 15 months. Then the emergency, we all hope, will have passed; the war will have closed; English and German and French ships will again dot the ocean. They are navigated at a much less cost than an American ship can be navigated, and this venture that we have made will go to the scrap heap. That is what will probably happen.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not wish to interrupt the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, the Senator does not annoy me. I always yield with pleasure to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have listened with interest to his address, but I should like to inquire of the Senator if he agrees with the view of the committee which reported to the New York Chamber of Commerce that the difference in the cost of operating vessels under the American flag and under foreign flags is from 5 to 10 per cent?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the statement that was read here this morning.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I read that statement for what it is worth. Every statement is worth just what the facts will justify. The truth is that the difference in the food supply as

between American ships and many foreign ships would probably be 5 per cent. The additional crew that we are required to carry is a very important item. Then there is the fact that we are compelled, under the laws of the United States, to pay the officers of the ship more than twice what is paid by foreign governments; the further fact that we are required to carry a portion of our crew of Americans, while they carry Lascars and Chinese and Japanese, and the lowest-paid laborers in all the world. Oh, I know the difference would not be as little as that. I do not know just what it would be, but it is enough to prevent our capitalists and our shipowners and shipbuilders from going into the business, and it always will prevent them from going into it until in some way we equalize the difference in cost between navigating an American and a British or German, Japanese, or French ship.

I will conclude the article I have been reading by quoting the closing paragraph:

Moreover, the Merchant Marine Commission caused a direct special inquiry to be addressed to the International Mercantile Marine Co. and other concerns, wholly or in part American, owning ships under foreign colors. The managers of these concerns, representing practically all of the American investments in foreign shipping, were asked point-blank if they would put their ships under the American flag providing Congress opened registry to them.

Without an exception, in reply to this specific question, they said they would not do so, unless, indeed, enough aid were given through subsidy or discriminating duty to enable these foreign-built ships to pay American wages to their crews and to offset subsidized competition.

Yet, if there were any actual benefit in "free ships," these American owners of vessels under foreign flags would be the prime beneficiaries.

Their unanimous opposition, therefore, is exceedingly significant.

"Free ships" are not only discredited by the experience of the world but are overwhelmingly opposed by the trained judgment of American ship merchants.

Mr. President, notwithstanding that argument, which was presented to the Congress and particularly to the Senate, when a bill was introduced prepared by a majority of the Merchant Marine Commission, and not strenuously opposed by the minority, we were met by the assertion that if we would only revise or modify or repeal our "archaic navigation laws" and let Americans go to England, to France, to Germany, and to Italy and buy ships as freely as the citizens of those countries could buy them, we need not worry any further about upbuilding the American merchant marine. Well, we have yielded to that, those of us who did not believe in it; a free-ship law is on our statute books, and still the ships are not here and they will never come here under that policy.

Then, when that contention failed, our opponents fell back on the plea that the discriminating-duties policy of the fathers, a policy advocated by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the other great men of the early period of our history, was really the policy that we ought to adopt.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. Would not this be a good occasion to apply the old-time principle of discriminating duties? It is a principle announced by the Supreme Court that a treaty may repeal a law, and a law may repeal a treaty. That part of the tariff law which provided for a discriminating duty operated to that extent as a repeal of existing treaties. Would not this be a good time to enforce that provision and resort to that practice? Would it not help to make up the difference in the cost of constructing the vessels and in the cost of operating them to have a discriminating duty of, say, from 5 to 10 per cent? I believe the old-time duty was 10 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to hear the Senator's views on those questions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I voted for that provision in the Underwood tariff law which allowed a differential duty of 5 per cent on goods transported in American bottoms; but I did it with a full conviction that if it was tried it would prove a failure. I will give my reasons for that belief. I regret exceedingly that it was held up. I regret that the law department of the Government ruled that, in view of the fact that we had entered into thirty-odd commercial agreements or treaties with foreign countries whereby we had promised not to adopt any policy that they did not adopt—in other words, reciprocity agreements—we could not enforce that provision of the tariff law in the face of those agreements, and that it ought not be attempted until such time as we annulled those treaties. I wanted to see the experiment tested.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me another question, I will make a brief preliminary statement in order that the Senator may understand the question. A bill is now pending, commonly called the seamen's bill, by which we propose to impose upon sailors of foreign ships entering our ports the same regulations that we impose upon our own sailors. Now, if we have the power to impose such regulations and restrictions upon the sailors of foreign ships entering our ports, why have we not the like power to resort to discriminating duties, and what is the difference in principle?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I had hoped we had that right, although I greatly doubted it, when the tariff bill passed. For myself, I should like to see it tried. I think it might be of some benefit. The Merchant Marine Commission considered that matter at very great length, however, and they have made a report on it, which I propose to read.

When the Merchant Marine Commission was organized a majority of the commission were in favor of discriminating duties, but after a thorough investigation of the subject, and seeing the difficulties that were in the way, they came to the conclusion that such a plan would not meet the requirements of the situation. As an illustration, in the early days we had a small import duty upon pretty much everything from all the countries with which we traded. We now are looking for trade with South and Central America, and the goods from those countries are almost all on the free list, so that the differential duty would not be of much benefit to the shipping interests of the United States, so far as those countries are concerned. The same is true of the Orient, where we are trying to extend our trade. Largely the goods are either on the free list or at a very low rate of duty, and we would get little benefit from that. We would get great benefit if we had ships across the North Atlantic—there is no question about that—where we could get the benefit of a differential duty on the goods that are brought from France, Germany, England, and Italy; but, unfortunately, this great country of ours, the richest in the world, leading all the nations of the earth in wealth, in manufacturing, in agriculture, and in mining, has exactly four second-class ships crossing the North Atlantic to-day. So that the great benefit we would receive if we had an adequate merchant marine traversing the North Atlantic would amount to very little in view of the fact that we have only those four lone ships as against the great fleets of Great Britain, France, and Germany.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from New Hampshire speaks of a differential duty. For information, I should like to know if the Underwood bill, instead of speaking of it as a differential duty, did not make a discount of 5 per cent on the duty on all goods shipped in American bottoms?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is a differential or discriminating duty.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. On general principles it would inure to our advantage. But to get any particular benefit out of a differential duty in the case of the nations with which we are trading, where we have most of the products on the free list, we would have to resort to the expedient of putting them on the dutiable list, which would result in a storm of disapproval throughout the country that no political party could stand for.

The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], who really knows more about ships and shipping than any other man in public life, and who I wish were physically able to take my place in this discussion, calls my attention to what Secretary McAdoo said in his speech at Chicago before the Commercial Club on January 9. I may say, *en passant*, that I do not know exactly why Secretary McAdoo should be given the distinction of understanding this great question better than some of the rest of us, but he is put forth as the exponent and defender of the bill we now have under consideration. He was the only man called before the committee of the other House to discuss it, except two Members of the body, each of whom, I believe, had a bill of his own; and he is going out into the great cities of the country announcing his views, which are undoubtedly the views of the administration, telling the people of the beauties and advantages of this measure, which is being condemned by the business interests of the country from one ocean to the other. Secretary McAdoo briefly discussed this matter of discriminating duties in his Chicago speech, and I will read what he said about it:

A provision for discriminating duties is contained in the Simmons-Underwood tariff bill—

Says Secretary McAdoo. It should be "the Simmons-Underwood tariff *law*"—

enacted in 1913, but the Attorney General has held that it violates our treaty obligations with various foreign nations. This plan, therefore, must be dismissed as unworkable. Even if our treaties did not stand in the way, and we could enforce such discriminating duties in favor of our ships, it would be easy for other nations to retaliate with similar discriminations and thereby largely negative such a policy. Retaliatory reprisals of this character would only prove hurtful by creating irritation and ill will and prevent the building up of our trade under our own flag.

That was not done during the early days of the Republic, when we had discriminating duties. We had no difficulty in enforcing them and building up our own interests without any irritating controversies with foreign nations; but very likely foreign countries might undertake to retaliate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Is it not in the power of the Government, under nearly all of these treaties, to denounce them, as it is called—to terminate them?

Mr. GALLINGER. They can be denounced by giving one year's notice.

Mr. NELSON. By giving one year's notice we could denounce all these treaties and get rid of them and resort to discriminating duties of 5 per cent——

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; or 10 per cent, or any other per cent.

Mr. NELSON. Or 10 per cent; and if we resorted to that, and denounced these treaties, and did it during the continuance of the present war, would we not have a good opportunity to make a start of it and to build up our shipping and avoid the question of subsidy?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think if we were rid of those treaties, or agreements, as they are sometimes called, we would have taken a long step toward putting the question of discriminating duties to the test. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that, whatever others may have done, after this exhaustive investigation on the part of the Merchant Marine Commission ended I took it upon myself to urge upon the then Department of State that it would be good policy for the Government to denounce those treaties and let us start anew. It was not done, however; and we are in exactly the same situation now, so far as those treaties are concerned, that we were then.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. In the seamen's bill that is pending now we propose to abrogate all those treaties, so far as they relate to seamen. If we do it in that case, is there any sane reason why we should not do it in the case of discriminating duties, and denounce them on that ground, too?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know whether it can be done in reference to seamen without the notice of one year.

Mr. NELSON. No; but would not the denouncement of a treaty in the case of seamen work as a denouncement of the entire treaty?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should hardly think so; but I am not versed in law, and would not venture to enter upon ice that might be too thin to carry me, so I must refrain from answering that question.

What I was about to say, however, was this: As free ships have failed, notwithstanding that policy was urged upon us as the panacea for all our shipping ills, so I feel sure that the discriminating-duty policy, if it shall be adopted, even if those treaties could be gotten rid of, would not to any large extent solve the problem.

I want to read what the Merchant Marine Commission said on the question of discriminating duties. It will be found on page 77 of Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session:

The historic policy of discriminating duties which the United States maintained in full to 1815 and in part as late as 1828 and even 1849, occupied so large a place in the inquiry of the Merchant Marine Commission that it is well to make at once a frank explanation why a return to this policy at the present time has not seemed wise to a majority of the commission.

It is probable that when the commission was appointed, in 1904, a majority of those Senators and Representatives composing it who had positive views favored another trial of the discriminating-duty policy, and believed that that course would be recommended to Congress. Moreover, from the very beginning of the inquiry, powerful arguments for the discriminating-duty plan were advanced, especially by the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, the largest shipping trade organization in America. This policy of the Fathers of the Republic, as it was well described, was ably advocated not only by many practical shipowners and shipbuilders but by many manufacturers and merchants—usually, however, in connection with the policy of mail subventions to regular lines, which may be said to have met with almost unanimous support in every section of the country.

These arguments had a very great effect upon the commission, but at the same time some very serious objections were disclosed in the radical difference of mercantile conditions between the first half of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century. In the first place, there were the 30 commercial treaties with foreign Governments—the very foundation of our modern commercial relations—which prohibit both discriminating custom duties and discriminating tonnage dues. These treaties of course could be abrogated, but notice of this would have to be given a year in advance, and new treaties without a discriminating duty clause negotiated on terms as favorable as before. This, manifestly, would be a difficult though not an impossible undertaking.

Far more serious than the abrogation and renegotiation of 30 commercial treaties would be the almost certain retaliation of foreign Governments. It is true that if they retaliated only against our shipping they could not do much harm, for an American vessel, even direct from the United States, is seldom seen now in European waters. But these foreign Governments would probably shape their retaliation where it would hurt and be effective—against our export trade in general—by discriminating duties on the products of our agriculture and our manufactures.

As an individual member of the commission I never laid much stress on that. I think this matter of retaliation is a two-edged sword, and against the United States, as powerful as it is, no other Government will rush into retaliation without giving the matter very serious thought:

Indeed, certain important commercial associations of the central West, while strongly favoring the development of the merchant marine, sent to the commission a formal remonstrance against the adoption of the discriminating duty policy because of the danger of foreign retaliation that would be provoked by it against the export trade of the United States. In this connection the fact is worth considering that in the years from 1789 onward, when the discriminating duty policy was practiced with so much success, the United States imported far more than it exported, so that discriminating duties were applicable to the larger part of our foreign trade, while now the United States exports very much more in both bulk and value than it imports, so that not only would discriminating duties be less effective for the encouragement of American shipping, but foreign retaliation would be far easier and more injurious.

But the weightiest of all objections to a return to the discriminating duty plan is neither the treaties nor retaliation, but the fact that in order to apply these duties for the adequate encouragement of the merchant marine, the free list of the tariff, covering almost half of the foreign commodities we purchase and consume, would have to be abolished. It is safe to say that this consideration counted more heavily than any other in bringing the majority of the commission reluctantly to the conclusion that discriminating duties could not now be invoked for the object we all desire—the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine in foreign trade.

In the fiscal year 1903, 43 per cent; in 1904, 47 per cent; and in 1905, 46 per cent of our entire imports came in free of customs duty.

I do not know that any Senator present can tell me what the percentage is under the existing law, but unquestionably it has been greatly increased over that of 1905—

This is in value; in bulk, inasmuch as these free imports were largely foods and raw materials, probably 60 or 70 per cent were free. In other words, unless the free list were abolished, discriminating duties could be applied to the encouragement of not more than 30 or 40 per cent of American shipping engaged in general foreign trade.

On the other hand, if the free list were abolished and these free articles made dutiable the result would be an increase in the cost of certain foods of the American people and certain crude materials of their manufacturing, for those free articles are, as a rule, noncompetitive products, chiefly from tropical countries, which can not, even under a duty, be produced in the United States. In 1789 and afterwards, when discriminating duties were so successfully applied for the encouragement of our shipping, nearly all imports were dutiable, and such a thing as a free list was scarcely known to our own or any other government.

There are strong political as well as commercial reasons why, if we are to have any American ships at all, we should have them in the trade with our sister republics of this continent, and the great neutral markets of Asia. In fact, the specific form in which discriminating duties have been most often and earnestly advocated before the commission has been as applying to the so-called "indirect trade"—that is, not against a British vessel bringing British goods or a German vessel with a cargo from a German port, but against European craft that seek to invade our carrying trade with Brazil or China or other neutral nations. It has been urged that discriminating duties in this indirect trade would not be so likely to provoke European retaliation as if the duties were imposed against British or German ships bringing goods of their own country. And it has been urged also that discrimination in the indirect trade, while arousing the least possible resentment, would give our vessels entire control of our trade with the nonshipowning peoples of South America and the Orient.

Unfortunately, however, it is this very trade with South America and the Orient that can not be gained for American ships unless the free list is abolished, for most of the products of those southern and eastern countries are now and long have been nondutiable in the ports of the United States. Thus, when the commission looked into this question it found that 98 per cent of our imports from Brazil, 96 per cent from Chile, 81 per cent from Colombia, 80 per cent from Venezuela, 82 per cent from Ecuador, or 82 per cent of all our imports from South America and 94 per cent from Central America were absolutely free of duty. In our import trade with China 50 per cent, with Japan 64 per cent, and with India 69 per cent are free of duty. Unless the free list were abolished discriminating duties could not adequately encourage American shipping to engage more largely in commerce with the republics to the south of us and the great markets of the Orient.

If conditions were everywhere as they are with our trade in Europe, where the free imports represent 28 per cent, or our trade with Cuba, whence we import chiefly sugar and tobacco and only 17 per cent of our purchases are on the free list, discriminating duties could be effectively applied for aid to American shipping. But the long series of public hearings before the commission has made it unmistakable that the American people desire American ships, not only in our Cuban

trade, but also and especially in our trade with South America and the Far East. Discriminating duties would not give us American ships in these important trades unless the free list were abolished, and here is the most urgent of the several reasons why the discriminaing-duty policy has not been recommended by the majority of the commission. The plan of mail and other subventions embodied in the bill of the commission was finally adopted because it is both more equitable and more effective.

These subventions will cost something. So, too, would it cost something to apply discriminating duties by the method suggested of reducing the duties on goods imported in American vessels. In either case it is necessary, in order to make this encouragement of shipping adequate and effective, to equalize the difference in wages and cost of construction between American and foreign ships, and in some cases to offset foreign subsidies. American ships in order to reach an equality of conditions must either receive a certain sum in subvention or retain an equivalent from the reduced duty in the form of higher freight rates.

In the long run, it is likely to be found that the subvention plan will involve the less actual cost to the Treasury.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the Senator if it would not be feasible to adopt the policy of establishing ocean lines under the act of March, 1891, which provides that the Postmaster General may make contracts for ships for the transportation of the mails on the outward voyage. The Senator from New Hampshire conferred a great benefit on the country in securing the enactment of that law, and I ask him if it would not be more advisable to amend the law now so as to apply to present conditions?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I have a bill pending before the Committee on Commerce for that very purpose which I propose to offer as a substitute for this bill at the proper time, and while I have little hope that it will commend itself to a majority of the Senate I shall hope that it will get a support that will be at least encouraging, so far as the future is concerned.

I have no disposition to go into the question of subsidies to-day. Later on, if this debate continues long enough, I may have something to say on that subject, but not to-day. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], however, suggested that the discriminating duties policy was preferable to a subsidy. I have always been puzzled to understand where the difference comes in. In the one case, if certain import duties are to put a dollar in the Treasury of the United States and we give a ship 5 per cent we get 95 cents. The difficulty that arises with me is as to the difference. We might just as well put the 100 cents in the Treasury and pay out 5 per cent of it in what is familiarly called a subsidy, so far as the interests of the Government or the interests of the people of the United States are concerned, as to halt the 5 cents before the money reaches the Treasury.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield, Mr. President, because if there is any real difference in the financial operation I should like to know it. I have asked the question a great many times and have never received a satisfactory answer. I hope the Senator from Minnesota can give it.

Mr. NELSON. I ask the Senator if there is not this difference: Any subsidy plan that I have noticed does not affect all ocean ships, but only ships of a certain class, whereas if you have a discriminating duty it will percolate through all our shipping and all vessels, big or small, engaged in our foreign commerce will get the benefit of it. I have never yet seen a subsidy bill pending here that has been so adjusted that all the shipping would get the benefit of it; it would be limited to certain classes, while a discriminating duty would cover all vessels. Is not that one advantage?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is the most cogent and convincing answer that has ever come to my question. There is a great deal of force in it. It is true that the late Senator Frye, who, I will say to my good friend from California, deserves credit for the authorship of the ocean-mail act of 1891 to a much greater extent than I do, offered a bill that did affect all classes of shipping. It is true that the merchant marine commission bill, which I had the honor to present to the Congress, looked to the same result; but it soon became apparent to those of us who are not afraid of subsidies, who do not get scared every time the word "subsidy" is shouted, that no such bill could pass the Congress, and the result was that we turned our attention to trying to get the ocean-mail act of 1891 liberalized, with the idea of putting on lines to South and Central America and the Orient under the terms of that law.

When I come to that in my discussion I shall show that if the original bill as it passed this body had not been emasculated in the House of Representatives we would not be worrying to-day over ship facilities to South and Central America and the Orient and Australasia. We would have them. We have imperfect shipping facilities now, but we would have had adequate shipping facilities if the House of Representatives had not been wiser than the Senate and reduced the subvention carried in that bill about 33⅓ per cent.

Concerning the free-ship policy and subsidies the Boston Herald has called attention to the fact that the free-ship policy in time of peace proved utterly without avail, but it was hoped that the war and its hazards to ships of belligerent nations would supply a powerful motive to seek the shelter of the flag of the United States, and to make this transfer easy the President recommended, and Congress passed, an act approved August 28, 1914, repealing the five-year age limit, authorizing the suspension of the law requiring that officers of foreign-built ships admitted to registry should be American citizens, and further authorizing the exemption of these foreign-built ships from American regulations for survey, inspection, and measurement. In other words, a premium or a subsidy was virtually offered to foreign-built ships as against American-built ships in overseas trade, American ships being compelled to comply rigidly with American laws in all these particulars. President Wilson now signifies that he is convinced that the new free-ship law, even with these exceptional inducements, has failed to meet the expectations of its advocates, and Government ownership and operation must now be made the maritime policy of the United States. On this issue the administration will find aligned against it in Congress and the country not only virtually all real Republicans but many conservative Democrats as well.

I have already said, Mr. President, what I am going to repeat, that no hearing worthy of the name has ever been held on the bill now before the Senate. In another body it had a hearing covering two days, but no representative business men, or those engaged in shipping, were heard. Two Members of the House of Representatives and Secretary McAdoo were the only ones who were called upon to state their views. Had the financiers of the country, and the men who have actual knowledge of the shipping industry been called, beyond a doubt an entirely different showing would have been made; but that was not done, for reasons that I will not stop to discuss.

Now, Mr. President, that we may thoroughly understand the matter involved in this proposed legislation, it is desirable to examine the bill and reports on it before entering into a discussion of the subject. On December 9, 1914, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] introduced a bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

That bill, which has been changed in many material respects, I am going to read. Before reading it I will make the suggestion that if the speed limit which was set by the President and the majority of this body for the passage of that bill had not been halted by the minority of the Senate we would have passed a bill so different from the one that is now before this body as not to be recognized by its author. I said on yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that the President owes the minority a vote of thanks, and that the majority in this Chamber ought to decorate the minority for holding up this bill long enough to give them, in caucuses by day and by night, an opportunity to bring forth a third edition of the bill, so unlike the first that the resemblance is undistinguishable by ordinary human beings.

Senate bill 6856, introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] on the 9th day of December last, and which we had every reason to believe, and we know, had the indorsement of the President of the United States, reads as follows:

That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof or of the District of Columbia upon the terms and conditions herein mentioned.

SEC. 2. That the object of such corporation shall be the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States.

I have inquired several times, Mr. President, where those "elsewhere" routes are to be established, and I have received no answer. I have asked if they are to be across the North Atlantic or across the Pacific to China and Japan and Australasia, or to the Philippines, or where, but no answer has been vouchsafed. So we are left in the dark as to what is proposed to be

done in the matter of establishing routes except to Central and South America. I further read from the bill:

The initial capital stock of such corporation shall not be over $10,000,000, of the par value of $100 per share, but the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time, as the interests of the corporation may require: *Provided*, That the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of each and every such increase. The United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of such stock at par, and the remainder thereof shall be offered for public subscription. The United States may further subscribe at par to an amount of such stock equal to that not taken by public subscription. Such corporation may begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board—

As originally provided, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce were to constitute that board. Just think, that those three men, not one of whom has had any shipping experience, not one of whom has any expert knowledge, were to be made a board to purchase, construct, and operate these vessels. Surely the minority has done the country a service in holding up this bill until the majority conceded that this was not a proper shipping board, and they have dropped from the board one member of the President's Cabinet and added to it three civilians, presumably men who know something about the subject. So, if we have not done anything more than that, we have justified the discussion of this question, which we propose to continue until such time as we can get a bill that commends itself to the business interests of the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the Senator to read section 4.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had not finished section 3. I will read that section first.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purposes of such corporation, with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing such vessels.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Senator from New Hampshire omitted some words. I will ask him if they are found in the first draft of the bill as first introduced. The words are "with the approval of the President."

Mr. GALLINGER. I read that.

Mr. STERLING. I wondered if they were incorporated in the original bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I read them.

Mr. STERLING. I did not so understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did not hear me when I read "with the approval of the President." The President can hardly be expected to have expert knowledge of shipping. A man who has devoted his life to educational pursuits and who presumably has not engaged in any industrial or mercantile business during his entire life could hardly be expected to be a competent judge in establishing shipping lines to Central and South America and elsewhere. So I think we do deserve a vote of thanks from the administration and the majority in the Senate for having held up this bill until they could reconstruct that shipping board.

I remember a story—probably it is not authentic—of a man who was called to the Cabinet of a President and put in the position of Secretary of the Navy. He did not know anything about the Navy; he had never seen the sea. He went to New York on a junket of some kind and went on a war vessel. He looked it over, and after a while he said, "Why, by gosh! the thing is hollow, isn't it?" [Laughter.] The shipping board would have about as much technical knowledge of shipping as that illustrious member of the President's Cabinet of some years ago.

Well, we have forced them to revise the shipping board, and they are going to put on some civilians. I hope they will not do as they did with the Federal Reserve Board and put on all Democrats. I should hope that we might get one good, sensible Republican who knows something about the question of shipping on that board, and perhaps we shall. The only chance we had of getting a Republican on the Federal Trade Commission was to put it in the bill. If we had not done that we probably would have been served exactly as we were in the construction of the Federal Reserve Board, which was made unanimously Democratic. I will now read section 4, as requested by the senior Senator from California:

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to such corporation, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to constitute a first and paramount lien upon such vessels thus transferred and upon all the property of such corporation: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board.

As this business is going to be run at a loss—and there is no doubt about that—I do not think the sinking fund will be a very serious part of the transaction.

SEC. 5. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

You will observe in this original bill our friends who were so extremely desirous during the last session to get foreign ships into the coastwise trade have now got the camel's nose in the tent by designating the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila and have added in the new bill the island of Hawaii.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is no doubt aware that an effort has already been made to allow foreign ships to enter our coastwise trade. Does the Senator believe that if this bill becomes a law that that will be still another step toward allowing foreign ships to enter our coastwise trade?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, absolutely; that is the purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me it would logically follow that that would be the case, and I wanted to know the Senator's opinion as to whether that is so or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. At the last session of Congress a bold attempt was made to put foreign ships into the coastwise trade of the United States. We had a lengthy discussion on it. If I ever contributed anything to a discussion that is worthy of remembrance I flatter myself that what I said on that subject is worthy of some consideration. When the vote was taken it was defeated by two to one in this body. Now, under the guise of an emergency shipping measure to put vessels on the trade routes of the world comes a proposition that those vessels shall engage to some extent in the coastwise trade of the United States. In the last edition of this bill it is boldly said that the vessels that are to be constructed—and most of them will be constructed in foreign shipyards, probably—are to be allowed to trade with Hawaii, which has always been considered a coastwise port. So that, defeated in the broad purpose, it is attempted under the guise of a bill of this kind to get the same result to a limited extent, beyond question with a belief and hope that if this bill goes through Congress the next attempt to put foreign ships into our coastwise trade and destroy our shipyards and our American shipping industry will be successful.

SEC. 6. That, subject to the direction of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power to vote the stock of the United States in such corporation and to do all other things necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

I suppose we will have a bargain-counter sale after this trial proves to be a financial failure, as it will.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act and such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided or to any other corporation or corporations now or hereafter organized, upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the

shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

Mr. President, we have had quite a number of bills dealing with the subject of the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine, but we have had no bill that did not require that all vessels should be constructed upon plans and specifications of the Navy Department, and that they should be so constructed as to be useful in time of war, and be at the command of the Government of the United States whenever needed. These, however, are to be "of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States." They would be of no use under those circumstances to the Navy of the United States or to the Government of the United States in time of war.

SEC. 9. That the President of the United States shall at any time have the right, upon giving written notice of his intention to the corporation using the vessels under the provisions of this act, to take possession for use as naval auxiliaries in the United States Navy or for other purposes of any vessels used by such corporation at a reasonable price or rental.

SEC. 10. That a detailed statement of all expenditures under this act and of all receipts hereunder shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

SEC. 11. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000,000.

SEC. 12. That this act shall take effect from its passage.

Mr. President, I have read that bill for the purpose of emphasizing what I have already said, that had we allowed it to pass at any time or at as early a time as the majority of this Senate thought it ought to pass, we would probably have had a bill very similar at least to that when it became a law. It was, however, held up, during which time the majority had nightly caucuses on this question, and they came in with an amended bill which I have not at hand, but it was very different from that, and which they said they would offer as a substitute before the vote was taken. Then they found fault that we were holding up this legislation which was so essential to the people of the United States; stating that the President wanted it and that we ought to concede that we are, what the President characterized us as being, a lot of ignorant men trying to do the work of the Government of the United States, and to allow his mind and the mind of the majority to control and to pass the bill.

Well, we did not conclude to do that. So not agreeing in their nightly caucuses—some of which I am told were rather tumultuous—they recessed the Senate over last Saturday and spent the day in further deliberation. Out of that caucus emerged this bill which is now, we are told, the perfected bill of the committee and which will be offered as a substitute for the original bill when the vote shall be taken.

I will read this bill to see if we can discover any relationship between it and the original bill. There may be some distant relationship; it may be a second cousin or something of that kind; but the relationship is not very close. So I will read it. It was reported on January 15, calendar day January 25; in other words, we had gone 10 days in continuous legislative session without morning business, without hearing the voice of the Chaplain invoking us to perform our duties faithfully and well under the oath that we had taken. On the calendar day of January 25 this substitute was submitted to the Senate by my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. Here it is:

That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia.

It will be observed that it is not "of the United States or any State or the District of Columbia," as provided in the original draft, but "of the District of Columbia." I believe they can incorporate in this District anything on earth, if they pay a dollar for it, and I do not know whether or not this is a matter of economy or otherwise; but, at any rate, it is to be "of the District of Columbia." The bill continues:

Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm or individual, citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over $10,000,000, of the par value of $100 per share.

The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders, shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

Well, Mr. President, the citizens of the United States need not worry over whether they shall be required to pay in full or in part, because it is inconceivable to me that any citizen of the United States is ever going to take a share of the stock in this losing venture. They will not do it.

The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stockholders at any meeting thereof.

Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

Supposing that we should make a proposition here that a shipping corporation should be free from public taxes, I wonder what would be said about it. Yet here is a great shipping corporation, to go into competition with private shipowners and private corporations, and we are going to exempt the property from taxation because the Government owns one share more than a majority of the stock. It is an absurd proposition.

At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the Senator from New Hampshire leaves section 1, I ask him if he has noted that if the United States should desire to lease or charter one of these boats to an individual it is prevented from doing so? However responsible the individual might be, he would be compelled to incorporate himself with associates before he could be permitted to take the lease. Does the Senator know of any good reason for such a limitation?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not. I had observed that as I read it, and thought it was a most extraordinary provision. As we are promised some defense of this bill from the other side of the Chamber, I am very glad the Senator from Illinois has called especial attention to it, so that we may at the proper time, if we are permitted to interrogate Members on the other side of the Chamber, ask them what the reason for that inhibition is. It does not strike me as being wise.

SEC. 2. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed $10,000,000, neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board.

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may

be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board; and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels, in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States, heretofore made or published, by authority of law, shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall as provided hereby take the place of those now in existence.

The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

On yesterday I called attention to those two paragraphs, which struck me as being extraordinary and unusual, under which all the rules and regulations now made under authority of law relating to navigation are to be wiped out of existence, and the shipping board may, of its own volition and according to its own motion, make another code of rules and regulations that will take their place after a certain specified date.

The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], for whose fairness and judgment I have profound respect, interrupted me to say that he felt sure that, when I understood this matter, I would agree with him that it was very desirable legislation, and he has said to me that he proposes to address himself to it, pending which I certainly shall not close my mind against the matter, but will be glad to support it if it is shown that it is a desirable thing to do, which it may be. I pass from that.

SEC. 5. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutuila, provided that the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be $6,000 per annum.

I can not quite understand why the members of the Trade Commission, whose duty it will be, if they have any duties except to disturb the business and industries of the United States, should be paid $10,000 per annum under the law which we passed a little time ago, and these men who are to have in charge this great interest should be paid the pitiful sum of $6,000 per annum. I think it is a discrimination that ought to be corrected.

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace, and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

SEC. 9. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily for use as naval auxiliaries, of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

SEC. 10. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

SEC. 11. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of $10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 3, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

Mr. President, I have read these two bills for the purpose of calling directly to the attention of the Senate the fact that, had it not been for the discussion which the minority insisted upon, we probably never would have seen this amended bill. It took the majority two weeks, or thereabouts, after an incubating process in caucus, to produce the measure that is now before the Senate as a proposed substitute for the bill originally introduced. I have read them for the further purpose of showing to the Senate that, if there is any relationship between the two bills, it is very remote, and that the new bill deserves the same scrutiny and the same careful discussion that the original bill deserved. I hope the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who are paying me special attention, both of them distinguished lawyers, will take that bill and dissect it and analyze it and tell the Senate precisely what it proposes to do. I am not a lawyer, and hence my opinion on legal points would be of little consequence; but I have taken the liberty of presenting the matter to the Senate in a form which I think will engage the attention at least of the two Senators to whom I have referred.

On December 16, 1914, the Senator from Florida reported, with certain amendments, the bill which had been introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] on December 9; but inasmuch as the bill has been revamped, I will not take the time of the Senate, as I had intended to do, to call attention seriatim to the amendments proposed in the bill as reported on December 16.

I think, Mr. President, for a thorough understanding of this question, inasmuch as the bill has not been debated by its proponents except for a brief speech by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], that it is my duty to read into the RECORD the majority report and the views of the minority on this bill. They ought to be illuminating, whether they are or not; and inasmuch as in the hurry of other duties I have not had time to read either of them, I think I ought now to acquaint myself and other Senators with the terms of these documents.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, would it not be just as satisfactory to the Senator to let them be printed in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a very great desire to read them for my own information, and if they go in the RECORD without reading I never will read them, because I seldom read anything in the RECORD. I treat that serial—or whatever you may call it—pretty much as the other citizens of the United States do, and seldom refer to it; and it is always a matter of amusement to me when a Senator gets up here and solemnly asks to put something in the RECORD, on the ground that it is important to the people of the United States and that they will see it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No, Mr. President, it would not be agreeable to me to have these reports printed in the RECORD without reading. I want to know what is in these reports, and if no one else cares that is their misfortune.

Mr. STONE. But in the interest of the Senator's health——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator need not worry about my health. The Senator from New Hampshire is in very good health, thank you. The advertisement that I got last evening in the Senate was not at my suggestion. I never felt better in my life.

Mr. President, Order of Business No. 737, report No. 841, entitled "Promotion of Foreign Commerce of the United States by Providing Adequate Shipping Facilities," was reported by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on December 16, 1914, and ordered to be printed. Of course, it was not ordered to be printed without at least carrying the implication that

it would be read. There is no use in printing a thing if we do not read it. Now I will read it:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, charter, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report it to the Senate with amendments with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

It will be observed in the beginning that this is a report on the original bill. The Senator from Florida, representing a majority of this body and the President of the United States, told us in the beginning that it ought to pass. The Senator from Florida has not made any report on this third edition of the bill, and we are somewhat in the dark as to whether or not he thinks that ought to pass. The report continues:

The bill as reported by the committee provides that the Government, through a shipping board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of purchasing, chartering, constructing, maintaining, and operating merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States.

The initial capital stock of the corporation shall not exceed $10,000,000, but the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or cause the capital stock to be increased from time to time, as the interests of the corporation may require.

The capital stock shall be divided into shares of the par value of $100, and the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of the stock, and for a like per cent of every increase, and the remainder shall be offered for public subscription. The United States may, however, subscribe at par to an amount of such not subscribed for by the public.

The corporation may begin business as soon as the 51 per cent of the stock is subscribed and paid for by the United States.

The United States, through the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may charter, purchase, or construct vessels suitable to carry out the purpose of such corporation and transfer them to such corporation upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by the shipping board.

The Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board, may issue and sell what are known as Panama Canal bonds to a total amount not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels.

Upon the transfer of the vessels to such corporation the corporation shall issue to the United States in payment therefor its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, such bonds to constitute a first lien upon the vessels so transferred and all other property of such corporation.

The bonds shall not be less in amount at their par value than the amount paid by the United States for the vessels.

The Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, sell such bonds to reimburse the Treasury for the expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels.

The vessels purchased, chartered, or constructed by the shipping board and transferred to such corporation shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and may engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila. The shipping board, subject to the direction of the President, is vested with full power to vote the stock of the United States in the corporation and to do all other things necessary to carry out the purpose of the act, and may at any time, with the approval of the Congress, sell the stock of such corporation.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the President to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment as are suitable for commercial use and not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation organized under the act, upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe. The bill further provides that the vessels purchased or constructed under its provisions shall, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, be of a type suitable for use as naval auxiliaries. The question of providing vessels for our merchant marine from a standpoint of the Naval Establishment had been under consideration for some time by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. May I ask the Senator if he will read louder so that I may know whether or not he is reading correctly? He might make a mistake.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will not the Senator take this seat?

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator assure me that his hearing is normal?

Mr. STONE. My hearing is normal, but the Senator is reading in a very low monotone.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Missouri promise me that he will stay until I get through reading this report if I read a little louder?

Mr. STONE. Well, I will stay a while.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would the Senator consider it a discourtesy if I offered him my seat and I took the next one to the right?

Mr. STONE. No; not a discourtesy.

Mr. GALLINGER. The offer is made. I shall endeavor to read so that the Senator will hear me. My voice is in excellent condition.

The same subject was being considered by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, from the standpoint of the merchant marine. Section 8, as written in the bill, is the result of a conference between Chairman PADGETT and Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman and Mr. HARDY, of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and has the approval of the committee, as it harmonizes both views.

Two committees of the House seem to have collaborated on that bill—a rather unusual procedure.

A detailed statement of all expenditures under the act and of all receipts thereunder shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

The bill carries an appropriation of $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act.

Before discussing the merits of the bill generally, it is the purpose of the committee to point out several amendments agreed to by the committee and to assign reasons for their adoption.

On page 2, line 4, after the words "United States," it is proposed to insert the following clause:

"or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, firm, or individual to be used for such purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board."

The object of this is to enable the corporation, in which the Government is the controlling stockholder, to charter ships, as well as to purchase and construct them, and also to make charter of any of the ships owned or controlled by it to other corporations, firms, or individuals, if the purpose of the act or any part of the objects of the act could be best secured through such charter parties. It will be observed that the amendment guards the interests of the Government by requiring all such charter parties made by the corporation to be specifically approved by the shipping board.

On page 4, line 9, after the words "Philippine Islands," we propose to insert the words "the Hawaiian Islands."

It is obvious that the ships owned by this corporation should have this right, as it is distinctly in the interest of the commerce of the country that additional facilities should be given to these islands.

On page 5, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act and."

The retention of these words would bring sections 4 and 8 into conflict with each other, as section 4 places the transfer of such vessels in the hands of the shipping board, while section 8 limits the right to the President. It seemed wise to the committee that section 4 should control, as the specific terms upon which the shipping board may make a transfer are stated in the act and the board can not go beyond that authority.

On page 5, line 10, after the word "vessels," it is proposed to insert the words "belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace and vessels."

If naval auxiliaries of a certain character are to be the subject of charter, lease, or transfer, there can be no valid reason against a like charter, lease, or transfer of vessels in the War Department.

Inasmuch as the authority to do this is vested solely in the President, it is safe to assume that the general interests of the country are sufficiently safeguarded.

It has been deemed wise, however, to limit the transference of these vessels to the corporation authorized by the act, and the committee has, therefore, agreed to strike out the words on page 5, lines 15 and 16, "or to any other corporation or corporations now or hereafter organized."

This bill purposes to initiate an American ocean-going marine, an object desired by all Americans. The annual toll paid by the United States to vessels flying foreign flags is variously stated at from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000. This seriously affects adversely the balance of international trade, and by itself is a matter calling for legislation to work a change.

That sentence sounds familiar to me, because I have called attention to that fact over and over and over again, but deaf ears were turned to it for a period of at least 10 years.

Not only is this so, but recent events have made clear to the entire country certain facts which it is the purpose of this legislation to alter. Our great and growing foreign commerce, aggregating over four thousand two hundred and fifty millions yearly, of which our exports form much the larger part, depends for its ocean transportation chiefly upon the merchant marine of the nations which are our own commercial competitors in the markets to which we all sell. By reason of this control by others of our needed transit facilities, we are subject alike to their primary interests and to their risks. If, for example, their primary interest calls for them to withdraw ships for purposes of war, the ships are withdrawn, and with them go the facilities we need, and we are without recourse. If the exigencies of war call for destruction by the enemy of one of the powers whose ships we use, that destruction takes place. With the destroyed ships American cargoes go to the bottom. Our commerce is immediately affected, but we again are helpless. If the exigencies of war call for the interning in foreign ports of merchant vessels carrying American cargoes under the flag of a belligerent, the ships are interned, and the cargoes they carry, though belonging to Americans and as a matter of fact though paid for by Americans, can not be secured, because the American interest in the cargo is necessarily subordinated to the belligerent interest in the vessel itself. All these conditions have actually existed in recent months, and some of them exist to-day.

Furthermore, it is the fact that the primary interest in the transportation of our ocean-borne commerce is that of the European stockholders in the companies which do the transporting. Those stockholders look to their investments to return them a profit. Therefore the business must be done in that way which is first of all most profitable for the European stockholders, and this may, and as a matter of fact does, work out to the disadvantage of American commerce. The two opposing interests are these: First, and most important to us, the interests of American agriculture, industry, and commerce as a whole; second, and least important to us, though now in control, the interest of European stockholders to have their ships so operated as to return them the largest element of profits. We have been content hitherto

to subserve the interests of the European stockholders, and to a minor extent of American stockholders in ships under foreign flags; but the shock of war has disclosed the fact that this arrangement, while seeming to work well in ordinary times, has in it the elements of weakness outlined above, and which are now plain to all.

In addition to this and in part because of the operation of the causes above suggested, there is at present a lack of vessels, even of those flying foreign flags, and a far greater lack of vessels under our own flag. This has resulted in a grievous advance of freight rates to almost all portions of the globe. The least advance which has come to the knowledge of your committee is 10 per cent on Asian business, but on certain goods, such as steel and iron, rates have advanced more than this. To South Africa the advance has been 20 per cent; to South America, 25 per cent; and to European ports from 50 to 1,000 per cent, depending upon the merchandise carried and the ports of destination. The present rate upon cotton from Galveston to Bremen is ten times that which prevailed a year or more ago, this in spite of the fact that cotton is not contraband and that the belligerent Governments permit its free passage. As this report is written, shipowners, chiefly foreigners, are reaping a rich harvest of profits at the cost of American producers, whose prices are necessarily diminished in proportion to the excessive tax put upon their wares for the benefit of the owners of ocean transportation lines. When it costs $15 a bale merely to transport cotton across the ocean, it is evident that this charge is a heavy handicap upon our entire cotton-producing interest at a time when we have the largest crop in our history.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator recognizes, does he not, that the charging of $15 a bale on cotton from here to Bremen is only a temporary matter, and also that that exceedingly high charge is made on account of the risk involved in taking cotton to that port? In fact, Mr. President, I sometimes think, and I ask the Senator if he does not think so, that this bill never would have been thought of or brought to the Senate if cotton had not been involved?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, Mr. President, I have long recognized the force of the old saying that "Cotton is king." We know that, and we know that a great deal of the attempted legislation of this Congress has been in the interest of the cotton producers, who doubtless have met with a serious loss, as the manufacturers and the laboring people of the industrial North have met with a serious loss under the conditions that prevail at the present time. But the people of the North have not sought relief by legislation.

Even this serious burden imposed upon our people against our will and beyond our control is not, however, the greatest danger possible. We now see clearly that the fortunes of war or the naval interests of a belligerent may at any time stop our transportation movement entirely.

If so, what good would it be if we had 30 or 40 more ships if they could stop it entirely? They would just stop that many more ships.

It did so for about two weeks in the month of August, and circumstances may recur to cause it to do so again. At a time, therefore, when the United States abounds in crops of wheat, corn, cotton, apples, for which a profitable market exists abroad, and when the world, both that part of it which is in arms and that which remains at peace, is calling as never before for the products of our mines and factories, we are all but helpless in the face of the largest opportunity we have ever known.

Why, Mr. President, the Secretary of Commerce tells us about twice a week that we are prosperous, that we are having remarkable prosperity in our country at the present time; and while in his vision he sees greater prosperity ahead of us, yet he has never admitted that we are suffering as this report indicates we are.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask the Senator at this point whether it is not a fact that our exports of food products have been for several months past extraordinarily great? Have they not been far above our ordinary exportation of such products?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that to be so.

Mr. ROOT. Is it not a fact also that the prices which our farmers have been receiving for their food products have been far in excess of those which they ordinarily receive?

Mr. GALLINGER. Probably from 25 to 50 per cent greater than in former years.

Mr. ROOT. Am I correct in assuming that the newspaper reports of $1.40 and above $1.40 a bushel for wheat are correct?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. ROOT. I mean the prices which have been received here—the Chicago prices, the prices received in this country for wheat. Is it not apparent, then, that the difficulty of high rates for transportation is an incident to the extraordinary demand for such products at extraordinarily high prices?

Mr. GALLINGER. That would seem to be so, and I have no doubt it is so.

Mr. ROOT. Does not that seem to be an exigency which we can contemplate with reasonable complacency?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator in that connection if he thinks that the shortage of tonnage and the extremely high price of freight for cotton at 8 cents a pound—2 cents below the cost of production—quite justifies the inference sought to be arrived at from the question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I am not fully informed on the cotton situation, and if the condition which the Senator from Mississippi suggests exists to-day I have no doubt it will soon cease. I have no idea that it will exist for any length of time.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask, according to the memory of the Senator from New Hampshire, whether the Senator from Mississippi has not, apparently for purposes of argument at this juncture, jacked up the cost of production of cotton as compared with the statements that were made when there was a general attempt here a short time ago to get the Government of the United States to put $250,000,000 in to meet that exigency? Was not 8 cents the figure stated then, and is not 8 cents more than the cost of production of cotton?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from New Hampshire will pardon another question, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he does not remember very well that during that discussion the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and various other Senators stated 10 cents as the price of production, and whether the price fixed in the sought-for legislation was not 10 cents, and whether it was not fixed because of the fact that it was thought that that was the price which would give back to the planter the price of production of cotton? I will ask the Senator, further, whether he does not believe that whereas some people peculiarly efficient in the administration of their farms can raise cotton for less, and some peculiarly inefficient must pay even more, it was generally agreed at that time that 10 cents was about the ordinary price of production with the present or then obtaining price of supplies for the plantation?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have not a very vivid recollection about that matter. I shall not dispute the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi. I know that cotton has been sold at 6 cents in some former years. I do not know whether or not the cotton growers were losing 4 cents a pound on it during all that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon another question——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator if that was not at a time when mules and meat and flour and meal and bagging and ties and everything else that the cotton planter purchases were obtainable at very low rates? I may add, as an addendum to the question, that there was a time in this country when we could produce cotton at 6½ cents, and that was not 15 years ago. The price of production of cotton has been going up, however, for the reasons I have stated, and also because the price of labor has been going up. At that time the price of labor in the field in the South was $8 a month plus, of course, the food and shelter of the hands. Now it runs from $16 to $20, and supplies have gone up, especially meat and breadstuffs, until the cotton planter who does not raise his own supplies can not hope to come out whole if he sells cotton at 10 cents, and very few of them do; and mules have gone up. At the time of which the Senator is speaking we bought pretty good cotton mules at $75 a head, and now they cost $150.

Mr. ROOT. May I add another question to this symposium?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. Is it not a fact that there has been an enormous overproduction of cotton? Has there not been a larger crop of cotton raised during this year than for many, many years past, and does not a great overproduction of cotton inevitably have the effect of bringing down the price?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that connection I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before this war broke out, in spite of the fact that we knew just what the new crop was, was not the price of middling upland cotton 12¼ to 12½ cents; and has there not been a growth in the consumption of cotton more than outrunning the growth in its production, substituting cotton in mercerized goods and in various other things for various other textiles of every sort?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I ask further——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield, but I fear I shall forget some of the question.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask, then, why the attempt was made to secure $250,000,000 from our Government for the purpose of buying the great body of cotton, accompanied by provisions in the proposed law penalizing the continuance of the present acreage of cotton, and why there has been a State-wide, country-wide, move toward an agreed reduction of cotton acreage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire one further question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire think, and does he not think the Senator from New York ought to know, that the reason why we were seeking a curtailment of production was because there had been this immense curtailment of consumption on account of the war?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire to pardon me for treating him as if he were a billiard ball, and caroming upon him in my conversation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire pardon just one more question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator know of anybody in this entire body who presents the appearance of being a more friendly intermediate carom ball than he, and anybody who stands it with greater patience and with more good humor? [Laughter.] I would also apologize if I thought any apology were necessary, but I know that the Senator from New Hampshire is enjoying it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I certainly am.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield now to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he did not think the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi that it costs 4 cents a pound more to raise cotton now than it did 15 years ago was rather an extravagant statement, for this reason: The average of an acre of land in the South is 1 bale of cotton of 500 pounds. Now, 4 cents a pound would make $20 an acre. It can not be possible that it costs $20 additional to cultivate 1 acre of land over and above what it cost some 10 or 12 years ago, because that, I think, is a very, very good price for the entire labor that there is upon the planting and the rearing of cotton and bringing it to the gin, but not after it reaches there. Of course it costs some little after that?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have enjoyed this symposium, as the Senator from New York characterized it, and I am very glad that I have emerged from it without a more personal reference to the billiard ball, which I rather expected would be made.

Mr. President, I always approach with a good deal of hesitancy a discussion with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I rather enjoy it on the question of the tariff, for the reason that we hold diametrically opposite views on that subject, and when we retire from the field we are both satisfied that we came out victorious; but when it comes to a discussion of the cotton question I am at a very great disadvantage.

I remember something about the discussion when our good friends from the South asked us to have the Government issue $250,000,000 in bonds to buy the cotton crop of the South and, I suppose, put it in cold storage, awaiting a customer. During that discussion my mind was made aware of the fallacy that the Government ought to go into that business at all. I felt then on that matter as I feel on the question that is now before us. The shipping interests of the country appeal to me very strongly, and I am proposing to do and am doing what I can to defeat this bill. But above and beyond every consideration of the shipping industry, the question of Government ownership of the means of water transportation is what is engaging my attention more particularly, and it is irresistibly driving me to oppose this bill with all the energy and whatever ability I can command.

I know that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair], my good friend the Senator from New Jersey, holds diametrically opposite views from what I do on the matter of Government ownership, because we have talked it over. The Senator from New Jersey is equally as sincere as I am. He sees no danger and doubtless he sees great benefits to the people of the country in Government ownership. I see nothing but harm and disaster to the best interests of the country, and for that reason I have more strenuously opposed this bill than I otherwise would have done.

Mr. President, undoubtedly the cotton producers are at the present time suffering, but I believe it will be only a temporary matter. We have suffered in the North. We have seen the factories and workshops of New England closed, the workmen on the streets. My sympathies were enlisted in their behalf, but we have had to wait our time. We have had to wait years until we could get relief. The relief at last came. Again, to a certain extent, the disaster has overtaken the industrial interests of my section of the country, but we do not expect to get relief by any emergency measure that we might propose.

Now, I will continue the reading of this interesting report:

> Even this serious burden imposed upon our people against our will and beyond our control is not, however, the greatest danger possible. We now see clearly that the fortunes of war or the naval interests of a belligerent may at any time stop our transportation movement entirely. It did so for about two weeks in the month of August, and circumstances may recur to cause it to do so again. At a time, therefore, when the United States abounds in crops of wheat, corn, cotton, apples, for which a profitable market exists abroad, and when the world, both that part of it which is in arms and that which remains at peace, is calling as never before for the products of our mines and factories we are all but helpless in the face of the largest opportunity we have ever known. The need of others for our goods is our sole reliance for transportation facilities. The wrath of other nations, one with another, may at any time cause these facilities to be removed. Even at present high rates ships are not available for many purposes until March. The situation is emergent, expensive, and it is impossible, with any due regard to the interests of American commerce, to permit it to continue a day longer than is necessary. The Associated Press says:
>
> "During the first four months of the war 54 British foreign-going ships, with cargoes, were captured or destroyed. Further, that losses to Scandinavian shipping have been, through mine disasters: Sweden, 8 ships; Denmark, 6 vessels; Norway, 5 vessels; and Holland, 3 vessels. There is grave uncertainty as to maintenance of the present insufficient supply of tonnage."

Well, Mr. President, if 54 British ships have been destroyed, there are almost 4,000 British ships left, at the lowest calculation. So I do not think that ought to alarm us.

> Numerous plans have been suggested to build up our merchant marine, the principal one being the payment of direct subsidies. The American people have never been willing to foster private interest in this way, nor is there any sign that they have changed their minds. The adoption by us of the plan of service subsidies in the carrying of our mails has not given that increase to our merchant marine promised by the advocates of that policy.

Mr. President, as I said an hour ago, if the bill the authorship of which belongs to the late Senator from Maine (Mr. Frye), whose memory is enshrined in our hearts, had been passed in another body as it passed this body, no one could have complained that it had not been a complete success. As it was, the rates were so reduced that we are now expending a small amount of money in the matter of mail subventions and as a result we are keeping our four lone ships on the north Atlantic; we are keeping a line to Venezuela; we are keeping one or two lines to South American ports; and we are keeping a few ships across the Pacific; I do not know how many. I am told, Mr. President, that the line that crosses the Pacific would to-day have to surrender and cancel their sailings were it not that the little British colony of New Zealand makes a contribution to that line. It is not to the credit of our country.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Would not the passage of this bill work the destruction of that Pacific line?

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely.

Mr. NELSON. Ruin it entirely?

Mr. GALLINGER. I fear so.

Mr. NELSON. Drive it off the sea?

Mr. GALLINGER. Especially if an "elsewhere" line is going to cross the Pacific. I do not know where else they will put it.

We are now paying four vessels of the American Line—the *New York*, the *Philadelphia*, the *St. Louis*, and the *St. Paul*—in the north Atlantic trade, about $735,000 per annum for mail transportation. For the conveyance of United States mails to foreign countries we paid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, to American steamers $1,409,483.77, and to foreign steamers—because American steamers could not be had—$1,429,434.25.

Mr. President, if that $1,429,434.25 that is now being paid to foreign steamers to convey our mails was added to the rates that are allowed in the ocean mail act of 1891, we would not have to employ foreign ships to carry our mails across the north Atlantic.

The Government has no control over the passenger or freight rates charged by these vessels, and it may be properly assumed that they charge all the traffic will bear.

Of course that goes without the saying. The Government has not as yet attempted to control the passenger and freight rates across the oceans of the world.

An investigation made by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives into steamship conferences and agreements in the domestic and foreign trade disclosed the fact that for three or four years prior to 1913 ocean freight rates increased from 50 to 100 per cent. Since July 1, 1913, the New Orleans Cotton Exchange certifies that the rates on cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool have advanced as follows per 100 pounds:

	Cents.
July 1, 1914	28
August 1, 1914	28 to 33
August 17, 1914	50
August 23, 1914	50
October 28, 1914	60
November 9, 1914	60
November 11, 1914	65
December 1, 1914	70
December 4, 1914	75
December 11, 1914	85

Or more than 200 per cent since July 1, 1914.

The following memorandum from the Treasury Department shows the abnormal increases on other articles of commerce:

Mr. President, I will ask permission to place that memorandum in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Memorandum concerning rise in freight rates, New York to Liverpool.

	Grain, per bushel.	Cotton, per 100 pounds.	Flour, per 100 pounds.	General cargo, per ton.	Provisions, per ton.	Freight.	Bottoms.
	Pence.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*s. d.*	*s. d.*		
Dec. 12, 1913.	2	30	14	17 6	20 0	Scarce....	Ample.
Mar. 12, 1914.	1½	25	12	17 6	20 0	...do.....	Do.
June 12, 1914.	1½	20	10	17 6	20 0	Increased	Being held for higher rates.
July 12, 1914.	2½	20	12	17 6	20 0	...do.....	Do.
July 30, 1914[1]	2½	20	12	17 6	20 0	Plenty...	Demand for tonnage increasing.
Sept. 5, 1914.	3	20	20	17 6	20 0	Scarce....	Ample.
Oct. 12, 1914.	4	35	21	20 0	30 0	Increased	Demanding higher rates.
Nov. 12, 1914.	6½	50	24	20 0	30 0	...do.....	Becoming limited.
Dec. 12, 1914.	8	75	26	30 0	30 0	Considerable.	Scarce.

[1] No rates quoted until Sept. 5.

A comparison of the freight rates between New York and Liverpool is shown by the above table and is most interesting and instructive.

Between December, 1913, and the end of July, 1914, the rates for the most part held uniform, there being, however, a slight advance in the grain rate, a slight decrease in the flour rate, and a fall of 50 per cent in the rate for cotton.

In December, 1913, there was more tonnage available than freight offered.

At the end of June, 1914, there was plenty of freight offered for shipment, but shipowners were holding their tonnage in expectation of higher rates, and this condition continued until the war.

For several weeks following the outbreak of the war shipping was demoralized and trans-Atlantic freight traffic was practically at a standstill.

By the first week in September sea conditions became more settled, but, while there was ample tonnage offered, the difficulty in financing cargoes caused a very limited demand for the ships. As a result the freight rates on standard cargoes were practically the same as during the normal times before the outbreak of hostilities.

During September the demand for tonnage steadily increased, and the shipowners naturally began to hold their tonnage for higher rates.

By the first week in November, the greatly increased rates offered by shippers were sufficient to bring out the ships, and the idle tonnage was rapidly utilized; by the end of November ships began to be scarce, and at the present time the lack of tonnage is clearly set forth in the following quotation from the New York Journal of Commerce, of December 12, 1914:

"The full-cargo steamer market continues exceedingly strong, influenced by a steady demand for tonnage and a very limited supply of same available before the middle of January. The bulk of the demand continues to come from the shippers of grain, cotton, coal, and general cargo to European ports, principally to the Mediterranean, and rates have advanced steadily, until at the present they are at their highest with every indication of further advances being recorded within the next few days."

This scarcity of ships has resulted in the tremendously increased freight rates, as shown by the above table. Comparing the rates current on December 12, 1913 (when world conditions were normal), with rates at the present time (Dec. 12, 1914, when available tonnage has been greatly diminished through the effects of war), we find the following very marked increases in the trans-Atlantic freight rates for the staple articles of export: Freight on provisions, 50 per cent; on general cargo, 70 per cent; on flour, 86 per cent; on cotton, 150 per cent; on grain, 300 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

Inasmuch as freights have been going up abnormally and without sufficient economic cause during years of almost universal peace, and inasmuch as they have transcended the bounds of reason since the beginning of the European war, your committee is of opinion that this is a most auspicious time to begin the augmentation of the American marine by Government action.

It is not sufficient, however, to draw attention to the increases in the rates for ocean transportation, however onerous those rates may be to the business of our American producers, whether industrial or agricultural. There is a far more important element to be considered, namely, the control by us, and in the interest of America as a whole, of our ocean transportation. This control does not now exist. We stand helplessly at the water front and let others do our business for us to their own great gain, subject to their own risks.

Mr. President, that sounds like some language I have used in debate in this body on bills relating to the American merchant marine. I have said that this is the only country in the world that denies the protection of the Government in any form to its products when they reach the water's edge.

They do it in their own way as to time, place, and character of transportation, and no one will pretend that they have extended to us in all respects equal facilities to those which they have furnished to their own peoples.

I have said that also. I have called attention over and over again to the fact that when we ship goods to Europe for South American trade we are dependent upon foreign Governments and foreign shipping combines when they are placed upon the docks at Liverpool or any other British port; that there is a discrimination on the part of the foreign shipper to take the goods of his own people as a matter of preference and allow our goods to remain there just as long as he chooses to do it. I have urged that as a reason, over and over again, why we should have an adequate American merchant marine, but I never thought that it possibly could be accomplished by the Government going into the shipping business and buying 30 or 40 ships to put on the oceans of the world. It is unspeakable that that could by any possibility solve this problem.

We need control of the situation in several ways. Control should be exerted over rates of transportation, in order that condition like those existing to-day shall become impossible. If there were American ships of ample capacity to carry cotton from our southern ports, or grain and apples from our northern cities, and if these ships were so controlled that the rates for transportation therein could be made such as were just alike to the vessel and to the shipper, a handicap would be at once removed which now, at a critical point in our financial history, is weighing us down.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that there is a very serious "if" in that sentence, and that "if" will remain there even after this bill becomes a law, if it ever does.

In the second place, control should be exerted as to the routes to be followed. In the interest of American commerce as a whole it should not be permitted that the necessity of European stockholders for earnings should dictate where and when ships should go. That is a matter we ought to control for ourselves, and in which we can not afford to be controlled by others. It should rest with us to say that such and such a ship shall go to such and such a place when and as American commerce needs to have it go there.

Well, Mr. President, if the Government can do that, the Government can work miracles.

It can not be imagined that the American people, who desire their commerce to be promoted by shipping, shall be content to have that promotion remain a secondary thing in the interests of certain investors, chiefly abroad, but partly at home.

Again, control should be exerted as regards the character of the transportation furnished. We need passenger facilities to South and Central America and to other portions of the world as good as those which Europe provides for her own people. In the past we have been handicapped by the fact that to reach Argentina and Brazil Americans have found it preferable to go by way of Europe. In short, it is the duty of the Government in all these matters, by its control, to be helpful to American commerce and not to be helpless in the whole matter.

This legislation, so far as it permits the control of ocean freight rates by transportation in vessels under Government direction, is in line with all recent rate legislation. It permits that to be done at sea which we have long done at home, and provides for the ocean carrier what we long ago provided for the common carrier on land. By reason, moreover, of the international character of ocean transportation, control by Government direction of vessels of the kind proposed by this measure is the only way available for that power over rates which we have long exercised on shore, and which present circumstances show us is badly needed at sea.

When the control of the rates on 30 or 40 ships on the different routes of the world regulates the charge on 4,000 or more ships that England has in the carrier service we will certainly see a remarkable demonstration of a man or a Government lifting itself by its boot straps. It can not possibly result.

The following communication from the Department of Commerce shows the great decrease of ships and tonnage from United States ports:

Again, Mr. President, I will ask to put that table in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection that course will be pursued.

The table referred to is as follows:

Net tonnage of vessels cleared from the United States for foreign ports during the five months ended Nov. 30, 1913 and 1914.

Month.	1913			1914		
	American.	Foreign.	Total.	American.	Foreign.	Total.
July	1,873,857	3,836,127	5,709,984	1,558,249	4,062,802	5,621,051
August	1,749,384	3,762,141	5,511,525	1,634,974	2,971,270	4,606,244
September	1,571,473	3,688,980	5,260,453	1,366,790	3,055,424	4,422,214
October	1,749,735	3,538,895	5,288,630	1,320,718	2,584,068	3,904,786
November	1,498,253	2,896,501	4,394,754	956,264	2,404,695	3,360,959

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

These facts clearly indicate that an emergency exists—there is a lack of ships—and that our people are being deprived of the means of transportation for shipments of many classes of their goods and are being mulcted by excessive and unreasonable rates upon shipments actually made.

Private enterprise with an unquestioned occupancy of the field has broken down at a crucial point and has failed to give us ships to meet the demands of our shippers. The Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola, Fla., of date December 12, 1914, sent the following letter to the committee:

"PENSACOLA, FLA., *December 12, 1914.*

"Senator D. U. FLETCHER,
"*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR SENATOR: We here do not know whether to be amused or disgusted in regard to interviews given out by prominent gentlemen, who should know better, as to the great number of ships available for carrying freight and the ease in obtaining them.

"If some of the gentlemen who talk this way would come down to this coast and see how our business is hampered by inability to get bottoms and the extraordinary freight rates charged they might change their minds as to the abundance of vessels available. The fact is that freights are almost at a prohibitive figure, and vessels can hardly be obtained even at the piratical prices asked.

"Congress will be doing a great service for this coast if they can find some effective means of remedying this serious situation.

"Very truly, yours,

"C. E. DOBSON, *President.*"

This letter is in agreement with the statements from two departments of the Government—the Treasury and Commerce—and accords with our conclusions that an emergency exists.

Well, Mr. President, when these 30 or 40 ships get distributed over the ports of the United States and are traversing the various routes over the seas, I do not imagine that Pensacola, Fla., will get a great many of them.

We have already stated that it is our belief that there is no division of sentiment among our people upon this question. We not only need an enlarged merchant marine to meet the present emergency, but legislation which will give us an enlarged American merchant marine, with ships flying the American flag, traveling on sea lines regularly with scheduled dates of sailing and well-advertised points of destination. Private enterprise has failed to fully give our people these advantages under their own control, and by that failure has seriously interfered with the full development of our foreign trade. It now remains for the Government, by wise legislation, to initiate a greater American merchant marine.

It is not desired to create a Government monopoly in the shipping business. It is not necessarily involved in the proposed legislation that the Government shall permanently remain interested in shipping. Wherever private interests will, at reasonable rates and with proper facilities, serve American commerce in ocean transportation, the Government will be more than content to have them do so.

So that, Mr. President, if the time ever comes when American shipping companies shall say to the Government that they will reduce their rates and carry commerce at a figure that this shipping board thinks is just, the Government will then surrender the business to private parties, and the very next day the private concerns can advance the rates if they see fit. Is there anything to prevent it?

By the proposed plan the Government will not enter the field of ocean transportation as a cutthroat competitor. Its purpose is to aid and not to injure American commerce, and it must, of course, be recognized that privately owned American vessels in ocean transportation are a part of American commerce, and are not therefore to be hindered, but rather are to be helped. The very steadiness of control that will be introduced into the situation through the proposed measure will itself be an element of aid to the privately owned transportation lines. We shall be content to have a large portion of our foreign commerce carried under the American flag in privately owned vessels. But we can not rest content while over 90 per cent of our foreign commerce is carried under foreign flags, subject to the primary interests which naturally arise under those flags, out of our own control in every respect, and with no limitation on charges save the exactions for profit of stockholders to whom American commerce is but incidental to their own stronger interests.

"TRADE FOLLOWS THE FLAG."

This maxim has been adduced in a thousand arguments and its truth has never been seriously questioned.

It has been questioned a great many times, but I will not stop to question it to-day—

Few commercial steamers carry the American flag, and this bill is the beginning of a movement to put the flag on a far greater number of genuine American-owned vessels and to send them out as carriers of our products and of return cargoes to and from all parts of the world. These ships will be genuine American ships, and will not only win from the peoples to whom they go a fair share of their trade, but will carry to them articles of our home production whose merit will win their way. The transportation lines established under this bill will be permanent, regular in their sailings, and controlled for the public good.

Mr. President, just think of the German ships interned in New York, if they are to be purchased, as it is suggested from various sources that they will be purchased—just think of those ships being "genuine" American ships, as this report says they will be!

This bill not only initiates a merchant marine as a necessary adjunct in the permanent development of our foreign trade by supplying regular transportation to foreign markets, but will be an important factor in our national defense, increasing the efficiency of the Navy and Army by providing naval auxiliaries with a trained personnel and transports available on demand.

The bill as drawn affects only our foreign shipping and does not affect the coastwise trade of the United States—

This was written before Hawaii was put into the bill, which is now offered as a substitute for the original bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is reported that the Democratic caucus has proposed an amendment to allow these vessels to go into our coastwise trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. They do in the substitute bill, so far as Hawaii is concerned, which has always been regarded as coastwise trade, and that is only the beginning. The report wisely suggests:

In the coastwise trade there is no emergency; we have an abundance of ships for all our coastwise demands, and they carry the American flag. In the foreign trade, however, we have a shortage of ships, and a still greater shortage of ships carrying the Stars and Stripes.

We have an abundance of ships in the coastwise trade, Mr. President, because we have protected them from competition with cheaper-built and cheaper-navigated foreign ships. The consequence is that we have a coastwise fleet that is not only the admiration of our own country but the admiration of the world. It appears, however, to be too successful, too prosperous, to suit some people, and it is now proposed to let foreign ships, under certain conditions, get into that trade.

The bill will create work for our shipyards, not only in the construction of ships but in the matter of repairs. Our shipyards for the construction of our war vessels successfully outbid the world for the construction of war vessels for Argentina, and it is believed that they can carry this successful competition into the construction of merchant vessels. Besides this, the bill will create a demand for material entering into construction, repairs, and alterations, and also for necessary supplies.

Not to any greater extent than if the ships were built by private parties.

The entire proposed cost under this measure is less than is the loss to the Nation caused by a fall in price of the present cotton crop of 1 cent per pound by reason of excessive freight rates.

The bill creates a Government activity and expenditure for the benefit of the commerce of all the people. We have now not over 1,400,000 gross tons of shipping available for the foreign trade, and much of this has, indeed, but a nominal existence, because it comprises old vessels not yet withdrawn from registry, and others whose cargo capacity is insufficient to meet their heavy operating cost. Our flag is rarely seen at hundreds of ports throughout the world. This is a reason for this new governmental activity—a full and sufficient reason for the creation of a corporation or corporations organized or to be organized and controlled by the Government of the United States to purchase, charter, control, and operate merchant vessels for the benefit of the agricultural, manufacturing, mining, and commercial interests of the country. The reason is still greater in the face of the fact that a great foreign war has paralyzed our foreign commerce at a moment when new and profitable fields are opening up, inviting our entrance, while private capital and enterprise is unable to remedy the disease.

Yes, Mr. President, it is too true that the flag is seldom seen in the ports of the world, where 75 years ago it was seen wherever American travelers happened to be. The Merchant Marine Commission took testimony on this point, and four gentlemen testified that they had gone around the world, one of them twice, one of them in his journey covering a distance twice around the world, and that they had rarely ever seen the American flag, unless it was on the yacht of some millionaire or on a battleship of the United States. This is not news to some of us. We have appreciated it for a long time, and have done all we could to remedy the evil; but, Mr. President, when Mr. Seabury

of New York, an expert, testified that, if we supply ships to take care of the entire commerce of the United States, we will have to invest at least $600,000,000 in the enterprise, I want to ask in all seriousness what good will $30,000,000 do?

Senate Document No. 225 of the Sixtieth Congress, first session, entitled "Development of the American Ocean Mail Service and American Commerce," says, on page 65:

"One of the most important features of the voluminous testimony taken all over the country by the Merchant Marine Commission was the insistence of practical men of business—merchants and manufacturers and bankers—not themselves interested in any way in shipowning or shipbuilding, that the lack of American ships prevented us from securing an adequate market abroad for the products of American manufacturing, mining, and agriculture."

And every one of those men, Mr. President, was in favor of the Government of the United States extending some aid in some form to the shipping interests of the country.

It may be safely assumed that the American people will not consent to any change in the conditions provided by law for American seamen. It is furthermore the case that the operation of ocean vessels presents problems of cost of operation which are not finally worked out.

I supposed they had been worked out, and I think they have.

Statements are made concerning one or another element of operation of American vessels which are so clouded by private interest or so utilized to enforce a special claim as to make both the present and the possible facts somewhat uncertain. The pending measure will provide an opportunity which private capital can not extend to determine, free from all question of private interest or prejudice, just what the facts are respecting the cost of ocean transportation under our flag. The cheapest water transportation of bulk freight by steamers is under the American flag, in the specialized ships which carry ore and other bulk cargoes on the Great Lakes. The cheapest ocean transportation for bulk freight is also under the American flag, in the large coastwise schooners upon our Atlantic coast. Private interests have never yet undertaken to determine on any considerable scale whether these facts can be projected further into a larger development of our American merchant marine.

Mr. President, the cheap transportation on the Lakes and on the coast by the coastwise ships of the United States is due wholly to the fact that the Government is giving those ships adequate protection by excluding from that trade all foreign ships. So these ships, protected against foreign competition, are giving cheap and adequate transportation; and the very statement of this report disproves the allegation, which has been made here over and over and over again, that the coastwise shipping of the United States is a monstrous monopoly which ought to be destroyed.

There is the highest marine technical authority for saying that American steamers can be constructed for ocean purposes so that their loading will be much less costly than is that of European-designed steamers; and it should be remembered that it costs more per unit to load and unload cargo into and from a vessel than it does to transport it across the ocean.

I assume that that depends upon the character of the cargo. It may be true of some things, but it can not possibly be true of all the products that enter into ocean transportation.

There are, therefore, problems in marine transportation of essential importance to American commerce, but which private capital has not been able hitherto fully to work out. This measure will provide for the first time adequate means for the study of these problems, through which study both private and public interests will gain.

It remains to review briefly the effects of the existing situation on our agriculture. When the present war broke out we faced trying conditions by which our farmers especially were seriously threatened. Their crops were ready to move, and had, in fact, begun to move. They were immediately confronted with the stoppage of the mechanism of exchange and with the absence of ships.

About August 7 embargoes were placed by all railroads against grain for Galveston, New Orleans, Baltimore, and New York destined for export. Within a few days thereafter there were reported to be 1,700 cars of grain in the railroad yards of Galveston alone, with the elevators full and no facilities for shipping. The railroads were lined with cars that could not be moved. Weather conditions were unfavorable and a serious loss was not only threatened, but actually sustained. By the week of September 10 shipping embargoes against vessels had been placed on all German, Swedish, and Russian ports, with the single exception of Gothenburg, Sweden, and shipping companies running to those ports refused to accept any consignments. The Galveston embargo was raised August 27, by which time there had been tied up in the Galveston yards alone about 3,000 cars of wheat. Like conditions prevailed in New Orleans. On September 1 the railroads entering that port raised the embargo there also.

So the emergency passed without our building any ships.

By September 10 it is reported that 275 vessels, most of them under the German flag, but many carrying American cargoes, had been seized by hostile cruisers, thus removing available tonnage that could otherwise have been used to handle American grain and cotton.

On October 25 every elevator in Galveston was full and 2,800 cars of wheat still waited on the tracks. On November 3 the Santa Fe Railroad advised the Interstate Commerce Commission by wire that they had not received any grain for export by way of Galveston since October 24, having thus put a second embargo upon wheat shipments for lack of shipping facilities from Galveston. The railroad company stated it was forced to put on this embargo, as they could do nothing to assist in transportation beyond Galveston; in other words, there were no ships available.

The vice president of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railway stated December 11 that there were on Galveston Island 1,767 cars containing 2,000,000 bushels of wheat; that all the elevators were full, and that 2,000,000 additional bushels were in transit to Galveston. On that same day the vice president of the Santa Fe Railroad stated that they had found it necessary on December 1 to renew the embargo against wheat for Galveston, which had been made effective as of the 16th of December, and that there were then in Galveston, or en route to that port, 3,800 cars of wheat on the Santa Fe system alone. There have thus been three separate embargoes on wheat at Galveston. It is apparent, therefore, that even after the current of exchange was restored the movement of the great wheat crop continued, and still continues, to be delayed for lack of ships.

The situation as regards cotton was still more serious, and continues to be so. Our communications with South America, unsatisfactory enough in normal times, are still more so under present abnormal conditions.

The industries of South America are largely extractive. They have the products from the farm, from the ranch, from the forest, and from the mine. Some of their agricultural products are competitive with those grown in the United States, but by far the larger volume of South America's agricultural products are not grown in the United States and are therefore noncompetitive, such as coffee, rubber, cocoa, and bananas.

In some of those countries cotton and woolen goods are wanted. American tractors are doing service in Chile as well as in Belgium.

Locomotives, cars, steel rails, structural steel for trusses, cement, harvesters, automobiles and supplies, machinery of all kinds, including fire engines made in the United States, have all been introduced in South America and the demand and use can be greatly extended.

Means of making deliveries and the interchange constitutes the chief factor to be provided.

It is believed direct credit facilities and arrangements for financial transactions can be supplied as needed.

In view of the importation in the last year and a half of a small amount of Argentine corn and Argentine beef there has been an attempt to alarm the farmers, especially of the Middle West. As a matter of fact, there is no danger even under the existing state of agriculture in this country of successful competition on the part of the Argentine farmers with those of this country. The total corn crop of the Argentine Republic in 1913 was 196,600,000 bushels; the total corn crop of the United States in 1912 was 3,125,000,000 bushels; and in 1913, 2,447,000,000 bushels. The shortage in 1913 as compared with 1912 in this country was 678,000,000 bushels. Argentina's total crop was less than a third of this shortage. A very small fraction of this total crop reaches this country.

And yet, Mr. President, after we had in a moment of mental aberration placed corn on the free list, with a surplus of corn in this country so far as our own people's wants are concerned, in the eight months prior to the beginning of the European war we had imported 10,000,000 bushels of foreign corn into the United States. We did not need it. We had corn enough and to spare, but it was sent here because it could be offered to our people cheaper than the American corn.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. It was sent here, was it not, because it could be grown so much cheaper in other countries, where the expense of producing the corn and of carrying on the farm was very much lower than it is in the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. Beyond a question they produce it very much cheaper.

[At this point a message was received from the House of Representatives.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not ask the Senator to yield to me. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. There has been no business transacted under the rule since the last quorum was called.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, there has just been business transacted, because we have received a message from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A message has been received from the House of Representatives. The Chair decides that the point of order is not well taken. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brandegee	Hughes	Oliver	Stephenson
Bristow	James	Overman	Sterling
Bryan	Johnson	Page	Stone
Camden	Jones	Perkins	Swanson
Catron	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Chamberlain	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	Lane	Robinson	Thornton
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Root	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Townsend
Culberson	Lodge	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	McLean	Sheppard	White
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Works
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixy-seven Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will occupy the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not yield, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire does not yield.

Mr. MYERS. I merely wished to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I thought he was through.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, I have hardly commenced. [Laughter.] I venture to say that not half a dozen Senators have read this interesting report, and I am delighted to see that they have come in to listen to the remainder of it.

European markets are strong competitors for all agricultural products from South America and receive the greater amount of South America's surplus. The importation of corn to the United States from all countries, including Argentina, for the year ending October 31, 1914, was seven-tenths of 1 per cent of the crop of the United States, or 16,000,000 bushels. During the same period the United States exported over 11,000,000 bushels. A great part of the corn imported was used in New York City in the manufacture of corn-sirup products. It really cuts no figure in our domestic price. We shall export this year more corn than we have imported—

We imported $5,000,000 worth more last year than we exported, according to these figures—

The same general situation is presented in the importation of meats. For the last year we imported 160,000,000 pounds of meat from Argentina. The total domestic production is 15,000,000,000 pounds. The amount imported, therefore, is 1 per cent of the domestic product.

That is more than I thought it was. I said a moment ago that under the existing tariff law, which put the products of the farm on the free list, we had imported 10,000,000 bushels of corn which we did not need from foreign countries; but, as was suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], labor is so much cheaper in those countries and the cost of production is so much lower that they can afford to raise corn and pay the transportation charges and compete successfully with our American corn; and according to this report—good Democratic authority—16,000,000 bushels of corn have been sent into the United States since the Underwood-Simmons tariff law was placed on the statute books.

Later on I hope the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] will have something to say on this subject. That Senator knows all about it, and he doubtless will talk about it before the debate ends. It is a good subject for him.

During the same period the United States exported over a billion pounds of meat products. The proportion of the imported meat to our total domestic product is inconsiderable. The Argentine meat does not in reality compete with our western beef, because of its character and quality. The amounts of these two commodities that will come to this country in the future are not likely to increase largely or to get far from the Atlantic seaboard. These two products are the principal ones in which American agriculture has not shown a satisfactory advance in recent years.

In the last 15 years the American corn crop has not materially increased, and the beef cattle have decreased in number by 12,000,000 head, and the number of hogs has decreased by three or four million.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he is familiar with the fact as to the price that was paid for this corn that was imported from Argentina?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say in reply that I am not; but it must have been sold cheaper than the American corn or it would not have found a market in the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. It was sold at an average of about 10 cents a bushel lower than the price paid for American corn.

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

In this same period our population has increased 23,000,000. Conditions have changed very rapidly in this country, and agriculture has been going through a period of adjustment. With improved conditions, with better financial facilities adapted to the needs of agriculture, with proper farm management, with increasing attention to forage crops and to live stock in the settled portions of the Union, the farmers of this country will not only produce corn and meat and other products to supply the home demand, but will supply also a considerable part of the demand of foreign countries. It is not complimentary to the intelligence of the American farmer to attempt to alarm him by the dangers of competition from foreign farmers. In any event, the small volume of competitive products that are being imported will probably benefit at least three farmers for every one who might feel the competition. If any grain whatever reaches the farming sections it will certainly largely benefit the cattlemen and stock raisers. This country is still an exporter of agricultural products, having sent abroad in 1913, according to the preliminary figures, $1,123,000,000, while it imported $815,000,000, consisting for the most part of noncompetitive products. It should not be forgotten that the American farmers export considerable quantities of agricultural products to South America. In 1911 we exported $125,000,000 worth of farm and forest products to South America alone.

It is highly likely that with direct shipping we shall continue to export to South America even more farm and forest products and more than we import.

I shall show, later on, that we have now direct shipping facilities to South America which exceed the present demand for cargo space.

The greater part of our importation of agricultural supplies from South America consists of things which we do not produce here. In 1911 we imported from South America $116,655,000 worth of forest and farm products. Of this total coffee represented $76,000,000; cocoa, about $5,000,000; and rubber, hides, and things of like character, the greater part of the remainder. With direct or better shipping facilities, we shall secure more of these things.

So far as South America is concerned, the principal result from direct or improved shipping facilities should be:

1. The importation of a larger volume of noncompetitive agricultural products from South America, such as coffee, cocoa, etc., on better terms than heretofore.

2. The importation of quantities of nitrates, especially from Chile, needed by American farmers for fertilizers.

3. A small amount of competitive agricultural products, negligible in comparison to our total domestic product.

4. The exportation to South America of larger volumes of agricultural products, especially from the West, such as wheat.

5. A large increase in the exportation of manufactured products.

6. Increased travel between South American countries and the United States, larger contact, and more friendly relations.

In such case it is highly likely that instead of having a large trade balance against us with South America, we shall witness the development of a credit there in our favor.

There is one South American product of decided importance to the farmers of the Nation to which we may give especial attention, namely, the nitrates. We are dependent largely upon Germany for potash. We have been using very little nitrates in fertilizers because of its high price, and yet our fertilizer experts say we are greatly in need of this important ingredient. The rapidly increasing demand of cattle feeders is taking cottonseed products, fish scrap, blood, and high-grade tankage out of the reach of farmers as fertilizers. We should get large quantities of nitrates from Chile. She produces at least 3,000,000 tons annually. This has gone for the most part to Europe. This country has received about a half million tons, which have been used mainly for making explosives. The head of one of the largest nitrate-producing companies of Chile, sent here recently by the Chilean Government, visited the Department of Agriculture and represented that if there was direct shipping connection between Chile and the Gulf ports of the United States through the Panama Canal Chile could send us six times the present volume of imports of nitrates at a price from 30 to 40 per cent lower than present prices, and that the farmer then could afford to use these nitrates in large quantities. The Chilean representative stated that Chile is in need of our coal for the navy and for industries, especially the coal from the Middle West. He asserted that ships coming from Chile with nitrates would return with coal and manufactured products. It is scarcely necessary to point out that a line touching at Chile could also reach other countries of the west coast of South America and would develop a volume of traffic between those countries and the United States.

As has been before stated, there is the most pressing need for ships to take our cotton to German ports for Germany and Austria and to bring back dyestuffs, cyanide, and other chemicals. We are informed through representatives of the Agricultural Department who were sent to Europe some time ago that Germany can use and would take from one and a half to two million bales of cotton, and that the price prevailing at present in Bremen ranges from 19 cents to twenty-one and a fraction cents. Austria would also take a considerable amount of cotton. The president of the British Board of Trade asserts that the cotton situation in Great Britain is improving and estimates that the English consumption will be 75 per cent of the normal. Yet, as all know, cotton is not moving satisfactorily to England, and is moving only with the very greatest difficulty to Germany, and probably none is reaching Austria. Our total exports thus far in 1914 fall almost 3,000,000 bales short of the 1913 figures. Unquestionably if we had additional ships under the American flag this situation would rapidly improve and much of the distress of the producers, the business men, and the bankers, not only in the South but throughout the country, would be relieved. The need is urgent. There is no telling how long the disturbance abroad will last and how long, therefore, we shall suffer unless the requisite action is promptly taken.

The report of the House of Representatives is attached and made part of this report; also Senate Document No. 601, entitled "American Merchant Marine"; also letter of 28th instant from Hon. William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. JONES. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the Columbia River Basin there are nitrate possibilities far in excess even of those in South America, and that all that is necessary to make them available is to have the water power of the Columbia River developed?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have known something of the possibilities of the development of those nitrate beds in the Columbia River Basin. I am not familiar with the details of it; but it has been called to my attention.

Mr. JONES. Is the Senator also aware of the fact that a bill is now on the calendar which if passed would make it possible to develop those nitrate possibilities in our own country?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; Mr. President, I was not aware of that fact, but it emphasizes what I have said several times, that there is no reason on earth in the minds of many of us, and I think the minds of a majority of this body, why the entire time of this session of Congress should be taken up considering this shipping bill, when the appropriation bills, including the river and harbor bill and the southern claims bill, the bill to which the Senator from Washington refers, and 200 or 300 other bills that are on the calendar remain unattended to. What the Senator says emphasizes what I have frequently asserted, that the country expects us not to give our time to the consideration of this controverted bill, but to take up the appropriation bills

and other bills and pass them and go to our homes. That is what the country expects.

The report of the Senate committee which I have read attaches as a part of the report, and adopts it, the report of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which I will now read:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 18666) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report it to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill provides that the Government, through a shipping board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any States thereof, or of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, maintaining, and operating merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere, to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States.

The initial capital stock of the corporation shall not exceed $10,000,000, but the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or cause the capital stock to be increased from time to time as the interests of corporation may require.

The capital stock shall be divided into shares of the par value of $100, and the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of the stock, and for a like per cent of every increase, and the remainder shall be offered for public subscription. The United States may, however, subscribe at par to an amount of such stock not subscribed for by the public.

The corporation may begin business as soon as the 51 per cent of the stock is subscribed and paid for by the United States.

The United States, through the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may purchase or construct vessels suitable to carry out the purpose of such corporation and transfer them to such corporation upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by the shipping board.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if in connection with this report there was not certain testimony taken, notably the testimony of Secretary McAdoo, and that in that hearing where Secretary McAdoo testified he admitted that, so far as private subscriptions to the stock of this so-called shipping company were concerned, there could be no possible promise of any profit on it? In fact, does not the Senator know that Secretary McAdoo admitted that it would be a losing venture both for the Government and for the private investors in that stock?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have called attention, Mr. President, during the discussion of this shipping bill to that rather remarkable hearing which was had in another body, a hearing that occupied a few hours. Two Members of the House gave their views and the Secretary of the Treasury gave his views, but no expert was called, no shipping man, no man interested in transportation was called, and that meager hearing is all we have to point our way in the consideration of this measure except the report which I am now reading. I feel fully justified in reading it, as I have heretofore stated, for the reason that I do not believe six Senators in this body have given it any consideration.

Secretary McAdoo did say that on some of the lines he expected there would be a loss, but he was not sure that there would be a loss on the whole, and in that respect he differs from every business man and shipper I have talked with, because they all say that there will be a very large loss, and that it is an inevitable loss.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not a fact that the plan under contemplation will launch this corporation after the Government has made its subscription of 51 per cent of the stock?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is the provision.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That clearly indicates that they do not hope for numerous or prompt applications for the other 49 per cent. Otherwise they would wait until the corporation was fully organized.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill provides that the corporation shall be launched, or it may be launched, when 51 per cent of the stock is subscribed. Knowing the Senator from Michigan as I do, a shrewd business man, who does not subscribe to anything which has not a reasonable prospect of a return upon the investment, I do not imagine that he will sell his automobile and put the proceeds in the stock of this corporation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; but, if the Senator will pardon me, I doubt seriously whether I will buy another if the present condition of industrial affairs continues.

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

The corporation may begin business as soon as the 51 per cent of the stock is subscribed and paid for by the United States.

The United States, through the shipping board, with the approval of the President, may purchase or construct vessels suitable to carry out the purpose of such corporation and transfer them to such corporation upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by the shipping board.

The Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board, may issue and sell what are known as Panama Canal bonds to a total amount not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels.

Upon the transfer of the vessels to such corporation the corporation shall issue to the United States in payment therefor its gold bonds bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, such bonds to constitute a first lien upon the vessels so transferred and all other property of such corporation.

The bonds shall not be less in amount at their par value than the amount paid by the United States for the vessels.

The Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, sell such bonds to reimburse the Treasury for the expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels.

The vessels purchased or constructed by the shipping board and transferred to such corporation shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States and may engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the island of Guam and Tutuila. The shipping board, subject to the direction of the President, is vested with full power to vote the stock of the United States in the corporation and to do all other things necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, and may at any time, with the approval of the Congress, sell the stock of such corporation.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the President to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries belonging to the Naval Establishment as are suitable for commercial use and not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation organized under the act, upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe. The bill further provides that the vessels purchased or constructed under its provisions shall, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, be of a type suitable for use as naval auxiliaries. The question of providing vessels for our merchant marine from a standpoint of the Naval Establishment had been under consideration for some time by the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The same subject was being considered by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, from the standpoint of the merchant marine. Section 8, as written in the bill, is the result of a conference between Chairman Padgett and Mr. Talbott, of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman and Mr. Hardy, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and has the approval of the committee, as it harmonizes both views.

A detailed statement of all expenditures under the act and of all receipts thereunder shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

The bill carries an appropriation of $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act.

We shall not discuss the desirability of having an American merchant marine. We will assume there is no difference of opinion on that point. The fact that we pay a sum variously estimated to be from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 annually to vessels under foreign flags to transport our commerce, which seriously affects our balance of trade, is urged as a sufficient reason why we should have a merchant marine of our own. But this is only one of the many reasons.

The present disturbed conditions in Europe, resulting in the demoralization of shipping under the flags of the belligerents, give emphasis to the need of more merchant vessels under the American flag to meet emergencies such as now exist. Just how to build up our merchant marine has always been the question that vexed us. No one has ever doubted that we can do so, taking into account our vast resources, if we could once agree upon the plan.

This bill is a departure from all plans heretofore presented to Congress to build up our merchant marine. The country is opposed to subsidies, and with good reason.

Mr. President, I submit that this question has never been submitted to the people of this country. Wherever it has been tested out in a State campaign the proponents of the question of subsidies have always been successful. So this ad captandum way of disposing of the question of subsidy I do not accept.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. I note the author of that report lays great stress on the fact that the shipping facilities for cotton are very inadequate, and that this affects the present price of cotton.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think the fact that wheat is selling at $1.46 a bushel, while cotton is selling for 8 cents a pound, disposes of that argument. Is it not a fact that cotton, being a secondary necessity, the consumer, not knowing whether the demand for the future is going to be normal or not, is afraid to buy cotton? If there was the same demand for cotton that there is for wheat, cotton would receive the same transportation facilities wheat has received. Wheat is a prime necessity; the people must have bread. Consequently the future consumption is certain. On the contrary, cotton not being a prime necessity, of course the European consumer is waiting to know whether there will be any demand for cotton or not, and the price of cotton will be just as uncertain as the duration of the war.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator's observation is entitled to serious consideration, and at first blush I should say that the Senator's argument is sound. I read further from the report:

Under the artificial stimulus of subsidies a few ships might be built and operated by favored companies at large expense to the Government without adequate returns. The method proposed in recent years has been to amend the ocean mail act of 1891 and pay to vessels of 16 knots speed for ocean mail service the sum of $4 per mile for each outward voyage. This would mean that the Government would pay ocean mail steamers of the type described in the act on voyages to South America about $16,000 for each outward voyage and on voyages to the Orient from $16,000 to $30,000 for each outward voyage. We now pay the four vessels of the American Line—the *New York*, the *Philadelphia*, the *St. Louis*, and the *St. Paul*—in the North Atlantic trade about $735,000 per annum mail subsidy. They are 20-knot vessels.

The Government has no control over the passenger and freight rates charged by the subsidized vessels. They follow the custom of all unregulated lines and charge all the traffic will bear, and this, too, without reference to the cost of the service or what would be a reasonable profit on the investment. The investigation made by this committee into steamship conferences and agreements in the domestic and foreign trade disclosed that for the three years prior to 1913 ocean freight rates increased from 50 to 200 per cent. The cost of the service did not increase in proportion to the increase of the rates. The profits of the regular lines in most of the trade areas during the period were very large. They charged all the traffic would bear.

It is claimed by the lines that ocean freight rates, beginning in 1913, have been receding from their former high level. It may be the rates became so high that the effect was to retard the movement of commerce and lower rates became necessary on that account, and it may be that increase in ocean tonnage, stimulated by the enormous profits, created a sharper competition for the traffic, with the result of lowering the rates. Be that as it may, the fact remains that no restraining hand was laid on the lines, either in the domestic trade or foreign trade, to enforce reasonable rates.

If this bill is enacted into law, it will serve at least a twofold purpose in the trade in which the Government-controlled vessels are employed.

First. These lines will be projected to ports in Central and South America and elsewhere to increase our mail facilities and to meet the growing demands of our foreign commerce.

Second. The corporation or corporations organized to operate these lines will be controlled by the Government through the President and shipping board, and they will have the power to regulate the rates for carrying the mails and for passenger and freight service. It will not be necessary for the Government to furnish vessels to handle all the traffic, nor is it desirable.

It is not desired to create a Government monopoly in the shipping business. Foreign competition can be met in a friendly spirit and on terms fair to foreign shipping and just to ourselves. We should be content if a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce is carried under the American flag, but we are not content to permit 92 per cent of our foreign commerce to be carried under foreign flags with no other limitations on their charges for the service than what the traffic will bear.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. May I ask the Senator, Is it seriously proposed that ships that are owned by private corporations are still to be permitted to navigate the ocean? Is there to be no attempt to monopolize this over-seas commerce, either to Europe or to South America? The report which the Senator has just read indicates that they still propose in some way to allow private corporations to continue in business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; it seems to be a fact that they generously are going to permit that; but another remarkable thing to me is that they are going to regulate the fares and freights. Whether or not they mean they are going to regulate them only on these Government ships, which will be but a moiety of the overseas transportation, is not very clear; but I hardly think they can regulate fares and freights across the oceans of the world on ships owned by private companies. But, as pretty much everything is being regulated these days, perhaps ocean transportation can also be regulated by law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me to ask him another question, I desire to say that if they only propose to have a few ships, I suppose that those bottoms will be reserved for the special favorites in the over-seas shipping, and that those who do not happen to come under the favor of the department will be obliged to use the ships owned by private corporations at the rates at which they can profitably carry their freight?

Mr. GALLINGER. I would not say that that would be the result; of course, it might be the result; but I will repeat what I perhaps have twice before said—that with 4,000 and more British ships engaged in carrying cargoes across the ocean, these 30 or 40 ships of ours, distributed all over the world, will never be heard of. Somebody may discover one of them in some port; but they are so negligible as compared with the immense traffic over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that it is inconceivable that they will make any impression upon rates or upon anything else.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another interruption?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not wish to interfere with the continuity of the Senator's thoughts, but does the Senator not think that, in order that all shippers may be treated alike and be served by the same instrumentality, the bill ought to provide for the purchase of all over-seas ships that now operate under the American flag? That would give all shippers an equal opportunity to get in before the favored ship departs; otherwise a ship that is to be especially commandeered by the Secretary of the Treasury on its voyage to South American or European ports might find itself so overburdened with traffic that it could not safely make the journey, and the traffic that they were unable to put aboard this Government ship might be compelled to use another medium of transportation less favorable, and therefore, naturally, in selling the products that are carried a discriminatory rate would have to be enforced in order to prove profitable either to the shipper or to the carrier.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask whether that would not be essentially a subsidy?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. ROOT. Would not the effect be that these favored shippers whose products are carried on these few Government ships at lower rates than the market rates would be receiving a subsidy?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Of course I have not the floor and I would not interfere with the Senator from New Hampshire, so I will allow him to answer this very pertinent question. However, if I were called upon to answer, I would say that it would not interfere; that it would simply be the practical application of the last Thanksgiving proclamation which emanated from the White House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is in line with the wise suggestions which the Senator is in the habit of making while we are debating great questions in this body. I quite agree with him that, if the Government is to build 30 or 40 ships and put them in the over-seas trade, putting behind them the influence and power of the Government, it would be no more than right that the Government should buy the four ships that traverse the North Atlantic, the few ships that traverse the Pacific, the line to Venezuela, the United Fruit Co. line, and other lines that have come under the American flag, and give them all a fair show.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Exactly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that would be a proper thing to do, but it is not proposed to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, the Senator will examine all these matters for himself. The Senator ought to read the report which I have read to-day—he has not read it and he was not in the Chamber all the time to hear the report read——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, this is becoming somewhat personal. [Laughter.] May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I read every line in the report before the bill was reported out of the Committee on Commerce. I read what the Senator has not himself read, but what I hope he will read before he takes his seat. I am very familiar with the report, and it was my duty to read it. I do not know that I would have read it as a matter of interesting history or as a matter of good fiscal or economic policy, but I have read it and I was here when it came from the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am delighted to know that one Senator has read this report. I had forgotten that the Senator from Michigan is a prominent member of the Committee on Commerce. Doubtless the report was submitted to the committee before it was presented to the Senate, and I presume that a few members of that committee did either hear it, or pretended to hear it read.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I must say, if the Senator will permit me another interruption, that the bill, too, was handed to us fully completed, but we never had much of an opportunity to change it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill the Senator saw was not the "completed" bill. The third edition of the bill, recently submitted to the Senate, is now said to be the completed bill. How soon it will be supplanted by another bill I can not say. The report continues:

It is urged that the Government should not engage in the operation of ships, but that the business should be given over to private firms or corporations; that the powers proposed to be vested in the President and the shipping board under the bill are extraordinary and

should be withheld by Congress; that, in view of the fact that the principal maritime nations of Europe are at war, we should be careful to observe our obligations as a neutral and scrupulously avoid any act that would create friction between our Government and the belligerents. Hence out of the abundance of caution we should do nothing in the direction of building up our merchant marine. We will notice these objections in their order.

Why should the Government not purchase or construct merchant vessels and operate them directly or, as proposed in this bill, through a corporation or corporations organized or to be organized and controlled by the Government and operate them for the benefit of the great agricultural, manufacturing, mining, and commercial interests of our country? Efforts have been made ever since the Civil War to restore our mercantile marine to some measure of its ante bellum greatness. These efforts have all failed. It would not serve any useful purpose to recite the causes of the decline of our merchant marine or of our failure to build it up again.

Mr. President, I propose later on to take up that subject in my own way, depending upon the facts of history to show exactly what the causes for that decline were.

The fact confronts us that we have less than 1,000,000 tons of shipping in the foreign trade, and our flag at the masthead of an American merchant vessel is unknown in most of the ports of the world. And now, with our foreign commerce paralyzed by the war in Europe, with new and profitable fields opening up and inviting us to enter them, private capital and enterprise are not forthcoming to meet the existing emergency.

It is worthy of remark that every bill pending before the committee provides for Government ownership in some form, and every proposition submitted for the consideration of the committee has as its basis the suggestion that the Government shall finance the projects, either by guaranteeing the bonds or in some other way lend them the credit of the Government. We find no fault with the demand or the necessity for it on the part of private interests.

We talk a great deal about subsidy; it has become almost a byword. Every time we make a suggestion that the Government might in some way help out the American merchant marine the word "subsidy" is iterated and reiterated. Now, listen to this:

It is worthy of remark that every bill pending before the committee provides for Government ownership in some form, and every proposition submitted for the consideration of the committee has as its basis the suggestion that the Government shall finance the projects, either by guaranteeing the bonds or in some other way lend them the credit of the Government. We find no fault with the demand or the necessity for it on the part of private interests.

That sounds like subsidy. What else can it be? They can not do this business without the credit of the Government being back of it, and it is proposed to put the credit of the Government back of it, and to have the Government finance the project. Mr. President, that is the worst kind of subsidy, almost as bad as buying the cotton crop of the South.

The war in Europe has not only demoralized commerce but credits as well, and however much enterprising citizens and corporations may wish to meet the demands in the present emergency without Government aid, they seem to be powerless to do so without Government aid. Hence the rational course for the Government to pursue to meet the present emergency is to utilize its resources in such manner as will inure to the benefit of all the people.

I want to read that paragraph again:

The war in Europe has not only demoralized commerce but credits as well, and however much enterprising citizens and corporations may wish to meet the demands in the present emergency without Government aid, they seem to be powerless to do so without Government aid. Hence the rational course for the Government to pursue to meet the present emergency is to utilize its resources in such manner as will inure to the benefit of all the people.

"Government aid"! It is subsidy when some of us ask for it, but a great patriotic act on the part of the Government when other people ask for it.

Mr. C. J. Owens, managing director of the Southern Commercial Congress, appeared before the committee and approved the bill and submitted a paper prepared by Mr. B. M. Baker, of Baltimore, a gentleman of wide experience in dealing with all problems affecting ocean transportation, suggesting that the Government, through a director of transportation, charter the ships purchased or constructed by the Government to corporations or individuals, who would furnish as security 20 per cent cash of the cost of the vessels transferred to them under charter and pay in advance as charter money 8 per cent per annum for such vessels as should be assigned to them, the vessels to be employed in such direct lines of service as would be acceptable to the Government; all rates and conditions and contracts to be under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission; no one corporation or firm to be allowed to charter in excess of $5,000,000 in value of the ships owned and controlled by the Government. Mr. Baker's suggestions are worthy of very careful consideration by the shipping board, who are accomplishing the purposes set out in the bill.

I know Mr. Baker well. He is an experienced shipping man, but I know also that Mr. Baker has held a great many different views on the subject of rehabilitating the American merchant marine. The last bill which I presented and championed in this body looking to a betterment of the merchant marine was supported by Mr. Baker.

If private capital is ready and willing to take over this business if the Government will furnish the ships, why would it not be better for our great commercial and manufacturing centers to take 49 per cent of the capital stock in the corporation or corporations that may be organized under this bill and accomplish the same purpose?

The Government, through stock ownership and the shipping board, would retain control over the corporation and accomplish in a simple and direct way all that could be accomplished through the Interstate Commerce Commission. Later on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will propose to Congress comprehensive legislation to bring all common carriers by water under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but it is not practicable to do so in this emergency legislation.

We have no doubt that the shipping board will exercise the powers vested in them with discretion and one regard for the public welfare.

We are in accord with those who feel that it is better, whenever practicable, for the Government to avoid engaging in any business that can be conducted as a private enterprise. But, as stated, private enterprise has failed to respond to the demands of our over-sea commerce. How much longer must we wait?

But it is said that we are vesting too much power in the President and shipping board. A canal through the Isthmus of Panama connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans was the dream of centuries. The great De Lesseps at the head of a private corporation with large resources failed to construct. The Government of the United States undertook the stupendous task a little over 10 years ago, and the greatest engineering feat in the world's history is an accomplished fact. The Congress vested in the President of the United States the authority to construct the canal and provided him with the funds to do so, and the work is done and the Government will control and regulate this gateway of commerce for all time. Private capital and enterprise were unwilling or unable to undertake to develop the rich resources of Alaska. At this session of Congress an act has been passed authorizing an expenditure of $40,000,000 to build railroads in Alaska to develop its resources. So what is proposed here is not an innovation. It is in line with these other great undertakings of the Government.

The Panama Canal act and the act authorizing the construction of railroads in Alaska vest in the President vast powers. That power, as far as the Panama Canal is concerned, has been exercised wisely and for the public good, and we feel assured the same will be true as regards the construction of railroads in Alaska.

Are the duties and responsibility vested in the President and shipping board under this bill so much greater in scope or difficult of execution than those vested in the President under the Panama Canal act or the act for the construction of railroads in Alaska that we should withhold them, urgent as is the demand that we do something for our merchant marine? Is an American owned and controlled merchant marine less important to our national welfare than the Panama Canal or railroads in Alaska?

Mr. President, there is a difference. When the Panama Canal was built it did not enter into competition with any other canal owned by private parties. When the railroad in Alaska shall be built, if it ever is, it probably will absorb the existing railroads in that Territory, because I understand the Government is now negotiating for their purchase, so that there will be no competition there. It is very different when the Government goes into competition with private shipping corporations in the matter of over-seas commerce:

It is not intended by this bill to discourage private enterprise, but to aid it.

We need not expect smooth sailing in our efforts to build up an American mercantile marine in the foreign trade. The task has been neglected too long.

We do not expect support for this bill from those who believe there is no other way to build up our merchant marine than by granting subsidies or subventions.

Then, again, there are thoughtful, prudent, and patriotic people who say we should exercise great care in our efforts to build up our merchant marine at this time. They caution us not to violate any of our duties or responsibilities as a neutral power. Their words of warning are entitled to our thoughtful consideration, but should not influence us to the extent of causing us to sit down, fold our hands, and do nothing until peace is restored in Europe. In other words, rather than hazard the possibility of a misunderstanding with one or more of the belligerents, some would have us make no effort to repair the damage done to our industries and commerce by the war in Europe or to exercise any of our rights as a neutral power. We have rights as neutrals as well as duties to be observed.

It will be noticed that the author of this report says, and I repeat the words—

In other words, rather than hazard the possibility of a misunderstanding with one or more of the belligerents, some would have us make no effort to repair the damage done to our industries and commerce by the war in Europe, or to exercise any of our rights as a neutral power.

A plain acknowledgment that we do hazard our rights as a neutral power in the legislation that is proposed.

Fears are expressed that we will involve ourselves in complications with Great Britain and France if we buy German ships. That may be. The bill does not direct the shipping board to buy ships of the subjects of any particular nation. They have the widest discretion in the purchase or construction of vessels. We have no reason to believe they will act otherwise than with the greatest care in whatever they may do.

Why, Mr. President, if it were known in certain financial circles in New York that there is no intention to buy those German ships, certain men would go in sackcloth and ashes for the next 30 days.

The President will have the State Department to advise him on all questions affecting our right and duties as neutrals. The belligerents have their diplomatic representatives in Washington through whom objection to any proposed purchase may be made, and we should assume that the President and shipping board will avail themselves of all sources of information before acting.

It may be well, however, for the benefit of those who seem to think we have no rights as a neutral power to buy ships of belligerents to call attention to international law governing the sale of enemy ships to subjects of neutral States.

After listening to the magnificent addresses of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I am greatly interested in knowing exactly where the author of this report finds any

justification for a different view from that advanced by those two distinguished Senators. I am reading this report for information, and I hope Senators will listen to it, because it will raise a question, I apprehend, between the authorities that are given here and the views of the Senators from New York and Massachusetts; and it may result in enlivening this debate, and in educating some of us who know little about international questions and certainly nothing about international law, if those two Senators will gratify us by speaking to the subject again before this debate closes. The report continues:

We quote from International Law, Oppenheim, edition 1912, volume 2, pages 117 and 118, "War and neutrality," "Transfer of enemy vessels":

"SEC. 91. The question of the transfer of enemy vessels to subjects of neutral States, either shortly before or during the war, must be regarded as forming part of the larger question of enemy character, for the point to be decided is whether such transfer divests these vessels of their enemy character. It is obvious that, if this point is answered in the affirmative, the owners of enemy vessels can evade the danger of having their property seized and confiscated by selling their vessels to subjects of neutral States. Before the declaration of London, which is, however, not yet ratified, the maritime powers had not agreed upon common rules concerning this subject. According to French practice, no transfer of enemy vessels to neutrals could be recognized, and a vessel thus transferred retained enemy character; but this concerned only transfer after the outbreak of the war; any legitimate transfer anterior to the outbreak of war did give neutral character to a vessel. According to British and American practice, on the other hand, neutral vessels could well be transferred to a neutral flag before or after the outbreak of war and lose thereby their enemy character, provided that the transfer, took bona fide, was not affected either in a blockaded port or while the vessel was in transitu, the vendor did not retain an interest in the vessel or did not stipulate a right to recover or repurchase the vessel after the conclusion of the war, and the transfer was not made in transitu in contemplation of war."

From reading some of the speeches made in the House when the war-risk insurance bill was under consideration, it might be doubted if we have any rights as neutrals.

In the interest of a well-informed public opinion on this subject, and that doubting Thomases may be convinced that we really have some rights that belligerents are bound to respect, we quote (International Law, Oppenheim, "War and neutrality," vol. 2, edition 1906):

"SEC. 297. Neutrality as an attitude of impartiality involves the duty of assisting neither belligerent either actively or passively, but it does not comprise the duty of breaking off all intercourse with the belligerents. Apart from certain restrictions necessitated by impartiality, all intercourse between belligerents and neutrals takes place as before, a condition of peace prevailing between them in spite of the war between the belligerents. This applies particularly to the working of treaties, to diplomatic intercourse, and to trade. But indirectly, of course, the condition of war between belligerents may have a disturbing influence upon intercourse between belligerents and neutrals. Thus the treaty rights of a neutral State may be interfered with through occupation of enemy territory by a belligerent; its subjects living on such territory bear enemy character; its subjects trading with the belligerents are hampered by the right of visit and search and the right of the belligerents to capture blockade runners and contraband of war.

"SEC. 314. There are two rights and two duties deriving from neutrality for neutrals, and likewise two for belligerents. Duties of neutrals are, first, to act toward belligerents in accordance with their attitude of impartiality; and, secondly, to acquiesce in the exercise on the part of either belligerent of his right to punish neutral merchantmen for breach of blockade, carriage of contraband, and carriage of analogous of contraband for the enemy, and accordingly to visit, search, and eventually capture them.

"The duties of either belligerent are, first, to act toward neutrals in accordance with their attitude of impartiality; and, secondly, not to suppress their intercourse, and in especial their commerce, with the enemy.

"Either belligerent has a right to demand impartiality from neutrals, whereas, on the other hand, neutrals have a right to demand such behavior from either belligerent as is in accordance with their attitude of impartiality. Neutrals have a right to demand that their intercourse, and in especial their commerce, with the enemy shall not be suppressed; whereas, on the other hand, either belligerent has the right to punish subjects of neutrals for breach of blockade, carriage of contraband, and the like, and accordingly to visit, search, and capture neutral merchantmen.

"SEC. 398. The guaranteed freedom of commerce making the sale of articles of all kinds to belligerents by subjects of neutrals legitimate, articles of conditional as well as absolute contraband may be supplied by sale of either belligerent by these individuals. And the carriage of such articles by neutral merchantmen on the open sea is, as far as international law is concerned, as legitimate as their sale. The carrier of contraband by no means violates an injunction of the law of nations. But belligerents have by the law of nations the right to prohibit and punish the carriage of contraband by neutral merchantmen, and the carrier of contraband violates, for this reason, an injunction of the belligerent concerned. It is not international law, but the municipal law of the belligerents, which makes carriage of contraband illegitimate and penal.

"The question why the carriage of contraband articles may, nevertheless, be prohibited and punished by the belligerents, although it is quite legitimate as far as international law is concerned, can only be answered by a reference to the historical development of the law of nations. In contradistinction to former practice, which interdicted all trade between neutrals and the enemy, the principle of freedom of commerce between subjects of neutrals and either belligerents has gradually become universally recognized; but this recognition included from the beginning the right of either belligerent to punish carriage of contraband on the sea. And the reason obviously is the necessity for belligerents in the interest of self-preservation to prevent the import of such articles as may strengthen the enemy, and to confiscate the contraband cargo, and eventually the vessel also, as a deterrent to other vessels.

"The present condition of the matter of carriage of contraband is therefore a compromise. In the interest of the generally recognized principle of freedom of commerce between belligerents and subjects of neutrals, international law does not require neutrals to prevent their subjects from carrying contraband; on the other hand, international law empowers either belligerents to prohibit and punish carriage of contraband in the same way as it empowers either belligerents to prohibit and punish breach of blockade."

We should assume that the President and shipping board, in the exercise of any powers granted or duties imposed by this bill, will keep well within our rights as neutrals.

Many of the lines now seeking shelter under the American flag, although American owned, may when the present crisis is passed again pass under foreign flags if it is to their pecuniary advantage to do so.

While we need merchant ships to meet the present emergency, let us pursue a policy that will secure them to us after the present conflict in Europe is passed.

The following table may prove interesting as showing our trade relations with Central and South America at the time the table was prepared. We understand conditions have not changed materially since 1911.

I ask permission to print that table without reading, if the Senate will grant it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Trade between the United States and nations of Central America, Mexico, South America, and the West Indies.

[Imports and domestic exports for the year 1911 into and from the United States. Foreign commerce and navigation 1911, 1091–1124.]

Country.	Imports into the United States.	Exports from the United States.
Nations which by treaty enjoy equal rights with the United States as to direct and indirect trade:		
Honduras	$2,657,009	$2,036,424
Costa Rica [1]	4,838,416	3,434,844
Colombia	8,994,460	4,836,262
Bolivia	327	891,593
Paraguay	34,516	86,986
Argentina	29,090,732	43,753,424
Total	45,615,460	55,099,533
Mexico	57,450,111	60,247,097
Guatemala	2,562,488	2,400,383
Salvador	1,463,792	2,090,053
Nicaragua	1,442,299	2,452,945
Panama	3,506,735	20,790,661
Cuba	110,309,468	59,962,955
Haiti	813,713	5,226,640
Dominican Republic	3,632,453	3,741,197
Venezuela	7,635,256	3,739,030
Ecuador	3,628,805	2,234,998
Peru	9,314,030	5,589,604
Brazil	100,867,184	27,150,672
Chile	19,941,000	12,037,140
Uruguay	1,613,736	5,262,367
Total	324,181,070	212,934,742
Grand total	369,796,530	268,034,275

[1] Treaties protect only the direct trade.

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

The following summary of the Latin-American trade situation, prepared by Hon. John Barrett, director general of the Pan American Union, may be interesting and instructive, as it is of recent date.

Following the receipt by cable this morning (September 6) from Latin-American capitals of the latest commercial data, Director General Barrett, of the Pan American Union, has prepared without delay, for the information of the United States commercial interests, a revised compilation of the very latest figures of Latin-American commerce, of which a brief summary is given below:

The 20 Latin-American countries of Central and South America conducted in 1913 a foreign commerce valued, approximately, at $3,000,000,000. The exact total was $2,870,188,575. Of this total the imports were valued at $1,304,261,736 and the exports at $1,565,916,812. This gives Latin America a favorable balance of $261,655,049.

Of the principal sources of origin of Latin-American imports Great Britain furnishes products valued at $322,036,347; United States, $317,323,294; Germany, $216,010,418; France, $103,220,223; Italy, $55,494,413; Belgium, $48,747,164; Austria-Hungary, $9,026,478; Netherlands, $8,293,859; Switzerland, $6,189,050; all other countries, $217,290,517. Although the United States ranks second, the possibilities for building up its trade are shown by the fact that the total of Latin-American imports, aside from those coming from the United States, amounts nearly to $1,000,000,000, or exactly $986,938,469.

The exports of Latin America, the European market for which is now greatly lessened by the war, amounted in 1913, approximately, to $1,566,000,000. Of this total the United States was the greatest purchaser, taking products valued at $504,378,212. Then came other countries as follows: Great Britain, $316,419,914; Germany, $192,394,702; France, $120,907,415; Belgium, $62,557,566; Netherlands, $43,277,631; Italy, $27,964,001; Austria-Hungary, $23,294,991; all other countries, $247,722,380. Although, therefore, it will be seen that Latin America sells in large quantities to North America, she exports to other countries, the majority of which are engaged in war, products valued at $1,061,538,600.

These statistics are obvious evidence of the present United States responsibility and opportunity in Latin-American commerce, and of the immediate necessity of a readjustment of international trade conditions for the benefit not only of the United States, but of the Latin-American countries.

As a part of the report there is appended Senate Document 601, Sixty-third Congress, second session, entitled "American Merchant Marine, an article prepared by the Southern Com-

mercial Congress on the proposed establishment of a merchant marine," which I will read:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine of the House of Representatives in its report of September 8, 1914, on the Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States said:

"We shall not discuss the desirability of having an American merchant marine. We will assume that there is no difference of opinion on that point."

No one can honestly take issue with that statement of the committee.

In order to establish an American merchant marine the above committee, after full deliberation, favorably reported a bill authorizing the Government, acting through a shipping board composed of members of the Cabinet, under the direction of the President, to acquire and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, these vessels also to be available as naval auxiliaries.

There is an idea abroad that this bill is a war emergency measure. This is not so. In its report the committee says:

"The fact that we pay a sum variously estimated to be from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 annually to vessels under foreign flags, to transport our commerce, which seriously affects our balance of trade, is urged as a sufficient reason why we should have a merchant marine of our own; but this is only one of many reasons."

Long before the beginning of the present war the need for an American merchant marine was so keenly felt that the Senate passed a bill known as the Weeks bill, which proposed to use naval vessels as a nucleus for an American merchant marine.

Objections to the shipping bill now before Congress has developed from two sources. It was to be expected that there would be objection by shipping interests which have been reaping the benefit of American inactivity in the foreign shipping trade. It was also to be expected that certain financial interests and their affiliations, especially those interested in foreign shipping, would object to a Government merchant marine.

Opponents to the bill have advanced arguments to sustain their position, but not one of them will stand analysis. Many newspapers and periodicals are opposing the bill, but the fact that they enjoy considerable advertising and other patronage from the steamship lines and the financial interests that are opposing the bill may go far toward explaining their position on this great question of an American merchant marine.

Mr. President, that is a serious charge against the newspapers of the country, inasmuch as not only the great newspapers in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia are opposing this bill, but the truth is that all over the country newspapers that can not by any possibility derive any financial benefit from advertising for the shipping interests of the country are opposing it, and the fact is significant.

(1) Opponents to the bill say that there are a large number of ships at present in American harbors unable to get cargoes; hence there is no need for a Government merchant marine.

A recent investigation has proven this not to be true. Ships seek cargoes at all times, but the present chartering market is very firm, and when the question of foreign credits is settled and commerce begins to move, as it must very shortly, there will be a positive famine in ships, as over 5,000,000 tons of German and Austrian shipping are completely out of commission, to say nothing of the large number of British, French, and Russian merchant ships which have been taken over by their respective Governments for transports and naval auxiliaries.

There are, all told, considerably less than 100 American ships in the foreign trade in the whole world, including all of the ships which have just taken American registry to secure the protection of the flag on account of the war.

I think, Mr. President, the author of this paper will revise his figures when he makes a careful inquiry concerning the number of American ships that are now engaged in the foreign trade in the whole world, and will place the figure at a very much higher number.

None of these ships are idle. Therefore, even though there were hundreds of idle ships in every American harbor, it would not alter the necessity for passing the shipping bill now before Congress, as all such ships would be foreign ships, and the object of this bill is to establish an American merchant marine.

(2) Opponents to the bill say that if the Government will not enter the shipping business private capital will provide an American merchant marine.

This is rather inconsistent with their statement that the harbors are full of idle ships, for, if that is true, private capital will find no attraction in the shipping business.

What likelihood is there to obtain private capital for this new business, especially to the amount contemplated by the shipping bill, $40,000,000, when long-established, going concerns find it impossible to obtain money except at heavy rates?

When the city of New York must pay 7 per cent, including bankers' commissions, for a loan of $100,000,000; when the State of Tennessee found it most difficult to obtain a loan of $1,400,000, it is quite certain that private capital will be unable to provide an American merchant marine, especially as it did nothing in the matter while the opportunity was open during the past 50 years.

(3) Opponents to the bill say that the Government will lose much money in this business.

This argument has been their favorite one. The bugaboo of increased taxes, "loss of the initial investment every three years," and much more of the same nature has been circulated in an effort to defeat the bill.

The shipping business is one of the most profitable in the world. Special Diplomatic and Consular Reports, page 39, says:

"The White Star Line, in 1910, earned a net profit of £540,000 on a capital of £750,000 after writing off £370,016 for depreciation. A dividend of 30 per cent was paid in that year."

The Holland Amerika Line earned about 50 per cent net on its capital during the fiscal year of 1913. The Hamburg-American Line earned about 30 per cent net during its fiscal year of 1913. These are only a few specific instances of steamship-line earnings. They are not at all unusual, but are the regular thing in the shipping business.

F. E. Dixon & Co., of London, who own and operate a large fleet of "tramp" freighters, showed earnings of about 50 per cent net last year, which proves that steamship earnings are large in the irregular services as well as in the regular lines. In fact, the profits in the steamship business are so large that frequently the entire cost of a ship is earned in two years.

Now, Mr. President, think of that! Yet private parties and private corporations will not engage in the business when it is said the profits are so large that the entire cost of the ship is earned in two years. It is absurd on the face of it.

The question will arise, Why have not Americans gone into such profitable business? The answer is, For the same reason that Americans have neglected the vast foreign export trade. They have been too busy with their industries at home.

But, unlike the export trade, which each manufacturer can work up individually, to establish an adequate merchant marine is so large an undertaking at this time and involves so large an amount of money that if it is to be done at all it must be done by the Government.

(4) Opponents to the bill say that there will be danger of the United States violating neutrality if it operates merchant ships at this time.

The report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine says:

"We have rights as neutrals as well as duties to be observed. * * * The President will have the State Department to advise him on all questions affecting our rights and duties as neutrals. * * * We should assume that the President and shipping board, in the exercise of any powers granted or duties imposed by this bill, will keep well within our rights as neutrals."

On this point the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, also says:

"The board proposed in this bill consists really of the President of the United States and certain Cabinet officers therein mentioned. I think there is no more punctilious citizen of the United States with respect to the neutrality of this country than the President of the United States. I think you may safely depend on it, if this bill is passed and this board is vested with power to act, that that power will be exercised in such a way that the neutrality of this country will be preserved."

(5) Opponents to the bill make an alternative proposition that we should build up an American merchant marine by granting subsidies.

Subsidy seekers have managed to create a belief that the merchant marines of European countries, especially the merchant marines of the two greatest maritime countries in the world, Great Britain and Germany, have been built up by granting subsidies to its shipping. Neither of these countries grants subsidies except to a very limited extent and for very special service.

Mr. President, Great Britain grants to its shipping in various forms $10,000,000 a year. It does not make any great difference whether it is in subsidies or in mail subventions or in any other way, she makes that contribution to the shipping of the Empire, and we are up against it to that extent.

The Hamburg-American Line, the largest and perhaps the most successful steamship company in the world, has never received a subsidy.

Possibly not a direct subsidy, Mr. President, and yet the German Government, owning the railroads of the Empire, grants all kinds of concessions to the shipping interests of Germany in the way of reduced rates on the carriage of their products, and in various other ways they grant subventions to the shipping interests of that country.

A moderate subsidy was granted by Great Britain to the Cunard Co. in connection with the steamers *Mauretania* and *Lusitania*, but that was chiefly to keep the Cunard Co. from selling out to the International Mercantile Marine, the combination organized by J. P. Morgan & Co. Over 90 per cent of the total tonnage of Great Britain does not receive a farthing of subsidy.

A modest subsidy indeed. It is a notorious fact that the English Government advanced $13,000,000 to build the *Mauretania* and *Lusitania*, with the provision that it should be paid back, I believe, at the rate of 2 per cent by the owners of those great vessels if they ever got ready to pay it back; and it was to be paid back in the shape of mail subventions. Suppose the Government of the United States should put up one-half that amount to allow the New York Shipbuilding Co. to build two great ocean greyhounds, what would be said about it? Yet they say it was not a subsidy to the Cunard Co.

It has been to me rather amusing and irritating sometimes to have this constant iteration of the statement that no subsidies are paid to the shipping of foreign countries, when the truth is that Great Britain alone pays annually over $10,000,000, and the entire amount that Great Britain, Germany, France, Japan, and other nations pay aggregate at least $50,000,000. Turn to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation and see what he says about that. Yet a gentleman representing the Southern Commercial Congress repeats parrotlike the statement that the merchant shipping of Great Britain and Germany is not receiving any subsidies or subventions from their Government. The author of that statement is either not well informed, or he is not honest in his views.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just for a question. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that many of the critics on the other side of the Chamber of the subsidy plan voted in the last tariff law to give a preference to shipments made in American

bottoms? To be sure, the department has very wisely held, I think, that that exemption interferes with our treaty rights or treaty obligations, but nevertheless that constituted, did it not, a subsidy? Is not that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have to-day stated, as I have stated several times before, that from my viewpoint, if the Government is to receive a dollar in import duties and it goes into the Treasury of the United States, and the Government pays out 5 cents of it, it is not different from having it halted before it gets into the Treasury of the United States, out of which 5 cents is taken and given to the shipping. I can not see any difference in the principle. Of course, it is in the nature of a subsidy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is a sort of preferential duty, and to that extent must it not constitute a subsidy?

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly so. I will now conclude the reading of this report:

> It will surprise many to know that the United States pays a larger subsidy to four American ships owned by the International Mercantile Marine, namely, the *New York, Philadelphia, St. Paul,* and *St. Louis,* than is paid by any foreign nation for similar service—

The author of this paper has made a discovery that no one else has ever discovered—

> This country pays to these ships an annual subsidy of about $735,000, and obtains practically nothing in return for this except the carrying of the mails on these steamers, which, at regular rates, would amount to only a trifling fraction of the amount of the subsidy. As a matter of fact, most of our mail goes forward on foreign ships, as they are much faster and they sail more frequently, the subsidized American ships being among the smallest and most out-of-date steamers in the North Atlantic trade.

We are paying, Mr. President, a little over the amount to foreign ships that we have paid to American ships for the carriage of our mails; but the report of the committee which I have read to-day frankly says that is because we have not American ships to do the work. The principle of giving a mail subvention to ships is a universal custom among the maritime nations of the world, and to say that the subventions to these American ships for the carriage of the mails is larger than the subvention paid to the ships of Great Britain is an absurdity not worthy of discussion.

> The extraordinary large profits in the steamship business show that steamships can be operated profitably under the American flag without a subsidy, in spite of the somewhat higher wages and better living requirements of American seamen; therefore it will be well-nigh impossible to obtain a subsidy simply to make up the extra profits possible under foreign flags.

Mr. President, the gentleman writing this paper is an official of the Southern Commercial Congress, and I wish to inquire of that gentleman, or some one in his behalf, why, if this be so, he does not invite the congress which he represents, composed of business men, not only in the South but, to some extent, in the North, to go into this business of shipping?

> The extraordinary large profits in the steamship business show that steamships can be operated profitably under the American flag without a subsidy, in spite of the somewhat higher wages and better living requirements of American seamen; therefore it will be well-nigh impossible to obtain a subsidy simply to make up the extra profits possible under foreign flags. For the same reason we will never have an American merchant marine unless it is established by the Government, because such private capital as may go into the foreign shipping business will operate under foreign flags to get the benefit of cheaper operation when the dangers of war are passed.
>
> The present war has made it possible to secure, at most favorable prices, an excellent choice of modern, up-to-date steamers of different nationalities, also many steamers not yet out of the builders' hands, hence not yet nationalized, at less than the contract price. Also, as a result of the war, the financial success of the enterprise is more fully assured, as we will not have the competition of the warring nations to the same extent that we would have in times of peace.

Does anyone believe that this handful of ships the Government is either going to build or buy will have any appreciable influence upon the great trade over the oceans of the world, when England alone has four or five thousand cargo ships engaged in that trade and is to-day rapidly building more ships? This writer continues:

> The $40,000,000 called for by the shipping bill will not be an expense, as the bill's opponents are pleased to call it, but it will be an investment of the first class, without considering the enormous advantage to the whole people of the United States in having an American merchant marine under Government control and the great reduction in rates that will be possible, as the Government will not desire net earnings of from 30 to 50 per cent on its investment, but will be content with only a fair return.
>
> It would be little short of a political and economic crime if we did not avail ourselves of the present almost unbelievable opportunity to do in a most practical manner that which Congress was endeavoring to do before the commencement of the war as best it could by means of the Weeks bill.

Mr. President, the custom of the Senate has been of late to meet at 11 o'clock and take a recess at 6 o'clock. The hour of 6 o'clock has passed, and I wish to inquire of the other side whether they propose to take a recess or an adjournment at this hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire asks the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] a question.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observe, Mr. President, that the Senator from Indiana did not hear me. I stated that the custom of late had been that the Senate should convene at 11 o'clock and take a recess or adjournment not later than 6 o'clock. I do not know whether or not for any reason that rule has been departed from.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say that we do not desire to take a recess now; we wish to proceed until at least 9 o'clock before we take a recess.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I think we ought to repeal all our eight-hour laws on the statute books if that is the decision of the majority of this body. It is not going to shorten this discussion by imposing arbitrary and cruel conditions upon the minority, and I hope the majority will reconsider their decision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. ASHURST.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make the point of order that there has been no business transacted since the last call for a quorum.

Mr. GALLINGER. The roll call has commenced.

Mr. SMOOT. The roll call has begun.

Mr. FLETCHER. There has been no response; and I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair has but recently assumed the chair, and does not know what has taken place in the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Nothing has taken place except the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has been speaking.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not particularly care to bring the question before the Senate at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the Senator had better withdraw his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida, the Chair thinks, has the floor. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield, then, until the Senator from Florida gets through.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply desired to raise the point of order, as the Senator from Utah suggested the absence of a quorum, that——

Mr. SMOOT. I do not particularly care to raise a question at this time on the point, and I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent that it be now withdrawn. If it is satisfactory, Mr. President, I ask that my request for a quorum be withdrawn at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not care to put the situation exactly as the Senator from Utah may want it. I do not want any business to transpire. That is the reason why I have made the point of order. To have the question ruled on by the Chair and to ask unanimous consent for something is business. That may be the purpose of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from Florida mistakes the object of the Senator from Utah. The Senator from Utah does not want to take any advantage at all of the Senator from Florida, nor does he want that question discussed to-night. Therefore, as I understood the Senator from New Hampshire has yielded the floor——

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I have not yielded the floor at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire has not yielded the floor?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not. I made a suggestion to Senators on the other side of the Chamber as to what the purpose was. We have not been notified that we were to be held here to an unusual hour to-night, and so I made an inquiry; that was all. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I was mistaken. I thought the Senator from New Hampshire had yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. SMOOT. Therefore, if I am mistaken as to the situation——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent to withdraw the suggestion of the absence of

a quorum. The Chair thinks it doubtful whether or not the request is in order; but the Chair will rule, if there is no objection, that the Senator has permission to withdraw his suggestion as to a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] claims that he is entitled to the floor, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I have occupied the floor for 7 hours and 20 minutes to-day, while I am about as fresh as when I began, and could accommodate our friends on the other side for another 7 hours, if they wanted to not listen to me, and inasmuch as I shall have abundant opportunity later on to continue the discussion, I yield the floor for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not see that the suggestion is any more in order now than it was before. No business has intervened. The Senator from New Hampshire simply yields the floor. There has been no further business; and I make the point of order that the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is not in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is business.

Mr. SMOOT. A Senator yielding the floor is not taking him off the floor; the whole question is open before the Senate for any business to be attended to.

Mr. GALLINGER. For anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Overman	Sterling
Bristow	Hollis	Page	Swanson
Chilton	Hughes	Perkins	Thompson
Clapp	James	Pittman	Thornton
Crawford	Jones	Pomerene	Tillman
Cummins	Kern	Sheppard	Walsh
Dillingham	La Follette	Shively	Williams
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Simmons	
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Smoot	

Mr. THORNTON. I am requested to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. RANSDELL], and ask that this announcement stand for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. STONE, and Mr. WHITE answered to their names when called.

Mr. BRYAN, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. LIPPITT entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. KERN. I move that at not later than 9 o'clock this evening the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana, that at not later than 9 o'clock the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] and vote "yea." I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], but by its terms I am privileged to vote when it is necessary to make a quorum. Apparently that condition exists, and accordingly I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRYAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. JAMES (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], but under the terms of that pair I have a right to vote on this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but under the conditions of a notice which I gave him some time ago I have a right to vote whenever it seems necessary to make a quorum. I therefore vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Ashurst	Kern	Reed	Stone
Bryan	La Follette	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chilton	Lane	Shafroth	Thomas
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thompson
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shields	Thornton
Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Tillman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
James	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
Johnson	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams

NAYS—6.

Bristow	Cummins	Perkins	Smoot
Clapp	Page		

NOT VOTING—54.

Bankhead	Dillingham	McCumber	Sherman
Borah	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Md.
Brady	Fall	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Stephenson
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Camden	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Catron	Hughes	Oliver	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Owen	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Penrose	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	Weeks
Colt	Lewis	Ransdell	Works
Crawford	Lippitt	Robinson	
Culberson	Lodge	Root	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum has not voted. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	James	Page	Stone
Bristow	Johnson	Pomerene	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Reed	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kern	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chilton	La Follette	Sheppard	Thornton
Dillingham	Lane	Shields	Tillman
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Simmons	White
Gore	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Overman	Smoot	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SHIVELY, and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to state that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is still detained at his home by sickness in his family.

Mr. OLIVER, Mr. LODGE, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. STERLING, Mr. WARREN, Mr. ROOT, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. LIPPITT, and Mr. CATRON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Indiana that not later than 9 o'clock this evening the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on a former roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). With the same explanation that I made on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I renew the statement I made with reference to the transfer of my pair from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and I will let that statement remain in force until the Senator from South Carolina returns to the city.

The result was—yeas 34, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Kern	Reed	Stone
Bryan	La Follette	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Shafroth	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Thornton
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Tillman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	White
James	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Johnson	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—2.

Bristow	Smoot

NOT VOTING—59.

Bankhead	Dillingham	McCumber	Root
Borah	du Pont	McLean	Sherman
Brady	Fall	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Stephenson
Camden	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	Hitchcock	Oliver	Sutherland
Clapp	Hughes	Owen	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Page	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Penrose	Walsh
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Warren
Crawford	Lewis	Poindexter	Weeks
Culberson	Lippitt	Ransdell	Works
Cummins	Lodge	Robinson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum has voted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact——

Mr. SMOOT. There is nothing in order but to develop a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson	Pittman	Smoot
Brandegee	Jones	Reed	Stone
Bristow	Kenyon	Robinson	Swanson
Bryan	Kern	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chamberlain	La Follette	Shafroth	Thornton
Chilton	Lane	Sheppard	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Shields	Walsh
Fletcher	Lodge	Shively	Williams
Gore	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
James	Overman	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one Senator are present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. PAGE, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. ROOT, Mr. STERLING, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. WHITE answered to their names when called.

Mr. OLIVER, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. CATRON, Mr. LIPPITT, and Mr. WARREN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] that at not later than 9 o'clock the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before the roll call begins again——

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a point of order. Pending the call of the roll no other business is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No roll call has begun. We tried a roll call on the motion and failed to secure a quorum, and we have been forced to go to a call of the Senate to see whether a quorum is present. A new roll call may now begin, but it has not yet begun, and therefore it is not pending. The first name has not been called.

What I desire to suggest for the consideration of the Chair, pending this call, is that no rule of the Senate requires, when the roll call on a motion fails to disclose a quorum, that at once the roll of the Senate shall be called for a quorum. There is no rule of the Senate which requires anything of the kind, and it is within the discretion of the Senate to determine what action shall be taken when the vote upon the motion of the Senator from Indiana fails to disclose a quorum. I ask before any procedure is had on the call for a quorum after this vote is had that the Senate may have an opportunity to give direction on the subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this rests on a higher ground than the rules. It rests on the Constitution. No business can be done without the constitutional quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Except to force the presence of a quorum.

Mr. LODGE. Except a motion to adjourn or to produce a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would suggest, then, that the action be taken to procure a quorum without another roll call.

Mr. LODGE. We have a quorum now. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know. I am submitting the suggestion to the Presiding Officer for his consideration. I shall bring it up when the roll call has been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRYAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and vote "yea." I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as on the former roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], but with the condition that I have a right to vote to make a quorum. I desire this announcement to stand in the present condition. I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement that I made before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). With the same explanation made upon the last roll call, which explanation I ask to stand for the balance of the day, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON. Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. He was here when the roll was called a few moments ago and is in the cloakroom now. Under those circumstances, I feel that I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	Kern	Saulsbury	Thomas
Bryan	Lane	Shafroth	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thornton
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Shields	Tillman
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Walsh
Gore	Overman	Simmons	White
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson	Reed	Stone	
Kenyon	Robinson	Swanson	

NAYS—3.

Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Smoot

NOT VOTING—56.

Bankhead	Cummins	Lippitt	Ransdell
Borah	Dillingham	McCumber	Root
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Sherman
Brandegee	Fall	Myers	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Stephenson
Camden	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sterling
Catron	Hitchcock	Oliver	Sutherland
Clapp	Hughes	Owen	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Vardaman
Colt	La Follette	Penrose	Warren
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Weeks
Culberson	Lewis	Poindexter	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Indiana is carried.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of no quorum on that vote. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. LODGE. The Constitution says:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members in such a manner and under such penalties as each House may provide.

It is perfectly clear, Mr. President, when the point of no quorum is made, where the roll call discloses the absence of a quorum, that no business can be done. Otherwise we are going contrary to the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll was called upon the motion and then a quorum was developed. March 20, 1912, a similar question was before the Senate and Vice President Sherman ruled on it. The Chair asks the Secretary to read from page 530 of Gilfy's Precedents.

The Secretary read as follows:

26. MEMBER HELD AS PRESENT TO MAKE A QUORUM, AS DISCLOSED BY THE ROLL CALL JUST HAD FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASCERTAINING THAT FACT.

[62d Cong., 2d sess.; J., p. 221, Mar. 20, 1912.]

An omnibus pension bill being under consideration,
On motion by Mr. SMITH of Georgia, to amend the bill by striking out, on page 1, lines 6 to 10, inclusive, as follows:
The name of Thomas Jefferson, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
After debate,
On motion by Mr. MCCUMBER, to lay the amendment on the table,
Mr. SMITH of Georgia demanded a division of the Senate.
On the question to agree to the motion to lay the amendment proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia on the table,
The yeas were 21 and the nays were 5.
The number of Senators voting not constituting a quorum.
The Vice President [Mr. Sherman] directed the roll to be called;
When,
Forty-nine Senators answered to their names.
A quorum being present.
The question being again taken on the motion by Mr. MCCUMBER, to lay the amendment proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia on the table,
On a division of the Senate,
The yeas were 31 and the nays were 8.
So the amendment was laid on the table.
Mr. SMITH of Georgia raised a question of order, viz, that the Senators voting did not constitute a quorum, and therefore the laying of the amendment proposed by him on the table was not in order.
The Vice President [Mr. Sherman] overruled the point of order, and held that, while a quorum had not voted, a quorum was present, as disclosed by the roll call just had for the purpose of ascertaining that fact. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3674–3678.)

Mr. JAMES. That settles it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS and others. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember well the occasion referred to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAMES. That is not in order.

Mr. STONE. I make the point that we have just had a roll call and that nothing has been done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. JAMES. Just a moment before the roll call is ordered. Does the Senator from Utah make the point of order with the knowledge that there are about 14 Republicans in the cloakroom, who come out here on propitious occasions and then retire upon other occasions not so propitious?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Kenyon	Robinson	Stone
Bryan	Kern	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Shafroth	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Thornton
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Tillman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Johnson	Reed	Smoot	

Mr. KENYON. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators are present—not a quorum. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. PAGE responded to their names when called.

Mr. OLIVER, Mr. ROOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. LIPPITT entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon the pending amendment to the shipping bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn; and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has moved that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has already determined that at the hour of 9 o'clock they will take a recess, and therefore a motion to adjourn is not in order.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. Senators will allow me to state my point of order. The point of order is that the Senate has already determined to take a recess, and therefore a motion to adjourn is not in order.

Mr. SMOOT. The motion was to take a recess "at not later than 9 o'clock."

Mr. JAMES. The motion to adjourn would not be in order until the motion to recess has been reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the form of the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know the exact terms of the motion of the Senator from Indiana; whether the motion was that not later than 9 or at 9 o'clock the Senate take a recess.

Mr. JAMES. The point of order I make——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the point of order made by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Is that the motion of the Senator from Utah is to adjourn, and as the Senate has already adopted the motion of the Senator from Indiana to take a recess——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the point on which the Chair desires enlightenment. The Chair desires to know exactly what the motion of the Senator from Indiana was.

Mr. JAMES. The motion of the Senator from Indiana was that at not later than 9 o'clock the Senate should take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow. Therefore, a motion to adjourn, which would bring in the morning hour, in which two or three hours could be filibustered away, is not in order. The very purpose of the motion of the Senator from Indiana was to prevent such a filibuster as has been going on; and the attempt now is to further such a filibuster.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No business has been transacted since.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, Rule XXII states that—

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but to adjourn.

Under the rules of this body a motion to adjourn is in order at any time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. REED. The point of order I make is that this question is not debatable, unless the Chair expressly states that he desires light on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know its terms, and he would like to have the exact terms of the motion of the Senator from Indiana stated.

Mr. KERN. Let the motion be read by the Reporter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the record be read.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no question about that.

Mr. JAMES. The point of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] would be well taken—that is, that a motion to adjourn would be in order at any time—if the Senate had not previously determined that it would take a recess, but the Senate having determined that it would take a recess at not later than a certain hour, a motion to adjourn is not in order. The only possible motion that the Senator from Utah could properly make would be a motion to reconsider the former action taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to understand the form of the motion of the Senator from Indiana; and he calls on the Reporter to read the motion. The Chair can not rule on the point of order until he knows the form in which the motion of the Senator from Indiana was put.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the rules of the Senate are more important than the question whether we shall take a recess at 9 o'clock or adjourn. My opinion is that the Chair is mistaken in the view——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is satisfied about the form of the motion made by the Senator from Indiana. The motion as made by the Senator from Indiana reads:

I move that at not later than 9 o'clock—

That does not mean that the Senate can not adjourn sooner than 9 o'clock.

Mr. KERN. But the motion was to take a recess to a time certain. The Senate has determined that when the recess is taken it will be to a time certain to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana moved that at not later than——

Mr. KERN. The motion of the Senator from Utah is a motion to adjourn generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That at not later than 9 o'clock this evening the Senate take a recess——

Mr. KERN. Until 11 o'clock to-morrow. The pending motion is a motion to adjourn, and it carries the Senate over until 12 o'clock to-morrow, which is a reconsideration of the vote on agreeing to the motion to take a recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has already acted and declared that it will meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and that a recess will be taken at not later than 9 o'clock to-night.

Mr. KERN. But, Mr. President, the motion to adjourn, which is now pending, carries us over until 12 o'clock to-morrow. The original motion was for a recess.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the point at which the Chair, in my opinion, erred was in holding that on a yea-and-nay vote less than a quorum could vote to take a recess, unless there were enough Senators in the Chamber not voting but paired to make a quorum. The precedent cited by the Chair, in my judgment, did not sustain the position——

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that that question has been settled and is therefore not before the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. I think it is in the discretion of the Chair to hear a discussion of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the right to make a statement, and the Chair will recognize the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. The precedent cited, Mr. President, was this: The absence of a quorum was suggested and the roll was called and a quorum developed. Then a motion was made by the Senator from Georgia and a division was called for—not the yeas and nays. That is, as I understand, what occurred. A certain number stood up on one side and a certain number on the other side, and then Vice President Sherman ruled that upon a division the motion was carried. It was not carried as the result of a yea-and-nay vote.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that paragraph 3 of Rule V justifies the Chair in going this far, that when the absence of a quorum is suggested the roll is thereupon called and the presence of a quorum is ascertained and the question pending, as in this instance, being a motion to take a recess and a yea-and-nay vote is had upon that motion, as a result of which it develops that a quorum has not voted, I believe then the Chair has the right, on motion, to request the attendance of absent Senators, and upon their failure to attend upon request to compel their attendance, but when they come into the Chamber it is not necessary for them to answer "present" in order to ascertain again if a quorum is present, but as they come in they should be required to vote upon the pending question. Now let us see. Paragraph 3 of Rule V reads as follows:

Whenever upon such roll call—

That is, when the absence of a quorum is suggested—

it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion except to adjourn shall be in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for a moment there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that refers to the situation when there is the suggestion of an absence of a quorum and not when the absence of a quorum develops as the result of a vote. If the Senator will read paragraph 2 that will be made clear.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand exactly. When any Senator suggests the absence of a quorum, then the roll must be called to ascertain whether a quorum is present or not.

Mr. SMOOT. That relates to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum and not to the situation when the lack of a quorum is developed on a roll call.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, when a quorum is not developed upon that roll call, it is the right of the Senate to request the attendance of absent Senators, or, if, in its judgment, it is necessary, to compel the attendance; but the rule does not say that when Senators attend they shall answer "here," instead of answering "yea" or "nay." There is nothing in the rule to require that procedure to take place.

It is certain, Mr. President, that the Senate has always been very careful to withhold from the Vice President or the Presiding Officer the right or the privilege of suggesting the absence of a quorum; and yet, if it be true that upon the failure of a quorum to vote on any pending question, the Vice President or the Chair has the right to direct, or can direct, the roll to be called to ascertain the presence of a quorum, in effect that is suggesting the absence of a quorum. There is nothing in the rules requiring him or permitting him to do that, and the Senate never intended that the Chair should have that power or right.

Mr. President, the rules of the Senate are not as full and complete as are the rules of the House; but in order that it may be known exactly what the situation is I will read the rule of the House, or that portion of it which is material:

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn there shall be a call of the House——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This discussion is going on out of order; but the Chair appreciates that the Senator desires his views to be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. BRYAN. The rule continues:

and the Sergeant at Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and after the roll call is completed each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant at Arms before the House.

Our rule on the subject is not as explicit as that; but there is nothing in the rule to require the Chair or to permit the Chair to suggest the absence of a quorum. So it seems to me it is permissible for the Chair to direct absent Senators as they come into the Chamber to vote upon the question then pending.

Mr. President, for one, I am not willing to concede that when the yeas and nays have been ordered on a motion to take a recess or on a motion to adjourn less than a quorum, counting those paired and present, can take that action.

I think the Chair is perfectly justified, when the presence of a quorum is developed, in holding that on the next motion to take a recess absent Senators as they come in shall be required to vote upon that motion. That will very quickly end the difficulty.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has said what I wanted to add when I was taken off the floor in relation to the precedent that was cited by the Senator from Georgia, because the Senator from Florida has stated the case exactly as it was. It was not on the call of the yeas and nays, but it was on a division. I do not want to take any more time on that, but I do want to call the attention of the Chair to Rule V, which has been referred to. I want Senators to follow me in reading Rule V, paragraph 2 and paragraph 3, and they will see that it applies only where the absence of a quorum is suggested. Paragraph 2 reads:

If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the presiding officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

Paragraph 3 reads:

Whenever upon such roll call—

Such roll call; it is not a motion.

Mr. BRYAN. No.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT (reading)—

Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel, the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is that raised by the Senator from Kentucky as to whether a motion to adjourn is in order. The Chair would like to hear the Senator upon that question. The Chair has already decided the other question and does not propose to change his decision. The Chair would like to hear the Senator on the pending question.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, my object in rising was to say that I will not agree to the proposition that upon a yea-and-nay vote, with less than a quorum present, the Senate can take any action except to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the principle is the same, and has ruled.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I do not see why there should be any criticism of the decision of the Chair. The yeas and

nays are ordered, not to ascertain the presence of a quorum but to find out whether a man votes affirmatively or negatively. It is simply an evidence of the presence of a quorum. There is no difference between a yea-and-nay vote as evidence and a division, which is made to ascertain the affirmative or negative of a proposition. Vice President Sherman declared that a quorum having been ascertained previously, and being present, they had a right to declare the question carried when a majority voted. It is simply evidence, and not a bit more evidence on a yea-and-nay vote than it is on a division. There are certain things of which the Chair must take cognizance. It seems to me upon this point that we have decided to take a recess, which is different from a motion to adjourn; and if it is contrary to it, the only way to remove it is by a motion to reconsider. I do not see how we can have two contrary motions. We have decided to take a recess, not later than 9 o'clock, until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, and a motion now to adjourn would be contrary to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question before the Senate—whether or not a motion to adjourn is in order under these circumstances.

Mr. LODGE. On the point of order now pending, if the Chair will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to hear from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Never before, Mr. President, have I heard it suggested that a motion to adjourn was out of order if business had intervened since the previous vote. The Constitution excepts the motion to adjourn from all other business. I turn hastily to one or two of the general authorities here in regard to the matter. I will first point out that our own rules give it precedence over every other motion when business has intervened.

Mr. Reed was a great master of parliamentary law and was not a friend of delay. In his manual he says:

> Motion to adjourn—Highly privileged.—The motion to adjourn is a motion which enables the assembly to rest from its labors, and is highly privileged. It is frequently said that a motion to adjourn is always in order, but there are too many exceptions for the rule to be so succinctly laid down. A motion to adjourn can not take a Member from the floor, can not interrupt the verification of a vote, and can not be entertained while an assembly is dividing. It can not be repeated until some business has intervened, and in the United States House of Representatives it yields to the presentation of a conference report.

Those are the only exceptions stated.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. SWANSON. That is true; it is always in order except where the legislative will has expressed itself otherwise, and the only way you can change the legislative will when it has once expressed itself is to move to reconsider. We say this motion is contrary to the motion to take a recess; and where the legislative will has expressed itself definitely the right way to change that will is to move to reconsider. That principle of parliamentary law—that where the legislative will has once expressed itself it must remain in force until it is reconsidered—changes the general parliamentary law that a motion to adjourn is always in order, provided the legislative will has not been otherwise expressed.

Mr. LODGE. This is the first time I ever heard stated the exception referred to by the Senator from Virginia, and it is not found in any of the books, if they are of any value.

I will now read from Cushing:

> As it always must necessarily be within the power of the House to bring its sittings to a close for the day—for otherwise it would seem that it might be kept sitting against its will and for an indefinite time—a motion to adjourn may be made at any time, with one exception, namely, when the question of adjournment has just previously been put and decided in the negative. If this motion, therefore, is made and seconded whilst any other question is pending, it takes precedence of such question, and if decided in the affirmative that question is, of course, interrupted and superseded without being decided either in the affirmative or negative.
>
> No expression of the legislative will can deprive a legislative body of the power of adjournment; otherwise it could be kept in eternal session.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senate has made an order that not later than 9 o'clock this evening the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my point is that no action of the Senate can supersede the motion to adjourn.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. LODGE. It is a question of the highest privilege. It is the first motion. It takes precedence of every other motion. It is vital to the life of the assembly. It can not be set aside by any arrangement whatever. We have just set aside an arrangement of the Senate which is a standing rule—to adjourn until 12 o'clock. We have just set it aside by a motion to recess to a day certain. It takes precedence of that motion.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. KERN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts hold that when an order of the Senate has been made and entered, by a deliberate vote of the Senate, that it will recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, that order may be vacated and rendered nugatory by a motion to adjourn?

Mr. LODGE. Why, unquestionably, by a majority vote to adjourn. If the Senate, as frequently happens, agrees that it will adjourn at 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock or at whatever hour you please, that does not cut off a motion to adjourn before that time; and a motion to adjourn takes precedence of a motion to take a recess.

Mr. KERN. The Senator's position is, then, as I understand, that after an order of the Senate has been deliberately made by a vote of the Senate it may be vacated without a motion to reconsider?

Mr. LODGE. Why, certainly, Mr. President; it may be vacated by a motion which takes precedence of it.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the precedence exists only before the vote is taken. If you do not make your motion to adjourn before a vote is taken on the motion to take a recess, it does not take precedence after the legislative will has expressed itself. You are entitled to have a vote on adjourning first. If you wanted to adjourn instead of voting to take a recess, you should have made the motion; then the issue would have been made. You failed to do that, however, and waived your precedence, and the legislative will has expressed itself for a recess.

The rule is that during the legislative session you can not possibly have one law passed contrary to another, because after the legislative will on the subject has expressed itself the only way it can be gotten rid of is under the rule which allows a motion to reconsider to be made in a limited time, which I think is three days. There never will be a termination of questions that have been voted on if the decision can be gotten rid of without a motion to reconsider. If the Senator will read further in that book on reconsideration and the settlement of matters, he will find that it has been decided by all writers on parliamentary law that the only way to change the legislative will when once expressed is to avail yourself of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. LODGE. It does not touch the motion to adjourn.

Mr. SWANSON. The motion to adjourn was entitled to precedence. The Senator failed to make it, and the legislative will expressed itself in favor of a recess.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. He uses the expression "the legislative will." What legislative will does he mean, the will of a single house of a legislative assembly or the will of both bodies?

Mr. SWANSON. Possibly "legislative will" would mean the decision of both bodies, and therefore it might be an inapt term; but I mean that the will of the Senate, as expressed, is that not later than 9 o'clock to-night we shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow. The only way you can get rid of that legislative will is to move to reconsider under the rules.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think anything can shut off a motion to adjourn except the exception stated in all the authorities.

Mr. KERN. If the Senator will allow me one word further, the motion I made sometime ago that the Senate take a recess at an hour certain, is a motion that has been very frequently made. The records of Congress are full of precedents for that motion. I undertake to say that in no instance has that motion ever been vacated by a motion to adjourn. We make the motion here almost every day. It has been made every month; it has been made every year—a motion that at a certain time the Senate will take a recess; and that is final. It has not been undertaken, heretofore, to vacate that order by a motion to adjourn. The motion is made and carried. The Members of the Senate have a right to rely upon it. They do rely upon it. They have always relied upon it. They go their ways. They understand, when they leave the Chamber, as to the time of the meeting next day. The Senator's proposition, on the other hand, is that when the order is solemnly entered upon the rec-

ords of the Senate any Senator at any time may vacate it and get rid of it by moving to adjourn. I submit that the mere statement of the proposition shows its absurdity.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. The same rule the Senator has cited says that you may offer an amendment. There is one amendment that can always be offered——

Mr. LODGE. An amendment to what?

Mr. SWANSON. An amendment to a bill. Motions to amend, to recess, or to adjourn are always in order; but you can not offer an amendment that is contrary to a motion that has been previously adopted by the Senate, because it is out of order.

Mr. LODGE. This is not an amendment at all; it is a question of a privileged motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator has the right, this being a privileged motion, to make it at any time, even though there is another question pending, provided it is not contrary to a motion that the Senate had previously adopted, and the right to amend ceases when the amendment is contrary to what has been previously adopted. A motion to adjourn, therefore, is not in order when it is contrary to something that has been previously adopted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the motion to take a recess has such power as that, of course it takes precedence of all motions. The motion to take a recess, however, is not only inferior in point of precedence to the motion to adjourn, but the motion to take a recess to a time certain is an amendable motion. This particular motion simply was that the Senate should take a recess not later than 9 o'clock and that when it took the recess it should be until 11 o'clock to-morrow. It did not say that it should not take a recess earlier than that. My point is simply that no vote as to time can deprive the motion to adjourn of its privilege. It is the only motion privileged by the Constitution. It has the highest privilege that any motion can possibly have. It is absolutely vital to the existence of the body, and no man would suppose for a moment that any arrangement about a recess would prevent the body from adjourning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not an arrangement; it is an act of the Senate itself.

Mr. LODGE. No act of the Senate can cut off the motion to adjourn. I am not aware of anything that can cut it off except those things stated by every authority. Every authority treats the motion in the same way—that it is in order at any time, no matter what has happened, except when the house is dividing, or during the verification of a vote, or, of course, when no business has intervened. In this case business has intervened. We have adopted this motion, and therefore none of the circumstances have arisen which would interfere with it. We are not calling the roll; we are not verifying a vote; and I can only say that to me it seems the most extraordinary idea that a motion to adjourn can be held to be out or order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Chair permit just one remark?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to hear from the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I can see no force whatever in the claim that because the Senate has voted, as the Senate did vote, that not later than 9 o'clock it would take a recess, therefore it has estopped itself from changing its mind on the subject. There is nothing sacred about the majority vote of the Senate, which at that time thought it was in the mood to take a recess, and so voted. To say now that a motion to adjourn can not be made because it is something different from what the Senate thought an hour ago seems to me to present no point of order at all. The Senate changes its mind from hour to hour.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senate changes its mind upon a question, should it not express that fact by a formal reconsideration of the first expression?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There is no doubt if the Senate wanted to reconsider the motion it would be in order, but if it does not care to reconsider but cares to express its change of purpose by carrying a motion which renders null and void the previous motion it has a perfect right to do it, and it can not be ruled out on a point of order, that it is not in order for the Senate to adjourn instead of taking a recess.

Mr. JAMES. Perhaps the Senator has not a right to move to reconsider.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course he would have to vote with the majority to make the motion.

Mr. JAMES. He could not have voted with the majority and therefore could not make the motion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not saying whether he could or not. The Senator from Georgia asked me if it was not necessary to move to reconsider if the Senate wanted to do anything different. In my opinion, I answer him frankly, it is not, because if the Senate votes to adjourn it does something different, and it accomplishes its purpose.

Mr. JAMES. It would be perfectly in order to reconsider, but that is not the course that was adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am entirely indifferent about this matter, but it is the effect of what the Senate has done that to-day we will not adjourn, but we will take a recess. We stop our session in two ways, either by a recess or by an adjournment. Is not the resolution that we passed a formal declaration by the Senate that the session to-day shall not close by an adjournment but by a recess?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Formally, but it is not final and is not sacred.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; it is not final.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Senate later wants to adopt a course which is inconsistent with taking a recess, it has a perfect right to do it if the majority so determines.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But is not the only way to keep the record of the procedure properly, when you change your mind, that you express the change by a reconsideration?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That would be a perfectly orderly method, and so with a motion to adjourn. There is no question in my mind——

Mr. JAMES. In one instance the Senator from Utah——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not yield just at the present in the midst of a sentence. I will yield to the Senator in a second.

Mr. JAMES. That is all right.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. This is merely a reconsideration of the intention an hour or two ago. They thought then it was desirable that we should take a recess to-night instead of an adjournment, and so voted. To say now that it is not in order to propose anything that is inconsistent with that action, if they have changed their minds and want to do something else, I would not use the word "puerile," because that is not a proper word to characterize the conduct or opinion of Senators, but it is a most startling novelty. I can not conceive that a point of order will lie against a motion to adjourn whenever the Senate wants to adjourn.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I speak with great diffidence on any question relating to the rules, because I am a young Senator, and I do not know very much about them, but it appears to me to be both the meaning of the rules and the precedents on the subject, and the common sense, that all dispositions made by the Senate as to what it will do at any particular time are always subject to a motion to adjourn—that it is always in order, and that it is not competent to debar the Senate from the right to adjourn by any order that can be made as to the future. It is a matter of common occurrence that a special order is made for a particular time, and no one will doubt that although the order has been made that the Senate at a particular time will proceed to consider a particular order of business, it is always subject to the Senate's right to an adjournment. The Senate can always do away with the effect of its order that at a particular time it will do a particular thing by adjourning before that time comes, and any resolution adopted that not later than a particular time a recess will be taken must be deemed to be subject to the always existing right of the body to adjourn.

Is it possible, sir, that a body can be tied up for the future by its own resolution? Suppose the Senate were to adopt a resolution that it would never adjourn—that clearly would not be competent. The right of adjournment is one that is always preserved by necessary implication in whatever disposition is made regarding future action.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, may I say just a few words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will be heard.

Mr. STONE. With all due respect to some of my colleagues on this side, I express the opinion that a motion to adjourn is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no doubt about it, and has so ruled. The Chair decided at the outset that the motion is in order.

Mr. STONE. I did not desire the Chair to decide it. I desired to make some observations. I think a motion to recon-

sider when made by a Senator entitled to make it is in order. I think a motion to take a recess now in accordance with the order of the Senate at any time before 9 o'clock is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On that line the Chair will suggest to the Senator from Missouri that there is a precedent, of date the 16th of August, 1912, where unanimous consent was given to take up a certain bill for that particular day, and when a motion was made to adjourn, although there was a unanimous-consent agreement, it was held by the Chair that a motion to adjourn is always in order.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not quite see the pertinency of the suggestion of the Chair on the point as to whether this motion is in order.

Now, I want to say as preliminary to a final observation that the scheme or plan being followed by our friends on the other side is perfectly apparent. We take a yea-and-nay vote on any question and they disappear in the cloakroom, leaving one or two on guard. A point of no quorum is raised, and upon that roll call they march out and answer "Present." That can be repeated, and it has been repeated several times to-night.

Now, what is the significance of it? It means that if they answer to the roll call—that is their idea and they are acting upon it—and a quorum is disclosed, no motion can be made to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and thereupon you proceed again until a motion is made to adjourn or to take some other action, and, when a yea-and-nay vote is called for, then they disappear, and when there is a new roll call to find a quorum they come in.

Now, what I want to do is to have no quorum on a roll call. I desire to have an order made by the Senate to arrest absent Members and bring them here to the bar of the Senate. The only way I see to thwart the highly entertaining and reputable practice pursued by our friends on the other side is for Democrats to refrain from voting when the roll is called, and then let the motion be made to bring in absent Senators. A game that two can play at is the one these gentlemen are attempting. What we want is an order for absent Senators and a writ issued by the Chair to bring them here.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me make a parliamentary inquiry. If the motion which is now pending is carried, will it mean that the Senate enters now upon the recess which it had previously determined to enter upon sometime before 9 o'clock, that the recess goes into effect and the Senate will meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock in pursuance of its previous action?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate made an order to take a recess. A motion to adjourn is always in order. A motion in this case would be in the nature of a reconsideration of the former action, because the Senate has a right to adjourn under the rules, and by adopting the motion would modify the order for a recess. If it does not and the motion to adjourn is voted down, then the order of the Senate to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow will be operative.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to ascertain what the Chair would rule in that case.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will allow me to finish——

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The point the Senator from Kentucky makes goes to the question of the Senate putting itself in a conflicting position in this, that if it has decided, as it did, that some time before 9 o'clock to-night, or by 9 o'clock, it will take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, then if a motion is made to adjourn and it is carried the question would be whether that meant that at the time of the adjournment the recess before determined upon would be entered upon and would take effect as had been previously decided by the Senate. If the motion to adjourn is in order, it seems to me it can only be in order in that respect, to carry out the previous decision and action of the Senate. Otherwise there is a hopeless conflict, and the only motion in order after the Senate has adopted the first motion, that on or before 9 o'clock it will take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, would be to take a recess now. That motion would be in order, and to make a motion to adjourn after having taken the first step is precisely like, after having passed a bill, to have some one get up and move that it be recommitted. If the motion is in order at all it can only be in order, I submit to the Chair, in so far as it carries out and is consistent with the previous action of the Senate, and it would only mean that instead of waiting until 9 o'clock to enter upon the recess the Senate decides to do so at this time. If it means that, then I say it is in order and is precisely the same motion, in effect, as would be a motion to take a recess now.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] loses sight of the fact——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. JAMES. I have taken the floor to argue upon a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor on the question of order.

Mr. JAMES. I do not yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have the floor for the purpose of discussing the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor to argue the point of order.

Mr. JAMES. I shall take but a moment, Mr. President. The statement of the Senator from Florida that the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] would have the effect to take a recess I do not agree with at all, because the Senator from Utah is quite explicit in moving not to take a recess, which he could do and which, under the former action of the Senate, the Senate could take at this time or any moment up to 9 o'clock, but he very deliberately moves to adjourn. Of course his purpose is to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock and give an opportunity for further filibustering. Then the order of the Senate to take a recess at a certain hour to a certain hour amounts to nothing. If the point of order I have made is overruled and a motion to adjourn, which is to do the very thing the Senate had theretofore determined that it would not do, is in order, then there is not the slightest use for a Senator to make a motion to take a recess until the Senate is ready to recess.

The Senator from Utah could not make a motion to reconsider the order for a recess. He knew that very well. He could not move to reconsider, because he did not vote with the prevailing side. Therefore he does by indirection, according to the ruling the Chair has intimated, that which he could not do directly. He has moved to adjourn, and of course if it is to be held that when the Senate deliberately takes action fixing a time at which it will do one thing, without ever moving to reconsider that action it can do another thing, you will find that you will have confusion worse confounded.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I simply wish to ask the Chair a question. I understood that the Chair a short time ago ruled upon the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania the Chair will state he has no doubt the Senate can adjourn, and if it adjourns it will adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not said anything yet upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], and I would not have done so but for the statement he has just made. It has been held in the Senate ever since I have been a Member of this body that the Senate can not only adjourn when the motion is carried by a majority, but where there has been a unanimous-consent agreement it can be set aside by a motion to adjourn.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to ask the Senator if in all the line of precedents he has before him or that he can obtain, can he cite the Chair to a single instance where the Senate had agreed to take a recess at a certain hour and then a motion was made to adjourn without theretofore moving to reconsider the former action of the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. I thought that was so apparent that I have not even taken the time to look it up and see whether there is such a precedent or not.

Mr. LODGE. It was never raised.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe it was ever raised in the Senate before; certainly it has not been done while I have been here, because every Senator has taken it for granted that it could be done.

I simply wanted to say to the Senator that I made the motion under the rule, knowing exactly that I had a right to make the motion. Of course the Senate can vote it down. That is all there is to it. I do not see that there is anything further to decide than the Chair has already decided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order. A motion to adjourn is always in order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRYAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. As he is absent from the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as upon the former roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], as before, and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of the transfer I made a little while ago, I vote "nay." I will let this announcement stand for all subsequent votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the announcement that under the terms of my pair I have a right to vote to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON. Transferring my pair as before, I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Brandegee	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Catron	Lippitt	Root	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Sherman	
Jones	Oliver	Smoot	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Kern	Saulsbury	Thomas
Bryan	Lane	Shafroth	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thornton
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Shields	Tillman
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Vardaman
Gore	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
Hughes	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams
James	Reed	Stone	
Johnson	Robinson	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—44.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Lewis	Poindexter
Brady	Dillingham	McCumber	Ransdell
Bristow	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Fall	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Goff	Newlands	Stephenson
Clapp	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Clarke, Ark.	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Townsend
Colt	Hitchcock	Owen	Weeks
Crawford	La Follette	Penrose	Works

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate now take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, on which he asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). As previously stated, I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. As he is absent from the Chamber, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], with whom I am paired, has not voted; but it being obvious that there is doubt as to whether or not a quorum will be developed, I will let my vote stand.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). When I voted I did not observe that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], with whom I have a general pair, was absent. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I withdraw my vote, as I see the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I am paired, is not present.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—9.

Catron	Kenyon	Oliver	Sherman
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Page	Smoot
Jones			

NAYS—39.

Ashurst	Kern	Root	Swanson
Bryan	Lane	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thompson
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
Gore	Overman	Shively	Vardaman
Hollis	Pittman	Simmons	Walsh
Hughes	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.	White
James	Reed	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Johnson	Robinson	Stone	

NOT VOTING—48.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lewis	Poindexter
Borah	Cummins	Lippitt	Ransdell
Brady	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Fall	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Gallinger	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Goff	Newlands	Sterling
Camden	Gronna	Norris	Sutherland
Clapp	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Owen	Warren
Colt	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, the yeas are 9 and the nays are 39. The Chair counts the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] as being upon the floor. A quorum is present, and the motion of the Senator from Utah is lost.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from New York will allow me, I simply want to register my objection to the ruling of the Chair that a Senator who is paired can be counted. The ruling, however, of course, will stand, but I merely wish my protest to go into the RECORD.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote upon the motion which has just been voted upon—the motion to take a recess—and upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate reconsider its vote on the motion to take a recess.

Mr. STONE. I make the point of order that the Senator from New York did not vote in the affirmative.

Mr. ROOT. I voted in the negative with the prevailing side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York voted in the negative.

Mr. STONE. Of course, as the Senator from New York says, that on the motion to take a recess at not later than 9 o'clock to-night until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning he voted for that motion, he can move to reconsider.

Mr. ROOT. No; that is not what I am moving to reconsider. I am moving to reconsider the decision of the Senate upon the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that we now take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Upon the motion of the Senator from Utah I voted in accordance with the decision of the Senate, and I therefore have the right to move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York moves to reconsider the vote by which the previous motion was carried.

Mr. ROOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. As he is absent from the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair as before and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. That Senator having been lately called suddenly from the Chamber, I transfer my pair with him to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. On that account I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the negative). I omitted to state my pair and its transfer. I should like to have the RECORD show my pair and its transfer as heretofore, and I allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—7.

Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Root	Smoot
Jones	Oliver	Sherman	

NAYS—39.

Ashurst	Kenyon	Robinson	Swanson
Bryan	Kern	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lane	Shafroth	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Tillman
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Vardaman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Johnson	Reed	Stone	

NOT VOTING—50.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lippitt	Ransdell
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Brady	Dillingham	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	du Pont	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Fall	Nelson	Stephenson
Burleigh	Gallinger	Newlands	Sterling
Burton	Goff	Norris	Sutherland
Camden	Gronna	O'Gorman	Townsend
Catron	Hardwick	Owen	Warren
Clapp	Hitchcock	Page	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Penrose	Works
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	
Crawford	Lewis	Poindexter	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate refused to take a recess, the yeas are 7 and the nays are 39. The Chair counts the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] present. A quorum is present, the nays have it, and the motion is rejected.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I understand that during my temporary absence I was counted as being present on a previous vote. I should like to ask if that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that is so. The Chair saw the Senator come into the Chamber and walk out.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask——

Mr. JAMES. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Mr. LIPPITT. Was my question answered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answered the Senator's question.

Mr. LIPPITT. I did not understand it. Excuse me; what was the answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answered that he saw the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] come into the Chamber while the roll was being called, and he was, therefore, present.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not think I was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But, without the Senator from Rhode Island, a quorum was present.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is not very important, but I do not think I was present during that time.

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

Mr. LIPPITT. I went out to the telephone for a few minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13044, an act to pension widows and minor and helpless children of officers and enlisted men who served during the War with Spain or the Philippine Insurrection or in China between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. Whenever we take it up we will have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon taking up the bill. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ASHURST responded in the negative.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. JAMES. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Wyoming before the roll call began.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, and that is as to whether or not this motion is debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask for the reading of the bill.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] had answered to his name, and therefore nothing is in order but the roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Wyoming before the roll call started.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was on my feet.

Mr. BRYAN. I make the point of order that upon a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill, it is not in order to ask for the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I desire to be heard upon that matter. I should like the Secretary——

Mr. JAMES. The Chair directed the Secretary to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. JAMES. The Secretary had begun to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Secretary attempted to call it.

Mr. JAMES. No; the Secretary did call it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read, in my time, on the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ordered a roll call. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that we are not entitled to have the bill read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that when the bill is taken up the Senator can ask to have it read.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But I ask to have it read now, and ask for a ruling of the Chair on my right to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator will not have that right unless the Senate decides otherwise.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then I most respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and on that appeal I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming appeals from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What is the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah moved to take up a certain bill on the calendar. The Chair had ordered a roll call when the Senator from Wyoming rose and demanded a reading of the bill upon which the Chair had ordered the roll call. The Chair ruled that the roll call having been ordered, the bill could not be read unless the Senate set aside that decision of the presiding officer.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, on the ground that the Chair had ordered a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the roll be called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I withhold my vote on account of my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is absent.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is absent from the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. On account of his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, it resulted—yeas 38, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ashurst	Kenyon	Reed	Swanson
Bryan	Kern	Robinson	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thornton
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Walsh
Hollis	Oliver	Simmons	White
Hughes	Page	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
James	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson	Pomerene	Stone	

NAYS—10.

Catron	La Follette	Root	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sherman	
Jones	Lodge	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—48.

Bankhead	Culberson	McCumber	Ransdell
Borah	Cummins	McLean	Shively
Brady	Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Fall	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Gallinger	Norris	Stephenson
Burton	Goff	O'Gorman	Sterling
Camden	Gronna	Overman	Sutherland
Clapp	Hardwick	Owen	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Townsend
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Weeks
Crawford	Lewis	Poindexter	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary reports that 38 Senators have voted in the affirmative and 10 in the negative. Counting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], a quorum is present. The Chair is sustained.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, in supporting the motion of the Senator from Utah to take up Order of Business No. 484, I am moved to say a few words, because I believe we are wasting our time here this evening.

SEVERAL SENATORS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And we have been doing so since 6 o'clock. Between now and 9 o'clock, without wasting time, we can take up and pass this pension bill.

Mr. JAMES. Who caused the wasting of time? The Senator's side.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. We have before us a bill that provides for pensioning the widows of soldiers and sailors in the War with Spain. We can pass it between now and 9 o'clock. To show exactly what the bill is, so that the Senate will understand it, I wish to read a few lines from it. It is a bill introduced April 6, 1914, now nearly a year ago.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator is anxious to save time——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I can only yield for a question. I am afraid of losing the floor, and I want to explain my views upon this matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. The bill has not been taken up, and is not before the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; but the matter is debatable.

Mr. FLETCHER. Upon the motion to take it up a roll call was ordered, and the first Senator's name was called, and he answered.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is all ancient history.

Mr. FLETCHER. So that the bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I decline to yield.

Mr. JAMES. I should be glad to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming declines to yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No, Mr. President; the time is limited, and I think I had better go on with the statement.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Chair overrule the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state his point of order.

Mr. FLETCHER. My point of order is that the bill has not been taken up, and that on the motion to take up the bill a roll call was asked for and ordered and the first Senator's name was called and he answered. That is the status of the matter, so that to discuss the bill now is clearly out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks discussion of the motion is in order.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, what I was intending to do was to discuss the question of taking up this bill. I was endeavoring, in my feeble way, to explain some of the reasons why I thought that during this time, when we are evidently accomplishing nothing, we might devote our time to some useful purpose.

This bill is House bill 13044. It has passed the House of Representatives and needs only the action of the Senate and the signature of the President to enact it into law. It was introduced, as I say, in the Senate of the United States——

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ASHURST. No; I do not ask the Senator to yield. I rise to a point of order. Inasmuch as the first name on the roll has been mentioned a time or two, it is obviously my duty to say a word.

The Chair, with his usual clearness, stated the question, and my name was called before a single Senator arose or addressed the Chair, and I voted in a loud voice. I therefore say the point of order is well taken, because I made a response, and when I responded no Senator was on his feet to address the Chair. It becomes, therefore, my duty to make this point of order, so that the rules of the Senate shall not be so obviously transgressed and to the end that debate shall not intervene after I have made a response to my name.

I protest against the rule being disregarded by the Chair or by the Senate. When I made a response no Senator was on his feet, and this debate is obviously a violation of the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, as I was stating when I was interrupted——

Mr. ASHURST. I do not propose to be isolated in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator that at the time the Senator answered to his name the Chair had recognized the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REED. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that this question is subject to debate. The Senator from Wyoming will proceed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 9 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, January 27, 1915), pursuant to the order previously made, the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 28, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 27, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, whose unchanging love ministers unto our needs day by day, though we are often fickle and false Thou art ever constant and true, punishing the evil that is in us, rewarding the good; upholding the right, condemning the wrong; and though we may deceive ourselves and others, Thou art never deceived, for Thy judgments are true and righteous altogether. Continue thus we beseech Thee to minister unto us that we may grow as individuals and as a Nation toward the ideals. In Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENNSYLVANIA ARBITRATION AND PEACE SOCIETY.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the House to print in the RECORD some views of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society upon our international relations and policy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by

printing certain resolutions of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, these resolutions were sent to me by three eminent Pennsylvanians who advocate peace at all times, Mr. Thomas Raeburn White, Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, and Mr. Stanley R. Yarnall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The document referred to is as follows:

The Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society holds the following views on the present international relations and policy of the United States of America:

1. The neutrality of our country in the present European war should be strictly maintained, and our Government should take no action that may arouse the suspicion or antagonism of any of the powers now at war; for this reason we regard as peculiarly untimely any proposal at this time to greatly increase the Army and Navy of the United States.

2. Our Government should be in a position, at the earliest opportune moment, to exert its good offices to effect a lasting peace among the nations at war, on grounds of equal justice, humanity, and international good will. A policy of expansion in the Army and Navy would lessen the influence of the United States as an impartial mediator.

3. The only possible justification for an increased Army and Navy in the United States would be for national defense, since no one suggests using the military or naval strength of our country for aggressive warfare. The following considerations lead us to believe there is no present danger of attack from other countries which would justify a policy of increased armaments:

(a) The geographical position of the United States.

(b) The financial and commercial relations between the United States and all the great powers which have double force at this period of fearful damage and loss in trade and resources.

(c) The fact that racial differences and distinctions, which are a cause of prejudice, antagonism, and hatred among European countries, become in the United States bonds of sympathy and interest that unite our citizens with the European countries from which they or their fathers emigrated.

(d) The fact that the countries at war are draining their resources in men, treasure, industry, and commerce at a pace that, if long continued, must result in exhaustion or bankruptcy. From this condition they can not recover for generations, and would be wholly unable to undertake an aggressive campaign against a nation of the situation and power of the United States.

4. A marked increase in the standing Army and Navy of the United States might be misunderstood by the powers of South America, with which our people should live in close bonds of friendship. Such a policy might revive distrust of the United States, now happily subsiding, and would doubtless be imitated, and thus in America would be encouraged the European military system which has brought the vast sorrow and loss for which Europe has been preparing.

5. The present state of Europe proves that preparation for war is the surest provocative of war. Armies and navies on a huge scale are created to fight, and in times of crisis they are like loaded weapons in the hands of angry men. The United States is committed to the policy of arbitration of international differences. Our Government has recently signed peace treaties with many nations of the earth. An increase in armament upon a comprehensive scale is a direct impeachment of our national good faith and a backward step in world federation.

6. Peace has characterized the national genius and development of the United States. Our greatest achievements in diplomacy and our most illustrious acts as a nation, our national prosperity, and the general education and culture of our people have been effected by peaceful means and rest upon the continuance of peace. The true greatness of the United States in international relations does not depend upon a great standing army or a growing navy, but rests upon our national honor, which demands even-handed justice toward all the world.

Since we hold these views: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we regard the present agitation for a general increase of the armed strength of the United States as unnecessary, untimely, illogical, and opposed to true patriotism.

That we are in full accord with the international policy of the President, as expressed in his message to Congress on December 8, 1914, and urge all true citizens to uphold and strengthen his hands at this time of grave national responsibility, so as to further a policy of peace, justice, conciliation, and good will as the truest safeguard of our national greatness, which will rest in the future, as it has rested in the past, upon a basis of moral strength rather than upon military and naval force.

Issued by the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, 1000 Bally Building, Philadelphia, December 30, 1914.

SPEECH OF HON. PERRY BELMONT.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by a former prominent Member of this House, Hon. Perry Belmont, on personal government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Hon. Perry Belmont on the subject of personal government. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL COMMISSION.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a copy of a short resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor on the bill (H. R. 17855) introduced by me to create an industrial alcohol commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing certain resolutions in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolution No. 39, by Delegate Andrew Furuseth, of the International Seamen's Union of America.

Whereas, on behalf of the organized farmers, Congressman CASEY, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill in Congress (H. R. 17855) providing for the establishment of an industrial alcohol commission and an appropriation to demonstrate the practical value of farm denatured alcohol distilling and guide the development of the industry in its early stages; and

Whereas the development of farm denatured alcohol distilling, if as effective as its advocates claim and as scientific investigation and the experience of European countries would indicate, would curtail if not destroy the monopoly of the liquid fuel supply by the Oil Trust, of the meat supply by the packers, and of alcohol as a solvent in many industries by the industrial alcohol and wood alcohol trusts; and

Whereas the evidence submitted to Congress is conclusive that fully 1,000 supposed employees of the Agricultural Department are paid from the Rockefeller educational fund of the Rockefeller Foundation; and

Whereas the Rockefeller Foundation, with its various educational funds, is evidently the means by which the entire educational system of the Nation, including the educational and demonstration work of the States and Federal Government, might be dominated by the Rockefeller interests; and

Whereas the John D. Rockefeller endowment of the Rockefeller Foundation, the interest on which supplies the various Rockefeller educational funds, is invested in the stocks and bonds of corporations, notably those controlled by the Rockefeller interests, conspicuous among which is the Colorado Industrial Co.: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, in annual session assembled, indorses the Casey bill, H. R. 17855, or legislation of similar import, acceptable to the organized farmers supporting the Casey bill, for the establishment of an industrial alcohol commission and an appropriation by Congress to demonstrate conclusively the practicability of farm alcohol distilling. Therefore, be it

Further resolved, That all organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor be, and hereby are, urged to assist in making these resolutions effective.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was called.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. ADAMSON. By authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I call up the bill (S. 2616) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service. Before going into Committee of the Whole I would be glad to ask the other side as to the possibility of limiting general debate.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desires some time, and others on this side desire time. I ask for half an hour outside of what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wants.

Mr. ADAMSON. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois want?

Mr. MANN. I can not tell. I do not think there will be any unnecessary delay in the committee on the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman shall have all the time he wants. I know he would treat me in the same way. Will an hour on a side be sufficient?

Mr. MANN. I will take an hour, and take chances.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will an hour on that side be enough?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I desire 30 minutes, on account of requests which have been made of me, outside of what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desires.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire an hour?

Mr. MANN. I may not use it, but I wish that much time if I need it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Suppose I ask for an agreement for two hours and a half, the time to be equally divided?

Mr. MANN. I do not care how much time the rest of them take.

Mr. ADAMSON. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate end in two hours and one-half, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] and myself.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That will not give us time enough.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think together we can accommodate the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If you will agree to yield 15 minutes of that time to us, it will be satisfactory.

Mr. ADAMSON. I believe that together we can accommodate him.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to fix the time now, why not fix it now?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will agree to yield to us 15 minutes, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think there will be any trouble about it.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. We want that understanding, so that there shall be no doubt that that request will be complied with.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will knock myself out of an opportunity for a speech rather than disappoint the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. We want the gentleman to make a speech to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman any request to make?

Mr. ADAMSON. Two hours and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to two hours and a half, half the time to be controlled by himself and half the time by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I must object, unless we are sure of an hour and a half. We may not use it, but the requests which have been made of me require that time.

Mr. ADAMSON. If three-quarters of an hour are not sufficient for the gentleman from Illinois, I will see that he gets the other 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I expect to yield some time. I suppose I will be the only one who will represent any time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman wants an hour in addition to the other half hour, I will see that he gets it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know if I can get a little time on this matter.

Mr. ADAMSON. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DIES. About 15 minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will modify the request and make it three hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks that the general debate be limited to three hours—an hour and a half to be controlled by himself and an hour and a half by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2616) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the Public Health Service has been a gradual growth. It has been the pride of Congress, it has been the pride of our committee, and I believe the pride of the country. Its operations have been giving great satisfaction in a great many respects and in a great many localities in cases of epidemic of various dread diseases in different localities, its attention to the marine hospitals, in attention to various persons engaged in public service, and its preventive work in looking out for health conditions throughout the United States.

Of course it costs money. It will be nothing new, nor will it be objectionable if we hear gentlemen talking about the necessity for economy and deprecating expenses. But a man can not raise a family without some expense. When he takes a wife it involves an additional expense, but it is generally worth the money. [Laughter.] When he begins to have children appear it is expensive, but it will not do to cut off food and clothing on the ground that it costs money. It is expected that the future usefulness will be worth the expenditure. It is very often wise to spend money in reasonable sums at the right time and for a proper and wise purpose. Saving at the spigot often turns the bung loose and wastes the contents of the barrel, and failing to apply one board when the old one is loose may enlarge the rent and lead to a roofless house if neglected too long.

I sympathize thoroughly with the desire for economy, and I am perfectly willing to put the knife to all authorizations reported by our committee, but, Mr. Chairman, the institutions under the charge and jurisdiction of our committee do not carry very large expense. A large curtailment of these authorizations will hurt, whereas the small curtailments of large authorizations hurt less and amount to more in the long run.

Other great committees, providing for other institutions of the Government, make appropriations by the hundreds of millions, and I believe they are mostly wise. I do not share in the cry and execration about reckless waste. I know how it is with different men of different judgments and having different ideas of many things. I am making these general remarks to prepare the House for my suggestion that the few institutions over which our committee has jurisdiction are necessary and useful to the Government and to the people, and that the amounts necessary to conduct them successfully are very small.

This bill will involve an increase of only about $46,000. The present expense of the establishment of the Public Health Service is less than $2,000,000—something over $1,800,000—with all its works, with all its conditions, with all its ramifications, and with all its good results. To increase that by the provisions in the present bill is a small matter compared with its great usefulness.

Two years ago a bill which had been agreed upon in a previous committee became a law while the gentleman from Illinois was chairman of the committee, and at that time passed the House but failed to pass the Senate. That bill fixed the salaries of the officers of the Public Health Service, increasing them and making a larger increase, perhaps, than this bill does.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That was not agreed upon when I was chairman.

Mr. ADAMSON. I remember that the bill that passed two years ago was agreed on in the committee and passed the House.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. The bill that was agreed upon and passed the House, that was reported to the House and afterwards became a law, was while the gentleman from Georgia was chairman of the committee, and that was a bill extending the scope and authority of the Public Health Service. No bill passed increasing salaries while I was chairman, or was favorably considered.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will refresh his memory he will find that the bill I called up was a Senate bill embracing a considerable amount of the old committee bill, and I smoothed the way for success through the House by agreeing with the gentleman from Illinois to eliminate all except what was in the old bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about it being an old bill. It is true in the last Congress we passed the Senate bill which did increase somewhat the salaries of the officers of the Public Health Service, striking out the provisions that are in this bill. I understood at the time that that settled the proposition, but as soon as they got a part, they commenced to back down from their understanding and insisted upon more.

Mr. ADAMSON. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, as to the recollection of its being an old bill, the gentleman from Illinois concedes that in the last Congress we passed a bill fixing the salary. It is true that the gentleman from Illinois objected to the first section of this bill at that time, but there was no contract governing future bills. I do not think that was in the recollection of either one of us.

The gentleman from Illinois objected to it at that time, and desirous to get through as well as I could by the process of elimination, I simply left out what he objected to in order to secure unanimous consent to pass the bill.

Mr. CARLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. CARLIN. This brings the service up to an equality with other services?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have not got to that yet. Having fixed the salaries of the officers to their satisfaction, placing them to that extent on a parity with the other services of the Government which competed for their services by offering better terms, we now desire to secure entire parity by providing quarters and baggage arrangements. In the other service these corresponding officers are furnished with what is known as commutation of quarters; when they are stationed at a place where there are no quarters they have to pay rent, fuel, and lights.

The other services pay these corresponding officers money sufficient to make up the necessary rent, quarters, light, and fuel. The purpose of this first section is to supply that deficiency and put them substantially on a parity with officers of like rank in the other services. In the first section, however, a baggage arrangement is made in the same degree. The second paragraph reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That the term of office of the Surgeon General shall be for a period of four years, at the expiration of which term he shall, unless reappointed, be carried as an extra officer in the grade of senior surgeon.

At the present time if the Surgeon General goes out of office without dying he gets to the jumping-off place, anyhow. He is at the top of the rock, and there is no other provision for him, no other place for him to work. He goes out of business; he

is without a job, rank, or anything else. The purpose of the present provision is to utilize him in the service, and he simply goes back to the rank of senior surgeon. He is carried as an extra officer with a grade of senior surgeon where his services can be utilized, which is right. After having supported him and utilized him in a way, practically educated him, the public is entitled to the benefit of his services as long as he is able to render them. The bill goes on to say:

Assistant surgeons shall be promoted to the grade of passed assistant surgeon in the order of seniority at the expiration of three years' commissioned service and after satisfactory examination.

I suppose there will be no objection to that at all.

Section 3 provides:

SEC. 3. That the chiefs of the Divisions of Zoology, Pharmacology, and Chemistry in the Hygienic Laboratory may, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury as officers of the Public Health Service, and they shall be entitled to leaves of absence as now provided by law for the commissioned medical officers of the Public Health Service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may appoint five aditional officers in the Public Health Service, who shall be entitled to the same leaves of absence, and each shall receive a salary of $4,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That said additional officers shall not be appointed until after satisfactory examination, to be conducted under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to determine their fitness for special work in sanitary engineering, epidemiology, pathology, bacteriology, housing, or other matters that relate to the propagation and spread of diseases of man.

In the bill two years ago we provided for this work to be done in the investigation of diseases, the very work mentioned in this section, and it is absolutely necessary to have men to do the work, and this section provides for their procurement and selection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. These men who are proposed to be appointed are not commissioned officers of the Army?

Mr. ADAMSON. Not of the Army. They will be regular officers of the Health Service.

Mr. BORLAND. They will be regular officers of the Health Service, but now they are in another branch of the civil service?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BORLAND. In the first section of this bill you provide the commissioned officers, medical officers in the Public Health Service, have certain commutation for quarters and certain allowances for baggage. By the terms of the bill, as I take it, that privilege extends only to commissioned officers.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I understand that all these are commissioned officers; that is my understanding, but these are not likely to be sent around to the places where they have to have these experts.

Mr. BORLAND. The question I want to get at is this: Are there some men in this service under this bill who will receive commutation of quarters and some who will not have it—men with practically the same general line of duties?

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I suppose those whose duties are purely clerical will not have them, but these officers will have them.

Mr. BORLAND. All commissioned officers?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BORLAND. That means men who are already in the Army and Navy service.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will read the list of officers: Surgeon General, Assistant Surgeon General, senior surgeon, surgeon, passed assistant surgeon, assistant surgeon, and these professors——

Mr. BORLAND. They will all have commutation of quarters, but these men who are Chiefs of Bureaus of Zoology, Pharmacology, and Chemistry will not have commutation of quarters. Now, will not there be immediate pressure on the part of somebody somewhere to see that these new men get the same privilege that the old men get? Will not there be a great deal said in their favor, and will not we be up against giving it to all the other branches of the service as well as the Public Health Service?

Mr. ADAMSON. I understand these men are to get it like the others, which makes this bill $46,000 or $50,000.

Mr. BORLAND. The net result will be——

Mr. ADAMSON. In section 3 there is a proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may appoint five additional officers in the Public Health Service, who shall be entitled to the same leaves of absence, and each shall receive a salary of $4,000 per annum.

Mr. BORLAND. I am not speaking of those mentioned there but those mentioned at the beginning of section 3, who are designated as Chiefs of the Divisions of Zoology, Pharmacology, and Chemistry in the Hygienic Laboratory. Now, I asked the preliminary question: These men are not commissioned officers in the Army and Navy at present, are they?

Mr. ADAMSON. Not in the Army and Navy; no.

Mr. BORLAND. Therefore under no law will they be entitled to commutation of quarters. If they go to the Public Health Service, will not they immediately ask to be put on a level with the other officers in the Public Health Service and ask for a commutation of quarters?

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I will express my opinion to the gentleman. I think when they become officers of the Public Health Service they are treated like other officers are. That is my understanding.

Mr. BORLAND. So they will get commutation of quarters?

Mr. ADAMSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. BORLAND. Then we are extending commutation of quarters to men who are not in the Army or Navy, but who are transferred by some form of detail to the same form of work.

Mr. ADAMSON. We are not dealing with the Army or the Navy at all, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with another branch of the public service, the officers of which are desirable in other services and who are tempted to quit our service in consequence of superior inducements to go elsewhere. We are merely trying to hold out inducements to these good men to stay in our service.

Mr. BORLAND. I assume that is true; but I have heard that same argument made about every other department of the Government. I have heard it made about the Reclamation Service, and I have heard it made about the Department of Agriculture and its various bureaus, that we had experts there that were underpaid and were not being liberally treated, and that if we did not treat them better they would go elsewhere. That is probably true of all these branches of the public service. But here is a proposition to pay a certain set of men in the Government service commutation of quarters as though they were Army or Navy officers. We are extending a principle that has heretofore been applied only to the Army and the Navy, who are supposed to be supported body and soul by the Nation, to men who are supposed to be paying their own house rent, like Congressmen and Senators. Now we are getting into a different system altogether.

Mr. ADAMSON. I like to hear my colleague talk, but on this occasion he is talking in my time.

Mr. BORLAND. I will get the gentleman more time.

Mr. ADAMSON. I had not finished answering the gentleman's question. The gentleman asked me a question and I started to answer it, and right in the middle of a sentence the gentleman interjected a speech. It was no doubt a good one, but I wanted to finish the sentence.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not want to trespass on the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. ADAMSON. The balance of the sentence I intended to utter is this, that, recognizing the pressing necessity of providing for these officers, it is not wise to be deterred from doing our duty by the apprehension, speculative, groundless, or otherwise, that somebody outside, seeing their success, might desire the same thing. That would not be good policy or statesmanship. We recognize that this ought to be done for these people at this time. No doubt as long as human nature exists human desires will be stimulated by anything good seen in the possession of others; but that ought not to deter us from enacting this wise legislation. We are providing for the necessary officers to carry on this service, and providing quarters for them commensurate with those accorded to similar officers in other services.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman agree to yield to me later on in the proceedings?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will if I can. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I reserve the balance of my time. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] use some of his time?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the Marine-Hospital Service began with the beginning of the Government in 1789. Up to 1811 this service in the hospitals along the coast took care of disabled seamen belonging to the Navy, so that in its origin this service was closely identified with the naval service. In 1871 Congress reorganized the service and gave it added duties and changed its personnel. Its work was placed under a supervising surgeon general. Admission to the service was through examination. Promotions were provided through examinations. As the result of that legislation the service very largely improved and its duties correspondingly increased.

In 1889 it was provided by an act of Congress that officers meeting the requirements of the service were to be appointed by

the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, thus making the appointees in this service the same as appointees in the Army and naval service. From 1897 to 1908 the pay and allowances of officers were the same as those of the corresponding grades in the Army and the Navy.

It will thus be seen that during those years these three services—the Marine-Hospital Service, the Army, and the Navy—were assimilated. In 1908, however, Congress passed a law granting substantial increases in pay and allowances to the officers in the Army and Navy, and in the Revenue-Cutter Service later, but failed to do the same thing for the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, as it was then designated.

In 1912 Congress sought, in part at least, to restore the equilibrium of these various services, raising the pay to the same basis as that in the Army and Navy and in the Revenue-Cutter Service, but it failed to pass any provision as to allowances for living quarters.

This bill seeks to remedy the omission in the act of 1908, and thus restores the equilibrium that had been maintained between these three services for many years. The act of August 14, 1912, changed the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service and granted certain increases of pay to the officers, raising the pay of the Surgeon General from $5,000, as fixed in the act of 1902, to $6,000, as it is now; but there was no commutation of quarters allowed the Surgeon General under that act. Under the act of 1912 certain increased duties were assigned to the Public Health Service, and the language of that act is as follows:

> The Public Health Service may study and investigate the diseases of man and conditions influencing the progagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage and the pollution, either directly or indirectly, of the navigable streams and lakes of the United States, and it may from time to time issue information in the form of publications for the use of the public.

That, as you can readily understand, devolved large additional duties upon the Public Health Service, and it is because of that that the last provision of this bill has been introduced, namely, authorizing the appointment of five professors or experts that have peculiar knowledge on the subjects of sanitary engineering, epidemiology, pathology, bacteriology, housing, and other matters that relate to the propagation and spread of diseases of man and to the public health.

These five professors will cost an additional $20,000, so that almost one-half of the amount called for by this bill is due to the act of 1912, calling upon the Public Health Service to investigate the diseases of man and the propagation and cure of disease.

That leaves, then, about $26,000 to be accounted for by the other provisions of the bill. The first provision is making commutation of quarters at the rate of $12 per room per month, which is the allowance now made to the Army and the Navy, and, in addition, giving the Secretary of the Treasury power to make reasonable commutation for fuel and lights.

In this Public Health Service many of the officials are not here in Washington. The field men are in the field, where no quarters are or can be provided. They are sent to seats of contagion, wherever these may be. They are sent to foreign fields. We have four or six of them now operating in foreign ports. We have four of them assigned to the Revenue-Cutter Service. They are therefore away from headquarters, and it is no more than right that these men under these peculiar conditions, and oftentimes in places of very great danger, should be permitted to have commutation of quarters which is now allowed to Army and Navy officers when away from quarters, and who for the most part are in no danger whatsoever.

In this bill we also equalize conditions in these services by permitting certain maximum allowances for the transfer of baggage, and the amount allowed in the bill is identical with that allowed for officers of the Army and Navy.

Another very valuable feature of this bill is that the Surgeon General, after having served four years as the head of the service, can be made to go back to the ranks, as it were; but if by qualification, experience, and skill he demonstrates his capacity as head of this service he may be reinstated or reappointed. After his service he goes back to the position of senior surgeon. Thus the Government and the people retain his valuable services, but a younger man may succeed him as Surgeon General. This is the identical practice now obtaining in the War and Navy Departments.

We also provide in this bill that the three division chiefs in the Hygienic Laboratory shall be granted leave of absence, the same as the other officers that are commissioned. This is a small matter, but it equalizes the service and increases the contentment and satisfaction of these officials.

Then, finally, in the bill we are providing for five experts to carry out the provisions of the act of 1912, giving the Public Health Service the right to investigate the diseases of man.

Now, this service has a great many duties, and it is performing them more efficiently than any public health service in any nation in the world.

Permit me to give you some few illustrations of the duties of this great service. In the first place it takes charge of the marine hospitals of the United States. This Government owns 33 such hospitals, and it has 141 relief stations located not only in the United States but in our island possessions. The amount of good done in these marine hospitals and relief stations is beyond question.

Then it has the duty of inspecting all the immigrants who enter the United States annually. These immigrants are inspected by the Public Health Service. In the last fiscal year they investigated 1,500,000 immigrants, and by reason of physical and mental disability they rejected over 41,000 of them. This Public Health Service is the first line of skirmishers that meets the incoming thousands of peoples who come here defective mentally and physically. Therefore they protect us from this sort of an invasion.

Again, this service has the right to regulate interstate sanitation, and a great work has already been accomplished in this line. Only recently they have made an extensive study of the water used in passenger coaches on railroads, in order to determine its fitness and its quality. There have been many instances of typhoid fever propagated by impure water carried in passenger coaches.

It also has a large force available to throw into any infected district on the outbreak of an epidemic, and it is a very valuable thing to have a trained force of men to go into a region where an epidemic has started and thus at the very outset restrain the spread of the disease. This is well known to you all. You can recall instances of that kind of service in New Orleans at the outbreak of yellow fever, in other sections at the outbreak of smallpox, and in the Rocky Mountain region at the outbreak of spotted mountain fever in the Bitter Root Valley.

This service also cooperates with the various State, county, and municipal authorities on health matters. Every year there is an annual meeting of the public-health officials of the United States with the officers of the Public Health Service, so that it becomes a clearinghouse on all health matters. Papers are read there by men learned in health questions.

Again, it conducts scientific investigations as to diseases of man and matters relating to the public health and as to foods and drugs, and also investigates the quality of toxins and vaccines and things of that kind, and inspects the manufacturing plants where these toxins and vaccines are made, so as to preserve a standard of purity for the people of the United States. It also treats the seamen in our merchant marine in these various marine hospitals. It also treats the personnel of the Revenue-Cutter Service, of the Life-Saving Service, and of the Lighthouse Service. All these are served by this Bureau of Public Health.

These officers of the Public Health Service may be assigned to the Revenue-Cutter Service, and, as I have already stated, several of them are doing duty on the vessels of that service.

So, all the multitudinous duties of this department of the Government, the responsibility resting upon it, and the great good it has accomplished are all arguments that deserve fair and favorable consideration at your hands. It is not a very easy service. In fact, it requires men of great skill and men of courage. Let me read to you something of the casualties suffered by this service in recent years. Five of the officers of this service within recent years have contracted tropical dysentery while in line of duty. In the Revenue-Cutter Service an assistant surgeon on board of one of the revenue cutters in Alaskan waters was drowned while seeking to afford medical relief to a lighthouse keeper. One died because he was afflicted with spotted fever while seeking to bring relief to the people of Montana.

Within a period of five years four officers contracted typhoid fever in line of duty and two of them died from that disease. Eleven officers have contracted tuberculosis in line of duty and three of them died from this disease. Twenty officers have contracted yellow fever in line of duty and six of them died from this disease.

It is a hazardous service, more hazardous than the Army or Medical Corps in time of peace, and because of the exposure to which these officers are subjected in cases of epidemic and in treating contagious diseases, these men should have the same consideration that corresponding officers have in the Army and in the Navy.

This service has rendered a great good to this country and to mankind. One of the officials by studying malaria laid the groundwork for the mosquito theory of yellow fever. Another

by his investigations of the disease of trachoma in immigrant stations laid the foundation for relief work in treating trachoma. Another official discovered the nature of the hookworm disease, a disease prevalent in some regions of the United States.

These men in their self-sacrificing, courageous way are doing great good to the people in the United States, and they certainly deserve the small consideration which this bill asks for them. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. How much time did the gentleman from Wisconsin use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin used 10 minutes of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota. The gentleman from Georgia told the Chair to let the gentleman from Wisconsin continue and charge the balance to him, so that the gentleman from Wisconsin occupied 10 minutes of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota and 7 minutes time of the gentleman from Georgia, making 17 minutes in all.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to be a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when the subject of increasing the salary of the officers of the Public Health Service was under consideration in the Sixty-first Congress. At that time there was no endeavor, no attempt made by the personnel of that service to have them accorded any increase of allowances such as is carried in this bill.

We all recognize the great worth and value of this branch of the public service. We can all approve every word that has been uttered by my colleague in praise of it, but that is no argument why we should depart from the policy that has been followed year after year and make this an allied arm of the Army and Navy.

There are two objectionable features in this bill. First, that which provides allowances for quarters to all the officers of the Public Health Service. It increases the salary of the Surgeon General virtually $1,152, because under existing law the Surgeon General receives no allowances whatever. Prior to the increase of salaries of the officials of the Public Health Service under the law passed August 14, 1912, the Surgeon General received $5,000. His salary was increased by that act to $6,000. The Surgeon General sought no further increase then. At that time he was living here in Washington, as Surgeon Generals always will live.

We have nothing but praise in favor of the present Surgeon General. We know of his great work, but we do not believe that it is right to increase his salary in this indirect way when only two years ago we increased his salary $1,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. What is the present salary of the Surgeon General?

Mr. STAFFORD. Six thousand dollars. Prior to the reorganization his salary was $5,000.

Mr. BOOHER. That was done two years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; August 14, 1912, to take effect some time in the fall of that year.

Mr. BOOHER. If this bill becomes a law it will increase his salary $1,400.

Mr. STAFFORD. Eleven hundred and fifty-two dollars.

Mr. BOOHER. It says in the report $1,400.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct attention further to the increases in the salaries of the under officials in this service. We raised the salaries of all the surgeons connected with the service. We granted liberal increases and provided not only for an increase but for automatic promotion, so that all officials would receive 10 per cent increase of salary for each five years of service up to 40 per cent of the basic salary. The Assistant Surgeon General's salary was fixed at $4,000, and by continuity of service he would go to the maximum of $5,000. The senior surgeon, whose initial salary was fixed at $3,500, would go to a maximum of $4,500; the surgeons proper, from $3,000 to $4,000; passed assistant surgeons, at the initial salary of $2,400, would be regularly promoted.

These liberal increases of salary at that time met their entire expectations. It was the purpose to increase their salaries so as to retain the services of efficient men. The argument now is that they are not paid sufficient salaries, and instead of referring to the law of 1912 they seek to increase them indirectly by granting them arbitrary allowances for quarters.

But there is another objection to this bill, and that is the retirement feature for the Surgeon General, the head of the service. After four years of service he is to be retired and carried in the grade of senior surgeon. I have no objection to the idea that the Surgeon General should only hold for a term of four years and at the expiration of his period of usefulness he should be disconnected with the service. But here we are providing the means whereby you carry him for all time as a senior surgeon and adopt in a veiled way the idea of pensioning a person by keeping him in the service when he is no longer able to perform efficient service.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman will notice it allows the Surgeon General to be reappointed at the expiration of the four-year term. He may serve several series of terms of four years.

Mr. STAFFORD. When his period of efficiency is at an end, then he is to be carried under this bill in the grade of senior surgeon. Oh, it is easy enough to understand what the purpose of that first term of four years is. If he is efficient, he will be reappointed; and as soon as his period of efficiency begins to abate, why then he is to be passed on and carried in the grade of senior surgeon, and the purpose is to carry him along after his years of usefulness are at an end.

Mr. DIES. What pension would he get?

Mr. STAFFORD. He would get the salary in the office of the grade of senior surgeon of forty-five hundred dollars. That would be his pay, whether efficient or not. He would, of course, continue to hold office, but the point is that as long as the Surgeon General is efficient he is to be continued for four-year terms in that position. As soon as he becomes inefficient or his years of efficiency begin to wane, then they pass him on, and under this second section he is kept in the grade of senior surgeon.

Further, I can not see where there is any similarity between the Public Health Service and the Army and Navy. I am not acquainted nor is this House generally acquainted with the reason for paying allowances for quarters to the naval and military officers. You might say of the Army and Navy officers that their duties are away from home, that they have no permanent place, and that we should provide for them at a certain fixed rate, but not so with the Surgeon General and many of these other surgeons. Many of these officials who are provided for in the Public Health Service have their homes right here in Washington, and they propose to have their homes here. If their salaries are not sufficient, let us increase the salaries, and not undertake in this way to increase them by allowances for quarters equal to those of similar officials in the Army and Navy. Another proposal, where they are used in comparison with the Army and Navy, is for the same allowance for transportation of baggage, 7,200 pesos, as if a traveling surgeon going around investigating health conditions in various places has as much baggage as a Navy or Army officer.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman think if he is going to get $6,000 a year, and when he finishes he is to get a pension for life, that he ought to have collected sufficient baggage to enable him to keep up that station of life?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Surgeon General, as the gentleman knows, does not travel at all. His domicile is here in Washington. This is nothing more than increasing salaries, and that is why I am opposed to it.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], or so much of that time as he may desire.

Mr. MANN. I want an hour's time; I may want to yield to somebody else.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that out of the three hours which have been provided for general debate, one hour of which was yielded to me, that I have to take the time to explain what the bill is. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] did not explain it. My distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], who spoke in favor of it, did not explain it. Both made speeches, good speeches, sound speeches, reflecting the sentiment of the House and the country with reference to the good work done by the Public Health Service. There is no one here who feels a greater interest in the Public Health Service or who has tried to be a better friend of the Public Health Service than I have, but there come times when it seems to me that Congress in appropriating the money out of the Treasury is compelled to say "Nay." The Public Health Service during my service in this House has had passed several laws increasing their compensation. Two years ago we passed a law increasing the basic pay in the Public Health Service. That does not represent the total pay, so that we made larger increases in the pay of that service than have been made in any other service of the Government in many years' time. Two years ago we increased the basic pay of the Surgeon General from $5,000 to $6,000; the basic pay of assistant surgeon from $2,900 to $4,000; senior

surgeons, from $2,500 to $3,500; surgeons, from $2,500 to $3,000; passed assistant surgeons, from $2,000 to $2,500; assistant surgeon from $1,600 to $2,000. These increases would have been sufficient to have satisfied any other employees of the Government, but those increases carried additional increases beside the ones I have enumerated. They, in fact, included, with longevity pay, the salaries of assistant surgeons from $2,900 to $5,000, not yet including allowances for rooms, which were $600, making an increase from $4,660 to $5,600 a year. We increased the senior surgeons from $3,500 to $4,500, besides the allowance for rooms. We increased the surgeons from $3,500 to $4,000. We made a number of other increases of this character, besides the allowance for rooms.

Now, here is an increase, made two years ago, in the salaries of all of these employees or officials of the Government, ranging from the neighborhood of $500 a year to $1,000 a year—only two years ago. My Democratic friends on the Democratic side of the aisle are hardly in a position to claim that, as the result of Democratic policy, the cost of living has so increased in the last two years that there ought now to be a further increase in salaries. But certainly if there ought to be an increase anywhere in the Government service, it is not in the salaries of the higher-grade officials; it is in the salaries of those who draw pay from $500 to $1,500 a year.

Now what does this bill propose to do? Under the guise of furnishing commutation for rooms and light and heat it proposes a considerable increase in the actual compensation of these officers or employees of the Government. It is a funny thing that whenever you have one service of the Government enjoying certain privileges every other service of the Government would like to get the same privilege. The military branch of the Government, for reasons which are obvious to everybody, has always received special privileges in the way of compensation, retirement, and allowances everywhere in every country to a certain extent. Now the Public Health Service comes in and says—and it has been making this claim for some years—"Why, you allow a surgeon in the Army so much for commutation for quarters, so much for light and heat. We ought to receive the same allowance." And for years they have urged that.

While I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years that claim was frequently urged, and I am glad to say that the committee never saw its way clear to allow the claim, as far as a committee report was concerned. I stated this morning that I had not agreed to a report to a bill at one time increasing the salaries of officers in this service. I am not sure that I was right about that. My recollection on these matters is somewhat hazy, because we have had these things before us so many times. I have never been in favor of an indirect method of compensation when you can get at it directly.

Two years ago the committee reported a bill to give the same allowances for rooms and light and heat that we are giving to the corresponding Army officers. Not only that, but in this Congress they reported the same bill. On December 15, 1913, they reported a bill to give to the officers of the Public Health Service the same commutation that was enjoyed by the Army. In this bill they make a slight reduction, and if we pass this bill the Public Health Service will again be before us in the next Congress seeking to have the compensation again increased so as to put them on a par with the Army surgeons, because the only excuse they ever have given for getting this increase in commutation for rooms and commutation for light and heat is that the Army surgeons have it.

Yet you do not quite put them on a par here. We will have to take it up again two years from now anyhow. They never will be satisfied until they get as much as they claim the Army surgeons get.

Only here the other day, on the Army appropriation bill, the officers had succeeded in getting incorporated into that bill as reported to the House a provision which when I called the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAY] to it he said he was not in favor of. He disapproved such a provision. That was a provision where the commutation was not enough to hire rooms in a big city or elsewhere, and then the Secretary of War could hire them regardless of expense. If $12 per month per room would not hire a six or eight room flat, under that provision the Secretary of War could hire an eight-room flat on the basis of $50 a month per room, and in some places, in some of the big cities, that is not considered an exorbitant rental.

Now, this bill proposes to increase the compensation for rooms. It proposes to allow the Surgeon General commutation for rooms, which he does not now enjoy, of $864 a year; the assistant surgeons general a commutation for rooms of $864 a year as against $600 which they now get; the senior surgeons a commutation of $720 a year as against $600 which they now get; a commutation to surgeons of $720 a year as against $600 which they now get; the passed assistant surgeons a commutation of $576 a year as against $480 which they now get; and the assistant surgeons a commutation of rooms of $422 a year as against $360 which they now get.

Those are not large increases in compensation. Why do they come for those? Each one of these officers received an increase two years ago of from $500 to $1,000 a year. In addition to the commutation of rooms, they now propose for the first time in this service to give a commutation of light and heat. It is proposed to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the power to make an allowance for light and heat; but, as a matter of fact, the allowance which is expected to be made, if allowed, is the allowance now made to certain other officers of the Government, and amounts for the Surgeon General to $288 a year; to the Assistant Surgeon General, $252 a year; to the senior surgeons, $216 a year; to the surgeons, $180 a year; to passed assistant surgeons, $140 a year; and to assistant surgeons, $108 a year.

Why should these men, efficient though they may be, receive this now proposed increase in their compensation in this indirect method of increasing compensation when two years ago they received a direct increase in compensation higher than has been granted to any other branch of the public service in many years? The salaries of the officers of the Marine-Hospital Service, now called the Public Health Service, were never fixed by Congress prior to 1902.

By the act of January 4, 1899, it was provided that the medical officers of this service should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the salaries were fixed by regulation of the service, leaving the salaries open, where Congress could control them. Then we passed the act of July 1, 1902, fixing the salaries of these medical officers at the amounts at which they were then fixed by the regulations which they themselves had made. Then, in 1902, was the first time they were put upon a fixed salary basis. They were well satisfied at that time to receive the salaries which were then fixed by their own regulations, when they had the power to make the salaries what they chose. Then they came along and got longevity pay in addition—10 per cent for each 5 years up to 20 years, or an increase of 40 per cent.

Mr. ESCH. That did not apply to the Surgeon General, however.

Mr. MANN. No; the Surgeon General did not receive longevity pay. He received a flat salary of $5,000 a year, which we raised two years ago to $6,000 a year.

In addition to all of these allowances which have been referred to, the bill provides for an allowance for baggage not to exceed in any case 7,200 pounds. They now have an allowance for baggage and personal effects in changing positions—an allowance to surgeons of 2,000 pounds, past assistant surgeons of 1,600 pounds, and assistant surgeons of 1,200 pounds, to be sent as freight. This bill proposes to give them an allowance of 7,200 pounds. They never will be satisfied as long as they can work Congress easily, and I would not be if I were in their place. It is our business to determine whether salaries shall be increased. There is not an official of the Government, not one, from the President down to the charwomen, who would not like to have their salaries increased. Of course a few years ago we increased very largely the salary and allowances of the President. He has made no request since that time for an increase, but there are no other officials of the Government that I know of who have not requested and urged increases in their salaries since that time, including the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Vice President, Members of Congress, Army and Navy officers, everybody connected with the Government. Now, we can not give large increases to most of these people. Certainly those who have received the beneficent attention of Congress only in the last Congress ought to be willing to take a back seat for a little while on increases in salaries.

This bill contains some other provisions that I do not profess to understand very well. Section 2 provides that assistant surgeons shall be promoted to the grade of past assistant surgeons in the order of seniority, at the expiration of three years commissioned service, after satisfactory examination. Here is a promotion regardless of vacancies. That also means a considerable increase in salaries. It is true the language of the bill is such that we might argue about what it means, but there will be no argument about it in the Public Health Service if it becomes a law, because it directs that certain promotions shall be made, and they will be made.

The bill provides that certain officials shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Personally, I wish all of these appointments in the Public Health Service were to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury instead of by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I am not a believer in having too many offices confirmed by the very distinguished and able body at the other end of this Capitol. I think the President ought, in the main, to be allowed to name the men executing the laws under his direction, without requiring him to dicker with anybody else. [Applause.] But the Public Health Service officers are now appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I do not know what reason actuated that distinguished body, which is the colleague of this body, in amending this bill so as to cut out their power of confirmation on a few officers named in this service. I wish they had gone further, and had cut out their power of confirmation over all appointments in the service.

For myself, I do not object at all to adding to this service certain officers and increasing their pay, because I assume—though I may not be correct about that—that it does not, in fact, add any officers, but only raises the pay of certain officers who are now in the service by authorizing their appointment as additional officers of the service.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the House at this time. I may want to yield to somebody else, or make some further remarks.

If we are going to have any economy at all, we must refuse. We pay no money out of the Treasury which somebody has not first paid into the Treasury. On every hand we are beseiged to make an appropriation for this laudable purpose and that laudable purpose, and people complain because we do not make the appropriations. I have wandered around here several years without finding anybody yet haunting the Halls of this House, or this Capitol, or the streets of this city, seeking an opportunity to pay money into the Treasury. And very often those who are most insistent that appropriations shall be made to pay money out of the Treasury are the ones who kick the hardest when they are asked to contribute small sums to be paid into the Treasury. Now, if we are going to increase governmental salaries we have got to increase taxes. Why should we now select out this service, which received its increase, more than was warranted, two years ago, and now asks for a further increase in its compensation? The truth is, friend of the Public Health Service as I am, I am going to state that the Public Health Service has been largely demoralized during the past five or six years, because there has been a propaganda from the top to the bottom, spending time working for an increase in compensation, instead of performing the work for which the men are paid.

These men do not receive poor pay. They receive salaries for life. When anything happens to them they are put upon the waiting list, on good compensation. They come into this service knowing that promotions will come to them; that they are cared for for life at good pay. I have hoped for some years in vain that instead of spending their time lobbying for a bill to increase their pay, they would devote their time to the business for which the Public Health Service was created. If some of our eminent surgeons over there would write some popular article to aid people in protecting themselves from disease, we would readily publish them by the thousands and hundreds of thousands, to the great benefit of the people of the country. I get hold of the bulletins issued by that service. I do not profess to be a man of any great understanding, but I think my understanding is probably up to the average of the people of the United States. I have read what they sometimes call a popular bulletin, but I can not understand it. I assume, although it may not be correct, that the ordinary citizen who receives it can not understand it. If they will employ some men at half the salary they now receive, and they could easily do it, to write some popular information which people can understand, something on the order of the Farmers' Bulletins that the Agricultural Department sends out, and distribute it to the people of the country, they can render invaluable assistance in preventing or curing disease or supposed ills.

I see no hope of that, even if this bill passes. They will not have received the amount of commutation that they have been asking for and they will be coming before us again.

If the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I regard as the greatest committee in this House, will tell these gentlemen, "Go and attend to your own business and do the work of the Government you are paid for; you ought to be satisfied," it would have a revivifying effect on the Public Health Service and would do more good than 40 increases in salary.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have been very much impressed with the gentleman's statement about the service. I have a high regard for the Public Health Service. I think the gentleman makes a very serious accusation against the Public Health Service when he says that they are lobbying for pay instead of attending to their business. I think that the House would be indebted to the gentleman from Illinois if he would give some specific instance on that point.

Mr. MANN. I shall not do it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like to know when they neglected the business of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman if he has never had any communication from them about it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have not.

Mr. MANN. That is queer, coming from where the gentleman does. I have been frequently besieged by them.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like to get some specific instance where they have neglected the public business.

Mr. MANN. A man can not put in his time in the public service trying to get an increase in salary without neglecting the public business. [Applause.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I think that statement can be challenged.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can challenge it; the gentleman would like to increase all salaries, I suppose.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like to increase the salaries of the men to whom the gentleman referred in the early part of his speech, the poor clerks who get from $500 to $1,500. I think there is an indictment of the Republican Party when it was in power that it did not give it to them.

Mr. MANN. I did not refer to partisan politics in the matter, but of course when a distinguished gentleman like the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island rises that is the first thing that occurs to him—partisan politics. If the gentleman wants to be nonpartisan, if he wants to correct what he says was the fault of the Republican Party, let him vote against making a second increase of salary to these highly paid officials, and then we will see what he does about increasing the salaries of the poor clerks while his Democratic friends have control of the House, the control of the Senate, and the control of the Government of the country.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I am ready to vote an increase.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is ready to vote an increase, but he will not get a chance.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have a very high regard for the surgeons of this department who do this splendid work for the people.

Mr. MANN. And probably knows nothing about it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Who?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. That is a very comprehensive charge.

Mr. MANN. A very comprehensive charge; and I am a very correct charger.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I doubt the gentleman's statement; but I have had occasion to observe the work done by these people.

Mr. MANN. That is what I said, somebody has been after the gentleman.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Nobody has been after me.

Mr. MANN. No one understands what this department is doing unless he goes out of the way to understand it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. No one has been after me; I carry my intelligence with me.

Mr. MANN. I did not understand what the gentleman said, because he was talking when I was talking. He could not keep still when I wanted to answer him. I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have nothing more to say to the gentleman from Illinois. I speak very seldom in this House, and the gentleman from Illinois speaks frequently. I merely wished to state something that was within my own knowledge, to say a good word for a service that does very excellent work, and I think it comes with ill grace from the gentleman from Illinois to make a statement as to the knowledge of any man on such a bill and in such a nasty manner.

Mr. MANN. That is sweet tempered. I do not believe the gentlemen is familiar with the Public Health Service yet, but if he is it is because some of these people have been working upon him to support their proposition.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. No one has been working on me.

Mr. MANN. Well, working him then.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. No one has been working me.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, they very often work people without their knowing it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I do not know what is working the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Very often people are worked without their knowledge. I do not see this benefits anything. I endeavored to be courteous to the gentelman, but it does not seem to have any effect. The gentleman can vote for these increases if he wants to. Other gentlemen can do the same thing. I can see no occasion for granting a second increase in compensation to these employees of the Government within two or three years' time. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly get as much pleasure in voting against this measure as any small assault I have seen made on the Treasury. Of course I have witnessed some assaults here by valiant armies for much larger booty than this, and I have swatted those chargers upon the Treasury with more pleasure and appreciation than I shall in this case, because the loot that is sought to be abstracted here is not so large as it is usually in such cases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in these brief 15 minutes it is unnecessary for me to say I wish that the human family might be healthy. I believe we all are on the side of health, although I am not so enthusiastic about throwing about the people all the regulations, inspections, investigations, suggestions, and advice on the part of the Government as to their health as some other gentlemen are in this Chamber.

I have no doubt that if those gentlemen, high priced, high paid, and learned, who are in the Health Service, had their way about it they would inspect every laborer in the country; they would inspect every farmer and probably require him, if the matter went as far as they would like it to go, to take his regular evening bath, keep his corns properly pared, and his nails manicured. [Laughter.] Indeed, the way we are traveling in this good Nation we will pretty soon provide supervisors for all the people in all the walks of life. Not only have we doctors to make folks stick out their tongues to see if they are in good health, not only have we now high-priced employees in the Forest Service going about over the country looking at the roots of trees and finding bugs upon them that are likely to destroy the forests, and having litigation with the homesteaders and incidentally eating up all of the forest-reserve funds in the payment of their salaries, but these activities will extend. We already have Government farmers going about, getting $100 or more a month, telling the farmer how to work, without working any themselves incidentally; telling the farmer how to farm and himself having been a failure as a farmer. I do not know how far it will go. I do not know how small the individual will become, finally having his ears pinched to pay this tax and his back stripped to pay that tax to sustain a growing army of Federal employees, but I can see how that Government doctor, the farm expert, your Government forest expert, the bug picker, when he draws his salary through life and when he gets old gets a pension which the gentleman from Illinois says he is going to get—and they are going to get them—you know they are going to get pensions all right—I can see that your Government farmer will sit down and watch the toil of his fellows and laugh at them because he is on the pension roll. The old Government bug inspector will be going through the forests where he once idled away hours, drawing pay from the people, with his gun and dog as a sportsman. Oh, if we get this beautiful socialism that taxes the people on all the activities of their industrial lives in order to set over them a great swarming army of Federal employees and inspectors the people will be wonderfully protected—wonderfully protected against every idea and every initiative and every personal individual ambition through all their lives. We know all the wastebaskets are filled in the morning with reports of bureaus and commissions. We have got one for everything. No bug is too little and no social problem is too great but that we manufacture a bureau or commission of some kind with salaried fellows [applause] to look after the insects and to look after the problems.

Now, I would be better pleased about this matter if this Bureau of Health would stick to the health business, and I candidly confess I have not read all the numerous bulletins with which I fill my wastebasket every morning from the Health Service any more than you gentlemen, but I just happened this morning, because I knew this bill was coming up, to glance at one of their health bulletins. The first word in that health bulletin, the first line, reads like this—get it; it is worth your while to get it:

> The spirit of individualism is rapidly passing out of modern society.

[Laughter.]

Mr. JACOWAY. Is that a health scientist?

Mr. DIES. That is Dr. Schereschewsky.

Now, you laugh at that, but I will give you the letters composing the word and let you see if you can pronounce it. It is "S-c-h-e-r-e-s-c-h-e-w-s-k-y." [Renewed laughter.] But he told the truth. I am not making fun of his name. He is not responsible for that. I have no doubt but that he is a learned Socialist, and he told the truth when he said "The spirit of individualism is rapidly passing out of modern society." And you and I, who hold the commission of the American people under this Constitution, under this representative democracy, are helping individualism to pass out of modern society. When the people clamor for relief from the burdens of taxation we appoint a commission at the people's expense to see about it. Do the people want relief from their taxes, we tax them more to find out why they are grumbling. [Laughter.]

Now, this bulletin by this gentleman tells a few of the things they want to do. I wish I had time to go more fully into some of the things that not only this gentleman wants to do but other uplifters in this Government, and I serve notice now, so that any gentleman may run who wants to run, that on some one of these days I am going to get an hour on an appropriation bill, and I am going to prove what this gentleman says, that by legislation in this Chamber and in this Congress and in the past Congresses and in this administration and in the administrations of the past we are helping to do in all our legislation just what this doctor says, "killing the spirit of individualism" and setting up in this country a bureaucracy, a Government of commissions, and we are coming rapidly to a Government of socialism. [Applause.]

Well, he goes on here, and on page 5 of this bulletin and lays out the plans that the Bureau of Health has for the safeguarding of the health of the American people:

> First, the prevention of the introduction and control of communicable diseases; the detection of physical defects and diseases in their incipiency among workers; the adaptation of work to the physical condition of the worker.

In other words, when they inspect the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] they are likely to tell him that he is working too hard. [Laughter.] And whenever they inspect me they will probably tell me that I am not working hard enough. [Laughter.]

Now, taking that one idea about suiting the man to the job, these learned Socialists who are going to get all this money out of the Government and draw pensions when they get so that they can not work are going to tell everybody the kind of job they are fit for, and, of course, along with that will go the Government power to make a man do what he is fit to do and prevent him from doing what he is not fit to do. [Laughter.] Listen:

> Adaptation of the work to the physical condition of the worker. It is evident that certain classes of work require certain physical qualifications or the absence of physical defects or diseases.

Now, if a man has the hookworm and they find him working out in the field they will take him and say, as one of your quasi parents in this paternal Government, "My good friend, you are too much infested with hookworm to go on with this work. You should be given a lighter employment."

And right in this connection, if I might say it without being officious, I wish to remind you that it is now being propagated all over the country that the Government owes everybody a job, and this gentleman evidently has that in mind when he says the job should suit the man and the man should suit the job. [Laughter.]

Now, I have no disposition in the world to be facetious about this question, but I want to say to this House that we are treading on dangerous ground. I can speak of one little incident that I spoke of the other day with more elaboration, because you will not charge me with playing politics when I say it, and that is this: As we add to the employees of the Government we increase our difficulties in this House with respect to the courage with which we can meet public questions.

For instance, you take the rural carriers of the country. They are as powerful in my district as they are in yours. They are generally good men. They generally do about half as much work as does the farmer to whom they deliver mail. They receive generally more than twice as much pay as the farmer, and nearly always have much less than half of his investment. But the rural carrier is organized, and he is looking at us, and he is watching us, and we are afraid of him; and for all these years we have gone on increasing his pay every year that he has asked for it, I believe, and we will continue to do it unless the people generally shall wake up, which I am looking for almost any time. [Laughter.]

We not only give the rural carrier from two to five times as much as the farmer, whose servant he is, can make, but we give

him free accident insurance and a little free life insurance, I believe, and when the Postmaster General tells us that we could save the people who are served, the taxpayers of the country, $17,000,000 a year by having this work done in a businesslike way, by contract, we in effect say to him, "How dare you put your hands upon the rural carriers of this country, who are looking at us and watching us all the time, in order to relieve the taxpayers, whom we can satisfy by an offer to buy their cotton and invest the money in railroads in Alaska or invest the money in ships to go to sea?" [Laughter.] If the rural carrier wants something, we pay him in cash out of the pockets of the people. If, however, the people want something, we tell them we will make them happy by building railroads up in Alaska and by having ships sail the seas. [Laughter and applause.] When the taxpayers of this country want something we tax them still further to give them relief.

That is the truth. I appeal to you as one patriot to other patriots, as one citizen of this Republic to other citizens of the Republic: How will it be with us when the Government gets into these other activities? What will be the eloquence in the other Chamber when a Senator arises in his place to ask increased pay for a poor sailor? How our friends will bleed and die here when a conductor or brakeman from Alaska comes in with his ears frozen off and his toes frozen off. If you grant a pension to a rural carrier with two legs in a moderate climate, in the Temperate Zone, how will Senators and Congressmen stand up against the demands of men who have braved the briny ocean amidst its stormy waves and the other fellow who has just come back from Alaska frozen stiff as an icicle? [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 25 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas, if he wants it. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I can not only use that five minutes, but I could use five hours in calling upon you to rally round the flag of individualism, round the flag of the old Republicanism and the old Democracy of this country, as against this socialism which is leading the people into the fallacy of Government ownership. And I am going to use more time in this Chamber and out of it, and I am going to stand for the man who pays the taxes. I am going to stand for the individual against the Government. I am going to stand for the people who have been hoodwinked with false promises. I am going to stand for the farmer in my district, who has been told that the Government ought to buy his cotton, and I am going to tell him that he is being deceived by gentlemen who know full well that the Government has nothing to buy cotton with. [Applause.] I believe, gentlemen of this Chamber, that a little innocent demagoguery is a good thing in Congress, but we are carrying it too far. From this Chamber and from the other Chamber at the other end of this Capitol we are educating the people to believe that the Government ought to buy their produce, that the Government ought to find a job for them and pay them a salary, that the Government ought to look after their health, that the Government ought to take care of them when they are old and in poverty. I hope that gentlemen will tell the people that the Government can do nothing of the kind, and that the Government never will do anything except to spend money and tax the pockets of the people. I wish the American people to know that all the Government can do is to give them a fair and equal chance in the race of life. Let the farmer alone, to stand upon his manhood, to work out his destiny in his fields, and stop teaching him that it is the duty of this Government to buy his produce or lend him money upon it. Let those who want to escape the ills of poverty learn the truth. Do not keep on taxing them and making them poorer when you tax them, but tell them the truth, that they must labor and practice economy if they would escape poverty. That will do for this time, but I am going to get some time to make a speech on these questions. I know I have not as much sense as many of you gentlemen have. Probably you can make better speeches than I can; but I have just enough sense to know that, small as I am, I do not love an easy place in Congress well enough to keep on holding it and eating the taxes of the people without telling them the truth, and that we are deceiving them about the functions of government and about the duty that the Government owes them and what they ought to expect from the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who has just taken his seat, because I feel sure that if he had read one of the recent bulletins issued by the Health Department he would withdraw any insinuation that he may have made that they are not worthy of their hire and that they ought not to have pensions. I want to read to him bulletin No. 40, issued by the United States Public Health Service, for release January 22, 1915:

[Health news.—Issued by the United States Public Health Service. For release January 22, 1915, No. 40.]

DO YOU KNOW YOUR AGE AND BIRTHDAY?

How old are you? When were you born? See if you really know. See if your children know how old they are.

Do not laugh at these simple questions until you try the test. Assume that you were born on March 16, and that you are 16 years old, in what year were you born?

According to a recent issue of the Public Health Reports it is a common occurrence to find school children, even high-school pupils in the junior and senior years, who can not tell how old they are, or who, if they know their age, can not tell accurately in what year they were born.

Now I call attention to the rest of this, particularly to the Members who have been inclined to think that these bulletins are not necessary to the public.

You will need this information when you apply for a marriage license—

I commend that to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] and my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], old bachelors, all.

You will need this information when you apply for a marriage license, or in registering for voting, or in seeking a Government position, or in case you claim that you are heir to a fortune that is going to some other person. You may have to go under oath as to your age when you pay your customs duties upon return from your next European trip, so you should practice up.

I commend that to my Democratic friends.

In some of our States there is no birth registration, so you may not be able to prove from the records that you ever were born—

Think what a calamity that would be to people going around over the country, not knowing that they ever had been born. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. From Bulletin No. 40, issued by the United States Public Health Service, for release to the newspapers January 22, 1915. It is a part of the advertising scheme that this Government is paying for, to which I have attempted to call attention on several occasions, which I think is absolutely in violation of the law. This is printed in the department in violation of the law, which provides that all printing shall be done in the Government Printing Office. They evade that by printing it in this form—some sort of a manifolding device—

This might be embarrassing to you if you want to marry in Europe.

Perhaps the easiest way to remember you are is to form some jingle or rhyme on your birth year. For instance: "In 1897 little Johnnie came from heaven," or "In 1882 little Susie began to boo."

[Laughter.]

Never mind what the rhyme is, just so you remember it, and if, after reaching the age of 40, you want to prove that you are only 23 years old, just change the rhyme, and perhaps people will believe you when you repeat the jingle to prove your youth.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not that a fake?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it is no fake.

Mr. MANN. It was published in the papers the other day.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And sent out to all the newspapers of the country in franked envelopes.

Mr. BUTLER. I will take the gentleman's word for it; but it seems incredible.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was mailed to papers, to be released on the 22d day of January, 1915. It was brought to me to show the character of bulletins that Congress permits the department to publish in violation of law. I was waiting for an opportunity to call attention to the character of these bulletins and to show how valuable they are and how we ought to continue the appropriation of money to pay for them.

Mr. NORTON. That bulletin was prepared by a distinguished surgeon, I suppose, who receives a salary of $4,000 or $5,000 a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know who it was prepared by, but I know where it comes from and that it is an official bulletin, and it is but little more silly than others that are issued by other departments.

Mr. MANN. This is really one of the most important bulletins that has been issued by the department in several years' time. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side if they want to use any more time?

Mr. MANN. I am willing to wait until the gentleman has used some of his time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 48 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois has 17 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the speech of the chairman of the committee and the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], a prominent Republican member of the committee, in favor of this proposed bill, were bottomed chiefly on the argument that in some way or other the men in this particular service were not enjoying advantages which are enjoyed by officers detailed in other services. A great deal was said about the importance of this service and the distinguished manner in which these gentlemen were fulfilling their duty.

That may all be admitted without admitting the necessity for this legislation. One of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with is this standing argument that some branch of the Government service is not enjoying in every possible way all the advantages and pay and emoluments and privileges that are enjoyed by other branches of the service. To refuse to extend these privileges is not discriminating against any branch of the service. It is true that as to the Army and the Navy we furnish commutation and quarters, because, as I take it, we own the Army and the Navy. Every minute of the 24 hours of a soldier belongs to his country. It educates him, it clothes him, it feeds him, it tells him where he shall live, what he shall eat and wear. But that does not extend to the civil service of the United States. There is no more reason for extending it to men who are not officers of the Army and the Navy than there is to extending it to postmasters or any other branch of the civil service. Why should we furnish quarters for these gentlemen? I have no doubt that there are many men serving as postmasters who would like to have us pay their house rent. I have no doubt that there are many serving in other capacities who would like to have their rent, fuel, and lights paid for. Without any reflection on the committee or upon this branch of the public service, I say that this is a wrong time for this House to begin extending this kind of privileges. [Applause.] They say it is only $46,000. Of course it is only $46,000, as an entering wedge; but how much more can we extend the principle? It is said that these gentlemen will leave the service if we do not take better care of them. I have heard that argument used about every branch of the public service. Unfortunately, all pay in the public service has not reached the point where it ought to be, but it is no more true of this branch of the service than any other. We are confronted with the absolute necessity of practicing economy in the public service. We have only got a certain amount of money to expend, and it belongs to the taxpayers of the country and not to the Members of this House.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I can not. We are full of sentiment, of liberality, of generosity, to men who happen to be in the public service, forgetting our obligations to the people whose money is put into the Treasury. Not a dollar can be taken out of the Treasury until the taxpayer puts it in there. We forget that our expenditures must be limited to the economical needs of the Government wisely and efficiently administered. [Applause.]

I say that this is the wrong time for the Democratic Party or any committee to begin even with a $46,000 expenditure of this nature. Now, I take it that these gentlemen will not resign from the service. I take it that this advanced pay given them a few years ago will satisfy them on the question of pay. I take it that they have been as well taken care of as any other branch of the public service, and now at this particular time I know it is popular to talk about economy and very unpopular to practice it. [Applause.]

When you put your finger on a thing and say we ought not to spend $46,000, gentlemen say this is the wrong place to practice economy; but you must economize somewhere and everywhere or there will be no economy at all. If any man can come in and say because this branch is meritorious it must have special privileges, other gentlemen will advance the same argument about every branch of the public service. I hope this bill will not be passed, not because I have any feeling against the service, not because I am not in full and entire sympathy with the great committee that reports it, but because I believe the sacredness of the Public Treasury is far and beyond the granting of any special advantage to these gentlemen benefited by this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is reported from the committee of which I have the honor to be a member; and since I have only five minutes, I am not going to undertake to go into the details, but I want to say one thing and endeavor to impress it upon the members of this committee. Thousands of dollars are now being spent on a propaganda in the interest of what is called the national defense, providing for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, to protect this country against imagined foreign invasion, of which there is not the slightest probability. More people die in the United States every year from preventable diseases than will ever die by reason of military invasion by any foreign nation. We sit here and vote $15,000,000 to build one useless battleship and then preach economy about the expenditure of a few dollars in promoting the public health, which is a real method of national defense. I get tired of hearing economy preached over little things like this, and yet when the naval bill comes in here, with a hundred and forty or a hundred and fifty millions of dollars of practically useless expenditure, gentlemen get alarmed and cry out that battleships are needed, costing many millions, while insidious diseases are prowling abroad over the land killing thousands, hundreds of thousands of individuals, from which the people might to some extent be protected by this expenditure; but when we say a word about national defense through national health agencies there is always an awful hue and cry made in behalf of economy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Because this bill will not support one of the great steel manufactories in furnishing material to build battleships, which, when built, in order to be safe, must be as far away from sea water as possible.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman does not ask me too hard a question, yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. In order to get these little fellows to stand by the big fellows, the method is to give a little hand-out, is it not?

Mr. SIMS. Well, I have never had much experience along that line, so I can not answer.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does not the gentleman know it is a fact that if a little hand-out is not given in the way of a little pension and a little life insurance, the result being an increase of salary, that the populace would rise en masse against these hundred-million-dollar outrages we perpetrate here from year to year?

Mr. SIMS. I can not agree with the gentleman, not having looked into the facts; but these hundred-million-dollar outrages are voted because of a propaganda of fear that scare the people into supporting such propositions, while many more people die of diseases which may be prevented by a small additional expenditure. But when it comes to doing something for the people that does not require the maintaining of shipyards and steel plants there is a terrible hue and cry about it. Now I yield to others who know better than myself about the increases, but I do not think that this House ought to refuse to appropriate reasonable maintenance to the Public Health Service, a life-saving service, while we vote hundreds of millions of dollars to a life-destroying service. As far as I am concerned, I believe in being a little consistent. Defense, when nobody threatens; defense, when there is no danger to anybody except somebody not making as much money as they otherwise could make out of their manufacturing plants. They scare people in order to cause them to favor millions of useless and unnecessary expenditures, all intended to destroy life; but when it comes to doing a little something to prevent diseases, to prevent the spread of contagious diseases, and help stamp them out, it is awfully extravagant. Members will vote for the battleships, cruisers, submarines, and flying machines with which to destroy life, but not one cent for anything that will preserve life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, it is probable I will use all of my remaining time in one speech, and I will ask the gentleman on the other side to proceed.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with a unanimous report. The members of this committee after hearing all the evidence came to the unanimous decision that it was no more than just and proper that the officers of this service should be placed upon a parity, as far as salaries, grades, and allowances are concerned, with the officers in the medical service of the Army and of the Navy. We in Cali-

fornia feel particularly grateful to the Public Health Service. A few years ago bubonic plague made its appearance in California, and it was through the prompt and aggressive action of this service that that disease was eradicated. A successful campaign against infected rats was waged. It was also discovered that squirrels were susceptible to this disease. A campaign was also carried on for the extermination of those rodents.

These and other measures adopted resulted in the disappearance of that dread disease from California, the Pacific coast, and, in fact, from the entire Nation. When my friend from the South, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], was attacking this bill I could not help but recall that a few years ago—I believe it was in 1905—when yellow fever broke out in New Orleans you did not find at that time any Member of this House from Texas or from any other of the Southern States attacking and belittling the Public Health Service.

Once before, in 1878, yellow fever broke out in New Orleans, before the Public Health Service was available for this important work, and the ravages of this disease resulted in the loss of millions of dollars to the people of the South—a loss not sustained during the last outbreak, because of the high efficiency of this service.

I wish Members of this House could take the time to go over the last annual report of the Public Health Service. You would learn that the administrative supervision of the work is conducted through seven divisions, giving you some idea of the activities of the service:

First. Scientific research and sanitation.
Second. Foreign and insular quarantine and immigration.
Third. Domestic (interstate) quarantine.
Fourth. Sanitary reports and statistics.
Fifth. Marine hospitals and relief.
Sixth. Personnel and accounts.
Seventh. Miscellaneous.

I turn now to page 16 of this report, dealing with the problems which have been studied during the past year. I read:

Problems studied: Among the diseases of man investigated in the several laboratories and in the field during the year are beriberi, diphtheria, endemic goiter, hookworm disease, leprosy, typhoid fever, malaria, pellagra, trachoma, tuberculosis, typhus fever, and certain occupational diseases.

Many people imagine that the hookworm disease is found only in tropical climates, but it is a fact that it is found in many of the States of this Union.

They are also investigating the water supply and sewage, comprising three distinct lines of study, namely, the pollution of rivers and coastal waters, the disposal of sewage, and the treatment of industrial wastes.

They have also taken up the question of railroad sanitation. This is important to everyone who rides upon the railroads of the United States. They are examining the drinking water. They are seeing that sleeping cars are properly fumigated, and they are doing many other things that have a tendency to protect the health of the great traveling public.

In the last 26 years there has been only one increase in the salaries of men connected with this service, but during this same period we have enacted over 22 different laws, placing additional duties and burdens upon the men engaged in this service. I want to refer just briefly to just a few of these laws which place additional burdens and responsibilities upon the men in charge of this service, placing the others in the RECORD.

In 1891 we provided for the medical inspection of immigrants, that the medical inspection of immigrants should be made by the medical officers of this service. In 1894 we passed an act for extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of life-saving stations. We passed an act in 1895 providing for the prevention of the spread of scarlet fever and diphtheria in the District of Columbia, under the direction of men of this service. We provided in 1899 for the investigation as to the origin and prevalence of leprosy in the United States, coming under the jurisdiction of the men of this service. We provided in 1900 for the establishment of quarantine stations in Porto Rico, and extending the United States quarantine regulations to that country.

During the Christmas holidays I had the pleasure of visiting the island of Porto Rico, and I found that the men of this service had in 1913 wiped out the bubonic plague which had been found on the island. It was by their prompt action that an epidemic of that plague was prevented.

We passed in 1902 an act providing for the building of a hygienic laboratory for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases, and this also came under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service. In 1902, also, we passed an act authorizing the President to utilize the services of these men in time of threatened or actual war; and I want to say in that connection that there never has been a war in which the United States was a party where this service has not cooperated with the medical officers of the Army and of the Navy.

In 1902, also, we passed an act to regulate the sale of virus, serum, toxin, and such products in the District of Columbia, to regulate the traffic in such articles, and so forth. The administration of this law was placed under this department. In 1903 we provided for the physical and mental examination of all arriving aliens, and that these examinations should be made by the members of this bureau. We provided in 1905 for the publication of the annual reports and bulletins of the Hygienic Laboratory and of the Yellow Fever Institute of the service.

I might say in connection with the criticisms which have been made against certain publications of this department—and I know that my friend from the State of Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], while he criticizes this bulletin, does not criticize the Public Health Service, because he knows of the splendid work they have accomplished on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. A little more; yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined myself to criticize the recent press bulletin issued by the department, which has been read during the debate. I have no doubt it was issued, although it hardly seems possible. I am inclined to severely criticize the issuance of bulletins of that kind. But that does not mean that every bulletin issued by this department is of a like character.

I want to call your attention here to a number of bulletins that have been issued by the Public Health Service that are of great benefit to the people generally throughout the United States. I have here one on the "Summer care of infants." That is of particular importance, not perhaps to some of our bachelor colleagues whose names were mentioned a few moments ago, but to the people generally who are raising children it is of great value. Another is "Diphtheria, its prevention and control." Here is another bulletin of great value to the people of the country, "What is a safe drinking water?" "Prevention of malaria" is a bulletin of importance, and "The water supply of ships" is another.

I might enumerate a great many other bulletins issued by this department which are of great service to the people of the United States.

Typhoid fever is a preventable disease. We are told that in the United States about 450,000 persons are incapacitated and about 35,000 die of this disease annually. The Public Health Service is doing a great work in educating the people as to methods for the prevention of this disease.

These men are engaged in a hazardous work, fully as hazardous as that of the medical officers in the Army and Navy of the United States. I believe that just as many men lose their lives in this service as lose their lives in similar service in the Army and Navy. It seems to me that the least we can do is to place them, as nearly as we can—which we have endeavored to do in this bill—upon an equality with the officers of the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

I agree with my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and would prefer to see an appropriation made directly for salaries, omitting allowances; but the various departments of the Government have adopted that policy, and, as long as they have, and these laws remain upon the statute books, the members of our committee do not feel that we can change the entire system.

But the main question is, Are these men entitled to this increase? Are they entitled to the same pay as the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy? After careful investigation, considering the splendid work which these officers are doing in every section of the United States in protecting the health of the people, to a greater extent than many of us realize, I believe that the least we can do is to pass this bill and place them upon a footing equal with like officers of the medical service of the Army and Navy. [Applause.]

LIST OF ACTS OF CONGRESS PASSED SINCE JANUARY 1, 1880, WHICH HAVE GRANTED ADDITIONAL POWERS AND IMPOSED ADDITIONAL DUTIES UPON THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

No. 1. An act to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Approved January 4, 1889.

No. 2. An act to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases from one State to another, and so forth. Approved March 27, 1890.

No. 3. An act in amendment to the various acts relative to immigration, and so forth. Approved March 3, 1891.

This act provided that the medical inspection of immigrants should be made by medical officers of the service.

No. 4. An act granting additional powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine-Hospital Service. Approved February 15, 1893.

This act provided for maritime and interstate quarantine; for the collection and publication of sanitary reports and statistics throughout the world; for rules and regulations to be used and complied with by vessels in foreign ports; for the treatment of infected vessels; empowered the President to prohibit the introduction of persons or property for the purpose of preventing the introduction of disease from foreign countries; and authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to take over State quarantine stations.

No. 5. An act extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of the life-saving stations. Approved August 4, 1894.

No. 6. An act making appropriations, and so forth, for the District of Columbia. Approved March 2, 1895.

This act provided for the prevention of the spread of scarlet fever and diphtheria in the District of Columbia, under the direction of the health officer of the District and the Supervising Surgeon General of the Marine-Hospital Service, and for the establishment and maintenance of a disinfecting service.

No. 7. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898. Approved March 2, 1895.

This act provided for the experimental investigation of the treatment and prevention of smallpox.

No. 8. An act for the investigation of leprosy. Approved March 2, 1899.

This act provided for an investigation as to the origin and prevalence of leprosy in the United States.

No. 9. An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and so forth. Approved April 12, 1900.

This act provided for the establishment of quarantine stations in Porto Rico and extending the United States quarantine regulations to that country.

No. 10. An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii. Approved April 30, 1900.

This act provided for the establishment of quarantine stations in the Territory of Hawaii and extended the quarantine regulations of the United States to that country.

No. 11. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902. Approved March 3, 1901.

This act provided for the buildings for the Hygienic Laboratory, and for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases and matters pertaining to the public health.

No. 12. An act to amend an act (approved Feb. 15, 1893) granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties, and so forth. Approved March 3, 1901.

This act added three sections to the act of February 15, 1893, the first of which provided for the designation of boundaries of the quarantine grounds and anchorage, and provided a penalty for trespass thereon, provided punishment for false statements relative to the sanitary conditions of vessels, and so forth. The second additional section provided that any vessel sailing from any foreign port without a bill of health shall be subject to quarantine measures, and so forth. The third additional section clothed medical officers of the service with authority to act as quarantine officers, and while so serving to take declarations and administer oaths.

No. 13. An act to increase the efficiency and change the name of the United States Marine-Hospital Service. Approved July 1, 1902.

This act changed the name of the service; provided that the salaries and allowances of the commissioned medical officers shall be the same as provided by the regulations of the Marine-Hospital Service; created the grade of assistant surgeon general in the bureau; authorized the President to utilize the service in times of threatened or actual war; created an advisory board for the Hygienic Laboratory; authorized the appointment of competent persons to take charge of the various divisions of the Hygienic Laboratory; authorized conferences with State or Territorial boards of health with the service; authorized the collection of mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics; and authorized the President to prescribe rules for the conduct of the service.

No. 14. An act to regulate the sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products in the District of Columbia, to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and so forth. Approved July 1, 1902.

No. 15. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States. Approved March 3, 1903.

This act provided that the physical and mental examination of all arriving aliens shall be made by medical officers of the service, and required that said officers shall have certain special qualifications.

No. 16. Public resolution No. 20. Joint resolution providing for the publication of the annual reports and bulletins of the Hygienic Laboratory and of the yellow-fever institute of the service. Approved February 24, 1905.

No. 17. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and so forth. Approved March 3, 1905.

This act repealed the act of June 26, 1884, which made a permanent appropriation of the receipts for duties on tonnage for the expenses of maintaining the Marine-Hospital Service, and directed the preparation of annual estimates.

No. 18. An act to provide for the investigation of leprosy in Hawaii. Approved March 3, 1905.

This act provided for the establishment of leprosy investigation stations in Hawaii; for the detail or appointment of medical officers, pharmacists, and employees; and directed the preparation of regulations for the administrative government of said stations.

No. 19. An act to further protect the public health and make more effective the national quarantine. Approved June 19, 1906.

This act provided for the control, direction, and management of quarantine stations, and so forth; directed that such stations be established at suitable places on the coast line; and authorized the detention and disinfection of vessels and the treatment of sick in hospitals until all danger of infection and contagion had been removed.

No. 20. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912. Approved March 4, 1911.

This act provided for the admission into marine hospitals for study of persons with infectious or other diseases affecting the public health.

No. 21. An act to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, and so forth, approved August 14, 1907.

This act provides that the Public Health Service may study and investigate the diseases of men and conditions influencing the spread and propagation thereof, including sanitation and sewage and the pollution, either directly or indirectly, of the navigable streams and lakes of the United States, and it may from time to time issue information in the form of publications for the use of the public.

The sundry civil bill of 1914 appropriated $200,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

No. 22. An act to provide for the construction of two revenue cutters, approved June 24, 1914, contained the following provision:

Provided, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, any of the revenue cutters provided for in this act, or any other revenue cutter now or hereafter in commission, may be used to extend medical and surgical aid to the crews of American vessels engaged in the deep-sea fisheries under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe, and the said Secretary is hereby authorized to detail for duty on revenue cutters such surgeons and other persons of the Public Health Service as he may deem necessary.

An Executive order approved January 4, 1900, extended the quarantine laws and regulations of the United States to the Philippine Islands and directed that the same be administered by medical officers of the service.

An Executive order approved July 28, 1900, extended the quarantine laws and regulations of the United States to the ports of Cape Nome and Dutch Harbor, Alaska, and directed that medical officers of the service be detailed for the purpose of administering the same.

An Executive order approved February 28, 1906, directed the detail of sanitary boards for the purpose of making inspections of Government buildings.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ADAMSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] such time as he wishes to use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for such time as he wishes to use.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, because I believe it is an absolutely just measure. This is not the time to increase largely public expenditures, and there are many bills that might come before this House at some other

time that I would then favor, which if they made great charges upon the Public Treasury at this time I would not vote for, if they should come before the House. But this bill is not in that category. The total increased expenditures proposed by this bill amount to $49,000. That is the beginning and the end of it. The sole reason for the bill is to put a lot of deserving men on an equality with other deserving men in the Federal service.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman tell us why these men are more deserving than the employees of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I can tell the gentleman a good many reasons why they are more deserving. These men in their work take their lives in their hands. They are battling for humanity. [Applause.] I do not mean to reflect on the civil-service employees of this Government, but most of them are battling for themselves. We have fixed a status for Army and Navy surgeons, in reference to pay, commutation for quarters, and other incidentals. Now, we have some inefficient men in both the Army and the Naval service, but most of the men who are Army doctors and Navy doctors are not only efficient, but they are men of splendid ability, and the pay that they receive from the Government of the United States is not at all commensurate with the compensation they would receive if they practiced their profession in private life.

Now, the men, at least in the Army, have an honor compensation as well as a pay compensation, because in the Army they carry the actual rank of an Army officer. I believe that is not true of the Navy, and it is not true of this Public Health Service. Here are men in this Public Health Service who have stood as a barrier against disease when it was about to attack the people of the United States in times of epidemic. My people in the Southland owe more to these men in the Public Health Service of the United States than to any other branch of the service that I know of. When I was a boy it was not an unusual thing to see epidemics of yellow fever roll up from the Gulf coast into the Southland, at the cost of thousands of lives and to the disturbance of our entire business conditions. I have seen a shotgun quarantine against yellow fever in Alabama from one end of the State to the other, when trains had to go through the State with the windows down and the doors locked. In those times this little body of men in the Public Health Service were the men who went to the front. They were the men who were on the firing line. They were the men who protected the lives of the people, not against a foreign enemy, but against an insidious foe. You provide for an Army and Navy to protect you against the possibilities of war in the future, which may never come, and with God's help I hope the people of this country will never have to call upon the Army and Navy in the future to protect us against a foreign foe. [Applause.] But these men of this Public Health Service are called on to protect the body politic against an insidious foe that is at our door every day and every night. No man here can tell when an epidemic of smallpox or some other serious disease may break out in his congressional district, and then it will be this Public Health Service that will come to the rescue and risk their lives to protect the people. Why, officers in this service have died in recent years in the discharge of their duty.

Now, all this bill asks is that you give these men the same compensation for quarters and for other incidentals of that kind that you give to the Army and Navy. You give it to some of them now, if they happen to be stationed where the Government has quarters, but if they are ordered to a station where there are no quarters—and that is what happens when they are ordered to some place on the firing line, where there is an epidemic—you not only want them to sacrifice their quarters, but you want them to be at an additional expense in renting quarters when you order them out on the firing line.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. HARDY. In my State it is very frequently the case that smallpox finds a lodgment in some little section of my county or of my district. The county physician is under a special obligation to look after that. He does it, and the position of county physician is very much sought after. It is not supposed to be very dangerous, nevertheless it may have that element of danger. What I wish to know is, Will all these county officials be on the pay roll of the Government in case they treat patients?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all; they are not in the service. They are mere volunteers, but these men spend their entire lives in the service.

Mr. HARDY. Will the Government undertake to utilize these men?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me give the gentleman an instance. Many years ago, when Dr. Wyman was at the head of the service, we had an epidemic of smallpox in my own district. It was a mining district. A large number of employees, many of them negroes, who are hard to control, were in the mines. Our doctors in that district, able, successful men in private practice, men who of necessity could not devote all of their time to this work, battled with it for a number of months, until the epidemic became so great that it was threatening the whole section of the State. Then it was that, at my request, the Public Health Service—it was known by a different name at that time—sent their officers there, organized the forces, brought about compulsory vaccination, and perfected an organization that drove the smallpox out of that community; and it never has been there since. That was a great service.

Mr. HARDY. Why should these men who perform the work for the United States have a pension any more than the local men?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman misunderstands the scope of this bill. This is not a pension bill. The whole thing in this bill is this: These men are in the employ of the Federal Government as surgeons and assistant surgeons of the Public Health Department. They have a definite duty to perform, just exactly as the surgeon in the Army and the surgeon in the Navy have their duties to perform. Their business is to make investigations to protect the public health.

Mr. HARDY. The reason I asked the question is because the gentleman spoke of putting them in the same line as the Army and the Navy, and I supposed that it was a proposition for pension, with other things.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This has nothing to do with direct pay or retirement pay of these officers; that is in the law now, although I do not know exactly what the provisions are. But the Army and Navy surgeons are given compensation for quarters in places where the Government has not quarters. This bill, in the main, is to give these men in this Public Health Service the same compensation for quarters, a house to live in, that is given to the surgeons in the Army and the surgeons in the Navy, and even given to the men in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. SHERWOOD. In the State of Ohio we have a State board of public health, and in all the municipalities we have local boards of public health. What is the necessity for duplicating this work? Is it because they have superior experience?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That goes to the question of the organization of the service and not to this bill. The reason is that these men make it their business, their entire business, to study questions of epidemics, to make investigations and be prepared to meet these questions, and that is the policy of the Government now. It is not a question of whether you will adopt a new service.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The members of the health departments in the State of Ohio, both State and municipal, devote all their time to the business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that under our quarantine system—of course, the gentleman from Ohio does not come in contact with that—the Federal Government now has entire control of the quarantine system. At one time the State divided with the Government that control, but that quarantine control is under this Public Health Service, and although yellow fever might never come into the State of Ohio and threaten the constituents of my friend I will say to him that whenever yellow fever comes into the South and threatens the constituents that I represent, the business interests of Ohio are as badly affected by it almost as the business interests of my State, because it stops the wheels of commerce. These men stand guardians over the public health at the frontier and protect the lives of our people, and they protect against the disturbances of business conditions that always follow epidemics in this country. I believe that this Public Health Service is one of the most important services in the whole organization of our Government.

But that is not the question here. The question here is whether you will do equal justice by these men with the Army and the Navy surgeons.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman think that these men are on a parity with the officers of the Army and the Navy who have to move about from place to place where there are no facilities, while these people are located here?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend from Texas is mistaken.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There is another provision——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman let me answer his question?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Let me put the whole question. There is another provision where it says the salary shall be increased 10 per cent when in active duty outside of the limits of the United States or on the seas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that provision relates only to when the surgeon is ordered to some place outside of the United States for investigation. That same provision applies to the Army and the Navy; there is no difference. They are not located in Washington. The headquarters are here, but they are located in various parts of the United States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Are not quarters provided under the present law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are quarters provided, but no commutation for quarters. As I understand it—and I hope the chairman will correct me if I make a mistake—as I understand it there are quarters provided for them at some places like quarters for an Army surgeon when he goes to a fort in Texas or Alabama. But when they are moved to a point where their work requires them to go, where there are no quarters, then they lose their quarters and get no compensation for it.

When you order an Army or a Navy surgeon to a place where there are not quarters provided he gets compensation in lieu of quarters. The place where these men are most efficient, where they render the best service, where they accomplish the most good, is when we order them to a point where there are no quarters established, because they go there to meet epidemic conditions, and under the present law as it stands to-day you would penalize them because you order them on the firing line.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact whenever they go to places like that their expenses are all paid?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not for quarters, not for rent.

Mr. CALLAWAY. When they go to a place like that their expenses include hotel expenses; and that is necessarily quarters, is it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not necessarily. If they went for a few days, it would cover it, but most of the places they go it takes time; at most of the places to which they go to battle with disease they stay six months or a year; stay there permanently; and he will not have his hotel bill paid.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not usually the condition that they are called to those places for days only?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT. They were in New Orleans for eight months.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very often they are ordered at the outbreak of an epidemic, like I cited in Birmingham, and it took five or six months before they could get the epidemic in hand.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I do not know what the rents are in Alabama, but I see in here it is $12 a room for six rooms. A man might be at a great many places where there are epidemics where they would not expend any such amount as that; some places it would possibly be greater.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know anything about what they pay for rent here or there. The idea is that we feel that they should have equal compensation for quarters that we give to the Army and Navy surgeons. Now, without reflecting in any way upon the great services of the gentlemen who serve in the Army and the Navy, I think these men stand as their peers in the service that they have rendered the country and in the ability that they have brought to the service.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There is no question about that; but I can not understand why we should prize up one salary by saying some other man is getting that same salary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here is the whole thing in a nutshell, although I do not want to occupy all the time of my friend, because he has to yield to other people; but the whole thing in the last analysis is this: That you have got capable, competent, scientific men who serve in this service for a lifetime. Men of the same class and ability in private life receive a great deal more compensation. If we want to keep efficient, capable men in the service, we have to give them fair and reasonable compensation or they will leave it and take up their practice in private life. Now, I believe that these men are not overpaid. I believe they are underpaid for the service which they render the Government. I believe there is no service in the United States that is more important to the people of the United States, and especially to the people from my part of the country, where we have epidemics; and these men stand at the outer guard of our country to protect our people, and to say that $49,000 is a matter we should hesitate to appropriate to do justice to such people I say is begging the question of economy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There is one further question I desire to ask. I see in section 2 the following:

SEC. 2. That the term of office of the Surgeon General shall be for a period of four years, at the expiration of which term he shall, unless reappointed, be carried as an extra officer in the grade of senior surgeon. Assistant surgeons shall be promoted to the grade of passed assistant surgeon in the order of seniority at the expiration of three years' commissioned service and after satisfactory examination.

Would not that have the effect of just interminably increasing this list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, now, I will tell the gentleman that that is in the interest of economy, if I understand it. I asked the chairman because he is better informed than I am, and I do not want to make a statement which I can not justify, and I will ask the chairman to correct me if I am wrong. Under the law to-day these surgeons are capable of retirement——

Mr. ADAMSON. I explained that when I was on the floor. At present the Surgeon General when he goes out of office would go out of the service, and can not be retained in the service, no matter how useful. Under the provisions of this bill he simply is sent back to the grade of senior surgeon and works as long as he is able in that grade, without any increased pay.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He goes back and works without any increased pay instead of going on the retired list, like he would in the Army and Navy, at three-fourths pay.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is a decrease.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In fact, he gets a decrease when he leaves the Surgeon General's office. I can see no objection to that provision whatever. I think I have stated my views in reference to the bill, and I sincerely hope it will pass. I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. How much on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman use some time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to waive my time, and I will waive it, but before doing that I desire to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. C. C. McCollum, of Pawnee, Okla., and other documents accompanying the letter, not of very great length—in fact, very brief—but a comprehensive view of the situation in the Philippines as bearing upon the capability of the Filipino people.

Mr. McCollum is a very capable gentleman and served four years in the Philippines, and his observations are interesting, fair, and comprehensive, and will no doubt be of great service to the House in determining the future policy of the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will waive the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma how much is there of that?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. It will take only a few pages of the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not object. Oh, I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Tennessee. I did not hear him.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it argumentative on the Philippine question?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. No; it is a statement of facts. It is absolutely fair.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I just wanted to know what it was. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who is going to waive his time, if he will yield it to me in the event I should want it? I yielded a good deal of my time to gentlemen on the other side, and some of my time was taken up in interruptions.

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will yield to me all of his time, I will use only such of it as I need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized. The gentleman from Illinois yields to the gentleman from Georgia his time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to console my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who takes the position that when he was on our committee we did everything that needed doing by rounding up everything that was proper to be done. I assure him that there still remained a good deal to do, and while we greatly deplore the gentleman's absence from the committee, we are still limping along and are trying as best we can to take care of matters that are committed to our keeping. We feel our responsibility, and we are constrained to ask for the necessary measures to keep them alive.

I also wish to state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I can prove by the word of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the distinguished Republican leader, that we are still doing business at the old stand, for he has on this floor many times commended us during the present Congress.

I also deplore the fact that in our weakness none of us is able to explain a bill but the gentleman from Illinois, because he always begins his speeches by saying that nobody has explained a bill, but he will now proceed to do it. [Laughter.] But there are two or three compensating considerations in connection with that. In the first place we do not have to accept the explanations of the gentleman from Illinois. In the second place, although the gentleman from Illinois knows more than any other man that ever was in the world and can use more of his knowledge and can touch it off on a hair trigger at the same time, he is sometimes forgetful, though he sometimes is absolutely correct in his statements and indorses what is good in our bill. For instance, he indorsed the latter part of the bill providing for these experts to attend to these particular duties made necessary by the act of 1912.

That leaves only three other things that he objected to. He objected to this commutation of lodgings, and he objected to the baggage, and he objected to one other thing in the bill. I do not remember just what that was. But the gentleman also failed to remember the old bill which he introduced and passed through the House. He and I disagreed in recollection about it.

It also affords the House the further consolation of knowing that we have not done as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] says—commenced to increase salaries during this war period—but we have the advantage of the precedent set by the great genius and judgment of the mind of the great man of Illinois four years ago for this legislation. I will ask the Clerk to read the two paragraphs marked "1" and "2," and I will ask the gentlemen here to take the present bill and compare it with what is read, and they will see that, appealing from the gentleman from Illinois to-day to the gentleman from Illinois four years ago, we have got him on our side, and have got him going. [Laughter.] You remember he denied ever having supported increase of salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That hereafter the salaries of commissioned medical officers of the Public Health Service shall be as follows: Surgeon General, $6,000; assistant surgeon generals, $4,000; medical directors on active duty, 10 in number, $3,500; surgeons, $3,000; passed assistant surgeons, $2,500; assistant surgeons, $2,000. Said officers, except the Surgeon General, shall receive an additional compensation of 10 per cent of the annual salary for each five years' service, not to exceed 40 per cent: *Provided*, That the total salary of an assistant surgeon general shall not exceed $5,000; that of a medical director, $4,500; and that of a surgeon, $4,000. When officers on active duty are not provided quarters they shall receive in lieu of same commutation therefor at the rate of $12 per room per month, as follows: Surgeon General, 8 rooms; assistant surgeon general, 7 rooms; medical director, 6 rooms; surgeon, 5 rooms; passed assistant surgeon, 4 rooms; assistant surgeon, 3 rooms; and commutation for necessary fuel and lights for the same at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That officers while serving outside the boundaries of the continental United States shall receive an additional 10 per cent of their salaries while on such duty. The allowance for baggage and personal effects to an officer in changing stations shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in any case 7,200 pounds.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, that incident of the lapse of memory on the part of the gentleman from Illinois also shows the difference between responsibility and the lack of responsibility. The gentleman from Illinois was chairman of the committee at the time he introduced and passed that bill, and as such was responsible to the country for the good of this service. When we passed the last bill two years later he was not chairman of that committee, but was the leader of the minority, and as leader of the minority he was startling the world and troubling the majority of this House by the most remarkable and interesting stunts as an objector that were ever seen in the world. [Laughter.]

Now, these gentlemen who are great economists are just like the gentleman from Illinois was. He has ceased to be chairman of the committee, and he not only did not reintroduce his bill with those things in it but he forgets about it, forgets that he had ever done it at all and that he had ever voted for a bill to increase salaries, although it was in his bill at the last Congress and in the one which passed.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I say, it is the difference between responsibility for the institutions and otherwise. These gentlemen who are kicking about economy are not responsible for these institutions. These gentlemen who are so particular about the $50,000 increase to protect the country against the ravages of dread disease would not be responsible for it, but we on this committee are responsible for looking after the interests of these institutions, and we try to do it without favor or affection.

We do not even try to talk about lobbying. If these people do not afford us the information we want, we summon them and ask them for the information; and if the time ever comes when any gentleman who talks about lobbying does not hold his ear open to the representations of all American citizens, official or otherwise, no matter what his business may be, it will be a bad day for the Republic. Away with the idea that getting information from the people is lobbying! This committee tries to do its duty. It tries to see what is needed by the institutions under its jurisdiction, and it brings in bills for their support. They were not initiated since the war abroad. They were instituted months—and one of them a year—before war broke out in Europe. But even if that were so, they ought to be done, because in times of disturbance and of upheaval and great danger it is of more importance that we should guard the avenues by which diseases may come into the country. [Applause.] Our law two years ago imposing this additional work on these people was necessarily followed by this bill to provide additional assistance and additional compensation to the men who do the work.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter when commissioned medical officers of the Public Health Service on the active list are not provided quarters they shall receive in lieu of same commutation therefor at the rate of $12 per room per month, as follows: Surgeon General, six rooms; assistant surgeon general, six rooms; senior surgeon, five rooms; surgeon, five rooms; passed assistant surgeon, four rooms; assistant surgeon, three rooms; and shall receive commutation for necessary fuel and lights for the same at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That officers while serving beyond the continental limits of the United States or on sea duty shall receive an additional 10 per cent of their salaries and increase while on such duty.

The allowance for baggage and personal effects to an officer in changing stations shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in any case 7,200 pounds.

Mr. BORLAND. I move to amend by striking out the enacting clause of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by striking out the enacting clause.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, we might as well dispose of this bill without the necessity of piecemeal amendment or further discussion of it. If the House is in favor of entering upon this new plan of providing commutation of quarters to men who are performing some civil function, this is possibly a good place to start; and a great deal can be said in favor of the fine character of the work these gentlemen are doing and its importance to the people of the country. I concede that a great deal can be said along that line, and practically all the speeches have been taken up with that. Those that have not been taken up with that line of argument have been devoted to the other equally fallacious argument, in my opinion, that these gentlemen are losing some of the good things that other gentlemen are getting. Every man who has served on any committee making appropriations for the public service has been met with that argument time and time again, that some set of men in the public service are getting more advantages than some other set of men in the public service are getting. There is no greater difficulty than that in the way of Members who would make economical appropriations.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FIELDS. Does not the gentleman believe that some men who are in the public service are getting too many advantages?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly. I believe if we want to practice economy, one way is to reduce the advantages which some men are getting.

Mr. FIELDS. I heartily agree with the gentleman in that.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is not that the lever that they use to prize up salaries and allowances in every department of the Government?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and if we pass this it will be a lever for a great many other gentlemen who think highly of their own services and who will come in and make a strong argument based on that ground.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Has anybody intimated that any of these men are going to quit the service on account of the insufficiency of what they receive?

Mr. BORLAND. Somebody has intimated that they were going to quit the service; but I think they will quit just the same if they are men who are worth so much more than they are getting here. But that argument has been used also by men in every branch of the public service, that they were underpaid. I am going to concede that that is true, but that is another fallacious argument for increasing salaries all along the line.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is the same argument that is used by these fellows that are sitting in the departments down yonder, some of whom can not do anything at all, is it not?

Mr. BORLAND. You can not begin to practice economy and efficiency in the public service as long as you make flesh of one and fish of the other. We can not take one branch of the public service and say, "These gentlemen take their lives in their hands, and they are indispensible, and nobody else stands on a footing with them." We can not do that. We can not discriminate among public servants in that way.

I concede that these men are very valuable, and that they could earn more money elsewhere; but other men in the public service think the same thing about their own work, and other men in the public service are just as devoted to their work as these men are to their branch of the service. I do not think that is an argument for putting them up on a pedestal and extending to them advantages that we are not willing to extend to others. If there is any merit at all in this argument of discrimination, the best way to remedy it, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] has suggested, is to take away the special privileges from those who enjoy them, who ought to be on the same footing as these men who do not enjoy them. That is the only way to economize, and if you gentlemen believe in economy and believe that the Public Treasury is not now adequate to meet all of the demands that we think ought to be made upon it, the thing to do is to strike out the enacting clause of this bill and settle the thing right now. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee desires and is entitled to know the reason why some of us support this measure, and why we believe it to be genuinely for the public interest. If the only basis for its enactment be, as has been argued here, that it will place one part of the public service upon an equality with other similar divisions of the public service, I would not vote for it. That is not a good reason for the increase of any public expenditure. I shall vote for it only because I believe it will be in the interest of true national economy and true national welfare, and because it is necessary to preserve the usefulness of a most important public service. The reason for such belief is this: The officers of the Public Health Service perform a more dangerous service for their country than do similar officers in the Army and the Navy. It is more important for the public and grows increasingly. We know that there are two classes of public duties with which this Public Health Service is particularly charged. The first is that of quarantine and supervision in our foreign commerce, and the second concerns the health activities of our people in our domestic commerce. It has been stated to you, and every man on this floor knows, that a pestilence coming within our borders in our foreign commerce is more devastating, and causes more loss of life and loss of property and loss in commerce than anybody can calculate; and if there is any governmental activity which ought to be made of national importance it is a public health service that will stop pestilence at the very door of its entrance into this country. The importance of duty and responsibility can not be measured as a matter of expense.

There is another public activity, and that is the conserving the welfare of our people in our domestic commerce and in our domestic activities. The commerce between our States and along our lakes and rivers is of tremendous importance to the welfare of our people and the development of our country. With the advance of civilization and the increase of population, there is a constant increase of danger of disease, so that the health of our country should be more and more guarded every day. Controversies and quarrels in various sections arise over the pollution of streams, over the suppression of infectious and contagious diseases, and their communication from one part of our country to another. In every session of Congress with which I have been acquainted, the Congress has added to the duties and work of this bureau. The gentleman from California spoke of the care of travel, of the fumigating of railroad cars. That duty was added to the work of this Public Health Service, I think, during the last Congress. The work of caring for pollution of our streams, of our navigable waters, of coordinating and leading the various activities of our country, has been placed in this bureau.

Controversies over these troublesome subjects frequently arise between States and different localities which have to be composed, and can be easiest composed, by the National Government. The people of this Government believe in the honesty, ability, and the integrity of the Public Health Service. The Treasury Department, at the requests of Senators and Representatives, often send their officers to different parts of the country to compose these important differences. We had a controversy on the Mississippi River which was of difficulty. It was only settled by sending there officials of the Public Health Service to confer and advise. People yield to their opinions and judgment and submit to what the public-health officials state should be done. Such work of this service is increasing, must increase of necessity, and its importance for the welfare of our people must be appreciated. Its leadership in the way of research as to disease and its care and amelioration has been fully described.

The result is that this service requires the very best skill which can be obtained. It needs, for the benefit of our people, the very best men; it needs the very best service from these men; it needs the very best equipment that can be obtained and maintained. The work of this service is more dangerous and more important than the corresponding work in the Army and the Navy. If you pay the corresponding officials of the Army and the Navy more, if you give them a larger salary, if you give them greater allowances, if you give them better pay, these officials will leave this service and go into the easier and better service. That must be expected and will sure come about. The result is that the health of the people is not cared for as it should be. We are liable to have in this important work inefficient men, or men not as well qualified as are the other services or as necessary for our people. For that reason I believe it is necessary to keep these men who are now guarding the health of the people. When we get good men let us keep them and utilize their services and not allow them to be induced to leave for private practice or for services with better opportunities. The House can not afford to take chances upon such a very important subject. For that reason I supported this bill, and I believe that it is necessary that it should be passed. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago my genial friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, produced and had read from the Clerk's desk a bill introduced by me in a former Congress when I was chairman of that committee. I introduced such a bill, and I would like to ask my friend from Georgia if it was ever favorably reported.

Mr. ADAMSON. My recollection is that it came to the House and was passed by the House.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman had read a copy of a bill introduced, because it was the only copy he could find. I introduced such a bill, but it was not reported. There is not a chairman of a committee who does not introduce a bill prepared by the bureau or department connected with the legislative jurisdiction of this committee without reading it, because it is so much more convenient to read it after it is in print than it is before. That was my custom. But I never favored such a bill, and I do not now.

I join in everything that has been said with reference to the value and importance of the Public Health Service, but that is no reason why these same men who fixed their own salaries prior to 1902, then obtained congressional sanction in fixing those salaries at the same amount that they had fixed them, and then in 1912 obtained an increase in their salaries of from $500 to $1,000 per man—that is no reason why we should now, under the guise of furnishing them heat and light, make another increase in these salaries. There will not be a single man in the Public Health Service who will leave because this bill is defeated, if it be defeated; there will not be a single man remain in the service because the bill is passed, if it be passed.

These people of the Public Health Service are good men; they have been well treated. Why do not they quit their importunings for increased pay? It is time they did.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is the salary of these men now?

Mr. MANN. It ranges from $6,000 down to $2,000. The man enters the service at $2,000 and allowances, and during his service he gets foggy pay, and it runs up to $6,000, besides allowances. Four or five thousand dollars salary for life is not so

bad. There is not a man in the Hall of this House who enjoys a perpetual salary of $4,000 a year. I doubt whether many of them will receive that salary for the balance of their lives, and I hope they will all live long and happily. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAMSON) there were—ayes 72, noes 50.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ADAMSON and Mr. BORLAND.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 78 ayes and 56 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARNHART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 2616) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final defeat or passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves the previous question on the bill.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Of course the Chair understands that, but the practice has been as a matter of fact, because it is not five minutes since the Chair looked it up——

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. That has been the practice, and on that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] moves the previous question.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Chair to put the question so as to have an automatic call of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what the Chair is going to do if the gentleman will give him a chance.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to give the Chair a chance.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee to strike out the enacting clause of this bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BORLAND. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 82, noes 61.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, does it have the same effect to make the point of no quorum or to demand a roll call?

The SPEAKER. It has.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to make it.

The SPEAKER. Which one does the gentleman want to do?

Mr. ADAMSON. I make the point of order of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-seven gentlemen are present—not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 132, answered "present" 1, not voting 120, as follows:

YEAS—171.

Adair	Campbell	Donovan	Gordon
Aswell	Candler, Miss.	Doolittle	Gorman
Bailey	Caraway	Doughton	Gray
Barton	Chandler, N. Y.	Drukker	Greene, Mass.
Beall, Tex.	Church	Eagle	Gregg
Bell, Cal.	Claypool	Fairchild	Gudger
Bell, Ga.	Cline	Fields	Guernsey
Borchers	Collier	Fitzgerald	Hamilton, N. Y.
Borland	Connelly, Kans.	FitzHenry	Hamlin
Brockson	Cox	Flood, Va.	Hardy
Brumbaugh	Cramton	Floyd, Ark.	Haugen
Buchanan, Ill.	Crisp	Fordney	Helm
Buchanan, Tex.	Danforth	French	Helvering
Bulkley	Davenport	Gardner	Hensley
Burgess	Deitrick	Garner	Hill
Burke, S. Dak.	Dershem	Garrett, Tenn.	Hinds
Butler	Dickinson	Gill	Houston
Byrnes, S. C.	Dies	Gillett	Johnson, Ky.
Calder	Dillon	Good	Johnson, S. C.
Callaway	Dixon	Goodwin, Ark.	Johnson, Utah
Johnson, Wash.	Mapes	Rouse	Switzer
Keating	Moon	Rubey	Taggart
Keister	Morgan, Okla.	Russell	Taylor, Ark.
Kelley, Mich.	Morrison	Sabath	Taylor, Colo.
Kennedy, Iowa	Moss, Ind.	Saunders	Temple
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Moss, W. Va.	Scott	Thomas
Kirkpatrick	Murray	Shackleford	Thompson, Okla.
Kitchin	Neeley, Kans.	Sherley	Treadway
Kreider	Norton	Sherwood	Tribble
Langley	O'Hair	Sisson	Underhill
Lee, Ga.	Oldfield	Slayden	Vare
Lewis, Md.	Page, N. C.	Smith, J. M. C.	Vaughan
Lieb	Paige, Mass.	Smith, Md.	Vinson
Lloyd	Palmer	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead
Lobeck	Park	Smith, Saml. W.	Wallin
McAndrews	Parker, N. J.	Smith, Tex.	Webb
McClellan	Parker, N. Y.	Stafford	Williams
McGillicuddy	Patton, Pa.	Stedman	Wingo
McGuire, Okla.	Peterson	Steenerson	Winslow
McKenzie	Post	Stephens, Miss.	Witherspoon
McLaughlin	Quin	Stephens, Tex.	Woods
Manahan	Reed	Stout	Young, Tex.
Mann	Reilly, Wis.	Stringer	

NAYS—132.

Abercrombie	Doremus	Kent	Ragsdale
Adamson	Dupré	Kettner	Raker
Aiken	Eagan	Knowland, J. R.	Rayburn
Alexander	Esch	Konop	Reilly, Conn.
Allen	Estopinal	Lafferty	Riordan
Ashbrook	Farr	La Follette	Rogers
Austin	Fergusson	Lazaro	Rothermel
Baker	Fess	Lee, Pa.	Rupley
Baltz	Finley	Lenroot	Seldomridge
Barkley	Foster	Lesher	Sims
Barnhart	Francis	Lever	Sinnott
Bartlett	Gallagher	Logue	Small
Beakes	Gallivan	Lonergan	Smith, Idaho
Blackmon	Gard	McKellar	Smith, Minn.
Broussard	Gerry	MacDonald	Stephens, Cal.
Brown, N. Y.	Gilmore	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Browne, Wis.	Harris	Maguire, Nebr.	Stevens, N. H.
Bryan	Harrison	Martin	Stone
Burke, Wis.	Hart	Mitchell	Sutherland
Burnett	Hawley	Mondell	Talcott, N. Y.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hay	Montague	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Hayden	Morgan, La.	Thacher
Carlin	Hayes	Mulkey	Thomson, Ill.
Casey	Heflin	Neely, W. Va.	Townsend
Clancy	Holland	Nolan, J. I.	Underwood
Connolly, Iowa	Howard	O'Shaunessy	Vollmer
Conry	Hughes, Ga.	Padgett	Walker
Cooper	Hull	Patten, N. Y.	Walsh
Cullop	Humphrey, Wash.	Phelan	Walters
Curry	Humphreys, Miss.	Platt	Watkins
Decker	Jacoway	Porter	Watson
Dent	Kelly, Pa.	Pou	Whaley
Difenderfer	Kennedy, Conn.	Powers	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Browning

NOT VOTING—120.

Ainey	Edwards	Hughes, W. Va.	Peters
Anderson	Elder	Hulings	Plumley
Anthony	Evans	Igoe	Price
Avis	Faison	Jones	Prouty
Barchfeld	Falconer	Kahn	Rainey
Bartholdt	Ferris	Kennedy, R. I.	Rauch
Bathrick	Fowler	Key, Ohio	Roberts, Mass.
Booher	Frear	Kless, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.
Bowdle	Garrett, Tex.	Kindel	Rucker
Britten	George	Kinkead, N. J.	Scully
Brodbeck	Gittins	Korbly	Sells
Brown, W. Va.	Glass	Langham	Shreve
Bruckner	Godwin, N. C.	L'Engle	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Goeke	Levy	Sloan
Cantor	Goldfogle	Lewis, Pa.	Sparkman
Carew	Goulden	Lindbergh	Stanley
Carr	Graham, Ill.	Lindquist	Stephens, Nebr.
Carter	Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Sumners
Cary	Green, Iowa	Loft	Talbott, Md.
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Vt.	Mahan	Tavenner
Coady	Griest	Maher	Taylor, Ala.
Copley	Griffin	Metz	Taylor, N. Y.
Crosser	Hamill	Miller	Towner
Dale	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore	Tuttle
Davis	Helgesen	Morin	Weaver
Donohoe	Henry	Mott	Whitacre
Dooling	Hinebaugh	Murdock	White
Driscoll	Hobson	Nelson	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Howell	O'Brien	Wilson, N. Y.
Edmonds	Hoxworth	Oglesby	Woodruff

So the report of the committee was adopted.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. METZ with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. IGOE with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MOORE.
Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. SHREVE.
Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. SLOAN.
Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. CARTER with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
Mr. DALE with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. ANDERSON.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. COADY with Mr. AVIS.
Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CARY.
Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. FERRIS with Mr. DAVIS.
Mr. GEORGE with Mr. FREAR.
Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. HENRY with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. JONES with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. HELGESEN.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MILLER.
Mr. LOFT with Mr. MOTT.
Mr. RAUCH with Mr. LANGHAM.
Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. PETERS.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. PROUTY.
For the session:
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a general pair with my colleague, Mr. SCULLY, and I wish to withdraw my vote and be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BROWNING, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BORLAND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report of the Committee of the Whole was adopted was laid on the table.

CALUMET RIVER, ILL.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House bill 18745, in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois. It is House Calendar No. 229.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if he cares to have the preamble read, or just the bill?

Mr. MANN. I think it all ought to be read.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then let the Clerk read it all.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18745) in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois.

Whereas by deeds dated May 4, 1887, and recorded in the recorder's office of Cook County, Ill., on April 6, 1889, in book 2497 of records, at page 219, and on April 8, 1889, in book 2481 of records, at page 271, respectively, the owners of the north quarter of fractional section 7, township 37 north, range 15 east of the third principal meridian, south of the Indian boundary line in Cook County, Ill., gave and granted unto the United States of America free and unobstructed right of way in and through the above-described ground 200 feet in width for purposes of a channel for the Calumet River, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 5, 1884, and in order to enable the United States to straighten the channel of the said Calumet River and conform to a survey and realinement of the channel lines of said river as adopted, established, and shown by plat approved by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army and filed for record in the office of the recorder of deeds of Cook County, Ill., on the 17th day of May, 1889, as Document No. 1102284, entitled "Map of the Calumet River, Ill., from Lake Michigan to Calumet Lake, to accompany report of W. G. Ewing, United States attorney, to the Attorney General, respecting cession of right of way for improvement of said river, under act of Congress approved July 5, 1884" (report dated Jan. 24, 1888, and report dated Feb. 12, 1889. William G. Ewing, United States attorney, northern district of Illinois); and

Whereas it is provided in the said deeds above referred to that "the shore or dock lines of said river as so established and shown on said plat shall hereafter for all purposes be taken as the true meandered lines of said stream"; and

Whereas a navigable channel has been cut through said north quarter of said fractional section 7 within the new channel lines of the Calumet River as shown on said map: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the old channel of the Calumet River in the north quarter of fractional section 7, township 37 north, range 15 east, of the third principal meridian, south of the Indiana boundary line, in Cook County, Ill., which lies outside of the new channel lines as established by the United States and shown on "Map of the Calumet River, Ill., from Lake Michigan to Calumet Lake, to accompany report of W. G. Ewing, United States attorney, to the Attorney General, respecting cession of right of way for improvement of said river, under act of Congress approved July 5, 1884," is hereby abandoned as navigable water.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5614. An act for the improvement of the foreign service.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. GILLETT, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 1139, Sixty-third Congress, granting a pension to Mark K. Bell, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CALUMET RIVER, ILL.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the author of this bill is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I wish to yield to him such time as he may desire. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] requested five minutes' time, not on the bill, however, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to speak on any subject he chooses for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] be permitted to address the House for five minutes out of the time of the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, a year or two ago there was organized the National Radium Institute. Dr. Howard Kelly, of Baltimore, was elected president, and is still president of the institute. Leases were obtained on carnotite mines in Colorado, from which they are to take out 1,000 tons of ore, and the radium is to be extracted under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines.

Some time ago it was said before the Committee on Mines and Mining by certain gentlemen who were interested in the business of extracting radium from the ore that the Government would never be able to succeed in its undertaking; that they had no process known for extracting radium that they would be able to demonstrate was successful.

I am pleased to-day to say to the Members of the House that under the process which has been put into operation by the Bureau of Mines they have been able to extract the radium from the ore [applause], and I have here a letter from Dr. Kelly, president of the National Radium Institute, to Secretary Lane, in which he says:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1915.*

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I herewith gratefully acknowledge, in behalf of the Radium Institute, the receipt from the Director of the Bureau of Mines of 171 milligrams of hydrous radium bromide, to be applied by the institute to purposes before planned.

It gives me the greatest pleasure in acknowledging this receipt, and in thus realizing the fruition of our hopes to thank the bureau for the extraordinary success of its labors in thus producing radium by simplified methods to be used for the public good, the entire process being developed in a plant both planned and operated by the Government, under the direction of Dr. C. L. Parsons, of the Bureau of Mines.

This radium will at once be put into solution and begin its course of beneficent activity in the service of suffering humanity.

With the radium already in our hands, the successful treatment of many conditions has been established beyond peradventure. Many of these cases have been utterly beyond the reach of surgery or other therapeutic measures. We have, however, felt throughout the past months the inadequacy of our supplies to meet the urgent needs in individual cases. We feel, therefore, an entire confidence that the supply now accumulating and heralded by this delivery will enable us to treat successfully conditions up to this time beyond our reach.

Very sincerely, yours,

HOWARD A. KELLY,
President of the National Radium Institute.

[Applause.]

I might say further that by the end of the year 1915 it is confidently expected by the Bureau of Mines that they will be able to supervise the extraction of 7 grams of radium, which Dr. Kelly and Dr. Douglas desire, and then the Government will secure its share of the profit in radium which comes from the operation of this plant in Denver, Colo.

So I congratulate the country upon the fact that the Government has been able to do this work. Especially are we gratified at this time, when we read of so many human lives being sacrificed in war, that there are men like Dr. Kelly and Dr. Douglas who are willing to give from their private funds $75,000 each and who have lately removed that limit and are willing to furnish more that they may secure this radium for the benefit of humanity and to save human life. [Applause.] I can not too strongly commend the work of these men for the benefit of those who suffer from disease. And I am glad to come to the House to-day and bring with me this small amount of radium, though it represents a value of $11,000 of this rare

metal. I hope that a sufficient quantity of it will be obtained so that it may be placed in the hospitals of our country, where human life may be saved and where those who are afflicted may be saved, and that we may have other ways of curing these diseases without resorting to a surgical operation and which in other cases can not be done. In this little tube which I hold in my hand there is $5,000 worth of this precious metal, and in the other tube there is $6,000 worth. [Applause.]

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the flax industry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of flax. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to explain the pending bill to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 55 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet River runs through my district. It was formerly a rather crooked stream, and in 1881 Congress invited the riparian owners to donate the property which would allow the Government to straighten the stream. They did so, by deeds providing that—

the shore or dock lines of said river as so established and shown on said plat shall hereafter for all purposes be taken as the true meandered lines of said stream.

The Government has improved the river on the new lines, and the old channel of the river remains partly water and partly mud. This bill is to declare nonnavigable a portion of the old channel located in the north quarter of fractional section 7. It has been reported upon by the War Department, which says:

The object of the bill is to abandon as navigable water that portion of the old channel of the river which lies outside of the new channel lines thus established by the United States—

As to a certain locality.

This proposition is unobjectionable so far as navigation interests are concerned, and it seems but fair and equitable to private property interests in the vicinity that the Federal Government should relinquish its easement in that portion of the old river bed which is no longer useful for navigation purposes. Favorable consideration of the measure is therefore recommended.

The owners of the property can not get to the new line of the river to construct docks or wharves, because just a little way from it is the old channel of the river.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, deeds were made by property owners?

Mr. MANN. Yes; deeds donating the land.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. By these deeds the Government obtained the easement?

Mr. MANN. The Government obtained the ownership of the land where the new channel runs, to straighten the river.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The title was conveyed by deed?

Mr. MANN. It was conveyed by deed and accepted by the Government as recited in the preamble.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the event that the bill passes, what becomes of that title?

Mr. MANN. That title remains in the Government, and the title to the old channel belongs to the persons who own the property on both sides of the stream.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They will be the riparian owners under the common law.

Mr. MANN. They own the title in our State, anyhow, subject to the easement of navigation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is a very interesting legal question in connection with drainage propositions in my section. If the gentleman is not pressed for time——

Mr. MANN. I am pressed for time, because I do not intend to delay the House long on this bill. There are other matters that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] desires to call up.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have often wondered to what extent Congress ought to go in declaring the legal proposition as to navigability or nonnavigability. So far as I know there is no act of Congress declaring a certain stream navigable. There are acts of Congress for the improvement of streams. Now, navigability is largely a matter of fact.

Mr. MANN. The declaration by Congress is the thing which controls the action of the Board of Engineers of the Army. In this case, for instance, they would not permit the owners of the property to put any obstructions in this old channel unless Congress declared it nonnavigable, and that is all the declaration amounts to. It does not establish the fact, because the fact is that it is not navigable.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was it not the understanding, and is there not a moral obligation on us, in accordance with that understanding, that there should be a substitution allowing the Government to straighten the channel and give us a new one, if we would abandon the old one?

Mr. MANN. There was an understanding, although I would not undertake to say that there was any moral obligation to declare this nonnavigable, because as to a part of this property I do not want to see the old channel declared nonnavigable where it is needed for the purposes of a turning basin.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if there are any factories or shipping interests now established along the thread of the old stream?

Mr. MANN. The thread of the part of the stream that this bill affects is vacant property on both sides, all owned by the same people.

Mr. CULLOP. Are there any factories now in operation along the banks of the old stream, on the part proposed to be abandoned?

Mr. MANN. Not as affected by this bill. This bill affects only the north quarter of fractional section 7, township 37 north, range 15. This is the third bill of this kind that we have passed.

Mr. CULLOP. I did not catch the gentleman's last remark. There was confusion near me.

Mr. MANN. We have passed two bills before as to particular sections of the stream. This only relates to a small section of the stream, and there are no improvements at all where this is.

Mr. CULLOP. What I had in mind was that if there were any factories or people using that part of the stream in order to get their commodities out to the main channel——

Mr. MANN. There are not.

Mr. CULLOP. If there were any such, it would work a great hardship upon them.

Mr. MANN. The same people own both sides of the stream, and the reason they want the channel declared nonnavigable is because they want to improve it up to the new channel.

Mr. CULLOP. The purpose is to fill in the old channel.

Mr. MANN. They can not get the money to do it until the nonnavigability of the old channel is declared, so that they can fill it in.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it necessary as a legal proposition to have an act of Congress declaring this part of the river nonnavigable?

Mr. MANN. It is not as a legal proposition. The gentleman is right about that. But as a practical proposition it is, because until such a declaration is made the engineers think it is their business to prevent any obstruction being put there.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the spelling of the word "realignment," on page 2, line 3, corrected, so that it will be spelled correctly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I call up the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we ought to have the bill read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to establish, provide, or improve the following aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, under the Department of Commerce, in accordance with the respective limits of costs hereinafter respectively set forth, which shall in no case be exceeded.

FIRST LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

A light at or near Dog Island entrance to St. Croix River, Me., $3,500.

SECOND LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improvements at Woods Hole lighthouse depot, Mass., $50,000.

THIRD LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the Hudson River, N. Y., $100,000.

Improving the aids to navigation at Sandy Hook, N. J., $20,000.

FOURTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the Delaware River, Pa. and Del., $80,000.

SIXTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the St. Johns River, Fla., below Jacksonville, $66,000.

SEVENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Additional lighted aids for Florida Reefs, and repairs and improvements to existing aids, $75,000.

EIGHTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the Mississippi River, below New Orleans, La., $50,000.

Constructing, or purchasing, and equipping a small tender and barge for eighth lighthouse district, Texas and Louisiana, $20,000.

TENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Light and fog signal and improving the present aids to navigation in Conneaut Harbor, Ohio, $63,500.

Improving the aids to navigation in Toledo Harbor, Ohio, $15,000.

ELEVENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving aids to navigation and establishing new aids in the Fighting Island Channel, Detroit River, Mich., $25,000.

SEVENTEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Light and fog signal station at or near Kellett Bluff, Henry Island, Wash., or at some point on the west coast of San Juan Island, Wash., $40,000.

Improvement of aids to navigation at or near the entrance to Coquille River, Oreg., $6,000.

EIGHTEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Light and fog signal station at Point Vincente, Cal., $80,000.

NINETEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Aid to navigation in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $80,000.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to use the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $200,000 for a tender for the first lighthouse district and elsewhere made by the acts of May 27, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 331), and March 4, 1909 (35 Stats., p. 970), as modified by the act of July 27, 1912 (37 Stats., p. 238), for the construction of additional tenders for general service.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to transfer the lighthouse property in lot 1, section 34, township 22 north, range 8 east, Iosco County, Mich., now a portion of the Tawas Lighthouse reservation, to the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of the Life-Saving Service.

SEC. 4. That hereafter employees of the Lighthouse Service compensated at a per diem rate of pay may be granted 15 working days' leave of absence each year without forfeiture of pay during such absence, under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided*, That no employee of the class herein mentioned shall be entitled to any leave until he has served 12 consecutive months, when he may be granted 15 days' leave, and that during the second or any subsequent year 15 days' leave at the rate of one and one-fourth days per month, as earned, may be granted from the beginning of the second service year: *Provided further*, That the inspectors of the several lighthouse districts shall have discretion as to the time when the leave can be allowed without detriment to the service, and that absence on account of sickness shall be deducted from the leave hereby granted.

SEC. 5. That hereafter post-lantern lights and other aids to navigation may be established and maintained, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, out of the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service, on Lakes Okechobee and Hicpochee and connecting waterways across the State of Florida and on the Apalachicola River and Chipola cut-off.

SEC. 6. That hereafter appropriations made by Congress for the construction and equipment of vessels of the Lighthouse Service shall be available for the purchase or construction of suitable models of such vessels.

SEC. 7. That hereafter the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service shall be available for defraying the expenses of cooperation between the Lighthouse Service and the Forest Service in the management of forest land on lighthouse reservations.

SEC. 8. That hereafter the provisions of section 8 of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., p. 487), relative to the administering of oaths to travel accounts or other expenses against the United States shall be extended to chief clerks in the offices of lighthouse inspectors or other employees in the Lighthouse Service designated by them, and hereafter chief clerks in offices of lighthouse inspectors and employees designated by them are authorized to administer oaths of office to employees of the Lighthouse Service.

SEC. 9. That hereafter the penalties provided in section 6 of the act of May 14, 1908 (35 Stat., p. 162), for obstruction or interference to any aid to navigation maintained by the Lighthouse Service shall apply with equal force and effect to any private aid to navigation lawfully maintained under the authority granted the Secretary of Commerce and the Commission of Lighthouses by section 6 of the act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 324).

SEC. 10. That hereafter the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, whenever he shall deem it advisable, to exchange any right of way of the United States in connection with lands pertaining to the Lighthouse Service for such other right of way as may be advantageous to the service, under such terms and conditions as he may deem to be for the best interests of the Government; and in case any expenses are incurred by the United States in making such exchange, the same shall be payable from the appropriation "General expenses, Lighthouse Service," for the fiscal year during which such exchange shall be effected.

The following committee amendments were read:

Page 5, strike out section 6.
Page 6, strike out all of section 10.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the committee has with great care examined the reports of the department on the subject of aids to navigation, and has had the hearings of the officials, and we have sifted out from the innumerable projects only those which appeared to be most meritorious and really necessary at this time. Out of several million estimated for proposed projects we have selected from class A, the first class, those that were personally verified before the committee as requisite at this time.

There is one additional amendment that the committee wants to offer, and I will ask the Clerk to read that. I will state that that comes on a recommendation of the governor of the Panama Canal and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. The Appropriations Committee had hearings on the Isthmus and came back and reported to the committee that these two little lighthouses were necessary on the Pacific coast, and the governor of the canal has asked that they have authority to build them.

The first idea was that the canal should build them, but as they are not to be in the canal or near the canal, but are outside to guide the ships from the midocean to the entrance of the canal, the committee thought the Lighthouse Service ought to build them, but the amendment provides that for convenience and economy of the Lighthouse Service they might arrange that the canal force should construct and maintain the lights.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I see that the bill carries $80,000 to improve aids to navigation by establishing new lights in the Delaware River in the fourth lighthouse district. I would like to inquire how they could find any additional space on that river for aids to navigation and whether they have got up any new plan. The gentleman from Georgia will remember that during our service on the committee we had several plans submitted for improvement of the Delaware River by aids to navigation. Have they got out a new plan or found a new place where they could put in a new aid?

Mr. ADAMSON. This is not the first time that I have had to regret the absence of the able and genial gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who devised a method of doubling up the lighthouses on the Delaware River. The gentleman from Illinois must be speaking facetiously, because he has heard the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania describe the absolute and unutterable necessity for more lighthouses, and I know that the gentleman must be jesting in asking about it. It may be that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he were here, could explain how he could pile lighthouse on top of lighthouse in that river, where there is such an immense commerce.

Mr. MANN. I thought possibly if I asked the question it would have the effect of bringing, through telepathy or some other means, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania himself to the floor of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. There is a good explanation of it. I will ask the Clerk to read the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that some words are omitted in the amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let the Clerk read it as it is.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 18, after the figures "$80,000," insert the following: "The Secretary of Commerce has authorized two lights on the Pacific coast."

Mr. ADAMSON. I had written the amendment with the view of adapting it to two or three contingencies. The words "Secretary of Commerce" should be left out, because they appear in the first section and make it read "two lights on the Pacific coast."

Mr. MANN. It ought to come in after line 20.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is after line 20. There is another item there I failed to observe.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman want the words "Secretary of Commerce"?

Mr. ADAMSON. No; that goes out. It should begin with "two lights."

Mr. MANN. There should be a heading "Panama Canal."

Mr. ADAMSON. On page 3.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have we reached the stage for amendment yet?

The SPEAKER. Why, the Clerk was reading the bill for amendment.

Mr. MANN. The bill has not been read for amendment yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am trying to give notice of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Constructing, or purchasing, and equipping a small tender and barge for eighth lighthouse district, Texas and Louisiana, $20,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Speaker, the item under consideration is the aftermath of the construction of an intercoastal waterway from New Orleans to the Rio Grande. It provides for an appropriation of $15,000 for a launch 65 feet in length and drawing not more than 3 feet of water. It was contended, time and time again, by the gentleman from Texas and others who are familiar with this stream that the principal navigation of this intercoastal waterway is that for pleasure. The Government is engaged in an extravagant proposition, and the committee has recommended another extravagant proposition of a pleasure launch to accommodate the superintendent throughout the year when the weather is balmy to take a trip by the inland canal from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande. Certainly the committee, since the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader, left it as chairman, has progressed. When the gentleman from Illinois was chairman and he presented any omnibus lighthouse bill he invariably refused to include such items as are embodied in this bill, and yet we find here in these pressing times, when the revenues are falling backward, when we are threatened with a bond issue, that the committee has adopted a new policy of recommending projects which have become hoary with age. I must again confess and state that some of the information I am going to give the committee was acquired by reason of a quondam service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At that time we had before us the old project of improving lights on the Delaware River. The intercoastal proposition had not then loomed up in the foreground as a "pork" in a river and harbor bill. That is a matter that has made progress in the last few years. But here we have appropriations, the Treasury being so overflowing with money at the present time, for the establishment of additional lights on the Delaware River, $80,000, and for an appropriation of $15,000 for a launch drawing not more than 3 feet of water to accommodate the superintendent and his friends, and perhaps the Congressmen if they go down there to take little pleasure rides on this beautiful inland waterway, that some day at the expense of hundreds of millions of dollars is going to circle the coasts from Norfolk along the Atlantic coast through the Everglades of Florida and along the Gulf coast to the Rio Grande. I certainly wish to compliment and congratulate the committee on its extravagant policy of economy in presenting to the House a bill which contains several items which the department itself did not regard as of first importance. There is certainly progress in these Democratic times of extravagance. [Applause.]

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Mr. Speaker, this item is one strongly recommended by the department. It provides for a motor launch about 65 feet long and only 3 feet draft, which the department says is absolutely necessary for establishing lights and day marks along the intercoastal canal and other shallow waters of the eighth lighthouse district. That portion of the canal from Galveston, Tex., to Corpus Christi, Tex., is being completed by the War Department, and in the next year or two the canal will be open to the Mississippi River. Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as it being as the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, this small boat is absolutely necessary for the purpose for which it is intended, and it is, moreover, strongly recommended by the department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aid to navigation in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $80,000.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to insert the committee amendment after line 20, with the subcaption "Panama Canal."

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, there is a committee amendment pending.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 20, strike out the word "aid" and insert the word "aids."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 20, and after the figures "$80,000," insert the following:

"Panama Canal: Two lights on the Pacific coast——"

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, before reading that, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois if that would not really come within the nineteenth district and render unnecessary the caption of "Panama Canal"?

Mr. MANN. No; it would not. They would not have anything to do with the maintaining of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Panama Canal: Two lights on the Pacific coast, necessary as aids to navigation, near the Pacific entrance to the Panama Canal, at a total cost not exceeding $48,000, one of them at Punta Mala, the other at Toma Island; and for the construction of these two aids the Secretary of Commerce may, by a satisfactory arrangement with the governor of the Panama Canal, have them constructed and maintained through the Panama Canal force.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows.

Section 6, committee amendment: Strike out all of section 6, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. That hereafter appropriations made by Congress for the construction and equipment of vessels of the Lighthouse Service shall be available for the purchase or construction of suitable models of such vessels."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, let us have a vote on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That hereafter the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service shall be available for defraying the expenses of cooperation between the Lighthouse Service and the Forest Service in the management of forest land on lighthouse reservations.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out, on line 16, page 5, the figure "7" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "6."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That hereafter the provisions of section 8 of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., p. 487), relative to the administering of oaths to travel accounts or other expenses against the United States shall be extended to chief clerks in the offices of lighthouse inspectors or other employees in the Lighthouse Service designated by them, and hereafter chief clerks in offices of lighthouse inspectors and employees designated by them are authorized to administer oaths of office to employees of the Lighthouse Service.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 21, strike out the figure "8" and insert the figure "7."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That hereafter the penalties provided in section 6 of the act of May 14, 1908 (35 Stat., p. 162), for obstruction or interference to any aid to navigation maintained by the Lighthouse Service shall apply with equal force and effect to any private aid to navigation lawfully maintained under the authority granted the Secretary of Commerce and the Commission of Lighthouses by section 6 of the act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 324).

With committee amendments, as follows:

Page 6, line 7, strike out the figure "9" and insert the figure "8."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 10, strike out the word "to" after the word "obstruction" and after the word "interference," and insert after the word "interference" the word "with."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 14, strike out the word "Commission" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CULLOP. I do that, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD an article on the increase in ocean freights, published in the Washington Times on day before yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article that was published in the Washington Times on the day before yesterday on the subject of increase in ocean freights. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

HIGH OCEAN RATES CHECK UNITED STATES TRADE—MCADOO AND REDFIELD SUBMIT CORRESPONDENCE TO SENATE SHOWING EXTORTION BY LINES.

A mass of letters written by American business men was submitted to the United States Senate to-day by Secretaries McAdoo and Redfield in response to the resolution adopted by the Senate some weeks ago asking for information regarding the ocean freight-rate situation. The correspondence is that of firms engaged in the export trade, and it tells of extraordinary increases in rates since the outbreak of war.

An analysis of the exporters' complaints was submitted with the letters. Parts of it follow:

Rates have been arbitrarily increased to an unparalleled height, without regard to the interests of the American trade.

STOPPING SOME EXPORTATIONS.

High rates are actually stopping exportations in some lines. Plants have been shut down in consequence.

Arbitrary and hurtful discrimination is made against certain classes of goods; lumber, for instance. Similar discrimination by a common carrier on land would be cause for criminal prosecution.

Rates to South America have been greatly increased, and there is a shortage of tonnage both to and from there.

The direct charge is made that the Holland-America Line has repudiated written contracts with American shippers.

EXAMPLES OF INCREASES.

Striking examples of increases are: On grain, from New York to Rotterdam, 900 per cent; on flour, 500 per cent; on cotton, 700 per cent.

New York to Liverpool rates on same commodities, 300 to 500 per cent.

Baltimore to Europe, rates on grain, 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent.

Norfolk to Liverpool grain rates, 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent.

Norfolk to Rotterdam cotton rates, 471 per cent.

Norfolk to Bremen cotton rates, 1,100 per cent (from $1.25 per bale to $15 per bale).

Savannah to Liverpool, from 250 per cent; to Bremen, 900 per cent.

Galveston to Liverpool, on grain, 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen, on cotton, 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

RATES STILL GOING UP.

Even higher rates were being reported while the statement was being completed, says the report, adding:

"Ocean rates are still rising and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other.

"The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates. It can not, under existing law, protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice and upon the instant, and our business men are helpless.

DAMAGING AMERICAN TRADE.

"The steamship companies are their own masters and do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether."

If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915, it is predicted in the report, at the December rate and the ocean rates are continued, American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) excess charges above normal to the amount of $216,224,400, or more than five times the $40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the ship-purchase bill to put into American ships for the protection of America's foreign commerce.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, the statement just read deserves the serious consideration of the people of this country, and especially so at this time. It clearly shows that our commercial interests are now imperiled by the ship monopoly, and it is of the highest importance that the public secure relief from its grasp at the earliest moment possible. The cost of ocean transportation has been outrageously advanced at this time, when the demand for it is very strong in order that our farmers and manufacturers might send their products abroad and realize handsome profits on the same. Instead of the producers realizing the profits on their products, the shipowners propose to absorb them by the increase of ocean transportation rates. This is an opportune time for our producers of both farm and manufactured products to realize handsomely on their productions, but between them and the realization of these profits intervenes the ship monopoly which proposes to absorb these profits by the abnormal increase of rates. The producers are entitled to these profits and should have them, but the Ship Trust has determined it will take them. A better example of monopolistic greed could not be furnished. It clearly illustrates what monopoly will do when opportunity is afforded. Our producers, the people who create wealth, earn the profits, have a great opportunity presented, but if this monopoly is permitted to continue, to exact these unreasonable charges, the people will not be permitted to enjoy the advantages afforded. This demonstrates the wisdom of passing at the earliest moment possible the President's shipping measure in order that this monopoly may be broken up and the people enjoy the splendid opportunity now offered for the sale of their products in foreign markets where they can realize handsome profits and build up industry in our country. Could we not at this time, while the country is waiting for the passage of the shipping bill, employ the Government transports for the transportation of our products to foreign markets and show the Ship Trust that it shall not exact from the people from industry these exorbitant charges for service?

To employ these boats already owned by the Government in this service would give this monopoly now exploiting the people, operating as a restraint on industry, to understand that it must make its charges reasonable or it will be unable to get business; that this Government will not tolerate it to restrain industry and plunder the people. Until some other arrangements can be made, either by the passage of the ship-purchasing bill or something equally as feasible, it seems to me wisdom and prudence would dictate we devote our transports and other like boats to this service and give this monopoly to understand it shall not exact such unreasonable and exorbitant charges for service and thereby hamper industry and deprive our people of the splendid opportunity now offered to realize handsome profits on their products. Conditions require that this effort on the part of the Ship Trust at this particular time to curtail commerce be defeated and the situation controlled by the Government so that our people may take advantage of the splendid opportunities presented. It is time prompt action be taken and this great monopoly given to understand it shall not plunder our people to satisfy its avarice. Every business is entitled to have a reasonable profit in order to make investment remunerative, but when any business attempts to extort such unconscionable charges for service as now demanded by this monopoly it needs a rebuke. It is now without competition, and hence the exorbitant rates, and because of its conduct the entire business of the country has to suffer. Prompt action is required, it clearly appears, in order that the country shall not longer suffer and business be curtailed. These excessive rates are restraining business activities and denying our people the privileges of foreign markets. If relief could be secured from these confiscatory rates it would furnish a great impetus to business, increase our commerce at home and abroad, and stimulate the energies of our people. It is no surprise the great Ship Trust is lined up determined to defeat the President's shipping measure. The reason is plain why it is united in its opposition to its passage. These exorbitant rates furnish the explanation. Its passage means the end of them and a reasonable rate substituted in lieu of the same.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That hereafter the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, whenever he shall deem it advisable, to exchange any right of way of the United States in connection with lands pertaining to the Lighthouse Service for such other right of way as may be advantageous to the service, under such terms and conditions as he may deem to be for the best interests of the Government; and in case any expenses are incurred by the United States in making such exchange, the same shall be payable from the appropriation "General expenses, Lighthouse Service," for the fiscal year during which such exchange shall be effected.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all of section 10.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

Mr. MOORE. This bill is a good bill and ought to pass, but in view of the pleasantry indulged in during my brief absence from the Chamber I wish to say that there is particular merit in it because of the item of $80,000 for improving the aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the Delaware River, Pennsylvania and Delaware. That improvement is made necessary by the progress of the work on the 35-foot channel of the Delaware River at what is called the schooner ledge range. The situation there is well explained in a letter from the secretary

of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, which I shall add to my remarks:

THE PHILADELPHIA MARITIME EXCHANGE,
Philadelphia, May 26, 1914.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Under the 35-foot channel project the reach of river covered by the present schooner ledge range has been divided into two ranges in order to avoid the rock area opposite Chester, and we are advised by the United States engineer in charge of the work that the new channel will probably be completed not later than the close of the present working season.

The change in the line of this channel will of course require a change in the lighthouse ranges, making necessary the establishment of two ranges in place of the present one. Under date of May 12 we took the matter up with the commissioner of lighthouses at Washington and received from him a reply on May 15, copies of both communications are attached hereto for your information.

It is the hope of our exchange that no time will be lost by the lighthouse department in making the necessary changes in order that when this section of the river is declared ready for commercial use it can be availed of.

We shall be obliged if you will give this matter some thought, as I am given to understand that a congressional appropriation is required for the purpose of properly equipping the new schooner ledge ranges.

Yours, faithfully,

E. R. SHARWOOD, *Secretary.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the brethren will stay with me, I would like to pass two or three little bridge bills before adjournment to-day.

The SPEAKER. What is the first one?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is the bill H. R. 20933. I will not call up any other large bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20933) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912.

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of a bridge now in course of construction across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., which the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. was authorized to construct, maintain, and operate by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway & Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn." approved August 23, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, extended for a period of one year from the time now limited, namely, the 23d day of August, 1915: *Provided*, That in all other respects the said bridge shall be completed, maintained, and operated in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me for a minute for the purpose of clearing up a few little defects?

Mr. ADAMSON. Of course, I am glad to have anything to improve the bill. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, all those interested in the building of this great bridge at Memphis have united in requesting me to press this bill extending the time in which the bridge may be completed. Work on the bridge has progressed well, but it is not thought that the bridge can possibly be completed by next July, the time limited in the bill, and so Mayor Crump, acting for the city; Mr. T. K. Riddick, acting for the committee of citizens; and Col. Canada, acting for the bridge company, have agreed on the bill, with some slight amendments, which I shall offer presently. We all believe that this request for an extension of time is made in good faith, and I hope the bill may pass this afternoon, as our time to get it through the Senate is very short. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to offer the following amendments: In line 5, on page 1, strike out the word "the," before the word "Arkansas." It is purely technical. It ought to be correct.

Mr. MANN. Strike out what?

Mr. McKELLAR. The word "the," before the word "Arkansas."

Mr. MANN. It is not capitalized.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not part of the name of the corporation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been asked to have it stricken out, and I think it probably just as well to strike it out.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 5, by striking out the word "the," before the word "Arkansas."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. In line 6, page 1, after the word "Company," I move to insert the words "its successors and assigns." That is in accordance with the original act, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 6, by inserting, after the word "Company," a comma and the words "its successors and assigns."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. And again, after the word "twelve," in line 1, page 2, add the following:

Amending an act of similar title approved July 20, 1912.

The chairman of the committee will remember that there were two of these bills passed, and the second one, that we are now amending, was an amendment to a former bill of similar title approved July 20, 1912.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "twelve," insert the words: "amending an act of similar title approved July 20, 1912."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. And in line 4, on page 2, strike out the word "the" before the word "twenty-third," and insert the word "until."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "namely," strike out the word "the" and insert the word "until."

Mr. McKELLAR. And, in line 4, on page 2, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "sixteen."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "sixteen."

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, the date of the expiration of the present law is the 23d day of August, 1915?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is the desire to extend the privilege one year from that date?

Mr. McKELLAR. Namely, until the 23d day of August, 1916, and I have offered this amendment so that there can be no confusion about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The present reading is confusing.

Mr. McKELLAR. But as amended it will not be.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take the opposite position. I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is the question?

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology as it is proposed to read is:

And the same is hereby extended for a period of one year from the time now limited, namely.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think that is awkwardly drawn. I think it can be improved.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants to extend it until——

Mr. McKELLAR. Until August 23, 1916.

Mr. MANN. This language is susceptible of two constructions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is, and it ought to be amended.

Mr. MANN. The way to do that is to strike out the words "the time now limited, namely," so that it will read:

Extended one year from the 23d day of August, 1915.

Anybody can understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not need unanimous consent. The gentleman withdraws the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The last two amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the last two. They cover it all. I move to strike out the words "the time now limited, namely," in line 3, page 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "the time now limited, namely."

So that the line as amended will read:

And the same is hereby extended for a perior of one year from the 23d day of August, 1915.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the title ought to be amended by inserting, after the last word of the caption or title, the following: "so as to extend the time for the construction of said bridge from the time now limited by law until August 23, 1916."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text of the bill.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, now I call up the bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of the bridge now in course of construction across the Delaware River, which the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, were authorized to construct, maintain, and operate by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, extended for a period of one year from the time now limited, namely, the 24th day of August, 1915: *Provided*, That in all other respects said bridge shall be completed and shall be maintained and operated in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That in the event of the termination of the corporate existence by dissolution or otherwise of the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co. the word "successors" contained in this act and the act to which this act is an amendment shall be construed to apply to any company which may be organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey which shall be empowered to construct a railroad substantially on the route of the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co. and which may in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. be desirous of completing said bridge.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out all of section 2.

Page 3, line 1, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer another committee amendment. I move to strike out, in lines 6 and 7, on page 2, the words "the time now limited, namely."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "the time now limited, namely."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman from Georgia state whether this is the bridge that was to be constructed near the city of Trenton?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is.

Mr. MOORE. In the extended hearings before the committee the city of Trenton, through its mayor, had some objection to the extension of this time, did he not?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; but I have a telegram here saying that he has no objection now.

Mr. MOORE. There has been a relocation of the bridge?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; it has been commenced and the work is going on, but they could not complete it within the time limit, which will be next August, and they thought it prudent, as there might not be an extra session, to have the extension now.

Mr. MOORE. There was a question as to whether this was not too close to another bridge, and that was raised by the mayor of Trenton.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any possible objection to it now?

Mr. MOORE. There was a serious objection at that time, but, as I understand from the chairman, it has been removed, and that settles the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the Senate bill to a third reading.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, DUXBURY REEF, CAL.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20977) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, or Bolinas Bay, Cal., at a cost not to exceed $20,000.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$20,000" and insert "$12,000."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal the other day in the consideration of the coast guard bill about how the life-saving crews would start out in stormy weather, high seas, and all that sort of thing. I read in the morning paper this morning—and it is not an infrequent occurrence to read similar articles—of how the crews of the Life-Saving Service were lying by safely on shore watching a vessel go to pieces out at sea, because they were afraid to put out in the high seas.

I do not criticize them for it, I commend them, because probably they could not overcome the seas. But there is a good deal of bosh uttered on the floor of the House on the subject of the Life-Saving Service at different times, about the enormous dangers they undertake, the immense property they save, and the great number of lives they save. As they grow older and older in the service, under the new coast guard bill, they will grow more cautious and more cautious, and they will put out only amid the calm seas, but when the waves are rolling high they will remember that they are too old for that kind of work, and they will remain on shore and watch the vessel go to pieces, like they are doing now.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from California says he does not have that kind of men in the service on the Pacific coast.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have read similar statements in regard to the Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCKY RIVER, OHIO.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 19078) granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of the Rocky River, Ohio.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between the city of Lakewood, Ohio, and the village of Rocky River, Ohio, near the mouth of Rocky River, in the county of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE BACK CHANNEL, OHIO RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20818) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20818) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Brunot Island Bridge Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, with approaches thereto, across the back channel of the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point on the southwesterly shore of Brunot Island, near the Duquesne Light Co.'s power plant in the twenty-seventh ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., to a point between Telford Street and the Ohio connecting railroad bridge on the opposite side of said back channel of the Ohio River in the twentieth ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa.

Said bridge shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 29, 1906."

SEC. 2. That the right to alter and repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "said bridge shall be constructed."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "alter and" and insert "alter, amend, or."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. I wish the gentleman would take up the bill H. R. 19428.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is that?

Mr. MANN. That is a bill about the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. We passed a similar Senate bill, and it ought to be stricken from the calendar and laid on the table.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think that ought to be done. I remember distinctly that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made the motion on my suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill H. R. 19428 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, SIUSLAW RIVER, OREG.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 8904.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8904) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg., in such locality as the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service may recommend.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was read for amendment.

The Clerk reported the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "recommend," insert the words "at a cost not to exceed $12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I have one other little bill. I do not know how long it will take, but if gentlemen do not want to stay and finish it it will only take a little time on next Wednesday. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I call up, by authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill H. R. 2496, House Calendar No. 194.

Mr. MANN. What bill is that?

Mr. CULLOP. For uniform classification of freights.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves the right to object to what?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. To object on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman raises the point of no quorum, and so does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, the bill having been called up, will it have the right of way on next Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. It would.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker had better think about that before ruling on it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not know whether any other Member has anything to offer, and I will move to adjourn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. McKELLAR. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this matter.

Mr. MANN. Impossible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do it after the point of no quorum is raised until that point is settled.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Chair has ruled this bill will be in order next Wednesday as unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe that suggestion to the Chair is correct. The bill has not been reported. The gentleman has to call up the bill affirmatively——

Mr. CULLOP. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would withhold that motion and let the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana simply rose in his place and asked to call this bill up, and in the meantime there were two points of no quorum made, and that seems to be the end of the thing.

Mr. CULLOP. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would withhold the point of no quorum until the bill can be reported.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman frankly, out of order, that this bill would probably consume a whole day. It would not expedite anything in the way of legislation. There will only be another Calendar Wednesday or so, and there are other Members very anxious to be reached, and I do not think it would be fair to them or to this committee under the circumstances to use up three days. We fixed it so as to give them two days.

Mr. ADAMSON. The Speaker can rule next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair is ready to rule now.

Mr. ADAMSON. We have not got to an adjournment yet.

The SPEAKER. That is true; but this point of no quorum was injected before the Clerk even got to reading the title of the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Under the rule, if the point of no quorum is made and I should move a call of the House, does the Chair reckon it would be voted down?

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the gentleman made the motion to adjourn.

Mr. CULLOP. If the point of no quorum had been made before the Speaker ruled on it, then the Speaker would not have authority to rule on the proposition because of the point of no quorum. It would deprive the House of jurisdiction to transact business, and hence he could not rule on the question.

The SPEAKER. Let it go over until next Wednesday, if the gentleman prefers. The gentlemen from Illinois and Minnesota both raised the point of no quorum, and there is none here.

Mr. ADAMSON. Our friends on the other side have been very good to us because they thought we were going to adjourn, and I hate to disappoint them.

Mr. MANN. Because the gentleman stated he was not going to call up anything except certain bills.

Mr. ADAMSON. I did not call up any large bill——

The SPEAKER. All the discussion on the subject is out of order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Thursday, January 28, 1915.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions in the case of Emma L. Conger, remarried widow of Peter J. Howe (H. Doc. No. 1524); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by the Department of Labor during the calendar year 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1525); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Army, together with a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1526); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the governor of Federal Reserve Board, transmitting first annual report of the Federal Reserve Board for the period ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1523); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 380) withholding from allotment the unallotted lands or public domain of the Creek Nation or Tribe of Indians, and providing for the sale thereof, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1326), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20427) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alabama to Walter Dean, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1327), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2334) for the relief of S. W. Langhorne and the legal representatives of H. S. Howell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1325), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 21202) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 21203) to provide for the establishment, operation, and management of a bureau, to be known as the "Farm women's bureau," in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 21204) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of McAlester, Okla., four condemned bronze or brass cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 712) authorizing the Committee on Printing to have printed 5,000 copies of letters from the Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of Commerce, transmitted in response to Senate resolution of December 18, 1914; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 713) to authorize the Committee on the Library to procure for the House a portrait in oil of the present Speaker, Hon. CHAMP CLARK; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) to create the national rural credit commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 21205) granting an increase of pension to Nelson N. Boydston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 21206) granting a pension to James H. Johns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 21207) granting an increase of pension to Julius L. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21208) for the relief of the Kern County Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Bakersfield, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 21209) granting a pension to Lillian G. W. Cobleigh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21210) granting an increase of pension to John W. Groesbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 21211) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Wheelden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 21212) granting a pension to Mary E. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21213) granting a pension to Peter Z. T. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21214) granting an increase of pension to Delender Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21215) to correct the military record of A. G. Vincent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 21216) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21217) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of O. B. Thompson and 25 other citizens of Patoskola, Ohio, favoring creation of a world federation of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of sundry members of the Catholic Church of Spangler, Pa., protesting against the sending of the publication called the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Austrian Musik and Beneficial Society, of Johnstown, Pa., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Ferdinand Bittmann, Frank Lintner, Joseph Heinreich, Henry O. Frank, John Ladenberger, Jakob Streibein, Justin Wenk, Harry E. Hipps, John C. Schmalz, Frank Zips, William Seibel, Emil Kamler, C. A. Young, Frank Ling, John Rosenbaum, Josef Bittmann, Charles Partsch, Theodore Warner, Herman Rockstroh, Josef Feik, Joseph Shober, Henry C. Schmalz, John Beide, Joseph Henry, Vincenz Reppmyer, Andrew Hipps, Julius Bischof, William J. Becker, Frank Springer, Th. Hanitsch, E. Springer, Leopold Hepner, Ernest Bischof, Joseph Reidel, Rudolf Niern, and Ernest Auerwine, all of Johnstown, Pa., for legislation laying an embargo on the exportation of contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petitions of citizens of Strasburg and Humboldt Township, Coles County, Ill., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Maritime Exchange of New York City, favoring bill to consolidate Revenue-Cutter Service and Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring appropriation for national celebration and peace jubilee at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Board of Managers National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, relative to transportation for veterans to visit their national cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of New York State League of Catholic Societies and the German Roman Catholic Central Verein, citizens of Mankato and vicinity, and L. H. Snyder, of New York City, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Mining Congress, favoring passage of House bill 15869, for betterment of the conditions of the miner; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petitions of Willystine Goodsell and Harrison Berlitz, New York City, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of priests of Scranton (Pa.) diocese and J. J Curran, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., protesting against sending publication called the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. G. Taylor, of New York City, protesting against amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill, relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Rev. Richard E. Kerschke and 28 other citizens of Adell, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo upon all contraband of war, save foodstuffs, wearing apparel, and surgical supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Carl Schwefel and 48 other citizens of the town of Lebanon, Dodge County, Wis., asking for the passage, at this session, of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. D. J. Bernthal, John Harmening, and 48 other citizens of Ixonia, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar resolution, to levy an embargo on all ammunition and contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. G. Kaniess and 38 other citizens of Kewaskum and vicinity, Wis., asking for the passage of Senate bill 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical instruments only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. W. Hennig and 53 other rural citizens of the vicinity of West Bend, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of House joint resolution 377, to levy an embargo upon and prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, etc., from this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Watertown (Wis.) Branch of German-American Alliance, asking for the passage of a law to lay an embargo and prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, etc., to any of the European countries now engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of Staatsverbund of Pennsylvania with Pennsylvania State League and German Roman Catholic Verein, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Richard Schwartneg, Dr. E. Schenk, Adolph Barlotonts, Joseph Bluemel, Phil Marx, and 293 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, indorsing and urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Louisiana mass meeting committee for the furtherance of American neutrality, and German Roman Catholic Central Verein, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 24 citizens of Lincolnville, and 104 citizens of Lyndon, Kans., favoring embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Louisiana mass meeting committee for the furtherance of American neutrality, New Orleans, La., and Samuel Schreiber and 43 citizens of Prairie du Sac, Wis., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of Arkansas favoring abolishing the Ozark National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Arkansas, asking Congress to complete the system of locks and dams on White River between Batesville and Cotter, in Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of Germania Club of Springfield, Mass., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of L. Loehr and 12 others, of Shelby County, Ohio, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: Petitions of H. C. Lupo and about 1,000 other citizens of Greeville, S. C.; also of about 20,000 citizens from various parts of the United States, praying the enactment of some law that will permit a citizen in the position of Harry K. Thaw to return to his home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petitions of Transfiguration Lodge, No. 164, Mount Pleasant; Branch 1147, National Polish Alliance, Smithton; St. Stanislaus Lodge, B. and N., No. 607, Freedom Lodge, National Polish Alliance, and Polish Falcons, Nest No. 41, all of New Kensington; St. Jana Chrg., Z. N. P., Mammoth; and Branch 680, National Polish Alliance, of Hannastown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Ferdinand F. Fanning, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the treatment of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Evansville Central Labor Union, by Chester Bickel, secretary, and William G. Steinmetz, Peter Klaser, Eugene Walker, W. R. Burnett, George Richrich, Howard Overlin, John P. Alt, Carl W. Willern, G. W. Harmon, John Henderson, Louis Taylor, Luke Hammond, Esslenger Printing Co., Phil F. Voelker, Andrew G. Dunn, J. W. Blurch, Ed Davis, Elvis Kinder, Henry Hammer, Ira R. Garrison, John J. Nolan, Charles P. Beard, William E. Shaffer, James Fitzwilliams, J. M. Pike, W. A. Hester, Adolph A. Althiede, Harry Woehler, Frank C. Gore, Stephen Kiely, Arlington R. Penn, Albert F. Hetherington, William J. Kennedy, Philip Temple, F. W. Alexander, Charles W. Wittenbraker, W. A. Korch, Ed. M. Crisp, H. M. Crisp, H. W. North, Howard H. Cox, George Decker, William Warren, George H. Hauser, Gus A. Myer, Margaret Viele, W. C. Gleason, Henry Stockenbarn, Frank C. Gregory, T. C. Davis, Henry C. Wolsiffer, Bernard H. Fiester, S. D. Thompson, Charles Finley Smith, and Louis F. Yokel, all of Evansville, Ind., and John H. Ashmead, of Princeton, Ind., favoring the Hamill bill for the retirement of the aged and infirm Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of the St. Anthony Benevolent Society, by Charles Muth, president, and John Fraser, secretary; and the St. Henry Society, by George Gloes, president, and Benedict Lindenberger, secretary, of Evansville; Julius Egbert, Chris W. Siebe, and John R. Wellmeyer, of Stendal; John Schlundt, of Wadesville; and the St. John Evangelical Brotherhood, by Rev. R. G. Kerz, Jacob Arend, W. W. Haas, Rinehold F. Haas, F. W. Rauth, Fred C. Begeman, Ernest Klodt, C. F. W. Inderriden, Otto C. J. Roller, William Rowell, C. H. Bohrer, Fred W. Rauth, and Charles Karb ,of Boonville, all in the State of Indiana, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Local Union No. 287, United Mine Workers of America, by William F. Vonderschu, secretary, of Newburg; Local Union No. 21, United Mine Workers of America, by Luther Hedrick, secretary, of Princeton; and Local Union No. 1243, United Mine Workers of America, by legislative committee composed of Ed. Thurber, A. J. Buffkin, and Fred Helen, of Boonville, all in the State of Indiana, favoring Kern-Foster bill for a further extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petitions of John McLain, William Alstott, and Golden Rule Council, No. 5, on behalf of Charles P. Fettinger, all of Winslow, Ind., favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Polish National Alliance of United States of North America, Assembly No. 247, Frank Schymik, president, and August Grabowski, secretary, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of A. F. Karges, president Karges Furniture Co., of Evansville, Ind., favoring passage of House bill 5308, for taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of W. H. Mushlitz and Dr. J. Y. Welborn, of Evansville, Ind., favoring a national investigation of North Pole controversy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., and 50 citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Women's Polish Alliance of Hartford, Conn., protesting against passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Humboldt, Nebr., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of Rev. Walter van Schenk and others, of Rockville, Conn., favoring embargo on exports of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of citizens of Mankato and vicinity, protesting against exportation of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring Senate bill 3672, providing for exchange between the Federal Government and State of New York of certain waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petitions of F. N. Morgan and citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pueblo (Colo.) German and Austrian Widows and Orphans War Sufferers' Society, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Eldorado Council, No. 1114, Royal Arcanum, Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring passage of the Hamill bill, relative to retirement of aged Government workers; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of Joe Sayers Camp, No. 1394, United Confederate Veterans, of Stamford, Tex., favoring placing all veterans of Confederate and Union Armies on equality; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of citizens of Little Falls, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 3672, relative to

Improvement of Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of Rome, N. Y., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Louisiana mass meeting committee, for the furtherance of American neutrality, protesting against exportation of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of the German Mechanics' Aid Society of Muscatine, Iowa, comprising a membership of 206, to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 815 American citizens, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Allegheny County Neutrality League, Pittsburgh, Pa., to prohibit the export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 31 American citizens of Muscatine, Iowa, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Carl Schumaker and others, of Enderlin, N. Dak., protesting against exportation of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 28, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

WITHDRAWAL OF ORDER FOR YEAS AND NAYS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when we took a recess last evening the yeas and nays had been ordered on taking up the bill (H. R. 13044) to pension widows and minor and helpless children of officers and enlisted men who served during the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection or in China between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902. I at this time ask unanimous consent that that order be set aside. I desire to withdraw it because I want the discussion of the shipping bill to proceed during the daytime and to have no other bill considered. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the order for the yeas and nays and also the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Perkins	Sterling
Brady	Hollis	Pittman	Stone
Brandegee	Hughes	Ransdell	Sutherland
Bryan	James	Reed	Swanson
Catron	Jones	Robinson	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Thornton
Clapp	Kern	Sheppard	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Sherman	Vardaman
Culberson	McCumber	Shields	Walsh
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	White
Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Works
Gallinger	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.	
Gronna	Page	Smoot	

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is unavoidably absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day and for the next several days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Chair desires to ask whether there will be any objection to the Chair announcing his signature to a bill? The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 5614) for the improvement of the foreign service, which had heretofore been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I will submit some observations on the pending bill.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 26, 1915:

S. 4012. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States public building at Grand Junction, Colo.; and

S. 6309. An act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

On January 28, 1915:

S. 2337. An act to create the Coast Guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had intended to conclude to-day my observations on the pending amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but the Senator from Montana having given notice that he would speak, and understanding that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] likewise wishes to speak to-day, I will postpone the further discussion of the measure until a convenient time in the future, which I hope will be to-morrow.

ON THE RIGHTS OF NEUTRALS TO PURCHASE SHIPS OF BELLIGERENTS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in the course of the discussion to which the pending bill has given rise doubts have been expressed, from time to time, as to its wisdom lest through its operation our country should become involved in international complications of a grave character or even be drawn into the maelstrom of the awful conflict now raging in Europe. It contemplates both the construction and the purchase by the Government of ships to meet the crying necessities for means to transport our products to foreign markets, such ships to be operated, leased, or chartered by a corporation to which they are to be transferred, of the stock of which corporation the United States shall own at least a majority. The immediate need is so imperative in character in the view of the supporters of the measure as scarcely to brook the delay incident to construction.

It is assumed, accordingly, that an effort will be made to acquire by purchase the vessels deemed essential to meet the exigency which has arisen. In this connection it is advanced that ocean freights are now so high, the business for which they are suited is now so profitable, that no ships can be bought save those of Germany and Austria interned in our ports and in theirs and those of other neutral nations. It is said that such bottoms either are subject to capture and confiscation, though sailing under our flag upon registry effected upon a sale made since the commencement of hostilities, or that the right of a belligerent to treat such property as continuing in the nation under whose flag it enjoyed protection at the outbreak of the war, is involved in so much doubt and obscurity that its seizure is to be anticipated. It is denied, however, that the interned ships are the only ones available for purchase, and the assertion is made with much confidence that judging from the number already offered no difficulty will be encountered in securing a tonnage quite sufficient for the enterprise for which the bill makes provision, though no German ships are acquired. If these are or may be regarded as eliminated, it follows, necessarily, that the price that will be asked for those which remain in the market will be materially enhanced, and the likelihood of the success of the venture will be proportionately diminished.

The antagonists of the bill rarely assert unequivocally that under acknowledged rules of international law the interned ships would become lawful prize should they be purchased and sent out under the American flag. They content themselves ordinarily with vague language implying that the inquiry as to

whether they would or would not be immune leads the mind into a maze so confusing as to forbid that it reach any definite or safe conclusion, and without pointing out the consequences likely to flow from a difference of opinion on the question leave the imagination of the auditor or reader to conjure up a fratricidal war as the necessary and inevitable consequence.

In any aspect of the case it is extremely desirable to know just what risk would be encountered should the Shipping Board purchase any of the German ships now in our waters and put them into the transoceanic trade through the instrumentality of the corporation for whose organization the bill provides. The main question involved will, in all probability, be presented by the case of the *Dacia*, the seizure of which on her voyage from Galveston to Rotterdam is, to judge from the press reports, imminent. I rejoice that in the duty devolving upon me of laying before the Senate the results of a somewhat careful study of the subject, I am privileged to say that, assuming the transfer of the *Dacia* to be bona fide, there is abundant reason to believe her immune from condemnation under the rules of international law, and that restitution will be due from any nation that interferes with her on the trip on which she is about to set out. It is a source of gratification to me that in the discharge of my obligation as a Member of this body, I am not required to give support to any theory of legal principles that may embarrass a fellow countryman in a controversy with a powerful nation or to take any position that may plague our Government in any effort it may make to obtain redress for him from it. His cause, assuming that he has bought in good faith, is our cause, and not alone our cause but the cause of neutral trade the world over.

The right of neutrals to purchase ships of a belligerent after the commencement of hostilities and to invest them with the security which attends other craft lawfully flying the neutral flag, has been stoutly maintained by both Great Britain and the United States for more than a hundred years. France has never formally accepted this doctrine, but she has acquiesced in it to such an extent, it has acquired such general recognition among the publicists of the world, that it is unbelievable that she would attempt to disregard it and appeal, as she must, to the judgment of the nations of the earth among whom she would stand practically alone. As for Great Britain, she stands committed to the view indicated so firmly that no honorable avenue of escape is open, even though it could be conceived she might desire to see it overturned. Her great judges reasserted and enforced the rule throughout the trying times of the Napoleonic wars when the very existence of the nation was at stake. It was applied in favor of the citizens of feeble States, and the subjects of petty princes whose favor she had no occasion to court and whose ill will she had no cause to dread. The Crimean War again brought the question before her courts, and again the rule that gave her distinction as the champion of the rights of neutrals as against the arrogant claims of belligerents was vigorously asserted and maintained.

The distinguished senior Senator from New York, whose views upon all questions of international law justly command the attention of the Senate and the country, advanced the argument before this body on Monday last that Great Britain had, by her adherence to the Declaration of London, receded from the position which her statesmen and jurists have held for over a century upon this important question, and that that country is now committed to a doctrine under which the purchase of any German ships effected since the war began must be treated as a nullity.

It is a salutary rule that new statutes are to be interpreted in the light of those which they displace. If there is any ambiguity in the language of the Declaration of London, it is evidently wise that it be examined in the light of the law and the practice of the nations participating in its preparation on the subject concerning which any controversy may arise. If it is claimed that substantial and important concessions were made by any nation, it will be wise to inquire with what vigor and consistency it had theretofore proclaimed and observed the doctrine which it is said to have abandoned.

AS MAINTAINED BY ENGLAND.

The law of England on the subject of the right to transfer ships from the flag of a belligerent to that of a neutral after a declaration of war or the commencement of hostilities is succinctly stated in a single paragraph of a manual prepared by Thomas Erskine Holland and issued in 1888 by authority of the Lord Commissioners of Admiralty for the guidance of the officers of the navy, as follows:

A vessel apparently owned by a neutral is not really so owned if acquired by a transfer from an enemy, or from a British or allied subject, made at any time during the war, or previous to the war but in contemplation of its breaking out, unless there is satisfactory proof that the transfer was bona fide and complete. (Holland, par. 53, p. 17.)

The instructions continue:

WHAT ARE ENEMY VESSELS.

19. The commander will be justified in treating as an enemy vessel:
(1) Any vessel under the flag and pass of the enemy Government.
(2) Any vessel sailing under a license of the enemy Government.
(3) Any vessel owned in whole or in part by an enemy, as hereinafter defined (see secs. 20–30).
(4) Any vessel apparently owned by a British, allied, or neutral subject, as hereinafter defined (see pars. 41, 42, 49, 55, 56), if such person has acquired the ownership by a transfer from an enemy made after the vessel had started upon the voyage during which she is met with and has not yet actually taken possession of her.
(5) Any vessel apparently owned by a British, allied, or neutral subject, if such person has acquired the ownership by a transfer from an enemy made at any time during the war, or previous to the war but in contemplation of its breaking out, unless there is satisfactory proof that the transfer was bona fide and complete. In the event of such a transfer being alleged, the commander should call for the bill of sale, and also for any papers or correspondence relating to the same. If the bill of sale is not forthcoming, and its absence is unaccounted for, he should detain the vessel. If the bill of sale is produced, its contents should be carefully examined, especially in the following particulars:
(a) The name and residence of the vendor.
(b) The name and residence of the purchaser.
(c) The place and date of the purchase.
(d) The consideration money and the receipt.
(e) The terms of the sale.
(f) The service of the vessel and the name of the master, both before and after the transfer.

The name and residence of the vendor are material to show whether or not he was an enemy.

The name and residence of the purchaser are material to show whether or not he was a person resident in British, allied, or neutral territory.

The date and place of the purchase are material to show whether or not the transfer was made in contemplation or in consequence of the war.

The consideration money is material, in case the vessel is alleged to have been transferred by sale, to show whether or not the transaction was bona fide; for if the transaction was professedly a sale, then the fact that the consideration was nominal or wholly inadequate would be a just cause for suspicion. But a transfer by way of gift or bequest will, if bona fide and complete, be as valid as a transfer by way of sale.

The receipt for the purchase money should be called for in case the vessel is alleged to have been transferred by sale; but if there is proof that the sale was bona fide and in other respects complete, the transfer will be good, although no receipt is forthcoming, and even though the purchase money has not in fact been paid, for the prize court does not consider any lien which an enemy vendor may have upon a vessel or cargo or freight for unpaid purchase money to be a subsisting enemy's interest rendering the vessel liable to confiscation. However, the fact that the purchase money, instead of having been paid in cash, has only been carried to an account will raise the presumption of the transfer being merely colorable, and such presumption can be rebutted only by clear proof to the contrary.

The terms of the sale are material to show whether the transfer was complete. The transfer would not be complete if the sale was not absolute, as if it contained a power of revocation, or a condition for a return of the vessel at the close of the war, or a reservation of the profits of the vessel, or of any control over her to be left in the hands of the former owner.

The service of the vessel and the name of the master, both before and after the transfer, are material to show whether or not the transfer be a genuine one, for if the service has continued unaltered by the transfer the commander will be justified in holding the transfer to be colorable only. The fact that the same master is retained in command after the transfer raises a suspicion, but standing alone will not be conclusive that the transfer was not bona fide.

If the transfer is bona fide and complete as between the parties, the fact that it was effected in fraud of the revenue or the law of the mercantile marine of any foreign country will be immaterial.

If the purchase was made through an agent, the letters of procuration should be called for.

The principle upon which the doctrine thus announced rests is sublimely simple. It is that a neutral nation may trade with either belligerent, except in contraband. The neutral may buy anything from the belligerent. If property of a citizen of a belligerent nation is sold and transferred to a citizen of a neutral country, it is his, and as much entitled to be regarded as his, as much entitled to protection and to immunity, as though he had produced it in his own country or acquired it from a fellow citizen. If an American should purchase a cargo in a German port, of German citizens, and carry it out upon the high seas in a German vessel, he might claim his goods, though the vessel should be seized and condemned. Very strict proof would be required of him to establish that he was, in fact, the owner of the goods; that they had actually been transferred to him; but assuming that fact to be established, they are not subject to lawful seizure. The doctrine which the English and the American courts have rejected and repudiated is that ships, and ships alone of all the infinite forms and varieties which property may take, constitute an exception to this rule. The sale of a ship may be simulated, as may the sale of any other species of property. In such case the liability to capture remains, because there is, in fact, no transition of ownership. It is to prevent a successful imposture that the stringent rules referred to are prescribed in the case of a pretended sale and transfer after a state of war arises.

That there may remain no doubt as to the English rule, I quote from III Phillimore's International Law, page 735, the

author of which work was an eminent practitioner before the admiralty court in prize cases and later a judge thereof, the following:

In respect to the transfers of enemies' ships during war, it is certain that purchases of them by neutrals are not, in general, illegal; but such purchases are liable to great suspicion; and if good proof be not given of their validity by a bill of sale and payment of a reasonable consideration it will materially impair the validity of the neutral claim.

And the following from the opinion of the Lords of the Privy Council in the case of the *Baltica* (XI Moore, 141–145):

The general rule is open to no doubt. A neutral while a war is imminent or after it has commenced is at liberty to purchase either goods or ships—not being ships of war—from either belligerent, and the purchase is valid, whether the subject of it be lying in a neutral port or in an enemy's port. During a time of peace, without prospect of war, any transfer which is sufficient to transfer the property between the vendor and the vendee is good also against a captor if war afterwards unexpectedly breaks out. But in case of war, either actual or imminent, this rule is subject to qualification, and it is settled that in such case a mere transfer by documents which would be sufficient to bind the parties is not sufficient to change to property as against captors as long as the ship or goods remain in transitu.

With respect to these principles their lordships are not aware that it is possible to raise any controversy; they are the familiar rules of the English prize courts, established by all the authorities, and are collected and stated, principally from the decisions of Lord Stowell, by Mr. Justice Story in his Notes on the Principles and Practice of Prize Courts, a work which has been selected by the British Government for the use of its naval officers as the best code of instruction in the prize law. The passages referred to are to be found in pages 63 and 64 of that work.

In view of this interesting tribute to Justice Story I quote the passages to which reference is made from his manual:

In respect to the transfers of enemies' ships during the war it is certain that purchases of them by neutrals are not in general illegal; but such purchases are liable to great suspicion, and if good proof be not given of their validity by a bill of sale and payment of a reasonable consideration it will materially impair the validity of the neutral claim; and if the purchase be made by an agent, his letters of procuration must be produced and proved; and if after such transfer the ship be employed habitually in the enemy's trade or under the management of a hostile proprietor, the sale will be deemed merely colourable and collusive. But the right of purchase by neutrals extends only to merchant ships of enemies, for the purchase of ships of war belonging to enemies is held to be invalid, and a sale of a merchant ship made by an enemy to a neutral during war must be an absolute unconditional sale. Anything tending to continue the interest of the enemy in the ship vitiates a contract of this description altogether. (Story on Prize Courts, p. 63.)

The case of the *Baltica* is of particular importance in the inquiry being pursued in view of the ingenious theory advanced by the eminent Senator from New York that under the Declaration of London a ship sold because she was likely to be captured by an enemy should she issue forth from her haven upon the high seas would still be legitimate prize, though she sailed under a neutral flag, the emblem of the nation of her new owners.

The *Baltica* was one of a number of ships giving rise to what are known as the Sorensen cases. Sorensen, at the breaking out of the Crimean War, was domiciled in Russia and was held to be a subject of that country. He owned quite a fleet of ships, and anticipating that the war was about to break out he transferred them all to his son, who claimed and established his right to the protection of a citizen of Denmark. The circumstances attending the sale naturally cast suspicion upon it, but the bona fide character of the transaction was established to the satisfaction both of the court of first instance and the higher tribunal to which the case went on appeal. That is to say, the sale was actual, not simulated; the title to the property was transferred, the vendor retaining no interest in the ships themselves and no right to have them returned to him at the close of the war or at any time. But it was frankly admitted that Sorensen senior parted with his property in the vessels because of the conditions sure to arise on the breaking out of the war. The eminent judge of the admiralty court, Dr. Lushington, said, in his opinion in the case:

The great principle by which I am to be guided in this inquiry is whether there is a transaction such as would accord with the ordinary course of trade, by which I mean not the purchase of this particular ship per se, for no one can doubt that this ship would not have been sold, and certainly not for the price, save for apprehension of the war; but whether independently of that motive, the transaction itself, the mode of sale and of payment was accordant with the ordinary custom of merchants during peace. (Spinks, 264.)

In all these respects he found the transaction unexceptionable except that under the agreement of sale one-third of the purchase price was to be, and had been, paid in cash, the remainder to be paid out of the earnings of the vessels. Because of this feature the lower court held that the sale was not absolute, or at least that the vendor retained such an interest as made the *Baltica* subject to confiscation. The Privy Council reversed the judgment and liberated the ship, maintaining that the transfer of title was complete, and that the claim upon the earnings did not amount to the retention of an interest in the ship itself. The feature that the sale was made in view of the imminency of war was not adverted to by the Lords of the Privy Council in their opinion in the case of the *Baltica*, but in that of another of the ships transferred under like circumstances—the *Ariel*—they said, having referred to the dates of incidents connected with the sale and the date of the declaration of war:

These dates seem of themselves to show that the sale was made in contemplation of war and imminente bello in a popular sense; but the evidence in the case goes further and shows conclusively that the Russian shipowners at Libau, feeling that war was at hand and that they could not employ their ships under the Russian flag, determined, on consultation, to sell their vessels, even at considerably reduced prices, rather than to keep them unemployed in Russian ports. It is argued that war can not be said to be imminent unless there be an embargo or some similar act of the country about to be belligerent, and cases are cited in which such circumstances have occurred, but none of those cases go the length of laying down any positive rule as to the necessity of such circumstances. Their lordships are of opinion that there is abundant proof that the sale was made imminente bello and in contemplation of it. Still, if the sale was absolute and bona fide, there is no rule of international law, as laid down by the courts of this country, which makes it illegal. Such a bona fide sale, made even flagrante bello, would be legal, much more imminente bello. (XI Moore, 128.)

The *Ariel* was likewise released. These captures had been made by the British Navy. The executive branch of the Government charged with the conduct of the war was insisting that the ships in question were lawful prize, but the courts of England vindicated the renown and added to the glory of English law by ordering that they be surrendered to the lawful owners.

The unequivocal declaration of the Lords of the Privy Council in the case of the *Ariel*, that under the rules of international law, as asserted by the English courts, a sale made because a state of war was imminent, or even because of the existence of such, is valid and to be respected, was fully justified by the decisions of the High Court of Admiralty, when Lord Stowell presided over its deliberations.

In the opinion in the case of the *Minerva* (6 C. Rob., 399) he said:

There have been cases of merchant vessels driven into ports out of which they could not escape and there sold, in which, after much discussion and some hesitation of opinion, the validity of the purchase has been sustained.

A note to the report of that case explains the reference in the language quoted, as follows:

(a) The *Nieuwe Vriendschap, Knuttel* (b), and other Dutch ships that had been lying with their cargoes on board at Curacao near two years in expectation of convoy, and were asserted to have been sold in that situation to imperial subjects and other neutral claimants.

AS ASSERTED BY THE UNITED STATES.

The attitude of the jurists of America on the important subject of our inquiry was disclosed in the extracts read from the work of Justice Story. It is quite commonly known that France has in the past proclaimed a different doctrine. The question which now so seriously confronts us was equally live and practical at the outbreak of the Crimean War. It was within the period when our merchant marine was a source of pride to every American, when the Stars and Stripes greeted the traveler in every great port of the world, when ships flying our flag played a very important part in bearing not alone our commerce but as well that carried on between foreign nations. In that situation the Attorney General of the United States, the Hon. Caleb Cushing, whose career has added luster to the American bar, in response to a request from the State Department, expressed in two formal opinions the rule of international law concerning the right to transfer ships from the flag of a belligerent to the flag of a neutral. No concern could have been felt at the time by those who might find it to their interest to buy, concerning the attitude of England, for her position was well known. So far as any anxiety was felt on the part of those most directly interested it must have been over the case which France might be able to make in favor of the doctrine she was understood to espouse.

(A) POSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

I quote first from a communication made by Mr. Cushing to the Secretary of State, under date of August 7, 1854:

It is true that the prize regulations occasionally issued by some belligerent nations have undertaken to prescribe a limitation in time of war of the right to purchase, naturalize, and neutralize foreign ships to the effect that in order to exempt from capture in the hands of a neutral a merchant ship purchased from the belligerent it must be shown that she was so purchased before the existing war or else after capture and lawful condemnation. (Hubner, De la Saisie des Batimens Neutres, tom. 1, pt. 2, ch. 3, s. 10, No. 4.)

France, by the prize regulations of July 23, 1704, article 7 (Lebeau, Nouveau Code des Prises, tom. 1, p. 332), and by those of July 26, 1778, article 7 (Lebeau, tom. 4, p. 342), enacted that no vessel of enemy's construction or which had been at any time of enemy's ownership should be reputed neutral without proof that the sale to the neutral owner was made before the commencement of hostilities. (Merlin, Repertoire, Prise Maritime, s. 3, art. 3, p. 144.)

Russia, on the other hand, at all times just in her appreciation of neutral rights, has in her wars with Turkey, where the question is a practical one, admitted that a ship of belligerent construction when it has become the property bona fide of a neutral, though purchased by him after the commencement of war, is not subject to molestation. (Hautefeuille, ubi supra, tom. 4, p. 28, note.)

The injustice and unreasonableness of making any distinction in this respect between ships and any other species of property were long since indicated (Lampredi, Del Commercio dei Popoli neutrali in Tempo di Guerra, pt. 1, s. 12, note), and this belligerent encroachment on the sovereignty and the rights of neutrals, notwithstanding that it continues to be asserted by some States, is rejected by the most authoritative writers on the public law of Europe. (See Hautefeuille, ubi supra, title 11, ch. 2.)

The exercise of commerce by every nation is one of the incidents of its sovereignty. The sovereign rights of a particular nation are not to cease whenever any two other nations choose to go to war. The neutral State is to conduct impartially between the belligerents, but its commerce remains free with respect to them and to each of them. That commerce is without limitation saving only the restrictions as to contraband of war and places besieged, blockaded, or invested, and thus restricted it extends in principle to all the possible objects of mercantile intercourse.

No Government has a right to contest the validity of the sale of a ship on the pretense of its having been at one time belligerent property. To undertake to do this is to usurp a jurisdiction over the business of other nations; it is to derogate from their independence; it is a mere abuse of force which a strong nation may impose on a weak one, but which every strong nation should indignantly repel, as it repels the pretension of the exclusive dominion of the sea by any one State. (6 Op., 642.)

On October 8, 1855, he addressed a further letter to the Secretary, in which, after adverting to his earlier communication, he continued:

Since that opinion was delivered several treatises of more or less value on belligerent law have been published in Great Britain adapted to current events and to the present state of the science of jurisprudence. They agree unanimously that the bona fide sale of the ships of belligerents to neutrals in time of war is lawful and valid unless made in transitu. (Hosack, Rights of British and Neutral Commerce, p. 81; Lock, Legal Guide of Sailors and Merchants during War, p. 129; Wildman, Law of Search, Capture, and Prize, p. 26; Hazlitt and Roche, Law of Maritime Warfare, p. 46.)

A still more important fact in this relation is the decision of the British high court of admiralty in a late case of a vessel captured as Russian, but claimed as the property of a Hamburger by purchase since the commencement of hostilities. In this case the court (Dr. Lushington) says, "With regard to the legality of the sale, assuming it to be bona fide, it is not denied that it is competent to neutrals to purchase the property of enemies in another country, whether consisting of ships or anything else. They have a perfect right to do so, and no belligerent right can override it. The present inquiry, therefore, is limited to whether there has been a bona fide transfer or not." (The Johanna Emilia, English Reports in Law and Equity, vol. 29, p. 562.)

Thus it is perceived that now in Great Britain not only is it held that neutrals have right to purchase belligerent vessels by the law of that country, but also by the law of nations; that the right is "perfect," and that "no belligerent right can override it."

I am not aware of any assumed belligerent right adverse to this, except in a French regulation of the reign of Louis XVI, as follows:

"Regulation of July 26, 1778. Article 7. Ships of enemies' construction, or which shall have been enemies' ownership, can not be regarded as neutral or as belonging to allies unless there be found on board certain documents, authenticated by public officers, certifying the date of sale or cession, and that such sale or cession had been made to the subject of an allied or neutral power previous to the commencement of hostilities, and that the said conveyance of an enemy's property to the subject of a neutral or an ally has been duly registered in presence of the principal officer of the place from which the vessel sailed and signed by the owner of the ship or by a person holding power of attorney from him." (Lebeau, Nouveau Code des Prises, tom. 2, p. 342.)

This regulation is defended and commended in a recent French treatise on prize law, with singular inconsistency, considering the just pride which the authors express in a view of the contemporary success of the French and American doctrine of neutral rights in the matter of the immunity of merchandise on board of neutral ships of commerce. (Pistoye et Duverdy, Traite des Prises Maritimes, tom. 1, p. 350; tom. 2, p. 1.)

It is remarkable also that while they carefully expose the difference between the English and the French public law in the first case, yet they as carefully suppress all indication of that law in the second case, although they quote several recent prize trials in the British court of admiralty which involve inquiry on collateral relations of the same great question, and the due understanding of which, in France, required that the English rule should be stated, at least by way of commentary, if not of approbation. (Tom. 2, p. 15.)

It is remarkable for the further reason that other French authors of deserved authority had pointedly condemned the regulation of Louis XVI. (See Hautefeuille, Droits et Devoirs des Nations Neutres, tom. 4.)

Rumor asserts that the regulation has been applied during the present war to the case of a Russian merchantman, purchased by a Spaniard, in the port of Cadiz.

But, considering the liberal character of the traditional public policy of France in the matter of neutral rights—a policy which, it is apparent, in other respects has the enlightened approval of the present Emperor of the French—it is not to be presumed that the French Government will assert this regulation adversely to the public law recognized not by neutrals merely like the United States, but by one of the two principal cobelligerents, Great Britain. We may rather anticipate that the Emperor, justly gratified to see England come up to the policy of France in regard to neutral transportation of belligerent goods, will not choose to remain behind England in regard to the purchase and sale of belligerent ships.

It is not recorded that the French Emperor disregarded the obvious warnings of these virile public letters. Whatever support has been given by France since the middle of the last century to the rule of Louis XVI has been purely academic. She paid no heed to it in the Crimean War nor in the war with Germany in 1870 nor during the war with China in 1884, as will be hereafter shown.

(B) POSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

In the contingency which brought out the letters of Attorney General Cushing, our Government took occasion to bring, in a most direct manner, to the attention of the French authorities, the attitude it would be compelled to take on the question being considered.

On the 19th of February, 1856, Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, addressed a letter of instructions to Mr. Mason, our ambassador at the court of France, in the course of which he said:

The law of nations secures to neutrals unrestricted commerce with the belligerents, except in articles contraband of war and trade with blockaded or besieged places. With these exceptions commerce is as free between neutrals and belligerents as if it were carried on solely between neutral nations, and it is difficult to conceive upon what principle an exception can be made and the neutral deprived of the rights secured in regard to the purchase of merchant vessels.

It is true a regulation of France has been referred to in support of the doctrine avowed by the Imperial Government, but it is hardly necessary to observe that a municipal law of that country can only affect persons under its control, and can have no binding force beyond its territorial limits. The parties who made the contract for the sale and purchase of the ship *St. Harlampy* were not under the jurisdiction of the municipal law of France; on the contrary, they were both within the jurisdiction of the United States as well as the property which formed the subject of the transaction. The validity or invalidity of the transaction can be determined only by the local or international law. It was a contract authorized by the laws of this country and the law of nations; and it was supposed to be universally conceded that such a contract would be respected everywhere. Certainly no Government except that under which the contract was made could interpose to destroy or vary the obligations which its provisions impose if not contrary to the law of nations. This is the doctrine of the European publicists, and it is especially sustained by Hautefeuille, whose authority will, I doubt not, be recognized by the Emperor's Government. He says, "It is impossible to recognize such a right as that claimed by the regulations of France." "Commerce," he adds, "is free between the neutral and belligerent nations; this liberty is unlimited except (by) the two restrictions relative to contraband of war, and to places besieged, blockaded, or invested; it extends to all kinds of provisions, merchandise, and movable objects without exception. Pacific nations can then, when they judge proper, purchase the merchant ships of one of the parties engaged in hostilities without the other party having the right to complain, without, above all, that it should have power to censure, to annul these sales, to consider and treat as an enemy a ship really neutral and regularly recognized by the neutral Government as belonging to its subjects. To declare null and without obligation a contract, it is indispensable that the legislator should have jurisdiction over the contracting parties. It is then necessary, in order that such a thing should take place, to suppose that the belligerent possesses the right of jurisdiction over neutral nations. That is impossible; the pretension of the belligerents is an abuse of force, an attempt against the independence of pacific nations, and consequently a violation of the duties imposed by divine law upon nations at war."

However long may be the period during which this doctrine has formed part of the municipal code of France, it is manifestly not in harmony with her maritime policy, and it is confidently believed by this Government that France will not assert it, not only against the practice of other nations but against the authority of her most enlightened writers on public law. (7 Moore on International Law, 416.)

I pause to invite the attention of the Senate to the language of Mr. Marcy expressive of the position that a disregard by a belligerent of a transfer of property made within a neutral nation and valid by its laws would be an offense against the sovereignty and independence of the latter.

The views expressed by Mr. Marcy were publicly proclaimed in official communications by many of his successors, notably by Mr. Cass in 1859, by Mr. Fish in 1877, and by Mr. Evarts in 1879.

(C) POSITION OF THE COURTS.

Finally, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a case growing out of the Spanish-American War—the *Benito Estenger* (176 U. S., 568)—reasserted the rule as expressed by the publicists of this country whose views have been referred to. These have been dwelt upon at some length, not only to impress upon the Senate the fixed character of the sentiment in this country upon the important question under review but to exhibit the intensity of that sentiment as it was disclosed on every occasion which called for an expression touching it—to expose somewhat fully the struggles through which we have passed—to maintain not only for ourselves but, as well, for the neutral nations of the world an inestimable right which the illustrious Senator from New York now tells us that, in an unguarded moment, under his direction as Secretary of State, we surrendered without a battle even of words; and surrendered, practically, in favor of a principle, to use the language of Mr. Cushing, "rejected by the most authoritative writers on the public law of Europe."

Reference has been made to the disregard by France during the wars of the latter half of the nineteenth century of the doctrine for which she has been credited with being the protagonist. She was engaged in war with China in 1883, growing out of controversies involving her East Indian possessions. Our citizens did not hesitate to purchase Chinese ships and sail them in the waters of the circumjacent seas under the American flag. Indeed, they were acquired in such numbers that President Arthur in his annual message to Congress on December 1, 1884, referred somewhat exultantly to the fact and asked for legislation giving them registry under our laws in virtue of which they might enter and unload in our ports.

THE DECLARATION OF LONDON.

Such was the state of the law when the conference of London assembled December 4, 1908, to frame a code of laws for the government of the international prize court, for the establishment of which the second Hague conference had made provision. The English-American theory was vigorous, dominant, established by practice and by precedent. The French theory was discredited, obsolete, and practically abandoned. The delegates from Austria-Hungary to the conference, which was composed of representatives of the great commercial nations of the earth—the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands—the delegates to the conference from Austria-Hungary referred to it as the "*ancient* French theory," the characterization being made in a formal statement submitted by them which embraced the following paragraph:

The ancient French theory under which enemy vessels could not from the outbreak of hostilities change their nationality—that is to say, lose their status as enemy vessels—implies an undue restriction of neutral commerce, as such commerce must in principle remain free, even in time of war. France herself further derogated from this theory in 1870.

The reference to the conduct of France in 1870 is fully justified, not only by her failure to make seizure of ships transferred to a neutral flag after the declaration of war but by the following from the instructions issued by the minister of marine for the conduct of the navy:

When the result of the examination of the ship's papers is that since the declaration of war the nationality of the hitherto enemy ship has been changed by a sale made to neutrals there is need of proceeding with great caution to make sure that this transaction was executed in good faith and not for the sole purpose of concealing what is really enemy property.

Obviously if no transfer made since the commencement of hostilities was to be held valid, no instruction would have been given to examine with care the ship's papers in such a case to determine whether the transaction was in good faith.

The statement of the various nations referred to was prepared in response to a request from the British foreign minister in communicating the invitation to other nations to participate in the conference in which he expressed the hope that the representatives would "interchange memoranda setting out concisely, with reference to the authorities supporting the contention made, what they regard the correct rule of international law on each" of seven points proposed as a program for the conference, as follows:

(a) Contraband, including the circumstances under which particular articles can be considered as contraband; the penalties for their carriage; the immunity of a ship from search when under convoy, and the rules with regard to compensation where vessels have been seized but have been found in fact only to be carrying innocent cargo;
(b) Blockade, including the questions as to the locality where seizure can be effected, and the notice that is necessary before a ship can be seized;
(c) The doctrine of continuous voyage in respect both of contraband and of blockade;
(d) The legality of the destruction of neutral vessels prior to their condemnation by a prize court;
(e) The rules as to neutral ships or persons rendering "unneutral service" ("assistance hostile");
(f) The legality of the conversion of a merchant vessel into a warship on the high seas;
(g) The rules as to the transfer of merchant vessels from a belligerent to a neutral flag during or in contemplation of hostilities; and
(h) The question whether the nationality or the domicile of the owner should be adopted as the dominant factor in deciding whether property is enemy property. (54 Sessional Papers, House of Commons, 1909, pp. 371, 372.)

Great Britain submitted the following on the subject of "Transfer of merchant vessels to a neutral owner during or in contemplation of hostilities":

1. The transfer, either by sale or by gift, to a neutral of a hostile ship other than a war vessel is not made invalid merely by reason of the fact that it took place during or in anticipation of hostilities.
2. Such transfer, however, is not valid—
(a) If it takes place in a blockaded port;
(b) If it takes place during a voyage;
(In this respect a voyage is ended the moment the ship reaches the port where it can be effectively taken possession of by the transferee.)
(c) If the vendor retains any interest in the ship, or if a clause stipulates the return at the end of the war.
3. The burden of proof that the transfer is bona fide is upon the plaintiff, and the transfer must be complete, in good faith, and for an adequate price.
A ship transferred to a neutral flag is therefore still liable to condemnation by a prize court should the conditions of the transfer give rise to suspicion of which the plaintiff does not clear himself, as, for instance—
(a) If no written evidence of the transfer is found on board at the time of the seizure;
(b) If the transferor has any control over the ship, a share in the profits, or the privilege of revoking the transfer;
(c) If the supposed transferee or his representative (the latter not being an enemy) has not taken possession;
(d) If the ship is subject to the control of an enemy;
(e) If the captain or person in command is in the service of an enemy.

The memorandum was accompanied with a long list of decisions by the courts of England, embracing those to which reference has heretofore been made.

It is singular and singularly regrettable that the memorandum submitted by the representatives from the United States omitted all reference to the subject so important here. The attitude of the dual monarchy has been disclosed. Japan gave her adherence to the English-American theory. The Netherlands went even beyond it in recognition of the right of transfer. Spain signified her acceptance of the rules expressed in the statement of Great Britain. Italy expressed the view that upon strict proof that the sale was not fictitious it should be recognized. France, Germany, and Russia declared in favor of the doctrine that sales made after a declaration of war are void, but without citing any authorities whatever. The position taken by each of the nations participating is set out in a compilation, which I send to the desk and which I ask be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

IS THE DECLARATION OPERATIVE AND CONTROLLING?

Mr. WALSH. The result of the labors of the Conference was the celebrated Declaration of London.

It was signed by all the delegates and represents mutual concessions, each being the consideration for the other; but it was never ratified by Great Britain; and as the ratifications of those powers which indorsed the work of their delegates have never been exchanged, it has not become obligatory as a treaty.

On the 20th day of August, 1914, Great Britain issued a proclamation reciting that—

During the present hostilities the convention known as the Declaration of London should, subject to certain additions and modifications therein specified, be adopted and put in force.

The additions and modifications referred to are as follows:

(1) The lists of absolute and conditional contraband contained in the proclamation dated August 4, 1914, shall be substituted for the lists contained in articles 22 and 24 of the said declaration.
(2) A neutral vessel which succeeded in carrying contraband to the enemy with false papers may be detained for having carried such contraband if she is encountered before she has completed her return voyage.
(3) The destination referred to in article 33 may be inferred from any sufficient evidence, and (in addition to the presumption laid down in article 34) shall be presumed to exist if the goods are consigned to or for an agent of the enemy State or to or for a merchant or other person under the control of the authorities of the enemy State.
(4) The existence of a blockade shall be presumed to be known—
(a) To all ships which sailed from or touched at an enemy port a sufficient time after the notification of the blockade to the local authorities to have enabled the enemy Government to make known the existence of the blockade.
(b) To all ships which sailed from or touched at a British or allied port after the publication of blockade.
(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of article 35 of the said declaration, conditional contraband, if shown to have the destination referred to in article 33, is liable to capture to whatever port the vessel is bound and at whatever port the cargo is to be discharged.
(6) The general report of the drafting committee on the said declaration presented to the naval conference and adopted by the conference at the eleventh plenary meeting of February 25, 1909, shall be considered by all prize courts as an authoritative statement of the meaning and intention of the said declaration, and such courts shall construe and interpret the provisions of the said declaration by the light of the commendatory given therein.
And the lords commissioners of His Majesty's treasury, the lords commissioners of the Admiralty, and each of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state, the president of the probate, divorce, and Admiralty division of the high court of justice, all other judges of His Majesty's prize courts, and all governors, officers, and authorities whom it may concern are to give the necessary directions herein as to them may respectively appertain.

Her allies took similar action.

On the 21st day of September another proclamation was issued reciting the one of earlier date referred to and setting forth:

Whereas it is expedient to introduce further modifications in the declaration of London as adopted and put in force: Now, therefore,
We (the King) do hereby declare, by and with the advice and of our privy council, that during the continuance of the war, or until we do give further public notice, the articles enumerated in the schedule hereto will, notwithstanding anything contained in article 28 of the declaration of London, be treated as conditional contraband:

SCHEDULE.

Copper, unwrought.
Lead—pig, sheet, or pipe.
Glycerin.
Ferrochrome.
Hematite iron ore.
Magnetic iron ore.
Rubber.
Hides and skins, raw or rough tanned (but not including dressed leather).

Article 28 referred to declared that neither hides, rubber, nor metallic ores might be declared contraband of war, so that as early as September 21 Great Britain gave notice that she would not observe or be bound by the declaration of London, which provided by article 65 that—

The provisions of the present declaration must be treated as a whole and can not be separated.

She went further, and on October 29, 1914, issued the following:

Whereas by an order in council dated the 20th day of August, 1914, His Majesty was pleased to declare that during the present hostilities the convention known as the declaration of London should, subject to certain additions and modifications therein specified, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government; and

Whereas the said additions and modifications were rendered necessary by the special conditions of the present war; and

Whereas it is desirable and possible now to reenact the said order in council with amendments in order to minimize, so far as possible, the interference with innocent neutral trade occasioned by the war:

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of his privy council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. During the present hostilities the provisions of the convention known as the Declaration of London shall, subject to the exclusion of the lists of contraband and noncontraband, and to the modifications hereinafter set out, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government.

The modifications are as follows:

(i) A neutral vessel, with papers indicating a neutral destination, which, not withstanding the destination shown on the papers, proceeds to an enemy port, shall be liable to capture and condemnation if she is encountered before the end of her next voyage.

(ii) The destination referred to in article 33 of the said declaration shall, in addition to the presumptions laid down in article 34, be presumed to exist if the goods are consigned to or for an agent of the enemy State.

(iii) Notwithstanding the provisions of article 35 of the said declaration, conditional contraband shall be liable to capture on board a vessel bound for a neutral port if the goods are consigned "to order," or if the ship's papers do not show who is the consignee of the goods, or if they show a consignee of the goods in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

(iv) In the cases covered by the preceding paragraph (iii) it shall lie upon the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

2. Where it is shown to the satisfaction of one of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state that the enemy Government is drawing supplies for its armed forces from or through a neutral country, he may direct that in respect of ships bound for a port in that country article 35 of the said declaration shall not apply. Such direction shall be notified in the London Gazette and shall operate until the same is withdrawn. So long as such direction is in force a vessel which is carrying conditional contraband to a port in that country shall not be immune from capture.

At the same time she issued new lists of contraband designating innumerable articles as contraband contrary to article 28 of the declaration, and characterizing many articles as absolute contraband contrary to article 23, which permits additions to the list of absolute contraband only of such articles as are used exclusively for war.

Since then the contraband list has been extended still further in disregard of the Declaration of London.

It is understood that the initiative thus taken by Great Britain has been followed by her allies. It is accordingly idle to assert that the Declaration of London, so contemptuously treated by the allies, can be appealed to by them in justification of any course they may take in the present war or even that it can justly have any persuasive force in the ultimate determination of our right to purchase the interned ships. The question remains as it presented itself when Marcy, Cass, Evarts, and Fish boldly proclaimed our right to buy.

It is not to be understood that the other warring nations have treated the Declaration with any higher evidence of regard

Whatever force may be given to it by the English prize courts in any respect in which it runs counter to the law as they have heretofore evolved it, neither Great Britain nor her allies can rely on it in diplomatic negotiations with our Government, nor can she make any persuasive appeal to its provisions before any arbitral tribunal to which any international controversy may be referred.

IF IT IS, DOES IT FORBID PURCHASES OF BELLIGERENT SHIPS?

But assuming it to have some virtue, let its provisions be examined.

Rule 56, covering the subject of a transfer effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is as follows:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

There, however, is an absolute presumption that a transfer is void—

(1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port.

(2) If a right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor.

(3) If the requirements of the municipal law governing the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled.

It is the view of the distinguished Senator from New York that this means that an effective sale can not be made of a vessel of a belligerent nation after the outbreak of hostilities if she is in a port from which she does not leave for fear of capture.

This astounding doctrine will be received by the American people with feelings of painful surprise. If it were asserted by almost anyone in America but the Senator it would have been scouted as impossible. His views will be read by no one with more astonishment than by the representatives to the Conference from Great Britain, who, in their report to Lord Grey, after reviewing the provisions of article 56, declared that its provisions "are practically in accord with the rules hitherto enforced by British prize courts." As the entire paragraph of the report is illuminating I read it, as follows:

The provisions respecting transfers made during a war are less complicated. The general rule is that such transfers are considered void unless it be proved that they were not made with a view to evade the consequences which the retention of enemy nationality during war would entail. This is only another way of stating the principle already explained that transfers effected after the outbreak of hostilities are good if made bona fide, but that it is for the owners of the vessels transferred to prove such bona fides. In certain circumstances, specified in the second paragraph of article 56, mala fides is presumed without possibility of rebuttal. The provisions under this head are practically in accord with the rules hitherto enforced by British prize courts. (54 Sessional Papers (1909), 100.)

This contemporaneous exposition by her representatives would have bound Great Britain in any controversy with our Governmen past all hope of escape but for the speech to which the Senate listened in some awe on Monday last. Possibly our cousins may be disposed to make some allowance on account of words spoken in debate into which, on the testimony of the Senator, partisan politics had been allowed to enter and to feel that he himself was not exempt from the infection against which he declaimed.

It will be quite pertinent to remark when the subject is officially canvassed that if it be true that such a revolution was effected by article 56 of the Declaration of London in the rules of international law touching the subject with which it deals as they had been understood, taught, proclaimed, defended, and enforced in America, Secretary Root would never have been so derelict in his duty as not to have communicated the fact to the Senate in transmitting to it the work of the conference for ratification. Indeed, it is unbelievable that he would have permitted the American delegates, who acted under his direction, as it is reasonable to suppose, and as he tells us in his powerful address, to give their assent to the surrender of a right which their country had so long and so resolutely upheld. It is incredible that in making their report our representatives would have omitted to apprise the country that they had been moved to make so vital a concession had they believed or understood they had done so, as it is impossible to believe that they would have remained silent when the question of the adoption of article 56 was before the conference had they conceived it reasonable to give to it the interpretation to which it is now insisted it is subject. They entered a solemn protest against language proposed at one time, if not that eventually adopted, touching transfers before the commencement of hostilities, as will appear from the papers transmitted to the Senate with the treaty, but apparently no word was heard from them by way of complaint concerning the language of article 56.

Some comments made by one of the German representatives during the course of the debate before the Conference were appealed to by the Senator from New York in support of his contention concerning the significance of the language of article 56, but it is sufficient to remark concerning the same that it has been repeatedly declared by our Supreme Court that debates before a parliamentary body afford no safe guide to the interpretation of a statute and are generally to be disregarded. And the rule is the same in England. In United States *v.* Trans-Missouri Freight Association (166 U. S., 290) the court said:

There is a general acquiescence in the doctrine that debates in Congress are not appropriate sources of information from which to discover the meaning of the language of a statute passed by that body. United States *v.* Union Pacific Railroad Co. (91 U. S., 72, 79); Aldridge *v.* Williams (3 How., 9, 24; Taney, Chief Justice); Mitchell *v.* Great Works Milling & Manufacturing Co. (2 Story, 648, 653); Queen *v.* Hertford College (3 Q. B. D., 693, 707).

The reason is that it is impossible to determine with certainty what construction was put upon an act by the members of a legislative body that passed it by resorting to the speeches of individual members thereof. Those who did not speak may not have agreed with those who did, and those who spoke might differ from each other, the result being that the only proper way to construe a legislative act is from the language used in the act and, upon occasion, by a resort to the history of the times when it was passed.

The doctrine of that case was reasserted in Maxwell *v.* Dow (176 U. S. 581), in which the court said:

What individual Senators or Representatives may have urged in debate in regard to the meaning to be given to a proposed constitutional amendment or bill or resolution does not furnish a firm ground for its proper construction, nor is it important as explanatory of the grounds upon which the Members voted in adopting it.

Nor is much aid to be gained from the meager reference to the action of the Italian Government since the London conference in condemning certain vessels carrying the Greek flag upon transfers from subjects of Turkey then at war with Italy. It is quite possible that the transfers were found to be colorable only—indeed, the report is equally consistent with either theory of the import of the language of the Declaration of London,

that first propounded by the Senator from New York, five years after the conference adjourned, and that announced by the representatives of Great Britain immediately upon the completion of its work. The declaration bears date February 26, 1909. Three days thereafter, on March 1, 1909, the British delegates made the report telling that the conference had adopted practically the rules of the English prize courts on the subject of the transfer of the flag of a belligerent.

The conclusion which they drew from the language used is plainly justified. If the owner of a ship, idle at its wharf or swinging at anchor in neutral waters because he fears capture, should she venture out, should cause a transfer of his vessel to be made to a neutral and register her under the flag to which the latter owes allegiance, the whole procedure being but a form without an actual and complete divestiture of the title or beneficial interest, the conclusion would follow, should she then undertake a voyage, that the transfer was effected "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed." His property, were the ship immune, is worth just as much as she was before. But he does not care to subject his ship to the risk of "the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed," namely, to capture. He prefers to allow her to remain idle where she is until the war is over. Then he may sail her again to any port. Another, similarly situated, reasons with himself that it would be wiser to sell, even at a very greatly reduced price, even at a substantial loss, reckoning that by the end of the war the money he receives, judiciously invested, will amount to more than the value the ship will then have. He sells, not to "evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed," not to get profits out of her while she sails under a false flag, but to realize upon an unproductive piece of property, the care of which is a constant expense to him. Indeed, it is conceivable that the burden of expense is so great that he may be forced to sell. Should claims accumulate past his ability to pay and the ship be sold upon a libel or in bankruptcy, would it be contended that the transfer had been made "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed"? In the recital of the facts in the case of the *Baltica*, Spinks, 265, in the opinion by Dr. Lushington occurs the following:

> It appeared to Mr. Sorensen, the elder, and to other merchants at Libau, owners of vessels under the Russian flag, that, as war between Great Britain and Russia was probable, the preponderance of the naval forces of Great Britain was such as would seriously embarrass, if not wholly prevent, the profitable employment of vessels sailing under the Russian flag, and that, therefore, it was expedient to sell their vessels, though at a considerable sacrifice. Actuated by these considerations, Mr. Sorensen, sr., framed a plan for the transfer of his property.

It was found that Sorensen did not transfer in order to evade the consequences to which his ships would be subject, namely, capture, but because the ship in his hands would be profitless during the war. He concluded to sell, even at a sacrifice.

It is conceded that under the Declaration of London a transfer by descent would warrant a change of flag, because the owner would have died, it is assumed, though the war had never begun. And yet such an assumption may be unfounded. Men have died from grief and from anxiety induced by staggering business reverses. May not a shipowner, anticipating his speedy death, give his ship to his son, who will inherit it, anyway? And if he may give it to his son, may he not, as Sorensen did, sell it to him at an advantageous price? If the son may inherit the ship and sail it under the flag of his country, being neutral, may not his father bequeath it to him? If the father may dispose of the ship by will, how shall he be denied the right to transfer the title by a sale?

NO DANGER OF INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATIONS.

It is idle, however, to delude ourselves into the notion, at least since the Senator from New York has spoken, that the question is one free from doubt or that our right to purchase the ships of the belligerents is not likely to be questioned. It is understood that an intimation has already come to the State Department from some source that the acquisition of any of the so-called interned ships would be regarded as "apparently unlawful." But what of it? Are we to abandon our historic attitude upon this question simply because some or all of the warring nations may exhibit some disposition to dispute it? Are we to decline to put the question to the test or discourage or withhold our approbation from any of our venturesome citizens who may be disposed to do so merely because of a vague apprehension that war may come from the temperate but determined assertion of our rights? Heretofore, without exception, the responsible officers of our Government have braved the enmity of powerful belligerents and openly counseled our people to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by a state of war to acquire ships to swell the volume of our merchant marine. We never got into trouble about it. In the case of the *St. Harlampy*, referred to by Mr. Marcy in the letter which has been quoted, a confidential note had been sent by the French minister of foreign affairs calling attention to the purchase of the ship theretofore the property of Russian subjects by certain Boston merchants, and conveying a warning that the vessel would be liable to seizure by French cruisers. Neither our Government nor the Boston merchants hesitated. No French cruiser, apparently, sought her out. It may be that she escaped, because the war came to a speedy close. But suppose she had been captured; what reason is there to suppose that such an incident would have involved us in war with France? It would not be the first time that a ship bearing our flag had been condemned as prize by a belligerent with which we were at peace. Though no ships carrying our flag have been seized during the present war, millions of dollars' worth of other property has been upon the claim that under the rules of international law it is subject to confiscation. The addition of a ship or two or 20 ships would scarcely aggravate the situation.

If the *St. Harlampy* had been seized by French cruisers, our Government would have protested and, because of the vast importance to our interests as well as those of the nations whose ordinary condition is that of peace, not war, would have attempted to impress upon the French prize court its views of the rule of international law applicable to the case. If it failed, and redress were not obtained through diplomatic channels, it would doubtless have demanded that the controversy be arbitrated. France could not, conceivably, have refused. Before the arbitral tribunal the controverted legal question would have been fought out and a service to the civilized world would have been rendered in securing from it an authoritative declaration of the law upon the disputed point.

OUR RIGHT OUGHT TO BE TESTED.

Such will undoubtedly be the general course that will be pursued should the *Dacia* be captured. There is no reason why even the most timid should look with alarm upon her eventful trip. Unfortunately the question of the bona fides of the sale to one of our citizens asserting title to her is involved. It may be that the court will find that the alleged sale is fictitious and that the Hamburg-American Line still, in fact, owns the ship or retains an interest in her or holds a contract for her repurchase after the war. In that case the question of the true construction of article 56 of the Declaration of London will never arise. In the fact feature of the case our Government has no interest; but assuming the proof to be indubitable upon that point, the controversy is narrowed to one involving legal propositions only over which individuals rarely come to blows or nations go to war. Indeed, recent treaties negotiated with all of the belligerents require us as well as them to submit the question in difference to arbitration. In view of the community of interest which obtains between our country and the other nations, from which the arbitrators must be selected, there is no ground for apprehension that the question will be considered by them in any attitude of hostility to our contention. We can not afford to forfeit forever the right to buy freely from belligerents property of any character without a struggle. We have paid dearly for our maintenance of this right in the past. We did not wince when it was invoked against us.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Before the Senator leaves the incident of the *Dacia*—he has dwelt with a great deal of emphasis and interest upon the question of bona fides, and evidently his argument as to our right turns largely upon that point——

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, I do not wish to quarrel with the Senator about that point. It is evidently a very important factor in the transfer from a belligerent flag to a neutral flag, and I am impressed that the question of bona fides is very important; and I desire to say that in the case of the *Dacia*, which was purchased by Mr. Breitung, prima facie he is entitled to the presumption that his purchase is bona fide and that it is not part of any ulterior arrangement that has been made with the former owners of that ship.

I know Mr. Breitung very well. Some Senators here to-day remember his father, who was an honored Member of Congress from Michigan for a number of years, a very wealthy man, a typical frontiersman, a man of courage and patriotism, and the highest conception of good citizenship. That his son should have purchased this ship out of his own abundant means and placed it in service does not surprise me and will not surprise any of those who have the privilege and honor of knowing him; and I have no doubt whatever that the entire transaction,

which has attracted the attention of the country, is in absolute good faith. I have seen no reference to Mr. Breitung that was especially meant as a criticism, but I felt, after listening to what the honorable Senator from Montana has said upon the rights of American citizens, that it would be appropriate for me to at least give expression to this thought.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am indeed delighted that the Senator from Michigan has given the Senate the assurance which his words convey. I myself have no cause to doubt in any way the bona fides of the transfer of the *Dacia*. I trust that Mr. Breitung will be able to establish that fact so conclusively that the case will present no question of disputed facts whatever. Then there will arise the sole question of law, in the determination of which this Nation has a most vital interest.

Our great merchant marine faded away during the dark days of the Civil War, when, according to Marvin, "Confederate cruisers compelled American merchants to choose between laying their ships up in port to rot away or selling at a half to a quarter of their cost to foreigners." This author adds that "in the one year 1864, beneath this extraordinary pressure, more American ships were disposed of to foreign owners than had been sold in all the years between 1854 and 1860." The figures are eloquent. During the four years from 1862 to 1865, inclusive, we sold to aliens 774,652 tons. During the four years embracing two before that period and two after, we sold but 75,372 tons, about one-tenth as many ships. The following table tells the story.

American ships sold to aliens, 1860–1867.

	Tons.
1860	17,518
1861	26,649
1862	117,756
1863	222,199
1864	300,863
1865	133,832
1866	22,117
1867	9,088

As these were mostly sailing vessels, averaging possibly 1,000 tons each, more than 600 ships went to foreign registry on account of the war. If they had been liable to seizure by the Confederate cruisers, notwithstanding the transfer, they would never have been sold. We lost our merchant marine because when we were at war other nations at peace with us could buy them. It is now asserted that by some brilliant feat of diplomacy we are deprived of the right to buy their ships when they are at war.

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to try out this question. The owner of the *Dacia* will have earned the gratitude of his countrymen if he shall persevere in his insistence upon the principle of the right of neutrals to buy in good faith the ships of belligerents, until that question shall be finally and authoritatively resolved. He ought not to be required to bear all the risk and expense of the test. If he shall succeed in establishing that principle, the Nation as a whole will be the rich gainer. If the test came upon the seizure of a ship purchased under the authority of the bill now being considered, the case would be presented in the best possible aspect, because in that event no question could be raised concerning the bona fides of the transfer, using the term as having the significance it ordinarily bears. It would be inconceivable that either the shipping board or the corporation which it is to bring into being would lend itself to a fraudulent scheme to enable belligerents to sail their ships under the American flag "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed." No prize court or diplomatic authority would entertain the idea. The cause would be open to contest on the law alone.

Indeed, the very groundwork of the French rule would be swept away in such a controversy. The only justification ever offered for it is that under any other fraudulent transfers would be made with intent to escape capture. The idea that a nation at war has some vested right to capture as its prey all the ships owned by its enemy at the outbreak of hostilities has never before been avowed.

In the case of a purchase by a friendly power the imputation of connivance would be impossible. France would scarcely suggest the possibility of such a thing in the case of a purchase by the United States, so while she might be disposed to insist upon her "*ancient* theory," so far as private purchasers are concerned, she would be put to severe straits to justify the rule in the case of a purchase made by our Government. Where the reason for a rule of law ceases, the rule itself ceases.

SHIPS ACQUIRED WILL NOT BE EXEMPT FROM ORDINARY LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.

But it is advanced that ships owned by the corporation, for the creation of which the bill makes provision, would not be subject to seizure as prize, nor could they be called upon to respond in an alien court of admiralty on account of a collision or other act or omission for which a privately owned ship might be held, and that because of that condition, unnamed and undefined perils which the imagination is left to picture, must be encountered if the plan proposed is pursued.

In this connection the case of the *Parlement Belge* is repeatedly referred to. That case applied the well-known rule that a sovereign can not be made subject to suit except at his own will. The craft in question was owned by the Belgian Government, engaged in carrying the mail across the channel. Incidentally it carried small packages of freight, for which a charge was made. It collided on one of its trips with another vessel and was brought before the admiralty court upon a libel, under which it was charged with responsibility for the damage done. Under the maritime law the claim, if established, would constitute a lien upon the offending ship, which would become subject to sale for the payment of the amount found due. The proceeding was *in rem* against the ship. It was held that she was immune from prosecution because of the nature of her owner and the character of the business in which she was engaged. In the opinion much was said on the question of the immunity of ships of war and other Government vessels, foreign and domestic, but the decision releasing the vessel was placed upon the ground that she was not primarily in trade, but was engaged in the discharge of a strictly governmental function. The court having said, after reviewing at great length the arguments and authorities—

> In the present case the ship has been mainly used for the purpose of carrying the mails, and only subserviently to that main object for the purposes of trade—

expressed its conclusion in one brief sentence, as follows:

> We are of the opinion that the mere fact of the ship being used subordinately and partially for trading purposes does not take away the general immunity.

Another case determined in the year 1873 by the High Court of Admiralty is much more in point in the present inquiry, namely, the *Charkieh* (42 L. J. R., N. S., 17). From the syllabus the essential facts and conclusions can be gathered. I read from it the following:

> The *C.*, belonging to the Khedive of Egypt and usually employed in carrying mail and passengers, came to England with merchandise and for repairs. Having completed her repairs, and while on a trial trip down the Thames, she came into collision with *B.* Held, that even the privileges of a sovereign prince would not extend to immunity from arrest in a suit for damages by collision; that if the privileges did extend to such an immunity they would have been waived in this case by the employment of the ship at the time as a trader. Proceedings in rem may in some cases be instituted without any violation of international law, though the owner of the res be in the category of persons privileged from personal suit.

Other propositions determined but unimportant here are passed. The vessel in question was one of quite a fleet held in the same ownership. The good sense of the conclusions arrived at, as heretofore indicated, will be apparent from the following from the opinion:

> I must say that if ever there was a case in which the alleged sovereign—to use the language of Bynkershoek—was "strenue mercatorem agens," or in which, as Lord Stowel says, he ought to "traffic on the common principles that other traders traffic," it is the present case; and if ever a privileged person can waive his privilege by his conduct, the privilege has been waived in this case.
>
> It was not denied and could not be denied after the evidence that the vessel was employed for the ordinary purposes of trading.
>
> She belongs to what may be called a commercial fleet. I do not stop to consider the point of her carrying the mails, for that was practically abandoned by counsel. She enters an English port, and is treated in every material respect by the authorities as an ordinary merchantman, with the full consent of her master; and at the time of the collision she is chartered to a British subject and advertised as an ordinary commercial vessel. No principle of international law and no decided case and no dictum of jurists of which I am aware has gone so far as to authorize a sovereign prince to assume the character of a trader when it is for his benefit, and when he incurs an obligation to a private subject to throw off, if I may so speak, his disguise and appear as a sovereign, claiming for his own benefit and to the injury of a private person, for the first time, all the attributes of his character; while it would be easy to accumulate authorities for the contrary position. (See especially Kluber, Europe, Volkerrecht, sec. 210, Kluber Droit des gens Lodern de l'Europe, nouvelle edition, par M. A. Ott, Paris, 1861, pp. 273, 274, and authorities cited in the note.)

After reviewing at length the opinion in this case, it was distinguished in the opinion in the case of the *Parlement Belge*, as indicated from extracts quoted therefrom.

That a sovereign may himself become a suitor in an alien court is indisputable. That he may waive his privilege and consent to be sued is equally without question. The case to which reference was last made asserts that by becoming a trader he necessarily consents to be sued, since no one can attribute to a sovereign a purpose, when he once engages in ordinary business transactions, to shield himself behind the privilege from responsibility in the ordinary courts upon the contracts he makes or from the liabilities he incurs in the prosecution of trade. But if he should exhibit any such disposition he would not escape accountability, since the privilege he enjoys, as was declared by

the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Santissima Trinidad* (7 Wheat., 352), he enjoys solely as a matter of comity. It may be withdrawn at any time.

The privilege—

The court said in that case—

stands upon principles of public comity and convenience, and arises from the presumed consent or license of nations, that foreign public ships coming into their ports and demeaning themselves according to law and in a friendly manner shall be exempt from the local jurisdiction. But as such consent and license is implied only from the general usage of nations, it may be withdrawn upon notice at any time, without just offense; and if afterwards such public ships come into our ports, they are amenable to our laws in the same manner as other vessels.

But that a sovereign state may waive its privilege no one disputes, and that it necessarily waives it as to any ship which it puts into general commerce is a most reasonable presumption. In the present instance, in which the Government puts the title to the ships in a corporation, a citizen which it creates to engage in trade, its purpose to waive any rights it may have as a sovereign state with respect to the property of the corporation can not be open to doubt.

The proposition was long ago determined by the Supreme Court in the case of The Bank of the United States against The Planters' Bank of Georgia, Ninth Wheaton, page 904. Were it not that concern may be felt in some quarters because of the high authority from which comes the suggestion that the corporation contemplated by the bill will have the attributes of sovereignty which inhere in the United States so far as to exempt it from suits, it would be inexcusable to detain the Senate by reading from the opinion in that case. Among the stockholders of the defendant bank was the State of Georgia, which was likewise one of its incorporators. It was urged that the corporation was not subject to suit in the Federal courts. This contention was disposed of in the following language:

It is, we think, a sound principle that when a Government becomes a partner in any trading company it divests itself, so far as concerns the transaction of that company, of its sovereign character and takes that of a private citizen.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator at that point to call especial attention to the proposition he has laid down?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill specifically provides that these vessels shall be—

Subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels, in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. That is the next step at which I was arriving.

Instead of communicating to the company its privileges and its prerogatives, it descends to a level with those with whom it associates itself, and takes the character which belongs to its associates and to the business which is to be transacted. Thus many States of this Union who have an interest in banks are not suable even in their own courts, yet they never exempt the corporation from being sued. The State of Georgia, by giving to the bank that capacity to sue and be sued, voluntarily strips itself of its sovereign character, so far as respects the transactions of the bank, and waives all the privileges of that character. As a member of a corporation a Government never exercises its sovereignty. It acts merely as a corporation and exercises no other power in the management of the affairs of the corporation than are expressly given by the incorporating act.

The Government of the Union held shares in the old Bank of the United States, but the privileges of the Government were not imparted by that circumstance to the bank. The United States was not a party to suits brought by or against the bank in the sense of the Constitution. So with respect to the present bank. Suits brought by or against it are not understood to be brought by or against the United States. The Government, by becoming a corporator, lays down its sovereignty, so far as respects the transactions of the corporation, and exercises no power or privilege which is not derived from the charter.

To make assurance doubly sure the bill expressly provides, as mentioned by the chairman, that the ships—

Shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to the rules, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels, in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

The ships to be acquired will, accordingly, be amenable in any court in any country under circumstances which would subject merchant ships held in private ownership to their jurisdiction. They may be seized if they carry contraband and divested of it. They may themselves be haled before a prize court that their right to fly the American flag may be inquired into. In short, they will be subject to just such treatment by foreign powers as merchant ships must undergo under the rules of international law. There will, accordingly, be no more risk of international complications than are likely to arise in connection with ships held in private ownership. Indeed, there will not be so much, for the latter may lend themselves to efforts clandestinely to introduce contraband into a belligerent country. The Government-owned ship will scarcely be subject to the suspicion of such conduct.

There may be valid arguments against the pending bill founded upon considerations of domestic policy. There are no evils attendant upon it, assuming it becomes a law, so far as our foreign relations are concerned, that have thus far been pointed out even if the shipping board should conclude to test, by the purchase of one or more of the belligerent ships in our ports, the question as to whether the Declaration of London has forever foreclosed us from further maintaining our historic attitude concerning the rights of neutrals to purchase the vessels of nations at war.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator one or two questions in regard to the London declaration. I understand the Senator has about concluded, so I assume he is not going to discuss the proposition any further.

Mr. WALSH. I have concluded.

Mr. NORRIS. I perhaps should have asked the questions earlier in the Senator's discourse, but I was not aware just when he was going to conclude that particular branch of the subject.

As I understand, the British Government, while not formally adopting or approving the London conference, has by proclamation, as the Senator has so well described, announced its intention to follow the London conference except wherein it had——

Mr. WALSH. Except in those particulars in which it does not like them.

Mr. NORRIS. In those particulars to which it has called attention in the declaration. Is not that true?

Mr. WALSH. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, as I understand, as far as the present hostilities are concerned, Great Britain has approved the London conference, with the exception of the particular notations mentioned in the several proclamations?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator may be a little confused about that. The declaration itself provides the method by which the various contracting nations may signify their adherence to it. Great Britain has not pursued that course at all.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I understand.

Mr. WALSH. And she, in her proclamation at the outset of the war, simply referred to the declaration of London for the purpose of brevity. Instead of setting out at length the rules which she would have her navy and her courts observe during the conduct of the war, she practically said, "They will be guided by the provisions of the declaration of London except in the following particulars."

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that England takes the position that as far as the present war is concerned her vessels and her officers are in fact instructed to carry out the declaration of the London conference excepting in the respects noted. Now, in any of those exceptions did England make any modification whatever of article 56, the one relating to the transfer of vessels after the beginning of hostilities?

Mr. WALSH. No; there is no specific reference to it, and no exception.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, as I understand, England will take the position or has taken the position that during the present war article 56 of that declaration is in full force and effect?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, when the Senator says "England," we do not get a very clear idea. England, like our own country, has different departments to her Government. She has an executive department, a legislative department, and a judicial department. This is an order in council, and it commands the courts to observe it.

Mr. NORRIS. It has the effect of a law; has it not?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know. The executive officers, the commanders of the navy, will of course be obliged to observe the directions that are given to them. Whether or not the prize court will be obliged to apply the rule of law which the admiralty believe ought to be applied—that is, the rule of the declaration of London—I am not prepared to say.

Mr. NORRIS. That was the next question I was going to ask the Senator. Since he has already answered it as far as his information goes, I shall not repeat it. Now I want to ask the Senator what action did Germany and France take?

Mr. WALSH. Let me continue, however, in answer to the question of the Senator. It is a matter of no consequence to us at all what rule of law the English prize court by the command of the executive authority may see fit to apply. We would like of course to have them take the view that the declaration of London is not binding upon them at all, and that their ancient rule of law ought to be applied. If they should decline

to do that that would not be the end of the matter by any means.

Mr. NORRIS. No; not necessarily.

Mr. WALSH. We would then demand redress through the diplomatic channels, and if redress was denied us through the diplomatic channels we would then demand that the question be submitted to arbitration.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, assuming——

Mr. WALSH. And our treaty would entitle us——

Mr. NORRIS. To arbitration.

Mr. WALSH. To arbitration.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think so; but let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the prize court would follow the order made by the Government, which it seems to me is but a fair assumption, because I do not myself doubt but what they would; then, if they did that, the diplomatic channels would fail to bring about a settlement without any doubt, would they not?

Mr. WALSH. I do not think so at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not mean that they would refuse to arbitrate. I mean that the diplomatic officials of Great Britain——

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. Would certainly stand by the judgment of her own prize court.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator fully. I do not think it follows by any means at all, because when the English representatives are brought face to face with the problem, and it is a question of a straight abandonment of the principle for which they themselves have been contending for a century and a quarter, and which during all that time has been regarded as consistent with their highest interests, I am not quite sure that they will not think again about it.

Furthermore, let me say to the Senator that I am not quite sure that by that time they may not reach the conclusion that it would be very much better to let us buy these German ships and add them to our mercantile marine than to have them go back to Germany after the war.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be. Of course that is outside of the question.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the Senator——

Mr. NORRIS. That is not involved in the question of law.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is asking me whether it is not a matter of course that we shall have no redress at all through diplomatic channels. I do not consider it hopeless at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that this same authority in Great Britain which has approved the London declaration, with the exceptions noted, is the authority that in the years that are past has outlined the course of England; in other words, the same authority of Great Britain that has mapped their course out in the past has now approved article 56 of the London conference.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but I beg to remind——

Mr. NORRIS. That ought to have and it would have just as great authority as their prior law, would it not?

Mr. WALSH. Undoubtedly; and I beg to remind the Senator that those same authorities have changed their minds several times since the war began.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. At the time the war began the declaration of London in its entirety was entirely satisfactory to them. After a little while they concluded that they did not like it as well and they changed it; and after a time they concluded that there were some other things about it that they did not like and they made another change, and they may conclude there are still other things, provisions of it which should not be observed, including article 56.

Mr. NORRIS. And they may change it again. That is true, I suppose. There is no one who doubts their authority to change their position.

Mr. WALSH. I am speaking about the possibility of their doing it.

Mr. NORRIS. They may do it or they may not. Of course the Senator assumes that they will not. I want to ask the Senator what action Germany and France took in regard to the London declaration?

Mr. WALSH. The ratifications have not been exchanged.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that is true; but is it not true that both Great Britain and France have approved the declaration of London?

Mr. WALSH. I stated in the course of my remarks that the allies of Great Britain had issued proclamations substantially the same as these I have read.

Mr. NORRIS. Then if a ship is transferred or alleged to have been transferred in violation of article 56 and is taken by the German Navy or by the French Navy, it would be taken into a prize court of the country and be passed upon according to the law of the particular country where the prize court was located, would it not?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, with the right on our part——

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. To take it up through the diplomatic channels.

Mr. NORRIS. Our right would exist, I take it. Wherever any prize was captured it would be taken into the prize court of the country capturing the prize, and I believe it would be conceded as a matter of international law, would it not? that every country would have the right and does have the right to enact such laws as she sees fit regarding its prizes or regarding the prizes or regarding the articles of war that may be in force during any controversy.

Mr. WALSH. I assume so, any proper legislative authority undoubtedly.

Mr. NORRIS. So these matters would be settled, if these ships were taken as a prize, not according to our idea of what ought to be the law, but according to the law in the country where they were taken, construed by the officials of that country?

Mr. WALSH. Temporarily, as a matter of course. That was so in the case in 1856 when France was threatening to seize any ships we bought from Russia. If the *St. Harlampy*, for instance, had been seized by a French cruiser, she would have been brought into a French port and would have been brought before a French prize court. We would have undoubtedly gone before that court and attempted to induce the French court to take our view of what the international law is. If she failed to observe our suggestions in the matter, we would take it up diplomatically.

The following is printed as an appendix to Mr. WALSH's remarks:

CHANGE OF FLAG.

[Translated from proceedings of the International Naval Conference, held in London December, 1908–February, 1909 (Cd. 4555). A. Bernard, translator. January 23, 1914.]

Views expressed in the memoranda of the various powers:

GERMANY.

ART. 3. The neutral or enemy character of a merchant vessel is determined by the flag it carries. A vessel carrying a neutral flag may nevertheless be treated as the vessel of the enemy:

1. If it carries the enemy's flag up to the outbreak of the hostilities or within two weeks immediately preceding.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(Nothing.)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

(G) According to the custom of nearly all nations, the sale of an enemy vessel made during a voyage, and after hostilities have broken out, can not prevent the capture of the said ship, which continues under the present circumstances to be regarded as an enemy.

(The ancient French theory under which enemy vessels could not from the outbreak of hostilities change their nationality—that is to say, lose their status as enemy vessels—implies an undue restriction of neutral commerce, as such commerce must in principle remain free, even in time of war. France itself, furthermore, derogated from this theory in 1870.)

Paragraph 26 of the proposed regulations relating to prizes adopted by the Institute of International Law in its meeting at Turin, seems to contain a solution of the question quite satisfactory, as it takes into account the interests of both belligerents and neutrals.

This paragraph reads as follows:

"The deed establishing the sale of the hostile ship made during war must be perfect, and the ship must be registered in conformity with the laws of the country the nationality of which it acquires prior to clearing port. The new nationality can not be acquired by means of a sale in the course of the voyage."

Nothing, furthermore, prevents the adoption of supplementary guaranties against the legitimate interests of a belligerent being injured by fictitious sales made by the citizens of the other belligerent.

SPAIN.

(G) The Government of His Catholic Majesty deems acceptable the rules suggested by the cabinet of London in paragraph 7 of its memorandum. When the change of flag of a ship corresponds to an actual transfer of ownership or to other reasons of a private nature its validity will be recognized, but if it is impelled by a desire to avoid by fraud the risks which nowadays exist for private hostile property in case of maritime war, it must be deemed a nullity.

FRANCE.

(G) The change of nationality of merchant ships made subsequently to the declaration of war is null and void. The transfer prior to the declaration of war when regularly made is valid. The dates of the transfer under a neutral flag prior to the declaration of war must be established by authentic documents to be found on board, and the transfer must have been finally registered before the proper authorities.

The act of naturalization granted by a neutral Government to the owner of a ship subsequently to the declaration of war must be held in suspicion. It is necessary in this case to act according to circumstances and other information, especially according to where the ship was built, the composition of its crew, the compliance with national provisions imposed upon the flag flown.

GREAT BRITAIN.

1. The transfer either by sale or by gift to a neutral of a hostile ship other than a war vessel is not made invalid merely by reason of the fact that it took place during or in anticipation of hostilities.

2. Such transfer, however, is not valid—

(a) If it takes place in a blockaded port.

(b) If it takes place during a voyage. (In this respect a voyage is ended the moment the ship reaches the port where it can be effectively taken possession of by the transferee.)

(c) If the vendor retains any interest in the ship or if a clause stipulates the return thereof at the end of the war.

3. The burden of proof that the transfer is bona fide is upon the plaintiff, and the transfer must be complete, in good faith, and for an adequate price.

A ship transferred to a neutral flag is therefore still liable to condemnation by a prize court should the conditions of the transfer give rise to suspicion of which the plaintiff does not clear himself, as for instance—

(a) If no written evidence of the transfer is found on board at the time of the seizure.

(b) If the transferor has any control over the ship, a share in the profits, or the privilege of revoking the transfer.

(c) If the supposed transferee or his representative (the latter not being an enemy) has not taken possession.

(d) If the ship is subject to the control of an enemy.

(e) If the captain or person in command is in the service of an enemy.

ITALY.

(G) "No vessel may be granted the nationality arising from the sale of said vessel by a citizen of a country at war with another country which is at peace with the King's Government.

"The Secretary of the Navy, however, if the bona fide character of the sale is ascertained, shall have authority to confer Italian nationality upon the vessel." (Merchant Marine Code, art. 42.)

The conclusion to be drawn from this provision is that, according to Italian positive law, a sale of an enemy vessel to a neutral purchaser subsequently to the outbreak of hostilities is presumed to be fictitious and as such can not be recognized. Proof to the contrary, however, subject to very special guarantees, may be given.

The council on diplomatic litigations (conseil du contentieux diplomatique) held much the same view, declaring that the transfer of ownership of a vessel can not possibly be regarded as valid unless evidenced by the ship's papers, and that no consideration would be given to a sale which would not have been entered on the ship's papers on the ground that the vessel was on a voyage. It appears, however, from this opinion that proof of the genuineness and legality of the sale is admissible. (Cont. dipl., June 16, 1866, capture of the ship *Venezia*.)

JAPAN.

The transfer of ownership of a vessel during, or in anticipation of, war by the enemy State or by a citizen thereof to another person residing in the other belligerent State, or in its ally's territory, or in a neutral State, is only valid if sufficient proof of a complete and bona fide transfer is adduced.

When the ownership of a vessel is transferred while this vessel is engaged on a voyage, such transfer must not be regarded as complete and bona fide until after actual delivery.

NETHERLANDS.

VII. (1) The validity of the transfer of merchant vessels from the flag of a belligerent to the flag of a neutral during, or at the outbreak of, hostilities is recognized without any restrictions.

(2) A merchant vessel transferred from the flag of a belligerent to the flag of a neutral in a blockaded port or a blockaded coast is not entitled to the treatment of vessels flying a neutral flag.

RUSSIA.

VII. The belligerents can decline to acknowledge the neutral character of any merchant vessel purchased by neutral persons from an enemy State or from a citizen of the latter, unless the new owner can prove that the purchase was completed before he was aware of the outbreak of hostilities.

REMARKS.

The transfer of a vessel for the purpose of evading the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed is not admissible.

Most of the memoranda, in stating the law in force, have followed different methods in the interpretation and application of this common principle. As evidence is difficult in this matter, simple or conclusive presumptions, more or less justified, have been proposed, especially when the transfer takes place during hostilities. In such case conclusive presumption of nullity does not constitute, according to all the memoranda, a general rule except in the case of a transfer while on a voyage.

Prior to the outbreak of hostilities common practice tends to recognize the validity of the transfer whenever such transfer has regularly taken place; that is, when there is nothing fictitious or unlawful about it capable of arising suspicion.

35. A ship may not be transferred to a neutral flag to escape the consequences of its character as a vessel of the enemy.

36. A transfer before the outbreak of hostilities is valid if it occured regularly; that is, if it is not brought under suspicion by any fictitious or irregular feature.

37. After the outbreak of hostilities there is a conclusive presumption of nullity in the case of a transfer made during a voyage.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on yesterday this Chamber was the scene of a most interesting performance. One of our oldest and most-respected Senators, the oldest in point of service in this body, stood the test of endurance upon his physical and mental faculties by speaking for seven long hours and without interruption. He completed his task and left the floor in good condition, and is this morning in his seat apparently as fresh and vigorous as ever, all of which justifies the hope that he will be with us for many years and possessed of all his physical and intellectual activities.

But, Mr. President, another feat was performed yesterday by another rugged old son of New England quite as remarkable, which, though not a deliberate one, should be embalmed in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the incident thus preserved to posterity. Therefore I will read it, for it illustrates as graphically as the long address of the Senator the rugged sturdiness of New England manhood, where old age does not always dim nor custom stale man's infinite varieties. I read from the New York World of to-day a special from Maine. It is headlined:

VETERAN STOOD ON HIS HEAD IN BARREL—THERE YET, PERHAPS, IF HIS GRANDSON HAD NOT FOUND A BLOCK AND TACKLE.

EAST KNOX, ME., *January 27.*

Maj. Simon Pratt, battle-scarred veteran of more bloody fields than any other Grand Army of the Republic man in Waldo County, who came home in 1864 with part of an ear clipped by a minie ball, two toes gone, and a thumb shot off, came near ending his eventful life in a most unsoldierly way yesterday.

Although he is 78 and weighs more than 200 pounds, Maj. Si is able to help some around the place. He reached into a barrel to set a hen that had nested in it and pitched in head first.

His grandson, Lafayette Marden, 13 years, and Lafayette's chum, Roscoe D. Clewley, were not strong enough to get the major out, but Lafayette saw a block and tackle and put a clove hitch around his grandfather's ankles, and they finally hoisted him out.

Posterity, of course, must determine, Mr. President, which of these two feats was the greater. In my judgment the palm should be awarded to the sturdy son of Maine, for his grandson rescued him from his barrel and restored him to the arms of his anxious family. He seems therefore to be "out of the woods."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I should have done it before the Senator read that most interesting article, but I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Borah	James	Overman	Smoot
Brandegee	Johnson	Owen	Sterling
Bryan	Kenyon	Page	Stone
Chamberlain	Kern	Perkins	Swanson
Chilton	La Follette	Pittman	Thomas
Clapp	Lane	Pomerene	Thompson
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Thornton
Culberson	Lippitt	Robinson	Townsend
Cummins	Lodge	Root	Vardaman
Dillingham	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fletcher	McLean	Sheppard	White
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Simmons	
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	
Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.	

Mr. OLIVER. My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is unable to attend the sessions of the Senate for the present on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered. A quorum is present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to discuss the bill pending as the unfinished business. I may have something to say on it to-morrow when the Senate reassembles after a recess or an adjournment.

The really great speech delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] this morning, masterful and instructive, I commend to the careful study of my Republican colleagues who have been complaining that Senators on this side do not or have not sufficiently discussed the bill. I regret that only a few of them were present to hear it. They have expressed great anxiety to hear some discussion from this side, and have complained bitterly at the small attendance of Senators. They were not here except in a limited way this morning. Hence I say I hope such of them as heard this great speech will personally ask their colleagues to give it prayerful attention by reading it and reading it in the RECORD, as it will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it has been a source of surprise and regret that our Republican friends seem to have determined not only to oppose this measure to the bitter end, but to put themselves in an organized opposition to practically everything suggested or proposed by those who, being in a majority, are especially charged with the responsibilities of legislation and of the conduct of the Government, and that they carry this opposition not only to questions of domestic import but to international relations.

Senators on the other side have surprised us by the freedom with which they have criticized and even attacked the policies of the administration with respect to international affairs. Many Republican newspapers have done the same thing—fortunately not all of them—and by way of contrast to what is said upon the floor upon that side and what is said in Republican newspapers generally, I wish to have read into the RECORD an editorial appearing in one of the greatest Republican journals in the country, and one of the most potential organs of that party, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I think it pertinent that it be put in at this time, that it may go along with the letter sent by the Secretary of State to me a few days ago,

and which has been printed as a Senate document. I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the request——

Mr. STONE. I can read it if the Senator objects.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But I am going to ask a similar courtesy after the Senator has had his article read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Tuesday morning, January 26, 1915.]

TURNING ON THE LIGHT.

Secretary Bryan's letter to Senator STONE, written in answer to a communication received from the Senator in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, ought to set at rest much of the useless and harmful agitation concerning assertion of neutral rights. It has not been possible at any time since the beginning of the war to find cause of just complaint of the course being taken by our Government. And the subject is one filled with so many difficulties which could easily become dangers threatening a continuance of our own peace that it has been impossible not to view with apprehension of its possible results a course of conduct tending, though not calculated, to raise and force complications which would end all our neutrality with a state of belligerency. The weight of public opinion has remained calm. That is the saving fact in the situation. But the noise and clamor raised by contending elements has been such as to create an artificial situation, and one which it is advisable should be met with an official statement of facts showing clearly the limitations within which we must act, and the action we have been taking within those limitations. The policy of maintaining secrecy in our foreign relations is not one upon which thus far the present administration can congratulate itself. We have seen enough of that in our Mexican affairs.

The Secretary of State is unequivocal in answering charges and objections made to the course of the department. Taking them up in detail, as they had been transmitted to him in Senator STONE'S letter, he deals first and most directly with the contention that an unnecessary discrimination is made in sales made to the allies which are not made to the Germans and Austrians. He, of course, disposes of this readily, as anyone could, with citations of governing laws and customs under which the citizens of any neutral country are privileged to sell actual contraband to any belligerent at their own risk and that of the buyer of the goods being captured by other belligerents. The fact that the Germans and Austrians are not now in a position to make such captures in no way invalidates the neutral rights of sale. To prohibit such sales, even by an exercise of the undoubted right to lay an embargo, would, he plainly thinks, be more an abandonment than an assertion of neutral right. It would be possible to go further and say that the exercise of such a right and power would be so far an abandonment of neutrality as to be almost tantamount to a declaration of hostility against peoples in a position to make use of such facilities as our industries may afford them. When a firm or corporation finds itself boycotted by any body of citizens it does not, for that reason, cease making sales to other bodies of citizens who find a way of reaching it and are willing to do business with it. Such as are kept away through force of the boycott it would willingly trade with if it could, but so long as they, for any reason, are shut off from its activities, it is not expected to suspend trade relations with all others.

The Secretary shows in detail the misleading nature of all of the charges made. He shows how this Government, instead of allowing transport of British military supplies across its Alaskan territory, distinctly forbade such transporting. He cites the records to prove that in each case where, as alleged, our neutral rights have been invaded without protest, that protest was made. He establishes the fact that in every case of the seizure of Germans or Austrians aboard American ships the wrong has been righted after protest by the Government at Washington. He states that allied ships lying outside our harbors have been withdrawn after protest. He disposes effectually, we think, of charges about coaling at Panama. Many of the points of objection raised he shows to be covered in the note to Great Britain of December 26, answered by Sir Edward Grey, and which is now the basis of further negotiation. We congratulate him and the country upon a statement which will go far toward removing a source of irritation and danger. We do this the more readily because of the evidence the statement affords that our foreign relations are not such a sacrosanct thing that any large body of American citizens may not know their state at any time on any question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, as he has the floor, I suppose——

Mr. STONE. I surrender it.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say that I certainly have made no adverse criticism, and I think no one on this side has made any adverse comment on that letter of the Secretary of State. I thought when I read it that it was a most excellent letter and did the greatest credit to the Secretary. My chief objection to the bill now pending is that the proposition to buy belligerent ships goes directly contrary to the principles laid down in that excellent letter.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I did not say that Senators had criticized that letter. I said, and I repeat, that Senators on the other side, very able and distinguished Senators, have criticized and even assailed the administration with respect to its general foreign policy, and I had the editorial read merely for the purpose of showing that one Republican journal at least is commending the general policy of the administration.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, lest the view of our friend from Missouri [Mr. STONE] should be taken as the unanimous expression of public opinion, I desire to ask consent to have read an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, which reflects a little divergent view upon the subject of the course of the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Tuesday morning, January 26, 1915.]

PRESIDENT WILSON AS A MENACE.

It seems to us that the time has come to speak very plainly concerning the attitude that has been assumed by President Wilson. For the President as a man we have the greatest respect. We have said upon frequent occasions that we do not question his sincerity. He believes thoroughly in himself and in his theories. Nevertheless, men are human and subject to human errors, and the President is not infallible.

On the contrary, while we dislike to say it, he constitutes to-day a menace to the country.

He is a menace not only in a business way, but to the peace of the Nation, while his assumption of sole power in Washington is a violence to the Constitution which is becoming more and more serious.

We are guaranteed under the Constitution a government divided into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The President has not yet laid hands on the judiciary, but so far as having a mind of its own is concerned, Congress has ceased to exist. It is dominated completely by the Executive. It dares not lift a hand unless bidden to do so by its master in the White House.

There was a time when men were sent to the House and Senate to represent their constituents. That time has passed into history. A Democratic majority exists in both branches, but it has no voice. In awe of its self-constituted leader, the "captain of the team," it trembles in his presence and hastens to do his bidding. If perchance there is a sign of rebellion he summons a caucus, places whatever measure he has in mind before it, makes of that measure a party affair, and demands and receives implicit obedience.

The lawmaking power is to-day in the hands of the President. He creates law and executes it, and by so doing he is menacing liberty of action and independence of thought and is making a mere plaything of the Constitution.

But since he is assuming the right to dictate legislation he must assume the responsibility as well.

He has belittled his high position as President of the United States, and prefers to be known as a party leader. In the common parlance of politics, he is a partisan boss and rules as a partisan, while his Secretary of State is engaged in the pleasing (to him) task of finding offices for "deserving Democrats."

As a partisan boss, therefore, Mr. Wilson must be regarded.

As a partisan boss, then, he is responsible for the deadly low-tariff law which but for the coming of the European war would now be plunging the business of the country into a far more serious condition than it is. Most of the mills that are to-day running full time are engaged in filling contracts for the armies of the allies. To the business of the Nation, therefore, Mr. Wilson is a menace.

If it is urged in his behalf that he and his party were pledged to a low tariff, the argument is valid, so far as the principle is concerned. But under no circumstances can the usurpation of the power of Congress be justified—the denial of the right of members of his party to amend or propose amendments to the particular form of law which he had had drawn up and insisted on passing.

However, the tariff is a matter which can be remedied in the end. But the ship-purchase bill is quite another matter.

It can not be urged that his party is pledged to a Government ownership of steamship lines, and yet here we find him demanding with all the energy that he possesses that, come what may, that mysterious bill which carries with it elements of international complications of a most dangerous character must be pushed through at the expense of everything else.

In this stand which he has taken we find not only a menace to the constitutional rights of Congress, not only a menace to business, but a distinct menace to the peace of the country.

From a business point of view this ship-purchase scheme is without merit. It proposes to finance a company with Government (the people's) money to buy ships at a cost of $30,000,000 as a starter (likewise with the people's money), and to place the management of this Government concern under a board to consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and three men to be appointed by the President.

Here we have a plan which depends upon a direct subsidy, which will be run at a great loss, and which will prevent private enterprise in shipping. No shipping concern under the United States flag depending on private capital could hope to compete with a Government-run concern with the entire Treasury of the Nation back of it to pay the losses.

It is a socialistic scheme, and is the first step in a Government ownership which might easily be stretched later on to comprise railways and telegraph and telephone lines.

But the more serious point is that of threatened international complications. There are few ships for sale except those that have been put out of business by the English Navy. These are exclusively German ships, and it is apparent that England, since she objects to the transfer to the Stars and Stripes of the German steamship *Dacia*, purchased by a private individual, would protest most vigorously if the United States Government came to the rescue of the German owners. Here is where President Wilson is playing with fire. He is inviting trouble. He is, to quote Senator LODGE, bringing "the United States within measurable distance of war."

It is easy to say that England already has her hands full and wouldn't fight. But how do we know that? There are hotheads on both sides of the water. Furthermore, the attitude of France and Russia would be the same as that of their ally. Again, there is Japan, with a navy that ranks only just below that of our own. In case of hostilities, where would we be? We should have just about all that we could contend with in Japan alone.

In any event, our commerce would be gone. We couldn't sell a ton of stuff outside the United States.

It is inconceivable that we should go to war; inconceivable that the President would permit war. But in case of a bitter controversy which, if carried to its end, would produce war, we should either have to make good or crawl on our hands and knees in the most humiliating manner.

Mr. Wilson is a man of theory. He had a theory about Mexico. He even sent an army to Vera Cruz. That action on his part was an act of war and would have brought about hostilities had not Mexico been

rent asunder by bandit bands. He played a game of bluff with Mexico, and his bluff was called. He has failed most miserably in his Mexican policy. He has made the United States a byword and a thing to be hissed in the streets of Mexican cities.

The President can theorize and bluff with Mexico. It is safe. But he can not theorize and bluff with England, France, Russia, and Japan. If he should buy the German ships, he would face a serious controversy, one that, because of the uncertain outcome, would at least disrupt the export business until it was settled, even if it did not bring on hostilities. And if we had to back down to prevent war after we had bluffed to the limit of controversy, in what sort of position would that leave us?

The ship-purchase bill is a disastrous scheme from any viewpoint whatever. As for President Wilson, we repeat what we said at the outset:

By assuming the attitude that he has, he is a menace to the country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I intend to propose to the shipping bill, which I ask may be read and then printed. It is a short amendment, but a very important one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the words "shipping board," in line 2, page 8, of the latest substitute presented on behalf of the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

And from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful to manufacture, barter, sell, or give away any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other alcoholic liquors of any kind upon any vessel or other structure located or operated upon any of the navigable waters of or under the jurisdiction of the United States, and any person who shall manufacture, barter, sell, or give away any such intoxicating liquors or otherwise violate the provision relating thereto, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined not less than $100 nor more than $5,000 or be imprisoned for not less than six months or more than five years or be both fined and imprisoned for each offense; and each act of manufacturing, bartering, selling, or giving away such liquors shall for the purposes of this provision constitute a separate offense.

Mr. SHERMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will yield to me just for a moment, I wish to ask unanimous consent to offer and have printed two amendments to the pending bill, and I ask that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the proposed amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8904. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg.;

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois;

H. R. 19078. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio;

H. R. 19746. An act to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912; and

H. R. 20977. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, which were, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "the time now limited, namely"; on page 2, to strike out lines 14 to 24, inclusive; and, on page 3, line 1, to strike out "section 3" and insert "section 2."

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the amendments of the House be concurred in; and I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER. With the understanding that it does not displace the unfinished business and will not lead to debate, I shall make no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. OLIVER. I make the request with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments of the House will be concurred in.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 8904. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg.;

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois;

H. R. 19078. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio;

H. R. 19746. An act to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas and Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912; and

H. R. 20977. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

[Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, while the Senator from Illinois is looking for a missing letter, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SHERMAN. The pad in which I had my papers fell on the floor, and they were mixed up. I had them arranged so I could find them; but I can quote the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Norris	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	James	Overman	Smoot
Catron	Johnson	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Chilton	Kern	Perkins	Swanson
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Robinson	Thornton
Culberson	Lodge	Saulsbury	Townsend
Cummins	McLean	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Walsh
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	White
Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. THORNTON. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. RANSDELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it has been often stated on the floor, and various editorials have been read, to the effect that the friends of the pending measure are remiss in their duty in not taking time to present in extenso the reasons for the proposed legislation. We on this side have been criticized quite severely because we have not been willing to prolong the discussion by interrupting speakers, engaging in colloquies, and participating more largely in debating the bill. I have felt that whereas the general subject has been before the country since at least last September and under consideration here for over six weeks, after reports upon the bill, quite full and accessible to all, and since the proposition has been under public discussion on the platform, in the press, and generally, for weeks, it is a mere pretense and subterfuge

to find fault with the friends of the measure because they have not consumed the time of the Senate by long-drawn-out speeches. We would like to have a vote at the earliest possible moment.

I said on the 4th of January, when we began the consideration of the bill, when some complaint was made that the effort was to "jam through" the legislation and deny full and free discussion, this:

I simply wish to suggest that there is no disposition on this side to limit debate or to prevent a fair and full discussion of the bill at all. There is no disposition, as the Senator expressed it, to jam through the bill. Even if we had the power to do it, certainly we have not any power to prevent an ample discussion and consideration of the bill. We simply want to get it before the Senate for that very purpose, so that Senators can proceed, and, whether they are ready or not, we on this side are prepared to discuss it.

Frankly, my disposition has been to have each speaker proceed under his own power and consume his own smoke as much as possible. However, if it will accommodate or gratify the opponents of the bill to have further views expressed from this side and more discussion of the subject, I am willing to venture to offer some matters for their consideration, which I expect, however, let me say in advance, they will not like and may ignore or push aside as without merit. Their newspaper friends will do the same. So, as far as being helpful to the public depending on the press is concerned, generally speaking, I fear my pains will be unrewarded. However, it will be my hope to interest the other side in some matters which will make it unnecessary for Senators to spend the time, hour after hour, in reading documents that are accessible to all of us.

The pending bill was introduced in the Senate on the 9th of December, 1914, and was referred to the Commerce Committee, and that committee reported it favorably on the 16th day of December, 1914, with certain amendments. Other amendments, without changing the general nature of the bill, mainly to clarify the language, were reported, and the whole, as amended, as proposed in the nature of a substitute, was reported on the 6th day of January, 1915. Numerous amendments were offered from both sides of the Chamber, and upon further consideration of the measure it was deemed advisable to report favorably upon additional amendments. As thus perfected, the first committee substitute was withdrawn and a second substitute, presenting the bill as now completed and taking the place of all prior amendments of the committee and the original bill, was presented by the committee on the 26th instant.

Arguments have been made which have been addressed, to some extent, to the details of the original bill, but mainly to the principle involved in the proposed legislation and the public policy, which is alleged to be a departure unsound and unwarranted. These arguments have proceeded along various lines, often crossing each other and frequently answering themselves.

We have been told by those opposing the measure that there is really no scarcity of tonnage, and yet that millions of American money is impatient to become invested in ships to engage in trade.

The facts overwhelmingly established disprove the first statement and the second answers it. We are told that cargoes are lacking and ships are abundant, and yet that American investors would at once put their money in ships but for the fear of the passage of this bill.

The railroad companies give notice that the elevators and warehouses and sidings at the ports are crowded, the demand abroad is great, and yet the commodities are not moving in sufficient quantities to avoid congestion, when at all.

We are told that the rates are not excessively high, insurance and delays considered; that mines strew the seas; that the hazard is great, and the dangers of seizure and interruptions by search are factors which justify the present rates of freight and charges. On the other hand, it is argued we need a merchant marine, and the Government should guarantee the bonds of private companies, which would provide the ships, and the Government's guaranty would bring forth the abundant private capital eager to make the investment.

It is asserted, on the one hand, that the 25 or 30 ships which opponents say could be acquired or built under this bill would have no effect on commerce, create no competition, cut no appreciable figure in shipping, and the corporation would soon become bankrupt, and yet the existing shipping interests are protesting they will be run out of business and can not stand the competition. Such are only a few of the inconsistencies in the arguments made.

It is argued in the face of these claims that no vessel of any nation at war should be acquired under any circumstances, and that if this is done the world's tonnage would not be increased and the danger of entanglement in international affairs would become imminent. The reports of Secretary McAdoo and Secretary Redfield and of the committee on that point are unanswerable. It is assumed in the argument that one purpose of the friends of this measure is to acquire German ships now interned. A man of straw is set up in order to have something to demolish.

We assert there is no such purpose or necessity. What do we want with a 56,000-ton ship? The best type of cargo carrier is less than 8,000 tons. Light-draft vessels, for South American trade especially, will be required. Let us examine briefly the foundation of the arguments against the measure as set forth in the minority views.

MINORITY VIEWS UNSOUND.

It can be easily shown that the report is full of fallacies, inaccuracies, and inconsistencies. Condensed to its substance, it holds (1) that if the bill is designed as an emergency measure there is no need for it, as existing conditions do not warrant it; (2) that if there is an emergency the bill does not provide a remedy; (3) that if the bill is designed as a permanent policy of the Government the minority is against it, because of the Government-ownership feature.

First. There is an existing emergency for that matter, but aside from that I would call attention to the House report, made a part of our report, in which this statement appears:

The fact that we pay a sum variously estimated to be from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 annually to vessels under foreign flags to transport our commerce, which seriously affects our balance of trade, is urged as a sufficient reason why we should have a merchant marine of our own, but this is only one of many reasons.

Again, it has been pointed out that Great Britain with her vast navy was, nevertheless, compelled to commandeer over 500—some estimates give 1,500—merchant vessels as transports and auxiliaries, and this shows the great need of passing this bill to establish an American merchant marine, to be available as naval auxiliaries in case of war, even if the present extraordinary shipping situation was no longer a factor. The agitation for an American merchant marine has been going on since 1880. The present shipping conditions caused by the war have only served to force on us a full realization of the consequences of not having a merchant marine of our own.

Nowhere in the minority report is there any practicable suggestion as to how we may otherwise establish an American merchant marine, nor does the minority report even say that it is desirable that we should have an American merchant marine; in fact, one may readily infer from this report that an American merchant marine is not at all necessary or desirable.

The minority report repeatedly disputes the fact that there is a shortage in shipping; and it says that the situation has been greatly "magnified and exaggerated." It refers to the "alleged scarcity of tonnage" (p. 4); "an imaginary lack of tonnage" (p. 7). "It is not improbable," says the report, "that on the whole the world's trade has diminished in a ratio commensurate with the loss of ocean tonnage" (p. 4). "Generally speaking, there is sufficient tonnage to meet all demands," says the report (p. 6). The report quotes the Boston Marine Association as to four sailing vessels alleged to be idle in Boston Harbor, as if in this day, even if these ships were idle, sailing vessels can be considered as a factor in the far-seas trade.

In view of the actual facts of the shipping situation, as anyone can readily ascertain, the attempt to prove that there is no shortage in shipping is little short of an insult to one's intelligence.

Vessels usually worth $5,000 a month now get $40,000 a month—

Says the Journal of Commerce, of New York, of January 11—

Demand for tonnage much in excess of the available supply. Charterers continue to experience great difficulties in covering their requirements as far ahead as April owing to scarcity and light offerings of available boats. A very similar condition exists in the sail-tonnage market relative to trans-Atlantic business, the demand for vessels being considerably in excess of the supply of those of suitable class.

This is quoted from the Journal of Commerce of January 11.

Fewer steamship sailings to South America. Shortage in January steamers unavoidable. Complaint made to Washington.

This is from the Journal of Commerce of January 12.

The demand for tonnage in the various trades shows no abatement, while the supply of available steamers does not begin to approach the requirements of the trade.

From the same journal of January 11.

The above quotations, which are only a few of the many available, are from a paper which is almost hysterical in its opposition to the shipping bill, but must, nevertheless, truthfully state the facts relative to the shipping market in its news columns. The editorials are in hopeless conflict with the admitted facts.

The minority report undertakes to show, by five reasons, that the high freight rates that have prevailed for some months past and which continue to steadily rise are due to causes other than shortage of ships.

War insurance covers all the risks enumerated in reason No. 1, and the cost of war insurance is not sufficient to warrant the exorbitant freight rates now prevailing. As a matter of fact, in many cases the charterers pay the war insurance on the vessel as well as on their cargoes.

The average cargo steamer, with a net dead-weight cargo capacity of from 7,000 to 10,000 tons, costs from $300,000 to $400,000. Assuming that they are insured for their original cost at the highest rate prevailing in Europe—except Germany—the cost of war insurance will not exceed 50 cents per ton cargo capacity in each direction. This utterly disproves the statement that war-risk insurance is a factor of any consequence in the increased freight rates. To illustrate: Rates on grain to Rotterdam have increased $10 a ton; rates on cotton to Rotterdam have increased $20 a ton; and to Germany rates on cotton have increased $60 a ton; and cotton is noncontraband and free from seizure. The Government provides insurance at reasonable rates on cargoes carried in American bottoms. This subject is discussed in Document No. 673, part 1, page 12, and it is shown that this item is no material obstacle.

Referring to reason No. 2, even a delay of 60 days, as mentioned in the report, would not warrant the increases in rates which have taken place, as, for instance, $5,000-a-month vessels now command $40,000 a month. However, such delays are exceptional, and in the great majority of cases vessels are being dispatched with little undue delay. Delays of a month and longer in certain South American ports have been the regular state of affairs for many years, yet they did not cause any noticeable increase in freight rates on vessels engaged in the South American trade until this war.

The statements made in connection with the steamship *Missourian* are misleading. In the first place, she could not carry 8,000 tons of freight in addition to the horses she carried. The *Missourian* was chartered by people who had a contract to supply horses to the French Government, and their contract calls for the delivery of the horses in France. Their profit is not made on the transportation, but on the sale of the horses, and that profit is large enough to warrant them in devoting the vessel exclusively to transporting their horses to France until they have completed full delivery of their contract.

As to reason No. 3, the charterers pay for the coal, and if they must bunker for the round trip and thereby reduce the carrying capacity, the loss is the charterer's and not the shipowner's. If there is any point to that reason, it would be that the owners should make a concession in the charter rate to compensate for the loss of space caused by the necessity of carrying coal for the round trip, but, as a matter of fact, the famine in ships is so great that shipowners simply say, "Take the ship on our terms and stand your own extra expenses," and even so their ships are snatched up with little argument.

Reason No. 4 I have covered in my comments and answer to reason No. 1.

The fifth reason asserts the breaking down of credits and exchanges, and that is alleged to complicate the situation.

I fail to find any connection between this reason and increased freight rates. If we are to consider this reason at all, it should have resulted in a decrease in freight rates, and it actually did result in that for a short period immediately after the outbreak of the war. If we need better financial arrangements as well as ships, the answer is they are being supplied.

It will be seen that all of the reasons which the minority has so laboriously stated are utterly without merit as explaining the great increase in freight rates.

As to the generalities on the question of freight rates, which the minority report quotes from two bulletins of R. G. Dun & Co., one dated three months ago, in the face of actual conditions as they are known to all in the shipping business, these are only additional absurdities appearing in the minority report. This is also true of the tables of freight rates which take up the last three pages of the report. So the argument that boats sailing from New York to South America show cargo space not occupied means nothing. The ships may have been loaded down to their marks with every pound of cargo they could carry and still have cubic feet of space left.

We now come to the minority's comment on the purchase of ships as provided for in the bill. Even if we are unable to buy a single ship and it is necessary to have all the ships built and to wait 18 months for them, as the minority says, the bill should be passed. That, however, is not the condition. British and French shipyards are working night and day turning out merchant vessels as fast as they can. New vessels are being launched every few days, and the Government will be able to buy at very favorable prices new or nearly new excellent cargo steamers to the full amount provided for in the bill. Incidentally I would mention that the present activities in European shipyards do not indicate the European shipping interests anticipate the slump in shipping which the opponents to the bill say will take place after the war.

A responsible shipbuilder tells me ships of 5,000 tons can be built in 7 months, and ships of 9,000 to 10,000 tons can be built in 11 months.

Trading possibilities have always augmented on the termination of war. That is the experience of the past, without exception.

The typical cargo steamer measures 7,760 tons gross, 4,870 tons net; length, 470 feet; beam, 54 feet; depth of hold, 31 feet; cargo carrying capacity, 10,400 tons; average sea speed, 13 knots per hour.

For several years, right up to the outbreak of the war, there have not been enough ships afloat to handle the commerce of the world, and for many years after the war is over there will be an even greater shortage of ships to take care of the rebuilding and new trade developments made necessary by the war.

The several references which the report makes to the purchase of interned German and Austrian ships are without justification. The purposes of the bill can be accomplished without purchasing a single one of the interned vessels.

The initial capitalization is not as absurd as the minority would have it appear. Forty million dollars is a good start; it will provide a fleet of at least 100 excellent vessels.

And we hear the Senator from New Hampshire and others talk about 25 or 30 ships as the result of this entire investment. The best information I can get on the subject is that some 100 vessels can be provided out of this fund.

The fear of those opposed to the bill, I am sure, is not that the enterprise will be a failure but that it will be a success, thereby confounding subsidists and Republicans and for all time destroying the possibility of a subsidy raid on the Treasury.

The methods suggested by the minority for reducing freight rates are hardly worth serious consideration, even if they had any bearing on this bill, which has for its object the establishment of an American merchant marine. That is not touched by suggesting that control of rates be vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission, or that "public vessels" be chartered to private concerns "with restrictions on freight charges." What "public vessels"?

The minority report says that increased and improved transportation facilities will not result in increased trade. The following experience in connection with increase of trade resulting from improved transportation facilities will tend to refute this claim of the minority. It is given by one who knows, having had that precise experience.

In 1908 the traffic between New York and Bermuda was maintained by only one line, the Quebec Steamship Co., who had had a monopoly of that trade for over 30 years. The traffic had shown a steady increase from year to year, and to all appearances they were fully filling all the requirements of that route. Another steamship line between New York and Bermuda was established and met with such great success that in 1910 the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. entered the field as a third competitor. Now note the results. In 1908 the annual passenger traffic between New York and Bermuda, in each direction, was about 5,000. In 1911 it was 27,000, and the freight traffic also increased tremendously. The Canadian experience also shows the unsoundness of the minority's position.

As to the objections to the Government ownership features of the bill as they appear to the minority, I will take them in the order in which they are stated:

(a), (b) For over 50 years there have been no "personal endeavor" or "individual initiative" shown toward the establishment of an American merchant marine by private interests; there is no such "endeavor" or "initiative" shown now, nor is there the slightest basis for believing that there will be any in the future without the spur of a subsidy or other form of bounty.

(c) The War Risk Insurance Bureau, recently organized, refutes the allegation that a Government enterprise is a "constant tendency to maximum costs."

Likewise the Government's operation of the Panama Railroad and steamships has been both economical and successful.

(d) In what manner is the proper and legitimate "multiplication of Government employees and officials" an objectionable feature? The Government is conducting large enterprises without waste or corruption or mismanagement.

(e), (f), (g) The United States Post Office Department is, I think, the most extensive business organization in the world. Considering the vast business done by the Post Office Department and the high pressure under which the work is done, the efficiency of the Post Office Department is truly marvelous. The percentage of mistakes and complaints is infinitesimal as compared with mistakes of the privately owned express and telegraph companies and complaints of their patrons.

If there is one respect in which a governmental enterprise will have an advantage over private enterprises, it is with respect to "labor problems." I fail to see why labor problems are mentioned as a disadvantage of a Government-owned merchant marine.

More "corruption" can be shown in many private business concerns than in the entire United States Post Office Department.

The minority report conjures and imagines dangers and difficulties in connection with a Government merchant marine which are not even remotely likely to occur and which are not worth attempting to answer. This much it may be well to say: "Surely the President of the United States, who can so easily involve this country in foreign complications in hundreds of ways not in the least connected with shipping, can be trusted to direct the operations of the shipping board, of which he would be practically the head, in such a way that the neutrality of the country will be preserved." My quotation is from a statement made by Secretary McAdoo before the House committee when the Alexander bill was being considered.

"Experience required": It is absurd to say that the Government will not be able to command all the "expert knowledge" and experienced men necessary to carry on the business of a Government merchant marine. Surely the building of the Panama Canal, not to mention numerous other business undertakings by Government or municipal authorities, completely disproves this statement of the minority. Likewise the minority's comments as to the lack of wharves, affiliations with shippers, agencies, and so forth, are utterly without merit. The Government has advantages in those respects that no private corporation could ever hope to have. Every consular office throughout the world is a potential agency for the Government merchant marine.

The possibilities of developing trade with the Republics south of us are indicated by the following statement:

TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICA.

Latin American imports from leading commercial countries for fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1913.

TO NORTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS.	Per cent.
From United Kingdom	12.83
From Germany	10.04
From France	7.15
From United States	52.53
TO SOUTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS.	
From United Kingdom	27.73
From Germany	18.35
From France	8.68
From United States	16.25
TOTAL OF THE 20 REPUBLICS.	
From United Kingdom	24.32
From Germany	16.45
From France	8.34
From United States	24.59

Out of a total of imports from all countries of $1,325,752,627.

Exports—Fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1913.

FROM NORTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS.	Per cent.
To United Kingdom	11.10
To Germany	7.91
To France	3.65
To United States	71.66
FROM SOUTH AMERICAN REPUBICS.	
To United Kingdom	24.09
To Germany	13.73
To France	9.87
To United States	17.65
TOTAL OF THE 20 REPUBLICS.	
To United Kingdom	17.79
To Germany	12.22
To France	8.34
To United States	31.03

Out of a total of exports to all countries of $1,539,123,597.

I shall refer to this trade as regards South America somewhat later on.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] propounded certain inquiries, which I propose to take up seriatim. He surmised the answers to the questions in his own way and made them the basis of his attack on the bill. He lamented the departure from principle involved, and predicted dire consequences if the bill should pass. He advocated conference agreements among shipowners, and, in its last analysis, his argument leads to a let-alone policy, which means that there should be nothing done and that we should acquiesce in the present situation, when our flag is off the ocean and our foreign commerce is demoralized, a condition of abject dependence upon competitors in trade and utter helplessness when they fail. The Senator deplores that influences outside the Senate move the proponents of this bill. This compels me to lay before the Senate some evidence of influences behind the opposition to this bill.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] undertook to show from newspaper clippings that the bill has no support in the press, and therefore he argued that there was no real demand for it by the public. I will submit some press comments of a different tone and offer some suggestions which have come to me to account for the attitude of certain newspapers cited by the opponents of the measure. The communications from the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce refute the contention as to the public demand. In the arguments of opponents they lay stress particularly upon objections to Government operation.

If the Government would only build the ships and pledge itself to charter or lease them at once, I apprehend that opposition to the measure would speedily disappear. It is the one word "operate" that disturbs quite a few people of great influence. To build the ships and then lease or charter them at such figures as might be obtainable—which, no doubt, could be arranged by the shipping interests to suit themselves—would be almost as good for them as their other proposal, that they would build or supply the needed ships if the Government would only guarantee their bonds. Just where the people generally would reap benefit by that arrangement, without very material, if not absolute, control over rates and routes by the Government, it is difficult to see. It is quite clear at a glance to see where the shipping interests would be served by that procedure.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] joined his colleagues in cordial disapproval of the measure mainly because of the power given the Government's agents to operate the ships. I desire to call attention to a proposal submitted by the Senator last August and the response thereto made by the Secretary of the Navy; and I marvel that the Senator's views, as indicated in his speech on this bill, appear so at variance with the proposals and announcements put forward by himself a short while ago.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in a learned, prepared argument, ostensibly in support of his resolution, but really addressed against the bill, assumes a case and then proceeds to attack it. He might just as well say that if this bill passes the President will issue a declaration of war as to say if this bill passes the United States will purchase interned ships which will be opposed by England and France, that it will be an unneutral act and result in a quarrel and disturbance, with unthinkable consequences. This bill no more compels or obliges the purchase of belligerent vessels than it authorizes a declaration of war. There is no more occasion for complications, national or international, or even for embarrassments of any kind, by reason of the passage of this bill than would be involved in a simple reiteration by resolution of what is contained in the national platforms of the several parties regarding the merchant marine.

Deplorable situations are pictured on the assumption that the President, two Cabinet officers, and three additional patriotic Americans will at once proceed to violate the neutrality of the United States and take sides in the titanic struggle going on in Europe. All this is pure, unfounded assumption. It is laying down a premise erroneous and unwarranted, which, at the outset, of course, destroys the correctness of the conclusion.

The other side of the Chamber has indulged in some very vigorous attacks on the President because of his patience and forbearance respecting the situation close by. What reason have they for supposing that he would go hunting for trouble elsewhere? He has brought down reproaches from some of those opposing this bill for his excessive love of peace and his determination to avoid strife in a quarter where effort was required to escape it. Why should he take affirmative action and invite a quarrel where no limit to its disastrous consequences could be imagined? No; the President has exhibited a real, absolute demonstration of his devotion to the cause of peace and his determination to secure it and preserve it at any cost of national dishonor.

Those composing his official family, beginning with his great-souled Secretary of State, approve and encourage the course he has marked out and laid down in his world message at Mobile and on other occasions; and it is to be hoped that no one in this country or abroad will be misled by the expressions of apprehension by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], followed by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], who was so conclusively answered in the great address this morning by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Here again an able legal argument, in the case of the Senator from New York, on a supposed and not a real case, was made; here again it was assumed that the purpose is and the action would be to purchase ships of belligerent nations in such sort as would put the United States in the attitude of "taking sides" in the Old World conflict. The sentiments of the Senator from New York respecting the importance of preserving a strict and sincere neutrality we all share; with his views re-

specting the significance of being careful we are all in full sympathy. There was no occasion to laboriously argue what is undisputed. There was a mistake in laying down by assumption, even by implication, the premise which did not and could not exist in fact.

I can conceive of no better and safer hands to which to intrust the tranquillity and the highest interests and happiness of the people of this country than those now holding them.

There is no need to purchase a single ship the purchase of which would be disapproved by a single belligerent nation as inconsistent with absolute neutrality; and yet the ships can be acquired and provided under this bill that will release our commerce and relieve our producers and shippers of a distressing and unendurable situation. To argue otherwise is only to awaken a prejudice against the bill, to direct attention from the real issue, to set up a bogy man in order to have something to bowl over.

The dismal forebodings of both Senators, proclaiming the terrible happenings they foresee, recall similar utterances against the banking and currency bill, the antitrust bill, and about every other bill that has been brought forward by the majority during this administration. The country has not gone to the bad, as they predicted it would when the Federal reserve act was passed. Let us see, for instance, what the Senator from New York said about that; and in connection with his observations that there are regretful indications that this measure is attempted to be made a party measure, the senior Senator from New York—and I am commenting on his speech of a few days ago—said on December 13, 1913, on the banking and currency bill:

> I regret that the circumstances under which the measure comes before the Senate are not more favorable to real discussion.

That is the general complaint; and yet when we discuss the bill, after they complain that the Democrats are not giving reason for this legislation and are not discussing the bill, and I attempt to respond to that demand mainly to gratify their insistence, I look on the other side and see that there are but three Republican Senators there, and one who is temporarily seated on this side, who does me the honor to listen to me, my good friend from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], and who I am glad to see at the present time is in very excellent company.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to commend his patient and thoughtful and rather heroic effort to enlighten the other side of the Chamber. I am sure the Members on the other side did not expect to have this privilege; that if they had known that the author of this bill was to present his reasons for its immediate enactment into law they would have been here in great numbers. What they lose I feel very sure is the gain of those who have had the pleasure of hearing the Senator thus far.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that that is the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I did not make the point, because that might be termed in the nature of a filibuster; and in that kind of a proceeding I have never engaged.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not at all surprised, Mr. President. I realize perfectly well that criticsim has been urged more for other reasons than because they really desired any discussion. I do not presume to be able to enlighten my friends on the other side on this or any other subject; but I am trying to discharge the responsibilities that I feel rest on me, partly by reason of their criticism and partly by reason of the impression they have put out over the country that the proponents of this bill are not willing or in position to discuss it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to make the observation, I am quite sure the Senator from Florida could enlighten them if they desired enlightenment on the subject.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, that this may not seem to be a purely family party, I think I have listened with profit to the Senator from Florida, and I think the entire discussion of to-day has been most creditable to the Senate and to the country. It will be many days before the Senate will have the privilege of listening to a more elaborate and painstaking address than we listened to this morning from the honorable Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who now occupies the chair; and to have cut off such a discussion by a peremptory demand that we should go to a vote without that kind of information would have been little short of parliamentary recklessness. I am sure we ought to have time to hear discussion such as the Senator from Florida is now conducting, and we ought to have time to read these elaborate discussions before we are forced to commit the country to almost an irrevocable error, if it should turn out to be an error.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the amiable Senator from Michigan how it is possible for his party to listen to this discussion when they are in the cloakroom or in the restaurant?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Why, I do not exactly know where my party is at the present time. [Laughter.]

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, has not that been the difficulty with the Senator's party for many years? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no. The trouble with our party is that we have not known where our opponents were. Most of the time we have been obliged to pursue them in the thicket and the darkness and the fog of their political convictions. We do not always have the pleasure of seeing them arrayed as they are this afternoon, with smiles and good cheer and hopefulness.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator and his Republican colleagues would do us the honor to listen to this discussion, they would have no trouble in finding out where we were.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President; that is very true. I do not question the whereabouts of the honored Senator from Ohio. I know that he is wherever the President of the United States places him, most of the time.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, while I am under his leadership I am quite sure I will not be led astray. It is to be regretted that the distinguished Senator from Michigan does not see fit to align himself under the same leadership. If so, he would not have been traveling in darkness so long as he has been.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this friendly discussion, but perhaps I ought to withdraw the remark that I made concerning the Senator from Ohio. When I made the remark I had just been reading the veto message of the President on the immigration bill, and I supposed, of course, the Senator from Ohio would follow his wise leadership in that as in all other matters.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the party of the Senator from Michigan seems to be somewhat in the chronic position of being split up. He is in the Senate and the others are out in the cloakroom. I want to say further that I ought to correct the Senator's statement in alluding to me as the author of the bill. I do not claim that distinction. I am simply acting chairman of the committee that has reported it, and I am doing all I can to support the bill and to explain its main features, and I am heartily in favor of the bill.

I will proceed with my reading from the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] on the 13th of December, 1913. He said:

> I am not one of those who denounce caucuses and attempts to secure united party action. Under my own conception of a government by political parties, membership in a party involves certain obligations to attempt agreement upon that united party action which is necessary to discharge party responsibilities. I do not think that the declaration of affiliation with a political party should be regarded as merely a means of obtaining office, to be forgotten after office is obtained. I think that when by declaring himself a member of a political party a man has secured an election to office by his fellow citizens, he has assumed toward them an obligation to seek to do his part toward discharging the responsibility of his party in putting into effect the policies which it declares.

So that I can quote the Senator in support of any action which the Democrats have taken in reference to this bill.

Then as to these forebodings which find expression now and then with reference to measures which our friends on the other side oppose, there are several illustrations in the same address. He said:

> So, sir, I can see in this bill itself, in the discharge of our duty, no influence interposed by us against the occurrence of one of those periods of false and delusive prosperity which inevitably ends in ruin and suffering.

Numerous expressions of that kind appear in this speech, signifying that if the Federal reserve act should pass, in his judgment the whole country would suffer, and credits would be put upon a basis which was unsound and unwise and destructive. In the same speech he makes this allusion:

> Then as our merchant marine has practically disappeared, we pay the freight and the insurance—certainly practically all the freight one way—on the goods exported or goods imported, however the custom of the particular trade may be, and that freight is paid to the foreign steamship owners.

He was speaking with reference to the amount of money which goes out of this country. He says:

> So, sir, if we enter upon this career of inflation we shall do it in the face of clearly discernible danger—danger, which, if realized, will result in dreadful catastrophe.

And at the close of his speech he said:

Ah, Mr. President, we are turning our faces away from the fundamental principle upon which we have come to our high estate. We are turning them weakly toward practices which history shows have invariably led to decadence, to degradation, and the downfall of nations. We are setting our steps now in the pathway which through the protection of a paternal government brought the mighty power of Rome to its fall; and we are doing it here without a mandate from the people of the United States. Ah, more than that, we are doing it in violation of the express verdict of the people of the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was with reference to what bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. The banking and currency bill, then pending in the Senate, which since has been written into law, and which I believe now meets the commendation and approval of the very people who were then opposed to it as well as of all other people generally.

So it is no new thing to hear these doleful predictions from our friends on the other side respecting practically every bill that is presented from this side for consideration. Similar predictions were made by the Senator and his colleagues respecting that and other measures which not only have not proven sound, but, in the course of events, experience has shown the futility and inaccuracy of such prophecies. The country ought to be somewhat steeled against that sort of thing by this time.

The argument advanced that no emergency exists is completely answered by the response of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to the resolutions of the Senate requesting them to furnish all available information in relation to the increased rates for ocean transportation which have taken place since July 1, 1914, and any and all other facts relating to ocean transportation which adversely affect or injure commerce.

I shall not take the time to read from the communication giving us the information desired and appearing as Senate Document 673, parts 1 and 2. The facts set forth completely overthrow the contention that no emergency exists; that rates are not exorbitant, in many instances even prohibitive; that tonnage is ample and only cargoes are lacking, as claimed by opponents of this bill. Our commerce is obstructed and in many instances has ceased to flow, this being caused both by lack of tonnage and exorbitant freight charges. The proof is there furnished in conclusive fashion.

Referring to that report for just one or two statements, reading from page 15 of part 2 of Document 673, the statement is there made:

While this report is being written—

And this report was presented on yesterday, so it is up to date—

information is received that rates are higher than those given in some of the tables herein presented, and that even at these extraordinary figures it is difficult to obtain cargo space for earlier sailings than March and April.

From the foregoing tables it will be observed that ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour 500 per cent; on cotton 700 per cent.

From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent.

From Baltimore to European ports (excepting German) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour 364 per cent; on cotton 614 per cent.

From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton 186 per cent.

From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from $1.25 per bale to $15 per bale.

From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent.

From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

And so on. The report deals further with the burden upon American business and with the effect of high ocean freight rates on the American farmer, which I shall be glad to have inserted in my remarks without reading, Mr. President—just those extracts.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I object to the insertion without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. FLETCHER (reading)—

Ocean freight rates are still rising and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other.

The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates; it can not, under existing law, protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice and upon the instant, and our business men are helpless. The steamship companies are their own masters and do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether.

(See letters of William Haas & Sons, Exhibit 43; Gano, Moore & Co., of Philadelphia, Exhibit 5; American Tripoli Co. (flour), Seneca, Mo., Exhibit 45.)

SCARCITY OF TONNAGE.

The scarcity of steamship tonnage is notoriously true. Every daily paper which publishes shipping news testifies to this incontrovertible fact. Attention is called to attached clipping from the New York Journal of Commerce of January 2, 1915, and the Wall Street Journal of January 1, 1915 (Exhibits 78 and 79), which show clearly the scarcity of tonnage.

But the conclusive evidence of the shortage of tonnage is the excessive and unparalleled ocean freight rates now prevailing. Such rates could not be maintained if tonnage was abundant.

BURDEN UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS.

Annexed hereto as Exhibit 1 is a summary of our sea trade and the estimated freight cost of handling it from July to December, 1914, inclusive, prepared by the actuary of the Treasury Department.

From this it appears that our total exports by sea for July, 1914 (before the war), were $139,225,479, and the ocean freight cost was $7,833,482, or 5.63 per cent; the total of such exports for December, 1914, were $226,000,000 (estimated), and the ocean freight cost was $30,742,500, or 13.6 per cent—an increase over July of 141 per cent.

If the ocean freight cost on December exports had been at the same rate as July, viz, 5.63 per cent, the total freight charge on our exports for December would have been $12,723,800 instead of $30,742,500. In other words, the increased ocean freight tax arbitrarily imposed upon our farmers and business men for the month of December, 1914, only, was $18,018,700. If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915 at the December, 1914, rate and the ocean freight charges are the same as for December, 1914, the American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) increased freight charges above the normal rate of $216,224,400, or more than five times the $40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the shipping bill to put into American ships for the protection of our foreign commerce.

In two months and seven days the increased ocean freight charges (above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914) exacted on our foreign trade at the December, 1914, rate would amount to $40,241,761, or more than the total amount, viz, $40,000,000, which the shipping bill authorizes for investment in an American merchant marine.

In 12 months, as before stated, the total increase in the freight tax levied by steamship owners, mostly foreign, upon our export trade, at the December, 1914, rate would amount to the sum of $216,224,400. If the same be applied to our import trade, there would be an additional increase of $95,640,000, or a total increased ocean freight charge on exports and imports by sea in one year of $311,864,400, or 141.6 per cent over the usual cost. (See Exhibit 2.)

Thus far we have been dealing only with the increased ocean freight charges over and above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914. Including these normal rates, and assuming that the December, 1914, total ocean freight charges, viz, $44,342,500, represent an average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade by sea for the year 1915 would amount to the enormous total of $532,110,000. (See Exhibit 1.) Almost the whole of this huge sum would be paid to foreign steamship owners and would have an important bearing upon our foreign trade balances; it might, in fact, turn these balances against us.

EFFECT OF HIGH OCEAN FREIGHT RATES ON AMERICAN FARMER.

It will be observed that the greatest increases in rates and the heaviest tax has been imposed upon the products in which the American farmer is most concerned, namely, grain and cotton. These commodities constitute the great bulk of our export trade and have the largest influence in throwing the balance of foreign trade in favor of this country.

While the steamship companies have imposed conscienceless taxes in the form of increased rates on grain, amounting, as already shown, to as much as 900 per cent to some ports, they have placed an even heavier burden upon cotton, where the increase in rates to some ports is as high as 1,100 per cent. This increase is particularly onerous upon the cotton producers of the South, because it comes at a time when the effects of the war have greatly reduced the value of cotton and when the southern farmers are least able to bear additional burdens.

Grain, cotton, and other commodities are usually sold "delivered" at the port of destination. When steamship companies raise the cost of delivery of grain from 6 cents to 60 cents per bushel, it makes a vast difference in the price the farmer receives for his product; and when ocean freight charges on cotton are raised from $1.25 to $15 per bale, the price at which the farmer sells his cotton is seriously reduced.

To show what the burden imposed on the farmers by these high ocean freight rates means, it is necessary only to bring out the fact that while the total freight cost on our exports by sea for December, 1914, was $30,742,500 the great commodities of grain, cotton, and flour bore $11,782,250 for this charge—or more than 36 per cent of the entire freight cost on all exports by sea for December, 1914.

The argument, as I understood it, of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] to-day was that this freight did not affect the price which the farmer got for his grain; that the freight was paid by the purchaser. Mr. President, these commodities are sold and delivered abroad, and whereas the farmer is getting a tremendous price, according to the usual standard, for his grain in this country to-day, he would be getting more than he is receiving now if this enormous charge for freight was not made against the shipment. It is true the price of grain is high and he is getting a good price for it, but that is no reason why he should not get a better price if the conditions can be remedied, as they should be remedied, by making them such that he will not be made to pay 50 cents a bushel to carry his grain across the ocean when he paid something like one-fourth or one-fifth that at former times. So it is with the other products—the cost of transportation does affect the price which the producer gets for his product necessarily, and affects it very materially and seriously so far as he is concerned.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is why we have been trying to reduce railroad freight rates.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose, of course, the Senator thinks that the passage of this bill will reduce ocean freight rates?

Mr. FLETCHER. I certainly do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. First, I will say that I understand under the bill $40,000,000 is to be utilized. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill provides for $10,000,000 capital and $30,000,000 issue of bonds. So the whole together—the capital and the bond issue—would amount to $40,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Can the Senator tell us how much tonnage that amount of money will purchase?

Mr. FLETCHER. My information is that it would furnish 100 ships.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of what capacity?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not all of them, of course, are very large ships, but ships suitable for doing the business; I should think something, perhaps, like a million tons. I was going to say 800,000 tons, but about a million tons, I will say.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think some testimony given before the House committee was to the effect that it would cost about $600,000 to build a freight ship of 8,000 tons capacity. Does the Senator agree with that estimate?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is only an estimate, and according to my information is high.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will remind the Senator that the only testimony upon that subject which was given before the House committee is that of a member of the committee, as I recall, and it was to the effect that it would cost a million or a million and a half dollars to build a passenger vessel of from eight thousand to ten thousand capacity, and it would cost about $600,000 to build a freighter of like capacity.

Mr. SIMMONS. In this country?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In this country.

Mr. SIMMONS. And something near half of that in Europe, I think, was the testimony, or more than that.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] estimated that $50 a ton would build these passenger ships.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; not passenger ships.

Mr. SIMMONS. Freight ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. For ships furnishing 800,000 tons he estimated $50 a ton as the cost of construction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would take, I think, possibly twice as much to build a passenger vessel of a given capacity as it would to build a freighter of the same capacity. If that estimate is correct, as I compute it, that would provide for about half a million tonnage instead of 800,000 or a million tons, as the Senator has stated.

Mr. FLETCHER. Fifty dollars a ton would give 800,000 tons for $40,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is correct, at $50 a ton.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is my understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] yesterday estimated that the cost of building freight vessels would be about $50 a ton. That is what I understood.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Supposing that that will supply 800,000 tons, does the Senator from Florida recognize that some of those ships at any rate would be those which are already engaged in the ocean carrying traffic? The Senator does not think that the entire $40,000,000 would be spent to buy ships that are now idle?

Mr. FLETCHER. I should not think so. Not necessarily so. Some, of course, would be built; but in addition to all that, in addition to what may be acquired by the use of the capital provided for in this bill, the bill also provides for the transfer of the present auxiliaries in the Navy, those transports which are not needed for the Army, and also for the transfer of the ships of the Panama Railroad Co., so that by the charter and lease of Government ships we have now, you have quite a considerable fleet to begin with.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The ships of the Panama Railroad are now engaged in the ocean carrying business, are they not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So they would not be in addition.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is true.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator does not think that we could build ships in time to meet the emergency which is supposed to exist? We would have to buy them in order to meet any emergency that exists, would we not?

Mr. FLETCHER. We would have to buy some, I think, but as I said awhile ago when the Senator was out, my information is that you can build in our yards a 5,000-ton ship in seven months.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Seven months is a long time. The emergency may have entirely passed by that time. At any rate seven months is a long time to wait for reduced freight rates.

The ultimate question I wanted to put to the Senator, however, is this: Assuming that we can add to the ocean carrying trade half of this tonnage—I mean by that that half of the ships that are procured by the use of this money will be ships that are now idle—so as to add to the ocean carrying traffic some 400,000 tons capacity, does the Senator think that, compared with the entire tonnage that is engaged in the carrying trade, putting that quantity of tonnage upon the ocean would materially reduce rates?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no question but that the moment this bill passes you will see a tumble in rates. I think there is not only not enough tonnage now, but there is manipulation of ships to help keep up these rates.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is not 400,000 tons, while large in itself, very small as compared with the total tonnage? The total tonnage of the world, I understand, is something like 47,000,000 tons.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know that we do not need the total tonnage of the world for our foreign commerce. I do not know what the total tonnage is—that is not controlling.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It certainly would not represent anything like one-tenth of the tonnage now in use in the carrying trade of the United States. The question which occurred to me was whether or not the addition of that would have any material effect upon freight rates. In other words, would it not be a good deal like the United States undertaking to run a freight train from New York to San Francisco once every month at a very cheap rate? That compared with the total business would be so small that it probably would not affect the railroad rates.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think that comparison applies here, and I do not think there is any question but what the effect here would be to reduce the rates and afford additional facilities. The very strongest argument in support of that view is the fact that the shipping interests are opposing this bill to-day. If executing the provisions of this bill would cut no figure in commerce, if it made no difference as to their rates, if it did not affect their business in any way whatever, if they were enabled to go on with the monopoly they have and with the combinations they have and with the levy of tribute upon the producers of this country that they are now making, they would say go ahead and pass your bill; but they are not saying that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me, I think the passage of this bill will be injurious to American shipping interests.

Mr. FLETCHER. How could it be injurious if it does not affect the rates or anything else they are interested in?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would discourage them from going into or continuing the business.

Mr. FLETCHER. We have been trying for 50 years to induce them. They not only will not go into it, but they refused to go into the merchant-marine business under the American flag.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not aware of any legislation which has passed Congress during that 50 years that has a tendency to induce American capital to invest in the shipping business.

Mr. FLETCHER. We passed an act some time ago that permitted them to get their ships wherever they could, in the cheapest markets of the world, and put them under our flag, but that brought none of them under our flag, and again the act approved August 18, 1914, and still none came except those that were practically engaged in their own business, some 372,488 tons.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator refers to the bill which was passed a few months ago?

Mr. FLETCHER. I refer to the Panama Canal act, approved August 24, 1912, admitting foreign-built ships to American register for foreign commerce, and the act of August 18 on the same subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Immediately after the passage of that last-mentioned act the bill in question was introduced. I recall that it was introduced in the House in August, about the time we were passing the last legislation to which the Senator refers. While the act which we have already passed operated as an inducement to American capital to engage in the shipping business, the bill which we are now considering and which has been pending has been hanging over the heads of the American shipping industry for several months, and it has had exactly

the opposite tendency. It has neutralized the effect of the legislation we passed a few months ago.

Mr. FLETCHER. We passed other legislation to encourage shipping; for instance, legislation admitting free of duty all material entering into the construction of ships; we passed legislation putting on the free list material for ships and supplies, and the construction of that law went so far as to admit free of duty the furniture and the bedding and the linen and everything on board a ship. They came in free of duty as a special favor to encourage shipbuilding in this country; and then we passed a law also making a differential in the tariff act in favor of imports in American bottoms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not any doubt that if the Senator's party had been content to have left that legislation without the interference which arises from this proposed legislation it would have operated as a stimulus to American shipping. But the point I make is that the threat of this legislation which has been impending for months has had a tendency to neutralize the good effect of preceding legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. My position is that the Senator is inconsistent. He is assuming that we will accomplish nothing by this legislation, because these few ships would not cut any figure in commerce, and then in the next breath he says we are discouraging people from investing their money in vessels. So one answers the other. Either this will amount to something or else there is no reason for anybody to be discouraged about it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I want to ask the Senator a question on the subject he was touching upon at the time he was interrupted by the Senator from Utah, to wit, the subject of these high rates being oppressive upon the producer in this country. The Senator hazarded his opinion that while the American farmer is now getting a dollar and a half for his wheat, according to to-day's market, he would be getting much more if it were not for these high freight rates. In other words, if the freight rates were at a point where the Senator thinks they should be and will be made by this bill, as he thinks, the farmer will get more than a dollar and a half a bushel for his wheat. I ask the Senator if he thinks that is altogether a desirable thing?

I have listened to debates here. I know nothing much about farming myself; I think I am the only one perhaps in the Senate who does not boast of having been a farmer at some time. I know very little about it, but I have heard from the Senator from North Dakota, and others say, that a dollar is a fair price for wheat and that when wheat went below a dollar the farmer was not getting a due return for his effort.

It seems that when wheat goes to a dollar and a half and above that the farmer has no cause to complain, and if by the action of this bill or any other legislation we give a fictitious profit to the farmer, which is paid, of course, by the consumer in the city of Washington or elsewhere, we are proposing legislation that is not altogether—scattered over the whole country—for the public good.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator misunderstood me. I do not think the passage of this bill will increase the cost of wheat to the consumer, but it will have a good effect, so far as the farmer is concerned, in that instead of these unprecedented charges going to freight companies the benefit would go to the farmer. Doubtless, the consumer would likewise be advantaged.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is it exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. And I do not believe now that the farmer——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. You add to the price that the farmer is now getting—a dollar and a half a bushel, which is an unheard-of price—whatever reduction in the freight rates this bill makes. If the rate is 25 cents a bushel, you would add 12½ cents of that, we will say, to a dollar and a half, making the people who do not raise any grain contribute that much to the farmer, who already is getting a very high profit on his product.

Mr. FLETCHER. The freight rate is a burden on the consumer and it is also an injury to the producer. The trouble about that business is now, I imagine, that the wheat has left the farmer's hands and is in the hands of other people, who very largely would get the benefit.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. This is wheat that the farmer still has and which he is selling to-day.

Mr. FLETCHER. As to that wheat, I expect it has very largely been sold to the elevators or their agents.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But if the farmer has the wheat, that is what he gets for it?

Mr. FLETCHER. At any rate, there is no doubt but the farmer would get more than he now gets if the freight were less than it is.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There is no question about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. And the consumer would perhaps pay less.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There is no doubt about that; but the Senator urged as an argument in favor of the bill that the farmer would get more.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I will suggest to the Senator from Florida that because the farmer is getting a good price during the European war, a thing which very rarely happens, there is no reason why the Shipping Trust should still pocket the profit.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think the farmer very often gets any more than he deserves. He is the one man in this country who works for everything he earns and gains.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, Mr. President, I have listened to that a great many times around the Senate, and I want to give it as my opinion that the farmers of this country are the most truly independent and the best fixed of any class of our citizenship, and I am glad of it, because they work for it; but they are no more worthy of good times than is any other class of citizenship, and there is no reason on earth why we should pass legislation one of the avowed purposes of which, as the Senator from Florida says, is to increase the already fictitious prices at the expense of the man who has to eat his bread.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will refer to that a little later on; I do not want to be diverted now.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I did not want to interrupt the Senator's remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will take up that phase of the matter—the effect of freight rates on prices—a little later.

I quite agree with the Senator from Wyoming about the farmer's independence and the satisfactory conditions which he claims obtain in many respects; but I deny that, everything considered, the farmer is especially favored. He depends very largely on the seasons; either it rains too much or it does not rain at all; there are uncertainties as to all his plans; there are pests and there are foot-and-mouth diseases and a thousand and one other things with which he has to contend. He has to labor about 400 days out of the year, and he deserves all he gets out of life.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think it is quite fair that the situation with reference to the farmer be left in just this way. The dollar and a half a bushel for wheat, so far as the Central Northwest is concerned, is not going to the farmer to any great extent. A great many of the farmers through the newer parts of the Middle West, indeed most of them, have mortgages for lands purchased and for improvements made, the interest on which must be paid as soon as the crop is harvested. They have expenditures for their hired men, their thrashing bills, and their interest. Unfortunately for them, the wheat bins on the farm were pretty well cleaned out long before this high price of wheat came. The people who have got the benefit of it, if an actual benefit has been received, are the elevator men, who have great quantities of it stored away, and the future-delivery men.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, that is what I surmised, and I made a similar statement a little while before the Senator from South Dakota came into the Chamber.

Mr. President, I must go on, because I am approaching some of the questions we have been discussing, and I may be able to throw further light on them in the orderly progress of the remarks I am making. I call attention especially to Exhibit 2 in this communication from the Secretaries of the Treasury and of Commerce:

Assuming that no state of war existed, and that the normal freight rates in force last July had remained in force in December last, and that the December freight cost, upon this basis, viz, $18,353,800, would have been the average for each month of 1914, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade for the year 1914 would have been $220,245,600, or $311,864,000 less than under existing conditions.

The table on page 23 of that report showing the increase in freight rates from the United States to Europe is as follows:

Increase in freight rates—Average for United States to Europe.

	Grain, per bushel.	Flour, per 100 pounds.	Cotton, per bale.	Meat, per 100 pounds.	Lard, per 100 pounds.
Estimated average:	*Cents.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*
July	5.6	11.5	$1.15	25	25
August	5.7	13.6	1.15	24.2	25
September	7.7	22.3	1.26	36	36
October	8.7	25	2.10	36.7	38.4
November	16.1	26	3.39	37	38.8
December	22.1	35	4.57	37	39.1
Increase, July to December, per cent	294	204	297	48	56

It is utterly absurd to say that these rates are only such as might be expected by reason of the conditions and that they are not exorbitant or excessive.

The burning questions are, first, Is there a remedy; and, second, if so, what is it? The opponents of the measure argue there is no remedy; they do not reach the second question. We answer both. We say there is a remedy and that this measure affords it

Now, what is the bill? It is so simple and plain that no time is required to explain it. Section 1 provides for the formation of a corporation of the District of Columbia for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the bill under certain provisions set forth in the bill itself and others found in the general incorporation act of the District of Columbia. The objects of the corporation to be formed and its powers are set forth in this proposed act and in the general act referred to. The initial capital stock of such corporation shall be $10,000,000, of the par value of $100 per share. The shipping board shall form the corporation. The United States shall always hold 51 per cent of the capital stock unless all the stock shall be disposed of.

Section 2 provides that the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of the capital stock, which may be increased on the recommendation of the shipping board and with the approval of the President $10,000,000, the United States holding not less than 51 per cent of all the stock at all times.

Section 3 authorizes the United States, through the shipping board, to purchase or construct suitable vessels, and the Secretary of the Treasury may issue and sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of not exceeding $30,000,000 for such purpose. The date of the maturity of all Panama Canal bonds may be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time after the date of the same he may deem advisable, instead of 50 years, as the law now provides. This provision is made for the reason that a better price may be had for bonds maturing in less time than 50 years. Time was when long-term bonds were more sought after and brought better prices than comparatively short-term bonds. To-day the demand for bonds maturing in less than 50 years is more active, and the Secretary will have the opportunity under this provision of taking advantage of the existing conditions in the public interest.

Section 4 authorizes the shipping board to transfer the vessels so purchased or constructed to a corporation formed as mentioned, and the corporation shall issue its gold 4 per cent bonds in payment therefor. Such vessels shall have the same status as vessels in private ownership duly registered under the laws of the United States. The existing rules and regulations relating to shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce shall be suspended by a certain date, and the shipping board shall propose and adopt new rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States.

Section 5 provides that all such vessels shall be registered as vessels of the United States, precisely as privately owned vessels, and shall engage only in foreign commerce, except that such vessels as are built in the United States shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade, in the same way as the law now permits vessels owned by private citizens to engage in that trade when built in the United States. But for this limitation of the restriction to foreign commerce, the vessels built by the United States in our own shipyards would be denied the privileges accorded to vessels owned by our citizens, and Congress would be not only indorsing but fostering and increasing the coastwise monopoly.

Section 6 establishes the shipping board, to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, two of whom shall have practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade. The salaries of the three additional members are fixed at $6,000 per annum, respectively.

Section 7 provides that, with the approval of Congress, the shipping board shall sell the stock in said corporation owned by the United States.

Section 8 authorizes the President of the United States to charter, lease, and transfer such naval auxiliaries as are suitable for commercial use and not required for use in the Navy and such vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial use not required for transports, and cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred the vessels of the Panama Railroad Co. All the vessels of the corporation shall be of a type, as far as practicable, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries.

Section 9 gives the President of the United States the authority to take possession for use as naval auxiliaries of any vessel owned or leased by the corporation upon terms fixed by the shipping board with the approval of the President, and in case of emergency such action may be taken by the President alone and without notice.

Section 10 requires the shipping board to make report of expenditures and receipts and of the operation of the corporation to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Section 11 makes an appropriation of $10,000,000 out of the Treasury, or in lieu thereof the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to that amount, to carry out the purposes of this act.

Now, let us see about the 14 questions propounded by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I am indebted to those who have had experience in managing and operating ships in foreign commerce for assistance and information on these points. I do not pretend to have extensive expert knowledge on this subject, though I have studied it to no little extent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to the discussion of those items will he permit me to ask the purpose of one or two provisions of the bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not want to occupy too much time, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator has any objection, of course I shall not insist upon asking the questions at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The first provision I want to ask the Senator about is that which permits the shipping board to make rules and regulations which may affect shipping, navigation, and the water-borne commerce of the United States. As I understand, those rules and regulations are now made by the Secretary of Commerce—formerly by the Secretary of the Treasury. Why is this power taken from an officer of the Government and put into the hands of the shipping board, which will itself be engaged in mercantile shipping?

Mr. FLETCHER. Well, in the first place, it is quite an undertaking to revise and reshape all the rules and regulations as they now exist, and it was thought that the shipping board, in view of its personnel, consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and three persons appointed from outside the departments, two of whom must be experienced in the management and operation of ships engaged in foreign commerce, would be peculiarly qualified to reform these regulations, some of which are said to be rather old, to be not calculated to promote the good of commerce or of trade, and not making for efficiency or serving any other good purpose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the three citizen members of the board, constituting a majority, would, of course, have control of the subject. The point I desire to suggest for the Senator's consideration is that the shipping board is really for the United States engaged in the transportation business, and I ask the Senator whether——

Mr. FLETCHER. I should not say that was quite the case. The shipping board votes the stock of the United States in the corporation, electing the officers, and the corporation will then conduct the business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; but really it will be under the control of the shipping board. The shipping board holds a majority of the stock, and may, under the terms of this bill, remove all the trustees at any time, and apparently without notice, so that they have the virtual control of the business. Now, I ask the Senator whether or not he would think it would be wise, for example, to put into the hands of the Postmaster General—who is conducting the post-office operations of the Government and, among other things, engaged in managing the parcel post—the authority to regulate and fix rates for express companies with which he is directly competing? In other words, does the Senator from Florida think it is a wise provision to put into the hands of the members of this shipping board, who are vitally interested in the welfare of this corporate business and are competitors with the private shipping

interests, the power to make rules and regulations governing the private shipping interests as well as their own?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator is laboring under a wrong impression. The Postmaster General is not a member of the shipping board under the substitute which has been offered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I was giving that as an illustration. I was asking the Senator, as a parallel case, whether he thinks it would be wise to confer upon the Postmaster General, who is engaged in handling the parcel-post business for the country, and thereby in that way competing with the express companies, the power to regulate the express companies and fix their rates?

Mr. FLETCHER. I scarcely think that is a parallel case, Mr. President, to begin with; and I can see really no objection to this shipping board reforming the present rules and regulations respecting navigation. As the Senator has said, that power rests now with the Secretary of Commerce, and he is on this board; and the Secretary of the Treasury is also a member; and the three experienced men selected from the outside will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I do not see but what that board would be a very excellent body to revise and reform the navigation rules and regulations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is just one other question I want to ask the Senator and then I will desist. I wish to invite his attention to the provision of the proposed substitute on page 3, which reads as follows:

> Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

Just what does the Senator understand that to include?

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that means that the corporation and its capital stock is to be exempt from all public taxes. As to the corporation, it means any corporation tax. It means, for instance, that the property of the corporation shall not pay a tax. If it shall acquire terminals anywhere, I think those terminals will not be taxable. This is my individual view; others may possibly hold that the ships are taxable wherever they may be registered. If one is registered from New York, and, under the laws of New York, such a ship pays a tax, that ship would be taxed according to the local law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That was exactly what I had in my mind in propounding the inquiry. The language is:

> Said corporation shall * * * be free from all public taxes.

If this corporation acquires terminal facilities in New York, for example, and those terminal facilities are taxed by the State of New York, then the corporation is not free from tax, is it? Your provision is not that no franchise tax shall be assessed but that the corporation shall be free from taxation of all kinds, which is the equivalent of saying, as I understand the English language, that no taxes shall be assessed against the corporation for anything.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is my understanding that the property to which this corporation may have title will be exempt from taxation. This corporation is to be organized in the District of Columbia. There are certain taxes levied against corporations as such, and there may be income taxes or other taxes that may apply to the corporation itself as distinct from the property it might have in different parts of the country or in other places.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me suggest to the Senator from Florida—and I am making the suggestion in absolute good faith—that, as I understand, under general law no franchise tax could be levied, in the State of New York or any other State, against a corporation which was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia. I think that has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States in more than one case—that the franchise of a corporation organized under the laws of one State can not be taxed in another State; but it has been held that its property may be taxed in any State where it is situated. Now, when the Senator, not relying upon that general principle of law which requires no declaration of the statute to carry it into operation, puts affirmative language into the bill, saying that this corporation shall be free from all public taxes, is not the fair construction of it that it means something more than an exemption such as the corporation would already have under general law?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think so. I think that in effect it is not the same thing. My own view would be that it is somewhat like a provision with reference to national banks. The corporation is exempt from tax; but the bank's real estate which it may own in some city, wherever it is located and doing business, is not exempt simply because the bank as a corporation is exempt from taxation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is true, but there is no statute which attempts to exempt a banking corporation from the payment of taxes upon its real estate.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a corporation organized under the laws of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The criticism I make of this provision is that apparently it does attempt to exempt the corporation from the payment of all taxes of every description. However that may be, I ask the Senator with reference to the provision for capital stock. The provision is that the capital stock of the corporation shall be free from all public taxes. Now, apparently that would cover this sort of a case:

Fifty-one per cent of this stock is to be subscribed by the Government of the United States. Forty-nine per cent of it may conceivably be subscribed by a citizen of the State of New York. The stock is his personal property, held in the State of New York. Does the Senator mean by that provision to withdraw that $4,900,000 worth of capital stock, held by a citizen of New York, from taxation in the State of New York by the State of New York?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator means where the stock is held by private individuals, living in some State, where under the laws of that State any stock of theirs would be taxable?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I had not considered that question from that standpoint, but I think it would be exempt from taxation. I think that is the effect of this provision.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator intend, by this provision in his bill, to exempt those shares of stock held by the private citizen in a State from taxation by that State?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think so; from all taxation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is, to permit him to take funds that would be taxable in the State, if held there, and invest them in the capital stock of this corporation engaged in a private business, and then escape all taxation in the State?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is my idea to exempt the capital stock from taxation entirely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator means by that that such stock is exempt from taxation by general law, I beg to differ with him. I think such shares of stock are taxable in the States now.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the language of the bill. They are exempt under this bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But, I say, under general law, in the absence of this provision, I have no doubt that those shares would be taxable.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; I do not question that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator attempts to change the general rule of law by this bill, and to make nontaxable what is now taxable or what but for this provision would be taxable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make an inquiry?

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not take up too much time. If the Senator will ask a question, I shall be very glad to answer it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is only a question upon the particular part of the bill to which the Senator's attention has just been directed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not want to weary my colleagues by extending my remarks too greatly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I want to ask the Senator what he believes to be the effect of lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 3, where the bill says:

> Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

I desire to ask the Senator whether that does not prohibit a citizen of the United States who has a claim, whether for $20 or for supplies furnished to this corporation or to its ships in the transaction of its business, from suing in the local courts, and compel him, at the option of the corporation itself, to proceed with his suit in the United States courts?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it does. He can bring the suit in the local court, and then it can be removed by this corporation to the United States district court.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does the Senator believe that it is a wise provision of law to take one private corporation and give it legal advantages before the courts of the country which no other private corporation enjoys?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think under the circumstances, with a corporation such as this formed here and doing a business like this, it is perfectly proper and advisable to provide that that corporation should be sued in the district court of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I shall want to be heard on that point a little later. I will not take the time of the Senator now.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is my view on that point. I think that is a very excellent provision.

FOURTEEN QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Now I shall proceed to deal with the 14 questions propounded by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], beginning at page 1863 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall not repeat the questions.

No. 1. Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I should say that the Government line should be conducted very much on the same policy that would guide any well-managed steamship company. The routes and sailing ports should be determined upon and altered as the vicissitudes of trade make necessary after a careful study of the situation by the officers and directors of the Government line and approved by the shipping board.

"The world is my field" is the motto of a certain large steamship line—the Hamburg-American Line—and it may well be the motto of the Government line in connection with the development of the commerce of the United States.

No. 2. The prime consideration that should determine the selection of routes and sailing ports should be the best interests of American commerce.

No. 3. This question presupposes that there will be such a large offering of freight for shipment that it will be difficult to take care of all the business. That being so, the need for quickly passing this bill is very manifest. The Government line should handle this condition by distributing its facilities as equitably as possible, always remembering that the shipping board will insure a fair deal to all; at any rate, aggrieved shippers will have opportunity for more effective redress than they now have against private-owned steamship companies. I submit a clipping from the New York Tribune of January 19, bearing particularly on this point:

SHIPS EARNING VALUE IN YEAR—HIGH FREIGHT RATES YIELDING GREAT PROFITS TO OWNERS OF STEAMSHIP LINES.

At the present freight returns for all commodities being shipped from American ports steamship interests are reported to be making large enough profits to pay back the cost of their ships within a year. A man connected with the export department of one of the large oil companies finds that it is almost impossible to get freight room for oil exports to South America because most of the lines formerly going from North American points to the southern continent have been diverted to European trade or are interned. On inquiry it was stated to him that ships used in European trade "pay for themselves within a year at the present average freight rates."

An exporter found the average freight rates from ports in the United States to various European points were more than $20 a ton at the present time, while for the same lines and the same articles the normal average before the war started was $3.20 to $3.40 a ton.

One textile manufacturer who exports largely to continental points had a contract rate with one line. Large amounts of goods were to have been shipped by this line several months ago and were delivered to the agents. After several weeks the shipper found them still on the dock, and discovered also that all other contract goods had been left there, while the ships had been crowded with goods paying the ruling freight rates. The shipper went to the representatives of the Government under which the line was registered. His complaint was taken up after considerable delay, and the line finally was ordered by its Government to take his goods.

No. 4. This question has been covered in the answer to question No. 1.

No. 5. The Government line, like every well-managed steamship line, should take care of the business immediately offering before undertaking to develop new business. New trade should be developed in the usual way; by maintaining regular sailings as often as may be warranted, and making rates as low as foreign competition makes necessary.

For instance, if, as recently testified to at the Committee on the Merchant Marine of the House, it costs 50 cents to ship a box of oranges from New York to Liverpool, a voyage of about 8 days, and the same box can be shipped from Jaffa to Liverpool, a voyage of 23 days, for 42 cents, it would be well to reduce the rate to meet the Jaffa competition.

If it costs, as testified, 30 shillings a ton to ship onions to New York via Liverpool, time in transit 26 days, and 40 shillings to ship the same goods from New York to Liverpool, time in transit about 8 days, it would be well to endeavor to develop a market for our onions in Europe by making a more equitable rate than here shown. Innumerable other illustrations, especially of rates to South America, might be cited, but these two will suffice. These illustrations are based on normal, not war-time, rates.

No. 6. The Government line should operate its vessels to earn a fair profit.

The records of Congress show that private-owned steamship lines earn very large net profits, annual net earnings of from 30 per cent to over 50 per cent being frequent. Senate Document No. 601 gives some specific instances. At the present time many vessels are earning their full cost in a single voyage.

The Government line will be able to make great reductions in freight rates and still operate on a profitable basis, as it will not aim for the enormous profits earned by private-owned steamship lines.

No. 7. The Government line should do as most steamship lines do, maintain regular schedules, and when deemed advisable also accept charters for some of its steamers. The probabilities are that the Government line's steamers will be chiefly employed on regular routes. It may be found advisable to send them where there is greater need, and employ them at times to relieve against oppression or total lack of tonnage.

No. 8. The Government should secure its ships in the markets of the world where no breach of neutrality will be possible, until a sufficient number of vessels have been secured with which to commence business. Additional ships should be added to the fleet by construction in American shipyards so far as possible. The transfer of naval auxiliaries and military transports and the ships of the Panama Railroad Co. will in themselves give us a good start. Bearing on this the special committee on the American merchant marine of the New York Chamber of Commerce, made up of experts in shipping, has just reported as follows:

If a substantial tonnage is to be created, it is idle to suggest that it be entirely constructed in this country, for the facilities do not exist for the work. * * * If a large tonnage built abroad is placed under the American flag, the necessary repair work will be an important aid in establishing American yards on a basis where they can compete with foreign shipbuilders.

I am assured that there will be no difficulty in obtaining at favorable prices an adequate number of suitable ships with which to commence business and adding to the fleet by constructing new vessels, as previously stated.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. From whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. FLETCHER. I was quoting from the committee's report to the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Do I understand that they advocate the building of these ships in foreign shipyards?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator advocate building the ships in foreign shipyards?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I did not say that. Shall I repeat the language from the document here?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is what I understood the Senator to say, and yet I was quite surprised.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is the quotation:

If a substantial tonnage is to be created, it is idle to suggest that it be entirely constructed in this country, for the facilities do not exist for the work.

That is the view of the committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce as expressed by them.

If a large tonnage built abroad is placed under the American flag, the necessary repair work will be an important aid in establishing American yards on a basis where they can compete with foreign shipbuilders.

That is the end of the quotation.

No. 9. The shipping board, which can act only with the approval of the President of the United States, can be depended upon to do nothing with regard to the purchase of interned vessels that will prejudice the quality of our neutrality.

No. 10. For 50 years American private capital has had an undisturbed opportunity to engage in the steamship business in the foreign trade under the American flag and has not done so.

Where American capital has engaged in the foreign trade it has conducted it under foreign flags, because it could do so from 5 to 10 per cent cheaper than under the American flag. I take these percentages from the report of the shipping committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce previously mentioned.

One of the members of this committee was Mr. George F. Dearborn, president of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. He surely knows what it costs to operate American ships as compared with foreign ships. This committee in its report says:

We desire first to point out that there has been a general misunderstanding of the added cost of operating American vessels as compared with the same vessel under a foreign flag. It has been frequently stated and generally accepted that the operation under the American flag will cost from 40 to 50 per cent more. We believe this percentage should be applied to wages alone, for the cost of fuel, supplies, insurance, and upkeep is substantially equal for the same vessel in the same trade, regardless of flag. On passenger ships, where the wage item may be a larger percentage of the total operating costs, the difference in favor of foreign vessels is somewhat greater; but with strictly freight carriers your committee is informed that the disadvantage under which American tonnage must labor is 5 and 10 per cent of the total operating cost. Even in passenger vessels of a type suitable for South American trade the disadvantage probably does not exceed 10 per cent.

This committee makes this frank admission in order to explain why American investors have been scared off from shipping investments. The report says:

The steamship man must obtain his capital for American ships from American investors. The American investor knows little of the value

of securities of steamship companies beyond the repeated statements in the public press that it costs 40 per cent more to operate an American vessel than one owned abroad, and that, consequently, competition is impossible without a heavy subsidy. These statements are not calculated to attract American capital to vessel securities.

In other words, according to the New York Chamber of Commerce report, subsidists have for years been deceiving the American people as to the cost of operating American ships in their efforts to wring from Congress a subsidy to make up the fictitious difference of 40 to 50 per cent in cost of operations, but have only succeeded in destroying the confidence of American investors in shipping investments.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FLETCHER. Just for a question, because I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I would like to suggest that, if the argument he has just read has discouraged private investors in going into that kind of business, what has he to say over the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury before the House committee that the experiment launched under this bill will undoubtedly be a losing venture, and that for a considerable time, at least, no returns will be adequate to the investment?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, no one can look into the future and tell just what the profits will be or what losses may occur, particularly when it comes to opening up new routes. A great deal is going to depend on the management, like any other business enterprise. If the Senator cares anything for my judgment about it, it may be that in the outset there will be losses in the opening up of new routes and in the operation of such line, but there is no need for that to continue. As the trade grows, as the business increases, there is ample reason for believing that the ships can be operated at a profit, and that they will be operated at a profit. I am in favor of their being operated at a reasonable profit. What I am dwelling on now is the New York Chamber of Commerce, which has been one of the most active and chief opponents of the measure and which has been quoted here in arguments over and over again. I do not know but what the report from which I am quoting has been read into the RECORD two or three times. The Senator from New Hampshire read it in full yesterday. The report made by that special committee to the New York Chamber of Commerce—the special committee being Irving T. Bush, William Harris Douglas, George S. Dearborn, Jacob W. Miller, J. Temple Gwathmey—contains the statement which I have mentioned to the effect that the claims which have been made in the years gone by that it cost from 40 to 50 per cent more to operate ships under the American flag than under a foreign flag have not been proved; that the public has been misled by those statements; that the actual fact is they find to-day, and so report, that it does not cost over 5 to 10 per cent more to operate under the American flag than under a foreign flag.

What I am trying to impress upon the Senate now is that this committee, making this formal report, declares that these statements which have been spread broadcast for years past as a basis for subsidy legislation are not true; that they have had the effect, not of producing legislation whereby these gentlemen could get their hands into the Treasury of the United States under some subsidy legislation, but have had the other effect, of driving capital away from the enterprise when it was most needed, and now they want to bring back that capital. They say private enterprise is ready to go into this business; that the statements which have been made and printed over the country for years past as a foundation for insisting that subsidies should be granted are not true statements at all; that they have been greatly exaggerated; and they admit now that the mistake has been made of driving capital away from this business by misrepresenting the facts. They say, and I accept their statement—I accept it because they know more about it than I do; I believe it is correct—that the difference is only 5 or 10 per cent between the cost of operating under the American flag and under a foreign flag.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is a level-headed, sound, business man, and I think, without exaggeration, a successful business man. I should like to ask him whether he expects the public to promptly subscribe for the 49 per cent of the stock of the shipping corporation which is to be offered to them?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will not take the time to answer that question, first, because while it may strike the Senator as being of consequence, and I give him credit for good faith in asking it, it seems to me utterly immaterial. It is beside the point I am discussing, in the first place, and in the next place it makes no difference whether the public subscribes for this stock or not. The bill provides that the corporation may begin its operation when 51 per cent of the stock is paid up, and whether the public will subscribe or not I do not know. We can not foresee and foretell what will happen in that regard; it may be it will; it may be it will not. It may be the United States will have to take every dollar of the stock. In that event I see no obstacles in the way nor any objection to that procedure. It will be offered, as I understand it, and if the people do not want it, as capital is needed the Government will furnish it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Early in the evening the Senator from Florida referred to criticisms that have been made upon the Federal reserve-bank law, and evidently he feels that thus far it has succeeded. I do not want to divert the Senator to a discussion of that question, but the prospects and prophecies that were held out to the bankers that this would be a profitable investment for them was coupled with the threat that if they failed to buy the stock in the Federal reserve bank their charters would be taken away from them. I undertake to say that if that threat had not accompanied the privileges that were to be derived from the Federal reserve act not one-twentieth of the bankers of this country would have invested in the stock of the Federal reserve banks, and I do not believe the public will invest in the stock of this corporation.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will not follow the Senator in an argument of that kind because we are not dealing with that proposition here. I want to confine the discussion to what is immediately before us as far as possible and proceed as rapidly as I can. So I simply repeat that whether the public subscribe for stock or not it in no way militates either against the feasibility or the success of the plan.

Perhaps the "high finance" of the International Mercantile Marine, the stock of which is to-day quoted at 1⅜ for the common and 5⅜ for the preferred, par value of each being $100, and of the Consolidated Steamship Co., which went into liquidation shortly after it was organized, may also have had something to do with scaring off the American investor from shipping investments.

It should be noted that both of the above mentioned were simply holding companies, and their stock-jobbing fiascos in nowise affected the profitable operation of the various steamship companies which made up these combinations.

Therefore, because of this state of affairs the chamber of commerce committee recommends a Government guarantee of shipping bonds "to all whose character and standing entitle them to it," in order "to satisfy the investing public that they can safely buy bonds secured by vessel property." "Otherwise," says the report, "the steamship man is helpless, and can do little to restore our shipping, no matter what inducements may be held out to him."

This does not indicate that "there is a larger amount of private capital ready for the purchase of ships which is kept from investment by this bill than is contemplated to be expended by the bill itself."

Secretary McAdoo covered the proposal of Government guaranties admirably in his recent Chicago speech, when he said:

> Guaranties by the Government of the principal and interest of bonds issued by private corporations engaged in shipping; this proposal is not worthy of serious consideration. It would be the worst form of subsidy, to say nothing of the wholly indefensible policy of having the United States Government become the guarantor of the bonds of private corporations engaged in any sort of enterprise. Once we entered upon such a course, we should be asked to indorse the bonds of corporations engaged in other than steamship enterprises. In time we should have the same kind of scrambling at Washington for Governmental favor in the way of indorsements of obligations of private corporations that we had for bounties to favored interests under our old tariff laws.

Now, I believe it is a fact that it does cost 5 per cent to 10 per cent more to operate ships under the American flag than it costs to operate them under foreign flags, as I have stated, and there is no assurance that after this war is over and there is no more need for the protection and cheaper war insurance given to ships under the American flag, that American capital in shipping will continue their vessels under the American flag at an added expense of 5 per cent to 10 per cent; and it is even less likely that they will add to their fleets under the American flag, unless they receive a subsidy.

It is quite certain that Congress will never grant a subsidy to a business so profitable as shipping simply to make up the difference between the large profits under the American flag and the larger profits possible under foreign flags.

From the foregoing it is very evident that there is not the remotest likelihood that private capital will or can do anything to establish an adequate American merchant marine.

They have said in this report that private capital has been driven away from such investments. The report claims further-

more that the cost of operation is 5 to 10 per cent greater under the American flag than under the foreign flag. The whole report assures the country that private interests will never develop an American merchant marine unless bonds are guaranteed or unless subsidies are granted.

It shows that by these false statements as to the impossibility of operating American ships except by the aid of a large subsidy they have injured themselves. The fact of the matter is that the revival of the American merchant marine has now become too big a problem for private capital to accomplish. It is no longer a question of whether we shall have a Government-owned merchant marine or a private-owned merchant marine; the question now is, Shall we have a Government-owned merchant marine or no merchant marine, and continue to depend on the foreigner to carry our ocean-borne commerce?

Forty million dollars is sneered at as being inadequate. If properly administered, as I am sure it will be, it will provide a mechant fleet far greater in extent than the entire present American merchant marine in the foreign trade, including all the shipping that has come under the American flag since the outbreak of the Civil War. That foreign shipping is shown by reference to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, page 188. The documented tonnage of the United States merchant marine employed in the foreign trade in 1914 was as follows: Two thousand three hundred and sixty vessels of 1,066,288 tons; added under the act of 1914, 104 vessels of 372,488 tons; total, 1,438,776 tons.

Now, as to question No. 11. If it is claimed private steamship companies can operate so much more cheaply than can the Government, then private capital will welcome the Government merchant marine, which will show the way and prove the business, for if the Government line can show a profit on any particular route, private steamship companies, according to the statements being made, can show a greater profit, and whenever any private American steamship is prepared to maintain a service equal to that of the Government line on any route established by the Government line, the Government line will withdraw from that route; there will be no necessity to sell it. The Government line will simply transfer its activities to some other undeveloped route.

As to question No. 12, there is no good reason why the Government line should not enter into conferences or agreements with existing lines if it should be deemed to be to the best interests of all concerned, always bearing in mind that the best interests of American commerce should be the first consideration of the Government line, healthy competition, and good service at reasonable rates being maintained.

As to question No. 13, fruit and meat are usually carried in combination passenger and freight boats, and where the traffic calls for such freight it will be a simple matter to properly provide for it. The transportation of oil is pretty well taken care of by the oil companies. There is not any likelihood that the Government line would be called upon to give much attention to the carrying of oil. If it should be, it will not be a difficult problem, and the tank steamers will be excellent naval auxiliaries.

Question No. 14 is fully answered in the answer to question No. 7.

As to the final question, "Is this to be a permanent or temporary policy?" I will say that it will be as permanent or as temporary as the circumstances make necessary. This phase of the question is discussed in the answer to question No. 11.

Mr. President, observations have been repeatedly made that the influences outside the Senate are urging the passage of the bill, implying that Senators on this side are not acting in pursuance of their own judgment. That makes it incumbent upon us not only to deny that implied charge, but to inquire whether it may not be prompted by those deeply interested on the other side, and to consider what those interests may be.

INTERESTS AND INFLUENCES AGAINST THE BILL.

There has developed considerable opposition from certain quarters. The cry of paternalism has been raised, the criticisms of Government ownership has been advanced, and several of the large news and financial papers of the eastern cities appear daily with editorials denouncing the administration's policy. These papers, being the recipients of large incomes from advertising contracts with the steamship companies, are naturally opposed to a plan inimicable to the interests of their customers. This fact may affect their vision. The greatest opposing power, however, to the policy of the Government is the steamship companies themselves.

An investigation of the shipping question and the interests that are involved reveals some very interesting facts. In the report of the proceedings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the investigation of shipping combinations the methods of the shipping interests are fully set forth. It is shown that a regular system of agreements and pools prevail, against which the independent shipper has no chance to live. The committee in its recommendations states:

> The committee believes that the disadvantages and abuses connected with steamship agreements and conferences as now conducted are inherent, and can only be eliminated by effective Government control; and it is such control that the committee recommends as the means of preserving to American exporters and importers the advantages enumerated, and of preventing the abuses complained of.

In the investigation by the committee it developed that certain ships were regularly used solely for the purpose of killing competition. To quote the exact words of the report:

> Thus, in the North Atlantic passenger service, the evidence presented in the suit against the Hamburg-American Line et al. shows that in about the year 1908 the conference lines authorized the appointment of a committee for the purpose of selecting fighting steamers to destroy the competition of nonconference lines. This committee, according to the evidence, would select suitable steamers from any of the conference lines to sail on the same days and between the same ports, the regular rates being reduced to a point sufficiently low to secure the traffic. As already stated in this volume (p. 46) "the evidence in the Government's suit shows that such opposition sailings were repeatedly instituted against certain independent lines. * * * Any surplus of passengers which were booked for the fighting steamer, but which could not be carried by the same, would be transferred to other conference line steamers at the reduced rates. The expenses and loss from the lower rates resulting to any line whose vessels had been selected were distributed over the members of the conference. It was thus a case of all the lines united in conference opposing every sailing of a single opposition line. By distributing the loss over the several members of the conference each constituent line would suffer proportionately much less than the one line which was fighting the entire group and which would inevitably soon exhaust its resources in the conflict with the combined power of the large lines with their superior speed and better third-class accommodations."

The report shows that the same methods are still in vogue not only in passenger but in freight traffic as well.

The shipping interests look with concern upon the entrance of the Government into the field; therefore they oppose the Government's policy of purchasing, and especially oppose bitterly the Government's operating, ships. It is believed that it is not so much Government competition that is feared, for it is generally acknowledged that there is sufficient business, but they fear that the entrance of the Government-owned ships will be a protection to the independent companies which will surely enter the field if it is known that fair play and equal competition will be accorded to them.

THE PERSONNEL OF THE SHIPPING INTERESTS.

The question arises as to who composes the American shipping interests. An examination of the personnel of those interested in the various steamship lines reveals a system of interlocking directorates and a community of interest probably unparalleled in the history of modern financiering. By consulting Moody's Manual of Railways and Corporations and the volume entitled the Directory of Directors, one can readily appreciate that the administration, in its desire to benefit the people, has somewhat displeased the most powerful financial interests in the country.

The same interests are associated both in the foreign and coastwise shipping. The most prominent foreign shipping corporations controlled by American interests are owned by the International Mercantile Marine, a New Jersey corporation. This company owns the capital stock of the Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. (Ltd.), known as the White Star Line, which flies the British flag; the Atlantic Transport Co. (Ltd.), British flag; the International Navigation Co., which owns the American Line (American flag) and Red Star Line (Belgian flag); and the Dominion Line. The parent corporation also owns the controlling interest in the Leyland Line. The Atlantic Transport controls the National Steamship Co. (Ltd.). The number of steamers owned by the corporation on July 1, 1913, including those under construction, was 137, with gross tonnage of 1,280,410 tons, exclusive of tugs, lighters, and so forth. A large majority of their ships are under foreign flags. Moody's Manual states that the majority of the stock of the International Mercantile Marine is deposited under a voting-trust agreement. The voting trustees are J. P. Morgan and Charles Steele, both members of the Morgan firm; J. Bruce Ismay, P. A. B. Widener, and Lord Pirrie. Transfer agents are J. P. Morgan & Co.; and the register of certificates, Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. Among the directors are J. P. Morgan, Charles Steele, George W. Perkins, and E. J. Berwind.

The fleets of the United States Steel Corporation, Standard Oil Co., and the United Fruit Co. took advantage of the law of 1913 to register under the American flag. While the Standard Oil and United Fruit Co. have considerable fleets of ocean-going vessels, the United States Steel Corporation has only a limited number of ocean-going ships, these being composed principally of lake steamers. An examination of the personnel of the directors of these companies shows that J. P. Morgan, George W.

Perkins, and Elbert H. Gary are on the executive committee of the United States Steel Corporation and that Mr. William Rockefeller, largely interested in Standard Oil, serves on the board of directors of the National City Bank with Mr. J. P. Morgan and Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip and others, who it will be later shown are largely interested in coastwise shipping. The United Fruit Co. is largely composed of Boston interests, though it is said the Standard Oil Co. interests are large investors.

Investigation of the coastwise shipping interests develops a situation equally interesting. Nine-tenths of the Atlantic coast shipping is owned by the railroads and two corporations. The report of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries says:

The steamers of the railroad-controlled lines, combined with those of the Eastern Steamship Corporation and the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indies Steamship Lines, number 199, or 84.7 per cent of the above-mentioned total for the 28 lines, and represent 516,055 gross tons, or 93.9 per cent of the total gross tonnage. Not only do the railroads and the two shipping consolidations dominate over nine-tenths of the tonnage, but it is significant that very few of the principal routes on our entire Atlantic and Gulf coasts are served by more than one regular steamship line.

The railroad-controlled lines referred to in the report of the committee are the Southern Pacific, or Morgan Line, the Old Dominion Steamship Co., the Merchants' & Miners' Transportation Co., and the Ocean Steamship Co., or Savannah Line. These, with the Eastern Steamship Co. and the Atlantic, Gulf, and West Indian Steamship Lines, generally known as "Agwi," constitute practically the entire coastwise shipping for the Atlantic seaboard. It is a remarkable fact that the interests allied in the ownership and control of all of these coastwise lines are also associated in the foreign American shipping. Taking the companies in the order above named we find that in the Southern Pacific Mr. Henry W. De Forrest, a prominent director, serves on the board of the National Bank of Commerce with Mr. Henry P. Davidson, with J. P. Morgan & Co., with Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, and Mr. William Rockefeller, of the National City Bank. Mr. L. F. Loree, another director, is on the board of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad and part owner of the Old Dominion Line. Mr. Ogden Mills, another director, is associated with the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., and he, with Mr. Cornelius Bliss, another director, are on the board of the United States Trust Co. of New York, on which board the same interests are found dominant.

The Old Dominion Steamship Co. is controlled by the Atlantic Coast Line, Seaboard Air Line, Southern, Chesapeake & Ohio, and Norfolk & Western Railroads. The same interests appear here. Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, of the National City Bank, appears on the boards of two of the railroads. Mr. Charles Steel, member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., Mr. Elbert H. Gerry, chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corporation; Mr. Victor Morowitz, a prominent member of the board of the National Bank of Commerce; and others of the same interests are found on the boards of these railroads. The Merchants' & Miners' Transportation Co. was, until recently, owned by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, which, from recent investigations by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Department of Justice, it was disclosed that this was controlled by J. P. Morgan & Co. The Government required the railroad to sell the Merchants' & Miners' interests. The new owners, however, belong to the same aggregation. The chairman of the board of directors of the Merchants' & Miners is on the board of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, of which J. P. Morgan & Co. are the fiscal agents, and others have similar affiliations. The Ocean Steamship Co.—the Savannah Line—is owned by the Central of Georgia Railroad. On its board are found gentlemen who are interested in New York banking houses with the Morgans and Rockefellers.

The Eastern Steamship Co. is a holding company which controls and operates 11 different steamship lines of the New England coast and controls practically the entire trade of that region. According to Moody's Manual, on June 30, 1913, the New England Navigation Co. owned two and a half million dollars in the stock of this company. Mr. J. P. Morgan is a director of the New England Navigation Co. The Eastern Steamship Co. is understood to be financed and largely controlled by Hayden, Stone & Co., of Boston and New York. G. L. Stone and J. W. Hayden of that firm are on its board of directors. The same firm are understood to control the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indian Steamship Lines, of which company G. L. Stone is vice president and H. R. Mallory, a member of the board of directors of the Eastern Steamship Co., is president. This company owns the majority of the stock of the Clyde Line, the New York & Cuba Line, Mallory Line, and the entire stock of the New York & Porto Rico Line and the Texas City Steamship Co. Mr. Edward J. Berwind, one of the directors of the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indian Steamship Lines, the holding company for the various subsidiary lines, is also a director in the International Mercantile Marine, along with J. P. Morgan and George W. Perkins, and is on the board of directors of the Guaranty Trust Co. with Mr. T. W. Lamont, of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., and on the National Bank of Commerce with Vanderlip and others. Mr. Berwind is also the head of a big coal company in New York City, whose business is that of furnishing coal to the various steamship lines, one of which is said to be the Hamburg-American. His brother, Mr. John E. Berwind, is also an official of the Porto Rico Line and is president of the Maritime Register, the leading shipping paper of the country.

To sum up the entire situation, I am assured that an investigation will prove that over 90 per cent of the coastwise and practically the entire foreign American shipping is allied through interlocking directorates with the National City Bank, United States Trust Co., National Bank of Commerce, Guaranty Trust Co., all of which have for their fountain head the Rockefeller-Morgan-Perkins interests.

It is against this aggregation that the administration, representing the American people, finds itself. The shipping interests realize that the entrance of the Government into the field will break the chain by which they have the independents shut out. Government-owned vessels are what they most fear, for it means a breakwater—a bunker—a protection for the independent who now dares at his peril to invest a dollar in shipping against the powerful organization, but who would be willing to invest if fair play was allowed. My information is the same interests own, or are interested in, several of the big eastern newspapers. The vision of these papers is colored, and others are affected by revenues of steamship advertising. Therefore you find a stalwart opposition by the eastern newspapers to the Government policy.

In further reference to the question of American shipping the reason has been shown why the eastern papers and the Shipping Trust are opposed to the bill. The argument has been advanced by some of the eastern papers that the Government should not purchase ships, for the reason that there is no money to be made in the shipping business, and the Government would lose vast sums.

In rebuttal of this argument the following extracts are taken from Special Diplomatic and Consular Reports prepared for the use of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives in dealing with the methods and practices of steamship lines engaged in the foreign carrying trade of the United States.

The following extract is from the report of Mr. H. P. Beecher, vice consul at Havre, France:

While the steamers of many lines run between Havre and various ports of the world, there exist between them no agreements, pools, or other combinations for the purpose of fixing tariffs, either for freight or passengers, of giving rebates, special rates, and other privileges or advantages, or for the purpose of pooling or dividing their earnings and destroying competition.

On the other hand, there exists between certain navigation companies (whose vessels, however, neither call at Havre nor are affected by French law beyond the enforcement of port regulations, dock dues, and pilotage) an agreement or combination.

It will suffice to name two of these:

First. The International Mercantile Marine Co.

This combination includes the White Star, Dominion, Leyland, American, Atlantic Transport, Red Star, and Holland-America Lines, the last-named company having been absorbed since the company's organization in 1902.

In that year there was formed in the United States a shipping trust for the purchase and control of the stock of the first six named companies. Until that year the White Star Line, for example, was owned by a British company, the Oceanic Steam Navigation Co., and nearly all the stock was held in Great Britain. But on February 4, 1902, an agreement was concluded between the American syndicate and the White Star Line for the purchase of its shares. Each holder of a share of £1,000 in the Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. received £4,196 in cash and £6,000 in preferred and common shares of the trust. The managers of the line, Messrs. Ismay, Imrie & Co., received 10 times their profits for the year 1900 and undertook for 14 years not to associate themselves with any other shipping enterprise trading to ports which the White Star had used.

The Dominion Line also received 10 times its profits for 1900, and Messrs. Richards, Mills & Co. the same. The Leyland Line was paid £2,347,000 in cash. The American, Red Star, and Atlantic Transport Lines, which had been acquired earlier and formed the nucleus of the trust, were taken over for the payment of £6,831,000 almost entirely in trust shares.

The trust created the following capital:

Common stock, dividend limited to 10 per cent until 4½ per cent debentures be paid off	£9,980,000
Preferred stock, cumulative interest at 6 per cent	10,340,000
4½ per cent debentures	10,550,000
5 per cent debentures	3,740,000
Total	34,610,000

(Or $169,000,000.)

Besides this, there are £1,376,000 of debentures in the companies constituting the trust.

The best asset of the trust has been the White Star Line, which in 1910 earned a net profit of £540,000 on a capital of £750,000, after writing off £370,016 for depreciation. A dividend of 30 per cent was paid in that year by this company alone, and a balance carried forward or placed to various reserves, among which was an insurance fund, for which £100,000 was set apart, in view of the increase of the fleet. At the same time the best part of the insurance was underwritten at Lloyds. As an illustration of the White Star's prosperity it may be observed that in 1908 the dividend was 10 per cent and in 1909, 20 per cent.

On the other hand, the earnings of the combination have not been as great as anticipated, and the limiting of the interest on the common stock has been superfluous. No dividends have yet been paid on either preferred or common stock, and the former, with a nominal value of $100, is quoted at $64.

The purchase by an American trust of so many British ships caused considerable concern in England, where sharp criticism was aroused. As a matter of fact, British law forbids a British ship to be owned by a foreign corporation. As a compromise a special agreement was concluded between the American syndicate and the Government, of which Mr. Balfour was then premier, an agreement which provided that British vessels—i. e., American vessels flying the British flag—should be controlled by a committee of British subjects.

As a sequence to this, and while Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan remained the principal power, Mr. J. Bruce Ismay, Lord Pirrie, E. C. Grenfell, H. A. Sanderson, and other British subjects constituted the elements required by law. In this manner the contention of the British Government that "shares and not ships" had been sold was complied with.

In the meantime Mr. Morgan was negotiating for the purchase of the Cunard Line, a fact which decided the British Government to take drastic action to prevent that company's vessels from passing into the hands of the trust. Such a purchase, in connection with an agreement which the American financier had concluded with two great German lines, would have given the syndicate a monopoly of the Atlantic passenger and a part of the freight trade. This was felt to be undesirable and dangerous.

The British Government consequently concluded an agreement with the Cunard Line by which the ships of that company were to remain British. The money required to build the *Mauretania* and *Lusitania* was advanced by the State at a rate of 2¾ per cent, and a special subvention of £150,000 a year for the working of the two lines was guaranteed.

Congressional report shows the existence of pooling agreements among practically all the lines. Mr. Robert P. Skinner, consul general at Hamburg, in his report states:

The most common device of the German shipowners for the maintenance of rates is the division of territory and the rebate system. It is stated that since 1890 this system has not been applied in trade with the United States. These pooling and rebate arrangements are national and international. A most striking example of these undertakings is the North Atlantic passenger pool, to which the conference lines, so called, are parties. These lines include all the best-known companies transporting emigrants from Europe to New York. As far as Germany is concerned, the mechanism of the arrangement whereby all emigrants passing through Germany are directed to conference-line steamers is as follows: The Prussian Government has established 10 sanitary control stations at various points along the frontier of Russia. It is a requirement of law or regulation, with ample means for making it effective, that every emigrant arriving in Prussia shall first sojourn at one of these stations, where he is routed to the United States and forwarded to the seaboard. The carrying out of the administrative and sanitary sides of this work is intrusted by the Government to the Hamburg-American Line and to the North German Lloyd Line, acting jointly as concessionnaires.

Agreements also exist regarding freight rates. The congressional report further states:

Between the following trans-Atlantic steamship companies, Hamburg-American Packet Co., in Hamburg; North German Lloyd, in Bremen; Holland-America Steamship Co., in Rotterdam; Red Star Line, in Antwerp, the following freight agreement has been arrived at to-day:

The purpose of this freight agreement is to bring about a mutual understanding regarding freight rates to be maintained on a corresponding basis and to preserve to each separate company its share of the total income from the freight traffic.

This freight agreement comprises the total freight traffic of the above-mentioned lines from ports of the North German seacoast, Holland, and Belgium to ports of the United States; it further includes the traffic with chartered vessels as well as with the lines' own steamers, and it further includes the freight for dead weight as well as for live stock.

As a rule, a meeting will be held every four weeks by the representatives of the freight departments of the combined lines for the purpose of agreement regarding freight rates to be maintained and for the exchange of opinions regarding the status of the business and measures to be taken to meet competition. The fixing of rates, however, is not done by majority vote but by way of open agreement. The fixing of freight rates, even when such go below the fixed minimum freight rates, can be done, viz, for all ports by majority vote, for single ports by consent of all parties. Furthermore, the cancellation of freight rates can take place by majority vote.

Not only with Germany but with practically all the European countries these pooling agreements exist. Following the report of Mr. T. J. O'Brien, former American Ambassador to Italy, the congressional committee states in reference to the traffic with Italy:

Copies of the pooling agreements between the 12 steamship lines referred to in Ambassador O'Brien's report have been furnished to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries by one of the interested lines. One is called the "Mediterranean freight-traffic agreement of December 15, 1911," and has for its object the assurance to each group of lines (group 1 comprising the six Italian lines and group 2 relating to the Anchor Line, the Hamburg-American Line, North German Lloyd, White Star Line, Cunard Line, and Austro-Americana) a certain proportion of the freight on cargo loaded at all ports of Italy and Sicily to all ports in the United States of America and Canada. The other agreement is called the "Mediterranean steerage-traffic agreement of February 8, 1909." By way of explanation, one of the companies interested draws attention to the fact that the steerage agreement was originally concluded in 1909, and in 1911 was renewed in its present shape with the exclusion of the Fabre Line; the latter company, although in principle willing to rejoin the contract, not having been satisfied with the participation quota offered to them.

This system of freight-pooling arrangements has not only existed between the American-European ports, but also between the United States and South American ports. The following is from the committee's report regarding South American traffic:

The reader is referred to the testimony of Mr. Christian J. Beck, freight traffic manager of the Hamburg-American Line, on pages 518 to 541, inclusive, of the hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the investigation of the so-called shipping combine. In his testimony Mr. Beck submitted the several freight and passenger agreements entered into between the Atlas service of the Hamburg-American Line and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co.

Briefly summarized, the agreement of February 21, 1908, provides for—

1. A freight-pooling arrangement on the basis of 77½ per cent to the Hamburg-American Line and 22½ per cent to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. A margin of 5 per cent on the above proportion, however, is to be allowed each company, and if at the end of the year it is found that the actual total earnings of each company have amounted to less than the respective proportions of 72½ per cent by the Hamburg-American Line and 17½ per cent by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co., then the difference between these minimum proportions and the proportions in the earnings shall be adjusted in accordance with certain rules adopted in the agreement. It is also agreed to ascertain, month by month, the quantity of cargo carried by the two lines, with a view to arranging the carriage in the agreed proportions, as far as possible.

2. A joint freight tariff to be agreed upon between the agencies of the companies in New York. The parties further agree to run their passenger steamers between New York and Colon alternately, as far as possible.

3. A division of territory. The Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. agrees not to extend its service to Haitian ports and Santa Martha, as far as sailings to and from New York are concerned, except in case of war with the Royal Dutch West India Mail Line, in which case the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. is to receive the privilege of calling at Haitian ports served by the Dutch Line.

It should be stated here that the Atlas service of the Hamburg-American Line and the Royal Dutch West India Mail Line have an agreement with reference to the division of Haitian ports between themselves, a copy of which is found on page 524 of the hearings in the investigation of the so-called shipping combine. The Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. also expresses its intention not to extend its present service to the port of Port Limon, and in case this should be done the two companies agree to meet, with a view to making such arrangements as will least interfere with the interests of each other. In turn, the Hamburg-American Line agrees not to call at Trinidad and Grenada from and to New York, excepting with their cruising steamers.

The Hamburg-American Line, however, reserves for itself the service between New York and Puerto Barrios, but if more than a four-weekly steamer should be required the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. is to have the option to share alternate steamers for the additional sailings.

On October 7, 1908, an agreement supplemental to the one of February 21, 1908, was entered into between the two lines. This agreement provided, among other matters:

1. That certain steamships of the two companies shall be dispatched from New York to Colon on alternate weeks.

Mr. Beck testified that these agreements had been renewed and are in existence to-day. He also testified that his line has no hard and fast agreement with the United Fruit Co., which also operates from New York to Jamaica and other ports enumerated in the above-mentioned agreement, but stated that it is tacitly understood that the United Fruit Co. will observe the same rates and conditions as the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. and the Hamburg-American Line. This understanding with the United Fruit Co., however, is only a rate-fixing arrangement and does not involve a pooling agreement.

In reference to the methods of killing competition, the following is quoted from the report of Mr. Robert P. Skinner, consul general, Hamburg, Germany:

Any account of the methods and practices of the German steamship companies would be incomplete without reference to the Syndikats-Rhederei, a corporation through which are operated the fighting ships of the six largest Hamburg companies engaged in extra-European trade. Nominally, the Syndikats-Rhederei is a vessel-owning company, with a capital of $1,428,000, engaged in commercial transportation enterprises. Actually, it is a defensive corporation owned, in respect to its capital shares, as follows:

Hamburg-American Line	$785,400
Hamburg-South American Line	136,600
German Steamship Co	154,700
German-Australian Steamship Co	130,500
C. Woermann	119,000
German East Africa Co	71,400
	1,428,000

The above distribution of shares is apportioned with reference to the tonnage of the companies named. This fighting corporation was organized on December 19 and registered on December 23, 1905, and one-half of the original capital was paid in immediately. Four comparatively small and inexpensive ships were purchased, and these, with such others as may be chartered from time to time, are hired out to the six owners of the company to meet dangerous competition and to drive it away. The fighting ships handle chiefly bulk goods, leaving merchandise, which requires prompt transportation, to the care of the parent company, which maintains its nominal rates as far as possible, the stress of competition being borne by the fighting ships principally. In times of peace the fighting ships engage in regular trade on time charters. As this corporation is not one for profit primarily, the investment in reality is a new sort of insurance. The Syndikats-Rhederei made no money at the beginning of its history, this fact indicating that the ships were all actively engaged in commercial warfare, but last year the returns were favorable, as rates, generally speaking, were higher and the regular lines required less expensive support. The manager of the company is Mr. Christian Friedrich Bransloew, who is known to be a very careful and competent man.

The purchase of Government vessels would mean a constant vigilance against these secret combinations. Therefore it is against the interest of the Shipping Trust for the Government to own vessels, and they will do everything in their power to prevent the passage of the bill. An examination of the special diplomatic and consular reports, prepared for the use of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and edited by Mr. S. S. Huebner, will show a mass of evidence of the existence of these pools and agreements between various steamship companies plying to all continents of the world.

Following this up, may we not find clearly accounted for the resolutions of certain chambers of commerce which have been produced in the arguments on the other side—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans? The same controlling influences will appear in them all.

I requested Mr. Philip Manson, of New York, to advise me respecting the action of a committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce, and to give me as full information as he could regarding the officers and their associations, and as to the reasons for their opposition to this bill. I have his permission to use his letter. I think you will agree that Mr. Manson understands his subject thoroughly, and, while he frankly sets forth the facts, he is fair and without ulterior motives. His standing, character, and intelligence I do not believe can be questioned. This is his letter, dated January 18, 1915:

THE ATLANTIC COAST STEAMSHIP CO. (LTD.),
290 Broadway, New York, January 18, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have to-day received yours of January 15 and the copies of the report, the proposed substitution, and Secretary McAdoo's address, for all of which I thank you very much.

Your report is a masterly document, and I am amazed that the newspapers, in spite of their bias, did not give their readers the benefit of it to a greater extent than they did. It simply shows to what an extent the newspapers are owned, controlled, or influenced by the interests that would prevent the shipping bill from passing. This is a sad commentary on American journalism, but I know it to be true, as I was in the newspaper business before I became interested in the steamship business.

The opposition to the shipping bill comes chiefly from two sources, namely, the steamship interests and the so-called Wall Street interests.

The steamship interests are opposed to the bill because they don't want additional competition, either governmental or private.

Wall Street interests are opposed to the bill for two reasons: First, because of the steamship interests which they own or control, and, second, because they fear that the success of this Government enterprise—and a great success it is bound to be—may result in Government ownership of telegraph, telephone, railroad, and other public-service corporations.

Without going into the pros and cons of Government ownership, the great concern that Wall Street has with regard to that is that under Government ownership the large profits which Wall Street receives from privately owned corporations every time they have a bond or note issue or other form of financing will be done away with.

However, Secretary McAdoo in his address has shown that the objection to the shipping bill on the ground of Government ownership is not tenable even if we were bound to consider it.

The opposition of the steamship interests is of the least importance, as they have not in themselves a very great influence with our legislators or the press.

The opposition of Wall Street influences is a much more serious problem to contend with. I am sure that they are spending large sums of money to kill this bill. A few weeks ago I learned of a fake marine association called the National Merchant Marine Association. After some difficulty I located this alleged marine association in the offices of the New York Life Insurance Co., and after interviewing the secretary I became satisfied that it was formed for the sole purpose of killing the shipping bill.

It is well known that the New York Times and the New York Sun are controlled by Wall Street interests. The New York Evening Post derives its existence from Wall Street. The Journal of Commerce is supported almost entirely by the foreign shipping interests and Wall Street. These are the papers that most strongly oppose the shipping bill. Newspapers outside of New York City attribute to the above papers a superior knowledge of shipping matters and follow their lead.

The position of such Republican papers as the New York Tribune and the New York Press on this bill can well be understood; nevertheless, being free of Wall Street influences, their party bias has not prevented them from indorsing the purpose of the bill and some of its features and to offer subsidy as a substitute, whereas the first-named papers damn the bill throughout, yet offer nothing in its place, the reason for which has already been indicated.

I now come to the request you make in your letter for information as to the men who control the New York Chamber of Commerce.

For many years it has been repeatedly charged that the New York Chamber of Commerce was not representative of the business interests of New York, but that it was controlled by Wall Street interests. The shipping interests are also owned and controlled by Wall Street interests, so the two are bound up in each other.

The following will prove this:

The president of the chamber of commerce is Mr. Seth Low, formerly president of Columbia University and a former Republican mayor of New York City. Mr. Low's present activities are confined to holding honorary positions, and his office as president of the New York Chamber of Commerce is regarded as one of them. Mr. Low may be depended upon to follow the lead of his fellow officers in the chamber of commerce, and it is with them that we are most interested.

Interlocking directors are indicated by letters, thus, (A.).

The officers and executive committee are as follows: (E. E.) J. Pierpont Morgan, vice president; director of the International Mercantile Marine (A.); New England Navigation Co. (B.); New England Steamship Co.; National Bank of Commerce of New York (C.); United States Steel Corporation; Western Union Telegraph Co. (D.); New York Central & Hudson River Railroad; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad (E); Northern Pacific Railroad; West Shore Railroad; and others.

Frank A. Vanderlip, member of executive committee. President and director of National City Bank of New York (H.); director of National Bank of Commerce of New York (C.); Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., of New York; American Security & Trust Co., of Washington; and Riggs National Bank, of Washington. Trustee of Consolidated Gas Co., of New York (I.) and Mercantile Safe Deposit Co., of New York; director of New York Edison Co.; Union Pacific Railroad; Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad; Hocking Valley Railroad; Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad; Norfolk Southern Railroad; Oregon Short Line Railroad; Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Co.; and Seaboard Air Line Railroad.

James Talcott, vice president. Director of the Manhattan Co. Bank, of New York.

William D. Sloan, vice president and member of executive committee. Director of National City Bank, of New York (H.); Guarantee Trust Co., of New York (K.); Guarantee Safe Deposit Co., of New York; Eastern Steel Co.; Mahoning Coal Railroad Co.; Central & South American Telegraph Co.; and Standard Roller Bearing Co. Trustee of United States Trust Co., of New York (L.).

A. Foster Higgins, vice president. Director and vice president of Compania Metallurgica Mexicana, and Sombrerette Mining Co. Director and president of Mexican Northern Railroad. Director of Montezuma Lead Co., Mexican Lead Co., Potosi & Rio Verde Railroad, Teziutlan Copper Mining Co., Crocker-Wheeler Co., and Knickerbocker Safe Deposit Co.

George B. Cortelyou, vice president. President and director of Consolidated Gas Co., of New York (I.), and director of New York Edison Co., which, with other companies, in all of which he is an officer or director, control the lighting and power business of Greater New York and vicinity. Also director of National Bond & Mortgage Insurance Co. and National Surety Co. (M.)

John I. Waterbury, vice president. Director of International Mercantile Marine (A.); Western Union Telegraph Co. (D.); American Telegraph & Telephone Co.; Western Electric Co.; Audit Co., of New York (N.); Chase National Bank, of New York (O.); United States Guarantee Co.; The Pacific Coast Co.; Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railroad; and Louisville & Nashville Railroad (R.). Trustee of Alliance Insurance Co., of London.

T. De Witt Cuyler, vice president. Director of Audit Co., of New York (N.); New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad (E.); and Interborough Co. (the New York subway); also director in many other transportation companies.

Frank K. Sturgis, vice president. Member of the governing committee of the New York Stock Exchange. Vice president and director of New York Quotation Co. and Standard Safe Deposit Co., of New York.

James G. Cannon, vice president. Member of executive council American Bankers' Association. Trustee of Associated Simmons Hardware Co. Chairman of the board of H. W. Johns-Manville Co. (Y.). Director of Bankers' Trust Co. (P.); Fidelity Trust Co., of New York; Fifth Avenue Bank, of New York (Q.); Metropolitan Trust Co., of New York (U.); Security Bank, of New York (A. A.); Transatlantic Trust Co., of New York; United States Mortgage & Trust Co., of New York (F.); United States Casualty Co.; United States Guarantee Co.; and Standard Milling Co. Trustee of Franklin Savings Bank, of New York (S.).

Anton A. Raven, vice president. President and trustee of Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co. (T.). President and director of American Bureau of Shipping. Vice president and director of Home Life Insurance Co. Vice president and trustee of Metropolitan Trust Co., of New York (U.). Director of Atlantic Safe Deposit Co.; Bank of New York; and Fidelity & Casualty Co. (V.).

William Skinner, vice president. Of William Skinner & Sons, silks. Member of board of managers of Silk Association of America. Vice president and director of Pacific Bank of New York. Trustee of American Surety Co. (G.). Director of New England Navigation Co. (B.); New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad (E.); Boston & Maine Railroad; Boston & Lowell Railroad; Boston Railroad Holding Co.; Central New England Railroad; Hartford & Connecticut Western Railroad; Maine Central Railroad; New York, Ontario & Western Railroad; Poughkeepsie Bridge Railroad; Rutland Railroad; First National Bank of Boston; Irving National Bank of New York; Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.; and Equitable Life Insurance Co.

William H. Porter, treasurer; also member of executive committee. Member of firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. (E. E.). Director of Bankers' Trust Co., of New York (P.); Chemical National Bank, of New York (W.); Astor Trust Co., of New York (X.); Astor Safe Deposit Co., of New York; Fifth Avenue Bank, of New York (Q.); Guarantee Trust Co., of New York (K.); Title Guarantee & Trust Co., of New York; Pere Marquette Railroad; Fidelity & Casualty Co. (V.); H. W. Johns-Manville Co. (Y.); and Remington Typewriter Co. (Z.). Vice president and director of United States Life Insurance Co. (D. D.). Trustee of Franklin Savings Bank (S.) and Mutual Life Insurance Co.

E. H. Outerbridge, chairman executive committee. Director of United States, Bermuda & Caribbean Steamship Co. His family, as agents for the Quebec Steamship Co., a British corporation, have had practically a monopoly of the steamship business between New York and Bermuda and between New York and the Windward Islands for over 30 years. Mr. Outerbridge is also secretary, treasurer, and director of the Pantasote Leather Co. and director of the United States Life Insurance Co. (D. D.).

Welding Ring, member of executive committee. Director of Fourth National Bank of New York and Security Bank of New York (A. A.). Secretary and director United States & Australasia Steamship Co.

Philip A. S. Franklin, member of executive committee. Vice president of International Mercantile Marine (A.). President, manager, and director of Atlantic Transport Co. (Ltd.). Director of Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co.; National Surety Co. (M.); International Elevator Co.; and Terminal Warehouse Co.

Samuel W. Fairchild, member of executive committee. Treasurer and director of Fairchild Bros. & Foster, chemists. Trustee of Bowery Savings Bank, of New York.

Darwin P. Kingsley, member of executive committee. President and director of New York Life Insurance Co. (B. B.); trustee of New York Trust Co. of New York; director of Citizens' National Bank of New York; National Surety Co. (M.); and Louisville & Nashville Railroad (R.).

Isaac N. Seligman, member of executive committee. Member of I. & W. Seligman & Co., bankers; member of advisory committee of

Audit Co. of New York; trustee of Rossia Insurance Co. of Russia; director of Anglo & London-Paris National Bank; Lincoln Trust Co. of New York; Mount Morris Bank of New York; and United States Savings Bank of New York.

Alexander E. Orr, member of executive committee. Vice president and director of Mechanics & Metals National Bank of New York; trustee of United States Trust Co. of New York (L.); and New York Produce Exchange & Safe Deposit Co.; director of Continental Insurance Co.; Federal Insurance Co.; Fidelity & Casualty Co. (V.); Harper & Bros.; and Queens Insurance Co. of America.

A. Barton Hepburn, member of executive committee. Chairman of board of directors of Chase National Bank of New York (O.); director of Bankers' Trust Co. of New York (P.); Columbia-Knickerbocker Trust Co. of New York; First National Bank of New York (C. C.); First Security Co. of New York; Fidelity Trust Co. of Newark, N. J.; Maryland Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md.; New York Life Insurance Co. (B. B.); American Cotton Oil Co.; F. W. Woolworth & Co.; Remington Typewriter Co. (Z.); Safety Car Heating & Lighting Co.; United Cigar Manufacturing Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Studebaker Corporation; and American Car & Foundry Co.

John Claflin, member of executive committee. President and director of H. B. Claflin Co.; trustee of Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co.; Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.) of London; United States Trust Co. of New York; and Palatine Insurance Co. (Ltd.) of London; director of Commercial Union Fire Insurance Co. of New York; German-American Insurance Co.; Home Insurance Co.; New York Life Insurance Co.; Astor Trust Co. of New York; Morristown Trust Co.; National Bank of Commerce of New York; and New York Life Insurance & Trust Co.

The committees of the chamber of commerce contain such names as:

Alexander J. Hemphill, president of the Guarantee Trust Co. of New York, and connected with numerous other large banking institutions.

Mortimer L. Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., bankers, and connected with many other banking and railroad companies.

Joseph B. Martindale, president of the Chemical National Bank of New York, and connected with many other large banking institutions.

Walter E. Frew, president of the Corn Exchange Bank and connected with other banks.

The committee on harbor and shipping has for its chairman, P. A. S. Franklin, vice president of the International Mercantile Marine. The other members of this committee are Herman Winter, an official of the Cunard Line; L. B. Stoddart, vice president and director of Bowering & Co., who own and operate the Red Cross Line, a British steamship company; Charles Sooysmith, civil engineer; Gustav Lindenthal, civil engineer; Charles D. Norton, president of the First National Bank of New York; and McDougal Hawkes, lawyer.

The committee of five that handed in the resolutions of protest against the Government shipping bill had for its chairman Irving T. Bush, president of the Bush Terminals, which depends for its existence on the foreign steamship lines which use their docks and wharves.

This committee also included:

George B. Dearborn, president of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., which is unalterably opposed to the idea of more steamship facilities except of its own.

Jacob W. Miller, formerly of the New England Navigation Co., but now vice president of the Cape Cod Canal Co., built by August Belmont & Co., bankers. It may be well to mention that the charges of the Cape Cod Canal Co. for tolls are so high that there is a considerable agitation for the Government to step in and take charge of it.

You will therefore see that the resolutions which the New York Chamber of Commerce passed against the shipping bill are in effect the resolutions of Wall Street and the shipping interests in their most concrete form. I venture to say that the facts shown by this list of officers of the New York Chamber of Commerce and the shipping companies and railroad companies and banking institutions in which they are directors, and in which they interlock to such a large extent, will be a surprise to most of the Members of Congress.

You will note that I have also shown the larger of the manufacturing corporations in which some of the officers of the chamber of commerce are directors. My reason for this is that a few days ago some of the papers published reports to the effect that the manufacturers of the country were against the shipping bill. It would indeed be strange if the manufacturers were opposed to this bill which has for its object improvement of shipping facilities and lowering of freight rates, all of which would be decidedly for the benefit of the manufacturers. But when you note that the manufacturers who have declared themselves against the bill are controlled by Wall Street interests their action is not so strange.

Regarding the Boston Maritime Association, the membership of that association is of the same nature as that of the New York Maritime Association. It consists of the shipping people of Boston, including officials of the foreign steamship lines. They naturally are opposed to the possible competition of a Government merchant marine.

I have before me a copy of their protest, and it is like all of the protests that I have seen against this bill, very much involved and without merit. It states the same fallacies as contained in the minority report of Senator BURTON; in fact, it appears to me that the minority report made use of the Boston Maritime Association protest for much of its argument.

Yours, very truly, PHILIP MANSON.

I received this letter from Mr. Bush, which explains itself:

BUSH TERMINAL CO.,
100 Broad Street, New York, January 19, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose a copy of the report of the special committee on merchant marine to the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.

In so doing I desire to make it clear that the report was not adopted by the chamber, and therefore represents only the views of the committee, which was composed of men acquainted with shipping matters, but without selfish interest in vessels in foreign trade.

Yours, very truly,

IRVING T. BUSH.

So I wrote Mr. Manson that he must be mistaken about the report being adopted or the resolutions passed. He replied as follows:

THE ATLANTIC COAST STEAMSHIP CO. (LTD.),
290 Broadway, New York, January 21, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of January 20 received, for which I thank you.

Relative to the action taken by the New York Chamber of Commerce on the shipping bill, the newspapers last Friday featured the fact that the New York Chamber of Commerce, according to action taken at their meeting the day previous, was opposed to the shipping bill.

I to-day called on the assistant secretary of the chamber, and he confirmed the fact that a resolution introduced by Mr. Bush had been voted upon and adopted. He read to me Mr. Bush's resolution, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York is opposed to the so-called Alexander bill and is opposed to its enactment."

Mr. Gwynne, the assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce, with whom I talked, explained to me that the Bush report consisted of two sections—one declaring that the chamber was opposed to the shipping bill, and the other recommending certain substitute plans to take the place of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Gwynne said that the portion of the report that disapproved of the shipping bill was voted on and adopted. That part that recommended certain substitutes for the shipping bill was referred back to the committee. It is being revised and will be acted upon at a special meeting of the chamber next Thursday.

In view of the foregoing I think that the only change necessary in my statement under that head is to change it to read:

"You will therefore see that the resolution which the New York Chamber of Commerce passed against the shipping bill is, in effect, the resolution of * * *, etc."

Also to change the word "resolutions" on the first line of page 9 of my letter to the singular.

I noticed a certain degree of uneasiness in the chamber officials' discussion of the matter with me. Mr. Gwynne tried to minimize the importance of the chamber's favorable action on Mr. Bush's resolution. I think their action of last Thursday is meeting with some objection among the membership.

As to Mr. Bush's statement that his committee "was composed of men * * * without selfish interest in vessels in the foreign trade," these are the facts:

Mr. Bush is the head of the Bush Terminals (docks and warehouses), which are used by the following steamship lines, all of which are strongly opposed to the shipping bill for perfectly obvious reasons:

American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., Russian-American Line, American Exporters' Line, Austro-Americana Steamship Co., Societa Anonima Trasporti Mestre, America-Levant Line, American & Manchurian Line, American & Australian Line, Norton Line, American & African Steamship Line, American & Indian Steamship Line, Dutch East Indies Line, Lloyd Brazileiro, Prince Line, Funch, Edye & Co. Lines, Royal Dutch West India Mail Line.

There may be more lines using Mr. Bush's docks and warehouses, but the above are sufficient to indicate that Mr. Bush's position in this matter is not totally disinterested.

Mr. George S. Dearborn is the head of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., which, as you will note from the above list, uses Mr. Bush's terminals. Mr. Dearborn's steamship company is benefiting tremendously from the present shipping situation, and is hardly likely to approve of additional steamship facilities.

Mr. Jacob W. Miller, formerly of the New England Navigation Co. (New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R.), and now of August Belmont & Co. and the active head of the Cape Cod Canal Co., which may have to fight being taken over by the Government because of the high tolls they are charging, is naturally adverse to a Government merchant marine.

The other two members of the committee, Mr. William Harris Douglas and Mr. J. Temple Gwathmey, so far as I know, have no particular knowledge of or interest in shipping. For them to conform to the views of the three members of the committee who do know the shipping business is entirely natural.

Yours, very truly, PHILIP MANSON.

On the 22d of January Mr. Manson wrote as follows:

THE ATLANTIC COAST STEAMSHIP CO. (LTD.),
290 Broadway, New York, January 22, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I inclose a copy of the shipping report of the special committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce. They are, of course, unalterably opposed to a Government merchant marine, but in trying to make out their case they have rather helped the cause of the shipping bill.

The failure of the chamber to adopt the suggestions made in the report was because of that. It was undoubtedly a surprise to the powers that be in the chamber to have this committee repudiate the time-honored Republican doctrine that a subsidy is absolutely essential for the revival of the American merchant marine, and the correlated fiction as to the high cost of operating American vessels. According to the published accounts of the meeting last Thursday there was much objection to this part of the report.

The report says that the only vital thing necessary to induce private capital to establish an American merchant marine is for the Government to guarantee the bonds of steamship companies "whose character and standing entitle them to it." They modestly refrain from saying who might qualify.

I have always maintained, based on my own experience, that there is not over 10 per cent to 15 per cent difference in operating costs between American and foreign passenger ships, and the difference is much less for cargo boats. Now the chamber of commerce committee confirms my contention.

I believe that the subsidists' claims, which they made with such positive assurance, that it costs from 40 per cent to 50 per cent more to operate American vessels, caused Secretary McAdoo, at the House hearings on the Alexander bill, and the President in his last message, to say the Government line might run at a loss for a time. The opponents of the bill have seized on this to call the bill a "disguised subsidy." Now that there is a statement from this expert committee, unfriendly to the bill yet disproving the Republicans' claim of much greater operating costs of American ships, their pretext for calling the shipping bill a "disguised subsidy" may be disposed of.

It is an absolute certainty that, if this bill is passed, the Government line will be a big financial success, assuming, of course, that competent people are in charge, and there need be no difficulty on that score.

Yours, very truly,

PHILIP MANSON.

On the 27th came more light on the shifting position of the chamber of commerce, as shown by Mr. Manson's letter of the 26th, as follows, inclosing a clipping from the Times. He says:

THE ATLANTIC COAST STEAMSHIP CO. (LTD.),
290 Broadway, New York, January 26, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER.
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I inclose clipping from to-day's New York Times containing a summary of the revised report to be submitted by the special committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce on Thursday.

Inasmuch as the shipping bill's opponents are making much capital of the opposition to the bill by certain chambers of commerce, and the newspapers opposed to the bill are basing editorials on such actions, I thought it well to point out to you that the New York Chamber of Commerce committee has turned a complete somersault on the most important points in their original report.

Their original report, repeatedly and with much detail, showed the falsity of the subsidists' claim that it costs from 40 per cent to 50 per cent more to operate vessels under the American flag; that in fact the difference was 5 per cent to 10 per cent only. The report showed that because of this false belief as to the greatly increased cost of operating American vessels, American investors have been scared away from shipping investments. The report repeatedly stated that a subsidy was not necessary; that only Government guarantee of private shipping companies' bonds would enable sufficient capital to be secured with which to establish an American merchant marine.

The revised report, signed by the same men, now says that our shipping industry can not be placed on a successful basis without subsidies, and proposes "a central board to ascertain, within a very few dollars, the exact difference in cost, ship by ship and voyage by voyage, between the operation of a vessel under the American flag and under any foreign flag." The report continues: "Much as this committee would like to believe that our merchant marine can be reinstated with a smaller amount of Government aid than this report proposes, as men of experience, and looking all facts in the face, the committee is bound to say that, in its opinion, nothing substantially less than is contemplated by this plan can be expected with any sort of confidence to bring about satisfactory results on an adequate scale."

The foregoing is heralded as their answer to Secretary McAdoo's challenge in his Chicago speech for opponents to offer a practicable substitute for the present shipping bill.

It will, of course, have occurred to you that before their plan can be acted upon it will be necessary to wait until shipping conditions and freight rates become normal, as it would be quite useless for the "central board" to work with present rates and conditions.

Rates and conditions will not be normal until a long time after the war ends; no one knows how long that will be. So even if one were to give serious attention to the recommendations of this committee, which so completely reverses itself, their plan is not a practicable one, and I believe that Secretary McAdoo and also you in the Senate called for a practicable plan.

Anything to delay action is the aim of the opposition. When the Alexander bill was up last session they said: "Put it over until the next session." Had action been taken then, the Government merchant marine would have been in operation to-day. Now they say: "Postpone action until next December." (See New York Sun, Jan. 9, clipping inclosed.)

I am sorry to have troubled you to return the copy of the Journal of Commerce letter. The notation to return which it bore was an old one. The Journal of Commerce did not publish that letter. That, however, doesn't alter the facts it contains.

In case they contain facts for you not previously stated, I inclose copies of recent letters to the New York Times and the New York Sun, neither of which were published, although letters opposing the bill find instant publication in those papers.

Yours, very truly, PHILIP MANSON.

In this connection I submit some correspondence which has been placed in my hands by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]. This indicates the activities of certain people against this bill and the methods employed. Here are "influences" which are "outside the Senate," and the country should know about them.

This is a letter to Mr. A. Rothschild, of Newark, N. J., dated January 15, 1915, on the letterhead of the United States Merchant Marine Association, 50 Church Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, *January 15, 1915.*

Mr. A. ROTHSCHILD,
Stengel & Rothschild, Newark, N. J.

DEAR SIR: The administration at Washington will continue to press to the limit of its power the so-called Alexander bill (H. R. 18666), proposing Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels, the Government investment to be $30,000,000 and operating losses many more millions. This is a socialistic scheme, with international ramifications. The dangers to our Government and to private business involved in this startling project are so far-reaching that we believe you will gladly help us to defeat it.

Will you not immediately write to each of the Senators and Representatives from your State and to any other Senators and Representatives in Congress whom you can appeal to—and it would be well worth while to address them all—a special letter containing your strongest arguments and protests against a proposition so obviously and overwhelmingly bad?

It could not help, but prevent, future merchant marine development. No American capital would enter the business in competition with Government owned and operated ships, and, worse yet, Government owned and operated ships could not compete against privately owned foreign vessels. Government owned and operated merchant vessels competing for private business against foreign merchant vessels owned by private interests would certainly cause international jealousy and friction and sooner or later would bring about war, a fact which of itself ought to make this socialistic scheme impossible.

We are mailing this letter to 5,000 prominent business men throughout the country, asking for a good, solid, American protest against this Government-ownership scheme. We should, and would, mail 20,000 or 50,000 letters if we had the funds for stationery and stamps. If you will inclose your check for $10, we will immediately devote the money to spreading this protest broadcast. The patriotic, conservative business people of this country can not be aroused against this peril too quickly.

I give you my personal assurance that we shall leave nothing undone, night or day, to win. Will you not write these letters? Will you not write us?

Faithfully, yours, WALLACE DOWNEY, *Director.*

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. If I may interrupt the Senator, I wish to say that I think that letter has had pretty general circulation. A similar letter was sent to me by a large manufacturing firm in Cincinnati, and, as nearly as I can carry it in my mind, it is an exact duplicate of the letter which the Senator has read. Can the Senator from Florida inform us as to who this association are and whom they represent?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no information on that except, as I say, from their letterhead and the letter of Mr. Rothschild to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], transmitting the letter of Mr. Downey. I really do not know. I have said I have no information on the subject, but I should say I have no information that I should feel like vouching for. It has been reported to me that Mr. Downey was once in the shipbuilding business and he may be so yet. I am not sure as to that. I really can not say as to the association. Mr. Downey appears here, and he signs his name as director.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, four or five days ago I wrote to this gentleman, in substance stating to him that, in order that I might be able to determine the weight which should be given to his protest, I should like to know who composed the association, and what interests they represented; but I have not been honored with an answer to my letter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I doubt if the Senator will get any reply to that. The accompanying copy of a letter to Mr. Downey from Mr. Rothschild reads in this way:

JANUARY 18, 1915.

Mr. WALLACE DOWNEY, *Director,*
United States Merchant Marine Association,
50 Church Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have your circular letter of the 15th instant regarding the proposed shipping bill, H. R. 18666. In reply thereto I beg to say that I am not afraid of any bill which may pass in regard to this matter, as I certainly think that the Government ought to do something about shipping facilities, whether through temporary Government ownership or otherwise, in order to relieve the shipping congestion and exorbitant shipping rates in force at the present time. If the Republican Party when in power had passed the necessary legislation for subsidizing American ships, the present legislation would not be necessary; but any attempt of this kind was always defeated by the shipping combinations in New York. This country did not go to ruin when a bill was passed to build the Union Pacific Railroad, and I do not believe it will go to ruin if the Government sails some merchant vessels to relieve American shipping. I do not feel, therefore, like subscribing to any obstructive campaign to relieve the present situation.

Very truly, yours,

A. ROTHSCHILD.

The letter of transmittal from Mr. Rothschild to the Senator from New Jersey is as follows:

NEWARK, N. J., *January 18, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM HUGHES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received this morning the inclosed letter in regard to the proposed shipping bill, H. R. 18666. I thought it might be of interest to you to know what was being done against it, and I am therefore sending it to you with a copy of my reply thereto for your personal perusal, and with sincere regards, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. ROTHSCHILD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me, I listened with a great deal of attention to the previous letter, and it rather indicates that this man is in favor of a subsidy.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume he is a Republican in New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no; he can not be a Republican, because he said he had no influence there in that party in obtaining a subsidy for our ocean-going ships; but I should like to know whether he regards this proposition as a subsidy, and if it is quite satisfactory?

Mr. FLETCHER. I only know what he states in his letter; but I do not find that he states that he had no influence with the party. He indicates that the Republican Party when in power should have passed certain legislation, and it rather impresses me he would have been in favor of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He indicates that it was his desire that we should pass some subsidy legislation, and he bemoans the fact that the Republicans when in power did not do it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to inquire was this Mr. Downey——

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the last letter was a letter from Mr. Rothschild to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] transmitting a copy of his reply to Mr. Downey's letter.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I recall very well the name Downey. Mr. Downey is connected with some shipbuilding organization, I think, in the State of New Jersey or in Delaware. I myself have received several communications from him, urging that "this iniquitous bill be stayed in order that the Republic might stand." I responded to him in quite emphatic terms, telling him where I stood on the subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is one of the letters, I take it, which is similar to the one I first read, sent out by Mr. Downey as director.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and others have inserted in the RECORD various newspaper articles which signified that the press of the country was all one way. I am tempted to refer to some clippings, which give facts in some instances and opinions in others, which are not in accord with those which those Senators have read. I do not care to wade through all of them, but I should like to insert some of them as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. JONES. If it is understood that we shall take a recess when the Senator from Florida is through, I shall not object to his printing in the RECORD the matter to which he refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida for permission to insert in his remarks the newspaper clippings to which he refers?

Mr. JONES. If it is understood that we are going to take a recess when the Senator gets through, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Florida, and it is agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make the request in order to save the reading, though I should really like an opportunity to read some of them, as I think they might do some good.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to hear them read.

Mr. JONES. I would not object to the Senator reading them.

PRESS COMMENT AND PUBLIC EXPRESSION.

The newspaper articles referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of December 7, 1914.]

5,000,000 TONS OFF SHIP MARKET—LOSS IN SUPPLY OF VESSELS SENDS UP FREIGHT RATES—EFFECT OF WAR ON COMMERCE SHOWN IN TIE-UP OF GERMAN MERCANTILE MARINE—REGULAR LINES HAVE DOUBLED AND TREBLED CARGO RATES—CHARTER RATES INCREASED—SPECTACULAR ADVANCE IN GRAIN FIXTURES.

A total of 5,000,000 tons in mercantile ships have been lost for a time to the world's commercial activities, bringing an era of high charter and berth rates as one of the direct and important results caused by the European war.

With 7s. 9d. the top figure paid for grain tonnage and 20s. per gross ton per month for a general cargo boat, rates for full-cargo steamers continue their upward advance with little indication that the crest of the ascending movement has been reached. Throughout the past two weeks factors in the chartering market have been watching rates increase and, in view of the extraordinary tendency in this direction, have not been inclined to commit themselves as to future prospects. The dominant factors in the present chartering situation are as follows:

First. The complete tie-up of the German and Austrian mercantile marines, with their many ramifications in the seven seas, is an important factor in the movement of the world's commerce.

Second. The continued withdrawal of British steamers from commercial service for use by the Admiralty. This has been variously estimated, but authorities figure that at least 500 vessels formerly employed in commercial services are now unavailable.

Third. The improvement in the foreign exchange situation, enabling the financing of cargoes, creating a speculative activity in exports of food products, shippers being assured of quick and profitable returns.

Fourth. The increasing demand for grain from Europe, it being estimated that export purchases in this country were amounting to 1,000,000 bushels a day.

Fifth. The comparatively low levels at which war-risk insurance is obtainable, removing one of the important obstacles that hampered commerce at the outbreak of hostilities.

Sixth. The reduced services by the regular lines operating to Europe, forcing American manufacturers who have taken contracts for supplying war materials to charter vessels in order to make agreed deliveries.

Seventh. The high space rates charged by the regular lines, berth charges being from 100 to 250 per cent higher than before the war.

Eighth. Owners of vessels available for charter are demanding compensation on a time basis in order to avoid losses in the event of being held up by the British authorities for examination and the probability of delay at the discharging ports in Europe, where the best dock facilities have been commandeered by the warring Governments.

It has been estimated that fully 5,000,000 tons in commercial shipping have been taken from service. The following table shows how tonnage has been affected by the war:

	Number.	Gross tons.
Total German and Austrian steam tonnage	2,438	3,507,331
British vessels commandeered	[1] 500	[1] 1,700,000
British vessels seized by Germany	88	[1] 265,000
Vessels lost by mines, etc.		330,683
Total		5,803,014

[1] Based on reliable estimates.

These figures are not entirely complete and do not include any other losses of French, German, Austrian, or Turkish vessels. It is therefore safe to infer that at least 5,000,000 tons have been taken out of the market.

The total German mercantile marine, including both sail and steam vessels of over 100 tons, amounts to 2,321 vessels of 5,082,061 tons. It is estimated that German shipping of a gross tonnage of 672,475 tons has been seized by the British authorities, while 406 German vessels, with a total gross tonnage of 974,226 tons, has been captured or sunk by the allies. In Russian ports German shipping to the extent of 114,488 gross tons has been seized, while a considerable amount is held in French ports. When the Germans captured Antwerp 32 German vessels, amounting to 114,000 tons, seized by the Belgians, were blown up by the retreating British troops.

The following tabulation shows the actual tonnage of the maritime nations having over 1,000,000 tons in mercantile shipping at the beginning of this year:

	Sail and steam.	Gross tons.	Steam.	Net tons.
British:				
United Kingdom	9,214	18,696,237	8,514	11,109,560
Colonies	2,073	1,735,306	1,495	915,959
Total	11,287	20,431,543	10,009	12,025,519
American:				
Sea	2,696	2,908,457	1,209	1,280,958
Lake	627	2,382,690	593	1,724,566
Philippine	77	46,409	69	27,080
Total	3,400	5,427,636	1,871	3,032,604
German	2,321	5,082,061	2,019	2,877,887
Norwegian	2,191	2,457,899	1,597	1,122,577
French	1,552	2,201,164	987	1,029,113
Swedish	1,436	1,047,270	1,043	551,964
Austrian	427	1,011,414	419	629,444
Dutch	759	1,309,849	662	794,840
Italian	1,114	1,521,942	591	773,818
Japanese	1,037	1,500,014	1,037	956,702

RATES DROPPED WHEN WAR STARTED.

With the advent of the war chartering rates slumped heavily. Many steamers that had been fixed in June and July for August loading were canceled, causing a surplus of tonnage in Atlantic ports. Owners of these vessels were glad to take any rate in order to keep their vessels in operation, with the result that a large volume of tonnage was fixed at figures under 2 shillings for various kinds of freights and voyages. One grain vessel was taken at Montreal to the United Kingdom with grain at 1s. 9½d. This was the lowest rate touched in the downward movement. On last Saturday the highest rate for grain to the United Kingdom from Baltimore (Montreal now being closed) was 7s. 9d.

The downward movement did not last very long, however. It continued through the month of August. The high rates demanded for war-risk insurance were a repressive factor, but when the European governments began to take stock and found that war supplies were urgently needed, and orders began to pour in on American manufacturers, the first improvement in charter rates came into evidence.

The surplus of tonnage gradually diminished and then chartering factors began to perceive that a scarcity was inevitable. This was attributed to the tie-up of German vessels, and it was at once seen that the volume of freight that was to be moved from the United States to Europe would necessitate the use of steamers of other neutral nations. Numerous small Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, Italian, and Greek steamers, that never before had made trans-Atlantic voyages, were chartered on the other side to come here and take away merchandise.

The European Governments, belligerent and neutral alike, took an active interest in the chartering of steamers, so that the much-needed supplies of war materials and foodstuffs could be secured from this country without delay. Rates for full cargo vessels began to advance, and when 3 to 4 shillings was paid for grain tonnage charterers thought that the crest of the advance had been reached. Then word began to filter in that British tonnage, formerly available for commercial services, was being withdrawn for war purposes at a steady rate. First estimated at over 1,000 vessels, shipping authorities now feel that fully 500 steamers, ranging from 2,000 to 8,000 tons, are in the employ of the British Admiralty.

With the volume of freight constantly increasing and the prospects of fewer vessels being available, charter rates continued their upward trend. Starting about the middle of October, rates moved higher week by week without a reaction of any sort up to the present, when further advances are anticipated.

PREDICT 10 SHILLINGS FOR GRAIN.

Chartering factors who were interviewed on Saturday declared that 10 shillings for grain tonnage was a probability before the end of the year, while rates for other commodities would also continue to advance.

When the St. Lawrence closed, recent grain charters have been made out of the leading American ports. New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Galveston are dispatching from two to three steamers a day each with full cargoes of grain. In spite of this heavy movement which has continued for over two months, the demand from Europe has not been satiated. Chartering of grain tonnage during the past week for December and January loading indicates that the heavy movement will continue well into next year.

One factor in the grain situation is that exports from the Argentine will be resumed in January. A cable received by the National City Bank on Saturday from its branch in Buenos Aires follows:

"The minister of agriculture of the Argentine Republic requests you to advise shipowners generally that excellent grain rates will be obtainable here from January to July for steam and sail tonnage."

Additional cable advices to the National City Bank report that the exportable surplus of grain from the Argentine will be as follows: Wheat, 135,000,000 bushels; oats, 75,000,000 bushels; linseed, 60,000,000; and corn (estimated), 40,000,000. It is also reported that the corn crop is now completed, wheat by January 15, oats by December 31, and linseed by December 15.

URGENT DEMAND FOR COTTON.

In the past month the foreign demand for cotton has grown to large proportions, but the volume of chartering has not been very heavy. One of the most important factors in this trade is the movement of cotton to Germany. American tonnage is absolutely essential for this movement in order to secure war-risk insurance. Cotton landed in Germany is worth from 14 to 18 cents per pound, while the average price here is about 8 cents. The factors in this movement who have chartered five American steamers to load during the early part of this month are charging from 2 to 3 cents per pound freight rate, as compared with 30 cents per 100 pounds paid for the same movement at this time a year ago.

Recently quite a few foreign vessels have been chartered to take cotton to Scandinavian ports, receiving from $1 to $1.30 per 100 pounds. The higher freight rate obtainable on grain charters has, however, caused vessel owners to ignore the cotton movement. But with the demand for cotton urgent and shipper seeking tonnage, rates will no doubt advance to a level that will make cotton a competing factor with grain.

The American steamers that have been taken for cotton movement are being compensated on a basis that will yield almost one-half of the value of a good-sized steamer in two trips. It is reported that a small vessel of 1,414 net tons will receive $20,000 a month, while several vessels of larger capacity are to receive proportionately greater returns.

HOW CHARTER RATES COMPARE WITH A YEAR AGO.

In December of last year, with the charter market holding fairly steady and normal trade conditions obtaining, grain tonnage from Baltimore to the United Kingdom and the Continent was obtainable at — 10½d. On Saturday similar charters commanded 7s. 9d. and upward. Cotton fixtures a year ago to Liverpool, Manchester, or Bremen were made at 25s. to 27s. Rates now range from $1 to $1.30 per 100 pounds. Last December general cargo boats were obtainable at 13 shillings. Now tonnage can not be secured under 16 shillings for the trans-Atlantic trade.

BERTH RATES MORE THAN TREBLED.

The regular lines, operating with a fewer number of vessels and sailings of the German lines stopped, have advanced berth rates from double to treble the rates in force at this time a year ago and, in fact, effective just before the outbreak of the war. The following comparative table shows the berth rates effective on Saturday, those quoted early in September when the rates first began to move upward, the charges made at the beginning of July when normal conditions obtained, and the rates demanded in December a year ago:

LIVERPOOL.

	Dec. 5, 1914.	Sept. 5, 1914.	July 1, 1914.	Dec. 5, 1913.
Grain	7d.	2½ @ 3d.	2½d.	2½d.
Provisions	30s. 0d.	20s. 0d.	17s. 6d.	20s. 0d.
Cotton	75c.	20c.	20c.	30c.
Sack flour	26c.	20c.	10c.	14c.
Measured goods	20s. 0d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.

MANCHESTER.

Grain	7d.	2½ @ 3d.	1½d.	2¾d.
Provisions	30s. 0d.	20s. 0d.	20s. 0d.	25s. 0d.
Cotton	75c.	20c.	20c.	30c.
Sack flour	26c.	20c.	10c.	14c.
Measured goods	20s. 0d.	17s. 6d.	15s. 0d.	15s. 0d.

LONDON.

	Dec. 5, 1914.	Sept. 5, 1914.	July 1, 1914.	Dec. 5, 1913.
Grain	7½d.	3½ @ 3¾d.	1½d.	2½d.
Provisions	30s. 0d.	20s. 0d.	20s. 0d.	22s. 6d.
Sack flour	27c.	21c.	11c.	14c.
Measured goods	20s. 0d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.

GLASGOW.

Grain		3d.	2d.	2½d.
Provisions	32s. 6d.	22s. 6d.	20s. 0d.	22s. 6d.
Sack flour	29c.	22c.	13c.	17c.
Measured goods	25s. 0d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.	17s. 6d.

HAVRE.

Grain		2s. 6d.	2s. 0d.	3s.1½d.
Provisions	40c.	30c.	30c.	30c.
Cotton	$1	21c.	25c.	40c.
Sack flour	40c.	30c.	18c.	22c.
Measured goods	$10	$5	[1] 12½c.	[1] 12½c.

[1] Cubic foot.

[From The New York Press of December 14, 1914.]

A BIG MERCHANT MARINE FOR BIG FOREIGN TRADE.

Since the storm of war burst over Europe the disadvantage and folly of being destitute of a great and flourishing merchant marine such as this country once possessed has come home to the American people with stunning force.

We are a trading nation. We trade with all the world. The sum total of our foreign commerce has become a prodigious thing; it grows with the years, the months, and the very days.

In the last half dozen years our foreign trade has risen from some $3,000,000,000 to some $4,000,000,000 a year. Even with the disturbance caused first by the new tariff and then by the war, our imports for the twelve months ending with last September were $1,874,776,939; our exports were $2,218,134,580, or a combined total of very nearly $100,000,000 more than $4,000,000,000.

Now, as we are always to be a trading nation, and as we mean never to be at war because of any spirit of aggression on our part, what an inconsistent, stupid, irrational thing it is that we, who are to be far and away the greatest international traders in all the world, and that we, who are more immune from the natural causes of war than any other great power in the world, should have our vast foreign commerce entirely at the mercy of the other powers.

Just for lack of ships. Our neutrality is of no avail if other powers at war can not let us have their ships to freight our cargoes across the seas. Our stupendous products, the greatest surplus of food or of anything else, can be of no purpose in foreign trade whenever those nations upon whose ships we must rely to carry our exports as well as our imports are not free to sail the oceans.

We have relied upon Germany to carry a very considerable part of our foreign trade, not only as between us and Germany, but as between us and other corners of the earth. The fleets of the allies have driven the merchant fleets of Germany off the seas. And so, though we are at peace with all the world, though we have a surplus of products in all manner of things, and though many peoples in this hemisphere and in the other hemisphere have been beseeching us to send them some of our supplies, we have not been able to respond to the fullest measure of their demands and to the fullest capacity of our supplies, because we lacked those German ships upon which we had been dependent for a certain part of our overseas traffic.

We have had the use of British vessels, or rather such vessels as Great Britain and France could spare for our traffic, and with these we have had to make out as best we could, doing no trading at all with many, many cities and lands begging us to send them food or goods or whatever it might be they wanted.

But conceive what it would mean to our neutral commerce if, instead of England having swept the seas clear of the German merchant marine, the Germans had swept the seas clear of the British fleets of commerce.

And conceive what it would mean to us if there were so nearly an even balance of sea power between Germany and England that the command of the seas were still in question, were being contested on all the waters of the globe. Then it would be as unsafe for English merchantmen to be abroad on the high seas as for German merchantmen.

We should still be neutral. We should still have abundant surplus supplies. The rest of the world would be asking for our surplus supplies, but we should be able to get no ships at all to carry our over-seas commerce.

What a position for a Nation to be in when it is destined to be the greatest trading Nation in the world! What a preposterous thing that its foreign commerce, even as between neutrals and neutrals, should always have to suffer just as if it were at war, just as if it were bottled up as Russia is bottled up by Germany and as Germany is bottled up by England.

But, peace or war, it is economic lunacy to be building the greatest foreign trade of all nations and yet to be permitting other countries to dictate the ocean freight rates, the insurance rates, and similar charges that foreigners might exact from our vast foreign commerce to eat up all its possible profits and advantages.

Conceive, if you will, a foreign trade not of $4,000,000,000 a year, but of $10,000,000,000 a year. It is just as sure that we shall go to the $10,000,000,000 from the $4,000,000,000 as that we have gone in no very long time from a few hundred millions to forty hundred millions.

And then conceive that this vast foreign trade of ten billions a year divides itself evenly, or nearly evenly, into imports and exports. Conceive that it divides itself into $5,100,000,000 of exports and into $4,900,000,000 of imports—or a trade balance in our favor of $200,000,000 a year.

But conceive that to get that trade balance of $200,000,000 in our favor on ten billions of foreign trade we have to pay freight, insurance, and similar charges twice or three times, even four times as much!

The net result of doing that sort of business is clear, isn't it?

If we are to be the greatest trading Nation in the world, we must have a great merchant marine to carry our foreign commerce whenever wars among other powers deprive us of their merchant marines, which are the only bottoms we now have to do our carrying for us.

But if we are to be the greatest trading Nation, and if there are never to be any more wars by anybody anywhere, we still must have a great merchant marine to save for ourselves hundreds and hundreds of millions of ocean freight charges a year which can sponge off all our trade credits abroad and leave us very much to the bad to boot.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of November 16, 1914.]

CHARTERING MODERATE—STEAMERS IN URGENT DEMAND FOR PROMPT LOADING—RATES STRONG AND TENDING UPWARD—SCARCITY OF BOATS AVAILABLE FOR NOVEMBER-DECEMBER LOADING.

A moderate amount of chartering of a miscellaneous character was reported in the steamer market, including several boats for grain and cotton cargoes to Europe. There is no falling off in the general demand for tonnage, and, as has been the case for some time past, the bulk of the orders are for prompt boats for trans-Atlantic business. Rates are very strong and continue to favor owners, due to the scarcity of boats in position to make November-December delivery at the loading ports. Grain freights offer freely, and there is an increasing demand for cotton carriers from South Atlantic and Gulf ports. In other of the trans-Atlantic trades, such as coal, deals timber, and general cargo, there is a steady moderate demand. Tonnage is also wanted for long voyage and South American business, but boats offer sparingly for business of the kind. The sail-tonnage market continues dull, and there are no indications of improvement in any of the various trades, and but little is doing in chartering.

[From Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, Monday, January 11, 1915.]

EXTRA SAILINGS TO MOVE OCEAN FREIGHT—BERTH-ROOM RATES STEADY, WITH TENDENCY HIGHER—STEAMSHIP LINES HAVE DISPOSED OF MOST OF EARLY GRAIN SPACE—MARCH AND APRIL SHIPMENTS TO UNITED KINGDOM IN DEMAND—LINES USING CHARTERED VESSELS TO COPE WITH FREIGHT.

In order to cope with the heavy movement of freight to Europe the trans-Atlantic lines have scheduled quite a few extra sailings during the months of January and February. Inquiry at the offices of various lines and among the large forwarding houses indicate that the volume of merchandise bound to the other side shows no falling

off. In fact, the demand for cargo space tends to indicate an increased movement during the fist quarter of the new year.

Quite a few of the large trans-Atlantic lines have already disposed of their grain space for the balance of this month and for part of February. Grain-berth rates to the west coast of England are holding firm at 9d., while an extra half-pence is charged to the east coast ports. It was stated on Saturday that the recent activity in the grain market portends a continuation of the heavy movement of wheat, flour, oats, corn, and rye to Europe. Sales of grain for export during the past week have been estimated at 7,000,000 bushels. During the latter part of the week just closed, quite a little berth room for grain, April loading, to the United Kingdom was disposed of at 9d. The demand for cargo space to the Mediteranean still continues in excess of tonnage facilities, and on Saturday 12d. was being paid for late January and February loading.

To London the Atlantic Transport Line has scheduled 10 sailings beginning January 14 to February 13. The steamers *Manhattan* and *Manitou* are to be dispatched on Thursday, to be followed by the *Minnetonka* on Saturday. The *Marquette* sails January 20; *Menominee* and *Kansas*, January 23; *Minnewaska*, January 30; *Minneapolis*, February 6; *Manitou*, February 10; and *Minnehaha*, February 13.

Twelve sailings to Liverpool have been arranged for the period between January 13 and February 6. The *Megantic* (White Star), sails on January 13; *Orduna* (Cunard) and *Philadelphia* (American), January 16; *Georgic* (White Star), January 19; *Lapland* (White Star), January 20; *St. Louis* (American), January 23; *Transylvania* (Cunard), January 23; *Baltic* (White Star), January 27; *Lusitania* (Cunard), January 30; *Arabic* (White Star), February 3; *New York* (American), February 6; and *Franconia* (Cunard), February 6.

The Wilson Line is receiving a large amount of freight for transportation to Rotterdam with transshipment at Hull. The *Buffalo* sails on the 16th, to be followed by the *Marengo*, *Ghazee*, and *Morocco* on January 23, the *Aleppo* on January 27, the *Colorado* on January 30, and the *Francisco* on February 6.

To Glasgow the Anchor Line has the following steamers: *Anconia* on January 21, *Cameronia* on January 30, and *Tuscania* on February 13, while the Bristol City Line will dispatch the steamer *Wells City* on January 16, *Bristol City* on January 23, *Exeter City* on January 30, *Kansas City* on February 7, and *Chicago City* on February 14.

Sailings to Christiania and Copenhagen are planned by the Scandinavian-American Line as follows: *Tomsk*, January 16, and *Oscar II*, February 4. The Swedish-American-Mexican Line will send the *Nordpol* on the 13th; *Inland*, 14th; *Sydland*, the 18th; *Preston*, the 23d; *Balto*, the 28th; *Sorland*, 30th; and *New Sweden*, February 5 to Gothenburg. The Barber Line will sail the *Taurus* to Gothenburg on January 31.

Holland-America Line sailings to accommodate the increased movement of foodstuffs to the Continent are as follows: *Zyldik* and *Gorredyk* on January 11; *Nieuw Amsterdam*, the 16th; *Sommelsdyk*, January 19; *Potsdam*, the 23d; *Rotterdam*, the 28th; and *Ryndam*, February 2.

The French Line, Fabre Line, Greek Line, and the Italian Lines will each have several sailings during the month.

Not only from New York is the movement of trans-Atlantic freight very heavy, but also from Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Newport News, Norfolk, and Savannah quite a few steamers are to leave with shipments of foodstuffs to relieve the scarcity in Europe.

The tendency in the cargo space market is upward. The demand for tonnage in the various trades shows no abatement, while the supply of available steamers does not begin to approach the requirements of the trade.

—

[From the Marine News of January, 1915.]

FREIGHT MARKETS OF THE MONTH.

* * * * * * *

No more than a year ago a steamer was thought to be doing well if earning under charter $5,000 a month. It now excites little astonishment to hear of her receiving $50,000. Carriers of grain are now getting 8½d. and 9d. in freight money, compared with 2d. and 3d. half a year ago. The rate for general cargo had similarly advanced from 10s. to 30s.

But cotton has for the time being become the dominant factor. The freight rate for cotton advanced toward the end of last year from 35 and 40 cents to $3 a hundred pounds. To put it in another way, the cotton freight rate is from 2 to 3 cents per pound as compared with 30 cents per hundred pounds paid a year ago.

In the scarcity of tonnage available for the cotton movement American steamers were engaged recently, receiving compensation on a basis that yielded almost one-half of the value of a good-sized steamer in two trips. A year ago grain tonnage from Baltimore to the United Kingdom and the Continent was obtainable at 1s. 10½d. Similar charters have now commanded 7s. 9d. and upward. For general cargo boats which were obtainable at 13s. can not be procured under 16s.

With the trans-Atlantic cotton rate of $3 taken as the basic rate, all other rates automatically rose in sympathy. This brought about its own check, and by the end of the year a falling off was noticed in westbound trade. The employment of chartered boats to carry special exports from Germany, like aniline dyes, potash, and other chemicals, put a further premium on bottoms, while the employment of vessels for relief supplies at heavy prices further enhanced tonnage rates.

Owners naturally held back their boats, waiting higher bids. The effect of this was seen particularly in the Rotterdam trade, when the Holland-American Line, finding that the westbound freight offering was falling off, ceased chartering on the liberal scale which had led them to engage more than 20 supplementary vessels. Tonnage prices became so prohibitive that other intending charterers retired from the market for the time. The difficulty of procuring freight space was thus materially increased, especially on the ships of the smaller regular lines of the neutral countries. Since most of the available space was taken up with foodstuffs and materials which the various Governments were taking for their own use, miscellaneous cargo was shut out and much left behind to congest the piers and warehouses.

Delays in contract deliveries and cancellations of orders consequently served to increase the irritation of shippers. Complaints found expression at Washington through the reports made by the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce to the Senate in response to the resolution calling for an investigation of the advance in ocean freight rates.

The first American steamer to arrive at Rotterdam was the *A. A. Raven*, from Wilmington, with 6,600 bales of cotton. The freight charges were reported by cable to be $10 per bale, or five times the normal rate. The rate from Galveston to Bremen, according to the report of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, is ten times that which prevailed a year or more ago. The rates were driven higher by the alarmists' reports about the navigation in the North Sea, while underwriters show a strong disposition to refuse to take risks excepting at premiums which altogether offset the prospects of exceptional profits. Meantime the great activity of the shipyards in England with orders for new tonnage and the large amount of second-hand tonnage likely to be put on the market helped to strengthen the opinion that the only cure for high freight rates would be the inevitable increase, sooner or later, in the supply of tonnage, the trouble thus working out its own cure. At the end of the year rates were advancing in other routes in the Far East and Australian trades. The South African agents found it necessary to advance their rates, and in the coast-to-coast route the low rates which had been set on the opening of the Panama Canal similarly took a strong upward tendency.

—

THE SHIP SHORTAGE QUESTION.

[Tampa Times, December 23.]

The Savannah (Ga.) News delivers itself of an editorial on the ship purchase bill which is well worthy of perusal. Says the News:

"The Senate Committee on Commerce is going to hold open hearings to determine whether there is a shortage of ships at this time to transport American products. The committee will quickly be convinced that there is. The evidence of it is apparent at this port and, it is fair to assume, at other ports. Practically all of the German ships engaged in the ocean carrying trade are now locked up in either home or foreign ports, and there are scores if not hundreds of them, and hundreds of British ships are in the public service as transports. The amount of American products to be transported abroad is as great as in any previous year, if not greater. No better evidence of a shortage is needed.

"The President is insisting that the Government shall begin the building up of a merchant marine by buying and building merchant ships. His purpose is to lead the way, since private capital does not seem to regard ships as a good investment. It is true, of course, that American ships can not be operated successfully in the foreign carrying trade in competition with foreign-owned ships under existing conditions, but it is clearly the purpose of the President to bring about a change in these conditions. If the Government owns ships, as is proposed, Congress will have the evidence brought home to it as to what changes in our navigation laws are necessary to make it possible for American-owned ships to compete successfully with foreign-owned ships.

"Of course, the Republicans are going to oppose changes in our navigation laws because of the protective principle in them. They have always advocated the building up of a merchant marine by means of subsidies. But a subsidy system within reason can be made to assist only swift, mail-carrying steamers. What this country particularly needs are freight carriers.

"If Congress should appropriate money for the purchase or construction of ships to be employed in commerce, they would be of a sort that could be used as transports or colliers, of both of which the Government is greatly in need. In transporting troops to Vera Cruz the Government had to hire ships at a very great cost, something like $1,000 a day for each ship. The money it paid out for transports in that little affair was enough to build several large merchant ships. So if the President's plan of inaugurating the building of a merchant marine were adopted the cost to the Government would be practically nothing, since when it desired to go out of the ocean carrying business it could turn the ships over to the Department of the Navy, which greatly needs transports and colliers.

"It is doubtful if this Congress will settle this question of using the Nation's money to build up a merchant marine, but it is almost certain that the next Congress will. Government ownership of merchant vessels for a time is the most practical way of sweeping away the barriers that prevent the United States from having a great merchant marine."

THE SHIP-PURCHASE BILL.

Republicans in Congress and the Senate, who are lined up against the ship-purchase bill, are identically the same as those who tried to pass the ship-subsidy bill—a measure that did not propose to have the Government own or have any voice in the ownership of ships. It was a big benefit to private owners, and one on which the Government was to pay the freight. The arguments used for a ship-subsidy bill were that the shipping of the world was inadequate to the task of carrying all the trade of the world, and that in consequence the United States, being one of the smallest ship-owning countries, her trade suffered more for lack of ships than any other country. The further argument was used that the cost of labor in this country was so great that American ship builders and owners could not build and man the ships at as small a cost as other countries could do it, therefore there must be concessions from the Federal Government to enable the owners to exist as a business proposition.

Now that the Federal Government proposes to step in and do for the people of this country and our business interests what these men were willing that the Government should pay to have done, they are opposed.

There is no logic in the situation. There is little logic in anything a Republican Senator, who has always had his nose in the pork barrel, would do or would not do. The whole thing that invites this opposition to the ship-purchase bill is that the measure provides that the Government itself shall build or buy ships and operate them, and if there is a profit that profit shall go to the Government, as would any loss that might occur. This seems to be the only reason for opposition, that the passage of the bill would forever bar the way to any subsidies to private owners.

There has never been a time since the United States became a Nation that it is as important as it is now for us to have a merchant marine. It is an opportunity as well as a duty we owe the balance of the world. We are the only great, resourceful, producing nation not at war, and we are the reliance of all the other neutrals to keep things going along a straight line until the havoc in Europe is ended.

—

[From the New York Tribune, January 20, 1915.]

SHIPS EARNING VALUE IN YEAR—HIGH FREIGHT RATES YIELDING GREAT PROFITS TO OWNERS OF STEAMSHIP LINES.

At the present freight returns for all commodities being shipped from American ports steamship interests are reported to be making large enough profits to pay back the cost of their ships within a year. A man connected with the export department of one of the large oil companies finds that it is almost impossible to get freight room for oil exports to South America because most of the lines formerly going from North American points to the southern continent have been diverted to European trade or are interned. On inquiry it was stated to him that

ships used in European trade "pay for themselves within a year at the present average freight rates."

An exporter found the average freight rates from ports in the United States to various European points were more than $20 a ton at the present time, while for the same lines and the same articles the normal average before the war started was $3.20 to $3.40 a ton.

One textile manufacturer, who exports largely to continental points, had a contract rate with one line. Large amounts of goods were to have been shipped by this line several months ago and were delivered to the agents. After several weeks the shipper found them still on the dock, and discovered also that all other contract goods had been left there, while the ships had been crowded with goods paying the ruling freight rates. The shipper went to the representatives of the Government under which the line was registered. His complaint was taken up after considerable delay, and the line finally was ordered by its Government to take his goods.

—

[From the New York American, Monday, December 28, 1914.]

MR. M'ADOO'S SHIPPING QUEST AND WHAT SHOULD COME OF IT.

Secretary McAdoo's call for information concerning the scarcity of ocean-going vessels, the lack of cargo space, and the high ocean freight rates exacted by those vessel owners who have space to offer should have the widest publicity.

It has a vital bearing upon the question of the rehabilitation of our American merchant marine.

"The Secretary of the Treasury says that letters already received show that the scarcity of vessels is so great and the freight charges are so high that American foreign trade is being seriously handicapped."

This official statement should put a quietus upon the chief argument advanced by certain newspapers—notably the Times and the Evening Post—against any governmental effort to build up and extend our merchant shipping.

To every suggestion for the purchase or building of ships by the United States Government to replace those withdrawn from the lanes of commerce by the war these newspapers have vehemently objected. "There are plenty of ships," they cried. "What is needed is cargoes, not ships. Cargo space is going begging." And so on, until the few readers dependent for knowledge of public affairs upon newspapers of this type might well have believed that there was no need for a larger ocean shipping list—American or otherwise.

Of course anyone with intelligence enough to read the sailing lists in the daily newspapers could see for himself that the course of these opponents of a truly national policy was one of deliberate falsehood. The published sailing lists, however do not cover fully the carriers of 75 per cent of ocean cargoes—the "tramps," or other purely freight-carrying ships. It is among these that war's demands for auxiliary ships and the high rates of war insurance have caused a scarcity of available cargo space.

Mr. McAdoo's inquiry will elicit facts with which the shipping community is well enough acquainted, but which it is well to have in official form. But when he has the facts, what is he going to do about it?

* * * * * * *

When Mr. McAdoo's inquiry has demonstrated, as it infallibly will, that American commerce is handicapped and hobbled by a lack of ships to carry it on, the National Government should proceed to provide those ships. But it should not go about it in a way to provide fat pickings for a lot of favored politicians and contracts a few years hence, when the shipping lines have proved profitable.

"American ships for the American people" should be the guiding maxim; a small group of beneficiaries of public favors are not to be regarded as the American people. What the Government builds and develops it should hold for the common good. The blunder of Pacific railroads must not be repeated on the ocean.

[From the New York American, Thursday, January 21, 1915.]

STUPID AND UNPATRIOTIC FIGHT ON SHIPPING BILL.

In the fight they are leading against the bill providing for a merchant marine the filibustering Senators are fighting against the people of the United States.

Every day that they succeed in prolonging their filibuster is a day lost to American commerce.

This country needs ships. It needs them now. Until it has them its commerce must stagnate. Until there is a way open over-seas American goods must remain in storehouses, or taking the long chance of falling into the hands of countries for which they were never intended and which will never pay for them.

The bill has defects. That is admitted. But defects can be remedied. There is plenty of time for that.

The crying need of the moment is ships. The United States must buy those she needs for immediate use. She must build a fleet of her own as soon as possible.

Filibustering Congressmen and Senators must get out of the way. It is stupid and unpatriotic to oppose the bill. It is fighting against the immediate interests of the whole people.

None of the Senators in this filibuster has any argument to offer that can compare with the argument which grows out of the real needs of the American people.

Here is a case which requires the assistance of every patriot in Congress, which demands the use of all the influence the Executive can bring to bear.

The prosperity of the Nation, now and hereafter, depends on the upbuilding of its merchant marine. Delays are worse than dangerous in this case, they are calamitous.

If the opponents of the bill can not be made to see the truth, they must be suppressed. The fight they are making on an immediately necessary measure is too dangerous to be tolerated.

—

[From the Tampa Times, January 23, 1915.]

PASS THE SHIP-PURCHASE BILL.

Secretary of Commerce Redfield put some concrete facts before the National Convention on Foreign Trade at St. Louis yesterday concerning the feeling of Great Britain and France toward the proposed law to enable the United States Government to purchase ships and put them in the ocean freight-carrying trade. Mr. Redfield, who ought to know, says Great Britain does not object; and from equal knowledge of the condition of the ocean freight-carrying business he is authority for the statement that the shippers in this country are being robbed right and left by the steamer owners.

Dealing with the statement made by various opponents to the ship-purchase bill—it was rather a coincidence that Senator Lodge of Massachusetts was making the statement before the Senate at Washington even as Mr. Redfield was addressing the convention at St. Louis—that the United States is working in the interest of Germany and intends to buy German ships now interned in this country, thus actually aiding the German Government, the Secretary of Commerce uttered a stout denial and backed his statement with fact. He showed that offers to sell outright had been made in any number of instances recently by English and French shipowners, who are anxious to get out of business until their countries are through fighting. "Last week we could get English ships immediately; buy them by cable. I have propositions here now," said the Secretary. "I am getting weary of being told not to do certain things which we never thought of doing."

Mr. Redfield had with him letters and contracts showing that ocean-going freights had advanced as much as 300 to 400 per cent, and that shipowners are constantly breaking contracts and compelling shippers to pay exorbitant advances.

"The Panama Steamship Co. earned a profit of $314,000 from its steamship operations in the 12 months ending June 30. That was after charging 6 per cent per annum depreciation on the ships," said the Secretary. "Extortion is closing American factories to-day and causing cable-stop orders at the time of our biggest opportunity. The violation of written contracts by shipping companies makes the robber of the middle ages look like a public benefactor."

Mr. Redfield said the steamer lines were doing things just now that would land any railway man who attempted similar holdups in jail. He continued:

"Two groups of private interests have asked that we hold up what we propose to do, and when I have asked them in return what they would do I got silence only. They come to me with prospectuses of steamship companies, admirably drawn, and the people are of the highest character and are sincere. When I put squarely to them this question: 'Will you operate a line of steamers that will take into primary consideration the interests of American commerce, that will take into account all the circumstances of the times, the extra cost arising from war risks, the delays, and the extra insurance' they say nothing."

The shipping interests are busy at Washington in an effort to kill a measure which, if enacted into law, is destined to build up our merchant marine and relieve our shippers of the extortion now being practiced.

—

[From the Washington Post, Monday, January 25, 1915.]

PROVIDING AN AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IS A NATIONAL NEED, NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE.

Providing the Republic with a merchant marine to fly the country's flag should not be made a political nor a partisan question.

For more than 30 years the Republican Party has failed in every respect to keep the pledges of its national conventions upon this subject.

The Democratic Party in its years of political power has made no better record as to its promises of a merchant marine.

For more than 10 years the Post has persistently urged action by the Congress upon this subject of such paramount importance to every citizen of the United States, but it was not until the present crisis as to ocean transportation arrived that serious efforts in Congress have been put forth to secure the needed legislation.

The losses in cotton to the planters of the South during the year 1914 would have paid for a score of dreadnaughts and for the construction of 100 first-class steamship freighters, and those losses could have been prevented if the Nation had possessed the ships.

As it is, the people have sustained the losses, and both dreadnaughts and steamships will have to be provided if the survival of our commerce is to be regarded.

Both political parties have been guilty of criminal neglect as to this, and both parties should unite to give the country the very wisest and the best legislation to provide for the present and the future.

Several things are clear as to what must be done if the interests of the Nation are made the prime object of the legislation.

Private capital alone will not and can not provide the country with a satisfactory service. Private capital has not occupied to any considerable extent the field vacant now for nearly 50 years. Private capital is fully aware of the cost and the impossibility of its competing for the world's ocean transportation as against cheaper vessels, lower-waged crews, efficient organization of foreign shipping combines subsidized in various forms by foreign Governments. Private capital in the United States is just as selfish and avaricious as is private capital abroad, and private capital in control of the operations and of rates would mean combination with foreign shipping combines and no relief to the interests of our merchants, our manufacturers, or those of the masses of the people of the United States.

The control of operation and of rates should lie with the Government, and the financial support in some form must be given by the Government, otherwise this country must remain at the mercy of its commercial competitors.

The Post does not advocate the administration measure as it stands to-day. It can be greatly changed for the better, amended, and transformed to serve the country in a practical, permanent, and successful way; and the leaders of the Democratic Party are but delaying action upon a vital national affair if they persist in trying to force the measure through as it reads at this time. They are doomed to failure in any such attempt.

The Republican Party has had 40 years of thought on this subject. What conclusion has its representatives in Congress reached? What measure have they to present as the line of Republican thought and action on this issue?

They have been charged with evolving no new idea on any political topic during the past 30 years. Are they about to plead guilty so far as the merchant marine of the United States is concerned?

They can not afford to play only the rôle of obstructionists to a Democratic bill. Let them prove their statesmanship by offering some better measure, by pointing out the defects of the present bill, and offering practical remedies for such defects.

The Republic must have legislation quickly for the establishment of its own marine.

The Post looks solely to the advancement of the interests of the country and to the prosperity of the masses of the people and considers both political organizations pledged to these results.

Partisanship should be set aside, political considerations promptly dismissed, and the Members of the Congress of all parties should unite upon legislation that will meet the demands of the American people.

[From the Florida Metropolis.]

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

There has never been an opportunity and duty like the present since the American Colonies declared their independence in 1776 and became the nucleus of a Nation. That duty lies along the line of producing and supplying the world with food and clothing and the necessities of life while Europe wars. The opportunity lies in seizing the trade openings all over the world and putting American products of mine and mart and factory into every nook and corner of civilization.

Europe has left the plow and the forge and the machine shop and the ship to pursue the dark death valley of war and waste, and America is the last of the great nations left to supply the world while Europe wars.

What does it matter if we raise crops doubly great, and if our factories increase their output twofold, if our foodstuffs, clothing, and supplies lie and rot in our fields and factories and on our docks and in our storehouses? What does it benefit Europe or us?

There is but one way to avoid such a calamity as that, and that one way lies in the buying or building and operating in this country under the American flag a merchant marine not only large enough to carry everything we have to sell, but everything that must be transported from place to place the world over, to continue trade and industry among the nations of the earth.

Commerce has been the forerunner of civilization. Had it not been for trade there would not to-day be half the globe covered with civilized people that are now representing civilization and human progress and enlightenment. It is trade that must keep the fires burning on the altars of civilization. It is trade that must supply the world with food and raiment while Europe wastes her men and her energies and her opportunities on fields of battle.

No other nation that is neutral stands any show of being able to build, man, and operate ships. It is left for America to do that. Our own prosperity and progress depends on our doing it, and we must do it now.

The Democrats in Congress and the Senate have made a start in the right direction to secure a merchant marine. The ship-purchase bill is not on as broad a scope as it should be, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a movement that means the accomplishment of great things for America, and every American citizen, no matter where he lives or what he does, or what his interest, ought to stand as one man behind the Democratic Party for the passage of the ship-purchase bill, and ought to speak in tones not uncertain as to their meaning and help the passage of this important measure.

And it is the duty of every Democrat to toe the mark and stand by his party in Congress, and by his country, and demand that every Democrat in both Houses of Congress do his duty and pass the bill.

GOVERNMENT SHIPPING BILL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1915.*

Editor WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The opportunity presented to American manufacturers to secure a large share of the business of neutral countries due to the European war should not be translated to mean that the bulk of this business will come to us of its own accord. In each one of the neutral countries will be found most efficiently equipped industries that will prove strong competitors. It therefore behooves us to study the ways and means of securing this dislocated trade in the quickest possible manner in order to become sufficiently intrenched to maintain a permanent advantage.

In the process of developing foreign trade much preliminary work is necessary—an understanding of the particular products adaptable to each and every country, a knowledge of the methods of packing, proper banking facilities, and last, but not least, prompt and regular transportation service.

Our business with foreign nations will not be confined only to staple products, raw materials, and foodstuffs, but to the thousand and one specialties that at present contribute to the comfort and efficiency of our own highly developed civilization.

After resident agencies and wholesale distributors are established and direct introduction to the larger interests is secured our manufacturers will find themselves flooded with small sample orders, given with a view of testing the quality and serviceability of the product and its adaptability to the purchaser's requirements. But one of the most important considerations will be the promptness in delivery, particularly during the present world-wide depression which necessitates buying from hand to mouth. These orders will come not only from countries and important ports where we have at present fair shipping facilities, but from countries and ports where we have directly absolutely none. The transportation cost to many ports are now beyond all possible profit on what would constitute even liberal-sized sample orders, and in many cases the present minimum charge alone would eat up not only all profit, but much of the principal involved so as to preclude making small shipments. But the same products shipped in bulk or large quantities would prove handsomely profitable to steamship companies.

Our larger manufacturers who have for years been developing foreign trade are now shipping in sufficient volume to be indifferent to any suggestion that will overcome this condition, but the smaller manufacturers who are about to exploit foreign markets will find the seriousness of this situation.

The Government shipping bill introduced in Congress will open up at the earliest possible moment avenues of transportation not only to ports now amply covered by established steamship lines, but to countries and ports where such facilities are inadequate or do not exist.

Private capital will not engage in what would be for some time at least an unprofitable proposition, particularly at this time, and for the American people to wait for individual enterprise to fulfill the requirements as indicated would simply mean blocking every effort for trade expansion that is so necessary to the early return of prosperity to our country. The development of the West would have been retarded a generation had not similar foresight been exercised by the Government in its generosity toward the railroads.

Letters of inquiry regarding American products are pouring into importing and exporting concerns from every country on the face of the globe.

Are we going to embrace this opportunity of creating a world market for our varied products, or are we going to allow partisan politics and the selfish interest of a few powerful shipping concerns, not only American but foreign, to prevent the passage of this most vitally necessary law?

When a sufficient volume of business is established private enterprise will be quick to embrace the opportunities presented, and gradually, but surely, will competing independent lines be established to take over the business previously handled by the Government line.

Obviously, subsidies to private companies could not produce the immediate results required.

If this bill is passed, the writer sincerely believes that our international market will expand beyond the expectations of most people unacquainted with the possibilities, and that every trade route over the seas will be regularly sailed by a highly efficient and healthy competing American merchant marine.

WM. T. BUTLER.

EDITOR.—Mr. Butler was until recently general manager of the Manufacturers' International Sales Co., 320 Broadway, New York City.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, January 26, 1915.]

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Baltimore platform made this reference to the merchant marine:

"We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury."

At that time the matter was on the old basis. Everybody favored, or so declared, the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine. As we had once been a carrying power on the sea, it was essential that we should become one again, and especially as sea traffic had grown to enormous proportions, and we were paying some hundreds of millions annually in freight rates to the foreign owners of foreign bottoms.

The controversy was over the method of procedure. How could the thing be done? Some advocated straight subsidies, and pointed to the fact that those nations with sea power of the carrying kind had established and were maintaining it by the granting of subsidies. How could we, it was asked, compete by other means? And by what other means?

This was opposed, on the ground that subsidies were un-American, and with us would lead to corruption and scandal. Better no merchant marine than one established and maintained on such a basis; and old-fashioned Democrats quoted repeated declarations of their party against all policies of a subsidy nature.

The war gave a new twist to the question. Suddenly we found ourselves in dire need of a merchant marine. We had none, and had not the time to build one for the emergency. Hence the proposition that the Government go into the sea-carrying business temporarily in order to relieve the situation, and buy ships owned abroad and now interned in American ports as a result of the war.

The President stands for the proposition, and so stoutly that he is willing to risk an extra session of Congress in pushing it. Many Republicans and a few Democrats oppose it, the former on the ground that it points and may lead to State socialism on a large scale, and the latter on the ground that it is a more objectionable form of subsidy than that their party has been thundering against for years.

While this proposition was known last fall, it did not figure prominently in the campaign. The tariff and business depression overshadowed all other issues, and in large part accounted for the rebuke to the administration administered at the polls. Public opinion has not yet been taken on this question.

[From the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville American, January 25, 1915.]

FIGHTING THE PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

A certain class of newspapers and public men who have favored all the emergency measures adopted by the Government to meet a remarkable situation brought about by the European war are now throwing up their hands in holy horror over the proposition for the Government to purchase ships to meet the emergency in the shipment of exports.

When emergency currency was proposed, these men and newspapers said it was just the thing; when it was proposed for the Government to advance millions to bring stranded Americans home from the war area, these men and newspapers said it was a proper thing to do; they favored any and all measures that were meant to give relief to the money centers; they were so patriotic and considerate of the public welfare that they were willing for the public to come to the aid of any tottering industry or great, though struggling, commercial interest; they even wanted to allow American ships to pass through the Panama Canal without paying toll, and whenever the American ships wanted to hold up the Government for a subsidy they were for it; but now when the Government proposes to purchase ships to meet an urgent necessity these same men and newspapers strenuously oppose it, because they fear the Government will refuse to get out of the business after the war is over.

Those who are fighting the shipping emergency bill are the ones who have always been the champions of a ship subsidy in whatever form it may have been presented. No doubt they would now favor a bill providing for shipbuilding, for then the Shipping Trust would have a chance to get its hands into the fund; but they are not willing for the Government to buy ships for immediate use and to meet the emergency, because such ships would come into competition with privately owned ships which, though inadequate for handling the traffic, the owners want to retain whatever monopoly they have always enjoyed.

The Louisville Evening Post, a newspaper that is sound on economics and democratic principles, calls attention to the fact that the shipping charges have advanced on account of a shortage in ships and the shipping combination, and that now it costs $15 a bale for cotton where the charge was formerly only $1 a bale for carrying it across the ocean; and that 17 cents a bushel on wheat is now the rate, whereas formerly the rate was from 4 to 5 cents a bushel; and yet the eastern newspapers, that paper says, point to "high prices" for farm products as demonstration that the farmers are the most richly rewarded toilers in the world.

The Post gives the opponents of the shipping emergency bill this nut to crack:

"Let them go back to the primal market. Let them go back to the farms and see what the farmers are getting for wheat and cotton and corn and cattle—for all of these food products that Europe is clamoring for.

"They will realize then that a good part of these fancy prices is absorbed by speculators, middle men, transportation lines on land and sea, and that the greatest extortioners are the shipowners.

"It is to break this combination that the President has urged upon Congress the bill to purchase ships.

"Why should we not purchase ships to meet this emergency? We purchased the Panama Railroad, we built the Panama Canal for the relief of traffic, we subsidized with land grants and bond issues our transcontinental railroads; last summer we sent ships abroad for the relief of the interned or imprisoned Americans in the different nations of Europe."

—

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 22, 1915.*

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association in special meeting January 20 make the following presentation to the Senators and Representatives from Illinois in Congress:

"The manufacturers of the Middle West want Congress to pass the ship-purchase bill because they believe that American ships are the only means by which the ocean rate competition can be met. Their foreign trade can not be developed with foreigners fixing the tariff for the hauling of their goods.

"The Illinois Manufacturers' Association has been the greatest agency in the Middle West for the stimulation of foreign trade. It has consistently and persistently kept up the agitation for years. It believes the American manufacturer is about to reap a harvest. Interest is developing in every direction. One thing, and one thing only, stands in the way, and that is that America does not control the ships carrying the American products."

You are therefore respectfully requested to use all your influence and to vote to secure the passage of the ship-purchase bill.

EDWARD N. HURLEY, *President.*

—

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *December 23, 1914.*

Whereas it has been brought to the attention to the board of governors of the Jacksonville Board of Trade that there is now pending a bill before the United States Senate to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, etc., and numbered Senate bill 6856; and

Whereas this organization thinks that this is a bill calculated to be of immense help in opening up routes of trade and getting our products to market: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of governors of the Jacksonville Board of Trade in regular session assembled, That we most heartily approve the bill and urge its passage. Be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress, and particularly our Senators, be requested to use their best endeavors to secure the passage of the bill at an early date.

[SEAL.] JACKSONVILLE BOARD OF TRADE,
CHAS. H. MANN, *President.*
W. N. CONOLEY, *Secretary.*

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to submit a letter from Mr. Sidney Story, of Louisville, Ky., who has had experience and gained a thorough understanding of this subject, particularly as relating to South American business. Mr. Story wrote me on November 16, 1914, saying:

I read in the Cincinnati Enquirer of the 11th instant a report giving your views in regard to the "Need for an American merchant marine." It is not only refreshing, but encouraging to note expressions of this kind from men of your standing and influence nationally.

The letter then discusses the general subject, particularly with relation to South American trade, and I will ask to insert it without further reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICAN TRADING CO.,
Louisville, Ky., U. S. A., November 16, 1914.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I read in the Cincinnati Enquirer of the 11th instant a report giving your views in regard to the "Need for an American merchant marine." It is not only refreshing but encouraging to note expressions of this kind from men of your standing and influence nationally.

We are a Nation enjoying profound peace, with a bountiful overproduction from forest, field, and factory. Our foreign commerce is seriously handicapped, simply because we have no delivery wagons to take our manufactures and foodstuffs to the nations who need them. This plight of ours is indeed pitiable, not to say humiliating.

I have given some thought to the study of this question, for in 1911 and 1912 I made two lengthy visits to South America and negotiated with one of those Latin Governments south of the Equator a mail contract for an American line if installed. The contract was for not less than $500,000 a year for a monthly service, the ships to be of not less than 12,000-ton capacity and 16-knot speed, and three years were given the said proposed American steamship company to build American ships, but in the meanwhile said American company to have the right to use by charter or purchase foreign ships of reasonable speed and tonnage.

There were many other privileges granted in this contract by the South American nation. One of the conditions of said contract was that the American steamship company should at least raise $3,000,000 by the sale of its stock and secure from the Government of the United States a mail contract to Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina.

The dense ignorance of the American people in regard to the need for ocean transportation prevented these plans from developing. The response of business men and shippers in America to an appeal for aid to an American shipping proposition has always been "Let George do it," which means we are satisfied with the service given us by our commercial rivals—England, France, and Germany.

These same smart, intelligent, American business men, who are close figurers at home when it comes to the question of railroad tariffs, display an amazing ignorance as to ocean freight rates in the expansion of our foreign trade.

The foreign subsidized American newspapers have for years molded public sentiment to believe that Americans can't run ships and that it is better for us to employ the delivery wagons of our foreign commercial rivals, who wring annual tribute from our commerce to the tune of hundreds of millions, and by their arbitrary and discriminatory tariffs keep us out of lucrative markets which would be ours if we only controlled the carriers.

Foreign subsidized newspapers, as well as certain press bureaus in this country, financially supported by foreign boards of trade and foreign steamship trusts, have been potent factors in blinding the people of America. Sinister influences have capitalized the prejudices of sections and parties to becloud the issue and make the voters take fright whenever the bugaboo of subsidy or preferentials is mentioned.

The South American nations are as great sufferers as we are. Like ourselves, they have little or no shipping and have been dependent entirely upon the foreign European ocean octopus to handle their foreign commerce.

Since the beginning of the European war it is not difficult to realize that foreign influences have been at work to defeat legislation that would give us relief from the present unparalleled, humiliating, and impotent situation in which this great Nation finds itself as regards its foreign commerce. No sooner is a measure passed by Congress which contemplates the purchase of German ships marooned in our harbors than diplomatic strings are pulled and the bugaboo of international intervention and treaty violation are waved in our faces. This is done to frighten American capital from investing in American steamship lines.

No one is fool enough to believe that we can buy any British, French, or German ships which have been withdrawn from the sea and are now anchored within fortified harbors. The Europeans are not such asses as to sell us their good ships so that America might build up a merchant marine and take possession of the ocean trade routes and thereby accomplish European commercial strangulation. Both Germany and England can better stand a 10-year war than to see America take possession of the trade routes with an American merchant marine. "Uncle Sam," who has been developing some aggressiveness during the last decade in the South American fields, is coming in for a share of this envy and jealousy, and it won't be long before powerful rivals will be trying to clip our wings.

In this connection I beg to attach an interview which I prepared for one of our papers last spring. You will note it refers to the exaggerated reports that reach us via London and France about things generally in South America. I think it would be well worth your time to read this interview.

The European nations have been indeed clever at the game. Their statesmanship has been farsighted and aggressive, and it has kept pace and, in fact, in the lead of their commercial advance.

With the control of the cables to South America; with the control of native newspapers, published in their own languages in all the leading centers of Latin America; with their European bank system controlling the finances and gobbling up all the federal, state, municipal, railroad, and industrial bonds; and with their control of the news service, which enables them to furnish North and South America with a few items concerning each other after said items were first censored in London; and with the absolute monopoly of the ocean carrying trade, no wonder we have not been getting more than 15 per cent of the immense foreign commerce of these Latin-American nations.

To him who is familiar with the history of America the fact is self-evident that Europe, and notably England, has been fighting America's effort to build up her maritime interests since 1782. You will remember that after the Revolutionary War England passed in her Parliament many drastic laws aimed at United States shipping. She even forbade American ships under the American flag to enter British ports, and our Continental Congress in 1782 granted in retaliation a 10 per cent preferential to all goods imported in American bottoms. This resulted in the development of our maritime interests so that in 1812 we carried 85 per cent of our foreign commerce, whereas to-day we only carry 5 per cent, and yet have 95,000,000 more people in the land, with an annual foreign commerce of four and one-half billion dollars.

The War of 1812 was forced on us because England was jealous of our maritime development. In 1814 we signed the treaty of Ghent practically at the point of a bayonet, which gave us peace, but sealed the doom of American merchant shipping, for the signing of said treaty was conditioned on President Madison repealing the 10 per cent preferential, which, in 1782, had been granted by the Continental Congress and which had built up her maritime supremacy in a few years. From 1814 to 1860 the history of the American merchant marine is full of struggles and disasters, due to the ignorance of backwoods legislators, whose minds are molded and prejudices capitalized by the subtle intrigues of foreign lands, who are determined that America shall remain a vassal among the nations, paying tribute to Europe for the carrying of American commerce. This humiliating chapter in the annals of our country bears out the warning of the immortal Washington, who, in his message to the American Congress urging legislation for the upbuilding of our merchant shipping, said, "The nation that controls the sea will control your commerce, and the nation that controls your commerce will dominate you politically." Every President, from Washington down to and including Woodrow Wilson, has ardently and strenuously advocated legislation favorable to an American merchant marine; but, strange to say, Congress has never hearkened to their appeal. Even now the preferential in the Underwood bill, which would grant relief to American shipping, is hung up in the courts by the foreign European shipping trust.

The present European troubles should teach us a great lesson. The American people, from ocean to ocean, are discussing the war and its effects on American commerce, and I believe the American people are now beginning to realize the humiliating and impotent state of this great Nation in respect to its foreign commerce. I believe the American people are beginning to see that, internationally speaking, "We have been asleep at the switch" and that our statesmanship has been shortsighted.

President Wilson not very long ago, in an address of his, said, "We must build a merchant marine if we want to expand our foreign commerce. If not," said Mr. Wilson, "we must then be content to remain within the confines of our own domestic development." This, of course, would mean stagnation as well as retrogression. President Wilson further stated on another occasion, "We have now reached the time when we must rise to greater heights and take a broader view of affairs internal and external." The President no doubt meant it is about time, for the American people should not be satisfied to remain a nation of peddlers and home traders; that we must cease to be content with swapping jackknives among ourselves, as we have been doing for half a century past, and must step out into the arena of international commerce and build up our commerce so as to build up a trade balance in our favor that will show an annual net profit.

The trade balance which "Uncle Sam" publishes annually of several hundred millions is misleading. Against that enormous trade balance should be charged up the millions we pay to foreign shipping to

carry our commerce; the millions we pay to foreign banks, through whom we finance our foreign commerce; the millions some of our countrymen send to their families in Europe annually; the millions American tourists annually take out of American and spend in foreign capitals; the millions we pay in the nature of dividends on foreign capital invested in American enterprises. When we charge off all these items, instead of a trade balance in our favor we will find a trade balance against us of several hundred million dollars annually, which accounts for our tremendous shipments of gold to Europe.

The conclusion is that the basic foundation of all development is transportation. It is the base of the triangle, of which agriculture and industry are the other two sides. This spells commerce, which is the lifeblood of nations. It is time, therefore, for American statesmenship to realize that government and business must be partners; that international statesmanship must march hand in hand with our foreign commercial development.

We have just built a great canal at the cost of $400,000,000, and yet we have but few American ships engaged in transmarine service to use it. We have built it, therefore, for the use of our foreign commercial rivals, to enable them not only to extend their further commercial conquests, made easier by the shortening of trade routes due to the Panama Canal, but to enable them also to take away from us what commerce we now have. What we should do is to get busy. Now is the time for action. Now is the time when we can capitalize the psychological moment and lay the foundation for the building of a merchant marine under the American flag, without which it will be impossible for this Nation to maintain prosperity within her borders.

We are exporting less foodstuff every year. England is spending millions annually to develop the cotton industry of other countries in order to insure her independence of American cotton. This is simply following out her old policy, which we must all agree is a wise and sagacious one from the English standpoint. England aided and encouraged the development of cattle raising in Argentine in order to insure independence of American beef, and to-day Argentine, or rather previous to the European war had been, supplying Europe with beef, whilst Australia has been supplying the world, practically speaking, with mutton and wool. For some years back England has been encouraging the growth of rubber in East India to emancipate her from dependence on Brazilian rubber. This she can very well do, since she controls a monopoly of transportation, not only on the sea, but on the Amazon. The British East India production of raw rubber to-day equals that of Brazil and is fast displacing the Brazilian produce, because England has practically a monopoly of ocean transportation. In time the Brazilian rubber industry, which now faces a crisis, will be destroyed and the world will be dependent on the British East India production. Following her wise statesmanship, England will see to it that the British manufacturer gets the inside track. Where will Mr. American Manufacturer get his raw rubber? He will be dependent on the British East India production, which will favor the English manufacturer first, and Mr. American Manufacturer will be compelled to close down his rubber factory and remove to England. The only thing that can deflect such a possibility is American transportation, operated in the interest of American commerce from the ports of our country to South America and the world generally.

The commerce is there waiting for such lines, and the rates of freights are profitable to such investments, as evidenced by the dividends recently declared by the Hamburg-American and other steamship lines, as well as by the volume of commerce which flows in and out of this Nation annually.

I will say for your information that you will note from the testimony taken before the merchant marine congress on January 7, 1913, that I was a witness in the foreign steamship trust investigation, which revealed the doings of some of our foreign friends in the South American fields in their efforts to keep "Uncle Sam" out.

I am a member of the New Orleans Association of Commerce and a member of the merchant marine committee of said association.

Awaiting the pleasure of hearing from you, I beg to remain,

Yours, very cordially,

SIDNEY STORY.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, dealing somewhat further with the trade of South America with a little more particularity, but in a condensed way, I desire to call attention to some of the opportunities for extending South American trade.

Argentina is a very prosperous country. It is largely agricultural. Of all the exports of the world to South America Argentina takes above 60 per cent. Of all our exports to South America Argentina takes about 40.3 per cent. That Republic affords an important market for manufactured products. Vessels are needed to meet the demands of commercial interchange. Small cargoes and trustworthy agents, the minister points out, are the main factors required to organize the trade which should be placed on a similar basis of credit as that practiced by European countries. Agricultural implements and manufactured goods of all kinds are wanted, and the minister estimates that the consumption market of Argentina can be increased $100,000,000 over present exports to that country. That market includes unrefined naphtha, wood, iron, machinery, petroleum, furniture, typewriters, machines, coal, steel rails, galvanized iron, woolen goods, pig and sheet iron, cement, locomotives, railway cars, refined sugar, automobiles, steel wire, rail joints, sheet zinc, cotton fabrics, printing paper, electric wire and cables, iron piping, household articles, clothing, and so forth. Return cargoes include hides, wool, quebracho, tannin, and so forth. The laws of Argentina permit the establishment of branches there by United States bankers.

In Uruguay the great packing houses on the River Plata are under American control. This is largely an agricultural country, needing agricultural implements, machinery, and manufactured articles, and goods similar to those mentioned above for Argentina. Both these countries have hides to sell. We could send them shoes, belting, valises, and other goods in exchange.

Colombia and Paraguay have hardwood for sale. Let them have axes, tools, machinery, and furniture in exchange. Colombia will exchange Panama hats, coffee, rubber, sugar, vegetable ivory, precious stones, and her varied products for cotton goods, implements, grain products, and manufactures of various kinds.

Brazil wants a market for coffee and rubber, and she needs conveyances, engines, machinery generally, our flour, and our cotton goods. Antwerp has heretofore taken a considerable portion of Brazil's rubber. We can exchange automobile tires and rubber goods for it.

Venezuela needs our oils, cereals, lumber, and manufactured goods. With these we can buy her cacao and coffee.

Bolivia wants locomotives, which we can swap her for tin. She furnishes about one-fourth of the world's annual output of tin, which has been going to Hamburg.

Ecuador furnishes about one-fifth of the world's supply of cacao. We can exchange cocoa and chocolate for the cacao beans.

Chile would like to sell her nitrates. We can send her harvesters, tractors, implements, and machinery of all kinds, as well as manufactured goods.

American trains are running on American rails on top of the Andes. American steel and cement are found in the high trestles of the La Guayra-Caracas Railway. American tractors are doing service in Chile.

The time has passed when any country desiring to take care of its people and to move forward can ignore its water transportation facilities. As Mr. Kirkaldy, in his work on "British Shipping," says:

A century ago the shipping of the world was, for the most part, employed in supplying luxuries solely for the well-to-do members of society. To-day it is the mass of mankind it benefits.

England has realized this and has taken advantage of every opportunity to provide for this important need. Mr. Kirkaldy further says:

The teeming population of England could be neither clothed nor fed were not foreign supplies obtainable.

Another English writer, Mr. Owen, in his Ocean Trade and Shipping, says:

Seeing that we are an island state, depending entirely, both for our export trade and for the import of our food supplies and raw materials, on our shipping, it is clear that any hostile interference with our vast over-sea transport system might be fraught with consequences of the utmost gravity. If our raw materials ceased to come to us and we were cut off as well from the markets for which our manufacturers produce, the trade of the country must perforce come to a stop; there would be no work, and consequently no wages for the workers; the country would be smitten with paralysis. Still more serious, however, would be any interference with our food supplies, and the mere possibility of such a dire calamity is a "heel of Achilles" to the Empire. Of every five loaves we consume four have been sold to us over the ship's rail; about two-fifths of our meat; considerably more than half of our eggs, butter, and cheese; and so on. In food, drink, and tobacco we import annually about 250 millions sterling. This means 685,000 pounds a day, 28,000 pounds an hour, 475 pounds a minute.

I ask permission at this point to insert two brief newspaper clippings bearing on the question of South American trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, permission is granted.

The clippings referred to are as follows:

GREAT OPPORTUNITY IN SOUTH AMERICA FOR COTTON GOODS—CURTAILMENT OF EUROPEAN MILLS OPENS DOORS—SOUTH AMERICAN AGENT SOUTHERN RAILWAY CALLS ATTENTION TO SOME PERTINENT FACTS AND FIGURES.

Great opportunities for expansion of the cotton-goods trade with the South American countries are open now that the European mills have been curtailed, and a number of southern cotton mills are taking active steps to capture a generous share of this trade, declares Charles Lyon Chandler, South American agent of the Southern Railway, who calls attention to the following figures:

Of the $14,000,000 of cotton goods imported by Chile in 1912 only $770,000 came from this country. Germany, whose trade is now cut off, supplied $3,400,000 and Great Britain the rest. In the same year Argentina bought $35,700,000, of which $5,527,000 came from Germany, over $17,000,000 from England, and only $445,300 from this country. Of the $18,000,000 of cotton goods imported by Brazil $3,800,000 came from Germany, $11,000,000 from England, and only $329,000 from this country. Figures in regard to woolen goods and cutlery into the South American countries show similar opportunity.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE—THE OPPORTUNITY GIVEN BY THE WAR TO THE UNITED STATES.

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: I have recently returned from an extensive journey which embraced Venezuela, Colombia, the Canal Zone, and a number of the islands of the Caribbean Sea. On this journey, through our "sphere of influence," I, like all Americans who travel there, regret the absence of the flag of the United States. We see it flying over our legations and consular offices, but with one exception nowhere else.

War news reached us first at Colon; we found Jamaica under martial law. Our steamer ran dark all the way home from Colon, but we did not sight anything in the way of a war vessel. At Puerto Colombia, Cartagena, Colon, and Panama numerous German steamers were tied up at neutral wharves, but the English vessels went on about their business.

It was a pleasure to learn that a bill was before Congress to reestablish our merchant marine, and now the President has signed it, to the delight of all who travel, especially in the Caribbean and the coast of South America. It only seems a pity that the coastwise steamship owners and other interested parties can not at this time put aside their petty jealousies and all work for the commerce of the seas that is rightfully ours. Everywhere abroad you see American goods in ever-increasing quantities, but all carried in foreign ships. Do you want to travel, you pay the foreigner for the privilege. Do you want to do business, you must do it through foreigners. Why, with this wonderful opportunity caused by the European war, do our people not awaken to the opportunity that is theirs for the taking? Be sure that England, still mistress of the seas, will not neglect to grasp the enormous German trade. At least a share of this is ours. All we need is the ships, and we now have the chance to secure them. Why all this pettifogging about neutrality and coastwise shipping? It is foolish in the extreme, and arises either from supreme ignorance of the situation or from selfish personal reasons. Can we Americans never rise to an international viewpoint; must we, a world power, still be colonials?

There is but one American steamship line trading to Venezuela and the Caribbean, and its fleet is composed of four vessels, the largest of 3,000 tons and 25 years old; the second of 2,500 tons, 30 years old; then two of 1,800 tons and one of 630 tons. It was my good fortune to see at Curacoa three of these, with the combined capacity of 4,930 tons, in the harbor of Willemstad, all flying the American flag at the same time. This line has a United States mail subsidy and is old in the service of the flag and the almighty dollar. It is a well-known fact that since its inception this line has made fortunes for everyone who has been interested in it. Yet the cry goes up continuously—they almost believe it themselves—that it costs too much to run an American ship. The boats go heavy laden with freight and passengers. If they would purchase some of the fine ships now for sale, they could and would grasp and hold the largest part of the traffic of the Caribbean Sea. Why not? They have the money and here is the chance; South Americans, West Indian islanders, all want us to come to them with ships and goods. The business people who understand welcome us, the ignorant hardly know us; the politicians hold us up as a bogy man for their own purposes.

There are vast opportunities in South America, especially in the countries least in the public eye. Brazil, the Argentine, Chile have been exploited and financed to death; but Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador, and others offer golden chances for banking and trade. They want us to come to them, to know us not as the northern bully but as a helping friend. Can we not stop talking and attend to business? Let us sell them the goods direct, not through England and Germany, for our southern neighbors use American goods in quantities, but they are shipped first to Europe and then to South America in foreign ships.

One instance: Domino sugar retails here at 6 cents a pound, in Caracas at 26 cents a pound, and that within sight of local sugar mills whose product of brown sugar retails at 11 cents a pound. And so with other American goods.

We have the greatest opportunity in the world; now is the time to act. Send out men who know South America, the people and their ways, and who speak Spanish. Send many, but send them now. Buy ships, put our flag on them, and do it now. Stop talking and get busy. The greatest chance in the world is ours.

Our ministers and consuls are alert and glad to help—a better class than the representatives of any other country.

F. WALN MORGAN DRAPER.

NEW YORK, *September 18*.

Mr. FLETCHER. The New York Tribune said, as I recall, that if this measure were limited in its application to Latin-American countries it would be unobjectionable.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the question of national defense. This bill is intended to provide auxiliaries for the Navy and military transports. I have heretofore called attention to Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session, pages 30-34 and 41-47, showing the need of ships as naval auxiliaries and as transports at that time. I have requested the Navy Department and the War Department to bring those reports down to date, and I present communications from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, respectively, which give the present requirements. I ask to have those communications inserted in my remarks. They show authoritatively, from the standpoint of these departments, that the enactment of this measure should not be delayed. They speak for themselves and require no elaboration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection the request will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 12, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 22, regarding the pending ship-purchasing bill (S. 6856) and calling attention to the report made by the General Board to the Secretary of the Navy, dated November 23, 1905.

You inquire as to what changes, additions, or modifications should be made to-day to the General Board's letter on the subject to bring it to date.

The matter has been referred to the General Board, and I am inclosing herewith for your information a copy of the board's indorsement.

Sincerely, yours, JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

[Second indorsement.]

JANUARY 12, 1915.

G. B. No. 423.
From: President General Board.
To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Letter of Senator FLETCHER re ship purchasing bill (S. 6856).
Character of auxiliaries.

Returned.

Second. The General Board interprets the first indorsement to refer to auxiliaries which might be obtained for service in war from the merchant vessels that are provided for in Senate bill 6856, and therefore reports as follows:

Third. Merchant vessels which would be most suitable for use in the Navy in time of war may be divided into three classes, viz, (a) Scouts; (b) Cargo vessels; and (c) Transports and hospital ships.

(a) Scouts: Fast passenger ships of not less than 23 knots speed, and of as great a steaming radius as possible.

(b) Cargo vessels: Cargo ships to be used as colliers, oilers, supply ships, repair ships, etc., of a minimum displacement of 10,000 tons, and a sustained sea speed of 14 knots and at least 6,000 miles radius.

(c) Transports and hospital ships. Passenger vessels capable of a sustained sea speed of 14 knots and of at least 6,000 miles radius, and capable of carrying a regiment of at least 1,000 men with their impedimenta.

Fourth. In the light of the terms of Senate bill 6856, of the letter of Senator FLETCHER, and of the department's indorsement, the General Board has no recommendations to offer in this connection concerning the other smaller auxiliary vessels referred to in its letter of November 23, 1905.

(Signed) GEORGE DEWEY.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 20, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter dated January 14, 1915, requesting information as to the number of auxiliary vessels that are required for the Navy of the United States in time of peace and the number of various types that would be required in time of war, you are informed that, in the opinion of this department, the number of auxiliary vessels recommended in the building program, together with those now in service, will meet the present needs of the Navy in time of peace.

As a matter of fact, the Navy of the United States maintains more auxiliary vessels in time of peace than that of any other nation, but by the lack of an adequate merchant marine, upon which other naval powers depend for a supply of auxiliary vessels in time of war, the United States Navy would be seriously handicapped if we should go to war under the conditions which now exist in our merchant marine. All nations utilize their merchant marine as an adjunct to the regular navy in time of war, and, in fact, depend upon it for supplying the auxiliary vessels of their fleets.

The active fleet of the United States in order to operate against any one of the possible enemies will need upon the outbreak of war the following number of auxiliary vessels:

1. Forty vessels for scouting purposes with a possible sustained speed of not less than 20 to 23 knots.

The 10 armored cruisers and the 5 first-class cruisers now in service will be used in the scouting line, and it will therefore be necessary to obtain by purchase or otherwise for scouting purposes 25 auxiliary vessels of great steaming radius and high speed.

2. Five mine depot vessels.

Two are now in service, which leaves 3 to be obtained at the outbreak of hostilities.

3. Twenty-five colliers of great capacity and with sufficient speed to permit of their accompanying the battle fleet.

There are at present in service 10 colliers which would be utilized for this purpose, and it will be necessary to acquire 15 more to accompany the fleet and an additional large number to maintain a supply line.

4. Ten oil-tank vessels with sufficient speed to accompany the fleet.

There are at present 1 of these vessels in service and 2 building.

5. Five supply and refrigerating ships.

There are at present in service 4 old supply vessels that can be utilized and the construction of a new one is authorized.

6. Five hospital ships.

One is now in service.

7. Five repair ships.

The Navy at present has 2 such vessels and it will be necessary to acquire and outfit 3 more.

8. Six transports suitable for carrying advanced base expeditions and material.

There are at present 3 such ships available and 1 under construction.

9. Ten dispatch boats of 18-knot speed.

10. Ten seagoing tugs.

There are at present available 2 large fleet tugs and 3 smaller ones that can be used for work in the open sea. It would be necessary to acquire 5 more seagoing tugs.

11. Five ammunition ships.

One is available, leaving 4 to be acquired.

12. Four destroyer tenders and repair ships.

Three of an inferior type are now in service and 1 new tender is building.

In addition to the above a large number of vessels suitable for harbor and coast patrol, submarine tenders, mine sweepers, and dispatch boats would be necessary for the harbor and coast defenses.

For this purpose the smaller cruisers, gunboats, and monitors would be used, and such additional merchant vessels as necessary purchased and converted.

The Navy has at present built and building the following auxiliary vessels:

Five supply vessels.
Twenty-two colliers.
Three oil-fuel vessels.
Four torpedo-boat tenders.
Four transports.
Two mine depot ships.
Forty-four tugs (two large seagoing tugs, five large enough to be used at sea, and the others suitable for inshore and harbor work).

It will be necessary at the outbreak of hostilities to acquire for naval purposes, by purchase, charter, or otherwise, at least the following number of auxiliary vessels:

Twenty-five merchant vessels suitable for scouting purposes.
Three mine depot ships.
Fifteen fleet colliers.
Seven oil-fuel vessels.
Four ammunition ships.
Four hospital ships.
Three repair ships.
Two transports.
Ten dispatch boats.
Five seagoing tugs.

In addition to the above a large number of vessels suitable for submarine tenders and mine sweepers would be necessary for the harbor

and coast defenses and coast patrol, and in case of a distant oversea naval campaign, which would be necessary in order to bring to a successful conclusion a war with any one of the possible enemies, a larger number of fuel and cargo ships would be needed to maintain the supply line to the base in the United States. The number of vessels necessary to supply an oversea fleet is dependent upon the distance from the base of supplies, and for the most distant oversea field of naval activity it is estimated to be 200 vessels.

The Navy has at present a number of small cruisers and gunboats which are not suitable for service with the battle fleet, but which in time of war would be used for harbor and coast patrol duty. It is the opinion of this department that upon the outbreak of hostilities with any naval power the Navy will be in need of about 100 auxiliary vessels of the types stated above, and would, in case the war necessitated an oversea campaign, need approximately an additional 100 vessels before the war could be brought to a successful conclusion.

In a consideration of the desirability of having merchant vessels immediately available as auxiliaries for service with the fleet, it is considered proper to invite attention to the fact that during the War with Spain in 1898, in which the naval operations were of very little importance when compared to what may be expected in any future wars, the Navy Department purchased for naval purposes 96 vessels at a cost of $11,418,027 and chartered at a high per diem rate 5 others.

The vessels purchased were:

Seven merchant ships which were converted into cruisers.
Thirty-one tugs.
Seventeen colliers.
Twenty-six yachts.
Sixteen vessels of special classes (refrigerating supply ships, hospital ships, repair ships, transports, etc.).

The vessels chartered were four large and fast passengers steamers at a cost of $2,000 to $2,500 per diem, and one tug at $1,000. The four large and fast steamers were used as scouts.

The merchant services of all foreign naval powers are much better prepared by their size, equipment, and organization for naval purposes, to supply naval auxiliaries than is the merchant marine of the United States.

Any steps, therefore, that it may be possible to take looking toward an expansion of our merchant service on the seas will add greatly to the number of auxiliary vessels available for the Navy in time of war, and the building up of an oversea trade in vessels flying the American flag will be of the greatest possible value to the naval arm of the national defense.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

—

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 7, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Further in reply to your letter of December 19, requesting information in connection with the shipping bill, I beg leave to send you herewith a copy of a letter and inclosure, just received from the Secretary of War in answer to your questions Nos. 6 and 7, respectively.

Very sincerely, yours,

BYRON R. NEWTON,
Acting Secretary.

—

JANUARY 4, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying further to your letter of the 21st ultimo, inclosing copy of Senate resolution passed on December 18, 1914, and of a letter addressed to you by Senator Fletcher, acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, I take pleasure in forwarding herewith a statement which has been prepared giving information called for by Senator Fletcher's questions Nos. 6 and 7.

Faithfully, yours,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

—

"6. WHAT IS THE NEED OF THE ARMY * * * FOR AUXILIARIES AND TRANSPORTS?"

In any military movement involving the transportation of troops oversea, the matter of first and paramount importance is the transport. The primary requisites of a sea transport are sufficiency, suitability, and readiness.

It has been demonstrated within recent times that under conditions hitherto prevailing the United States could not expect to obtain a sufficient number of suitable steamers flying the American flag required for an expedition involving the transportation of large armies oversea, and it would unquestionably be necessary to charter steamers of foreign register. It requires no argument to show how comparatively helpless we would be were it necessary to charter a large number of foreign ships at such a time as this, when the largest maritime nations of the world are engaged in warfare and in need of all their resources, while the neutral maritime nations are jealously guarding their own interests. Any legislation tending to foster the growth of an American merchant marine, therefore, would vastly increase the potential military efficiency of our Army by providing a source upon which the Nation could draw in time of great need for its Army transports, officered and manned by American citizens, provided the operation of law would authorize the taking over of such vessels on the breaking out of war, or when war becomes imminent. Such a law should act automatically and effect transfer to the military service from commercial service at a price and under conditions provided in the law itself, together with the crew of the ship and all appurtenances. Aside from the greater facility and dispatch with which a large fleet of transports could be fitted out under such conditions, the efficiency of the personnel of such ships must, of necessity, be immeasurably superior to the personnel of foreign ships, whose only interest would be of a pecuniary nature, the elements of patriotism and sacrifice being entirely lacking among the latter.

In principle the War Department is heartily in favor of anything which will tend to promote the growth of an American merchant marine, as, with such a marine, the mobility of its forces will not be limited and circumscribed by the natural barriers of oceans and seas, and under certain circumstances the efficiency of its forces could be immensely increased by the knowledge that there was a certain and sure source upon which to draw for its Army transports.

The annual reports of the Quartermaster General for the past few years have advocated the advisability of providing new transports for the service, to replace the present units which are becoming old and so out of date as to prove increasingly more expensive in their upkeep and operation; he being of the opinion that the Army of the United States requires as a part of its equipment transports of the most modern and efficient type if it is expected to perform efficiently its required duties at points away from the continental limits of the United States; it being considered just as necessary that the Army be provided with first-class transports as for the Navy to be provided with first-class battleships, if it is expected that the United States is to maintain its proper position among the powers of the world.

"7. WHAT HAVE WE READY, OR WHAT COULD BE MADE READY IN THREE WEEKS, TO TRANSPORT TROOPS AND SUPPLIES?"

The War Department now has 10 troop transports, 1 animal and freight transport, 1 refrigerator transport, and 1 cable ship in commission and ready for service. Also, 2 troop transports out of commission, which, however, are very old and unserviceable, and authority for their sale has been requested of Congress.

It is probable that about 20 ocean-going steamships of American register could be chartered or commandeered and made ready for service as troop and animal transports within a period of three weeks; average capacity for about 1,000 men each.

The owned transports now in commission, as at present fitted, have a total carrying capacity of 11,045 men, 27,301 tons of impedimenta and supplies, 750 animals, and 2,224 tons of refrigerated stores, at 100 cubic feet per ton.

Of the owned ships now in commission four are engaged in trans-Pacific service, including the one animal and freight transport, and three are engaged in interisland service in the Philippines. The cable ship is in service between Seattle and Alaskan ports, thus leaving only four transports, including the refrigerator transport, available for duty on the Atlantic. The total capacity of the four transports now available for Atlantic service is 2,857 officers and men, 5,902 tons of impedimenta and supplies, 200 animals, and 1,171 tons of refrigerated stores, at 100 cubic feet per ton.

—

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 7, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your letter of December 22, in regard to the report made to the Secretary of War by the General Staff, December 22, 1905, appearing in Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session, pages 41 to 47, on the subject of "The Army's need of merchant steamships as transports in war," I have the honor to advise you that that report is equally applicable to conditions to-day, except that our tonnage, under the stimulus of recent legislation, has since September 1, 1914, been increased by 50 vessels of 4,000 tons or more, making an increase in total gross tonnage of 263,954 tons.

Of merchant steamships of American registry of 4,000 tons or more gross tonnage there are now on the Atlantic 70, with a total gross tonnage of 435,539 and capacity to transport a total of 95,000 men.

On the Pacific there are 23, with a total gross tonnage of 191,073 and capacity to transport a total of 42,000 men.

Assuming these ships to be engaged in foreign trade, there exists the same probability, formerly referred to, of not more than one-third of them being available within 15 days. In other words, if the Navy needed none of them, it appears probable that we would be able in 15 days to embark on the Atlantic in suitable ships not more than 31,660 men and on the Pacific not more than 14,000 men.

The fact, however, that the Navy must count on supplying its deficiencies from the same list of ships leaves the number finally available for the Army somewhat problematical.

The requirements and specifications for ships suitable for Army transports remain the same as given in the report of the General Staff to which you refer.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

PREVIOUS STEPS IN THIS DIRECTION.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, last August the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] was taking rather advanced ground in the direction of the pending measure, if, indeed, he did not plant his banners upon its very front line. Senate bill 5259, introduced by him, provided:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines by employing such vessels of the Navy as in his discretion * * * for the purpose of establishing and maintaining regular communication between the east or west coast or both coasts of the United States and either or both coasts of South America.

The vessels were to carry mail, passengers, and freight under such regulations and at such rates as the Secretary of the Navy might prescribe. The Senator introduced a resolution—Senate resolution 317—on the subject, and that resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Secretary of the Navy recommended the passage of the bill, and the committee made a favorable report August 3, 1914, and the bill passed the Senate on August 3, 1914. I think it worth while to set forth the resolution, the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, and the brief report of the committee, because they are all recent and throw considerable light on the question now before the Senate. I ask that they be included in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Senate. Report No. 718. Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

UNITED STATES NAVY MAIL LINES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AMERICA.

Mr. THORNTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report:

We, the undersigned members of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, recommend the passage without amendment of S. 5259, being a bill introduced by Senator WEEKS, entitled "A bill to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and

South America," and being the bill recommended for passage by the Secretary of the Navy in response to Senate resolution 317.

B. R. TILLMAN.
CARROLL S. PAGE.
CLAUDE A. SWANSON.
GEO. C. PERKINS.
N. P. BRYAN.
MOSES E. CLAPP.
J. R. THORNTON.
MILES POINDEXTER.
CHARLES F. JOHNSON.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS, TRANSMITTING CERTAIN INFORMATION ON SENATE RESOLUTION 317 RELATIVE TO A PLAN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LINE OF SHIPS TO RUN BETWEEN THE CITIES OF NEW YORK AND NEW ORLEANS AND THE CITY OF VALPARAISO, CHILE, AND INTERMEDIATE PORTS, TOGETHER WITH A DRAFT OF A PROPOSED BILL TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME.

[S. Res. 317.]

Mr. WEEKS submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Whereas it is desirable to develop and extend commercial relations between the United States and the countries of South America by the establishment of direct lines of communication for carrying the United States mail and for the transportation of passengers and freight; and

Whereas private capital has not engaged in this service to a sufficient extent to furnish facilities comparable to those enjoyed by the people of other countries having trade relations with South America: Therefore be it.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to cause to be prepared, in detail, a plan for the establishment of a line of ships to run between the cities of New York and New Orleans and the city of Valparaiso, Chile, and intermediate ports, to consist of the cruisers *Columbia* and *Minneapolis* and the scout cruisers *Salem*, *Chester*, and *Birmingham*, and that the information requested in this resolution shall include the following:

First. The time required by these ships to make a round trip between the ports named.

Second. The number of passengers which could be carried in each ship as now equipped or with any changes that would not impair their usefulness if required in the naval service.

Third. The amount of freight that each ship could carry under similar conditions; this estimate to include mail as well as freight.

Fourth. The number of naval officers and seamen required to man the ships engaged in the service which is proposed.

Fifth. The probable cost of the service, including the pay of the officers and men employed in connection with it and all other necessary elements, such as wharfage in the cities where the ships would touch, fuel, repairs, and maintenance of every description.

Sixth. The cost of such necessary changes as may be required to put the ships named in condition for such service, in removing unnecessary military equipment and any other changes necessary in order to carry passengers and freight safely and to adequately perform the service proposed in this resolution.

Seventh. An expression of opinion by the department as to whether the above-named ships can be used for such purposes without impairing their usefulness for naval purposes should their prompt return to the naval service be required.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 11, 1914.

Hon. B. R. TILLMAN,
Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: 1. Referring to Senate resolution No. 317, Sixty-third Congress, second session, I have the honor to forward to your committee a report embodying the information requested.

2. It is practicable, by the use of naval vessels, to carry out the purpose indicated in the resolution, and the following vessels will be available for the service, viz. *St. Louis*, *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, *Columbia*, *Minneapolis*, *Salem*, *Chester*, *Buffalo*, *Rainbow*, *Ancon*, *Cristobal*, *Hector*, *Mars*, *Vulcan*, *Cyclops*, and *Neptune* (or two equally good), and the *Nanshan*.

3. The *St. Louis*, *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, *Columbia*, and *Minneapolis* are fast cruisers; the *Salem* and *Chester* are fast scout cruisers; the *Buffalo* and *Rainbow* are transports; the *Ancon* and *Cristobal* are steamers employed by the Panama Railroad Co. to be turned over to the Navy Department; and the others are naval colliers.

4. The cruisers are suitable for carrying only a small number of male passengers—15 to 20 each—and could not be fitted for carrying bulky freight without interfering materially with their military value; but they could carry the mails and a limited amount of express freight and parcels, about 150 tons each.

5. The *Buffalo*, *Rainbow*, *Ancon*, and *Cristobal* are suitable for carrying a limited number of passengers and any kind of freight: *Buffalo*, 20 first-class passengers and 4,000 tons of freight; *Rainbow*, 25 passengers and 2,500 to 3,000 tons of freight; *Ancon* and *Cristobal*, each 74 first-class and 32 steerage passengers and between 10,000 and 11,000 tons of freight. The naval colliers are not suitable for carrying any passengers, but are well adapted to a freight service; the first three carrying 6,500 to 10,000 tons each; the two of the *Cyclops* class 10,000 to 12,500 tons of freight and 2,900 tons of fuel oil in bulk each; and the *Nanshan* about 3,000 tons.

6. The distance from New York to Valparaiso via Panama and Callao is 4,666 miles, and each of the fast cruisers going at 15 knots could cover that distance, allowing 24 hours for delays incident to passage through the canal, in 13 days 23 hours; or make one round trip without stop, except at the canal, in 27 days 22 hours.

The distance from New Orleans to Valparaiso via Panama and Callao is 4,087 miles, and the time for the same vessels to make one round trip without stop, except at the canal, is 24 days 17 hours.

The distance from Panama to Valparaiso via Callao is 2,652 miles, and the same vessels can, at 15 knots, cover the distance in 7 days 9 hours, or make one round trip in 14 days 18 hours.

The other vessels are slower, and will sustain a speed of 12 knots, except the *Nanshan*, which can be counted on for 10 knots.

7. By the use of the *Charleston*, *St. Louis*, *Columbia*, and *Minneapolis*, a fast but very expensive mail service, with accommodations for a limited number of male passengers, could be easily maintained between Panama, Guayaquil, Mollendo, and Valparaiso, with weekly sailings from Panama. A far less expensive service could be maintained by the use of the *Salem*, *Chester*, *Columbia*, and *Minneapolis*. These stops would be best for quick deliveries of mails to the South American countries on the west coast, to Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Paraguay. There is a daily railway express service from Valparaiso to Buenos Aires and Montevideo via the Trans-Andean Railway. The time from Valparaiso to Buenos Aires by rail is about 60 hours, and to Montevideo 72 hours. Allowing four days for the delivery of mails from New Orleans to Panama, and 11 days for delivery from Panama to Valparaiso, the mails from the United States would reach Buenos Aires in 17½ days and Montevideo in 18 days. The time from Liverpool to Buenos Aires by mail steamers running in connection with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. is 22 days, and to Montevideo 21 days, on a weekly schedule. From New York to the same ports via existing lines the time is 24 and 23 days, respectively, with a weekly schedule. There is at the present time a weekly mail and passenger service between New Orleans and Colon. If it should be found desirable to run the mail steamers from New Orleans to Valparaiso, it could be done by the addition of another cruiser, but at very greatly increased cost. The cost of running each vessel is given in the table appended marked "A."

8. A passenger and freight line can, in addition, be maintained between New Orleans and Valparaiso, and a freight line between New York and Valparaiso, making such ports as may be necessary; or a combination freight and passenger service and a freight service between New York and Valparaiso.

For a service from New Orleans, the *Buffalo*, *Rainbow*, *Ancon*, and *Cristobal* could be used, insuring a sailing every 14 days.

In addition, a freight line can be maintained between New York and Valparaiso, using the five large colliers, which would insure a sailing every 12 days.

If the vessels mentioned above for the New Orleans trade were combined with the freighters, a mixed service could be maintained, which would insure a steamer from New York every seven days.

The *Nanshan* might be useful as a freighter between Panama, Buenaventura, and Guayaquil.

9. Due to the engine room, fireroom, and bunker construction of the cruisers, a large number of men is required in the engineering department; in addition, these vessels are great coal consumers, and would have to coal both on the outward and return voyages. Since continuity and regularity of mail service would be essential, it would be necessary to maintain at some point on the west coast, preferably at Callao, either ashore or afloat, a reserve of coal. This need could, however, be easily met.

10. The personnel that would be required for the ships is as follows: *Columbia*, *Minneapolis*, *Salem*, and *Chester*, 9 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 202 men each; *Buffalo* and *Rainbow*, 9 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 118 men each; *Ancon* and *Cristobal*, 9 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 135 men each; *Hector*, *Mars*, and *Vulcan*, 7 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 117 men each; *Cyclops* and *Neptune* (or two others of equal capacity), 7 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 134 men each; and the *Nanshan*, 7 commissioned and 6 warrant officers and 69 men; a total of 114 commissioned and 84 warrant officers and 2,002 men.

11. The cost of changes necessary to fit the vessels for the proposed service would be small. For the *Rainbow*, on which it is contemplated installing five additional staterooms at a cost of $2,000, $3,000 would be required; and $1,000 for each of the other vessels would probably cover the cost of changes proper. In addition, each vessel carrying passengers would need an auxiliary radio installation required by law for passenger ships. This would cost $2,000 for each vessel, and the total cost for the above vessels would be about $32,000.

12. The pay and subsistence of officers and men to man the 14 ships would be about $1,862,444, and the maintenance of the ships, other than pay and subsistence, including repairs, docking, and supplies of all kinds, would approximate $1,774,250; total, $3,636,694.

13. The probable cost of the shore establishment for operating the lines is difficult to estimate at this time. This would include salaries of officers, agents, clerical force, and other personnel, terminal facilities, wharfage, port dues, rent of offices, furniture, and other expenses, and the department is making an investigation to determine this expense. It is believed, however, that it would be but a small percentage of the total cost, as Government terminal facilities will be used wherever practicable.

14. The expense of such services would, of necessity, be relatively large, due to the character of the vessels to be used and the fact that they must be kept in condition for immediate military service if required. It should be remembered, however, that there would be considerable return to the Government in mail, passenger, and freight receipts.

Retired officers or officers on the reserve list, should one be created, would be employed in the service as soon as practicable, and under such conditions the expense involved in the pay and subsistence of officers, as given in the table, should be reduced by three-fourths.

When it is considered that the men will be enlisted men in the Navy, and available for service with the Navy in time of war, the actual total additional expense for personnel for 14 ships would be but $151,244.

15. Should the department be authorized to establish the service as contemplated in the resolution, it is suggested that the question of ships to be used, ports to be made, schedules, etc., be left entirely to the discretion of the department, and the department would make every effort to carry out the plan successfully. In so doing it is considered best to inaugurate the business by establishing a fast line from Panama to Valparaiso, via Callao and Mollendo, and utilize for the purpose the *Columbia*, *Minneapolis*, *Salem*, and *Chester*. This mail and passenger line, in connection with those now in existence from New York and New Orleans to Colon, would be a rapid-transit route between the United States, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile, and thence, via the Trans-Andean Railway, to Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay.

It is not deemed wise to establish at the beginning a schedule that would utilize all the vessels mentioned as available. One sailing a month of freighter or passenger vessel from New York and New Orleans to Valparaiso and intermediate ports would be enough for a beginning. As business developed other vessels would be added, and sailings made more frequent, as the traffic warranted.

The *Rainbow* or *Nanshan*, or both, as the traffic might warrant, would be scheduled to ply between Panama and Guayaquil, Ecuador, via Buenaventura, Colombia. These would carry mails, passengers, and freight, and act as feeders for our freighters passing through the canal and connecting with the mail lines from New Orleans and New York.

As for docks and terminal facilities, the navy yard at New Orleans is well adapted for the purpose, and the New York yard could be used until the traffic warranted renting another terminal. The cost of wharves in New Orleans would depend upon the freight handled, and would, therefore, be included in the freight rates. In South American ports practically all cargoes are handled by means of lighters, the cost of which would be included in the freight rates.

Although it might appear that the cost of maintenance of the four cruisers of the fast-mail line from Panama to Valparaiso is excessive,

this is not so apparent when considered in connection with the freighters. One is necessary to the other for developing the South American trade, and the average cost should be taken. The freighters would begin to pay for themselves at once by taking coal and oil, for which there is great demand, and returning with general freight.

16. The department sees in the plan an opportunity for a twofold advantage:

First. The opportunity for developing a large trade with South America, which is not practicable for private vessels under the United States flag.

Second. The gradual development of a large auxiliary fleet which would be necessary in time of war, and which would be built up and maintained in time of peace without cost to the Government, as it will pay for itself after having once been firmly established.

Should the development of the business warrant, the cruisers used in this service would be gradually replaced by auxiliary vessels vastly more suitable and economical for the service itself as well as for the use of the Navy in time of war.

17. The approximate cost of maintenance of the ships of the lines proposed for beginning the service is as follows:

1. Fast-mail service from Panama to Valparaiso, using the *Columbia*, *Minneapolis*, *Salem*, and *Chester*:

Pay and subsistence of officers and men----per annum--	$597,120
Maintenance, including repairs, docking, supplies of all kinds, etc., per annum----------	790,800
Total----------	1,387,920

2. *Rainbow*, plying between Panama, Buenaventura, and Guayaquil:

Pay and subsistence of officers and men----------	118,840
Maintenance, including repairs, docking, supplies of all kinds, etc----------	81,300
Total----------	199,140

3. Monthly sailings from the terminals, New York and New Orleans, for Valparaiso and intermediate ports, would cost, on the average for each vessel engaged in the service, as follows:

Pay and subsistence of officers and men----------	121,160
Maintenance, including repairs, docking, supplies of all kinds, etc----------	100,500
Total----------	221,660

18. Any of the vessels mentioned for this service can be so employed without impairing their usefulness for naval purposes in any way, should their prompt return to the naval service be required.

19. In indorsing the establishment of this service the department takes occasion to state that the personnel of all vessels engaged in it should be naval officers and enlisted men of the Navy, and it will be necessary to increase the number of men at present allowed by law by the number of men required for this service.

20. The draft of a bill which would, in the opinion of the department, meet requirements is inclosed, marked "B."

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

TABLE A.

Vessel.	Complement. Officers.	Complement. Men.	Passengers, number.	Freight, tons.	Active pay of officers.	Retired officers' pay.	Difference.	Pay and subsistence (men).	Total pay and subsistence, officers and men (6) and (9).	Total additional pay and subsistence (9) and (8).	Maintenance of ships, exclusive of pay and subsistence, including docking, supplies, and fuel.	Total cost of maintenance afloat (11) and (10).	Cost of changes.
St. Louis[1]	Commissioned, 9; warrant, 6; 15.	335	15 to 20	Exp. 150	$40,960	$29,700	$11,260	$221,000	$261,960	$232,260	$226,000	$458,260	$3,000
Columbia	do	202	15 to 20	Exp. 150	40,960	29,700	11,260	133,320	174,280	144,580	197,750	342,330	3,000
Minneapolis	do	202	15 to 20	Exp. 150	40,960	29,700	11,260	133,320	174,280	144,580	197,750	342,330	3,000
Salem	do	202	15 to 20	Exp. 150	40,960	29,700	11,260	133,320	174,280	144,580	196,500	341,080	3,000
Chester	do	202	15 to 20	Exp. 150	40,960	29,700	11,260	133,320	174,280	144,580	196,500	341,080	3,000
Buffalo	do	118	20	4,000–	40,960	29,700	11,260	77,880	118,840	89,140	96,500	185,640	3,000
Rainbow	do	118	25	3,000	40,960	29,700	11,260	77,880	118,840	89,140	81,300	170,440	3,000
Ancon	do	135	(2)	10,000–11,000	40,960	29,700	11,260	89,100	130,060	100,360	113,600	213,960	1,000
Cristobal	do	135	(2)	10,000–11,000	40,960	29,700	11,260	89,100	130,060	100,360	13,600	213,960	1,000
Hector	Commissioned, 7; warrant, 6; 13.	117	None.	6,500–10,000	35,574	25,380	10,194	77,220	112,794	87,414	97,250	184,664	1,000
Mars	do	117	None.	6,500–10,000	35,574	25,380	10,194	77,220	112,794	87,414	97,250	184,664	1,000
Vulcan	do	117	None.	6,500–10,000	35,574	25,380	10,194	77,220	112,794	87,414	97,250	184,664	1,000
Cyclops	do	134	None.	10,000–12,500	35,574	25,380	10,194	88,440	124,014	98,634	120,000	218,634	1,000
Neptune	do	134	None.	10,000–12,500	35,574	25,380	10,194	88,440	124,014	98,634	120,000	218,634	1,000
Nanshan	do	69	None.	3,000	35,574	25,380	10,194	45,540	81,114	65,734	49,000	114,734	1,000

[1] Charleston and Milwaukee same as St. Louis in all respects.

[2] 74 first class; 32 steerage

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the position the Senator then took in furthering his own bill answers his position now and is to be preferred as the sounder of the two. He is moving backward instead of forward in opposing this measure. He then declared that "private capital was not furnishing facilities comparable to those enjoyed by the people of other countries having trade relations with South America," and he proposed to have the Government supply them.

Mr. President, I am reminded at this point of some comment made by Mr. W. D. Boyce, of Chicago, in his very interesting and instructive book, Illustrated South America, page 3, as he was proceeding on his journey to South America, to wit:

I am prompted at this point to speak critically of the peculiar policy of my own country in the matter of ocean commerce, since the vessel on which I sailed was a representative illustration of the absurdity of that policy.

The vessel was owned by the United Fruit Co., a United States corporation, commonly called the Fruit Trust. This corporation owns and sails under foreign flags over 90 ships. These were built abroad, mostly in Scotland, and cost two-thirds of the price of ships of equal tonnage and quality if built in American shipyards. In order to avoid the payment of duties imposed by the United States, they fly foreign flags and have officers who are citizens of and carry papers of foreign countries. Yet our United States shipyards compete with and undersell foreign countries in building ships for foreign navies. This is a United States corporation, selling all its fruit in the United States, and controlling the tropical fruit market as completely as the Standard Oil Co. has controlled the oil business. In the event of war with a foreign nation this Fruit Trust, being a United States corporation, would demand and receive protection for its shore property from the strong arm of the United States. It is rather an anomaly, isn't it? Capt. Lamb, our ship's chief officer, was an Irishman; her purser a Scotchman; her chief cook an Englishman; her flag British; and her firemen, all Chinamen.

Doubtless all the company's 90 vessels are similarly manned.

The questions that arise are these:

1. Why should the ships of a United States corporation fly foreign flags?

2. Why should our Government be called upon to protect the shore property in a foreign country of a trust that has its ships built in other lands?

3. Why should not our laws be so made that it would be possible to build ships in the United States, fly the Stars and Stripes, and officer them with our own brave men?

Mr. Boyce was speaking as a good American citizen, and his impressions and questions are quite natural.

CONSTITUTIONALITY.

I shall not take much time in discussing the constitutional phase of the question. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] finds constitutional objections to the bill. Clearly, it seems to me, the bill may be rested upon the provisions of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution. Congress is given power, in clause 3—

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

In clauses 12 and 13 Congress is empowered to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy.

The Senator's own amendment can scarcely be distinguished from the provisions of this bill, so far as the technical, constitutional question is concerned. I have no doubt whatever as to the constitutionality of the law if the bill passes.

OCEAN CARRIAGE BEFORE WAR.

The war has emphasized a situation which was unsatisfactory before and fast getting intolerable.

An extraordinary man is David Lubin, of California, delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture,

with headquarters in Rome. Patriotic, earnest, sincere, he is a thinker and sees far ahead and comprehends big problems. He was in Washington last August, and he had a few things to say at hearings before the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sweet, and committees of the House and Senate.

Let me read some extracts, first, from Senate Document No. 423, Sixty-third Congress, second session, what he said on the subject of "Cost of ocean carriage" as far back as December, 1913, and January, 1914. Mr. Lubin said:

The slightest turn of the wheel directs the motion of the automobile. The slightest change in the cost of carriage directs the price movement of the staples. The slightest movement in the world's price of the staples directs the economic, the social, the political life of the people. What the wheel is to the movement of the automobile the cost of carriage is to the price movement of the staples.

Then he proceeds, in a letter to Mr. S. S. Pratt, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, to discuss the subject further, and he quotes from Mr. Pratt's letter. He says:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE,
Rome, Italy, December 11, 1913.

SERENO S. PRATT, Esq.,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have your valued letter of November 24, in reply to mine of the 5th and 7th on the question of reporting the cost of ocean carriage for the staples of agriculture. I am pleased to note that you say "our chamber would be willing to cooperate with you in giving out any information that we feel would be of real value." You point out, however, that there are difficulties in the way which would be likely to render the information on cost of ocean freight rates now available of no utility. You say:

"We have carefully noted your comments and the marked clauses in the report (S. Doc. 961). The matter has been given very careful attention by one of our committee on foreign commerce and revenue laws, who has made inquiries in regard to this matter among the agents of the shipping companies on our New York Produce Exchange. * * * It would be extremely difficult to give any definite information in regard to freights that would be of value in publishing the world's price for cereals."

You further say:

"You no doubt are aware that freight rates, particularly for agricultural products, change almost daily and sometimes several times during the day, depending upon the demand or otherwise for freight room. Rates quoted to-day would be only for refusal for 24 hours, and they are constantly influenced by the fluctuating demand for room in the various steamers. * * * Frequently wheat has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel."

Now, if what you say of New York also holds good of the other world market centers, what guide, then, have buyer and seller as to the equity of the relation between prices current elsewhere and the home price? If the cost of ocean carriage influences the home price of the product, and if this cost fluctuates to an extent which makes it practically an unknown quantity, what conclusion are we driven to? What but this, that buyers and sellers everywhere lack the data on which to base their calculations so far as this price-forming factor is concerned? That is to say, that buyer and seller, in determining what they should pay and what they should receive, have to guess the probable cost of carriage in the various ports of the world or simply trust to luck and chance. If this is the case in the distribution of the staples of agriculture on such a progressive market as New York it is surely a sad commentary on the state of commercial procedure in the twentieth century.

Then he quotes from a letter from Hon. Walter Scott, of Saskatchewan, Canada, in which he says:

The subject of the cost of ocean carriage is being given a great deal of attention in Canada, so much so that the head of the Canadian railway board [Mr. Drayton] was recently sent to England to inquire into the question with the purpose of ascertaining whether any action is open to the Canadian authorities which would likely lead to a lessening of the exceedingly high rates in force at present. These rates, I understand, have within the past two or three years been largely increased. The question has become acute in Canada.

Mr. Lubin says:

I think it can be shown that the question before us can not be narrowed down to the limits of one or two countries. It is broader than a local issue; it is broader than a national issue; it is, in fact, an international issue. Nor can it be narrowed down to a mere question of high rates or low rates. The real question is one of steady rates, fixed rates, equitable rates, rates periodically fixed in advance for the principal world's ports and promptly made public.

That there is an adequate basis for this stand can be clearly shown by the following illustration:

Let us say that the price of wheat is $1 a bushel in Liverpool; that is to say, $1 a bushel is offered for wheat delivered at the Liverpool warehouse. Wheat is therefore worth $1 at the exporting ports at New York, Seattle, Montreal, Rosario, Odessa, etc., less the cost of carrying it from any of these ports to Liverpool. Now, if the cost of carrying wheat from New York to Liverpool be 24 cents, these 24 cents will be deducted from the dollar, leaving the New York price at 76 cents; 76 cents not only for the quantity exported, but also for the entire quantity in the home market, for it is a well-known fact that the home price and the export price is the same. But if the cost for carrying be nothing, if wheat be carried, say, from New York to Liverpool free of charge, as ballast, the price in New York should then be (barring deductions for minor expenses) $1 as in Liverpool. So, here we have an example in which the price in New York is $1 a bushel one day and 76 cents a bushel the next day.

That this is no fanciful nor overdrawn statement is shown by the following: In reply to my inquiry as to whether this institute could be supplied with regular reports on the cost of ocean carriage, the New York Chamber of Commerce informed me, November 24, 1913, that as there was so much fluctuation in the rates for ocean carriage the publication of those rates could not be of economic value. Corroborative of its statement the chamber said:

"Freight rates, particularly for agricultural products, change almost daily and sometimes several times during the day. * * * Rates quoted to-day would be only for refusal for 24 hours. * * * Frequently wheat has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel."

It seems to me that instead of disproving the needs for the proposed service, the New York Chamber of Commerce has given facts which strongly support my contention, for here we have an example of the cost of freight ranging anywhere from nothing to 12d. (24 cents) per bushel.

This is intended to show, and does show quite conclusively, that long prior to the war, in 1913, not only had the rates of freight on the transportation lines across the ocean been gradually increasing and were high then, but it was simply impossible to get any quotation that was good for 24 hours on bulk shipments. You could not figure what the freight was on a cargo of grain from New York to Liverpool for over 24 hours. They were liable to shift and change from nothing to 12 pence within 24 hours.

That was the situation prior to the war. We have no reason to believe it will not be the situation when the war is all over, unless there is some way devised for taking this matter out of the absolute, arbitrary, monopolistic control of certain people handling this shipping.

Mr. Lubin made a statement before the Assistant Secretary of Commerce on Friday, August 14, 1914, about a year after this other time, and he again brings that question up. He says:

What is this resolution? Is it a proposition about getting ships to carry our exports overseas during the continuance of this war? It has nothing at all to do with the war, but it has much to do with the question of agriculture, the distribution of agriculture. It has to do with the question of the world's price of the staples, and it has to do with the home price of staples. Say, for instance, that the price of wheat in Liverpool is $1; in other words, the buyer there says, "I will give you a dollar per bushel for wheat." The producer in this country says, "Very good; give me the dollar and I will give you the bushel of wheat," and the buyer in Liverpool says "All right; deliver it right here in my warehouse and you may have the dollar."

And so you see that a carrier is wanted to carry it over the sea, and now if it costs a cent a bushel for delivery from New York to Liverpool the American seller will receive 99 cents for the wheat, or 1 cent deducted from the dollar. If it should cost 25 cents for delivery from New York to Liverpool it would only leave the New York seller 75 cents net a bushel. Seventy-five cents net for what? Is it for the quantity exported? Yes; and, more than that, for the remaining quantity that is left in the home market. For the export price for the staples is the home price likewise, and right here we see there is a great difference between the price-fixing mode of the staples and the price-fixing mode of the manufactures. The cost of carriage on neckties or shoes may advance or decline, but that cost of carriage will not increase or diminish the home or foreign price of all other neckties or shoes. But in the case of the staples of agriculture, inasmuch as they are sold in the bourses, pits, or exchanges, which are practically the world's megaphones, speaking to one another, it thus follows that an increase or decrease in the cost of carriage has an immediate and direct effect in the home market and an indirect effect in the world's price. And this I tried to explain at the last joint meeting that we held on August 1, between the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce, when Mr. Harris, the Director of the Census, presided. You will remember, Mr. Harris, the illustration I gave; let me repeat it. We attach a hook in the ceiling and fasten a pulley on the hook, then pass a rope through this pulley and pass the two ends of the rope down on a line horizontal to our arms. We take one end of the rope in the left hand and let that represent the home market price of the staples of agriculture, and we grasp the other end of the rope in the right hand and call it the carrier, and then we do this [indicating]; in proportion as we raise the right hand, down will come the left hand, and as we press the right hand down, up will go the left hand. In other words, when you raise the cost of carriage you lower the home market price correspondingly, and when you reduce the cost of carriage you raise the home market price correspondingly.

And so we see that if we give the carrier full play he has it in his power to raise and lower the home price at will, and in the matter of ocean carriage, if there is a combination of shipowners, they can raise and lower the world's prices at will; they can raise the price of carriage and thus lower the cost of the product and then go into the pit and buy. They can then lower the cost of carriage and raise the price of the product correspondingly, and then sell. They can do this, and make so much money out of producer and consumer until they get tired gathering in money. They can not do this with raising and lowering the cost of carriage on neckties, shirts, typewriters, or desks, but they can do this on the staples of agriculture, because manufactured merchandise is transported at fixed rates, with 30 or 60 days' notice of a change of rates, but the staples of agriculture have no fixed rates of carriage at all. The rate can be 1 cent a bushel one day and it can be 25 cents a bushel the next day.

Now, you and I know that a buyer of manufactured goods must figure it all out in buying, the charge at the place of sale, the cost of carriage to lay the goods down. Without such calculation he could not rationally buy. Now, then, how is a man to buy the staples of agriculture or how is the producer to sell it? What is the basis for their calculation? Since the cost of carriage is an unknown factor, how is the price to be arrived at? We are driven to the conclusion that there is no rational way of arriving at what the price should be. There is a rational way for buying and selling merchandise, for the cost of carriage of merchandise is fixed with 30 or 60 days' notice for any change. But in the case of staples of agriculture there can be no basis for calculation so long as the cost of carriage may vary from day to day and from hour to hour.

"Give us this day our daily bread," and the good Lord gives us this bread, but a lot of irresponsible shipowners come along and by

arbitrarily changing the rates of ocean carriage from day to day, and from hour to hour—by doing this, they put a measuring rod on the bread, which in substance is the same as saying, "The good Lord gives you the bread all right, but we, the shipowners, shall determine for you what the size of that loaf shall be," and when the shipowners have that power they have more power than presidents, emperors, czars, kings, or princes upon this earth, and that is too great a power to have. They should have no such power; it does not fit in with the twentieth century. It is not sensible; it is not just; it is not right; and it should stop and stop for good.

That was the condition prior to the war with reference to this subject. There is not only an emergency now that calls for this legislation; there is a prospect ahead of us that calls for it. The condition before the war was getting to be almost impossible, especially with regard to the transportation of freight. As to the passenger transportation, that was controlled by conference agreements, pools, and combinations. Generally the same condition prevailed as to freight, except the North Atlantic freight. The freight moving southward was all parceled out and controlled by combinations and conference agreements, rates fixed as these people saw fit to fix them, and after the war, of course, the same situation would ordinarily obtain.

DEVELOPMENT OF SHIPS AND SHIPPING.

Now, I wish to make some general observations on the development of shipping and what it means. From the Roman wooden ship with leather sails, the Venetian buss, the Viking ship, to the magnificent liner of to-day is a romantic and interesting story. From the expedition of Richard I, which taught English sailors, to the trip of the *Oregon*, the story embraces discoveries of continents and world communication. In the period from the laws and judgments of Oléron, in 1194, to the modern admiralty laws and rules and regulations respecting navigation, the history of civilization and enlightenment has been written. Improvement has followed improvement in design, construction, and motive power, and the great shipyards of Belfast and elsewhere are to-day preparing to build ships one-third larger than the *Olympic* and *Titanic*. The tendency is to overdo size at the expense of safety and to stress speed to the increase of risk and danger.

From the days of the celebrated East India Co., chartered in 1599 by Elizabeth to the Earl of Cumberland and about 200 knights and merchants, it has been the experience that trade is developed by going after it. The largest ship of this company was the *Dragon*, 600 tons. One wonders what the earl would think of the 56,000-ton *Vaterland*. Ships have increased in size on an average of a hundred tons a year.

The American clippers, the fast-sailing Baltimore brigs, were once our pride, and compelled British shipowners to devise new designs. The period of the sailing ship was between 1850 and 1890. The keenest rivalry for the ocean carrying trade of the world existed between the United Kingdom and the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century. American foreign trade spurted ahead about 1830, and by the year 1850 our total tonnage, including lake and river craft, was only about 750,000 tons below that of England. By 1861 the margin was reduced to about 250,000 tons.

After the Civil War we concentrated our efforts on internal development. British shipbuilders produced a faster and better type than our clippers. They substituted iron for wood as material for construction. England repealed in 1849 her old navigation laws, and five years later threw open her coasting trade to all comers. These were the operative causes for the decline of American shipping.

It is worth noting, though our own experience causes us not to be surprised, that British shipowners protested most vigorously against changing the navigation laws and declared most earnestly that they would be ruined. These shipowners had insisted on more and more restrictions. They caused the passage of the act prohibiting any foreign ships trading with the "American Plantations" (Colonies) unless licensed, and in October, 1651, Cromwell's full policy came into operation and the navigation act provided that no goods or commodities whatever of the growth, production, or manufacture of Asia, Africa, or America should be imported into England, Ireland, or the English Plantations except in British-built ships, owned by British subjects, or of which the captain and not less than 75 per cent of the crew were British subjects. The war with Holland resulted. All this legislation and all these provisions were repealed in 1849. It is still the law, however, that the trade from any one part of any British possession in Asia, Africa, and America to another part of the same possession can only be carried on in British ships.

In October, 1849, we threw open the foreign trade of the Union, but retained the coasting trade in its integrity for the benefit of American bottoms.

The trans-Atlantic service as it exists to-day really commenced in 1838 with the steamers *Sirius* and *Great Western*. The auxiliary steamer *Savannah* crossed the Atlantic in 1819, taking 29½ days. The *Sirius* crossed in 17 days and the *Great Western* in 15 days. In 1905 the turbine steamer *Virginian* made the record Atlantic passage in 4 days and 6 hours.

The desire for speed has always been an unfortunate feature of trans-Atlantic voyages. Always good business management has been as essential to success as fine ships and powerful engines. The invention of the compound engine solved the problem of producing a cargo steamer which would be a commercial success. The typical cargo steamer, as given by Mr. Kirkaldy, measures 7,760 tons gross, 4,870 tons net; length, 470 feet; beam, 54 feet; depth of hold, 31 feet. Her cargo-carrying capacity is 10,400 tons; consumption of coal, 68 tons a day; steams 4½ knots per ton; average sea speed, 13 knots per hour. He estimates the cost of transporting a ton of goods 1,000 miles at 2 shillings. Such a steamer ought to be built for not exceeding $600,000.

The authorities say shipping is divided into two great classes—the liner, carrying pasengers, mail, and cargo, and the tramp, fitted to go anywhere and do anything, capable of picking up freight at a large number of widely scattered ports. The tramp is the one great ship which has carried civilization into the remotest parts of the earth by opening up trade routes, and it has never been subsidized by any country.

The English adopted the policy of combinations about 10 years ago when they thought Americans were endeavoring to get command of the north Atlantic trade by forming the International Mercantile Marine Co., consisting of the White Star, American, Red Star, Atlantic Transport, Leyland, and Dominion Lines, the fleet in 1912 numbering 126 ships and moving 1,140,000 gross tons. Out of this precedent amalgamations and working agreements have flourished exceedingly. This "unification of interests" tends irresistibly toward a gigantic world monopoly under the control of the leaders of British shipping.

In the continental and international conference now in operation the procedure followed is based on—

First, a division of areas.

Second, a consolidation of rebate systems.

Third, agreements or understandings that the same rates are to be charged on similar goods from the United Kingdom and the Continent.

The gross tonnage of ships and steamers belonging to the United Kingdom in 1912 was 18,213,620, which, together with 1,660,740 tons belonging to the Colonies, gives a total of 19,824,360 for the Empire.

England has appreciated the importance of a merchant marine. She does a business of $65,000,000,000 a year. It means commerce and exchange, without which the conditions of living for the greater part of mankind would be one of uncertainty. Thereby the luxuries of the rich have become the necessities of daily life.

The land road and the caravan were the original route and vehicle of exchange. The water road, river, lake, and sea was developed. First, coasting voyages were attempted. Then the ocean route was opened up and the countries of the world were brought into touch. Railways revolutionized the land route. The engineer, scientist, and navigator have carried the world's trade to all points of the earth's surface possessing economic advantage.

By removing the bar at Suez the distance between western Europe and India was reduced 4,000 miles. The advice to Philip II that "what God had joined together man must not part asunder" has been recognized as a species of superstition. The isthmus has been pierced, and the distance and danger of voyages from Europe to Pacific ports and countries have been greatly reduced by the opening of the Panama Canal. The cruelty and wrongs of the Spanish Main growing out of the absurd bull by Pope Alexander VI, giving Spain and Portugal exclusive rights on the seas, disappeared along with the recognition that the sea is the open free highway of trade for all the people of the earth.

English shipowners strongly opposed the building of the Suez Canal. Engineers said it could not be done. It took 10 years to break down the opposition. New types of ships were built. The British flag is first among the 5,000 ships which pass through it annually. The time required is 17 hours, and the original £20 shares are now worth £220.

Increased trade means cheaper transports and cheaper goods, raises the standard of living, and furthers the ends of civilization.

The great industrial and manufacturing centers of the world are the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Eastern States of the United States. The great food-producing countries are

North and South America, parts of eastern Europe, and the countries of the Far East, including Australia and New Zealand. The United States is the only country which is not only a hive of manufacturing industry but also produces sufficient food for themselves and a large quantity for export. This means a large trade in the export of both manufactured goods and foodstuffs. What we need are ocean carriers. The countries supplying raw material are northwestern Europe, North and South America, India, China, Japan, and Australasia.

The Panama Canal will give our manufacturers an advantage of 2,500 miles over British manufacturers to New Zealand. All Japanese and New Zealand and Australasia ports east of Port Lincoln will be nearer New York via Panama than to London by any route.

The western coasts of South and Central America are opened up to us. Our own eastern and western coasts are brought into water communication. We are proceeding to deal with that factor in commerce, the rate of exchange. Goods pay for goods in international trade, but the relation is fixed by money values. The bill of exchange is the medium for settling the great bulk of international trade. The price of a bill is known as the rate of exchange, and this is definitely determined by the cost of transporting and insuring gold. Fluctuations and difficulties are experienced with China, because she does not have the gold standard.

Considering this bare sketch of conditions to-day without regard to disturbances by the European war we can understand how it is stated by English authorities that the focusing points of the world's shipping routes now are:

First, that stretch of sea lying between the south of Ireland and Ushant, where St. Georges Channel, the British Channel, and the English Channel all merge in the Atlantic Ocean.

The second great focusing point of the world's shipping routes at present lies between Cape Race and Long Island.

The Panama Canal will give the third, perhaps destined to become as important as the other two. American coal should be stored at both ends of that canal.

An American merchant marine would add to our prosperity, give us foreign markets, strengthen us among the nations and benefit all those with whom we would form friendly relations thereby.

Let us not overlook our opportunities nor shirk our responsibilities.

The passage of this bill means work for our shipyards, steady shipbuilding and ship repairing, putting these industries under full steam, causing their highest development and greatest efficiency, resulting in enabling them to turn out work as favorable to builders as the yards of any country can. Perfection in designs and types of standards have not been reached. We can accomplish as much in that direction as any other people. Private enterprise will be thus encouraged and helped. The trade routes just now are in a situation to be shaped as our trade possibilities demand, and as those entirely feasible are established it becomes simply a question of growth. The development is bound to afford opportunities inexhaustible in extent for private capital. The intervention of the Government while benefiting the producers and shippers of the country will likewise advantage, not injure, what is known as the shipping interests in the legitimate pursuit of their business.

It will be a mistake for which the future will pile up increasing regret if we fail at this opportune time to take proper care of our foreign commerce by doing what will place us on a solid footing from which we can shove out from shore a definite, substantial beginning of an American merchant marine, launched with the purpose that it shall not be scuttled, but that every care shall be taken that the fleet shall grow, increased by private enterprise, serving our country in every capacity needed, carrying our flag and good will on every sea.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of the United Mine Workers' Association of Jasonville, Terre Haute, Newburg, and Hymera, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Bureau of Mines, which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Stendal, Jonesville, and Woodburn, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo and Addison, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the Postmaster General, at his own discretion, to exclude matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Local Branch No. 84, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, of Meriden; of the German-American Alliance of Norwalk; and of sundry citizens of Danbury and South Norwalk, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Stoneboro, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the Army and Navy equipment, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry local branches of the United Mine Workers of America in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Bureau of Mines, which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a memorial of the Professional Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of white and colored persons in the District of Columbia and the Territories, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present practice of issuing Government stamped envelopes bearing printed return requests, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to restrict the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to exclude certain publications from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented memorials of sundry citizens of Aroostook County, Me., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National German-American Alliance, of Lewiston, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Court Schiller, No. 117, Foresters of America of Meriden; of the Hungarian societies and sundry citizens of South Norwalk; of Rev. W. von Schenk and 130 other citizens of Rockville; and of sundry citizens of Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Gavel Lodge, No. 18, Knights of Pythias, of Naugatuck, Conn., remonstrating against any change being made in the existing law providing for the printing of Government return envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on the Upper White River, Ark., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of local union No. 2196, United Mine Workers of America, of Terre Haute, Ind., and a petition of Local Union No. 1967, United Mine Workers of America, of Hymera, Ind., praying for the extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines, which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Association of the First Evangelical Church, of Elkhart, Ind., and a petition of the Epworth League of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the Federal censorship of motion-picture films, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of V. G. Tolbert, A. Heacock, B. C. Strode, and 47 other citizens of Decker, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing a return of a citizen to his own State after his acquittal of the charge of crime in another State, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of Local Union No. 2610 and Local Union No. 2583, United Mine Workers of America, of Roslyn, and of Local Union No. 2747, United Mine Workers of America, of Issaquah, all in the State of Washington, praying for the extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines, which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 201, United Garment Workers, and sundry other labor organizations of Tacoma, and of Local Union No. 626, Culinary Alliance, and sundry other labor organizations of Walla Walla, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Davenport, Wash., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the board of trustees of the Merchants' Exchange of Seattle, Wash., praying for the appointment of a commission to revise the navigation laws and regulations, and remonstrating against the passage of the pending ship-purchase bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the American Federation of Labor, of Philadelphia, Pa., and of Mr. A. O. Wharton, president railroad employees' department, American Federation of Labor, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to extend the boiler-inspection laws, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Union No. 1335, and sundry other labor organizations of Seattle; Cigar Makers' Union No. 113 and sundry other labor organizations of Tacoma; of Timberworkers Union No. 2 and sundry other labor organizations of Everett; and Longshoremen's Union, Local No. 38-25, and sundry other labor organizations of Bellingham, all in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of the so-called La Follette seamen's bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 7459) for the relief of William E. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7460) granting a pension to Anna Mitchell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7461) granting an increase of pension to John M. Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7462) granting an increase of pension to Helen Morgan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7463) granting a pension to Rosalie A. Partridge (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7464) granting an increase of pension to William E. Howard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7465) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Boyd (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7466) granting a pension to Margaret Hayden (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 7467) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Brockway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7468) granting an increase of pension to William R. Donaldson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7469) granting an increase of pension to William Hawkins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7470) granting a pension to Albert C. Schuman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7471) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Nolan;

A bill (S. 7472) granting an increase of pension to Michael Galligan;

A bill (S. 7473) granting an increase of pension to John P. Leister;

A bill (S. 7474) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Green;

A bill (S. 7475) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Thomas (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7476) granting an increase of pension to James B. Kitts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 7477) granting a pension to Andrew J. Pope; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 7478) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Ferris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 7479) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Beck; and

A bill (S. 7480) granting a pension to Viney Blanks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7481) granting a pension to Frank J. Bauer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7482) granting an increase of pension to James M. Palmer; and

A bill (S. 7483) granting an increase of pension to Gardiner Roberts, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7484) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7485) granting an increase of pension to Job Ingram (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7486) granting a pension to Alice Cox (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7487) granting an increase of pension to Aniceta R. de Lopez; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 7488) for the relief of the owners of the Nicolas Duran de Chaves grant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7489) granting a pension to William Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS (H. R. 20189).

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THORNTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment proposing to reappoint officers of the Army who were mustered out without a hearing under General Orders No. 1, January 2, 1871, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20347), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning

The motion was agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Thursday, January 28, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 29, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 28, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, deliver us from the superstitions which make cowards of us all, the sins which make us slaves, and lift us into the higher realms of thought and purity, that we may worship Thee in spirit and in truth, think our own thoughts, act our own volitions, and harmonize our souls with Thy will. In the Christ spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY AND SATURDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the passage of the naval appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, Friday, and that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Saturday morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, and that when it adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. Saturday. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is intended to bring on the naval appropriation bill right immediately following the disposal of the Agricultural bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. If we finish the Agricultural bill to-day at an early enough hour, I think the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs expects to take up the naval appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs? I notice that he is not here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. I am making the request at his suggestion.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it the desire of the gentleman from Alabama and that of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the naval appropriation bill shall follow this bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Speaker arranges how the bills shall come in. My understanding is that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will be recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. MANN. I suppose that is a matter between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. We might be able to run in the pension appropriation bill at some odd moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes these bills up in the order in which they are reported, unless there is some good reason for acting otherwise upon them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, acting on the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I suggest that the Naval appropriation bill, if ready, shall follow the Agricultural bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Speaker has not put the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Assuming that it is on the subject of rural credits, is that to print a lot of stuff in the RECORD?

Mr. BULKLEY. It is for printing some information on the subject of rural credits.

Mr. MANN. It is not newspaper clippings and the like?

Mr. BULKLEY. No. It is careful work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Salaries, Division of Publications: One editor, who shall be chief of division, $3,250; 1 editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, $2,500; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 2 assistant editors, at $2,000 each; 4 assistant editors, at $1,800 each; 1 assistant editor, $1,600; 1 assistant editor, $1,400; 1 assistant editor in charge of indexing, $2,000; 1 indexer, $1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, $2,100; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,600 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,500 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,400 each; 1 draftsman or photographer, $1,300; 6 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,200 each; 1 assistant photographer, $900; 1 assistant in charge of document section, $2,000; 1 assistant in document section, $1,800; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, $1,500; 1 forewoman, $1,400; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 9 clerks, class 1; 16 clerks, at $1,000 each; 40 clerks, at $900 each; 18 clerks, at $840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 8 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at $780 each; 16 skilled laborers, at $720 each; 1 folder, $1,000; 2 folders, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 messengers, at $720 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at $600 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 laborer, $840; 2 laborers, at $600 each; 4 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $174,750.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in dealing with this particular bureau of the Department of Agriculture that they have a system of writing a letter, written on a typewriter by some clerk, signed by the Chief of the Bureau of Publications, in response to every addressed frank that is sent to them requesting that a publication be sent to any person in the United States. I have frequently gotten as high as a dozen or 20 of these in a single morning in response to addressed franks sent out by my clerk.

Now, it seems to me that that is a great deal of labor, to write a letter of some five or six lines on a typewriter, merely to tell me that the addressed frank has been used and that the publication has been sent. It may be a matter of very trifling interest to me and not of very great interest to the man who receives it. Still he is entitled to the Government publication, and I am glad to send it to him, and sometimes it is of value. But it does not seem to me that it is necessary to write a letter about it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. I have received some of these acknowledgments in which they acknowledge receipt of a number of franks all at once.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and so have I. Sometimes they combine several in one letter.

Mr. RUBEY. Is not that because you combine several franks in one request?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; that may be.

Mr. RUBEY. If you put all the requests in one letter, you will probably get one acknowledgment for them all.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; but that depends on how my clerk sends them out, or it depends on whether I get the requests all at the same time. But the main point is that, so far as the department is concerned, it is useless to write a letter of that kind at all. It seems to me a blank form or a little printed slip would do just as well, if any acknowledgment is necessary.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, that is just what I was going to suggest to the gentleman, that a printed form slip would serve every purpose and save the time of at least one stenographer, and I should think of half a dozen, which it must take to reply to the receipt of these address blanks sent by the Members of Congress. That work must take the time of several employees in this department, and I think the suggestion of the gentleman is a wise one.

Mr. BORLAND. In view of the fact that there are 437 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate, manifestly one stenographer can not attend to that business, if it is all done on the same scale as it is in regard to my requests.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied the suggestion of the gentleman will be taken under consideration by the officials in charge of the work. It is a good suggestion.

Mr. BORLAND. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes, and not to talk on the particular item that is before the committee, but on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, without confining his remarks to this particular paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on page 2265 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25 the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] said:

> The statement has been made several times on the floor of the House carrying inferences that there was some sectionalism in this bill in the expenditure of the money carried by it. In order that the country may have the facts, I want to ask unanimous consent in this connection to publish some figures issued by the Department of Agriculture showing the expenditure of funds by sections.

In the course of the colloquy which followed I reserved the right to object to the unanimous consent, in order to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina how the divisions referred to in which the money was distributed were made, and inquired if the statement was to show the expenditures by States, to which the gentleman from South Carolina replied, "No; not by States."

I was curious to see whether there was, as a matter of fact, any sectionalism in the distribution of the funds, and I have taken the pains to make an analysis of the distribution of the appropriations covered by the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The analysis of the expenditures is interesting and instructive. I am sure it will throw light upon the manner in which the money is distributed. Here it is:

Appropriations in Agricultural bill for 1914 and 1915.

States.	Excepting Forest Service and Weeks law.		Including Forest Service and Weeks law.	
	1914	1915	1914	1915
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut	$885,692.88	$1,190,412.70	$1,508,365.81	[1] $1,426,243.70
New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	1,194,013.60	1,361,927.84	1,202,783.60	[2] 1,369,714.84
Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin	1,771,953.78	2,261,669.71	1,922,998.78	[3] 2,420,678.67
Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas	1,939,529.63	2,395,493.02	2,092,038.63	[4] 2,551,281.02
Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida	1,450,381.69	1,963,220.59	1,731,404.21	[5] 4,559,859.5
Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi	$677,691.04	$967,866.55	$726,348.48	[6] $1,965,055.55
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas	1,037,477.71	1,364,231.20	1,121,566.71	[7] 1,449,709.20
Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada	1,109,691.03	1,390,148.73	4,156,263.03	[8] 4,539,875.73
Washington, Oregon, and California	793,356.92	989,234.36	2,503,236.92	[9] 2,701,558.36
Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam	131,736.19	147,241.09	180,631.19	[10] 196,618.09
Washington, D. C.	4,111,572.54	4,466,499.81	4,555,287.54	[11] 4,931,577.81
SUMMARY.				
Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas (15 Southern States)	$3,103,389.00	[12] $1,223,316.04	$3,517,157.96	[13] $7,933,036.04
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam (33 Northern States, and Territorial and insular possessions)	7,825,974.03	[14] 9,736,127.45	13,566,317.96	[15] 15,205,681.41

[1] Decrease, $82,122.11.
[2] Increase, $157,932.24.
[3] Increase, $497,679.89.
[4] Increase, $459,242.39.
[5] Increase, $2,828,455.38.
[6] Increase, $1,239,705.07.
[7] Increase, $327,942.49.
[8] Increase, $383,612.70.
[9] Increase, $198,292.44.
[10] Increase, $15,986.90.
[11] Increase, $376,290.27.
[12] Increase, $1,119,927.04.
[13] Increase, $4,415,878.08.
[14] Increase, $1,910,189.42.
[15] Increase, $1,639,603.45.

The grouping of the States by the department is ingenious, and unless one made a comprehensive study of the expenditures under that grouping it would not be possible to tell how one section of the country is discriminated against in favor of another, but I feel sure that with this analysis no one will have any difficulty in reaching the conclusion that there is such discrimination.

For example, the analysis shows that Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut received $82,122.11 less in the current law than they did for the fiscal year 1914.

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania received $157,932.24 more in 1915 than in 1914.

Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, $497,679.89 more.

Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, $459,242.39 more.

Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida received $2,828,455.38 more in 1915 than in 1914.

Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi received $1,239,705.07 more.

Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas received $327,942.49 more.

Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada received $383,612.70 more.

Washington, Oregon, and California received $198,292.44 more.

Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam, $15,986.90 more.

Washington, D. C., received an increase of $376,290.37 over 1914.

Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, 15 Southern States, received $3,517,157.96 in the 1914 Agricultural appropriation bill and $7,933,096.04 in the current law, or an increase of 202 per cent. Think of it.

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania,

Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam, 33 Northern States and 4 Territorial and insular possessions, received $13,566,317.96 in the 1914 bill and $15,205,951.41 in the current law, an increase of only 11 per cent as compared with 202 per cent increase for the 15 Southern States above indicated.

In this connection it will be interesting to note that the 15 Southern States receiving out of the Agricultural appropriation for the current fiscal year an increase of $4,415,938.08, paid into the Treasury in corporation and individual income tax $5,987,642.85, while the 33 Northern States and the 4 Territorial and insular possessions, which received an increase of but $1,639,633.45 in the current law over that of 1914, paid into the Treasury in 1914 in corporation and individual income tax $54,722,623.67.

The expenditures in the Washington office in 1914, amounting to $4,555,287.54, were about 24 per cent of the whole appropriation, while the apportioned expenses of the office for 1915, amounting to $4,931,577.81, were 25 per cent of the total appropriation, and the increase for 1915 over that of 1914 amounts to about 12 per cent.

To say that this is an extravagant overhead charge is to state the case mildly.

I do not assert that the statement made by the Department of Agriculture, and introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, grouping the expenditures for 1914 and 1915, was intended to make it impossible for anyone to understand the facts, but I do assert that no one, without a very close study of the question could possibly tell from the statement really what was expended and what proportion was expended in the different sections, but I have undertaken that study for the purpose of giving to the House the information which every Member ought to be able to read and understand, without making a technical analysis of the figures and for the purpose of placing before the country the facts.

Of course no one can tell how the appropriations made in the bill now pending will be distributed by the department, but it is fair to assume that the same rule will be applied in the distribution of the funds that characterized the distribution made under the current law, in which event it is obvious that discrimination in favor of one section and against another will be practiced.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take the time of the committee in answering the statement of the gentleman from Illinois. In fact, I have not had an opportunity to analyze these figures myself. I put them into the RECORD just as they were handed to me by officials of the department.

I can say this, and I think it will be confirmed by every member of the Agricultural Committee on this side and on that, that this bill is drawn with no view of giving any section of the country any advantage over any other section of the country.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is true.

Mr. LEVER. I believe that Republican members of the committee will acquiesce in that statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me just for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not charge the committee with any discrimination. I simply charged that the department, in the distribution of the funds, had discriminated.

Mr. LEVER. I think, looking over the summary furnished by the department, that the summary shows that the 15 Southern States, or the South Atlantic States, get about one-third of the total appropriation from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. They get more than half.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has the figures more clearly in mind than I have, but I think the gentleman, in his analysis, is overlooking the fact that about $1,500,000 is included of the appropriation under the Weeks law, which has largely in the last few years been going into the Southern States. But taking the real, genuine work of the department, even including the Weeks law, I think the gentleman will find, upon careful study of the figures, that the Southern States get about one-third of the appropriations, or about what they are entitled to; although I do not think either the Committee on Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture, or the House itself ought to be concerned very much as to where these funds are being expended. The question is, Are they being expended where they are needed and where they will do the most service to the entire country?

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he has at hand any comparison of the distribution of this money back in 1910, 1911, or 1912?

Mr. LEVER. The comparison I have is only for 1914 and 1915.

Mr. GOULDEN. I should go back to the department as administered by our friends on the other side and see what was done then.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from New York, and I am glad to say, that ex-Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson was always fair, always generous, and always helpful to the people of the South in the administration of his department.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think that is universally conceded.

Mr. LEVER. I am absolutely glad to stand here and say for him that he has never discriminated against us. In fact, it might be said that, if anything, he was somewhat partial to us, and I thank him for it and I am glad to pay him that tribute.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think that everyone interested in this subject heartily indorses that sentiment.

Mr. LEVER. He was a Republican, but he was a big man, who did not see any North, any South, any West, or any East, but he saw the whole great country and its common interests.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is why I asked the question, because I have the most implicit confidence in Secretary Wilson, and I wanted to know what proportion went to the 15 Southern States under his able administration.

Mr. LEVER. I have not the figures at hand. They are, of course, obtainable.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of ex-Secretary Wilson's administration, that the gentleman's statement is true; and also I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of the matter, that the appropriations are more needed in those States to develop agriculture along certain lines than they are in the North and West.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 20415, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very important message, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION (H. DOC. NO. 1527).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aleins to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a Nation, would very materially have altered the course and

cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1915.*

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall move a reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed, and that the same be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire any snap judgment on anybody. I think that no one who favors the bill has had any tips as to when the message would come in. I believe that there ought to be a fair discussion of it, and I believe that the message itself within its four corners gives good reasons why the bill should become a law. Therefore I shall ask unanimous consent that on either Thursday or Friday, as may best suit the convenience of gentleman who are opposed to it, the message be taken up for consideration and the consideration of a motion to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto, and in the meantime that the message lie on the table.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did the gentleman say next Thursday?

The SPEAKER. The time is not a necessary part of the request. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the veto message and bill lie on the Speaker's table temporarily.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that we who are opposed to this legislation are in the same position as the gentleman from Alabama and those who support it. We did not receive any tips, as he states, or any information. We did believe that this great humanitarian President of ours would veto the bill, because we believe that he desires to do what is right and what is just. Therefore I resent the statement that anyone on our side has received any tips as to the possibility of what was likely to be done by the President. Many of us may have had an idea as to our President's intention, but he is not a man who would deliberately give an advantage to one side or the other.

As to the day on which this should be considered I would much prefer, if we could agree to a day, one early next week. I believe Tuesday would be agreeable to the majority of the Members, because that would give ample opportunity to all, no matter where they reside, to be present. That will give us five or six days. I ask the gentleman from Alabama whether it will be possible to agree on Tuesday of next week?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to disclaim having made any imputation on the gentleman or those opposed to the bill, as the gentleman from Illinois says. I will not even say that the wicked flee when no man pursueth. [Laughter.] It will not be convenient or agreeable to have the message considered before Thursday of next week.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield—while both gentlemen say that they did not receive any tip as to when or whether the President would send a veto message, I think everybody else in the House had received a tip that the President was going to veto the message, and he had to send in a message today, to-morrow, or next day, and that is not very far apart. What is the object in postponing the matter for more than a week?

Mr. BURNETT. I frankly state that I think Tuesday would not be ample time.

Mr. MANN. Ample time for what?

Mr. BURNETT. For Members who desire to be here to be present. I could have called it up to-day, I suppose, but I thought it was not fair to do it, and for the same reason, when there may be ample time for Members to be here without any snap judgment being taken, I thought Thursday of next week would be better.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. WALLIN, and others objected.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to refer it to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, who made the objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and others.

Mr. MOORE. I made the objection. I think it is unnecessary to wait a week. The gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that it be postponed for a week.

The SPEAKER. That was not a part of the request.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that it be postponed until Thursday, and the Chair put the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not put that part of the request. The gentleman from Alabama did put into his request that it lie on the Speaker's table until next Thursday, but the Chair stated that it was not necessary to put in the date, because it is a privileged matter and the gentleman from Alabama can call it up whenever he gets ready. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a matter that is privileged. It is within the right of the gentleman from Alabama and his committee to have the message referred to the committee for consideration before reporting it if they desire. It is for the chairman of the committee to determine what time he thinks it is convenient to take the matter up, and I see no reason in the world why an agreement should not be made to let it lie on the table, as it saves time.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman recollect what action the House took when the bill was vetoed by President Taft as to the length of time to be given?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think at that time it was near the end of the session and there was a full attendance of the House. The chairman of the committee thought it advisable to call it up at once. But the only point I am making here is that this is a matter for the chairman of the committee to determine, when he thinks it advisable to bring it before the House, like all other legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Did not the gentleman from Alabama make the motion immediately on receipt of the Taft veto?

Mr. BURNETT. No; not until the next day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He may have, but it must be clear to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, although there may be doubt as to whether there is a two-thirds vote in favor of this bill, there can be no question but that a majority of this House is in favor of the bill, and the gentleman from Alabama can have it referred and bring it back when he pleases, and I think it is wise if we can agree on it satisfactorily to the gentleman and everybody else and let it in the meantime lie on the table.

Mr. MOORE. I am perfectly willing to come to an agreement now, but the gentlemen on the other side seem to have adjusted the matter between themselves, and the chairman of the committee fixed next Thursday and no other day.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I think we can all agree to Thursday next, and I hope all objections will be withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE. Now, many of us would be willing to have a day fixed. I am perfectly willing to have Tuesday fixed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection that a day should be set. I do not desire to delay or desire to hurry or inconvenience any Member of the House. I would prefer that we agree on a day. If we could agree on Tuesday of next week, it will be agreeable, if not I am willing to yield, and if we could set it for Wednesday it would be agreeable to me.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I understand Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday, and that this is privileged business, anyway.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will help clear up this situation a little. This veto and all matters appertaining to it are privileged. The gentleman from Alabama, if it goes to his committee, can call it up in 15 minutes if he wants to do so, or he can call it up on Calendar Wednesday or on Monday, or any time he please; the whole thing is privileged.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentlemen who would prefer to send this matter to the Committee on Immigration, of which I am a member, that they withhold their objections and set a day. I agree with the gentleman who desires to set a day certain, as it will relieve many of the Members of this House from embarrassment. It will make a certain time when gentlemen will all be here and vote upon this all-important matter, and I respectfully suggest to the membership of the House present that we agree upon a day. May I say, in order to come to a conclusion, that we set it for Thursday?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the Chair restate the situation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will restate the situation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object, I think, anyhow. As I understand it—and if I am not correct I would like to be informed—if this bill is referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that committee has the power to report the bill with the veto message back at any time and demand immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And they can agree among themselves as to when it shall be called up in the House instead of trying to do so this morning where it is a waste of time, and therefore I object.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. I will withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois withholds his objection for a moment. I desire to call his attention to this fact: If it is referred to the committee, no one knows, of course, but the chairman when the meeting of the committee would be called, and there would be no one but the chairman and members of the committee who would know when the committee is likely to meet and when they would report the bill and when it would come up. I think it would be much better if we could agree on a day now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have absolute confidence in the integrity and honesty of purpose of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. I have no doubt whatever that he will be perfectly fair with the committee in the matter, and the House can be notified with reference to the time after the gentlemen have agreed upon a day.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I think it will be fairer to every Member of the House here and those who are not here now to have an understanding as to a date, rather than that the committee should report and then get an understanding later on when it will again consume some time, and I think it could be better settled here.

Mr. MANN. I do not see much chance of getting a unanimous-consent agreement, and so I object. Let us go on to other business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the gentleman from Alabama is recognized to make any motion he sees fit.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message of the President be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it in order to move an amendment to a day certain?

The SPEAKER. This is simply a motion to refer, and if it is voted down the gentleman from Alabama can call up the bill right now.

Mr. BURNETT. And in connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will call the committee together and ask them to report this bill back on Thursday, and on that motion I move the previous question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves the previous question on his motion to refer.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on referring the bill and veto message of the President to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was then put, and by vote of the House was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. SABATH. To ask that 100,000 copies of the President's veto message be printed for distribution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that 100,000 copies of this message be printed.

Mr. HOWARD and Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] notifies the House and the country that on Thursday the committee will report this bill back.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to move that 100,000 copies of the President's message be printed?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. That has to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to ask unanimous consent that 50,000 copies of this message be printed for the use of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] objects.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. And first, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an analysis of the figures prepared and put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I will take some little time to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting some figures which he names. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. From the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, I have before me a summary of expenditures of that department. The same was published some days ago in the RECORD. From it I quote these figures. For the 15 Southern States—and in these are included Maryland and Delaware—for the year ending June 30, 1914, $3,579,319.40 was expended in the Southern States, and in the remainder of the States of the Union $17,145,628.36 was expended. All these figures include the Forest Service and the Weeks law.

Mr. Chairman, in the very nature of things it is impossible to say that so many dollars can be or must be expended in this particular State or in that particular State, or in this particular section or in that section, and the sooner the Members of Congress understand this fact, that all the States of this Union act as one, and that whatever injures one section of the country necessarily injures other sections of the country, and stop this quibbling over sectional propositions in a great bill like this, the better it will be for the country. [Applause.]

I dare say that in the gentleman's home State more money is expended on the meat-inspection proposition in the great city

of Chicago under this bill than in any other given locality in the United States. And yet who objects to it? [Applause.] Problems arise in one section to-day that were not expected yesterday.

Take, for example, the hog-cholera proposition. When that outbreak sprang up and wiped out these great values, Congress did not hesitate to spend $600,000 in a few of the western hog-growing States of this Union. Take again the case of the foot-and-mouth disease, which sprang up this year. Congress did not hesitate to spend $2,500,000 to wipe out that disease, because whatever destroys the values in one State of this Union is going to be felt in its effects in the other States of this Union. Again, when the forests of New England were invaded by the gypsy moth, appropriations were at once made available to curb this destructive pest. No man from the South was unpatriotic enough to raise the sectionalism cry when these appropriations were made.

Now, let us take up the question a moment further. You take it in the section of the country where the chief industry is cotton growing. My State produces 4,500,000 bales of cotton. Last year we had nearly 8,000,000 head of cattle to help furnish the meat supply, to say nothing of other millions of dollars from other crops and stock. We probably get less out of this Agricultural bill than any other section in the Union, and yet we are the greatest wealth-producing agricultural State in this Union. When the European war broke out, on the very eve of the time when the cotton, which annually adds a billion dollars to our wealth, came on the market there was no market for it. Who felt it first? We people who produced this great crop in the South, the crop that goes, 65 per cent of it, to foreign countries and brings back the gold supply. Who felt it next? I will tell you. Our people from the South patronize and purchase the manufactured products from the people of the other sections of the country. We go to the West, and we buy your flour. We go to the New England States and buy your manufactured products. We go to other sections to buy iron and steel to build our bridges across our streams and to erect our skyscrapers. We purchase from the manufacturers of our northern and eastern brethren farm implements, tools, wagons, and harness. We take the money made from the cotton and we purchase your finished products.

I want to ask you, when this market for cotton fell down, what happened in the Southern States? The first thing to happen was that expense accounts had to be cut down in those States for people to live. Our merchants had already put in their orders for the next year's supply, and they canceled those orders for dry goods and hardware and everything that could be done without, so that while the direct injury was felt first by the South, every other section of the country felt the kick-back of that injury and loss sustained by reason of the failure in the price of the great staple crop of the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague [Mr. YOUNG of Texas] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think this side ought to have as much time as you have consumed on that side.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] had 13 minutes and I had less than 5. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] will have 10, and that will leave 5 over there. If you want to make it 10, all right.

Mr. MANN. Do you want 10 minutes to continue this sectional discussion?

Mr. LEVER. I understand the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] wants to make a statement along this line. He is a member of the committee, and one of the best ones on it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from South Carolina wants to open a discussion that will probably last all afternoon. If he wants 15 minutes on one side, then I suggest an equal time on the other side.

Mr. LEVER. No; the gentleman misunderstood my request. I was asking unanimous consent that the discussion on this paragraph be closed in 10 minutes. That would give the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] five minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] five minutes.

Mr. MANN. They are both on the same side.

Mr. LEVER. No; I think the gentleman from Minnesota is on the other side of the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] that the statement that I made was simply an analytical study of the figures placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. If those figures had not been placed there, I would not have made the study; but the figures speak for themselves, and what I said is deduced entirely from what the gentleman said and from those figures.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, is there any objection to my request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not put the request, as he thought gentlemen were going to agree. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, when these great problems confront the agricultural interests of the country, it is for this country to deal with those problems. If the foot-and-mouth disease breaks out in any part of the country, we want to deal with it and suppress it, and it makes no difference in what section of the country it springs up. Let any other problem threaten a great crop of the country, it is the duty of the Government to intervene and meet that problem, because this is one country, and one section can not be injuriously affected without that effect being felt in every other section of the country. In the very nature of things some sections of this country are given specifically to agriculture. Other sections of the country are given specifically to manufacturing and mining and other industries, great in themselves, yet in those sections of the country, under the very conditions that surround them, agricultural problems do not arise as they arise in the great agricultural belt of the country. And what I appeal for is that we ought to remember that this is one country, one flag, and one interest, and no man wants to be guilty of trying to destroy a great bill or an appropriation, it matters not in what section problems are being dealt with, when that appropriation is wisely expended for the purpose of improving agricultural conditions, because those conditions need to be improved, and this committee is free from partisanship and free from sectionalism. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this discussion, and would not do so were it not for the fact that the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, and prepared by the Department of Agriculture, is, in my opinion, absolutely misleading and unfair. I do not mean by that to claim that the figures are erroneous, but I do mean to claim that if that statement purports to show that one section of the country has not received a larger proportion of the local benefits of the appropriations in the Agricultural bill than another portion of the country, then the statement is absolutely misleading in that respect.

The Department of Agriculture expends annually about $25,000,000. According to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for last year, $16,000,000 of that amount is spent in regulatory services. No one would claim for a minute that that $16,000,000 ought to be taken into consideration in a statement which purports to show that one section is not receiving greater local benefits from the appropriations than another. For instance, the Bureau of Animal Industry spends some $3,000,000 a year in meat inspection. Probably 90 per cent of that money is spent in half a dozen cities in the United States, and yet no one with a modicum of fairness could claim that those particular cities or the States in which they are located ought to be charged with local benefits under that appropriation.

Six hundred thousand dollars are spent annually in animal quarantines. No one would claim that that appropriation ought to be charged to any particular section. We spend some $635,000 a year for the enforcement of the food and drug act. No one ought to claim that that amount should be taken into consideration in determining the local benefits of this appropriation bill. Yet that is exactly what the Department of Agriculture has done in making up this statement.

Now, there are some items in this bill the benefits of which are purely local and recognized as being local. Among these are the items for farm-demonstration work in the North and for cotton boll-weevil work in the South. Of those items the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], who preceded me, says his State probably receives less than any other. Yet the record shows that the State of Texas received last year $72,000 for farm-demonstration work, while the State of Iowa, very nearly as

large, if not larger, in its agricultural products, received but $17,000.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Is it not true that there is $400,000 appropriated in this bill for farm-demonstration work in the North?

Mr. ANDERSON. And that $400,000 is distributed among 33 States, while the $666,000 appropriated for the cotton boll-weevil work and farm-demonstration work in the South is spent in 15 States. I do not complain particularly about that. Everybody who knows anything about the agriculture of the United States knows that the South needs help worse than any other section of the country. The thing I am complaining about is that the Department of Agriculture has presented a statement here which is absolutely misleading as to the facts, if it pretends to show, as I think it does, that these 15 Southern States have not received greater local benefits from the Agricultural bill than the rest of the country.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman will concede that any benefit derived from this money spent in any part of the country will be for the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, no; I think not. I do not think the gentleman's statement is entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $18,750.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed an item relating to telephone and telegraph charges, and I take occasion to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he was able to get those figures that we asked for the other day with respect to the division of the appropriation for general telegraph and telephone charges.

Mr. LEVER. I asked for the information requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the colloquy between him and myself. I believe the proposition the gentleman had in mind was, if a corporation or an individual telegraphed to the department for information, could that information be telegraphed back at Government rates and paid for by the Government?

Mr. MOORE. The question was whether they could get it free of charge.

Mr. LEVER. They do not get it free of charge. I put that information in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. Was it put in the RECORD as of the day's proceedings?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CROP ESTIMATES.

Salaries, Bureau of Crop Estimates: One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; 1 chief clerk, $1,800; 6 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 14 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,300; 19 clerks, class 1; 17 clerks, at $1,000 each; 21 clerks, at $900 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $660 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, $480; 1 charwoman, messenger, or laborer, $540; 2 charwomen, messenger boys, or laborers, at $360 each; in all, $116,780.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask a question about this bureau. Does the gentleman from South Carolina think this information that the people of this country derive from the Crop Estimate Bureau is worth what it costs?

Mr. LEVER. I do. I regard the Bureau of Crop Estimates as one of the most valuable lines of work conducted by the department. The estimates and statistics that they furnish are almost invaluable to the farmers of the country.

Mr. BOOHER. How are they valuable to the farmer?

Mr. LEVER. Let me illustrate very briefly: The Department of Agriculture collects statistics—estimates—as to the total yield of the cotton in this country. It gathers those statistics as to the condition of the cotton crop from time to time. On the first Monday of December, I think it is, it publishes a final estimate as to the yield of cotton. That estimate, coupled with the information issued by the Census Bureau every two weeks, furnishes the farmer the only accurate, unbiased data of the probable yield of that crop for the year that he can have.

Before this system was adopted the speculators of the country—large cotton firms—would issue their own private estimates—and they do now—with the effect that it kept the market in a turmoil and kept the farmer in absolute darkness as to the actual situation. Since, however, we have begun to carry on this system of estimates—while the individual estimates go out to the country; to the whole speculative world—the farmers themselves, in my part of the country at least, look to the accurate information issued by the Census Bureau and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. And is it not a fact that the estimates made by the Government as to the cotton crops have been approximately correct?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I will say that there was an investigation of the matter made four or five years ago and a period of 10 years was taken to ascertain how accurate these figures were. It was found that in one five-year period they overestimated the crop very slightly, and within the other five years they slightly underestimated it, but the average was only about 2 per cent out of the way for 10 years. The farmers appreciate the service and want it continued, although a great many farmers misunderstand it.

Mr. BOOHER. My observation of the bureau is about this: When the crop has been planted three to six weeks they begin to issue bulletins as to the probable production of that crop, and they keep it up during the entire season. At first they report that it is going to make 99 per cent of a full crop. The result of that is that the grain speculators put down the price of grain. Then they make an estimate that there will be 80 per cent full crop, and the price goes up and the speculator gets the benefit of it because he has got the crop. And then perhaps it will be 75 per cent of a full crop. Whenever a report of that kind goes out there can be but one result, and that is that it acts injuriously on the producer of the crop. It may be true that the cotton estimates are different from those of wheat, but you take it in the great wheat and corn raising sections of this country, and the different reports go out affecting the prices of the commodity injuriously to the producer.

Mr. BALTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. BALTZ. I noticed last year that the State report of Illinois estimated the crop of wheat at 20,000,000 bushels, while the Federal report was 53,000,000; that was on last year's crop.

Mr. BOOHER. I read in the hearings that they made their investigations very carefully and tried to be accurate, but they go to the great transportation companies—in other words, the railroads and the warehouses—and they take their estimates and compare them with their own, and upon these estimates they mainly base their reports; but the information comes mainly from the railroads and the warehouses.

The time of Mr. BOOHER having expired, by unanimous consent he was given five minutes more.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, I have talked with a great many farmers about this matter—or rather they have talked with me—and I have not had a farmer talk with me but who was opposed to these crop estimates. It may be that the farmer does not understand it. It may be that I have not been able to explain it thoroughly to him; but the farmers as a general thing do not rely on this information, and they do not believe that it is worth the money that it costs the Government.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Suppose the Government got out no estimates at all, would not that leave the farmers at the mercy of the speculators to bear down on the price o the commodity?

Mr. BOOHER. No; I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this country for 110 years never had any crop estimates, and the farmers got along very well; and we did not hear of anybody being crushed.

Mr. JACOWAY. Was not the Government different then from what it is now?

Mr. BOOHER. Wonderfully different; we did not have much paternalism in the country at that time; and now we have more paternalism and less individualism.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Do not the large dealers send men out into the country, into the field to make estimates, and do not they send out competent men to make investigation as to the production?

Mr. BOOHER. There is no doubt about that; and if the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee, he will see that Mr. Easterbrook says that they rely a good deal on information gathered by the very class of people that the gentleman mentions. You can pick up any agricultural paper in the country and it publishes the estimates of the very men the gentleman suggests, and the farmers get the advantage of it.

Mr. CULLOP. Is it not true that the crop report of the Government is usually taken by some man of the city who drives out along the road and looks over the fields and then sends in his estimate?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not know about that.

Mr. CULLOP. That is true in my section of the country.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is not true in our section of the country.

Mr. CULLOP. In my State our farmers rely on the reports made by the large dealers who send out competent men who go into the fields and make their estimates. They rely upon those estimates more than they do upon the Government report.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in response to what the gentleman from Indiana says, that in our section these crop estimates are made as a rule by practical farmers. They visit the farm and make estimates. I desire to make the further suggestion that it was the condition suggested by the gentleman from Indiana that private parties engaged in various kinds of business sent out agents and made investigations and made reports in their own interest that required the legislation to be adopted which is in this bill, providing that the Government should make the estimates and make reports in order to meet the reports which private parties were making, which were not in the interest of the producers, but in their own interest and in the interest of the people who wanted to buy the products.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOOHER. I have but a moment or so remaining.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will ask for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for two minutes, and I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, now I do not know, of course, the way these appointments are made except from the hearings, but the department I assume uses the best means it can. I assume that the department tries to be just as accurate in it as it can be; there is no question about that in mind, but the question with me and with the farmers with whom I have talked about this is whether or not this information is worth the cost of obtaining it. The farmers with whom I have talked say it is not, that when they report a full crop or that there will be a 95 per cent crop of corn or wheat that the price of wheat goes down, which was an injury to them if they have got any of the old crop on hand. Now, in a few weeks or a month they issue another bulletin that the size of the crop is not going to be more than 80 per cent. Then what is the result? The grain in the hands of speculators goes up and the farmer, the producer of the wheat or corn or oats or other cereal, is caught in the trap going either way. If he backs up they get him, and if he goes ahead they get him. Now, if it is worth the money that the chairman of the committee seems to think it is the appropriation ought to be made, but it does seem to me there ought to be a careful investigation of this question by this Committee on Agriculture to see whether or not this section of this bill can not be cut down, and cut down very materially, and if it is not worth to the producers of this country what it is costing it ought not to be made.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have crop estimates at all, it is very essential that they be made by the Government. If you withdraw this work of estimates from the Government, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, you put it entirely in the hands of the speculators to make them, and I do not care how fair gentlemen here think they will be in those estimates to the producers, I had rather trust Government officials, who are sworn to do their duty, to do the just thing by the farmers of the country than to turn this work over to the men who are figuring on ways and means to buy the crop as cheaply as possible. Various concerns representing those who speculated in cotton and grain used to be the only source of this information. They gathered such information as they desired, and published such crop estimates as helped their business, and by this method of crop estimation they robbed the producer every year of millions of money. [Applause.] It is this that caused the friends of the producer to see the necessity of having estimates made by the Government. Now, if we do not have estimates at all, it is all right; the Government need not make them; but the very moment you withdraw this work by the Government the speculators will fleece the corn producer, the wheat producer, and the cotton producer. These estimates are not made now by information gathered about towns and cities. My information is that these representatives of the Government are in every precinct in the farming sections of this country. I helped to increase the number and this committee had to do with swelling this number of crop reporters for the Government.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a bad step for us to take, for as long as estimates can be made by somebody, speculators will make them, and then in the absence of reports or estimates by the Government, which will try to speak the truth in regard to crop estimates. The farmer would be left to the mercy of speculators to make and publish whatever estimates suited them. Why not? Here is a man who wants to buy a certain crop. He proposes an estimate on that crop. Is he going to publish an estimate that will injure his business and put up the price of the very thing that he wants to buy cheaply? Of course not. [Applause.] Then, if he works to his own interest it is necessary that the Government shall come in and make a true estimate as to what the crop will be. Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit that time was when this information on which these estimates were made by the Government was not as full as it is now, but the information now gathered by the Department of Agriculture comes in, not from a handful of reporters, but from hundreds and thousands of reporters in the various farming portions of the Government.

Mr. BOOHER. Where does the gentleman get his information that the Government has got these skilled men in every community in this country?

Mr. HEFLIN. I furnished a list of over 1,000 names from my district four or five years ago, and I recall that Members of this House were called upon to furnish the names of men who would report in the various sections and precincts of the country.

Mr. BOOHER. You can not find anything of that kind in these hearings. I call the gentleman's attention to the hearings and ask him to read them, and I think then he will qualify his statement.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; not in these hearings. I am not referring to the hearings on this bill, but about what happened four or five years ago. I suppose the chairman of this committee remembers when we were called upon by the department to supply the names of those who would do this work——

Mr. LEVER. Yes——

Mr. HEFLIN. Giving reports as to the condition of the crop in the growing season. I have supplied names myself from my district, and I am certain they did not single out my district and neglect the other districts in the United States. It can not be, I am sure, that my district was of so much more importance in an agricultural way than the district of my good friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit me to read just a question and answer from the hearings, showing where they get this information?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I read:

Mr. MAGUIRE. I would like to inquire whether you have made a comparison to see how your forecasts agree with such as Mr. HELGESEN suggests—the railroad estimates? A great many railroads and other agencies make forecasts.

Mr. ESTABROOK. We watch those very closely and make comparisons from time to time. We consider them as one source of information.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Do you think your agents all over the country are influenced one way or the other by the reports that they see of some railroad systems or the forecasts of some agency?

Mr. ESTABROOK. No; I think not. It is their business to check these up. That is what they are out in the field for. They interview all these people, see those elevator men and railroad men, keep in touch with them, and get their estimates, and then check them up from their own private sources of information. If it were at all necessary, we could disprove many of those estimates.

Now, you take what the railroads gather up and what the warehouses gather up, and that is the whole thing on which you base the estimate.

Mr. LEVER. Will my friend yield to me for a word?

Mr. HEFLIN. They interrogate every witness available, I understand, and consult every reliable source of information possible in their effort to make the estimate speak as nearly as possible the truth.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is right. That is what I myself was going to say.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest to the gentleman to wait until the next paragraph. The time on this paragraph is up.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Crop Estimates: For all necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting data relating to agriculture; for making and publishing periodically crop and live-stock estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products, as follows.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have spent all my life in proximity to the cotton fields. All my life I have been interested in the yield of the cotton fields. I have had ups and downs as a grower, with more downs than ups, and in the last year, particularly, a disastrous experience as a cotton grower. I have had a good many years of experience as a cotton dealer and as an exporter of cotton. I want to say of my knowledge—not speaking from prejudice, but of my knowledge—that the effort of every business house with which I have ever had any acquaintance that has ever put out a forecast of the yield of cotton has been to make it accurate.

Why should they not be accurate? Successful business is not conducted upon a lack of information. Men of repute and integrity—and there are such in all branches of business—do not want to acquire a reputation of spreading misinformation abroad. This House seems to be full of gentlemen who believe that because a man is in business he is necessarily dishonest and untruthful; who believe that there is only one side to a speculative market.

Now, business men just as often go in on the bull side of cotton, to make a profit out of an advance, as they go in on the bear side, to make a profit out of a decline; and in the South they very much more often go in on the bull side.

Now, I recall in my experience one house, a great English firm in London, strange to say, and not in Liverpool, which has been marvelously accurate for more than 30 years in its estimates. A member of that firm whom I know personally very well, a man of high character and a reputable and an honorable and a truthful man, traveled in every State in the South in the months of July, August, and September, beginning his journeys in the Gulf States and working up with the development of the cotton crop; and on information supplied by him this house annually put out a forecast which was marvelously accurate.

On the other hand, before they began taking the figures respecting the output at the gins, and which necessarily, as the yield of cotton increased normally year after year, showed in the reports an increased production almost each year, when the Government was issuing annual estimates, those estimates were marvelous for their inaccuracy. I remember on one occasion going down to the Department of Agriculture the day after an estimate was made and seeing the man there in charge of that bureau. I do not remember the figures that were given out in that estimate, but I will use arbitrary ones for the purpose of illustration. An estimate, say, was put out that the crop would be 9,100,000 bales. I went to that man and I said to him: "Good heavens, how can you issue such a report as that, when the receipts that are already in show more than that amount?" He said: "Mr. SLAYDEN, I know it is absurd and inaccurate, but we can not reach any other conclusion on the data which are provided to us."

Mr. LEVER. How long ago was that?

Mr. SLAYDEN. That was some years ago. I observed it for 20 years in succession, Mr. Chairman, and the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were almost uniformly inaccurate.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not get up here to state that. I got up here to resent the imputation that men of business, speculators, even, can not be honest and truthful men. The country seems to have gone mad on the theory that because a man does not toil with his hands in the field he is necessarily trying to rob somebody.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman of what particular value to the producer of the growing crop it would be to underestimate that crop unless he is holding over some of last year's crop that he wants to sell?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not understand the gentleman. Does the gentleman mean the crop grown in 1914, now being marketed?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I mean what particular value is the estimate of the crop of 1915 to a man who is growing that crop unless he has some of the crop of 1914 lying over?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It would be of particular value to the buyer if he estimates an excessive yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. But it would be of no value to the producer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers, and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, $17,500: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange books and periodicals of the library not needed for permanent use for other books and periodicals.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Here we have an item providing for the purchase of books and materials connected with the library of the Department of Agriculture. In this paragraph we find an item for official traveling expenses. It is very hard for me to understand—though, perhaps, the gentleman can give the information—how a library can have any traveling expenses.

Mr. LEVER. I answered that question last year in the consideration of this bill, and I will state my recollection of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not recall that the gentleman had done so. If I had recalled it I would not have asked the question.

Mr. LEVER. Occasionally the librarian of the Agricultural Department desires to attend some convention of librarians, and the traveling expenses are allowed him for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman has not remembered all that he said last year.

Mr. LEVER. I do not recall all that I said.

Mr. MANN. Occasionally the librarian of the Agricultural Department is required to attend a sale of books, or to inspect books which are very rare, which are for sale, and which are very much desired by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Illinois for supplementing my statement.

Mr. MANN. I think the expense is very nominal, but occasionally it is required.

A MEMBER. Not over $200 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand the need of having some small amount for that character of expense. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. REED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill of the following title:

S. 6839. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings, grounds, and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for,

and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, $115,000, of which sum $5,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 18, on page 59. It is evidently a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the above acts and the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," relative to their administration, including the employment of clerks, assistants, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, freight and express charges, official traveling expenses, office fixtures, supplies, apparatus, telegraph and telephone service, gas, electric current, and rent outside of the District of Columbia, $59,500; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the work of the Department of Agriculture with that of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts, and make report thereon to Congress: *Provided*, That of this amount $20,100 may be used for general administrative expenses connected with the lines of work of the States relations service, including the offices of the director, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, library, accounts, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto: *And provided further*, That hereafter all correspondence, bulletins, and reports for the furtherance of the purposes of the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," may be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe by such college officer or other person connected with the extension department of such college as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate to the Postmaster General.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the last proviso in the paragraph as being new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. To what part of the paragraph does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. From line 10 to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $386,080.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 63, in line 2, by striking out "$386,080" and inserting in lieu thereof "$289,560."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed reduces the item for farm-demonstration work in the Northern States by 25 per cent. If this amendment is adopted I intend to move to reduce the amount for farm-demonstration work in the South proportionately.

This morning there was carried in the Washington Post a story regarding the present financial condition of the country. That story states that there will be a deficit in the Treasury of about $90,000,000 at the end of the present fiscal year, and that there is now a deficit of about $70,000,000, notwithstanding the war tax and the income tax; that in the near future we will probably be under the necessity either of finding new subjects of taxation or of issuing bonds. It emphasizes the necessity of exercising the most rigid economy.

I am in favor of the extension of agricultural education. I am particularly in favor of it in the way of demonstrational work. But under the Lever Act, if the States take advantage of all its provisions, we will expend this year $1,080,000 more than has been expended for this purpose in any previous year with the exception of last year, when we spent $480,000 more than the preceding year. In view of the constantly increasing appropriations contemplated under the Lever Act and the condition of the Treasury I think the Congress ought to cut down the appropriations under these items, both the one to which this amendment applies and the succeeding one, until those items shall represent only investigational work and overhead charge on the part of the United States Government. The time has now come when the demonstration work in agricultural lines ought to be carried on practically exclusively by the agricultural colleges and other State institutions and the investigational work carried on by the Federal Government. In other words, the activities of the Federal Government ought to be limited very largely to the investigational lines, while the State work ought to be confined to the dissemination of the information gathered by the investigational work of the Federal Government. With that end in view, I have proposed this very modest reduction of the two amounts involved in this bill going to farm-demonstration work.

Mr. BARTLETT. Until last year this work was done in cooperation with other people, who also furnished funds for the purpose, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. The work under the next item was, and under both, I think.

Mr. BARTLETT. Under both.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then in the last appropriation bill an amendment was put on in the Senate, and the House agreed to the amendment, prohibiting the department from using any money contributed by anyone else, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. It prohibited the department from accepting certain kinds of contributions. Of course, the States were not prohibited from contributing.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but Congress, by the adoption of this Senate amendment, prohibited the Secretary of Agriculture from accepting contributions from outside to the fund over which Mr. Knapp exercises control.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; from private persons or corporations, and the amount of the appropriation was increased by reason of that fact.

Mr. BARTLETT. It was doubled, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman think the prohibition contained in that Senate amendment last year ought to be repealed?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think both these amounts ought to be reduced.

Mr. BARTLETT. You could reduce the amount if you restored the old law, could you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, under the old law it was just half of what it is now.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is mistaken. We have no assurance that the old cooperative arrangement would be restored.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it ought to be restored.

Mr. LEVER. Neither do I.

Mr. HAUGEN. We had no assurance, but we passed the Lever Act, which provided for the appropriation of $480,000 permanent appropriation, which adds that amount to this appropriation. Besides, we have other appropriations available, providing the States accept and put up an equal amount, which in the aggregate will amount to $1,080,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about that proposition, and the chairman of the committee stated, when the Lever bill was under consideration, that he thought the policy would be to reduce these two items as fast as the appropriations became available under the Lever Act. The work done under these appropriations should be limited very largely to investigational work with the view to furnishing information which the demonstrations under the Lever Act were to carry to the people. The only purpose of my amendment is to commit Congress now to the policy of reducing these two items as funds under the Lever Act become available. As I said in the first place, for the next fiscal year more than a million dollars will be available under the Lever Act, and we certainly can properly at this time make a reduction in these two items.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman makes the statement that for the next fiscal year the fund available under the Lever Act will be about a million dollars. The gentleman makes the statement on the assumption that the States are going to accept the provisions of the Lever Act, many of which have not so far done so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood that all the States had accepted the terms of the Lever Act. I do not mean to say that all the States have made appropriations which will entitle them to a portion of the fund appropriated under the Lever Act, but what I do mean to say is that if the States do make the appropriations, as they are expected to, more than a million dollars will be available under the Lever Act. I think it is better that the appropriations should be made under the Lever Act than under this item, because the contributions by the States are compulsory, and they are not compulsory under these two items. That adds another reason why the appropriations should be carried as far as possible under the Lever Act and not under these two items.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Under this provision they require cooperation of the States, and they will not give them any money unless they contribute.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true; but the item does not require a contribution.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The department does.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is true the department requires a certain contribution from the States, but it has not been uniform. In some cases it has been equal to the contribution of the Federal Government and in many instances it has been less, while under the Lever Act the contributions in every case must be uniform. Every State is then treated exactly alike. If the appropriations for farm demonstration work are based on the Lever Act, we will get away from the sectional proposition that we have been talking about this morning, and the appropriations will be fairly distributed over the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I can move to amend his amendment, can I not? When the Lever Extension Act was brought before this House for a final vote last September, as I recall, I protested against the policy under which the National Government was committing itself of appropriating millions and millions of dollars for work belonging exclusively to the State, in that instance amounting in 10 years, as I recollect, to the enormous sum of $4,500,000. Here we are reaping in this demonstration work the whirlwind of the practice in having the National Government assume State functions. The proponents of that measure in advocacy of it stated that these appropriations would be eliminated, and yet we find the department, admitting that although the work is the same, coming and asking that these appropriations in this bill shall be continued. If there is anything that emphasizes the extravagance of the department and the disinclination of the department that has a hobby to check expenditures, it is this very item under consideration.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield. I do not think the amendment goes far enough, and I would like to see the whole appropriation eliminated. Here we have an appropriation of $300,000 for cooperation in demonstration work. The hearings disclose that the work is identical with the work provided for under the Lever bill. What justification can anybody in these hard-pressed times, when a bond issue is imminent and when a deficit stares us in the face and when this bill is under consideration which carries the largest appropriation that it has ever carried in the history of the Government, have for the continuation of these large appropriations.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I want to suggest to the gentleman that there was an amendment offered to the Lever bill on the floor of the House which provided that nothing in that bill should interfere with these appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, but the hearings disclose that the work is identical under these appropriations as in the Lever bill. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are to be expended under this extravagant appropriation of the Government's money.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that we are, in effect, appropriating money twice for the same purpose?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are appropriating for identically the same thing under the items in this paragraph and the work as authorized in the Lever Act.

Mr. MOORE. In an address made by the gentleman on yesterday he referred to "pork" in the river and harbor appropriation bill. Does the gentleman mean to say that same condition might apply to the agricultural bill in connection with any of these items?

Mr. STAFFORD. What condition?

Mr. MOORE. Why, the gentleman yesterday referred to "pork" in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is acknowledged by everybody. As far as the intercoastal waterways project is concerned, everybody, except, perhaps, the president of the Inland Waterways Association—everybody else who is not prejudiced or biased or interested in this subject—knows it is a chimerical proposition. But I decline to go off on that proposition.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is way off now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is extravagance. Here we have an instance where the department is not willing to accept hundreds of thousands of dollars appropriated in a permanent act, but comes here again asking for a continuation of the same old appropriations, so as to increase the agents in this field of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Michigan opposing this section?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I am in favor of the bill as it stands.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will not ask for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], although we admit that some of the statements made by him and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are correct. It is true that the work to be done under this appropriation and the appropriation carried in the following paragraph are the same, to some extent, as the work contemplated in the Lever Act. Some one has said it was the Lever-Smith Act, but it is the Lever Act. [Applause.] A gentleman in another body tried to take advantage of the popularity of this act to attach his name to it, but the credit for this law belongs to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and to him alone. [Applause.]

The Lever Act provides money for extension work in cooperation with agricultural colleges of the country; the first year $480,000, $10,000 for each State, to be given to each State unconditionally. It provides for an additional appropriation of $600,000 each year for seven years, when the law will mature, when it will carry annually the sum of $4,580,000. Most of that money, though, is to be appropriated by the Federal Government and paid to the States on condition that the States shall duplicate the amount which they might respectively be entitled to receive under the law. And it was intended by the committee which framed the law that that money should be used largely to carry on the same kind of work that is now being carried on under these two appropriations—money to be appropriated under this paragraph for farm demonstration work in the States outside of the cotton belt and the money appropriated in the next paragraph for helping the States of the South to overcome the evils and the effects of the boll weevil. Now that line of work is entirely in its infancy. It has practically just begun, and these sums of money appropriated for it in the different sections of the bill are, I was about to say, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the money actually necessary to carry on the work. These sums appropriated by this bill are altogether much lower than is necessary properly to carry on the work.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield right there for a moment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I think the figures will show this work has been carried on in two hundred and some odd counties, whereas there are 1,600 counties without it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not remember those figures, but I know whenever application is made for some of this money the Department of Agriculture has found it necessary to deny the request; they have not the money, because the appropriations have not been large enough.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman does not think the appropriation is large enough and that this work is not carried on fast enough, why does he not move to increase the appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The work is increasing very rapidly, and the money provided by the Lever law is at present small, but each year it will be larger, each year following it will be larger, until it will total the sum of $4,580,000. The idea in continuing the appropriation provided in this bill is that that work be carried on and the maturity of the Lever bill be anticipated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $666,020: *Pro-*

vided, That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers, and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 7, strike out "$666,020" and insert "$499,515."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely offer this amendment as a matter of good faith with myself. I stated that I would offer it as I had offered the amendment to cut down the preceding item. As a matter of fact this item ought to be cut down a great deal more than the amendment provides. The statement submitted by the Department of Agriculture to the committee shows that this $666,000 is divided among 15 Southern States at an average of about $44,000 each, and that the preceding item of $386,000 is divided among 33 States at an average of about $12,000 a year each. I merely moved to cut it down 25 per cent in the hope that our southern friends would recognize the equity in making that small reduction.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, personally I believe that if there is any money that the Government spends that is of more value than any other money it spends, it is the money that we spend in aiding the farmer by practical demonstrations and theoretical demonstrations which add to the value and the amount of the crops produced. [Applause.]

I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman. The amount carried in the bill now is between $600,000 and $700,000—a very great increase over what it was a few years ago—and it is further supplemented by the amount carried in the Lever bill. The Lever bill adds half a million dollars a year for a number of years to the amount of the permanent appropriation until that amount will be over $4,500,000, I believe. That will be 10 years from now, and by that time it is very likely that you will be carrying a larger amount for this appropriation, because I doubt very much whether the appropriations in these two items will be discontinued or even reduced.

There is no doubt but that the country, through the theoretical and practical work of the Department of Agriculture, and the teaching and the urging which they have done, has considerably increased the productivity of the soil. Yet we have only commenced on that subject. In the little farms of Europe, of course, there is an advantage there. They produce a much greater amount of wheat and other cereals and other crops per acre, with the same amount of cultivation, than we do. It is true that with our large areas and farms we must not expect to produce quite so much, and yet everyone knows that in the midst of a time when the cost of living is increasing and the population and consumption are increasing more rapidly than the amount of crops produced from the soil—in the midst of all that we could very largely increase the quantities per acre and the number of acres by more careful attention and cultivation.

Now, having said that, I would like to say a word to my southern friends. The amount in this item is $666,020. That is for farm demonstrations exclusively in the South. The other item was for $386,000, for farm demonstrations in the North. I make no complaint whatever about that. I think you need this demonstration work under present conditions in the South to a greater extent than it is needed in the North. But when we freely give it to you, so far as the North is concerned, sometimes I wonder at the nerve of some gentlemen from the South who, whenever a proposition comes up affecting the industries of the North, proceed to get red in the face and inveigh against these industries in the North. We are willing to help you in the South.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois would say that about any member of the Committee on Agriculture, however.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not say that about the chairman of the committee, nor, so far as I recall, have I said it about any member of the Committee on Agriculture, although I do not think that any of the gentlemen from down there are practically interested in taking care of our industries in the North, outside of our agricultural products, and they have been very fair about those, I believe. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] a little while ago said was true, that wherever you help one part of the country you help the whole country, and where you injure one part of the country you injure the whole country. We ask just the same attention from you about our matters that you receive from us. I constantly hear Members on the other side of the House, and sometimes members of the Committee on Agriculture, assaulting as violently as they know how some of the industries of my city, without which your farmers would be in very much worse shape than they are now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN and Mr. LEVER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, will be recognized first.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up any of the time of the committee, but I think it is fair to the committee to say that the farm demonstration work in the North has been begun only within the last three years and since the party to which I belong has been in the majority in this House. Before that time not a dollar of money for this purpose was being expended except in the South. That is a strange coincidence—that the Republican Party should have started the farm demonstration work in the South and that the Democratic Party should have started the farm demonstration work in the North, and it shows how nonpartisan and nonsectional and how generous to each other the members of the Committee on Agriculture are. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman explain to the House how this money is expended; in what way it is distributed in carrying out the purpose of the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that that is rather a long story, but I can do it in a few moments, I think.

Mr. MOORE. I can come in a little later.

Mr. LEVER. No; I prefer to answer the question now. In most of the States there is a cooperative arrangement with the State agricultural college in the expenditure of this sum. The State agricultural college is located at some central point in the State, and in this college is what we know as the extension leader. This extension leader has his various local demonstrators in the various communities of the State, who come in personal contact with the farmers of the community and impart to them the information in regard to better methods of agriculture.

Mr. MOORE. The paragraph provides for the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere. Does that mean labor in the sense of mere manual labor or is it scientific labor or brain labor?

Mr. LEVER. I really do not know what construction they give to the term "labor" there, but that item provides for the overhead charges in the city of Washington.

Mr. MOORE. The item says:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $66,020.

I am asking the question because that is a very large sum of money, and if it is applied to the employment of labor, that is one thing. If it is applied to the appointments of scientists and experts, that is another thing. That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman this: That under that language probably this item will provide for the charwomen or a messenger and probably occasionally a laborer, but the bulk of the administrative expenses in the city of Washington would be such as the gentleman describes as scientific work.

Mr. MOORE. Are bodies of workingmen sent out to do this work, or is it a body of scientific and brain workers?

Mr. LEVER. These men sometimes travel and meet large bodies of farmers in conventions. They sometimes meet a convention of the various county agents and impart to them the instructions that they carry from the city of Washington, but the bulk of this work is done in the field.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has anticipated one of my questions, but I want to ask if the chairman of the committee has any idea of how much of the amount included in these two items is for the employment of labor in the city of Washington, including all overhead charges—about what percentage of these two appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that I can not give the exact figures off hand. Here are the items submitted in the estimates, but I have not added them up. It is, however, a comparatively small amount, about the usual amount for administrative purposes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am somewhat familiar with the demonstration work in the North in this direction, and I want to compliment the committee and the department for the progress that they are making. If the chairman of this committee [Mr. LEVER] had done nothing else than to secure the passage of the Lever Act, his name would be handed down to posterity, and

as a benefactor would be remembered by the farmers of this country for many years. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there anything in the hearings about what progress is being made toward the destruction of the boll weevil?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the purposes of these two items, and the general progress being made under the two items, were quite well known to the members of the committee, and hence we did not take the time of the committee to take testimony upon the subject, so that the hearings this year were not very full.

Mr. BOOHER. What new method have they discovered, or what new remedy have they discovered, for this scourge in the cotton district?

Mr. LEVER. They have not discovered any new remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. The only practicable way that has been found of handling the boll-weevil situation is to grow a crop of cotton under certain cultural methods in spite of the boll weevil. In my judgment, so far as the entomological work in reference to the boll weevil is concerned, practically no positive progress has been made. Some negative progress has been made. I mean by that, they have discovered that a great many suggested remedies will not do the business.

Mr. BOOHER. A year ago it was discovered that rotation of crops would destroy the boll weevil. Is that practiced yet?

Mr. LEVER. That is being practiced yet.

Mr. BOOHER. Does it require $660,000 a year to inculcate that knowledge?

Mr. LEVER. That question has been asked a great many times. I think this language is very unfortunate. It carries the words "boll weevil" in it. My genial friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has always protested against that language, but for certain tactical reasons I have not desired to have those words cut out.

Mr. BOOHER. What are the tactical reasons?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I simply protested against the language used; not against the appropriation or the use made of it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; only against the language in the appropriation. The tactical reason was that I was afraid if I brought this bill in here with this item changed by striking out the words "boll weevil," I would create a panic among my southern friends, and that is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will ask the gentleman how much money has been appropriated for the boll-weevil proposition?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman offhand. We have been appropriating for it for about 10 years.

Mr. BOOHER. Not less than $500,000 a year, have we?

Mr. LEVER. Not that much until very recently.

Mr. BOOHER. There has been more than $3,000,000 appropriated, has there not?

Mr. LEVER. This is the first year the amount has exceeded $500,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Heretofore it has been carried at $500,000, has it not?

Mr. LEVER. No; up to last year the Federal appropriation was only about $250,000 to $275,000.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman in charge of the bill knows. Last year, on account of the proviso here striking out the cooperative arrangement which had theretofore existed between the general education board and the Department of Agriculture, which, I think, was a wise provision, this was increased.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, are they making any progress in this work at all toward the destruction of the boll weevil?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that the work of farm demonstration in the South—getting the boll weevil out of your head now—is absolutely creating a revolution in the agriculture of the South.

Mr. BOOHER. I am not talking about farm-demonstration work. I am in favor of it. I want some information on the subject of boll weevil, if I can get it.

Mr. LEVER. I have been very frank with the gentleman about the boll-weevil proposition. I am very willing to have an amendment to strike it out, because the language of the bill is misleading.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not want to strike it out. I am trying to find out what progress has been made.

Mr. LEVER. I am telling the gentleman.

Mr. BOOHER. You have not told me.

Mr. LEVER. Either the gentleman is unfortunate or I am.

Mr. BOOHER. I suppose I am unfortunate in my understanding.

Mr. LEVER. No; I think not. I am.

Mr. BOOHER. Over $3,000,000 has been appropriated to find out some remedy for the boll weevil. What progress has been made?

Mr. LEVER. I stated to the gentleman a moment ago, as plainly as I knew how to state anything, that the entomological work in regard to the boll weevil has not made any affirmative, positive progress. The entomologists disagree with me on that, but in my opinion they have made no positive progress. They have made some negative progress, in this, that a great many remedies suggested by different people have been tried out and found to be useless in checking the ravages of the boll weevil. Whatever positive progress has been made has been due to the cultural methods which the Department of Agriculture is inducing the people of the infected areas in the Southern States to adopt.

Mr. BOOHER. This boll weevil does not infest the whole country. It is only found in spots.

Mr. LEVER. The boll weevil covers the larger part of Texas and Louisiana, a large part of Mississippi, and it is now in Alabama and touching the border of Georgia, and going eastward at the rate of about 70 miles a year.

Mr. BOOHER. Diversified farming is a remedy for it, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. They think so; yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Then why do you want $600,000 to teach people that diversified farming will stop the boll weevil when they know it already.

Mr. LEVER. My friend thoroughly misunderstands the scope of this work. We are teaching the people how to diversify.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the farmer in your country know enough to sow wheat or oats or rye, or to plant corn when his cotton crop was destroyed the year before, when he has been told by your experts to do so, or do you have to go down there and put it in for him?

Mr. LEVER. No; we do not go down there and put it in for him at all; we do not sow his wheat, we just simply preach to the people the doctrine of diversified agriculture and show them how.

Mr. BOOHER. You have been preaching that for 10 years, have you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I have been preaching it for 15 years.

Mr. BOOHER. And it has not done any good.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I think it has.

Mr. BOOHER. You have got the same boll weevil down there, have you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the boll weevil is there and we will have more in 10 years.

Mr. BOOHER. Then why make this appropriation of money if you are not accomplishing anything?

Mr. LEVER. We are trying to grow cotton in spite of the boll weevil; and, also, we want the people to diversify their crop growing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will yield.

Mr. NORTON. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, is it not a fact that this item of $66,000 is used largely for demonstration work in the South, not pertaining to the eradication of the boll weevil, but to assist in the improvement of farm conditions in the South?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true to some extent. The chairman of the committee, I thought, had explained that to the gentleman from Missouri. All of the money is used in teaching the farmers how to farm in boll-weevil regions.

Mr. NORTON. Just as the preceding item is used in the North in cooperative demonstration work?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; with the additional amount made necessary by the presence of the boll weevil in the South. I am certain that my friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] is not objecting to the appropriation because it is appropriated for use in the South. I could remind my friend that we very cheerfully appropriated $600,000 last year to be used in the hog-cholera region, and that was in the Middle West and not in the South.

I hail from a Southern State, and, Mr. Chairman, I stand ready to vote for relief for the people in any section of our country. I do not care whether it is in the East, in the North, or in the West. I am ready to support at any time any measure to aid the farmers in every section of our country. I sometimes grow a little weary with gentlemen who undertake to charge that this committee is appropriating money to aid the South to the detriment and neglect of other sections of the country. This work of eradicating the boll weevil is of vast advantage to the farmers in my section. We have taught the farmers in the section affected by the weevil how to produce some cotton even in his presence. I want to say that one remedy we are teaching the people is to plow the cotton when the weevil is in the small square. Shaking it off by the plow and by the animal coming in contact with the stalk causes the little square to fall, and turning up the fresh soil, moist in the heat of the day, causes the square when it falls on the soil immediately following the plow to get very hot and very dry, and that actually kills the weevil; it steams him to death. But we are teaching the people down there to grow other things than cotton. I want to say to my friend that it is not an easy matter to teach people who have been raising cotton for 100 years, and relying absolutely on that crop, to quit producing cotton. You have got to show them that they can do better by producing other crops.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not want the gentleman to think that I am objecting to this appropriation because it is for the South. I am not objecting at all; I am trying to find out what progress has been made. Now, I am going to recommend something to the gentleman; I do not know whether he will follow it or not. The Agricultural Department has published an interesting bulletin, No. 519, on cotton raising. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama has sent any of those bulletins into his district.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, I think that the farm that the bulletin refers to is in my district.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman think that would educate his people?

Mr. HEFLIN. I think, as I have said here once before, that the old negro who claims to have made that tremendous amount of cotton on 2 acres of land—7 bales of cotton on 2 acres of land—produced most of it at night while his neighbors were asleep. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. I know that the gentleman said so, but the Department of Agriculture does not agree with him.

Mr. HEFLIN. Of course, the department is further removed from the premises than I am and knows less about the old, old method of producing cotton in the nighttime. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. The trouble is that the farmer who is so successful in raising the cotton happened to be a colored man, and you would not take any advice from him. Nobody had to go and tell him how to raise cotton, but he did it by hard work. Now, I recommend the gentleman to get 5,000 of these bulletins and distribute them personally to these people, and if he does so they will get rid of the boll weevil in his district. Information on this subject should be welcome, without reference to the source from which it emanates. Why does not the gentleman avail himself of the information contained in Bulletin No. 519 and advise his constituents who are cotton raisers to do likewise?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless some one makes the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I just inquired of the Chair if all time had expired, and I understood the Chair to say that it had.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair meant was that if under the general rule a point of order was made, there was no more time.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Will it be proper to ask for recognition to discuss the amendment after the gentleman from Michigan has spoken?

The CHAIRMAN. According to the way we have been running, unless some one makes the point of order, I think it would be.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel the same about this amendment as I did about the one offered to the preceding paragraph. I think this appropriation ought to be continued this year, so that the work may be continued and extended as it will be, and perhaps appropriations of this kind ought to be continued even a little longer than one year, or until the States have the full benefit of the money coming from the Lever law. But what the chairman of the committee said in answer to an inquiry by a gentleman as to the meaning of this appropriation justifies the action that some of us have taken or attempted, rather, to take with a view of changing this language. These words "boll weevil" ought not to be in the bill at all.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman is right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The appropriation has nothing whatever to do with the boll weevil. The money is used for the hire of men and to pay the expenses of men to work and cooperate with the farmers in the South in the study of agricultural problems, and in particular to bring about better agriculture in that part of the country. The need of that effort was made evident by the ravages of the boll weevil. The boll weevil came and devastated the cotton fields, and it was necessary for the people in that section of the country to have some relief, and they asked for an appropriation, and the use of the language "for the relief of the boll-weevil situation" was a subterfuge. I always believed it was a subterfuge, and the House by misapprehension has appropriated this money, believing that it was to be an appropriation to fight the boll weevil, whereas it was simply to teach the people other lines of agriculture, made necessary by the ravages of the boll weevil. Now, the question has been asked as to how this money is used. In the North it is used in this way: The Department of Agriculture will offer to the people of a county—in my State, for instance—the sum of $1,200 a year to be applied to the payment of a man to do work in that county, on condition that the people of the county, the county authorities or some association organized for that purpose, shall undertake to furnish the rest of the money necessary to pay the salary and expenses of the man, usually from $2,500 to $3,000 a year in the aggregate. Perhaps a dozen or 15 men are now employed in my State in that way, covering a dozen or fifteen counties. In addition to that a man is employed in a congressional district to oversee the work of the county men in that district. There are several district men in Michigan. These congressional-district men are paid by the Department of Agriculture altogether out of this appropriation. Then there is one man employed over the entire State, employed jointly by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural college, and he is paid out of the money furnished by the department out of this appropriation and by the agricultural college out of its own money. Now, that is the work in a general way as it is done in the States of the North. I think the work done in Michigan is typical of the work done in other Northern States. I do not know so much about how it is done in the States of the South. The criticism made by the gentleman from Missouri, that the people in some sections are asking for too much to be done for them, is a proper criticism. The people in some sections of the country, perhaps all of them, have been asking that in various lines of work too much—more than should be asked—shall be done for them. They have not been satisfied with advice or suggestions as to better methods. Many of them asked to have the Federal representatives come in and actually take part with them and do the physical work in connection with their business or the lines of work in which they are engaged.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, this discussion upon the boll weevil has brought out two or three very clever suggestions, one of them from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], which interested me mightily. His speech was eloquent and it was patriotic. He believes that what benefits one section of the country benefits all sections of the country, and what tends to injure one section of the country tends to injure all sections of the country. That is a fine, splendid, patriotic sentiment, and I believe in it. I believe in it thoroughly with respect to the treatment of farmers in an Agricultural bill. I believe in it thoroughly also with respect to a river and harbor bill, and I believe in it thoroughly with respect to the welfare of all the people of this country, whether employer or employee. Sometimes gentlemen have contended on this floor, and violently, over the question of "special privileges" supposed to be granted to one section of the country above another section or to one kind of industry over another industry, and generally such conflicts have arisen from attacks made upon the eastern and northern industries. So I hail with pleasure and with gratifica-

tion the speech of the gentleman from Texas because of its breadth and its foresight, and I commend the leader of the Republican side of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for so promptly stating that there was another side of this question affecting our so-called sectional criticisms. Now, here is a bill that proposes to appropriate for the benefit of the country $22,000,000. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a moment ago made some reference to river and harbor "pork." He alluded to the river and harbor bill.

I contend that the river and harbor appropriation bill is a bill that tends not only to improve the commercial relations of the country and lower the freight rates, but it also gives employment throughout the country to as great an extent as is provided in any other bill. From the answer of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and from the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] it does not appear that the bulk of this appropriation of $666,000 for the treatment of the boll weevil goes to the labor of the country. Apparently it is not put in circulation to feed the men who work upon the farm; it is expended rather in the payment of salaried men, who are specialists or instructors, whose duty it is to teach the plodding farmer how to do his work. Now, I am in favor of the farmer who does the farm work, just as I am in favor of the man who works upon river and harbor improvements, or who dirties his hands in digging the canal. These are the kind of men I want to help, whether they live in Texas or up in Pennsylvania.

I question whether we are doing much to help these men here, since most of this appropriation of $666,000 goes to pay the specialists who tell the workingman how to work. I believe in the elimination of the boll weevil, and I want you gentlemen to get this money. I think you ought to have it. But I think it is only fair to say that if the appropriation is intended wholly and solely for those who have been trained to instruct, rather than to work, it would be better to frame our agricultural bills and our river and harbor bills, so that actual labor, whether in the factory or on the farm, may have at least an equal chance at our hands, along with our intellectual friends, the specialists. [Applause.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, this matter was thrashed out in the committee for a long time, and if the committee had taken my advice in regard to the matter there would have been no occasion for this lengthy discussion on the subject.

When the men from the Department of Agriculture in charge of the expenditure of this $666,000 were before our committee, I asked them what success they had had in exterminating the boll weevil. They said they had had no success whatever and had no hope of exterminating that pest. Then I wanted to know why they retained this language in the bill, and they could not give any excuse for it.

I suggested to the committee at the time that it would be well to strike out these words, "and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil," leaving this section worded identically as the preceding section, except that it was inside the cotton belt; not outside.

There is no man from the North who will oppose an appropriation of whatever sum of money is necessary for farm demonstration work in the South, but I believe it is wrong to leave language in this bill that is absolutely misleading. People in the North who do not know the situation can not understand why we appropriate money that can not be used for the purpose expressed in the bill or for the accomplishment of anything practical in that line for the benefit of the South. It is absolutely misleading, and I think if we were wise enough to strike out these words it would obviate the necessity for lengthy discussions of this matter in the future when it has no bearing upon the value of this appropriation whatever.

While I do not now want to submit an amendment, because the committee turned it down—and I am perfectly willing to stand by the judgment of the committee—I still believe that it would be a wise thing to strike out this language, so that this discussion will not occur annually over these words and over this same sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, an amendment is pending. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Island of Guam, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, $120,000, as follows: Alaska, $40,000; Hawaii, $35,000; Porto Rico, $30,000; and Guam, $15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Island of Guam, and this fund shall be available until used: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii $5,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 64, line 11, as follows: "And this fund shall be available until used."

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter there be prepared by the Department of Agriculture an annual report on the work and expenditures of the agricultural experiment stations established under the act of Congress of March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 440), on the work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in connection therewith, and on the cooperative agricultural extension work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture and of agricultural colleges under the act of May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture;" and that there be printed annually 8,000 copies of said report, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. This is purely legislation.

Mr. BARNHART. It is new legislation, to begin with, Mr. Chairman, and it makes it permanent law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen may be right, but I have an idea that they are not, and I am going to call the attention of the Chair to page 253—the present occupant of the chair has that volume there—of "Laws Applicable to the United States Department of Agriculture." At the bottom of page 253 I will read:

That there be printed 8,000 copies of the report of the Director of the Office of Experiment Stations, prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, on the work and expenditures of that office and of the agricultural experiment stations established in the several States and Territories under the law of Congress of March 2, 1887, for 1903, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture; and that annually thereafter a similar report shall be prepared and printed, the edition to be the same as for the report herein provided.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If that is the law, what is the purpose of this item in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. The explanation given by the chief of the bureau was that inasmuch as the department under its scheme of reorganization has changed the name of this service, there might be some question about the authority. He thinks he has the authority to print, but he wanted to be absolutely sure. I say I am not sure that this is a change of existing law. I am in doubt about it myself.

Mr. MANN. There is no doubt about it changing existing law.

Mr. LEVER. I am ready for the Chair to rule.

Mr. MANN. Is the only explanation that of the change in the name?

Mr. LEVER. That is the only explanation given in the committee.

Mr. MANN. As I recalled, when I saw this item, we now get a quota——

Mr. LEVER. The House now gets 2,000 copies——

Mr. MANN. Of these reports?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And this does not change what we now get?

Mr. LEVER. This language here would just continue that exactly. That is the only purpose. It may be that the item is subject to a point of order. I am in doubt about it, and the department is in doubt about it, but they very frankly confess that. But they said they thought it was well to let them continue to make these reports. I think this is a very valuable document.

Mr. MANN. Of course if it is to continue reports now being printed, and this paragraph is necessary because of the change of name, I would not make a point of order against it.

Mr. LEVER. They included, in addition, only the agricultural extension bill in this language. The reports will also cover the operations under the agricultural extension act. That is all there is to it. I do not believe it is subject to a point of order myself.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to Rule XI, on page 363 of the Manual. It reads:

All proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

Then I want to call the attention of the Chair to section 2, paragraph 4, of the act of March 1, 1907, which reads as follows:

Orders for printing extra copies otherwise than herein provided for shall be by simple, concurrent, or joint resolution.

Further on it says:

Such resolutions when presented to either House shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who in making their report shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing, upon the estimate of the Public Printer.

Mr. LEVER. Is the gentleman reading from the statute?

Mr. BARNHART. I am reading from the statute. I have given the Chair the citation.

Mr. LEVER. But this is authorized under that joint resolution.

Mr. BARNHART. It should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. LEVER. What is the necessity of referring it to the Committee on Printing when it is already law? This is an exception to the gentleman's proposition. It seems to me the language is clearly in order, under the explanation I have made in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. BARNHART. How could the gentleman do it under the act of 1914 if his premise is true?

Mr. LEVER. I have tried to explain, in the first place, that this is nothing more than a continuation of work authorized under this joint resolution which I read to the Chair a moment ago. In the second place, answering the gentleman's other question, the department had some doubt as to their authority to do this work.

Now, in my own judgment, I think they have the authority. I am a little in doubt about it, I confess, but they want to do the work that they have been doing and that they were authorized to do under the old Office of Experiment Stations. The name of that office is now changed, and they want to do exactly the same work, except that they want to include in it the extension work. I think it is authorized.

Mr. BARNHART. Over and above all, it is a move to secure further privileges of public printing for a department. These department heads seek from time to time to get all of the appropriation allowances they can in the sundry civil or other appropriation bills, and then come directly and indirectly to Congress to get more and more. Personally I have no objection whatever to publishing every possible document that will conduce to larger success in agriculture or any other department of human endeavor, but I know from my own experience that it is the general disposition of these departments to go before the Committee on Appropriations and get all that they can secure there, and then come to the other committees of the House, or to the House itself, and ask for more, in order that they may exploit certain notions of their own with the general appropriations; and then when the Congress wants anything for the benefit of the people generally, it must make additional appropriation, as the departments utilize all of their printing allotments as they choose to do.

Mr. Chairman, if it is in order for the Committee on Agriculture—I will not say to usurp the functions of the Committee on Appropriations, but to assume its functions in this respect—and also to assume the functions of the Committee on Printing, then the rule which I have just cited has no force.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering: One director, who shall be a scientist and have charge of all scientific and technical work, $4,500; 1 draftsman, $1,920; 1 chief clerk, $1,900; 2 clerks, class 4; four clerks, class 3; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, $1,600; 1 clerk, $1,500; 1 clerk, $1,440; 2 clerks or instrument makers, at $1,440 each; 1 clerk or tabulator, $1,440; 2 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,380; 2 clerks, at $1,320 each; 4 clerks, at $1,260 each; 5 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, $1,200; 1 clerk or draftsman, $1,200; 1 clerk or draftsman, $900; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,200; 1 clerk or photographer, $1,000; 2 clerks, at $1,140 each; 2 clerks, at $1,080 each; 1 clerk, $1,020; 7 clerks, at $1,000 each; 3 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk or instrument maker, $1,200; 1 messenger or laboratory helper, $840; 2 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers, at $720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $660; 5 messengers, laborers, or messenger boys, at $600 each; 5 laborers, messenger boys, or charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $75,960.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to line 17——

Mr. LEVER. On what page?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On page 66:

One clerk or editorial clerk, $1,600.

And then, in line 22:

One clerk or editorial clerk, $1,200.

I presume those are the gentlemen who perform these meritorious services, of which I gave an illustration yesterday, of preparing these bulletins for the press. This is the first place where I have seen them appropriated for. They have these gentlemen in all the other departments, but no man on this floor can find out how they are paid. What are the duties of these distinguished editorial clerks, and what do they do?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I think the language of the items explain just about what you could expect their duties to be. I have not looked into that. The gentleman understands that it is impossible for me to know the duties of every clerk and employee in the Agricultural Department. That is a physical impossibility. I think they get out bulletins——

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. As I remember the explanation made by the department of the work of these clerks, it is that they prepare the manuscripts sent in to them by the writers in the department for printing at the Printing Office.

Mr. LEVER. That is the inference I draw from it, of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The other day I took occasion to look up the traveling expenses of the department. I had the data on the desk, but it is gone now. I found where they paid some man $10, expenses to go down to Richmond, Va., to see about purchasing a printing press for the Forestry Service to be sent out to Utah. I was wondering what the Forestry Service needed with a printing press in that State.

Mr. LEVER. I should wonder about that myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And whether it is a part of the duty of one of these editorial clerks to edit some paper in Utah.

Mr. LEVER. I have no information about printing presses at Denver, and of course I do not know anything about the $12 to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can look up the item.

Mr. LEVER. I do not question the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I had it on my desk, but I can not find it now. I think it is to be commended that in this bill it states here what these items are for. In the Post Office Department they have a gentleman by the name of McAdam, who prepares these bulletins, and so far as I have been able to find it is not possible to ascertain how he is paid. He is not under the civil service, but he is there on a salary telling what a great and glorious work the Post Office Department is doing.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman would send me the information about the printing press in Utah.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman will find it in the accounts of traveling expenses, but I will furnish it to him. I do not say that none of the bulletins are of any value, for some of them are, but it has gotten to be an abuse. Take the bulletins issued by the Agricultural Department, and most of them are valuable; but such a bulletin as I read here yesterday, sent out over the country where we appropriate $100,000 a year for that kind of nonsense, is an abuse. The principal object of some of these bulletins is to create a sentiment to compel us to make more appropriations for the bureau. You will see a great many containing insidious attacks on Congress and say if Congress would only appropriate more money so they could investigate certain things they could do great service to the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. I notice in the item a salary for clerks and employees at $1,920 a year. How does the committee or the department fix a salary at $1,920 instead of $1,900 or $1,950?

Mr. LEVER. It is their method of division; it is at the rate of $160 a month.

Mr. BARKLEY. They fix it by the month?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not recall when this bureau was established. Is the gentleman able to tell me the year?

Mr. LEVER. No; I have not the record here, but it was 8 or 10 or 15 years ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman tell me the amount of this appropriation originally?

Mr. LEVER. That would be hard to recall.

Mr. BUTLER. I know that we ask the gentleman from South Carolina many questions that we ought not to ask him; we use him as a sort of encyclopedia.

Mr. LEVER. The original appropriation was very small.

Mr. BUTLER. And yet the office expenses have crept up to $75,960.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that there is an apparent increase in the statutory roll of $23,000 on account of transfers of certain items carried in other parts of the bill. The Roads Office has grown very rapidly.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate that it has grown very rapidly, and especially the appropriations. I should like to know something about the activity of this bureau. Will the gentleman tell us what it is the bureau really does in the way of assisting in the construction and maintenance of good roads? It does no more than advise?

Mr. LEVER. The Government, of course, conducts a great many experiments in road building, as to the best kind of road machinery, but does not enter into the building of roads except probably a mile here and there as a demonstration proposition. They do give advice in the construction of roads.

Suppose that a county in my State has issued bonds for the construction of roads. The department will be called upon to send an expert or a specialist to go over the local conditions and the best methods of expending the money and the best kind of roads to be built.

Mr. BUTLER. Has not the State of South Carolina its own road department?

Mr. LEVER. We do not have any central department; no State institution; it is a county organization.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, this bureau does have an official who goes about and advises as to the kind and character of roads to be built.

Mr. LEVER. They do.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know how many officials they have traveling around giving advice?

Mr. LEVER. I can not; but that can easily be ascertained.

Mr. BUTLER. Gentlemen understand how much easier it is to get this information from him than it is to hunt it up. As I understand, they decide on the advisability of the territory where they are invited to go examine the character of the ground and advise the authorities what sort of a road to build.

Mr. LEVER. They look over the material, and then they have to determine, considering the kind and quantity of material, the most economical and the best way to build the roads in that locality.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that they not only advise as to the best road to be built, but they allow the engineer of the department to stay on the ground and instruct the local officials how best to build the road, and allow him to remain for two or three weeks until they are advised properly how to construct the road.

Mr. LEVER. That statement is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to make this observation. I am greatly interested in road construction, but I believe it is a factor in our public life that ought to be worked out by different communities and different States. I believe that much of this appropriation of $660,000 is absolutely wrong and a waste of money. But there is no use of making any objection to it here. I live in a community where we build our own roads. The State of Pennsylvania has its own road department, or a department of public roads, where we can obtain instruction if we see fit. This appropriation has grown to the enormous sum of $600,000, and inasmuch as we may next year have to hold out our hats, I think we ought to reduce some of these expenses.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The interest in public-road building all over the United States has increased to such an extent that it justifies to some extent the additional appropriation in this bill. I can give a succinct illustration that occurred in my country. They had a certain kind of material down there, and they were in doubt whether a road could be constructed of that material.

Mr. BUTLER. But it would not cost $60,000——

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They want to build it for the purpose of demonstrating that the material could be used and that it could be built with benefit to the community and economy to the country.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for about three minutes. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state Indiana has more good roads than any other State in the Union and it has made more progress in the development of good roads probably in the last three or four years than any other section of the country in road making. These appropriations have been made from time to time and continue to grow, and while I am not in favor of large appropriations of this character, I do believe, from the fact that we have a skilled force of men going throughout the country to demonstrate with very little cost that good roads can be scientifically and economically made and the way to construct them, that Congress ought to take advantage of that opportunity which it now has. I know that one county in the district which I represent has built and in process of construction 600 miles of stone roads. They have had a man from the Department of Agriculture who had given the people in that section some instructions in building gravel and stone roads, and it happens, Mr. Chairman, that the character of the soil is of a loamy character and does not contain much gravel, and they have been able to continue this gentleman from the Department of Agriculture there for three weeks to get this sort of instruction, which is very valuable to the people of that community; and I am satisfied that as long as the Government has made this expenditure and has increased this appropriation, that the value and benefit of such information disseminated throughout the country can not be overestimated. I merely wanted to make that observation, which came within my range of view.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to call attention to the paragraph of this bill which provides for an expenditure of $75,960 for a civil force in this bureau. In this paragraph there is no provision made—I can not find it—to pay for an official who visited the community of which the gentleman spoke to give instructions. I have noticed this item grow from an inch long until it covers a page. It is mighty expensive, and I simply here make my protest and give notice that if I live to be a Member of Congress when the Republicans come into power I intend to make an effort to get rid of this item or greatly reduce it.

Mr. CLINE. I desire to say to the gentleman I am not out of harmony very much with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said; but inasmuch as we have increased these expenditures to the extent we have, and inasmuch as we have experts on hand, and inasmuch as we have men who know the necessity for the dissemination of knowledge is very great, I believe that we ought to make use of what we now have. As a general proposition I am opposed to all appropriations of this character; but from the fact that we have now large experience, derived from former appropriations, I think that advantage ought to be taken of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have often wondered what the men engaged in the Office of Public Roads do for a living, and I still continue to wonder why it is we continue to increase the number of men whose employment is of an uncertain character, and I am still more at a loss to understand why it is that the Office of Public Roads has included in its functions an investigation and report on the utilization of water in farm irrigation. We have in another department, I believe, a bureau that has charge of irrigation subjects of the country; but what irrigation has to do with road building is more than I can understand; and yet there is a paragraph in this bill, under the head of "Office of Public Roads," for investigation and report on utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice, an appropriation of $106,400.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the item has heretofore been carried under the Office of Experiment Stations and has been transferred here because it was thought it was more nearly an engineering proposition and logically belonged to this bureau.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it has no more to do with road building than the man in the moon has, not a bit. It is only another way of pretending to give an organization that has nothing to do from the outset some excuse for existing.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield again? Because I know he does not want to do anybody an injustice. The gentleman will notice that the title of this office has been changed to read, "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering."

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I understand that.

Mr. LEVER. And the change which was made was to meet the criticism which the gentleman is making, so as to make it really indicate the character of the work being done under it.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if men are employed in the Road Construction Bureau because of their expert knowledge of materials that are required and the conditions under which roads are to be constructed in various sections of the country, the further admission must be that these men are not qualified to do the thing which this section authorizes the men in the Road Building Bureau to do.

Mr. LEVER. Well, now, the gentleman has his facts wrong again, and I want to keep him straight, because I know he does not want to state the facts wrongly. The organization heretofore existed in the Office of Experiment Stations, and has been bodily transferred over here.

Mr. MADDEN. Why it should be transferred to the jurisdiction of a general manager, or whatever his title may be, director of good roads, is a matter I can not understand. This man who has charge of experiments in road building has no knowledge whatever, if I understand the man, of the duties that are to be performed in connection with the investigation of the utilization of water in farm irrigation.

And then it goes on further and gives the authority to this man to investigate and report upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp lands and wet lands, which may be made available for agricultural purposes. I had supposed that when you authorized men to develop agriculture you would find men who were qualified to advise as to what the best method of agriculture is. We are pretending here in this paragraph of the bill to employ men who are versed in the best methods of road building, and I have some doubt about whether we have accomplished the object for which this law is intended even then, because I do not regard the man at the head of the Office of Public Roads as the best qualified man to give advice as to how roads should be built or as to the materials to be used in the construction of roads. On the other hand, I believe that every community in America best understands its own needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all communities naturally employ the materials which are in closest proximity to the road that is to be built, no matter what advice they get as to what is the best material abstractly for the construction of a road. After all, the cost of building a road is the prime consideration entering into the question of its construction, and, although it may be quite well understood by an expert or even by a layman that a granite road would be much preferable to a burned-clay road or that a crushed-stone road or a road made of macadam or concrete would be better than an ordinary dirt road, the financial condition of the people of the community would be such that they would not want to build either kind of road, and no matter what kind of advice they might get from the expert they would decide the question altogether upon their financial condition. So after all, in the case of a community in South Carolina, for example, where the gentleman who is chairman of this committee [Mr. LEVER] lives, his people would assemble their officials and decide whether they wanted to build the road. They might ask how the road would be constructed in the best way by somebody, but when the time came when they would conclude and determine how much money they were going to spend on the building of the road the taxpayers would decide that question, and the advice of the expert from Washington would be wholly unnecessary and ignored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering: For salaries and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, office fixtures, apparatus, traveling and all other necessary expenses, for conducting investigations and experiments, and for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same, and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports, as follows: *Provided*, That no part of these appropriations shall be expended for the rent or purchase of road-making machinery, except such as may be necessary for field experimental work as hereinafter provided for.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Answering the inquiry of the chairman [Mr. LEVER] awhile ago, I have that item now. It is found in the expenditures for traveling from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia, performed by certain officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

I find I was in error as to where they wanted to send the printing press. I find, on page 55, this item:

Ballard, C. M., clerk, Richmond, Va., and return, January 21, 1914: To examine, with a view to purchase, "Humana" automatic press feeder for printing office at supply depot, Ogden, Utah.

That is under the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I would like to see a printing plant established out there, and we have found it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, as to this proposition of printing these bulletins, I have a few more suggestions to make. I know I am talking out of order, but I will not consume more than five minutes. I hold in my hand a Weekly News Letter to Crop Correspondents. I understand that is printed in the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether I am right about that or not. I am only speaking on hearsay. I recognize they have the right to print bulletins in the Weather Bureau. The law specifically provides that. Is there any specific provision giving the Department of Agriculture the right to print these bulletins?

Mr. LEVER. No specific authorization that I know of, and I am inclined to think they do not print this in the Department of Agriculture. My own idea is that it is printed at the Government Printing Office. Of course the Department of Agriculture gets up the facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is undoubtedly printed under the direction of the Government Printing Office, because it is so stated at the bottom.

Now I want to call attention to a decision that I have here from the Comptroller of the Treasury, under date of December 11, 1914, which I think the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. BARNHART], who is not here just at present, ought to have brought to his attention.

The decision is that they have no authority to purchase printing presses for any of these departments unless it is especially given them by act of Congress, and that they have no right to print these various documents that come from these departments without authority.

Now, the duplications of all these bulletins of the character to which I called attention yesterday are merely subterfuges. It is simply a violation of the regulations to print. While they are manifolded, they are still simply printed, and they keep a great number of men employed in that work, estimated to cost, as I said, $100,000 a year. There is no excuse for their doing that, because here is a decision of the comptroller delivered recently to this very Bureau of Good Roads that we have just passed. They wanted to purchase a printing press and use it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print this decision in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the decision referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the decision referred to:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 11, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

SIR: I have your letter of December 3, 1914, requesting a decision upon whether a printing press may be purchased for the use of the Office of Public Roads to do certain printing upon tracings, engineering drawings, maps, and plans prepared by said office.

You state that in preparing them "several different styles of letters are required and in many cases only one impression is necessary. It is desirable for the draftsman who prepares the tracing or plan to select the style of type and in many cases to make the impression himself after setting up the form." Also "that it is impracticable to have the Government Printing Office do the lettering or printing on these plans and tracings."

It is proposed to purchase the printing press under the item in the appropriation "General expenses, Office of Public Roads" (Public, No. 122, p. 27), as follows:

"For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, $145,000."

Where printing offices are authorized in the departments they are required to be under the control of the Public Printer, who is to furnish all presses, etc., from the general supplies of the Government Printing Office. (Sec. 31, act of Jan. 12, 1895.)

The authority to use a department appropriation for the purchase of a printing press must be considered with respect to the statutory provision, supra, and the further provision in the statute (sec. 87) that all printing for the executive departments shall be done at the Government Printing Office.

In Ninth Miscellaneous Comptroller's Decisions, page 47, April 6, 1899, section 31, supra, was viewed by this office as prohibiting the Division of Vegetable Pathology of the Department of Agriculture from procuring and operating its own press for the printing of scientific names for labeling herbarium specimens, although at times only one or two of the same kind were required, and there seemed to be inconveniences and practical difficulties in complying with the law.

In the present case I understand the use of a printing press as commonly understood is necessary, and that the work to be done thereby is none other than printing. Whatever may be said as to purchasing printing presses in the nature of labor-saving machines, and under an appropriation for such machines, as was the case in Seventeenth Comptroller's Decisions, page 349, cited by you, the statutory provisions, supra, necessarily must exclude the furnishing of printing presses under general department appropriations, and if I were to authorize the purchase under such an appropriation it would be not so much a construction of the permissible uses of an appropriation as an arbitrary permission to make such use.

The impracticability there is stated to be in having the work done at the Government Printing Office does not permit me to go to the extent of authorizing a printing press to be installed in your department, but is matter for addressing to Congress supporting a request to make specific provision therefor. In absence of such authority in the appropriation in question its use for the purchase of a printing press is not authorized.

Respectfully, GEO. H. DOWNEY, *Comptroller.*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUTLER. I find a proviso in this paragraph which denies to this bureau the privilege of purchasing road-making machinery. Does this bureau purchase road-making machinery?

Mr. LEVER. It can not, except under the terms of the proviso.

Mr. BUTLER. Not under this "except such as may be necessary for field experimental work as hereinafter provided for"? Does the gentleman have the information at hand from which I can learn about how much money this bureau spends every year in the purchase of what is known as road-making machinery?

Mr. LEVER. I presume we have it here somewhere, but I can not tell offhand. This proviso was put on this bill on the floor of the House to prevent what members of the committee thought might be an abuse. We did give them the authority to purchase some machinery for experimental purposes. Just how much they have expended I do not know. Of course we have the facts, but I can not lay my hand on them. They are available.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman direct my attention to some publication by which I can learn just what this bureau does with its money?

Mr. LEVER. There is a large book known as "Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture." I refer the gentleman to that.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman. Now, does the gentleman know of any public roads that this bureau has constructed?

Mr. LEVER. My colleague [Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina] has a mile of model road which was built in his county.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman from South Carolina tell me how I can get them to build a piece of road at my home?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; go down and see them about it.

Mr. BUTLER. No; there is no use of my going down to see them. I will get my friend to do it. I should like to have 25 miles of good roads built, and yet I would not ask the Government to build a road that the people there ought to build for themselves.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows that these are nothing but model roads, built for demonstration.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is a road a foot long, built by the United States, I call that a special privilege, and inasmuch as the Government has ordered off rural carriers on the ground that the service is a special privilege, I say this is all wrong for the same reason.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They do not build any roads at all. They simply instruct the people in the construction of the roads.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to say that possibly the chairman of the committee has been misunderstood by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in stating that a mile of road in my district was built by the Government. That mile of road in my county was built by the county, and every cent of the expense of it paid by the county. All the United States Government did was to send its engineer there to supervise its construction and advise them as to the best methods to be used in its construction.

Mr. LEVER. My colleague [Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina] states the fact which I attempted to state. My language misled my friend from Pennsylvania, but I had not intended it to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. I congratulate the people of South Carolina on their ability to take care of themselves, instead of standing around the Treasury holding out their hands for something that does not belong to them alone. This is all wrong, and the gentlemen who stand for it will regret it.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. During the debate on Tuesday, concerning expenditures in the Forest Service, I was unable to be present on the floor and participate in the discussion, but I have read in the RECORD the very serious strictures made by some Members concerning the operations of the Forest Service and its great expense to the Government and the necessity for an investigation concerning its operations. I hold in my hand a copy of some resolutions that were adopted by the Longmont Commercial Association in the growing and active city of Longmont, Colo. I desire that those resolutions be read in my time, as they bear directly upon the paragraph which is now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The resolutions will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution.

Whereas the Longmont Commercial Association, through its authorized representatives, has been apprised of the plans of the Forest Service in regard to the construction of roads and trails in the Colorado National Forest; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the members of the Longmont Commercial Association that said proposed improvements portray a real knowledge on the part of the Forest Service of the needs of the people, and, planned from such knowledge, tend toward the most effective and comprehensive development and use of the forest; and

Whereas the aforementioned plans of the Forest Service, if permitted to be brought to a successful conclusion, will render all points of the Colorado National Forest accessible, and in so doing will serve to develop the wonderful scenic and economic resources of the region: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Longmont Commercial Association, That the plans of the Forest Service for the construction of roads and trails in the Colorado National Forest are hereby given hearty indorsement; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly and respectfully urge the cordial support of the Colorado congressional delegation to such measures of financial appropriation and otherwise as will tend toward an early completion of the work herein outlined.

Attest:

D. W. THOMAS, *Secretary.*

LONGMONT, COLO., *January 11, 1915.*

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment being withdrawn, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, $145,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to say a word here commenting on the objection made to some of these appropriations because they provide for work to be done by agents and representatives of the department, which work ought to be done by the people of the communities themselves. I believe much of that objection is good. There is a growing disposition on the part of the people all over the country to ask appropriations for the employment of men, to be paid by Federal appropriations, to go into local communities to do work the people themselves ought to do. Now, in this road bureau there have been demands upon the bureau for men and machinery for the actual building of roads, whereas the work of the officers and representatives of the department should be simply to give advice and make suggestions as to the character of the material to be used and methods of construction, while the work itself should be done by the people themselves.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the limited time I have I can not yield. The gentleman will excuse me. This disposition is not limited to any particular section of the country. In the South, when they were trying to eliminate the cattle tick, the people were asking to have not only demonstrations and experiments made, but that vats for dipping should be built by the Federal Government. In Massachusetts and other parts of New England, where the Government was making an effort to stop the ravages of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth, it was determined by the representatives of the Bureau of Entomology that the best way was to clear out the brush along the highways and along the railroad tracks, because vehicles and railroad trains passing back and forth knocked down and carried along the nests of the moths and distributed them to other places.

The people of New England, usually willing to pay their own money and to do their own work, demanded that the department itself should do the work, and the result was that this experimental, highly scientific bureau, the Bureau of Entomology,

at one time employed as many as 500 men in doing nothing more or less than cutting brush along the highways. The members of the Agricultural Committee will bear me out when I say I have opposed appropriations for that kind of work, as I have stood strongly against like appropriations, or to be similarly used, in other parts of the country, insisting that it is the duty of the department to make investigations and experiments to learn the best means and the best methods, to learn evils and the best way to overcome them, and then, after learning the way and being able to point out the way, that its work should be limited entirely to pointing out the way in which the people themselves should do the work.

Now, in relation to this particular matter, it will be noticed that we have refused permission to the Office of Public Roads to buy machinery. It was demanded of them that expensive road-building machinery be purchased and that the bureau send out forces of men to use these machines and actually do the physical work and in some cases pay the entire expense of building the roads. It is a wrong policy; we have stood against it and have tried to prevent it by the insertion of this proviso, and we ought to go further—the effort of the committee ought to be, and the Congress ought to approve its recommendations, to limit these appropriations to the making of investigations and experiments and to pointing out the best way to the people; and the people themselves ought to be required or permitted to do the actual work themselves.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan, to ask the chairman a question. I want to learn, because I am preparing myself for a fight in the future against this appropriation of the public funds, which I think is absolutely unnecessary and wrong. I do not criticize the gentleman from South Carolina or his committee. I helped to grow into present practices. I voted for the Shackleford bill, but I thought it would produce some good roads. Now, I wish to ask the chairman a question. I find here an appropriation for a system of road management. Will the gentleman please tell me what on earth is "road management"?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The maintenance of the road, I suppose. I do not know unless it is road maintenance, the method of managing and taking care of the road. I know in some places the people have taxed themselves to build a road, and then they have constructed it and gone off and left it to maintain itself. They thought that all that was necessary was to construct it, and left it to take care of itself.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate the gentleman's statement; it is wise, and we will all profit by it. I suppose one official from the Government will come along and tell the people that here is a puddle in the road, and you ought to get rid of the puddle, and I will determine for you whether to drain it or put some stones in it. Is that management?

Mr. LEVER. I will give the gentleman the information. It is work covering general statistics and research, investigation and experimental maintenance, and the economical study of highway system and traffic. Lectures, demonstrations on road and bridge models, instruction on highway engineering, maintenance of State index. They employ a corps of collaborators, one in each State.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has read well. I only wish I was able to understand it as well. I find in the next paragraph, "Investigation of the best methods of road making." Will the gentleman tell me how the fine discrimination is made between road management and road making?

Mr. LEVER. Under this item we send out experts to the town where the citizens want to build a road, and these experts advise as to the best method of building the road under the peculiar conditions that may exist there.

Mr. BUTLER. Then will the other agent arrive and advise them on the method of managing the road?

Mr. LEVER. No; I think the method of management is left as a scientific matter.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the two do not go together and ride in the same car?

Mr. LEVER. No; the first part of it is scientific work and the other is practical.

Mr. BUTLER. I notice that you provide that the office of director shall be filled by a scientist.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; he is a scientist and a graduate of Harvard.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not understand how a Harvard graduate should know any more about road building than I do, and I never was a graduate.

Mr. LEVER. He is a graduate from the engineering department and regarded as one of the great engineers of the world.

Mr. BUTLER. I take my hat off to him. I did not know of his proportions.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are certain roads in an adjoining State, Maryland, that are dirt roads, and at certain seasons are very bad and certainly need attention. I want to ask if the bureau recently created has measured up to its expectations. Has it done good work and been helpful to the country?

Mr. LEVER. I read the report of the chief of the bureau some nights ago, and with reference to the sand, clay, and dirt roads I feel that he is doing very satisfactory work.

Mr. GOULDEN. What will be the average cost of these dirt roads per mile? I heard an estimate made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] placing it at $400, but I thought that was rather low.

Mr. LEVER. From $400 to $1,580, depending upon conditions.

Mr. GOULDEN. It would depend also on the proximity of the clay and the sand, the material used in making these improved roads.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is there much demand on the department at this time, or in 1914, for instruction in this kind of road building in the engineering department? This, I understand, costs the various communities nothing.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; more than they could meet, and cost nothing.

Mr. GOULDEN. I ask because I have in mind making a request myself in the near future.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 200 of the hearings, in which he will find all this information as to dirt and clay roads.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I do that in order to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, a question in regard to the road engineers. Who determines whether they are engineers? Is there a school or department that educates them and do they have a diploma? Who determines whether they are competent engineers?

Mr. LEVER. They are appointed through civil-service examination, which determines their competency. Of course, an examination would be established in order to determine whether they are competent men or not.

Mr. KREIDER. In view of the fact that there are two separate items provided in the bill—one of $42,600 for road management and another of $145,000 for road building and road maintenance—are the same engineers qualified to do both or does it require one engineer to show them how to manage the road and another how to build and maintain it?

Mr. LEVER. As I tried to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago, the work under the first item to which the gentleman refers is largely scientific, constituting the whole big problem of the best method of road management. Of course, it would take a high-grade man for that kind of work. The work under this item of $145,000 is largely in sending out engineers to carry to the country the information that has been gathered by the other men. The one is scientific and the other is taking the information out to the people and demonstrating it.

Mr. KREIDER. Is it not a fact that scientific road-building work and the science of road building are so closely allied that it is a very difficult matter to separate the two?

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

Mr. KREIDER. The point I want to make is this——

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, I have no doubt that the man who goes out and supervises the building of one of these roads will probably be a competent man for the work on the item before, but not necessarily so.

Mr. KREIDER. My thought was this: That it would not be necessary to double up expenses by sending two men possibly 500 miles from their home office.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman misunderstands this entirely, I think. In the item carrying $42,000 the department does not send its experts out into the country to teach the people how to manage their roads. Whatever field work the men of the department do at all is going out into the field hunting up from other folks the management of roads so as to develop the best system of management. It is a scientific expert study of the problem of road management, and on a road proposition such as suggested a moment ago they would not send one of that type of men to show the people at Aiken, S. C., how to manage that little amount of road.

Mr. KREIDER. When they have acquired the knowledge, how do they distribute that knowledge? Do they publish it through the form of a bulletin?

Mr. LEVER. No; they distribute that information through bulletins and also the item carrying the $145,000.

Mr. KREIDER. Well, that is for road building and making.

Mr. LEVER. And expert advice, if the gentleman will read.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, $34,820.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] was addressing himself to this amendment, I tried to obtain some time from him in order to ask him a question. I think the gentleman was fair and considerate in his remarks concerning the desire and disposition of the people to constantly impose upon the Federal Government for work and money in the conduct of local enterprises that should be developed properly and justly by individuals either singly or jointly. I purposed to ask the gentleman this question. If he did not think that that desire on the part of the people was largely promoted by Congress in the character of legislation proposed and considered, and in voting large sums of money for purposes which are more or less indefinite in character? That Congress is showing by some of the provisions of bills of this character and the appropriation of large sums of money in an indefinite way without giving actual knowledge as to how the money is to be spent, and how it has been expended from former appropriations, and how easy it is to extract money from the Treasury. The people hear of these large sums and what has been expended in this locality and in the others for various purposes, and are thus stimulated to secure from the Government, if possible, that which they think has been denied them. Then these bureaus, through the dissemination of bulletins and literature, some of which is largely unreliable and not at all necessary, arouse in the minds of the public a desire to secure from the Government that support and that assistance that they are unwilling to contribute themselves. I believe that the fault, if any exists, largely rests upon the shoulders of Congress and does not rest upon the people.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate what the gentleman says. Congress has grown. I can recall the time when Congress did practically nothing of this character, and I am willing to confess I grew along with Congress in this kind of work. I do not object to instructions being given upon public road building. I do not object to such assistance. What I object to is this enormously extravagant, in my judgment almost useless, expenditure for office hire, clerks, messengers, and charwomen. I want the money to go where it will assist in the construction of work and be used for the purpose which Congress would have it used for. Remember, I do not object to this instruction, let me say to the gentleman. I do not object to such——

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Does not the gentleman believe that a large proportion of every dollar of money that we appropriate for this purpose is used purely in clerical ways, and that it has not had the effect which was intended?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and more than correct. The same thing he says here now I have heard said many times in this House, and yet we have not advanced one step to correct the evils which we all saw before us. In the community in which I live there is a pike—now, let me call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina to it, so that he may have it in his mind when he prepares his next bill—the first pike built in the United States is the one running from Lancaster to Philadelphia, built in 1795. That pike has stood all these years without ever moving, unaffected by the heat of summer or the cold of winter. The builders never employed an engineer. It was built by the people in the different communities, who hauled the stone, putting the big stone at the bottom and the smaller sizes on the top. We knew then how to make public roads. We did not require an expenditure of $60,000 to show my community how to build a pike that has lasted for 115 or 120 years, and practically without repair.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows there were some roads built in ancient times such as the Appian Way and the roads built by Cæsar that have lasted for 2,000 years and more.

Mr. BUTLER. So has the road I speak of. It was built to stay. I only give this to the Chairman to illustrate that when men see fit to apply the good sense which nature has given them they can do those things largely themselves, and do not need $60,000 to spend in messengers, clerks, and charwomen hire.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman—I happen to know about the pike the gentleman speaks of because I have been over it—but what about his dirt roads?

Mr. BUTLER. The mud roads are bad roads. We are against mud roads. We can not do everything, however, at one time.

Mr. GOULDEN. You have got them.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but I will say to my friend that we have got so much taxes in our county that we have to lower the rate of taxation. We have so much money in the treasury that we do not know what to do with it.

Mr. GOOD. Give it to Secretary McAdoo. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. We will make our own roads in our own fashion. They will be good roads, and they will not cost the Government a penny.

Mr. GOULDEN. I suggest you had better begin soon. They are bad roads. You need scientific engineers to show you how to build them.

Mr. BUTLER. If the engineer comes, we would have no money left. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOULDEN. You do not spend your money aright.

Mr. BUTLER. We will not give the money to the engineers. We will put it on the roads. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; for the purchase and installation of equipment for experimental purposes; for the giving of expert advice and assistance; for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside of the District of Columbia; and for supplies and all necessary expenses, $106,400.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by adding a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 68, by adding, after line 25, a new paragraph, as follows:

"For investigating and reporting upon the cost and feasibility of pumping from wells for the irrigation of lands in southwestern Nebraska; for preparing plans for the impounding of waters that now go to waste in water courses leading into streams in southwestern Nebraska; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of wells for irrigation for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on subirrigation and for demonstration purposes, $100,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order now, although it seems to me that if the point of order would lie against this amendment it certainly would lie against the paragraph that has just been read and the one following.

On examining the provisions of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we find appropriations made for draining swamp lands and also for irrigating lands that have no water at all. We have in my part of the country a condition of semiarid lands. If we can get water on that land once a year, we could then produce bountiful crops. A survey has been made by the Government, proving that there is an inexhaustible supply of water close to the surface, but we have never been fortunate enough to get the assistance of the Government in that part of the country to develop our resources. There are possibilities of making this section one of the finest agricultural countries in the world. A bulletin has been issued by the Department of Agriculture giving experiments on 18 different wells in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas—wells used for pumping water for the irrigation of rice fields. I will insert in the RECORD their experiments or investigations. These wells range from 150 feet to 300 feet deep. They are proven to be practicable.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARTON. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Are these wells to which the gentleman refers operated by the Government of the United States or by the people of the localities?

Mr. BARTON. In only one instance, I think, the State of Arkansas and the Government of the United States cooperated in building one well and operating it.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any reason why the people of Nebraska could not dig these wells for themselves?

Mr. BARTON. Not at all. If the gentleman had examined my amendment he would find that we do not ask the Government to do it. We simply ask the Government to do what it has already done in other parts of the country and is providing for all through this bill—to investigate the feasibility of the proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any reason why they should not investigate that themselves?

Mr. BARTON. No more reason than that the people of the South, who will receive the benefit of many provisions in this bill, should do those things themselves; no more than that a State should take care of its own rivers, or should take care of its own rural carriers, or should take care of its own roads, and do for itself a lot of other things such as run through this bill; for example, the reclamation of swamp lands and the irrigation of arid lands.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BARTON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that if he and any of his friends will come down to the Staked Plains in Texas they will find large wells that have been put in there, and you will find all the authority you want there as to the best means and appliances for pumping water, for pumps, engines, and everything connected with doing this irrigation work, without any experimentation or the spending of a cent. We will be glad if the gentleman will con.e down there and buy some of those irrigated lands. They will be sold cheap.

Mr. BARTON. We could go into areas in Illinois where they have drained their swamp lands, and in Iowa, where I am personally acquainted, where they have tilled their land, but why ask us to do different than other sections of this country? Other sections of this bill provide that people of other States may be very much benefited by Government assistance. Why deprive us of the same privilege? Swamp lands are not in existence in that part of the country. Neither is it arid. It is a semiarid region, and we are asking for this help from the Government that the people as a whole may be benefited. I ask gentlemen of the House to give us more than ordinary consideration. I ask for only $100,000 for this experiment. We are appropriating much more for nearly every other experiment that is provided for under this bill. I believe we are entitled to advice. We are asking not for money to dig wells, not money to turn the water on the land, or anything of that character, but to enable us to have it demonstrated to us that this project is feasible and that it can be done.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I will insert the following as a part of my remarks:

The United States Department of Agriculture issued October 30, 1908, a pamphlet giving the cost of pumping from wells in Louisiana and Arkansas, and I will insert at this point a description of some of the plants and the results of tests:

DESCRIPTION OF PLANTS AND RESULTS OF TESTS.

In general, the tabulated results are self-explanatory. The attempt is made to bring out the facts of greatest interest to the owners of pumping plants, and especially the cost of pumping. Measurements covering several years show that the average quantity of water used on rice is about 15 inches in depth over the land during the growth of a crop, and this depth has been used in computing the cost of pumping per acre irrigated. No data showing the cost of attendance and other labor employed in pumping were collected. This is considerable, as the plants are operated night and day for 60 to 100 days each year, taking practically all of the time of two men, who receive from $1.50 to $2 per day. This makes an average cost of perhaps $3.50 per day for attendance. Assuming an average season of 80 days makes this cost $280 for each plant. In each case this sum is divided by the number of acres, to secure the cost of attendance per acre.

Interest is assumed at 7 per cent, and depreciation at 10 per cent of the first cost. Interest, depreciation, attendance, and fuel cost for 1.25 acre-feet, or 15 acre-inches, are added to secure the annual cost of pumped water per acre irrigated.

PLANT NO. 1.

The plant of Mr. H. E. Wesson, located about one-half mile northeast of the railway station at Welsh, La., was tested on June 17, 1907. This same plant was tested in 1905. The engine and boiler used at that time were still in use in 1907, but the well and pump had been changed. The new well is 335 feet deep; it has a 10-inch casing with 80 feet of strainer, consisting of wire of trapezoidal cross section wound over a pipe through which numerous holes had been drilled. The new pump is a No. 6 compound vertical centrifugal. It was driven by a quarter-twist belt. The engine flywheel is 60 inches in diameter, and the pulley on the pump 18 inches in diameter. This pump is peculiar in that no pit is required except the steel casing above and fastened to the pump, of the same diameter as the largest diameter of the pump. A hole of the proper diameter is bored into the ground to a depth sufficient to submerge the impellers of the pump. This hole is approximately three times the diameter of the casing below. With this type of pump alignment of shaft is insured. The pump was placed 40 feet below the surface.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, having seventy-two 2-inch flues 9 feet long, and has a capacity, according to the builders' rating, of 50 horsepower.

The engine is a simple noncondensing slide valve, and has a cylinder 12 inches in diameter and stroke of 15 inches. There is a feed-water heater in the base of the engine. The boiler was fed by a pump. The feed water used during the test was weighed.

The fuel used was crude oil, costing $1.40 per barrel of 42 gallons at the plant. During the test it was measured in an elevated tank by noting the fall of level. The specific gravity was determined by means of a hydrometer.

The cost of this plant was as follows:

Engine, boiler, and shed	$1,175
Belt	50
Well, pump, and derrick, including steel pit	2,074
Total	3,299

The plant was in fairly good condition, as the engine had received a general overhauling and had been placed on a new foundation.

The water pumped was measured by means of a weir 36¾ inches in width, with end contractions suppressed; the depth over the crest of the weir was measured by means of a hook gauge.

It was impossible to measure the depth of water in the well even when the pump was not running; however, there was an old well about 75 yards away in which the depth could be measured. The water in the old well and in the new one was known from previous observations to be at the same level.

As already stated, the useful work credited to the pump was computed on the basis of the height from the level of water in the well when the pump was not running to the level at which it was discharged. It must be remembered that the true head was greater than the head used. The water in this well is lowered when the pump is started, and there is a loss of head in passing through the screen and some loss in the suction pipe below the pump. The only way the true head can be known is by attaching a vacuum gauge to the suction pipe underneath the pumps, and this was impossible. The efficiency given might be termed the efficiency of engine, pump, and well, charging the lowering of the water and loss in the screen to the well.

There was a comparatively small amount of heat added to the water at the feed-water heater, because the steam merely enters the heater and emerges from the point of entry. This arrangement could be improved by having the exhaust pipe taken out at a point which would compel the steam to travel along the outside of the pipes containing water in the heater.

Results of test of plant No. 1.

Duration of test, hours	4.67
Lift, feet	11.60
Average indicated horsepower	42.3
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.21
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,444
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.265
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	207
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	4.89
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	781.1
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	67.3
Cost of fuel per barrel	$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.906
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0214
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$3.42
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.294
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	10

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$3,299

PLANT NO. 2.

The well-pumping plant of Mr. John H. Armstrong, located about 3 miles southeast of Welsh, La., was tested on June 18, 1907. It was used to water 140 acres during the season of 1907.

The well is 9⅝ inches in diameter and 305 feet deep. The pit is 35 feet deep, and there are 82 feet of sawed strainer (fig. 2).

The pump used is a No. 6 vertical-shaft centrifugal with a 14-inch pulley.

The engine is a slide-valve; diameter of cylinder, 9½ inches; stroke, 12 inches; diameter of rod, 1⅞ inches. The exhaust of the engine passed through a closed heater to the smokestack. The flywheel of the engine to which the pump is belted is 40 inches in diameter.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, with 52 tubes 12 feet in length and 3 inches in diameter. The builders' rating of boiler is 60 horsepower. A feed-water heater utilized a part of the heat of the exhaust steam that otherwise would have been thrown away. A small, direct-acting steam pump is used to feed the boiler. The mean temperature of water coming from the well was 80° F., while the mean temperature of the water after passing through the heater was 188.5° F. The saving of fuel by the use of the heater in this case was 9.5 per cent.

The importance of a heater in a small pumping plant is too often overlooked. An inexpensive one can be made of pipe fittings; in the average case a heater will save about 10 per cent of the fuel, and at the present prices for fuel so large a saving is well worth while. Feed water was measured during the test by weighing.

Indicator cards and general observations were taken every half hour.

Coal was carefully weighed and the time noted for using each 100 pounds. The fuel used was bituminous coal, costing $5.70 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

The discharge was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume built in the discharge ditch for that purpose.

The height through which the water was raised was measured in an abandoned well near the one in use, as in the case of the test plant No. 1. The height from water surface to level of discharge was the head used in computing useful water horsepower.

The cost of this plant, complete, including engine, boiler, belts, foundations, heater, and feed pump, well pump, pit, well, lumber, strainer pipe, and shed, was $2,668.

Some trouble was encountered because of the slipping of the cotton belt, and during the test the belt lacing broke and had to be repaired. Otherwise the test was entirely satisfactory.

The pump is provided with an appliance for maintaining alignment of shaft. Briefly, it consists of special pipe fittings by means of which the discharge pipe of the vertical-shaft centrifugal pump is brought over near the shaft and then carried up parallel to the shaft. The pipe is screwed home very solidly into the fittings so that it is rigid. Special bearings for the shaft are then clamped to the pipe. Any settling of the pump or change of position results in a corresponding change in the discharge pipe and shaft, so that the alignment is maintained.

The results of the test follow:

Results of test of plant No. 2.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	17.5
Average indicated horsepower	48.95
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	4.55
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	2,050
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.376
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	212.5
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	4.34
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	565.2
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	22.3
Cost of fuel per ton	$5.70
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.608
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0124
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$1.62
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.092
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	19.2

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$2,668
Area irrigated, acres	140
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$19.06

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$1.33
Depreciation, 10 per cent on first cost	1.91
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.03
Attendance	2.00
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	7.27

PLANT NO. 3.

The pumping plant owned by Mr. M. A. Neely and located about 4 miles north of Welsh, La., was tested on June 20, 1907. During the season of 1907 about 300 acres of rice was irrigated.

The engine is a simple, noncondensing, slide-valve, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder, 11 inches; stroke, 14 inches; diameter of rod, 1¼ inches. From the flywheel of the engine power is transmitted to the pump by means of a rope drive consisting of four strands of 1¼-inch manila rope. The driving sheave on the engine is 69 inches in diameter and that on the pump 21 inches in diameter.

The pump is a vertical-shaft centrifugal, in a pit about 30 feet deep. The well has a depth of 325 feet; 80 feet of strainer is used. It is of the usual type made by drilling holes in the casing and then wrapping it with wire.

The boiler is a horizontal, return tubular, rated by the builders at 50 horsepower.

The fuel used was crude oil from the Jennings field, costing $1.40 per barrel at the plant. During the test the height of oil in a cylindrical tank was noted and at the end of the test the same level was restored by adding a weighed quantity of oil to the tank.

Feed water is forced through a heater by the steam pump used to feed the boiler.

The water discharged by the pump was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume leading from the pond in which the pump discharged to the small canal used to convey the water to the field.

Indicator cards and other observations were taken at half-hour intervals; the duration of the test was four hours. The level of the water in the discharge pipe could be observed when the pump was not running by letting down a lantern. The distance from this level to the point to which the water was discharged was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency.

The cost of the entire outfit, including boiler, engine, pump, well, belt, and shed, was $2,200.

The results of the test follow:

Result of test of plant No. 3.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	23.86
Average indicated horsepower	53.7
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	4.34
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,953
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.359
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	191.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower, pounds	3.57
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	531.5
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	22.3
Cost of fuel per barrel	$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.84
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0157
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$2.34
Cost of fuel per foot acre-foot	$0.098
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	21.8

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$2,200
Area irrigated, acres	300
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$7.33

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$0.51
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	.73
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.93
Attendance	.93
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	5.10

PLANT NO. 4.

The plant owned by Mr. L. E. Robinson, located about 7 miles northeast of Welsh, La., was tested on June 22, 1907. It was a new outfit, used for the first time during the season of 1907, when about 230 acres was watered.

The plant is equipped with a heavy-duty, noncondensing slide-valve engine, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder 12½ inches, stroke 20 inches, diameter of rod 1⅝ inches. The flywheel is 60 inches in diameter; a quarter-turn belt is used to transmit power from the engine to a No. 10 centrifugal pump, similar to that described in test No. 1, having a discharge pipe 12 inches in diameter. The well has a casing 18 inches in diameter, is 320 feet deep, and has 105 feet of strainer. The pit is 50 feet deep.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, with 79 3-inch tubes 13 feet long.

Fuel oil was used. It was stored in a vertical cylindrical tank. The distance from the rim of the tank to the surface of the oil was observed every hour, and the weight of oil computed from these readings and the specific gravity. As the oil used during the test had been placed in the tank from which it was fed by gravity to the burner only a short time previous to the test, it is probable that some water was still mixed with it, as sufficient time had not been allowed for it to settle. The exhaust pipe of the small steam pump used to feed the boiler was run through the fuel-oil tank and by this means the temperature of the oil was raised to 103° F.

The discharge of the pump was measured by placing a plank, beveled on the downstream side and with a sharp corner on the upstream side, across the flume below the pump, to act as the sill of a weir without end contractions. There was quite a large velocity of approach which was taken into account in computing the quantity of water. A hook gauge was used to measure the depth of water over the sill of the weir.

The water fed to the boiler was carefully measured by means of a calibrated barrel, which was filled by means of a hand pump and then allowed to empty into a barrel below, from which it was pumped to the boiler. There was a heater in which the water had its temperature raised from about 75° F. to 175° F.

During the test readings of the hook gauge were taken every 15 minutes; indicator cards and general observations were taken every half hour. The quantity of oil used was measured every hour.

The level of the water in the well was found by means of a steel tape let down into the discharge pipe. Before the test was started the observed depth was 26.5 feet below the level of discharge, while at the end it had increased to 27.5 feet; the mean of the two was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower.

The cost of the outfit was as follows:

Engine and boiler, feed pump, piping, etc	$1,500
Well, pit, and pump, set up	2,304
Shed	600
Total	4,404

The results of the test follow:

Results of test of plant No. 4.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	27
Average indicated horsepower	47.2
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	2.78
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,251
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.231
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	240.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	5.10
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	1,042.4
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	38.6
Cost of fuel per barrel	$1.05
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.79
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0168
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$3.43
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.127
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	18.4

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$4,404
Area irrigated, acres	230
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$19.15

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$1.34
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.92
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	4.25
Attendance	1.22
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	8.73

PLANT NO. 5.

The pumping plant of Mr. W. S. Robertson, located about 2 miles east of the town of Iota, La., was tested on June 26, 1907. This plant watered 175 acres of rice during the season of 1907.

The plant is equipped as follows: There is a simple, slide-valve, noncondensing engine, with diameter of cylinder 10 inches, length of stroke 12 inches, and diameter of rod 1¼ inches. The engine is direct connected to a rotary pump having a capacity of 13.6 gallons per revolution. The engine and pump are placed in a pit about 10 feet deep. The pump has its suction side connected to two 10-inch wells, each 200 feet deep and about 40 feet apart. The pump is between the two wells, about 20 feet from each. The discharge pipe of the pump is 12 inches in diameter. The suction pipes are provided with wire-gauze strainers of unknown length. The plant has been operated for five years.

The boiler used is of the locomotive type, rated by its builders at 25 horsepower. Water is fed to the boiler by means of an injector.

The fuel ordinarily used is coal and wood. The cost of the former is $6.35 per ton and of the latter $2.25 per cord at the plant. During the test coal only was used, so that the measurement of fuel could be made more definitely. Coal was weighed up in quantities of 40 pounds and the time noted when each charge was fired.

The water pumped was measured in a small flume by means of a current meter.

Indicator cards, readings of steam pressure, temperature, and observations with the current meter were taken at half-hour intervals.

The true head pumped against was determined in this case by placing a vacuum gauge on the suction pipe. Measuring the head from the point where the gauge was attached to the level of discharge and

adding it to the vacuum expressed in feet of water gave the head against which the pump was actually operating.

It was impossible to directly measure the depth of water in the well, as the tees at the top of the well casing into which was screwed the pipe leading from the well casing to the pump were both several feet under ground. Previous to 1907 the pump and engine had been at the surface of the ground. The flanges forming covers for the top of the tees had often been taken off the tees and the depth measured and compared to the depth observed by neighbors in the discharge pipes of centrifugal pumps at a distance of a mile or two from the wells tested, and it was found that they always agreed within a few inches. At the time the test was made the level of water in the same neighbors' wells was known to be about 20 feet from the surface, and therefore that head was used as the basis for computing useful water horsepower, in order that a comparison could be had between the centrifugal pumps and the rotary. By consulting the summary of results it will be seen that the efficiency on the same basis as that used for all other pumps is 50 per cent better than the best one of any other class. This accords with the efficiencies found for large pumps of this type. By consulting the table showing the cost of pumping it will be seen that this plant made a good showing in comparison with others as to fuel economy. A feed-water heater would reduce the fuel bill by about 10 per cent and ought to be added to the equipment of this plant.

The total cost of this plant complete, including boiler, engine, pump, wells, piping, etc., was $3,300.

Results of test of plant No. 5.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	33.25
Average indicated horsepower	21.9
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.19
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,436
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.265
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	120
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	5.48
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	452.8
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	13.62
Cost of fuel per ton	$6.25
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.376
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0172
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$1.42
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.071
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent (with the lift estimated at 20 feet, to correspond with other plants, the efficiency is 33.4 per cent)	55

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$3,300
Area irrigated, acres	175
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$18.86

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$1.32
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.89
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	1.78
Attendance	1.60
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	6.59

PLANT NO. 6.

The plant owned by Mr. Henry Schambaugh, located near the town of Iota, La., about a mile distant from the plant described as plant No. 5, was tested on June 27, 1907. One hundred and forty acres of rice was watered in 1907.

The engine is a noncondensing slide-valve, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder, 11 inches; stroke, 13 inches; diameter of rod, 1¼ inches. The flywheel, 50 inches in diameter, drives a vertical shaft centrifugal pump by means of a quarter-twist belt. The diameter of the pulley on the pump is 14 inches.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, having 54 tubes 2½ inches in diameter by 8 feet 3 inches long, rated by its builders at 40 horsepower. It is well lagged with sheet metal arranged to leave a space over the surface which is filled with charcoal.

A pump is used to feed the boiler. The feed water is forced through a heater in the engine base, into which the engine exhausts. In this way the feed is heated from an average temperature of 84° F. to 147° F.

The fuel used was crude oil, costing $1.40 per barrel of 42 gallons at the plant.

The pump is a No. 6 vertical shaft centrifugal, having suction and discharge pipes each 10 inches in diameter. The well is 315 feet deep and the pit 38 feet deep. Both sawed and wire-wound screens were used in the 60 feet of strainer.

The water pumped was measured by means of a current meter in a flume about one-fourth mile distant from the pumping plant. Although the test lasted for four hours, the water measurement was taken only during the last two hours.

Fuel oil was measured at half-hour intervals by the drop in level in a vertical cylindrical tank from which the burner is fed by gravity.

Indicator cards, readings of current meter, and the other observations were taken at intervals of a half hour.

The distance between the water level when the pump was still and the level of discharge was measured by means of a steel tape in the discharge pipe of the pump. This height was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency. The pump had been running for some time and was stopped only long enough to make the measurement.

The cost of the entire plant was $2,500.

Results of test of plant No. 6.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	21
Average indicated horsepower	38.6
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.30
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,485
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.274
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	133.3
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	3.45
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	486.5
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	23.17
Cost of fuel per barrel	$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.585
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0152
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$2.14
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.102
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	20.3

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$2,500
Area irrigated, acres	140
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$17.86

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	$1.25
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.79
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.68
Attendance	2.00
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	7.72

PLANT NO. 7.

The plant owned by Mr. T. J. Curtis, tested on July 9, 1907, is located about 3 miles northwest from Gueydan, La. During the season of 1907 about 165 acres of rice was watered.

The engine is a slide-valve, noncondensing, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of piston, 11 inches; stroke, 14 inches; diameter of rod, 1 7/16 inches.

The boiler is of the locomotive type and contains forty-eight 3-inch flues 11 feet 9 inches long. The length of boiler over all is 18 feet and the diameter of the front portion 45 inches. The builders' rating is 50 horsepower.

The pump is a vertical-shaft centrifugal, with a 6-inch discharge pipe. A quarter-twist belt from the engine flywheel drives the pump.

The well is 10 inches in diameter and 238 feet deep, with 80 feet of wire-wound screen. Of this, 60 feet is wound with galvanized and 20 feet with copper wire.

The fuel used was coal, costing $6.75 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

An injector is used to feed the boiler. There was no feed-water heater. The feed water was measured in a calibrated barrel.

The discharge was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume. Readings were taken at half-hour intervals.

Coal was weighed out in 30-pound quantities and the time of firing each charge was noted.

Indicator cards and other readings were taken at half-hour intervals.

The cost of the outfit is given in detail in the following statement:

Engine, boiler, and pump	$1,562.00
Well, 238 feet deep, at $3	714.00
Strainer	80.00
Lumber for pit	16.00
Digging pit	16.00
3 hoops for pit	9.00
160 feet lumber for pump frame	3.20
Cost of setting pump	12.50
Cost of unloading boiler from car	5.00
Hauling pump, boiler, and engine	14.00
3,000 brick	30.00
3 barrels cement	12.00
Labor for setting engine	50.00
Total	2,523.70

When the pump was idle for some time the level of the water was only 7.81 feet below the height to which it was elevated when the pump was running. Water stands quite near the surface in the Gueydan district, as it is much nearer the Gulf of Mexico than the wells previously tested, and the level of the ground surface is lower than it is farther north. At first glance it would seem as though the pumping of water in this territory would be much less expensive than in sections where the distance from water surface to ground level is much greater. The advantage, however, is lost when the wells are pumped to nearly their full capacity. The hydraulic gradient in the immediate vicinity of the well falls from this cause as well as from the loss of head in flowing through the gravel, so that the original height as observed may be only a small portion of the total head when the pump is running at full capacity, and therefore the head as observed and used in these tests may be only a small part of the total head.

Results of test of plant No. 7.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	7.81
Average indicated horsepower	32
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.77
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,695
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.313
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	172.5
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	5.39
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	551.1
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	70.6
Cost of fuel per ton	$6.75
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.583
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0182
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$1.87
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.24
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	10.5

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$2,524
Area irrigated, acres	165
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$15.30

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	$1.07
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.53
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.34
Attendance	1.71
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	6.65

PLANT NO. 8.

On July 10, 1907, a test was made of the pumping plant of Mr. J. W. Gardiner, located about 3 miles south of Gueydan, La. It furnished water to irrigate 200 acres of rice in 1907.

The equipment of this plant was as follows: A slide-valve, noncondensing engine; size of cylinder 14 by 20 inches with piston rod 1¾ inches in diameter.

The engine is belted to a jack shaft about 25 feet long, from which power is transmitted by quarter-twist belts to two vertical shaft No. 6 centrifugal pumps, one for each of the two wells. The depth of wells is 230 and 233 feet, and the diameter of the casing in each case 10 inches, with 60 feet of wire-wound strainers at the lower end. The wells are 100 feet apart. The pits were comparatively shallow, only about 20 feet deep.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, having a length of 18 feet and a diameter of 54 inches. There are seventy-six 3-inch flues 13 feet in length.

Feed water is pumped into the boiler direct by means of a small steam pump; the mean temperature was 73° F. During the test it was impossible to measure the feed water, and as the plant was in bad condition it was not of much importance that the feed be measured. There were several leaks about the ends of tubes from which the water was running in little streams into the fire box. There were also several leaks in the steam main and the engine was in need of adjustment. A leak in the suction pipe of one of the pumps necessitated the flooding of the pit and doubtless reduced efficiency to some extent.

It was intended to run the test for four hours, but at the end of two hours the main belt broke, necessitating a shutdown for about a half hour, so the test was concluded at the end of the two-hour period.

The fuel used was Pittsburgh bituminous coal, costing $7 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant. The coal was carefully weighed during this time. The revolutions per minute of engine and one of the pumps were observed. As the pulleys on the jack shaft and pump were the same in both cases the revolutions of the pump, neglecting slip, were identical.

The discharge from both pumps was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume.

The test was in every way satisfactory. However, it is probable that observations as to the fuel used for a longer period of time would have given a slightly more reliable result, but, considering the condition of the plant, further efforts in this direction were unwarranted.

Again, as in the case of test No. 7, the water was near the surface, so that the height through which the water had to be elevated was only 6.27 feet. The plant had been in operation several days and was stopped to measure the head. The remarks made in the case of the previous test apply equally well in this one.

The following is a detailed statement of the cost of this outfit:

Cost of wells and pits	$1,700
2 Kingsford pumps, at $200 each	400
Engine and boiler (second hand)	1,000
Shed	250
Belting	150
Total	3,500

When purchased the engine and boiler had been used but were almost new and were bought at a bargain. The shed was unusually large and contained more material than was necessary. The cost of belting was excessive because of the arrangement of the plant, one main belt being required between engine and jack shaft and two more between jack shafts and pumps.

Results of test of plant No. 8.

Duration of test, hours	2
Lift, feet	6.27
Average indicated horsepower	57.79
Average discharge of pumps, cubic feet per second	6.38
Average discharge of pumps, gallons per minute	2,878
Average discharge of pumps, acre-feet per hour	0.53
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	403
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	7
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	760.4
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	112.7
Cost of fuel per ton	$7.00
Cost of fuel per hour	$1.413
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0244
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$2.68
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.428
Efficiency of engine, pumps, and well, per cent	7.9

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$3,500
Area irrigated, acres	200
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$17.50

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$1.23
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.75
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	3.35
Attendance	1.40
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	7.73

PLANT NO. 9.

This plant is located about 1½ miles west of Lonoke, Ark., at the State Agricultural Experiment Station. The plant was installed in 1904 by the State of Arkansas in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. During the season of 1907 45 acres was watered.

A noncondensing slide-valve engine is used, having a diameter of cylinder 8 inches and diameter of rod 1 7/16 inches and stroke 13 inches.

By means of a quarter-twist cotton belt the engine drives a vertical-shaft centrifugal pump placed in a pit 30 feet deep. The well is 100 feet deep with casing and 30 feet of copper-gauze strainer. The engine flywheel is used as a pulley. It is 54 inches in diameter, while the pump pulley is 14 inches in diameter.

The boiler is of the self-contained, horizontal, return-tubular type, shell 10 by 2 feet, 10½ inches. There are 26 3-inch tubes. The setting is built of bricks and the plant is in fairly good condition.

An injector is used to feed the boiler; there is no heater.

The test lasted for four hours; the conditions were fairly regular.

Coal was weighed in quantities of 45 pounds, and the time of firing each charge noted. Indicator cards and general observations were taken at half-hour intervals. The quantity of water fed to the boiler was carefully weighed.

The water pumped was measured by means of a permanent 12-inch Cipolletti weir. The height of water over the crest was measured by means of a hook gauge.

The level of the water in the pit was known to be the same as that in the discharge of the pump when the pump was idle. The height of the discharge from that level was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency, as was done in the plants tested in Louisiana. On this basis the head was 27.6 feet.

The fuel used was bituminous coal, costing $3.40 per ton at the plant.

The cost of the entire plant, including machinery, shed, and well, was $1,800.

Results of test of plant No. 9.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	27.6
Average indicated horsepower	17.2
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	1.10
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	495
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.0913
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	123.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, do	7.2
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, do	135.6
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, do	49.1
Cost of fuel per ton	$3.40
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.211
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0123
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$2.32
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.0842
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	20

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$1,800
Area irrigated, acres	45
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$40

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	$2.80
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	4.00
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.90
Attendance	6.22
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	15.92

PLANT NO. 10.

On August 20, 1907, the well pumping plant belonging to Mr. W. H. Hicks, located about 5 miles southeast of Lonoke, Ark., was tested. Ninety-two acres of rice was watered during the season of 1907.

The well is 168 feet deep; the casing is 10 inches in diameter and has 70 feet of sawed strainer. The pump is a No. 6 vertical-shaft centrifugal, placed in a pit 40 feet deep.

The engine has a 10-inch cylinder with a 12-inch stroke; diameter of rod, 1⅞ inches.

The boiler is a horizontal return-tubular, 14 feet long by 44 inches in diameter, having 28 3-inch tubes. The setting is of brick. The furnace was in bad condition, due to cracks in the front of the setting, causing several large leaks. An injector was used to feed the boiler; there was no feed-water heater.

The fuel used was wood, costing $1.50 per cord, and bituminous coal, costing $4 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

The water pumped was measured by means of a portable 18-inch Cipolletti weir placed in the discharge ditch.

During the test the water used was carefully weighed, as was also the coal. The wood used was measured. General observations as noted in the log were taken at half-hour intervals. The test lasted for 2½ hours. All the conditions were uniform and the results entirely satisfactory.

The height through which the water was elevated was measured, as in the other tests, by means of a steel tape in the discharge pipe of the pump. It was 35.8 feet. The plant had been running for several days, and was stopped only long enough to measure the head.

This plant could cut down fuel expense 10 per cent by installing a heater. The mean temperature of feed was only 60.5° F. A heater could be employed to raise the temperature over 100°, and not only effect a saving in fuel but also prolong the life of the boiler by avoiding stresses due to wide variations in the temperature of the water in its different parts.

The total cost of this plant was as follows:

Well, pit, and pump	$1,000
Engine and boiler	1,100
Total	2,100

Results of test of plant No. 10.

Duration of test, hours	3
Lift, feet	35.8
Average indicated horsepower	41.7
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	1.64
Average discharge of pump, gallons, per minute	738
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.136
Cost of fuel—	
Coal, per ton	$4.00
Wood, per cord	$1.50
Cost of fuel per hour	$0.312
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	$0.0075
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	$2.30
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	$0.0642
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	16.1

COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	$2,100
Area, irrigated, acres	92
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	$22.82

ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	$1.60
Depreciation, 10 per cent on first cost	2.28
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.88
Attendance	3.04
Total annual cost per acre irrigated	9.80

I could insert the other tests made, but I feel that enough proof has been marshaled to convince this body that irrigation by wells is practical.

A survey has been completed of southwestern Nebraska, which proves that the supply of water a few feet under the surface is practically inexhaustible.

We know that damming of the watercourses leading into the streams must prove of benefit in bringing more rains, and as the representative of this part of our country I plead with you to give us this appropriation, so that men that we help pay, will devote a portion of their time to our interests. On page 75

of this bill you have made special provision for the Louisiana farmer, as we did in the last Agricultural bill. All through the bill runs legislation that will specially assist favored communities. I know from living in Nebraska a lifetime that you could not come to the assistance of a people who are more worthy than the farmers of southwest Nebraska, who have for years watched their crops dry, wither, and blow away; then with indomitable courage tackle the job again and again. We are just asking our rights, and I ask you in the interests of economy and right, to buy $100,000 less powder, shot, and shell, and come to the rescue of the farmers of southwest Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I wanted to suggest to the gentleman that the appropriation made in this paragraph was for investigating the very subject to which his amendment applies. I did not catch directly the reading of his amendment. It says:

For investigating and reporting upon the cost and feasibility of pumping from wells or the irrigation of lands in southwestern Nebraka; for preparing plans for the impounding of waters that now go to waste in watercourses leading into streams in southwestern Nebraska; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of wells for irrigation; for the purchase of materials and equipment—

And so forth.

Here is $106,000 appropriated, which applies anywhere in the country where these investigations may need to be made or can be made.

Why can not part of this appropriation be applied to the very purpose that the gentleman from Nebraska is asking for, to come in with all the balance of us?

Mr. BARTON. I am inclined to think, after reading this paragraph, that it would not apply to the damming of watercourses or the holding of water just as a sort of surplus and for experimenting on subirrigation.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is wrong. Although the department is not doing the character of work specified by the gentleman from South Carolina, I am satisfied that the language is broad enough to permit the department to do it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It strikes me that the language is broad enough to permit the department to do exactly what the gentleman's amendment intends they shall do, and that he can take his chances on the $106,000 that is appropriated in this paragraph.

Mr. BARTON. I trust I shall be fortunate enough to have the chairman of the committee and the gentleman now addressing the committee use their good influences to have this paragraph applied to southwestern Nebraska; and if they do, I shall have no objection to having the amendment voted down, as I know it will be.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like some light from the chairman of the committee, if the statement he has just made is correct, as to why it is that he raises a point of order on the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I reserved a point of order simply because I could not hear the amendment as it was read. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, in all probability, and I am going to withdraw the point of order and let the House vote on the proposition.

Mr. MARTIN. While I am on my feet I should like to ask the chairman upon what theory this work is put under the Department of Good Roads, or Public Roads?

Mr. LEVER. The only engineering corps in the department at all has been carried in the Office of Public Roads, except the engineers provided for in the items for irrigation and drainage. Those two items have been carried as miscellaneous items in the Office of Experiment Stations. They require engineers to do that kind of work. The Secretary of Agriculture thought it was better to concentrate all the engineering activities, both for roads and rural engineering, in one bureau, and we agreed to it.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course the gentleman is aware that the Government is maintaining a very large corps of engineers in the Reclamation Service under the particular work of hydraulic engineering.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will notice that we have confined our work to the irrigation work in connection with agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. Practically all the irrigation work that the Reclamation Service is doing is in connection with agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. This has to do more largely with the country outside of the arid region.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is now for the first time putting these two classes of engineering work in connection with water as applied to farming under the particular Bureau of Good Roads.

Mr. LEVER. Heretofore they have been carried under the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course they have no logical connection with the Office of Good Roads.

Mr. LEVER. They have no connection whatever with the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman think this is only another way of building up and giving dignity and larger scope and jurisdiction to a bureau which we will be called upon to appropriate more and more for as we go on?

Mr. LEVER. I tried to point out a moment ago to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the name of the office has been changed, so as to indicate the character of the work that is being done. It is now designated the Office of Roads and Rural Engineering. Formerly it was the Office of Roads. This suggestion comes from the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authority to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. I think this is one of the mischiefs of our method of making appropriations. We are doing work in various departments, and here is a great corps of engineers whose business it is to understand all about irrigation as applied to farming, and we are also building up this bureau in the Department of Agriculture, really duplicating the work that those engineers must do, in order to be informed about irrigation projects, and there are engineers to spare in that department.

Mr. LEVER. It is not really a duplication in the usual sense of the word "duplication." We are trying here to concentrate these engineers in one bureau, in order to prevent duplication, at least in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. I know from actual observation and experience that the problems connected with irrigation, and the application of irrigation to farming, are being studied by those engineers in the Reclamation Service, and anyone desiring to be informed ought to be able to ascertain information from that service, without the necessity of duplicating and multiplying appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think this amendment is so juicy that it may precipitate a good deal of discussion, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be closed in six mintes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. May we have the amendment reported again, so that we will know what it is?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BARTON], for I know something about the needs of this country in southwestern Nebraska, and even in northwestern Kansas. I have in my mind a farmer, who unfortunately lost his life last spring, who was willing, if this effort would be made by the Government, to supply, in addition to whatever money the Government would use in boring wells, all the labor that was necessary.

It is a rich land; it is a rich country; but, like some parts of Texas, it needs rain. It needs water. With the needed water it would make a productive country. If the Government would search for these subterranean streams I believe it would find an immense amount of water coming from the mountains that settles into the earth with underground streams. I am firm in the belief that if a number of ponds were impounded that it would cause, on account of evaporation, more rainfall, and that land in western Nebraska is as rich as any land in the country. I have heard it stated here that when Illinois and Iowa people wanted drainage they drained and tiled their own lands, but they did it after their lands were worth $100 or $150 an acre, when they had become rich and could afford to do it. But here is a new country, practically all homesteaders, who have settled there within a few years and have not got the means to do what the Illinois and Iowa farmers did. I believe it would be helpful and develop one of the greatest grain-producing countries in the United States. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, one moment. I am satisfied that under the language of the amendment just read the work contemplated in the amendment can be done. However, I want to say that the committee has given no consideration to the proposition. It was not estimated for. It is a large sum of money, and I trust that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that the department was doing the very thing up to a few years ago and then abandoned it? A number of wells were sunk, but the expense of pumping was so great that they abandoned it.

Mr. LEVER. Not since I have been closely affiliated with the work of the department has that been done; but the gentleman has been on the committee much longer than I have, and I am sure his recollection of the facts is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage, and for giving expert assistance by advice or otherwise in the drainage of such lands; for conducting field experiments and investigations concerning the construction and maintenance of farm drainage work; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of farm drainage structures; for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on drainage; and for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside the District of Columbia, and for supplies and all necessary expenses, $96,280.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. Following the book that we used in making up the bill, I find that there is a paragraph which I remember we approved of, at the bottom of page 102, and I do not see it in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. I am about to offer that as an amendment, as a new paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment to the existing paragraph. Would a new paragraph cut me out?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think it would.

Mr. MOORE. Then I want to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 69, in line 8, after the word "work," by inserting the following: "For investigating and developing drainage with a view to the extermination of the disease-carrying mosquito."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I question whether this is subject to a point of order. It follows the language of the paragraph closely, and pertains to the department work. However, I desire to speak on the merits and to say that for several years I have undertaken, at the instance of a large number of people who are annoyed by the pest, to have some consideration given in this bill, which appropriates so much money for other insect purposes, to the elimination of the mosquito.

The very efficient but, in this instance, hard-hearted chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], has maintained that the mosquito is a pest that pertains only to man. He contends for that reason that my amendment has no place in an agricultural bill; that the mosquito, to obtain a status here, must harass the plant or disturb the peace of mind of the barnyard fowl or annoy the cow. He seems to want to hold me directly to these animals of the lower kingdom. I contend that there is no pest on earth that in virulence and in its general powers to irritate has a worse effect upon humankind or animals in both kingdoms than the mosquito. It belongs to no section of the country and can not be confined to any State. It develops everywhere and roams everywhere. Recent scientific information—and all through the bill we have a plethora of scientific helpfulness, from the experts in bugology to the deep thinkers in all the other "ologies"—leads us to believe that the treatment of the mosquito is wrapped up in the drainage question. It is scientific to believe that the mosquito can be conquered by proper drainage; therefore the amendment ought to be in order.

I have looked this bill over and believe the proper place for this amendment is in the drainage paragraph, and I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Entomology both are doing considerable work along the line the gentleman suggests, I am constrained to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire what the point of order was?

Mr. LEVER. That it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE. New legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not; but the Chair ruled so quickly and before I had any explanation of the point of order that I felt myself entitled to know what the point was.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the point was ruled on last year, and ruled out of order.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had no desire to be discourteous to the gentleman in any way. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage, and for giving expert assistance, by advice or otherwise, in the drainage of such lands; for conducting field experiments and investigations concerning the construction and maintenance of farm drainage work; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of farm drainage structures; for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on drainage; and for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside the District of Columbia, and for supplies and all necessary expenses, $96,280.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment as a new paragraph, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 15, on page 69, the following paragraph:

"For investigation of farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal and construction of farm buildings and other local engineering problems involving mechanical principles, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $12,805."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I understand the gentleman desires to know about this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly do.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say when the committee first began consideration of the bill and first began making it up it did so on the theory that we were not going to put into the bill any new lines of work unless they were in the nature of emergencies, and the committee reaching this item was not advised at the time that it was a character of work that was already being carried in the Bureau of Plant Industry under the Office of Farm Management, and hence cut the entire item out. Later the Secretary of Agriculture wrote me——

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield? A part of this also has been carried in the Bureau of Animal Industry and also transferred.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. Lately the Secretary of Agriculture wrote to me, and I will read a portion of his letter:

The amount heretofore allotted for the work of construction of farm buildings in the Bureau of Plant Industry alone was $12,805. If item 40, carrying $25,000, should not be approved by the committee in its entirety, I sincerely hope that there will be an adequate allowance for the farm architectural work. It is clear that unless $12,805 is allowed for this work the activities of the department in this direction will be curtailed. Instead of being curtailed they ought to be extended, as there are many demands upon the department for assistance in this direction and very much more could be done than is being done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman show or state where there has been any authorization heretofore for investigation and construction of farm buildings and machinery?

Mr. LEVER. I have just read it to the gentleman. It has heretofore been carried under the general-expense item of farm management. The gentleman will remember heretofore the Office of Farm Management has just simply been carried in one line in the bill, "For farm management," and it has been carried under that language——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to read a note from the department, so far as farm buildings are concerned, to show that it is entirely new and that it has never been carried heretofore?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know what note the gentleman speaks of, but I read to the gentleman from the Secretary's letter. The Secretary may be giving misinformation——

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but he is not giving all the information. He does not say anything about investigating the subject of farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. STAFFORD. This note is entirely consistent with the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. He states what has been heretofore carried and also gives the nature of and the additional amount needed, showing that the investigation of farm buildings and machinery is new. That is why I am protesting

as to the need of this department of engineering stretching out into some new field connected with farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is certainly mistaken, although I am very glad to have——

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not at the moment.

Mr. LEVER. I have just read the gentleman what the Secretary said:

Mr. STAFFORD (reading)—

This item also relates to farm buildings and involves the transfers from other bureaus of specialists engaged in such work. This is also in the interest of economy and efficiency, as this work is of an engineering character.

The Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering is equipped with a mechanical department under the direction of a mechanical engineer, and it is believed that with the small additional appropriation asked for this department can be made of great use to the farmers of the country in connection with the development and testing of farm machinery.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman continue to read?

Mr STAFFORD. I did read the other, but I read it out of order.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the gentleman to read it into the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have read it into the RECORD, but I read the last sentence first and then went back. I got the idea by just reading this last statement that this is new work involving an investigation of farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. The last sentence shows it is a transfer.

Mr. HAWLEY. The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, does not include all that was proposed in the item in the book the gentleman has in his hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. We have modified the language there from the estimates.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the words "and machinery" have been eliminated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let us have the amendment again reported, Mr. Chairman, but not out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the item that I am most opposed to is the investigation into the construction of farm buildings. I think that is an idle proposition.

Mr. LEVER. But we changed it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology of the amendment as now proposed will cover all the activities, even in the more specific wording, of the Book of Estimates.

Mr. LEVER. I differ with the gentleman. We changed the language because we wanted to modify it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection if the gentleman would strike out the "construction of farm buildings." I do not wish to limit the activities of this department. I have no objection to investigating farm drainage disposal. I see no need, however, of a scientific investigation of the construction of farm buildings. Farmers know what they need with respect to their buildings.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is not a new project. It was carried in at least two bills.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that we had the man in charge of this work before the committee, and his testimony was to the effect that there was a tremendous demand throughout the country for the study of the most economical and advanced plans for the building of small farm homes. He submitted to the committee a number of letters from engineering societies all over the country commending his work, and he submitted also a number of pictures to the committee, together with plans and drawings and the like of that. I think this is very important work. We had a special hearing on it after the bill was made up, and the result of it is this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is allowed to remain in this act, will the subsequent appropriation be increased?

Mr. LEVER. Not so long as I am chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will certainly be chairman of the committee until a vacancy occurs in another body, and we all know that he will then fill that vacancy with credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order, or reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to know the difference between this amendment, so far as it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the amendment which I offered a little while ago and which the Chairman ruled out.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I am not sure that this amendment is in order here in the first place, but this whole Agricultural bill relates to agriculture. The gentleman's proposition was a medical proposition, a scientific study of diseases of the body.

Mr. MOORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It related wholly to drainage, as it pertains to the mosquito. It is purely an agricultural proposition.

Mr. LEVER. That is one of the very things that should be kept out of this bill.

Mr. MOORE. It is just as pertinent as many of the items that have been inserted in the bill. There are some people who say that because there is $660,000 in this bill for investigations of the cotton-boll weevil that therefore the bill is a "pork-barrel" bill, just as they say it of a rivers and harbors bill. I want the gentlemen to remember that it is perfectly easy to rule out an amendment that does not meet the approval of the committee on the ground that the amendment contains legislation tacked onto an appropriation bill; but it is not always fair for the committee to come in with an amendment that proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and have everybody sit quiescent and allow it to pass.

Now, I consider the destruction of the mosquito more important, not only to the animal kingdom, but also to the human family, than a provision attached to the bill making an appropriation to buy more machinery or pay more salaries. That is my point.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MOORE. I do not make the point of order. Having said what I desire to say, and having shown that some of us are on guard over here, and that we appreciate the power which the committee has over the proceedings of the House, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Nobody doubts that the gentleman is on guard all the time.

Mr. MOORE. Of course; I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in regard to that item for investigation as to the construction of farm buildings, does that recommendation come from the farmers throughout the country or does it come from engineering societies?

Mr. LEVER. From both. Mr. Atherton, who has charge of this work, showed us half a dozen letters and indicated that he has a great number more, many from farm women, asking about plans for building a kitchen and building farm homes. It was very interesting.

Mr. BAILEY. In other words, as I understand, the people of this country have come to look to the "Little Father in Washington" for all kinds of guidance?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I think that is true. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $497,700.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the membership of the committee of this House and the country would be pleased to know that it is possible to thrash and put wheat into the sack or bag at a cost of 2 cents a bushel.

I go back to the days of the old cradle, when the farmer used the cradle to cut his wheat, and from that time down to the

time of the reaper, and from that down to the twine binder, that ties the bundles and throws the bundles into a pile.

A MEMBER. Into a shock.

Mr. HELM. Oh, they do not shock it. Now, I am speaking of something that is worth the attention of you gentlemen. Here is a proposition. A gentleman by the name of Jones stopped at the hotel where I board who has invented a machine that will cut, thrash, and put in the sack wheat at 2 cents a bushel, as against 12 cents under the old methods that have been used heretofore. In these degenerate days, when a man invents a gun that can destroy 300 or 400 men at a shot, or knock down a city, his name is heralded to the world as a genius; but a man who can put up and operate something that makes for good, a machine that lightens the burdens of life, and who accomplishes something good for mankind, gets no attention, is never heard of; and when a man gets upon the floor here and talks about an invention that has done as much to benefit mankind as the sewing machine did in its day, or as the screw propeller did for ocean navigation, or the cotton gin for the planter, when a man presents a proposition that will reduce the cost of harvesting grain from 12 cents a bushel to 2 cents a bushel, there is a ripple of laughter in the House of Representatives, from men who are presumed to be at least sometimes serious in the matters in which they are engaged.

Mr. NORTON. I come from a wheat-raising State. Can the gentleman tell us where this machine is in operation?

Mr. HELM. The name of the inventor is Mr. Jones, and he comes from Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. NORTON. It cuts, harvests, and thrashes and stacks grain at 2 cents a bushel?

Mr. HELM. He cuts the grain and thrashes it and puts it in sacks at 2 cents a bushel, assuming that you have a yield of 50 bushels to the acre.

Mr. NORTON. That is quite an assumption in the wheat-raising country. Of course, it might be all right here.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will inform the gentleman that it is not too much of an assumption. I have seen many a field out there that averaged 65 bushels to the acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. I suppose some of you gentlemen here doubt that there is such a machine. I suppose some of you are so skeptical that you will not believe there is such a machine, but it is in operation. It cut approximately 320 acres of grain last season without a single breakdown, going all the time.

Mr. SLOAN. Was that a season's work—320 acres?

Mr. HELM. Oh, no.

Mr. SLOAN. I was going to say that that would be a very slim season's work.

Mr. HELM. Oh, no. You will understand that this gentleman has only recently got his machine perfected, and that was only a try out.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. What effect would the use of such machines have on the demand for labor?

Mr. HELM. I suppose, like all similar labor-saving machines, it would reduce the number of persons employed in harvesting.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HELM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the invention of the sewing machine was opposed because it was feared it would lessen the demand for labor, but, on the contrary, it increased it very greatly?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Has not that been the universal experience with labor-saving machinery?

Mr. HELM. I think so.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. In connection with the question of the gentleman from Indiana, I want to ask what effect it would have on the price of bread?

Mr. HELM. I should naturally suppose it would cheapen it, if we could get away from the Biscuit Trusts.

Mr. BUTLER. Can you not mow down the trusts? [Laughter.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Does not the gentleman know that there is only a small section of the United States where that machine could be used?

Mr. HELM. Here is a picture of the machine running on a hillside.

Mr. HELGESEN. Let me tell the gentleman something he does not know, that in the great wheat section the grain does not ripen on the straw so that it can be thrashed at the time it is cut. This machine can only be used on the Pacific coast or where the grain will ripen on the stalk, so that it can be thrashed at that time.

Mr. HELM. The inventor claims that the machine can be successfully operated in any wheat section of the country.

Mr. BUTLER. Is this machine for sale?

Mr. HELM. It is for sale, and I have not a particle of interest in it and never expect to have.

Mr. BUTLER. I know my friend has not. How much does it cost?

Mr. HELM. It costs less than a thousand dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky has concluded.

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Markets and Rural Organization: One chief clerk, $2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 5 clerks, class 3; 9 clerks, class 2; 10 clerks, class 1; 5 clerks, at $1,000 each; 1 laboratory aid, $900; 2 clerks, at $900 each; 1 laboratory aid, $720; 2 laboratory aids, at $600 each; 1 map tracer, $720; 1 map tracer, $600; 2 messenger boys, at $600 each; 1 laborer, $540; 4 messenger boys, at $480 each; in all, $56,400.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope it has not escaped the attention of the Members of this House that the newspapers report a hurried meeting of the Cabinet at the Treasury yesterday for the purpose of revising downward the estimates submitted to Congress in December last by the various departments of the Government.

This is a belated recognition of a grave situation, but it is better late than never.

However, I observe in the account of the retrenchment conference that the deficit of more than $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30 next is attributed to "reckless appropriations by Congress, chiefly in 'pork-barrel' rivers and harbors and public buildings bills," no mention being made of the Army bill, the fortifications bill, or the Navy bill, although they cap all records for these in times of peace. Apparently there is no thought of retrenching in the direction of "preparedness." The Army bill carries $101,000,000 and the Navy bill as drawn calls for an expenditure of more than $148,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, early in the life of this Congress I took occasion more than once to remind Democrats of what I have called the "forgotten plank" of the Baltimore platform—that plank pledging the Democratic Party to rigid economy in public expenditures—but without avail. Republican extravagance which we had denounced was outdone by our own party, and no serious effort on the part of our leaders, let it be said with regret, was made to curb the saturnalia of extravagance. In a most flagrant manner was economy disregarded in making provision for Army and Navy. Had we been face to face with a foreign war we could not have spent money with a more lavish hand.

We are told that the income tax has proved disappointing. That was to have been expected. The income tax is, after all, a tax on conscience, and the conscience of those possessing taxable incomes is sometimes elastic. Incomes in some mysterious manner shrink at the approach of the inquisitor. They never yield quite the revenue which they are expected to furnish.

The emergency tax law has likewise disappointed the expectations of Treasury officials and party leaders. It has not yielded the returns hoped for. It fails to make up the deficit in revenues occasioned by the decline in customs receipts since the outbreak of the European conflagration. Either the country must seek out new sources of supply or it must lay the ax at the root of the tree of extravagance.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, I have voted consistently for economy. In some cases I have been compelled to part company with my party leaders in doing so. I have felt that I owed no higher duty to the people than that of standing across the path of those headed toward the Treasury; and this I have done as best I might, not always or often successfully, but I have stood there nevertheless.

While money has been wasted on rivers and harbors, and perhaps also on public buildings, the waste here at the very worst has been negligible in comparison with that on battleships, big guns, fortifications, and militaristic expansion. For every dollar wasted in the one direction a hundred dollars have been wasted in the other. The country has something material to show for the money it devotes to rivers and harbors; it has something material to show for the money it invests in public

buildings; it has something material to show for the sums it spends on agriculture and other activities designed to promote the development of our resources; but what has it to show for the enormous sums it has devoted to naval and military expansion? It has a vast array of fighting machines of one sort or another; it has nearly 200,000 men drawn from gainful pursuits to be borne on the backs of the workers of the land; and it has a shouting and tumultous band of patriots, of whom the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is perhaps the most vociferous, who insist that, with all the expenditure, we are unprepared for defense and in so sorry a plight that the nations of the earth make merry at our expense.

Of course this is sheer tommyrot. It is inspired, it is to be feared, by other than genuinely patriotic motives. But that it is sweeping this Congress before it is only too apparent. The question then arises, Shall jingoism prevail or shall sober sense resume its sway and put an end to the orgy of militaristic extravagance, which has already gone too far?

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products, $238,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee how much of this lump sum of $238,000 is for salaries. In the first paragraph you appropriate $56,400, entirely for the salary list.

Mr. LEVER. That is for statutory salaries.

Mr. BOOHER. How much of this $238,000 is appropriated for salaries?

Mr. LEVER. Necessarily the larger part of this appropriation is for salaries and traveling expenses. This is the lump sum, which carries the scientific force of the office.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman mean to say that it costs $56,400 and $238,000 for salaries to run this bureau?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Missouri must understand that we are not employing any soldiers or building anything, but practically our whole appropriation is a matter of salaries. The whole Department of Agriculture is made up of men who are employed upon salaries. There is a scientific force and a statutory roll, and, outside of rent and traveling expenses, practically every dollar of this appropriation is expended for salaries.

Mr. BOOHER. How long has the bureau been organized?

Mr. LEVER. It was organized two years ago, with an appropriation of $50,000.

Mr. BOOHER. And it has grown to $352,650 in two years—a pretty rapid growth.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but they have transferred some work from other bureaus. The total increase is about $90,000.

Mr. BOOHER. It is more than that, because the bill now appropriates $352,650.

Mr. LEVER. But that represents a considerable number of transfers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if he can state briefly what progress is being made by the Department of Agriculture in the work cut out for it under this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. The Office of Markets in the outline of its work promises to develop into one of the most important lines of activity in all the Department of Agriculture. Of course it is a new work, and a large part of the time has been spent in organizing the work. It has been a very difficult matter to get men of that expert training, comprehension of facts, and understanding necessary in the conduct of the study of the problems of marketing. But they have made substantial progress in their investigation and study, and they have been of immense use in their work with the Committee on Agriculture both in the cotton-futures act, the grain-standardization bill, and the warehouse bill, and various other lines of constructive legislation that the committee has been studying. I think the office is now prepared to do very good fundamental work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask whether or not it is the purpose of the office to extend its work so as to give the farmer information as to the foreign markets, or whether or not it is proposed to confine it altogether to the markets in this country?

Mr. LEVER. The language of the item under which various other items are allowed here is so broad that I am satisfied that the whole problem of marketing as to its effects on agriculture in this country, both domestic and foreign, can be investigated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. There are quite a number that want to speak.

Mr. MANN. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. There are several on this side who want to speak.

Mr. MANN. If they are going to speak 25 minutes, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. My colleagues will see the situation that we have here, and we must complete this bill this afternoon if we have to keep a quorum here all night. I do not think it will be necessary, but gentlemen can never tell in the consideration of a bill what will happen. I would be glad to accommodate Members, but I can not do it. If we are going to get through the bill in a reasonable time we must not devote so much debate to every provision. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate be limited on this paragraph and amendments thereto to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask what that paragraph includes?

Mr. LEVER. From line 13 to line 21.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I do not care to speak on that.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am offering an amendment, which I believe to be an important amendment whether it is in order or not in this paragraph, and I certainly want the right to speak five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair will control the time. Personally, I should be glad to have the gentleman have the time, and if the gentleman from Tennessee will expedite his questions, there will be a few minutes of my own time left.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I agree with him. I do not think there is a more important appropriation in the bill, so far as the farmer is concerned, than this, and I hoped the office had proceeded far enough so that they could undertake to make some investigations in the foreign field as well as in the local or domestic field.

Mr. LEVER. I am sure that when we come back next year we can report great progress in this work, probably along the lines the gentleman suggests.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] asked what progress this Bureau of Markets had made. I do not believe that the gentlemen of this House have given this part of the Agricultural Department proper consideration. The poor farmer—and when I say the poor farmer I mean the man engaged in diversified farming, the man who digs his living out of the ground my making food to feed the human race—has been taught by the Government many years how to make crops, but we are not showing him the places or the methods of marketing. I refer to the seventh district of Mississippi, where the boll weevil virtually put that prosperous part of the country out of commission. These farmers have learned diversification of crops, but they are up against the proposition of getting a market for their corn, their molasses, their potatoes, Irish and sweet, and all kinds of vegetables. This Bureau of Markets should show the men producing these crops the best method of packing, the best method of marketing, and a way to find the markets for these farm products, and the Government should furnish an inspection that will keep them from being cheated by the commission dealers or middlemen in the cities. That, in my judgment, is what the Bureau of Markets should devote its attention to. The gentleman from Tennessee wanted to know if they could look out for the foreign markets. We have people in this country that they should look out for. People in the cities are crying for diversified products of the farm. You can not get them to the cities without the poor farmer being robbed in commissions and transportation charges. In Washington you pay 50 cents a peck for corn meal, and in the seventh district of Mississippi the farmer can

not as a rule get more than four bits a bushel for his corn. There is something wrong when the farmer can not get full value for his labor out of his crops. That is what the bureau ought to do, to show the people where they can sell their products and the people in the cities can get their stuff for reasonable prices without the farmer being oppressed and without the people in the city being robbed. The farmer and the consumer should be brought together, and when the Bureau of Markets gets its machinery operating in a systematic way a great portion of the waste, expense, and stealage will be done away with. Then the poor farmer will get a fair price for the products of his farm and the poor consumer in the city can eat a plenty. As it is now the consumer pays an exorbitant price for the things he eats and the farmer hardly gets enough for it to keep soul and body together. A few middlemen and transportation companies are getting rich off of the labor of the farmers. The farmer must get relief, and you fellows had better get busy in his behalf.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure, of course, the gentleman does not want to discriminate against any class of farmers of this country. I want to call his attention to the fact that there are some farm products for which there is no market in this country, particularly dark tobacco, which is exported to Europe. Now, does not the gentleman think that it is the duty of the office of the Bureau of Markets to undertake to give to the tobacco farmers who grow tobacco for the purpose of export the same facilities for a market and the same information that it does to other farmers?

Mr. QUIN. Why, certainly I do; but that is something that the world is bound to have. They are bound to have that tobacco. Men are going to chew and smoke tobacco just as long as the breath of Adam is in them, and we have to have the markets to sell tobacco in. Now, in reference to the tobacco markets, they have organized a great trust to oppress the tobacco farmers. We know that is the case. Mr. Chairman, the proposition the gentleman is talking about will be attended to later. We have a bill passed by the last Congress that will prevent the thieves in the Tobacco Trust from robbing the producers of tobacco. I contend that the farmer of this country right now needs this Market Bureau extended. The gentleman from Missouri seems to think there is too much money expended on it. I want to spend more on the Bureau of Markets, for I realize the sale and distribution of farm products is bound to be handled in a sensible and practicable way. Instead of spending that money on these men going around to look over the great mountains of this country, instead of spending it on men going around to look at the beautiful spots to establish parks, there can be no better work done by the Agriculture Department than to find markets for the farm products of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. If the gentleman referred to me as objecting to this——

Mr. QUIN. No; not as objecting to it; but that there was some extravagance about it.

Mr. BOOHER. No; my question was only as to how this money was all spent or how much of the lump sum has been spent for salaries; that is all.

Mr. QUIN. I am in favor of expending whatever money is necessary to extend the Bureau of Markets in every possible manner to help the farmers of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to the paragraph which has already been sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS: Page 70, line 16, after the word "products," insert "and for establishing and operating an exchange, with the necessary branches thereof, for the economic sale and distribution of farm products, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, at as early date as practicable, a farm-produce exchange, with such branches thereof as may be necessary, in order to afford a medium through which the economic and systematic sale and distribution of such products may be effected.

"In the operation of such exchange the Secretary of Agriculture, as far as practicable, shall cooperate with the several States and the various agencies therein which may be utilized, and may formulate plans and regulations for exchange of service between them and such exchange.

"It shall be the duty of each of the departments of the Government to furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such statistics and data as they may acquire which would be useful in the operation of such exchange, and to render such other service in the sale and distribution of farm products through such exchange as it would be practicable to render.

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall keep advised as nearly as practicable with the details of the quantity, quality, location, and price at which held, of agricultural products and the volume and location of demand in the United States and abroad, and the price at which such products may be sold, and shall make such information available to the producer and purchaser of such products, and shall endeavor to bring about such system in the sale and distribution of such products as shall eliminate the waste and extremes in prices resulting from the present lack of system therein.

"Those desiring to offer products for sale through such exchange may do so by grade or by sample delivered to such exchange, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, but all tenders of such products shall be for a definite quantity and quality: *Provided, however* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit contracts for the sale of such products to be made upon a basis grade, with the option to deliver other grades in fulfillment of such contract: *Provided, however*, That no contracts shall be made through said exchange permitting a delivery within a wider range of grades than the ordinary user of such product dealt in uses in the general conduct of his business wherein such products are used, nor upon any other delivery value difference than the commercial difference between the basis grade and the grade or grades delivered.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require such deposits in money, bond, or other guaranty of compliance with the obligation to deliver according to tender or receive and pay according to offer as in his judgment may be necessary to insure compliance with the contracts made through such exchange.

"All information furnished by such exchange shall not be at a higher cost than that necessary to defray the expenses of transmission.

"No charges shall be made to individual producers or to producers' organizations for services rendered in effecting sales of products grown by them or by their members, as the case may be.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish such rules and regulations governing transactions through said exchange and the service rendered by said exchange as in his discretion may be deemed necessary."

During the reading of the amendment,

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I also reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I submit there has been enough read to put the matter before the House. If the gentleman wants to talk on the subject, he had better proceed; if not, we will have to make the point of order against it in order to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved against the amendment, and nine minutes are left for debate.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by myself, to create a produce exchange and a clearing house of information, does not propose to bring the Government into a new field of activity. It would only bring the Government activity into a field already occupied by it, into rational conformity with the conditions which now obtain in that field. The Government has definitely committed itself to the policy of aiding agriculture to deal properly with its big problems. For this purpose the Agriculture Department was created. As community isolation and community self-sufficiency have disappeared with improved transportation facilities and the development of great cities, there has been added to the two original great agricultural problems—production and preservation of soil fertility—a third and the most difficult one, namely, that of sale and distribution of farm products. The amendment is intended to confer the necessary power upon the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to bring the activities of the Agriculture Department into the new field of difficulty. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand upon what theory opposition to this amendment can be based. Everybody knows that production, preservation in the soil of the power to continue to produce, and the proper disposition of the products by the producers constitute the farmer's business.

The farmer's business being indispensable to the very existence of all people, its difficulties have been taken cognizance of by all the enlightened Governments of the world. A special department in each of them has been created to protect the public interest by aiding farmers to deal with the big problems of agriculture. No gentleman on this floor can deny that the sale and distribution of farm products is the most difficult of the three. Underpaid farmers on the one hand and underfed people on the other, because of the wasteful and absurd system of sale and distribution of farm products demand the creation of the necessary machinery for their distribution. Mr. Chairman, within the memory of men yet active in the affairs of this country but a small percentage of agricultural products entered into the channels of commerce. Production was primarily to supply the family of the producers and was diversified to meet their needs.

Local necessity, rather than the adaptability of the soil, fixed the character of crops. Then the people conformed to local production. When the land raised wheat but not corn, the family ate flour bread; and when it raised corn and not wheat, they ate corn bread. Of the small percentage sold a large part went to the neighboring towns and villages. They had to use what the community produced. The expense of transportation would not permit outside products to come in, and the expense of transportation would not carry products far away. The slowness of transportation barred perishable products from distant markets. If this condition had not changed I would not be offering this amendment, but it has completely changed. The farmers' children no longer wear homespun clothes, homemade shoes, and so forth. The farmer produces primarily to sell now. The people have moved from the country. Towns have grown to be great cities.

Now, nonfarmers can not purchase from their farmer neighbors. Consumption has moved far from the field of production, not only physically far away but far away in every other sense. Both the producer and the consumer require just what this amendment proposes to create. It would establish between producer and consumer a dependable substitute for the lost personal acquaintance and put them in trading relations with each other. It would reduce the expense of sale and distribution, first, by giving to many agricultural products a commercial status as they come from the farms; second, by making the point of origin the point of sale, thereby enabling products to move from the point of origin to the point of use by the most direct and economical route, and thereby make it possible to have the total volume of movement of all products to a given point of use substantially conform to the total volume of demand for use at that point. I understand full well the difficulties, but I say it is possible of substantial accomplishment. To the extent this accomplishment is achieved, uniformity of price to producers, uniformity of cost to consumers, and uniformity of supply in the markets throughout the country would result. With this exchange and clearing house of information in proper operation the millions of dollars' worth of food products which now decay in the fields after production and in congested markets—a clear loss to farmers—would go to the tables of the people who need them, and at a price which would reduce the cost of their living. Here is the place for those who want to reduce the cost of living to do effective work.

In addition, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the exercise of the power proposed to be conferred by this amendment is necessary to give result to many of the present activities of the Department of Agriculture. We are spending millions of dollars per annum in the department teaching how to produce. I know a man in southwestern Texas, for instance, who absorbed some of this information. He put in a field of lettuce. He worked hard to produce a superior quality and succeeded. He was proud of his achievement. He sent a hundred samples to the different markets. It was pronounced excellent. In great hope he made his first shipment of a carload. He paid in freight charges $9 above the result of the sale. He tried once more and had to pay $13 above the receipts, and the rest of his crop rotted in the field. Now, I would like to know what good that enthusiastic Government agent did that man or the people who wanted lettuce to eat, but who did not know where the lettuce could be found, while the man did not know where the need was. A few years ago somebody went over into east Texas and inspired the people along the Cotton Belt Railroad to put in Irish potatoes. There was much enthusiasm. When the potatoes were harvested, they discovered that potatoes were bringing a good price in St. Louis. They all shipped to that market, and their returns would not pay for the seed they had planted. The much-preached doctrine of diversification received a solar-plexus blow in that country. We were told that our eastern section is a great peach country, and it is. I know of one concern that spent nearly half a million dollars developing a peach orchard. They have cut down hundreds of acres of bearing trees and put the land in cotton because of the uncertainty—the gamble of trying to reach a profitable market.

I have seen field after field of cantaloupes rotting because there was no market. The local stores, when they could sell them at all, were retailing the choicest ones at 10 cents a dozen, while in a neighboring State they were retailing at 10 cents apiece. I have seen thousands of bushels of tomatoes rotting on the plants when no doubt the poor people in your cities could not afford to have them for Sunday dinner, because of the local price. We have been spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to kill the boll weevil, and I have seen figures compiled showing the number of bales of cotton destroyed per year, and then this number of bales multiplied by the price, to show the loss to the South resulting from this ravage. When everybody knows that a small crop of cotton brings more money than a large one, not because it ought to, but because of the methods under which it is sold. There is absolutely no medium through which the investing energy of the world can reach and safely purchase the chief product of my people. There is no open market, no market place except for the professional operator. Had such an agency existed this year as this amendment proposes to create, cotton would not have gone within 2 cents per pound of the price to which it went. Millions and millions of money from all over the country would have gone into competitive bidding against the professional speculator, if the ordinary individual could have made his investment through such an agency, assured as he would have been of integrity of transaction, protection against physical damage to his purchase, and that without further personal attention, through the same dependable agency he could later sell his purchase. I know this to be a fact, because I talked to people from different sections of the country, who believed cotton a good investment, and were willing to back their judgment with their money.

The biggest problem of agriculture is not that of production. My people always produce as much as they can get a fair price for under present marketing methods. What I want the Agriculture Department to do, after it has taught my people how to raise more, is to prevent the application of that information from working an injury to them. There is nothing extreme about this amendment. It proposes the safe and common-sense thing to do under existing conditions. I hope you will not confuse this with any valorization scheme or thing of that sort. I have never asked for valorization of cotton by the National Government. I would not for anything on earth put it in the power of Congress to fix the price of the cotton which my people produce. Those of us who come from the cotton districts constitute about one-fourth of the membership of this body. The same power that could fix the price at 15 cents per pound could fix it at 5 cents. I mean no reflection on this Congress, but I know human nature, and three-fourths of you represent constituents who do not raise cotton. I am not only not asking you to fix a price, but I am not willing to give that power to you. I am not asking for anything artificial. I want to destroy the artificial, the clique-controlled market of the country, and establish an honest market place, an open market place, for the actual products of the soil, a market place in which the whole world can trade with full assurance of protection. I want again to direct attention to the language of the amendment.

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, at as early date as practicable, a farm-produce exchange, with such branches thereof as may be necessary, in order to afford a medium through which the economic and systematic sale and distribution of such products may be effected.

In the operation of such exchange the Secretary of Agriculture, as far as practicable, shall cooperate with the several States and the various agencies therein which may be utilized, and may formulate plans and regulations for exchange of service between them and such exchange.

It shall be the duty of each of the departments of the Government to furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such statistics and data as they may acquire which would be useful in the operation of such exchange, and to render such other service in the sale and distribution of farm products through such exchange as it would be practicable to render.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall keep advised as nearly as practicable with the details of the quantity, quality, location, and price at which held of agricultural products and the volume and location of demand in the United States and abroad and the price at which such products may be sold, and shall make such information available to the producer and purchaser of such products, and shall endeavor to bring about such system in the sale and distribution of such products as shall eliminate the waste and extremes in prices resulting from the present lack of system therein.

Those desiring to offer products for sale through such exchange may do so by grade or by sample delivered to such exchange, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, but all tenders of such products shall be for a definite quantity and quality: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit contracts for the sale of such products to be made upon a basis grade, with the option to deliver other grades in fulfillment of such contract: *Provided, however*, That no contracts shall be made through said exchange permitting a delivery within a wider range of grades than the ordinary user of such product dealt in uses in the general conduct of his business wherein such products are used, nor upon any other delivery value difference than the commercial difference between the basis grade and the grade or grades delivered.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require such deposits in money, bond, or other guaranty of compliance with the obligation to deliver according to tender or receive and pay according to offer as in his judgment may be necessary to insure compliance with the contracts made through such exchange.

All information furnished by such exchange shall not be at a higher cost than that necessary to defray the expenses of transmission.

No charges shall be made to individual producers or to producers' organizations for services rendered in effecting sales of products grown by them or by their members, as the case may be.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish such rules and regulations governing transactions through said exchange and the service rendered by said exchange as in his discretion may be deemed necessary.

This amendment is governmentally and economically sound. I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the plan suggested by the amendment does not contemplate the construction of a marketing machine, but the assembling of the parts of this machine which are now in existence, supplying only the necessary parts to put it into operation. The present organization of the Agricultural Department and of a number of other departments can be utilized. The entire agricultural organization of the several States can be utilized as well as cooperative organization throughout the country, and so can the Consular Service abroad. The necessity for this service by the Federal Government is obvious. No State can create such a marketing agency for its products as is needed, because much of the products of each move interstate. The movement of the products of a given State might be highly systematized and yet failure result because of conflicting shipments from other States. Interstate and foreign commerce under our Constitution is exclusively under the control of the National Government. The several States could deal with production and soil conservation within their respective confines, but they have no extraterritorial jurisdiction which would enable them to deal with marketing beyond their borders. We are therefore confronted with a situation where we have an Agricultural Department dealing with that two of the three big problems of agriculture which the several States have full and complete power to deal with, and practically ignoring the only one of the three big problems which the States can not deal with. If there is any common sense or governmental wisdom in this, I am unable to discover it, and therefore I have offered this amendment. I presume it will go out on a point of order.

But the time will come when it will have a more favorable reception. I am not guessing. I know it. I recognize it is a very difficult thing which I propose; that is why I am urging that we begin now before the situation becomes more acute. We ought to legislate now while we can do it deliberately and give the Secretary of Agriculture time to work out the problems involved. It seems to me that any man who will open his eyes to developments must see that upon the heels of this problem of sale and distribution is coming the problem of building up and holding in reserve a sufficient quantity of food to insure against the hazards of current production. The machine proposed by this amendment will be indispensable to that service. No change of so great importance to all the people ever progressed with such rapidity as that by which the world's reserve supply of food is being exhausted. You men from the great cities may be indifferent now, but you will not be indifferent long. Your people are more and more paying the preventable cost which I have mentioned. You are more and more paying in the price given for that which you consume the value of that which wastes after production. Your people more than my people will suffer when the time comes when there is not enough food for all.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I consider this Office of Markets one of the most important in the Department of Agriculture. It was suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] a little while ago that the expense of this office has increased quite rapidly in the short length of time it has been in existence. I helped to establish it two years ago with an appropriation of $50,000. Last year we made an appropriation for it of $200,000, and this year, by reason of transfers from other offices and divisions of the Department of Agriculture to this Office of Markets and its increasing work, it required a necessary increase, which brings it up to the appropriation that is recommended in the present bill of $484,050.

Nevertheless, the work that has already been done by this office justifies the expenditures that have been made. It has assisted in the preparation and passage in this House of some very important legislation. One of the bills was the United States cotton-futures act. Another was the warehouse act. Still another was the State grain act, which passed the House a few days ago. Another still is the United States cotton-standardization act, which is pending with a favorable committee report at the present time.

The work which this office proposes developing is along the lines of cotton handling and marketing; cooperative purchasing and marketing; market surveys, methods, and costs; market grades and standards; city marketing and distribution; transportation and storage; miscellaneous problems in marketing and collaboration; marketing by parcel post and express; marketing live stock, meats, and animal by-products; marketing business practice; grain market investigations.

These are the subjects which will engage the attention of this office during the next year. As was suggested a moment ago, it is not so much the production in this country, because we have a good deal of that—and it is increasing year by year—but the great question that is engaging the minds of the American people to-day is where we can best dispose of products after they are brought into existence. It is to devise ways and means whereby the producer can realize the highest benefit from the products which he brings into existence. If we can bring the producer and the consumer close together and eliminate so far as possible the middle man, who now gets the great bulk of the selling price to-day, we will have accomplished a solution of a very great question which is before the American people at the present time. [Applause.] So that I say that this bureau has begun a great work which will go on from year to year. It is true that it promises the very best field in which to labor for the benefit of the man who produces the farm products which the people who buy them desire to secure at the lowest possible price, and one of the great questions that we all know is confronting the American people to-day is the high cost of living.

We desire to reduce the cost of living if it is possible to do so, and in order to reduce it we want the producer to get the best possible price from the man who consumes the product and eliminate this terrible expense that intervenes between the sale of the product by the producer and its purchase by the man who buys it at the end of the line for his own personal use. If we do that, the cost of living will be very materially reduced, and that is a matter of vital importance to the American people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to incorporate in my remarks a further discussion of this item in this bill, prepared by Hon. Charles J. Brand, Chief of Office of Markets and Rural Organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The statement prepared by Mr. Brand is the following:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION FOR THE OFFICE OF MARKETS AND RURAL ORGANIZATION.

GENERAL CONSIDERATION.

"An increase is recommended for this branch of the work because this is a new organization which has necessarily been feeling its way, but which has now done the preliminary work which has brought it to the point where definite services of far-reaching importance can be performed. It has developed a viewpoint and personnel which justify the expectation of exceptional usefulness in several specific fields.

"Before outlining the exact lines of work upon which this increase will be spent, I wish to say that the money already spent in what may be called preliminary work has produced valuable results, for this office has been of material assistance to Congress in framing at least four important economic measures, one of which—the United States cotton futures act—has become a law, and its enforcement is now in the hands of this office.

"The second is the United States warehouse act, which has passed both Houses in different forms and which we confidently expect to see enacted before the close of this session.

"The third is the United States grain grades act, which has just passed this House by an overwhelming vote; and the fourth is the United States cotton standards act, which is now before this House with a favorable report from this committee, and it may be said in passing that this is really the most far-reaching measure of all.

"Had the Office of Markets and Rural Organization rendered the country no other service, its existence would be amply justified and the money appropriated for its use would have yielded a very satisfactory return. This, however, is far from the case. From the work already done we have every reason to expect as great help from this office when we are ready to consider the regulation of cold storages and commission houses, and inspection service under suitable supervision, and other economic questions already pressing for attention.

"The increase recommended will enable the office to actually set in motion new services of direct money value to the public, as well as important fundamental investigational work, upon which in the end improvements in our marketing system will rest.

"The regular lines of work in this office were presented to the committee in some detail when the hearings were held for the annual appropriation for the present fiscal year. These include cotton handling and marketing; cooperative purchasing and marketing; market surveys, methods, and costs; market grades and standards; city marketing and distribution; trans-

portation and storage; miscellaneous problems in marketing and collaboration; marketing by parcel post and express.

"The work on these projects will be continued necessarily under the appropriation here proposed, but the added amounts beyond those absolutely necessary to provide for slight additional growth will be devoted to three new projects, namely, marketing live stock, meats, and animal by-products; marketing business practice; and grain-marketing investigations; and to the extension of the market news-service work in the form of a demonstration under the project established last year, entitled 'Market surveys, methods, and costs.'

"In addition this office is charged with the work which has to do with rural credits, agricultural insurance, and rural social and educational activities, the appropriation for which during the current year is carried in the miscellaneous section of the last agricultural appropriation bill. In the plan of reorganization all of this work has been included in a single administrative unit.

"The character of the work and its importance warrants a slightly more detailed discussion of it than usual and will be taken up under the headings suggested above.

MARKETING LIVE STOCK, MEATS, AND ANIMAL BY-PRODUCTS.

"Considering the importance of the great market centers which handle a large proportion of the live stock sold in the United States, a thorough study of the organization, equipment, methods, and charges for services rendered at these markets is essential to the interest of all who produce or consume animal products. In this work special attention will be given to the efficiency of methods and reasonableness of charges for feed, yardage, and handling of live stock. It should be determined whether the prevailing rates and customs are equitable and whether the regulations in force operate to the advantage of patrons to a reasonable degree. In the nature of our marketing system these central markets should be regarded as public-service institutions. In view of the interstate character of the bulk of shipments passing through them, they are to a degree a proper subject for Federal control, at least so far as may be necessary to insure fair and efficient service.

"Transportation facilities to and from the market centers likewise determine in a large measure the economy and dispatch with which farm live stock and their products may be marketed. Hence there are numerous railroad problems which vitally concern the stockmen, not only regarding freight rates, but availability of cars, stock train service and accommodations, proper loading facilities, feeding stations en route, live-stock contracts, and liability of carriers for loss and damage.

"The sale of farm live stock involves peculiar problems in localities where farmers have less than carload lots for sale. Even in the older cattle and hog feeding districts a considerable proportion of stock must be disposed of in small numbers at a time. Local buyers or speculators frequently impose large margins of profit in handling their purchases and form little trusts among themselves to maintain such margins in a community. Farmers' cooperative live-stock shipping associations within recent years have proven a successful means of avoiding some of the costs of the local middleman's service, and an extension of this movement in various parts of the country offers an exceptional opportunity for aid on the part of the Federal Department of Agriculture.

"Classification and grading of live stock and meats, both at the market centers and in local communities, will be given careful study with a view to establishing standards of quality among dealers, instructing producers of live stock as to market demands and conducting a campaign of education among consumers, looking toward a more rational and intelligent selection of meats. Such a standardization would render market quotations more uniform and intelligible, and thereby enable stockmen to operate with greater confidence and precision.

"In different parts of the country where live-stock production is new and undeveloped, as, for example, on western irrigation projects and in parts of the South, where diversified farming is being developed, marketing problems arise which demand prompt and intelligent aid. Adequate help in the solution of these problems can only be extended by Federal agencies, and this work is to be provided for by the Office of Markets and Rural Organization. On the other hand, certain localities and individuals have developed methods of marketing which possess features of marked efficiency, and it should be the function of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization to disseminate the knowledge and encourage the use of these methods in other localities where they are feasible. Examples of this kind are the direct marketing of home-prepared meat products, especially farm-cured hams, bacon, and sausage, municipal and cooperative slaughtering and curing plants, live-stock shippers' associations, and other forms of cooperation, and the shipment of meats by parcel post.

"Specific and first-hand information is needed regarding the actual cost of marketing live stock and distributing meats and animal by-products as an indication of the efficiency of present market methods, and the margin of profit realized by each class of middleman who participates in the operation. Charges of extortion are freely made, and there is a lamentable lack of cooperation among all parties involved, from the producer to the consumer. Authentic figures representing the entire transaction in detail are almost entirely lacking, and it is desired to conduct carefully planned investigations which will serve as a basis for just conclusions regarding the legitimate and proper place of each class of middleman involved. Information of this kind can not fail to bring about a better understanding and a more confident attitude on the part of producer, middleman, and consumer, and thereby react favorably upon the entire live-stock and meat industry.

MARKETING BUSINESS PRACTICE.

"The marketing of agricultural products is a business, and as such, in order to bring the greatest returns to the producer and lessen the price to the consumer, marketing must be conducted in a thorough businesslike way. The farmer is expected to be both manufacturer and salesman. Selling—marketing—is a tough proposition, even more so for farm products than for many manufactured articles. The farmer needs help on it. His physical force is almost exhausted by the work of production.

"While we have considerable literature dealing with the business problems of industrial and commercial enterprises and volumes on cost accounting and efficiency engineering for manufacturing establishments, wholesalers, retailers, municipalities, etc., we have no literature on the fundamental requirements, from a business standpoint, for the proper conduct of cooperative purchasing and marketing organizations and other agencies engaged in the marketing of agricultural products. There is no place where information can be obtained relating to plans of financing farmers' organizations. The requirements for accounting systems and auditing, data relating to modern appliances for offices, methods of obtaining cost per unit of doing business, processes and plans for the elimination of wastes, and other business essentials are unfamiliar to practically all farmers' organizations.

"Realizing the above, and encouraged by the results obtained in helping the farmers' elevators and farmers' produce and fruit exchanges of the country, by the devising of accounting systems, which have been praised by all who have come in contact with them, and by the demand for information that would place marketing agencies on a sounder and safer business basis, it is considered necessary to give concrete and specific help on the business side of marketing. The best results in improving business methods of farm marketing agencies can not be secured by investigations alone. The information gathered must be disseminated in every possibly way and especially by well-planned demonstrations.

"If we can prevent the failure of one-tenth of the farmers' elevators which annually fail in this country, due to a lack of knowledge as to certain essential business requirements, it is estimated that we will have saved the farmers in one year several hundred thousand dollers. Over $100,000 were lost in one year in a northwestern grain State through the failure of farmers' elevators, due to the inefficient business methods employed in their operation. We are told that it costs a certain percentage of the sale price of a product to handle it on a commission basis; that it costs so much to handle a bushel of grain through a local elevator; and that the cost of marketing a pound of butter from the creamery to the retailer is so much, and yet we have no accurate information on these costs. To successfully eliminate waste we must secure the accurate costs of each step in the marketing and distribution of agricultural products, in order that unnecessary wastes and excessive profits may be discovered and eliminated.

"The Department of Agriculture, in the Office of Farm Management, is now engaged in investigating farm bookkeeping and farm cost accounting, and devising systems for keeping farm records, realizing that proper accounting is one of the great needs of the individual farmer. If with his limited knowledge of accounting principles the average farmer is not able to keep such accounts as should be kept for his own farm, how can he be expected to handle a good system of accounts and efficient plan of operation for the marketing of his products? If it is necessary to improve the business of the farmer with relation to his production, is it not as essentially necessary to improve the business of marketing those products?

"It is the purpose of the work above outlined not only to be helpful to the farmers' organizations, but also to give the individual farmer in his marketing business such helpful assistance as may be possible.

"All the various marketing agencies should keep proper accounting records. So doing should eliminate unnecessary wastes and help to place the marketing of agricultural products upon a business basis. This is necessary before the producer can receive an equitable value for that which he produces.

GRAIN-MARKETING INVESTIGATIONS.

"Up to the present time such investigations of the marketing of corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, and other grains as have been conducted have been carried on under the funds set aside for the project entitled 'Miscellaneous Problems in Marketing and Collaboration.' This was due to the fact that the importance of grain-marketing investigations was not recognized, but because the problems in connection with the inauguration of the work in the marketing of perishables were believed to be more acute.

"The development of the office has now progressed to a point where it is important that grain-marketing work be instituted. The following general topics will serve to indicate the direction which the work will take: Studies of the primary marketing of spring and winter wheat, including especially the uses and abuses of dockage in the first sale and the comparison of results in the case of grain passing from the farmer to the line elevator and to the farmers' mutual elevator; the various methods of marketing corn, both for the domestic and export trade, to be studied and compared and especial attention given to the marketing of southern corn. The crop of the South, in a general way, matures almost 30 days in advance of that of the grain belt, but because of inadequate handling and distributing machinery it is not harvested and gotten onto the market in advance of the huge crop of the Middle West. A distinct and fair commercial advantage is thus lost.

"A study of future grain transactions and exchange practices similar to that which has been conducted in future cotton markets should be undertaken. This will involve, among other things, the determination of the relation of cash prices of wheat to future quotations, the effect of the character of the future contract on prices and especially a study of the benefits of hedging. Other topics include the comparison of the 'spread' in marketing of various grains, with the possible suggestion of methods for its reduction; the investigations of grain-storage practices in primary point and terminal elevators; scalping practices and the function of scalping in the large markets, commission methods in the grain trade; mixing practices at terminal elevators, and the effect of mixing on prices of higher grades; a study and comparison of the various grading and inspection methods in use to determine their relative efficiency in economical marketing; the advisability and desirability of uniform grades; 'inspection in' as compared to 'inspection out'; investigation of the efficiency of farmers' cooperative elevators as compared with private and line elevator systems; warehousing practices in the grain trade; and track selling and the cost of marketing grains by the various methods in vogue.

MARKET-INFORMATION SERVICE.

"The project entitled 'Market surveys, methods, and costs' embraces a number of those phases of the work of the office in which the public has manifested universal interest and to which the shippers of perishable products look for the earliest and most tangible results. There is a general feeling that this office should build up an information service, both as to crop movement, market receipts, and prices, which will be prompt enough to give to the entire shipping public the facts which are now available only to the larger distributing organizations, and which each obtains for itself at an excessive cost. We plan to institute a series of reports day by day of car-lot movements of specific crops out of certain important producing districts, reporting the destinations and the movements from diverting points as far as practicable. This information can be obtained from many important transportation lines and their agents, and it is of the greatest importance, especially to shippers of perishable products, to know what is going out simultaneously from competing producing areas. A general dissemination of this information must result in a wiser distribution, in fewer needlessly glutted markets, and in more uniform and fairer prices in all the markets. Much of this information, so far as it relates to perishable products, will ultimately have to be handled telegraphically if it is to be an effective instrument in the improvement of marketing conditions and the stabilizing of prices.

"This is a work which can not be done on a very small scale. If undertaken at all, it must cover at least the commercial movement of one entire crop. This means that there must be a considerable office force ready to give instant attention to the telegraphic information and to compile it and prepare it for telegraphic release with the least possible loss of time. Fortunately, the office force and equipment which will make possible the handling of one crop will also enable the department to handle several crops coming on the market in succession. It will, however, require a somewhat larger field force to secure the necessary information on the movement of four crops than on the movement of one. True economy will, therefore, be effected if the technical field force is increased to the point where it can check up all the information which is being received and tabulated in the office.

"This service to accomplish its greatest good must be supplemented by a system of disinterested reports on conditions existing in the principal distributing centers where the car-lot shipments are inspected and sold. The department must know the actual prices paid for specific typical cars of produce, must have its own information on their condition, and must be able to furnish disinterested information and advice which will enable shippers to improve the quality and condition of their products on arrival, thus insuring better prices. A study of the quotation machinery of many of the important markets has shown that the shipper receives little useful information from such figures as are furnished him.

"The office has already the nucleus of the necessary force, made up of men who have had experience at both the producing and distributing end, several of whom have made a special study of terminal market conditions in a number of our most important cities during the present year.

"The increased amount included in the bill which it is planned to expend in this work is not sufficient to establish a comprehensive price-reporting service for the entire country or for all products, but will finance a sufficient field and office force and provide for enough telegraphic service to handle about four products which succeed each other in the markets and which are shipped over long distances.

"The logical development of this service will inevitably cost money, but it will as certainly assist in securing a better distribution and more economical marketing of farm products, and is the only means yet devised or suggested which promises to reduce the number or frequency of glutted markets. The increase for this phase of the work is confidently recommended as an investment which will yield immediate and profitable returns.

"The investigations of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization so far attempted have opened a wide field of study, suggestion, and field demonstration along the line of grading, packing, standardizing, distributing, and marketing of practically all our farm products. The economical feeding of the Nation demands that intelligent help be given both the producers and consumers along these lines. The present force of this office is wholly inadequate, both as to numbers and equipment, to undertake the lines of work that seem most urgent, to say nothing of the constant requests of producers and consumers from all over the land for assistance along their own special lines."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is clearly new legislation, and he sustains the point of order against it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities; to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by the research, experimental, and demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and State experiment stations, $35,920.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. This item, Mr. Chairman, provides in part for a diffusion amongst the people of the United States of "useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by the research, experimental, and demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and State experiment stations," and the appropriation provided is $35,920.

I desire to comment upon this paragraph in order to have the committee thoroughly understand the difference between this kind of an appropriation and the appropriations contained in a bill that was recently before the House and which has now gone to another body, where it is threatened with destruction because

it is a so-called "pork-barrel bill." The rivers and harbors bill which passed this House, and which was subjected to a very close scrutiny, had the interest of no salaried officers of this Government, save those, perhaps, who are employed in the War Department in the Corps of Engineers; and I venture to say that no man will contradict me in the statement that not one of those engineers had anything to do with the passage of the rivers and harbors bill because their salaries were involved. Their salaries are assured under the general operation of the War Department, and it would avail them nothing to lobby the bill through this House.

The river and harbor bill provided a total appropriation of $31,000,000 to carry on a great structural work of the Government, involving the employment of labor in every section of the country and in every State of the Union. That was work that meant the making of revenues for the Government and an increase in the business and the material of the Government. I call attention to that work now threatened with destruction and contrast it with this bill, because we here propose to appropriate approximately $36,000 of a total of $22,000,000 for a purpose which is so built up in words that as we read it we have to pause to understand what it means: To diffuse—not to work, not to labor, not to construct, not to create revenue, but to diffuse—among the people of the United States "useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by research, experiment," and so forth. This means brains, for sure, against——

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman argue that that information should be boxed up rather than diffused?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all. It may be very valuable information, but I question whether it can be placed in the same relation with the labor-creating work, with the constructive work, with the revenue-producing work, with the trade-promoting work, contemplated in the river and harbor bill, which has been subjected to very great abuse in both bodies of the National Congress and before the people.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The purpose of river and harbor construction is to carry trade, ultimately, is it not?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Does not the gentleman think this will go hand in hand, finding markets for these farmers, so that they can use these boats to carry their produce?

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that, and I want to say that these two lines of work should go hand in hand; but I am making this criticism because there seems to be a tremendous influence in Washington that is able to carry through an Agricultural bill, while there are no salaried officers in various branches of the Government, scientists and experimenters, as it were, to stand behind the river and harbor bill. And say what you please as to the river and harbor bill, there is no lobby in Washington made up of men paid by the Government of the United States to urge it forward. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations on this paragraph, which provides for the study of cooperation among farmers and the diffusion of knowledge resulting from that study. And in doing so I call attention of the committee to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] a few moments ago, and which I fear was not understood or appreciated by the members of this committee.

To my mind no more important amendment has been offered in the whole course of this discussion, nor is there a more important section in this bill than the section now under consideration. As the gentleman from Texas suggested, it is all very well for the Department of Agriculture to teach farmers how to raise more crops, but larger crops do little good if those crops and the profits of them are taken from the farmers by combinations and monopolies in the market place. The gentleman's suggestion that there ought to be an exchange operated by the Government which would make the transfer of the farmers' products directly to the consumer without graft or the exaction of undue profit is the most valuable suggestion yet made in the whole consideration of this bill. There is not an open market place in the whole United States for the great staple products of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and cotton. There is no place where they can be dealt with as merchandise upon their intrinsic value. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, the Board of Trade at Chicago, and such organizations elsewhere have a grip upon the market place under existing laws that makes it utterly impossible for the farmers' produce to get a square deal; and if this Government had wisdom, it would create for the benefit of the farmers of this entire Nation an exchange, an open market place, where the gamblers would not be permitted to destroy values during the seasons when the farmers must sell, and would not be permitted to exploit the consumer all the time by making the spread between the farmer's price and the consumer's price wider than it should be.

I repeat that if there was a Government exchange operating honestly, the farmers would get more for their produce and the consumers would pay less for what they have to buy in order to live. Yet this important amendment went out on a point of order; and gentlemen on this floor hardly stopped conversation to listen to its being read, and gave it no consideration whatever while its author was making its meaning clear and urging its passage.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Agriculture for making this point of order, because I recognize the fact that the able chairman of this committee has been working along the line of marketing; but I insist that if this House did its full duty it would pass this amendment as separate legislation. It is more important than this subdivision of the bill under consideration; infinitely more important than that of experimental farms and of scientific farming, elsewhere provided for, because, unless you make the market place an honest place and guard against price manipulation and control, the amount of the crop, the skill in raising it, the transportation problems, and other reforms all go for nothing, and all of the profit is reaped, as I deliberately say it has been for over a quarter of a century, by gamblers in the pit, so-called future traders in cotton and grain, who do not steady the market, as claimed, but rather make it fluctuate and change to serve their gambling purposes. When this great Agricultural Committee and this House acquire sufficient comprehension of the great problem of marketing and learn its evils they will destroy future trading as a first step and then make the market an honest, fair, and open market. When they do this and provide a system of honest inspection this House and this committee will be serving this entire Nation to a degree that they have not yet approached in the consideration of agricultural legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. In view of the appointment of a commission to visit Europe to investigate the matter, and the further fact that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and Senate have prepared bills on this subject, what is the necessity of this paragraph with reference to rural credits?

Mr. LEVER. This item is for the study not only of rural credits but of other means of cooperation among the rural population—the study of rural insurance; the study of rural communication; and other problems of rural cooperation.

I think they have only one man in the department now who is studying rural credits, and I heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss], who knows as much about this subject as any man, say that this gentleman's presentation of it to the Banking and Currency Committee was the strongest presentation made at all.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I want to ask a few questions of the gentleman. The Secretary of Agriculture in his report for 1914, on page 26, used this language:

> There seems to be no emergency which requires or justifies Government assistance to the farmers directly through the use of the Government's cash or the Government's credit.

Then he goes on further, and uses this language:

> It is the judgment of the best students of economic conditions here that there is need to supplement existing agencies—a proper land-mortgage banking system, operating through private funds, just as other banking institutions operate, and this judgment is shared by the leaders of economic thought abroad.

Now, the Secretary seems to have all the information he wishes to form an opinion as to the character of the banks that ought to be established. Why make an appropriation for a subject which the Secretary has expressed an opinion on already.

Mr. LEVER. The judgment of the Secretary is not going to control the expert information gathered under this appropriation. I do not know personally whether the gentleman referred to a moment ago by me—Mr. Thompson, I think his name was—concurs with the Secretary in that regard or not. I have not discussed it with him because it does not come under my jurisdiction.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, there was an appropriation of $50,000 carried for this identical purpose, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the current year, there was an appropriation of $200,000 carried for this purpose.

Mr. LEVER. Not for this purpose. This is an item carried separately, a separate item in the bill that has been transferred to this work.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. It covers the same subject matter.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is mistaken; the first appropriation for the Office of Markets carried $50,000, and there was a separate item of $40,000 for this work, and now they have combined the two under one management.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars has been appropriated.

Mr. LEVER. Not for the study of rural credits, but for the general problem of marketing, and so forth.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. The Secretary of Agriculture seems to have formed a definite opinion as to rural-credit institutions that ought to be established.

Mr. LEVER. This is not all for the study of rural credits.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. As I understand it covers all the items contained in rural credits and other forms of cooperation in rural communities. It covers the items on pages 70 and 71 down to line 19. But that $250,000 has been carried in a previous bill and covers these two items.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a waste of the people's money to make this appropriation for the Department of Agriculture to experiment on the subject of rural credits and marketing farm products. Before an effective system of marketing farm products can be established it is necessary that we establish a system of rural credits which will supply the farmers of the country with money on long time at a low rate of interest. A banking and currency system for the farmers is just the opposite of a banking and currency system for those engaged in commercial pursuits. A commercial banker is engaged in congregating the money of a community in a common fund to be loaned to the people of that community. These funds are taken by the bank as demand deposits, and necessarily the bank must be in position to repay these deposits at any time they are called for. This renders it necessary for the banks to loan on short time, upon such security as will insure the payment of the obligation at maturity. In other words, the bank can only deal in paper having an early maturity, and known in commercial banking as liquid assets—that is, commercial paper which can at any time be converted into money. On the other hand, the function of a rural credit system of banking is to assemble the assets of a community and secure an advance of money on them. One is to assemble the money and loan it; the other to assemble the securities and secure money on them. The commercial banker must loan for a high rate of interest on short time, while the farmer must secure his money for a long time at a low rate of interest. Both the Moss-Fletcher bill and the Bulkley-Hollis bill provide a system of rural-credit banks to be incorporated under the terms of the different acts, privately owned and controlled. These systems would necessarily be conducted for dividend purposes, and this would defeat the whole purpose of a rural-credit banking system, which is to lower interest rates to the farmers. The more I have thought on this subject the more I have become convinced that the whole subject ought to be taken in hand directly by the Government, without the intervention of banks of any character, even though the banks should be organized and financed by the Government.

I have arrived at this conclusion: First, by reason of the great cost of establishing and maintaining such a system as provided in the Moss-Fletcher and the Bulkley-Hollis bills would entail, which cost, of course, would have to be paid by the borrowers and would to that extent increase the interest rate; and second, because of the red tape that would be encountered by the farmers when they applied for a loan. Only last fall, when the cotton farmers of the South were forced to sustain a loss of nearly $400,000,000, and from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000 of this loss fell on the Oklahoma farmers, a pool of $135,000,000 was raised to loan them on their cotton. It was announced that the amount of the loan would be $30 per bale at 6 per cent interest, running for one year, with the privilege of renewal at the option of the borrower for an additional period of six months. When the fund had been subscribed and the promise of great relief was made to the farmers the Federal Reserve Board so hedged the fund about with restrictions and regulations and red tape that only $12,000 of that vast sum that promised so much relief has been applied for. The newspapers on yesterday carried a news item that the pool was to be dissolved on February 1. The item reads:

COTTON FUND TO END FEBRUARY 1—RESERVE BOARD BELIEVES LOAN PLAN HAS ACCOMPLISHED ITS PURPOSE.

Unless there is an unexpected increase in the demand for loans the $135,000,000 cotton loan fund will end its existence shortly after February 1. Then subscriptions of banks through the North, West, and East will be canceled and southern bankers and cotton men left to finance the surplus crop in their own way.

Up to date applications for loans from the fund amount to about $12,000, and officials here say they have no reason to believe that there will be any more applications before the period for making them expires, February 1.

Members if the Federal Reserve Board said yesterday that, in spite of the few applications, the loan fund had done its work in keeping up the confidence of the cotton men at a time when confidence was needed.

The rules and regulations concerning the loaning of this fund were such that the farmer—the actual producer—could not take advantage of it. One of the regulations governing the fund was that no loan be made on cotton in less than 100-bale lots. This regulation necessarily precluded the actual producer, except in rare instances, from securing the benefits of the fund. For this reason I foresee that the borrower will obtain little relief from any system of rural-credit banking that is enmeshed by a lot of red tape and numberless rules and regulations prepared by clerks and janitors who feel that they must add dignity to their positions.

I heard the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] discuss his bill the other day, and I see no reason why the plan he outlined is not practicable and feasible. It provides a farm-loan department in one of the bureaus here in Washington, and the gentleman from Arkansas, in discussing the bill and outlining its provisions, said:

To procure a loan under the provisions of this bill all the machinery for its operation is local. The farmer desiring a loan would apply to his postmaster, who would appoint two committees of people residing in his community, and these committees would appraise the lands at their fair value, and the improvements would also be appraised at their fair value, but separately. These appraisements would be turned in to the postmaster, and the postmaster and the chairman of the two committees would revise the appraisement and forward to the commission at Washington, and from that appraisement the amount to which the applicant is entitled would be determined. The title to the lands would be determined by an abstract furnished by the applicant and examined without cost by an agent of the Government. If the Torrens system of registration of land title prevailed, the certificate of the State is made, under this bill, sufficient evidence of title. Inasmuch as that system is so much cheaper and safer than abstracts and title guarantees, this bill would hasten the day when all States would adopt that system of land registration. The loans are to be guaranteed by the Government, though the Government would put no actual capital in the system. It guarantees the repayment of these loans as it guarantees the circulating medium of the national banks and Federal reserve notes. It does under this for the farmer only what it has done for the merchant, doctor, banker, lawyer, and manufacturer in the banking laws as they are now written. An applicant for a loan under the provisions of the bill does not name the rate of interest, but his securities are placed on the market and sold at par to the one who is willing to accept them at the lowest rate of interest, thereby putting the farmer in touch with trust funds and savings-bank accounts and all moneys that are seeking an absolutely safe long-time loan and would procure for the farmer as low rate of interest as the bonds of our Government command in any market of the world. Not only will it attract domestic capital, but foreign capital willing to invest in our Government bonds would be willing and anxious to invest in these securities and at the same rate of interest. In addition to the interest that the farmer will be compelled to pay, he will pay some per cent to be determined by the commissioners as an amortization fund, which fund will be a trust fund held in the Treasury, to be deposited in banks or loaned, as the commission may prescribe. The holders of the securities may cash their interest coupons at interest-paying dates at any post office or national bank in any State or Territory of these United States.

These funds are exempt from taxation in exactly the same way and for the same reason that the Federal reserve act exempts from taxation the resources of the regional and member banks. The security upon which the loan rests will have been taxed in the community where it is situated, and to tax the loan would be double taxation, and therefore increase the rate of interest the farmer would be compelled to pay.

The bill provides, further, that the loans shall be issued in series of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, or 30 years, at the option of the borrower, but where a loan is for a period greater than five years the borrower has the right at any interest-paying period to pay the entire indebtedness or $100 or any multiple thereof, and on the sums so paid all interest payments will cease.

Until a successful system of rural-credit banks is established it is idle to talk about establishing a system of marketing farm products, for the reason that as long as the farmer is compelled to pay the heavy rates of interest which he is forced to pay in Oklahoma, and which run from 10 to 36 per cent, he is forced as soon as his crops mature to throw the same on the market, no matter what price he may obtain therefor, in order to pay his banker or his merchant, who have carried him for the amount he owes them, and thereby stop the accumulation of interest. If a successful system of rural credit banks is established so that the farmer can secure money on his assets on long time at a reaonable rate of interest, he will be in position to withhold from the market his products and sell them as the consumer's needs demand, thereby cutting out the profit of the middleman, and enabling the actual producer to secure the full value of the product of his toil. The object of a rural credit system of banking is to put the farmer in direct touch with the man who has money to loan and cut out the profit of the middleman, enabling the farmer to secure money on the same terms that those engaged in commercial pursuits now ob-

tain it, and the object of the bureau of marketing farm products is to enable the farmer to sell direct to the consumer, thereby cutting out the profits of the middleman and secure the full value of the crops which he produces.

I am convinced that the Government could not exercise its activities in a line fraught with more good to our country than by establishing both these systems. In 1913 Congress remained in extra session from April 7 until the convening of the regular session in December in order to perfect a system of banking and currency which would afford relief to the commercial interests of our country. The Democratic platform at Baltimore declared:

> Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits or agricultural finance. Therefore we recommend that an investigation of agricultural credit societies in foreign countries be made, so that it may be ascertained whether a system of rural credits may be devised suitable to conditions in the United States. * * *

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of making good our promises to the people of this country. I can not understand how Members of this House, who vote for an Army appropriation bill carrying, in round numbers, $130,000,000; a Navy appropriation bill carrying $148,000,000, in round numbers; a rivers and harbors bill carrying $34,000,000, in round numbers; and for every bill which increases the appropriation for salaries of Government employees, vote against every proposition advanced for the benefit of the American farmer, on whose back every one of these different organizations ride.

I am not in favor of, nor does the farmer desire, any special privilege in this country, but when we can appropriate $35,000,000 to build a railroad in Alaska—$1,000 for each person in that far-distant Territory—and $40,000,000 to build or purchase ships to carry the commerce of our country on the high seas, it does seem to me that those who ask us to so vote ought to be willing to vote to assist more than 40 per cent of the people—the farmers—when they are threatened with financial ruin and bankruptcy. I shall continue to vote against the Army, the Navy, and the rivers and harbors bills, as well as all other appropriation bills, until the farmers and producers of this country receive justice at the hands of the Congress.

I hope an extra session will be held in 1915 to grant the same relief to the farmers and producers of the country as was given the commercial and banking interests in 1913. I am willing and anxious, though I have been here now nearly constantly for the past two years, to remain another year in order to perfect the rural credit banking system and the marketing of farm products system, which I regard as absolutely necessary to the future prosperity of our country. I therefore indulge the hope that the President will call an extra session of Congress to perfect these bills and grant relief to the farmers of the United States from the extortionate rates of interest which they have been compelled to pay by dividing the profits of their toil with the middlemen.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say what is in the minds of all here, that the expenses of this Government finally rests on the backs of the tillers of the soil, and that they expect us to vote and speak for them. So long as they honor me with a seat in this House I shall raise my voice and cast my vote as will most promote their interest and their prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, $352,650.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 19, insert the following:

"NATIONAL MARKETING COMMISSION.

"That the President be authorized to appoint a national marketing commission, to be composed of nine members, five of whom shall be engaged in agricultural or horticultural pursuits and four of whom shall be selected with special reference to their knowledge of commerce, finance, transportation, and law, and who shall receive compensation not in excess of $7,500 each per annum.

"And furthermore, that said commission shall meet in the city of Washington, at a time designated by the President, to organize by the election of officers and to adopt a plan of action for the effective organization of the States, counties, and localities of the United States, to the end of securing the economic distribution of the products of the farm, orchard, and garden.

"Said commission shall, furthermore, be empowered and directed to act with such organizations and individuals as may elect to become part of the national marketing system, when such organizations and individuals may have been authorized by said commission to cooperate to that end."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, to that I reserve a point of order. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, there are three gentlemen who want to be heard on this proposition; and, while it is getting late and I am anxious to get through with the bill, I think, in courtesy to them, I shall ask that all debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is the intention of the gentleman to ask that the committee sit in session until the bill is finished and to pass it to-night?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How many more amendments of this character, which they know will not go into the bill, but upon which they want to talk, are to be offered?

Mr. LEVER. I know of no more that will provoke discussion. I have one committee amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject, I want to say that I have an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me that we ought to get through by 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. I thought we ought to have finished the bill by 3 or 4 o'clock, but I am perfectly willing to stay.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that I am anxious to finish the bill, but the bill is made up in such a way that I am at the mercy of these gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think that; but I think we ought to have a reasonable discussion.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will go out on a point of order, but I desire to thank the chairman for his generosity in giving 15 minutes to the discussion of the proposed amendment.

The Agricultural Department has done much in the past few years in speeding the farmer up to a greater production in the output of the soil. He has been taught to make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. But little has been done to find a market for the product of the farm. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and others who have preceded me have made appropriate remarks by saying, substantially, that every bushel of corn or potatoes or product of the farm or the garden that may go to waste is paid for by somebody in the centers of population. The trouble with this country, of course, is that we have not the cooperative spirit that obtains in the European countries, and especially among the German people. We have been taught to rely entirely upon our individual efforts. Individualism has been accentuated and emphasized in this country to the exclusion of cooperation. Now, I know this proposed amendment will go out upon the point of order reserved by the chairman, but I have an object in this as well as the other Members who are desirous of addressing the committee. I want to lay stress upon and emphasize as much as possible the great importance of this matter, in order that the same may be crystallized in the minds of the membership of this House as well as the incoming Congress.

We are in great need of something like this. Now the joint resolution 344 was not the product of my imagination altogether. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and other Members of the House, Senator FLETCHER and one or two other Members of the Senate, as well as Mr. Lubin, including Dr. Owen, the secretary of the Southern Commercial Congress, got together and thought out this resolution, and I was selected to introduce it. This proposed resolution now before the committee, however, is a substitute for the resolution, because it was thought by its friends to be more practicable at this time.

The bill before the committee at this time goes only to the extent of "acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products, and the purchasing of farm supplies," and so forth.

I appreciate the necessity of acquiring necessary data and proper diffusion of the same among the people, but data and statistics alone will not bring relief either to the people who grow surplus agricultural products or to the consumer thereof. What we need is not so much data, but the inauguration of a movement whereby the producer and consumer may be brought into closer relationship, to the extent that many of the middlemen now making fabulous fortunes off products of the country may be eliminated, thereby causing the grower of agricultural products to obtain a higher price than he is now receiving and at the same time permitting the consumers of these products—the people who reside in cities and crowded centers—to purchase the same at a cost less than now obtains.

I am not informed as to the value of agricultural products that annually go to waste by an improper distribution, but it runs, I am quite sure from the best information I can gather,

into hundreds of millions of dollars. In addition all of this waste is not an additional loss. The producer of many of the articles that are marketed receives an inadequate price therefor, not only on account of the intervention of so many middle men, but for the further reason that without a coherent system the farmer does not know of a market for the sale of his stuff.

Those of us who have been observers know that without a system of marketing and cooperation many products reach a city only to find that city overcrowded with a great surplus of similar products, with the result that if a sale is effected it will be a sacrifice, and frequently the price obtained is insufficient to pay the transportation charges. Speaking concretely, I recall in my own county several years ago many of the farmers there undertook to diversify their crops, and with a degree of cooperation in the raising of Irish potatoes. They set to work early in the spring, planted their potatoes, reaped an early harvest, and put the same upon the market in St. Louis and elsewhere, with the result that few of them, as I recall, received enough for their potatoes to pay the railroad transportation charges. These products reached their destination only to find that the market was flooded, so to speak, with potatoes that had just been received a day or so before.

Now, such a thing as this would not happen if we had a national marketing commission, properly linked and correlated with similar State, county, and local organizations, all working and cooperating to a general purpose to find a market for everything to be marketed at the best price to be obtained, and with as little cost as possible for transportation charges, and thus bringing more nearly together the producer and consumer.

I have been told by several of the Members from the California delegation that a number of years ago tens of thousands of California fruit of all kinds were thrown overboard into the Pacific Ocean to be disposed of for the reason that a market could not be found for these products, and when a thing like this happens the farmer who loses his vegetables, his potatoes, corn, or what not, is not the only loser; the people who are compelled to buy these things, on account of this loss, are thereby forced to pay a higher price for that which they purchased on account of this loss.

I know of no two subjects that so vitally affect the great masses of the people of this country, especially the great farming class of people, who, by their toil, feed and clothe the world, as a failure for the Congress to provide a proper national marketing commission, such as this amendment of mine purposes to create, and another as well—a failure to enact a proper rural-credit law to enable the farmer to borrow money at a low rate of interest on a long-time loan, that his farm may be improved, ditches, fences, and houses constructed, as well as the purchase of the necessary live stock that he may thus have an investment to operate upon.

Our agricultural people can not prosper as they should if both these important factors, so necessary in their life, are to be continued to be denied. These two legislative demands are necessary for their prosperity.

It is not sufficient, I say, that a man may be able to borrow money for a period from 6 to 12 months only, as it would be impossible for him within this time to make the improvements to which I have just referred. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend at this juncture to lay such great stress upon the subject of rural credit, as important as that subject is, but to speak more directly to the pending amendment, and to the bill itself; but in passing I will say that my disappointment has been great, and I know dozens of other Members of this House share with me the same disappointment, that we have not been able to give to the people not only one but both of these measures—a rural-credit law as well as a national marketing commission. The people have a right to not only expect one but both of these, and if Congress continues to refuse to grant these demands it will continue to earn the displeasure and disappointment of the people.

But from this digression I revert to the subject at hand. I wish every Member of Congress could have heard the argument made by Hon. David Lubin before the House Committee on Agriculture September 14, 1914, on House joint resolution 344, introduced by me on September 10, as I now recall, the pending amendment which I am just now discussing being a modification of this other resolution of mine, House joint resolution 344.

Mr. Lubin, as you recall, gentlemen, is the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, which sits permanently at Rome, Italy. It was Mr. Lubin who conceived, or dreamed, so to speak, of this great institute to which the United States and all the other nations of the world, except two or three of the smaller countries, some years ago entered into a treaty or convention, and all of these are represented in this institute.

Mr. Lubin returned from Italy last August and was in Washington about seven weeks, and it was my pleasure to be with him a good part of every day, and I was selected by him and others to introduce House joint resolution 344, and I am sorry indeed that the Agricultural Committee, owing to the shortness of time since then, has not been able to give proper investigation to this matter and to report out a bill on same. It is in substance a resolution creating a national marketing commission.

For the past 10 years Mr. Lubin has been in Rome as the American delegate to this International Institute of Agriculture. He is not there for the small salary that he receives, because he made the remark to the President of the United States in my presence, when I accompanied him to see the President about this and another matter, that he spent six or seven times the salary he receives.

It seems Mr. Lubin is a man of considerable means, and by no means is he dependent upon his salary, which is $3,600 per annum, and the work already accomplished by him in behalf of his own country would immortalize him, not to mention the great world-wide work he is doing as a member of this institute, which, so to speak, acts as a great clearing house to the world on all matters pertaining to agriculture.

Practically all of the European countries have a marketing commission in one form or another, and most of them are modeled after the German system, which, as stated in the outset of my remarks a few moments ago, alone is largely responsible for the great strength in arms which Germany is to-day displaying to the world. Very little, if anything, of any value whatsoever goes to waste in Germany. There is no such thing over there as a trust in food products. The cooperative spirit there is probably not equaled elsewhere in the world, and if our country is to ever take her place, as in time she must, we, too, must be more cooperative and less selfish than we are.

We must learn that we are in a measure our brother's keeper; that each of us does not live for himself alone; that as our neighbors prosper we, too, may prosper, and that out of a just and friendly cooperation grows concord, agreement, and mutuality; that those giant aggregations of wealth, centered in a few hands which we call the trust, have long enough devoured the substance of the people, and that such institutions are made possible largely by our own selfishness and lack of cooperation; that the more we pull apart and have dissension in our own ranks the more readily the enemy enters the camp, taking always advantage of any mutiny that may exist.

House joint resolution 344, above referred to, and introduced by me, has received wide advertisement, I think largely through the efforts of Mr. Lubin in the State of California, which is his home State. I have received many letters in the past few weeks from all parts of that great State from all kinds of organizations, societies, and associations, as well as from individuals, farmers, fruit and truck growers, and the like, and many of the Members of the California delegation have received like letters, all urging that this resolution of mine, referred to, pass at this session of Congress; and I ask, Mr. Chairman, that as a sample of these letters I may have printed in the RECORD three communications, one of which, from Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, of that State, has just been a few moments ago received by me, and the other two received by me on yesterday, and I herewith submit the same to be printed.

The letters referred to are as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1915.

Hon. W. S. GOODWIN, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. GOODWIN: The men and women of California are beginning a Nation-wide campaign for the furtherance of H. J. Res. No. 344, the national marketing commission resolution which you introduced. They feel that this commission will be an important factor for the entire country, especially from an economic standpoint. It is a question that will vitally affect many phases of our existence, and among those most interested in its successful working out will be the producer, the consumer, the public carrier, the realty man, and others.

As you have stood sponsor for the resolution, we will be glad to hear from you in regard to suggestions for a campaign. To whom shall we appeal expecting assistance, and to whom, if any, shall we look for opposition?

To begin our campaign we held a public mass meeting, at which the resolution and proposed bill was indorsed by Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, its president-elect speaking for it from the platform; the public carriers, with representatives from the Pacific Electric and Salt Lake Railroads; the Well-Fargo Express; and the parcels post, in which the postmaster represented the carrier. A letter from E. P. Ripley, president of the Sante Fe, also indorsed the work, and was read from the platform that night.

The man who organized the first cooperative citrus association in the State, 23 years ago, represented the producer, the head of one of the largest and most influential produce exchange houses in the West, declared unequivocally in favor of the bill, and the attitude of the

consumer was presented by a woman who had been instrumental in establishing the municipal markets in the city.

The Outlook Association's campaign has been indorsed by the following local organizations: The chamber of commerce, all of the chambers on the Pacific coast, except one which we have been unable to reach; the realty board; the City Club, 600 members; the Friday Morning Club, 1,500 members; the Ebell Club, 1,500 members; the Evening City Club, 400 members; the Woman's Civic Club, 200 members; the Municipal League; the Woman's Republican League, and many others of importance.

In addition to these commendations, the chairman of the committee received this morning the most enthusiastic and unqualified indorsement from Gov. Johnson, a copy of which is inclosed to you.

For creating national interest in this campaign there are committees appointed as follows—and their political characteristics are noted that you may see at once the absolutely nonpartisan nature of the campaign:

Mrs. D. C. McCan, Democrat, chairman of campaign committee; Department of National Housewives League, Mrs. Edwin T. Earl, Progressive—wife of Progressive editor; Federation of State Societies, James R. H. Wagner, Republican; Interstate Woman's Committee, Mrs. Frank E. Wolfe, Socialist; National Legislation, Miss Mary Foy, Democrat; State Legislation, Mrs. Seward Simon, Republican; Public Carriers, Mrs. James F. Scherfee, Progressive; Membership, Mrs. E. C. Bellows, Republican; National Federation of Woman's Clubs, Mrs. R. J. Waters, Democrat; Speakers and Meetings, Mrs. W. C. Tyler, Democrat; Finance, Dr. John R. Haines, Progressive; Landowners, Mrs. Harriet Barry, Progressive; Distribution of Literature, Mrs. William Carnes, Republican.

Letters have been sent to all the registered agricultural organizations in the State and to the organizations represented in these committees. All the members of the house and senate and the members of the committee on agriculture as well as the gentlemen present at the hearing on September 14, 1914, have also been notified of our undertaking.

Awaiting your reply, we are,

Yours, very truly,

OUTLOOK ASSOCIATION,
Mrs. JAS. F. SCHERFEE,
President.
Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN,
Chairman of Campaign Committee.

—

JANUARY 23, 1915.

Hon. W. S. GOODWIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The Outlook Association of California has begun a state-wide campaign for the purpose of furthering H. J. Res. 344, and it asks that you at once make known to the members of the Committee on Agriculture your interest in the resolution and your desire that it be brought out of committee at once and given an opportunity for favorable action at this session.

Indorsements of the Outlook Association's campaign in this work have been received from every chamber of commerce on the Pacific coast except one, which we have not been able to reach—from the president of the Santa Fe Railway; E. P. Ripley, from the Salt Lake Railway; the Pacific Electric Railway; the Wells-Fargo and parcel post representatives; the Realty Board; the Municipal League; the City Club, 700 members; Friday Morning Club, 1,500 members; the Ebell Club, 1,500 members; the Federation of Poultry Growers of Southern California, 500 members; Women's Republican League; Business Women's Civil League; and many others of importance.

In addition we received this morning an enthusiastic letter from Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, a copy of which we inclose, giving his unqualified indorsement to the campaign and to the proposed national marketing commission.

In speaking of this matter to your associates it might be well to remind them that these indorsements are all from voters, and that we who represent them in this campaign will be glad to know of their attitude in regard to this important resolution, upon which we want your immediate active cooperation.

Very truly, yours,

THE OUTLOOK ASSOCIATION.
Mrs. JAS. F. SCHERFEE, *President.*
Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN, *Chairman.*

—

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Sacramento, January 29, 1915.

Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN,
Chairman Campaign Committee, The Outlook Association,
Los Angeles, Cal.

DEAR MADAM: I gladly avail myself of this opportunity to express my earnest hope that House joint resolution 344, providing for a national marketing commission, will be adopted by Congress, and I also wish to commend you personally for your activity in behalf of this measure.

I am keenly interested in the problem of marketing farm products, and I take it that the resolution now pending at Washington is a step toward solving it. In California our farmers have, in some instances, demonstrated signally what can be accomplished, for the benefit both of the producer and the consumer when intelligent methods of marketing are introduced. Speaking generally, however, the agriculturists labor under serious disadvantages in this particular that imperatively demand correction. The farming industry has failed to receive, probably more than any other, the aid of governmental functions. Such a body as a national marketing commission could, I am sure, perform a great service to the country.

Please accept my thanks for honoring me with your request for an expression of my opinion for, if it can avail anything to help you in your cause, I shall, because of my deep interest in the matter, feel grateful to have had the opportunity to lend a helping hand.

Sincerely,

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, *Governor.*

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. You will see from two of these letters, Mr. Chairman, that divers and sundry organizations have indorsed this resolution, and among these are many women's clubs, political, social, business, agricultural, and others have indorsed this resolution.

The good women in that State are cooperating with the men in bringing about a better condition of affairs. They have many hundreds of organizations working to this end, to the end that not only their own lot may be made better, but likewise the lot of their children and grandchildren and neighbors may likewise be made better.

That man serves himself best who serves the world best, because "no man liveth unto himself alone."

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this amendment were not to be ruled out on a point of order, I am not sure that at the present time I should be advocating it. I am here on this floor at the present time to emphasize the necessity of correlating all information that may lead to the marketing of crops and to the saving of waste. In my experience—and I believe individual experience is best worth while as illustrative—I can sell beef from the range but two months in the year. I can not sell beef any other months of the year because my beef comes off grass and is only good those months. If I tried to send to the eastern market the beef killed on my range, I would find that the local markets in the East could not afford to buy from me, because I could only furnish them for two months in the year.

If others could supplement for the rest of the year, we could furnish cheap and good meat all the year around under existing conditions. Retailers must buy from sources that can furnish them all the year around, and therefore unless I can market my beef locally I must sell my cattle off the range for feeders. This is but one of the propositions that is up to me and to every other producer, this question of the economic waste due to the lack of a coherent system of marketing. As a boy in California I continually saw the most outrageous waste of product. Fruit was dumped overboard into San Francisco Bay, and it bobbed with wasted produce. All over this country to-day we find that produce is going to waste simply because people do not know how or where they can market their output. The remedy that is proposed under this bill seems to me inadequate. The amendment is a forward vision.

This amendment will lead to a system which, working toward complete distribution, would carry with it merely the expense of a central body, which body will cooperate through the States and through the counties down to the smallest districts, and will work with all the machinery furnished by the granges and other farmers' organizations. It is our duty to know how we may place products where they are needed at the lowest possible cost. When we passed a bill the other day to standardize the apple barrel we were working exactly along this line of marketing and of creating standards. We must find out where products are and where there is a market for them. We must standardize the qualities and the packing of products. We must learn the freight rates and distribute the information, and show whether products can or can not be exported from the place of their origin. In so doing, in furnishing information, in establishing standards, we shall afford this country the greatest possible service. We shall provide against waste, and in so doing we shall practically duplicate our productivity. By the simple process of bringing producer and consumer together we shall more than double the beneficence of production. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I have any of my time left, I yield it to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I most heartily support this amendment, and I wish that the amendment might be permitted to come squarely before the committee at this time, so that a vote could be taken upon it.

A national marketing commission will be of inestimable value to the country and will fit in splendidly with and properly supplement the local cooperative marketing organizations that are now to be found in many of the States. In the State which I have the honor in part to represent we have a number of local cooperative marketing organizations affiliated with the American Society of Equity and with the National Grange which are doing a very good work in disseminating knowledge concerning market prices to their members and in assisting and directing the farmers to market their products to the best advantage.

This amendment proposes to have established in this country an organization similar in its scope to the Landwirtschaftsrat in Germany. In that country is seen the highest development of cooperation among its people engaged in agriculture. Farming in all its departments has reached a higher degree of development in Germany than in any other country. All of us have seen within the past few months some of the results of Germany's wise agricultural development and great agricultural resources in the manner in which that country has been carrying on its part in the great European war. And

I now venture to say that the remarkable improvement in farming and farm life that has taken place in Germany during the past 70 years and which has been so greatly assisted by the study and attention that has been given to the problems of cooperative marketing of farm products, will be even more strikingly emphasized to the world in the months to come.

The national marketing commission provided for in this amendment would, as part of its work, gather information from the different States of the Union as to the supply and demand for different farm products, and thus be in position to direct local marketing organizations where their farm products might be sent and marketed to the best advantage. To-day in this country such system of farm marketing as we have is an indefensible, archaic system, through which the farmer very often receives but a small portion of what he should receive for his products. In the marketing of wheat by the farmers of my State this year during the months of September, October, and November they received in most cases from 10 to 20 cents a bushel less for their wheat at the time of sale than they should have received and which they would have received if a thoroughly well-organized cooperative marketing system was in operation in this country.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I regret this amendment is subject to a point of order and that a point of order will be made against it. The establishment of a national marketing commission is of the utmost importance to the country. The proposition has been indorsed by nearly all of the farmers and orchardists' associations and by all but one of the chambers of commerce of California, where we know from experience the economic value of cooperation in the distributing and marketing of certain farm products.

Mr. Chairman, in California the citrus fruit and deciduous fruit people have organized voluntary associations which have resulted favorably toward the bringing of good results to the farmers and marketing fruits at a reasonable cost to the consumers. But in the United States in general the system of distributing and marketing farm products is unscientific, wasteful, and uneconomical. The farmer receives less than he should for his products and the consumer pays more than he ought to. How this national marketing commission is expected to correct this condition and benefit the farmer and the consumer and to destroy trusts in food products is best explained by Mr. David Lubin in his own words, and I will send to the desk his statement, which I will ask the Clerk to read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WE CAN REDUCE THE COST OF LIVING—SHALL WE?

A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR A NATIONAL MARKETING COMMISSION.

The undue rise in the price of foodstuffs and the evil influences on the economic condition of the people arising therefrom has given, and is now giving us, as a people, an added incentive to find an effective remedy. This remedy should not be of a temporary character, but should be a permanent betterment.

Fortunately we have had living in Rome, Italy, a man who sees things with a world vision, and from that vantage ground has proposed a remedy which will be both effective and permanent.

Mr. David Lubin, in speaking before the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, when the matter of a remedy was under discussion, said:

"On the 3d of October (1914) it will be 10 years that I have been living in Rome as delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture, and in that capacity the opportunity presented itself for observing the operation of the Landwirtschaftsrat (German Council of Agriculture). This system (of directing the marketing of the products of the soil) is substantially in operation in a number of the continental countries, and is more clearly defined in Germany than in the other countries.

"The more I observed the operation of that system the more I became convinced that its adoption in the United States would promote the economic interests, not merely of the farmers but of the consumers, of all the American people. Yes; it would even transcend the boundary line of economic advantage; it would go beyond that; it would be a political advantage to the American people.

"The American people simply must adapt and adopt the Landwirtschaftsrat, or drift, as old Rome drifted, toward the ultimate fall.

"The President and the people are complaining about the undue rise in the price of the products of the farm; for the undue rise in the price of food products. Well, what is the remedy?

"Will it be to argue with buyers and sellers or to penalize them? I do not think anything can be accomplished in that way. There has been a great talk, and there is a great talk all over the country that the trusts are responsible for the high prices in the cost of food products, for the high cost of living. Well, there is but one effective way to fight the trusts, and that is to take the goods that are trusted out of their reach; that is the way to make the trust impossible, and this is just what I propose under the plan to be set forth."

The plan, in substance, is this:

First. Let the President of the United States appoint a national marketing commission consisting of (*a*) the president of an influential chamber of commerce; (*b*) the mayors of three of the largest cities in the Union; (*c*) three members of the leading mail-order and department stores; (*d*) a leading railroad man; (*e*) a parcel-post man (*f*) a leading banker; (*g*) a leading workingman; (*h*) two Congressmen; (*i*) a Senator; making 14 in all; and in addition to these let the President add 15 farmers from the various sections of the United States.

This committee of 29 would be the national marketing commission, who would meet and organize for the purpose of having the food products in the various States of the Union distributed under the plan that shall be explained further on.

Second. Said national commission shall have prescribed power of direction of similar committees to be appointed by each of the governors in every State in the Union.

Third. Said State commissions shall have power to appoint committees of the same kind for every county in that State, and the county commissions shall have the right to appoint the township committees.

The national commission, after organization, shall devise a plan for the delivery and sale of the products by the farmers or their hired agents. They shall devise plans and specifications and details of sample rooms, auction rooms, exchanges, pits, and street markets, and designate, for the benefit of the producers or their agents, how the products in townships, counties, and States shall be synchronized for shipment, for display, by private sale or by auction, the rules for selling and delivery, the terms of sale and the mode of procedure.

The various commissions appointed are to ask the cooperation and assistance of the press, the carriers, the Federal, State, and county officials, the ministers of the various denominations, the various chambers of commerce and boards of trade, the labor leaders, and the farmers everywhere.

For instance, the products will be synchronized all along the route of the railway and train service will take these products up and deliver them, according to a schedule known beforehand to both the producer and the purchaser, at certain sales places.

Each town and city will have its auction rooms and at almost every hour of the day a different line of produce will be offered for sale. There will be the open-air markets; the cities and towns will designate certain public squares for that purpose, when these public squares will be converted into a market, with a space designated for each seller.

In these markets or exchanges, run by the farmers, under the direction and in accordance with the plans of the different commissions, all the different kinds of farm produce could be put on sale at different hours in the day or week. There would be a time for the sale of potatoes or other root crops; a time for the sale of fruits; a time for tobaccos; a time for cereals; a time for cotton, wool, flax, and hides; a time for dairy products and forage; a time for live stock and poultry. Thus every hour in the day these markets or exchanges would be to the agricultural interests of America what the heart is to the human body.

The mode of disposing of farm produce here proposed is not new. It is in operation in almost every country of Europe, and why should it not be in operation in the United States? The old and present system which places the buyer from a wholesaler in direct contact with the producer by bringing him to the farm where the product is grown, is not conducive to the economic welfare of the farmer. On the contrary, under this old system the farmer becomes, as it were, the "under dog," the hungry dog tusselling with a bare, gristly bone.

In fact, the close approach of a few large buyers surrounding the districts producing the crops which they wish to purchase may be compared to the besieging of a city by an invading force of irresistible power. Closer and closer these few buyers hem in the farmer in the producing district until, finally closing up the ranks, they stifle all sound commercial practices and instincts in the seller. And thus those few buyers succeed in substantially voting over to themselves, at their own price, the products of the seller.

If we ever have a scientific analysis of the causes which have led up to the formation of the trusts in the United States, it will surely be found that one of the main causes is the seemingly harmless system which places a few large buyers in direct contact with the producers, by bringing them to the farm to purchase the product where it is grown. This system enables these few buyers to surround the many sellers and hem them in completely, thus using them as a property peculiarly their own, to have, to hold, and to keep.

At any rate, under this new system proposed, the best brains of each community would be given a chance to act upon its own problems and solve them in the most direct and effective way, but also in concert with an organization which has an underlying principle of procedure, or design, back of it all.

The whole thing would work out somewhat after this style: Supposing John Smith, of Whittier, has a dozen sacks of potatoes which he can not sell in his local Whittier market. He can call up or write his Whittier township commission and tell them that he needs a market for that dozen sacks of potatoes. But the township commission does not have a market for them in that township. It in turn calls up the Los Angeles county commission, and says: "County commission, we have a dozen sacks of potatoes for sale. Can you find us a market?" "Yes; there is demand for 12 sacks of potatoes at Sawtelle (in Sawtelle township). Will you send them there?" "Yes; we will send 12 sacks of potatoes to Sawtelle to-day," and John Smith accordingly finds his market, prepares them in proper style for shipping, and sends them to Sawtelle.

"Well, you object, that can be done now without all that machinery to go through." Yes, it can, but here is where the "design" back of all this thing—this machine—comes in. After the county commission has told Whittier commission that there is a market at Sawtelle for his potatoes, supposing El Monte (township) commission comes in with a request for a market for 10 sacks of potatoes. Under the old plan of marketing both producers might have sent their potatoes to the Sawtelle market, and there would be conflict, with the result that potatoes would be a drug on the Sawtelle market, and neither of them would be able to get their price. They would have to be held for future consumption, or else reshipped to some other market, where they might come in conflict with some other shipment from another source of supply. With this machinery in operation, the county commission would say to the El Monte commission, "We have just made arrangements to fill the needs of Sawtelle to-day, but we have an inquiry from Venice (township) for 10 sacks of potatoes; ship them there to John Jones." Thus by both shippers working through their county commission it could direct them aright, while if the two township commissions should try to operate between themselves, and not through its county commission, confusion would arise, because no central bureau would have the information that the two had come to terms on the transaction.

In a large sense this is the big difficulty that shippers of produce are meeting every day. They have no way of knowing that, at the same time they ship a carload of onions for the St. Louis market, Texas is doing the same thing for the same market. Had both shippers some central bureau that would give trustworthy information on such operations or consignments, no duplication of markets need arise.

Now take an example of interstate shipments. Supposing California finds that she has a carload of apples in the hands of some one of its growers, and no local market can use them. The township commission in which the carload of apples is located would call up, or write, its county commission that it had a carload for shipment, but had no local market. The county commission upon investigation would find no local county market, so it would wire the State commission its need of a market for a carload of apples. If the State commission could find no market in any of the counties of the State it would then wire the national commission, "Have carload of apples. Where shall we send them?" The national commission, if it had no call for apples, would start a wire, say, to the Louisiana State Commission.

That State commission would wire the Orleans Parish commission, and that parish commission would wire the New Orleans commission, asking if it had a market for a carload of apples. That New Orleans commission would find that Chris. Reuter in New Orleans could use a carload of apples, and back the wire would start, "Ship carload of apples to Chris. Reuter, this city." Now, mark you well the routing of that wire back—first to the parish commission, next to the State commission, then to the national commission, then to the California State commission, then to the county, and finally to the township commission where the apples were on hand. Then the owner would himself ship that car to Chris. Reuter in New Orleans. The commission's work would have been done, and it would not duplicate that order from some other source of supply.

Now, should the New Orleans commission have wired back direct to this California township commission, the national commission or the two State commissions involved might be spending time and money to find a market, without knowing that the market had already been found. Or meanwhile it might have had another inquiry for a market for a carload of apples from Vermont, and not having had the information go through its hands from the New Orleans market, would have routed the Vermont apples through, only to find a duplication.

It has been this very conflict of information or entire absence of it that has caused many losses and disasters to shippers. In other words, there is no design in the marketing situation as it is now. No light; no intelligence. And it is light and intelligence that is needed in the process of handling the products of the soil. We have light and intelligence in every step taken by the maker and seller of lead pencils, muslins, machinery, steel, iron products, or any of the varied products of our industries. That intelligence we take as a matter of course or of pride, according as we look at it. Certainly we never think of it as being paternalistic, nor socialistic, nor even cooperative, but just good, sound business sense. Why not apply the same sound doctrine to agricultural products?

Another point showing the "information" feature: Suppose California is producing asparagus commercially. California markets demand white varieties of asparagus shipped in bulk, while the eastern markets demand the green varieties shipped or packed in bundles. Through this information bureau this intelligence could be given the grower here in California, and he would not be so foolish as to grow white asparagus for the eastern market, nor would he ship in bulk to an eastern market.

Or supposing it is potatoes that are to be shipped. Orders here are placed by the pound or sack. In eastern markets the orders are placed by the bushel or barrel. By inquiry it could be ascertained before shipment that bushel cartons would be more acceptable to the eastern buyer than sacks, and that red potatoes would find an easier market in the South than white, while the Chicago market wants white potatoes altogether.

The situation would be no different were the product fruits, melons, or perishables. The information could be just as specific for them as it need be for hay or grain. If the outlook for tomatoes was bad, information could go out that canning would be advised for all local California tomatoes. The canned product would have a means of finding its market also.

This system or scheme of operation, as provided in the Lubin suggestion, would result in a form of cooperation compatible with the American spirit. Cooperation in agricultural products is a world movement to-day, and corresponds to similar movements among other producing factors. In other branches of economic activity the development is in the direction of larger producing units. So it is in agriculture, and the failure to meet this change with a new theory of marketing has wrought havoc with our markets. In the face of this modern concentration of forces the farmer can not remain isolated, if he is ultimately to retain any influence upon the fruit of his soil.

The resolution under consideration provides a coherent and coordinating clearing house of information on all questions relating to the products of agriculture, both for the use of the producer and consumer. The numerous organizations, widely scattered and wholly disconnected at present, while serving many useful purposes, are not only inadequate but often conflicting when it comes to handling the problem of economic distribution.

This is the great unsolved problem of this country, and until it is solved there will be waste, unprofitable labor, and high living cost. No greater service could be rendered all the people than is possible with such a commission determined upon the wise solution of the difficulties of marketing and distributing the necessity of life.

We would be betraying the competence of mother earth should we give up in despair. So long as there is one hungry man and one unused potato in the fields that has not found that hungry man we have not succeeded in organizing the greatest of the world's arts—the art of growing things—into a united, intelligent industry, whence can come that opulent productivity which justifies the industry of the farmer.

Now, the proposal is practical or it is not. If it is not, that ends the matter; but if it is, it can be safely counted upon that every Member of the present Congress will feel it his duty not merely to urge the passage of this resolution, but also to exert his best energy toward putting the work called for in the resolution in proper working order.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of that part of Mr. Lubin's statement that for lack of time the Clerk has not read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment changes existing law, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved August 18, 1914 (Public, No. 174, 63d Cong.), entitled "An act to tax the privilege of dealing on exchanges, boards of trade, and similar places in contracts of sale of cotton for future delivery, and for other purposes," including all expenses necessary for the purchase of equipment and supplies; for travel; for the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and for all other expenses, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, that may be necessary in executing the provisions of this act, $75,000.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in connection with this item in the bill certain data relating to the workings of the cotton-futures bill as far as it has gone.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. It will be remembered that in my report accompanying the cotton-futures bill, which latter became a law, I predicted that as a result of this legislation the value of the New York contract would be enhanced from $1 to $2.50 per bale, and that this enhancement of the value of the quotation basis, reflecting itself in the spot markets of the South, would mean from $15,000,000 to $35,000,000 each year additional to the cotton producers.

Immediately succeeding the beginning of the war in Europe the exchanges closed, and remained closed until the 16th day of November. On that day they reopened. The cotton-futures act does not become effective in whole until the 18th of February of this year, but in anticipation of its becoming operative the exchanges since their opening have been dealing in two kinds of contracts, namely, the old contract, under which they formerly operated, and the new contract, drawn to conform substantially with the provisions of the contract provided for in the cotton-futures act. I feel a pardonable pride in finding that my prophecy as to the effect of this act in enhancing the value of cotton in the hands of the farmer is borne out by the difference in the value of the two contracts, showing a much higher value for the new contract over the old, as will be seen by the following comparison furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
1914. NOV. 16. (Opening day.)				1914. NOV. 16. (Opening day.)			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	Spots: Middling, 7.75.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	7.29			December	7.28	7.35	0.07
January	7.39	7.58	0.19	January	7.36	7.45	.09
March	7.40	7.77	.37	March	7.48	7.66	.18
May		7.99		May		7.55	
NOV. 17.				NOV. 17.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7 15/16.			
December	6.00			December	7.06	7.13	.07
January	7.09	7.25	.16	January	7.15	7.22	.07
March	7.08	7.47	.39	March	7.28	7.34	.06
May		7.67		May	7.35	7.50	.15

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
NOV. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December		6.94	
January	7.04	7.20	0.16
March	7.06	7.41	.35
May	7.22	7.62	.40
NOV. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December		7.01	
January	7.13	7.27	.14
March	7.15	7.48	.33
May	7.32	7.69	.37
NOV. 20.			
Spots: Middling, 7.60.			
December	7.16		
January	7.28	7.39	.11
March	7.30	7.56	.26
May	7.46	7.75	.29
NOV. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.			
December		7.26	
January	7.37	7.45	.08
March	7.37	7.57	.20
May	7.51	7.75	.24
NOV. 23.			
Spots: Middling 7.75.			
December	7.29		
January	7.40	7.47	.07
March	7.42	7.59	.17
May	7.55	7.75	
NOV. 24.			
Spots: Middling 7.75.			
December	7.23		
January	7.34	7.40	.14
March	7.36	7.52	.16
May	7.43	7.63	.20
NOV. 25.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.			
December	7.31		
January	7.40	7.49	.03
March	7.42	7.59	.17
May	7.50	7.70	.20
NOV. 27.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.			
December	7.37		
January	7.41	7.52	.11
March	7.47	7.63	.16
May	7.60	7.75	.15
NOV. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.			
December	7.30		
January	7.32	7.40	.08
March	7.36	7.52	.16
May	7.50	7.66	.16
NOV. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.24		
January	7.25	7.37	.12
March	7.29	7.51	.22
May	7.50	7.64	.14
DEC. 1.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.14		
January	7.16	7.31	.15
March	7.20	7.49	.20
May	7.45	7.61	.16
DEC. 2.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.15		
January	7.16	7.31	.15
March	7.19	7.48	.29
May	7.45	7.60	.15
DEC. 3.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	6.99		
January	7.02	7.15	.13
March	7.05	7.37	.32
May	7.32	7.49	.17

New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
NOV. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	6.98		
January	7.06	7.15	0.09
March	7.20	7.22	.02
May		7.46	
NOV. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7.25.			
December	7.08		
January	7.16	7.27	.11
March	7.29	7.37	.08
May		7.58	
NOV. 20.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
December	7.17		
January	7.25	7.32	.07
March	7.35	7.45	.10
May	7.50	7.65	.15
NOV. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
December			
January	7.37	7.42	.05
March		7.55	
May		7.74	
NOV. 23.			
Spots: Middling 7⅞.			
December	7.26		
January	7.32	7.39	.07
March	7.38	7.49	.11
May	7.58	7.67	.09
NOV. 24.			
Spots: Middling 7⅞.			
December	7.22		
January	7.29	7.33	.04
March	7.36	7.45	.09
May	7.53	7.62	.09
NOV. 25.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.22		
January	7.31	7.37	.06
March	7.42	7.51	.09
May	7.59	7.67	.08
NOV. 27.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.28		
January	7.33	7.37	.04
March	7.46	7.55	.09
May	7.64	7.72	.08
NOV. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.12		
January	7.20	7.25	.05
March	7.34	7.43	.09
May	7.52	7.60	.08
NOV. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.10		
January	7.24	7.24	.00
March	7.30	7.39	.09
May	7.47	7.56	.09
DEC. 1.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.08		
January	7.25	7.24	.01
March	7.28	7.37	.09
May	7.45	7.54	.09
DEC. 2.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.14		
January	7.26	7.25	[1].01
March	7.27	7.36	.09
May	7.41	7.53	.12
DEC. 3.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅛.			
December	6.99		
January	7.12	7.10	[1].02
March	7.14	7.21	.07
May	7.27	7.40	.13

[1] Old style.

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	6.99		
January	7.03	7.17	.14
March	7.05	7.37	.32
May	7.34	7.52	.18
DEC. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	7.05		
January	7.07	7.20	.13
March	7.09	7.39	.30
May	7.42	7.57	.15
DEC. 7.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	7.05		
January	7.03	7.20	.12
March	7.10	7.40	.30
May	7.43	7.59	.16
DEC. 8.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	7.06		
January	7.08	7.22	.14
March	7.10	7.41	.31
May	7.43	7.59	.16
DEC. 9.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	7.04		
January	7.06	7.14	.08
March	7.08	7.33	.25
May	7.37	7.51	.14
DEC. 10.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.			
December	6.88		
January	7.90	7.02	.12
March	6.92	7.17	.25
May	7.21	7.35	.14
DEC. 11.			
Spots: Middling, 7.25.			
December	6.67		
January	6.69	6.88	.19
March	6.89	7.09	.20
May	7.13	7.27	
DEC. 12.			
Spots: Middling, 7.30.			
December	6.80		
January	6.80	6.98	.18
March	6.96	7.19	.23
May	7.21	7.36	.15
DEC. 14.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.			
December	6.93		
January	6.94	7.10	.06
March	7.10	7.31	.21
May	7.34	7.49	.15
DEC. 15.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.			
December	6.88		
January	6.85	7.07	.22
March	7.06	7.27	.21
May	7.30	7.45	.15
DEC. 16.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.			
December	6.97		
January	6.95	7.16	.21
March	7.14	7.35	.21
May	7.38	7.52	.14
DEC. 17.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.			
December	7.05		
January	7.05	7.26	.21
March	7.24	7.46	.22
May	7.50	7.66	.16
DEC. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.			
December	7.11		
January	7.10	7.31	.21
March	7.28	7.50	.22
May	7.51	7.66	.15

New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	6.94		
January	7.12	7.11	0.01
March	7.14	7.22	.08
May	7.27	7.41	.17
DEC. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.00		
January	7.22	7.19	0.03
March	7.19	7.29	.10
May	7.34	7.48	.14
DEC. 7.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	6.97		
January	7.19	7.18	0.01
March	7.20	7.29	.09
May	7.34	7.48	.14
DEC. 8.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.06		
January	7.18	7.16	0.02
March	7.23	7.26	.03
May	7.37	7.46	.11
DEC. 9.			
Spots: Middlings, 7 1/8.			
December	6.93		
January	7.06	[1] 7.04	.02
March	7.14	7.18	.04
May	7.26	7.37	.11
DEC. 10.			
Spots: Middlings, 7 1/8.			
December	6.80		
January	6.92	6.92	
March	6.99	7.03	.04
May	7.10	7.21	.11
DEC. 11.			
Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December	6.74		
January	6.85	6.86	.01
March	6.95	6.95	
May		7.13	
DEC. 12.			
Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December	6.85		
January	6.95	6.95	
March	7.03	7.03	
May		7.21	
DEC. 14.			
Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December	6.72		
January	7.04	7.02	0.02
March	7.15	7.15	.00
May	7.23	7.33	.10
DEC. 15.			
Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December	6.90		
January	7.00	6.98	0.02
March	7.10	7.10	.00
May	7.18	7.28	.10
DEC. 16.			
Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December	6.97		
January	7.07	7.07	
March	7.20	7.18	0.02
May	7.26	7.36	.10
DEC. 17.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.04		
January	7.14	7.13	0.01
March	7.28	7.26	0.02
May	7.36	7.46	.10
DEC. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/8.			
December	7.00		
January	7.14	7.12	0.02
March	7.29	7.28	0.01
May	7.37	7.47	.10

[1] Old style.

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	7.14		
January	7.14	7.34	0.20
March	7.35	7.52	.17
May	7.54	7.69	.15
DEC. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.			
December	7.15		
January	7.16	7.38	.22
March	7.35	7.57	.22
May	7.57	7.74	.17
DEC. 22.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.33		
January	7.33	7.55	.22
March	7.55	7.73	.18
May	7.77	7.93	.16
DEC. 23.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.23		
January	7.22	7.44	.22
March	7.44	7.62	.18
May	7.65	7.80	.15
DEC. 24.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.			
December	7.32		
January	7.23	7.51	.28
March	7.51	7.69	.18
May	7.72	7.87	.15
DEC. 25 (holiday).			
DEC. 26 (holiday).			
DEC. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.			
December	7.42		
January	7.40	7.64	.24
March	7.63	7.82	.18
May	7.85	8.01	.16
DEC. 29.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.			
December	7.38		
January	7.38	7.62	.24
March	7.61	7.81	.20
May	7.85	8.01	.16
DEC. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.			
December	7.33		
January	7.31	7.65	.34
March	7.55	7.79	.24
May	7.80	7.95	.15
DEC. 31.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.			
December			
January	7.25	7.67	.42
March	7.55	7.80	.25
May	7.80	7.98	.18
1915.			
JAN. 1 (HOLIDAY).			
JAN. 2.			
Spots: Middling, 7.90.			
January	7.40	7.80	.40
March	7.70	7.93	.23
May	7.95	8.12	.07
JAN. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.			
January	7.55	7.95	.40
March	7.87	8.12	.25
May	8.12	8.31	.19
JAN. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.			
January	7.46	8.02	.56
March	7.85	8.20	.35
May	8.10	8.36	.26

New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
December	7.03	7.14	0.11
January	7.15	7.15	
March	7.32	7.31	[1].01
May	7.41	7.51	.10
DEC. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
December	7.00		
January	7.17	7.15	[1].02
March	7.34	7.33	[1].01
May	7.42	7.52	.10
DEC. 22.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December		7.35	
January	7.28	7.28	
March	7.52	7.51	[1].01
May	7.59	7.69	.10
DEC. 23.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	6.95		
January	7.14	7.13	[1].01
March	7.39	7.38	[1].01
May	7.48	7.58	.10
DEC. 24.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	7.17		
January	7.17	7.24	.07
March	7.49	7.48	[1].01
May	7.57	7.67	.10
DEC. 25 (holiday).			
DEC. 26 (holiday).			
DEC. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
December	7.05		
January	7.17	7.27	.10
March	7.57	7.58	.01
May	7.68	7.78	.10
DEC. 29.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
December	7.05		
January	7.27	7.27	.00
March	7.56	7.57	.01
May	7.67	7.77	.01
DEC. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7 1/16.			
December	6.90		
January	7.26	7.26	
March	7.52	7.53	.01
May	7.64	7.74	.10
DEC. 31.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅛.			
December			
January	7.26	7.28	.02
March	7.54	7.55	.01
May	7.67	7.75	.08
1915.			
JAN. 1 (HOLIDAY).			
JAN. 2.			
Spots: Middling (holiday).			
January			
March			
May			
JAN. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅛.			
January	7.58	7.58	
March	7.81	7.83	.02
May	7.94	8.02	.08
JAN. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 7⅛.			
January	7.63	7.63	
March	7.83	7.88	.05
May	7.96	8.07	.11

[1] Old style.

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
JAN. 6				JAN. 6.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	Spots: Middling, 7⅞.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January	7.43	7.87	0.44	January	7.52	7.46	[1]0.06
March	7.55	8.05	.50	March	7.69	7.74	.05
May	7.80	8.25	.45	May	7.84	7.95	.11
JAN. 7.				JAN. 7.			
Spots: Middling, 8 cents.				Spots: Middling, 7⅞.			
January	7.40	7.77	.37	January	7.48	7.41	[1].07
March	7.52	7.97	.45	March	7.68	7.68	.00
May	7.77	8.17	.40	May	7.81	7.89	.08

[1] Old style.

I desire also to quote from the market letter of January 8, 1915, of A. Norden & Co., of New York, a large cotton firm, bearing upon the effect of the Lever Act upon the market:

Some of the selling has also been from southern sources, as the advance here was much more rapid than in southern markets, and at times we have apparently been on a parity that might warrant shipments from some localities on a commercial basis; it must not be overlooked, however, that with our new contract this shipping parity has changed radically; New York will no longer be the dumping ground for undesirable odds and ends, and cotton will only come here in volume, if our prices are maintained on a competitive level with the rest of the world.

The largest cotton manufacturer in the South, and probably the best-informed man in the South upon cotton in all of its phases, writes me under date of January 8, 1915, as follows:

It will interest you to know that during this season the New York contracts are maintaining, as they should, a proper relation to southern spots.

This was one of the main purposes of the bill and was predicted as the result of the cotton-futures act. I said also in my report accompanying the cotton-futures bill that the adoption of the bill would tend to make manipulation less frequent and at the same time fluctuation less violent and therefore legitimate hedging more safe. That prediction is being borne out, as is shown from this excerpt from the market letter of Shearson, Hammill & Co., of January 6, 1915:

The New York Cotton Exchange has adopted the Government standards of grade, and is now operating under the provisions of the United States cotton-futures act, commonly known as the Lever bill. Under the new classification, the buyer is assured of receiving a merchantable grade of recognized spinning value, and the future market should reflect this improved standard at all times. It is possible, therefore, for the investor to use the New York market on a basis of future delivery without involving a tie-up of any material sum of money, and obtaining the same results involved in the purchase, storage, and insurance of the actual cotton itself.

I desire to submit also an excerpt from the market letter of Henry Clews & Co., of New York, of January 5, 1915, one of the largest brokerage firms in the country and one of the most reliable, as follows:

There was a quiet tone to the cotton market during the entire week, but the undertone continued strong, due in great part to the further increase in buying for foreign account and domestic investment interests. To some degree, however, the firmness was owing to the fact that the new contract under the terms of the United States futures act is really stronger than the trade has been generally led to believe. On the medium grades, which include middling, strict middling, and good middling, as well as strict low middling, it has been discovered that the new Government standards are worth 35 or more points over the old standard of classification. In addition to this it is necessary to consider the stipulation of the staple, which calls for at least seven-eighths of an inch. While this requirement does not affect deliveries from such sections as Texas, Oklahoma, or Arkansas, it has a decided influence on tenders from the eastern portion of the belt. Another feature that should be considered in regard to the new contract is the single certificate provision, which makes it possible for the holder of contracts of cotton in the local stock to withdraw a certain number of bales and replace these withdrawals without being forced to take out certificates for the full contract. There is no question that these three features alone demonstrate the enhanced value of the new contract, and, as repeatedly pointed out in these advices, the New York market is now as never before the best spinners' market of the world.

It is very gratifying to me, because I have spent 10 years in the study of this problem, to feel that this act is working in the interest of the cotton producer and is at this moment adding from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 to the value of his crop for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $484,050.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to detain the House at all, but so many gentlemen have made speeches on the subject of marketing, telling how the farmer receives such a low price for his products as compared with what he ought to receive, especially my friend from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON], who has just stated that the farmer in his State received 20 cents a bushel less for wheat than the market prices would justify, that I am lead to say a word or two.

Last summer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE] offered a resolution directing the Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce to make an investigation of the selling price of wheat in Kansas, asserting in his preamble, as I recall it, that wheat there was selling by the farmer for 20 to 25 cents a bushel less than the market price would justify. Finally the resolution was passed, delegating the Secretary of Agriculture to make the investigation, and that investigation was made by this bureau; and in a report sent to Congress on December 7 last is the result of that investigation.

When we came to examine the report of the department we found that instead of the farmers of Kansas selling their wheat—I presume the same thing applies to North Dakota—for from 20 to 25 cents a bushel less than the market price would justify, this statement, part of the summary, is set forth:

The prices of wheat paid to farmers in Kansas are based largely upon the prices in Kansas City, Mo., and at the Gulf ports for export. From these basic prices must be subtracted the freight rate, shipper's profit, and other incidental charges and the margin taken out by the country elevator to determine the price which is paid to the farmer. Since the margins of profit taken by the grain dealers in the larger markets are very small—averaging about 1 cent a bushel—it appears that the farmers of Kansas, as a general rule, are obtaining all their wheat is worth.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In corroboration of what the gentleman has stated, I wish to say that a statement was recently made to me by a gentleman connected with one of the great grain exchanges of the country that he was selling grain at a profit of one-eighth of a cent per bushel. His profit was included in that.

Mr. MANN. Here I read another extract from the report, page 5, which is as exhaustive on the subject, and it gives an illustration. I read:

Country buyers work on a margin of from 2½ to 4 cents per bushel. Hence, the country price on a given day would be the price for which the buyer can sell his grain "on track" at the elevator, less his margin. For example, on September 28, an elevator which allows a margin of 3 cents per bushel on all wheat purchased received several track bids averaging 90¼ cents per bushel, basis No. 2 hard, which is the contract grade in Kansas. The quotation to farmers on this day was the "on-track" price quoted the elevator less its margin of 3 cents, or in this case making the price to the farmer 86¾ cents per bushel. When the local buyer does his shipping on a commission basis he will take the spot price at Kansas City, subtract the freight and other charges incident to selling in Kansas City, and deduct his margin. If the market quotation at Kansas City on spots is 97 cents, the freight to Kansas City 5 cents, commission and other charges 1¼ cents, and the elevator margin 3 cents, the local market price would be 97 cents minus 9¼ cents, or 87¾ cents.

That is the way the wheat is sold; and if there are farmers in Kansas or North Dakota, who do not know enough to sell their wheat for the market price at Duluth or Minneapolis, less the freight charges, a very small commission charge, and a very small elevator charge, what they need is an education. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] ought to print a speech and send it to all of them, so that they will know their rights.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NORTON. From the reading of the pamphlet by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I am led to believe that the gentleman who wrote it probably knows considerably more about city-farm life than he does about some of the problems surrounding the marketing of grain.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to inform him who wrote it?

Mr. NORTON. It may be that the Secretary of Agriculture did, who is reported in the newspapers to have stated a short time ago——

Mr. MANN. No; it was not written by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. NORTON. That the farmers of the country did not need any rural-credit legislation.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to state who wrote it.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois state who wrote it?

Mr. NORTON. I shall be pleased to have the gentleman state the names of the authors of the article.

Mr. MANN. It was written by W. H. Kerr and L. H. D. Weld, Office of Markets and Rural Organization, and Charles J. Brand, chief of this bureau.

Mr. NORTON. I will state to the gentleman that the condition in North Dakota during the months in which practically all of the marketing of grain was done last fall was this: The cash price of wheat in Minneapolis and Duluth was from 10 to 20 cents a bushel higher than was the future market price of grain; that is, the cash market price of wheat in September at the terminal grain markets was from 10 to 20 cents a bushel higher than the November and December future market price. The local elevators in North Dakota bought the farmers' wheat at local prices, based on the future market price of wheat less transportation and incidental charges, and not at all based on the cash market price of wheat at the terminals.

Mr. MANN. That would depend on when it was delivered.

Mr. NORTON. It was delivered to the local elevators, of course, at the time it was bought.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not usually.

Mr. NORTON. Such has been always my observation.

Mr. MADDEN. Not future prices.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not familiar with the handling of this product, I am afraid.

Mr. NORTON. With all due respect to the general superior knowledge of the gentleman, I am confident that I know as much about the problems pertaining to the marketing of wheat as does the gentleman from Illinois. I am convinced of the fact, also from my own observations and experience, that the farmers of my State received in most cases last fall from 10 to 20 cents a bushel less for their wheat than they would have received for it if they had been able to market it through a cooperative marketing exchange.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak again on this question, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has so completely missed the point which Members have urged here as to what the farmers received for their crops, and has so clearly failed to comprehend the point that I urged in this matter of markets, that I feel impelled to make a few more observations.

Mr. MANN. I did not hear the gentleman's speech, so I disclaim any effort to answer it.

Mr. MANAHAN. I regret that the gentleman did not hear my speech.

Mr. MANN. I regret it, too.

Mr. MANAHAN. It would have enlightened the gentleman on this important subject of marketing.

Mr. MANN. I have heard it before, and I never thought so.

Mr. MANAHAN. Read it again. I never lose faith in the capacity of the gentleman from Illinois to understand, if he will study long enough.

Now, the point made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and others regarding what the farmers receive for their products—its inadequacy under present marketing conditions—is based upon facts; and when the gentleman from Illinois says that the report which he read shows that the farmers received approximately what they ought to receive, deducting from the price upon the market place transportation, commissions, and incidental terminal expenses, and rests his case upon that, he does not take into consideration at all the more important fact that the price upon the market place is an artificial price, made by gamblers betting on the future price. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] ought to know that every bushel of cash wheat or grain sold upon the Chicago market is based upon the future bidding in the pit at the very hour when it is sold. In other words, the men in the pit and speculators from all over the country operating in the pit; clerks in banks and in business houses, for instance, who want to take a "flyer" upon the market place, are competing in the market place with the farmer who really has grain to sell, and beating down his price for real grain by what they think they may be able to buy grain for several months in the future.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the grain-producing States the farmers also indulge in fliers, as the gentleman calls them?

Mr. MANAHAN. A few poor, misguided farmers may, but that does not justify the infamy of having the price of a staple article of food made by gamblers in the pit. [Applause.] And when any man says to me that that is an honest price, I say he does not know what he is talking about. It is a gambler's price; a dishonest gambler's price; a dishonest gambler's deliberately dishonest price.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MANAHAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman name one agricultural product that is not dealt in upon the exchanges that costs as little from the producer to the consumer as those that are dealt in on exchanges—just one?

Mr. MANAHAN. I certainly can.

Mr. SHERLEY. Name it.

Mr. MANAHAN. Barley; and I myself put the proposition up to the leading officials of the Chicago Board of Trade before the Rules Committee of this House, and I put the same proposition up before the leading members of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, before the legislative investigating committee of the Minnesota Legislature, for which I was the attorney two years ago, to produce their books, and offered to show by their own records that every grain that was not affected by future trading sold at a closer margin than grain affected by pit trading, notwithstanding the fact that many of the local inspectors in grading malt barley graded it as feed barley—notwithstanding this dishonesty barley sold by the producer closer to the real price than wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANAHAN. I have not taken much time of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I know the gentleman has not taken much time, but if every Member of the House should take the time the gentleman has, even 10 minutes, we would not be able to get through. But I will not object.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether the debate is ended then or not.

Mr. LEVER. I had the idea that this was the last speech. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. HELGESEN. I object. I want five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I just read an extract from an official report, and it will take the gentleman four days to answer it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], it was put squarely up to the great operators in Chicago and Minneapolis to show by their books the actual amount they made on grain subject to sale for future delivery and how much they made on grain not subject to pit trading. They did not dare produce their books, because, by the system they have, instead of making 1 cent on a bushel, which is the ostensible commission, they make 6 cents, 7 cents, or 8 cents a bushel. How? By a concerted action and arrangement between themselves and local inspectors and public-warehouse men, by which bidding in futures is manipulated for the purpose of making the market fluctuate, and prices are forced up or down at will by means of grain in the warehouses they control, where the enormous quantities are stored, and which they can throw in a doctored, mixed, and depreciated condition into the market for the purpose of controlling their trading program.

Only December last a case was tried in Chicago, with which I have no doubt the gentleman from Illinois is familiar, in which

Mr. Leiter was sued for $330,000 by Peavy and Pillsbury, so-called elevator interests of Minneapolis. It was in the time of the Leiter corner in wheat that the cause of action arose. These men, Peavy and Pillsbury, it was claimed, broke an agreement with Leiter to withhold their grain while he cornered the market, and it cost Leiter and his father something like twelve or thirteen million dollars. The corner in wheat was busted, and Leiter was almost busted because, forsooth, the agreement with his fellow gamblers busted under temptation.

Leiter was sued for $330,000 worth of notes that he gave to elevators controlled by these coconspirators of his, while they were in bad faith unloading their storage grain upon him, and Judge Humphrey, of the Federal court, submitted to the jury the question of whether or not there was an illegal conspiracy between these three men to control the price of wheat, and if they found that there was such a conspiracy to control the price of wheat the notes would be void. It was submitted on the testimony showing the understanding between these men—only three men—and the jury brought in a verdict that there was such a conspiracy, and the $330,000 in notes were declared void. If three men can by this sort of agreement as to how they shall bid in the pit and withholding their grain in storage control the price of wheat, as they showed they could, what can half a dozen do? What can the whole combination do, operating as a close corporation like the chamber of commerce?

Mr. SHERLEY. What happened to that attempted deal? The fellows that were in it went broke.

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes; but the price of wheat went up almost to the present price.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did it hurt the farmer?

Mr. MANAHAN. Of course it did. The farmers did not unload any of that wheat. The speculators had gotten nearly all of the wheat in the elevators before they conspired to corner the market and hold up consumers. The Peavys and the Pillsburys had the wheat, and the farmers did not have it. The suggestion that future trading lessens the margin of profit between the price the producer gets and the price the consumer pays is absurd. Is any man so childish as to think that these great operators whose profits depend upon this margin would cling so tenaciously to the pit and defend it so valiantly if it narrowed their margin and cut their profits? Are the Armours and Leiters and Pillsburys in the grain business for their health or for profit—big, fat profit?

They want wide margin between producer and consumer. They do not operate their corners in the fall, but wait until after the farmers are compelled to sell the wheat. After the bulk of the crop has been sent to market the pit machinery is set in motion to boost the price of wheat and flour, and the consumers pay the excessive prices. The farmers are compelled to sell their wheat early, as a rule, and the result is that the wheat they sell cheap the middle men later sell at a very much higher price to the consumer in the form of flour. I say again and deliberately that these gamblers' prices are swindling prices. They do not depend upon the law of supply and demand, which is practically constant and unchanging.

Why, look at it. Right after war was declared they boosted it up 40 cents. Then it went down 20 cents. It has ever since been juggled back and forth. Every time the price of grain changes 1 cent it affects the value of the farmers' product in the United States $50,000,000. If it juggled 10 cents, it is affected $500,000,000 in the aggregate.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the export of wheat have something to do with it?

Mr. MANAHAN. Very little. The members of the Chicago Board of Trade, the grain gamblers, deal in three hundred times as much phantom wheat as they actually handle in real wheat. They sell more wheat futures every day than actually comes to Chicago in a year. That was shown by the testimony before the Rules Committee. They make the price of wheat for the world, because their pit trading dominates, and what they send abroad or export to Liverpool is miserable doctored wheat, which can not affect domestic prices. Only yesterday the head of the chemical department, under the pure-food act, attached 100 cars of grain in Baltimore and other export points for being doctored and adulterated with water and screenings by Chicago Board of Trade and other operators in the West. If our prices were not made by gamblers operating under cover of monopoly, and if foreign buyers were not swindled repeatedly by dishonest dealers, shielded by boards of trade, where the pot dare not call the kettle black, the law of world supply and demand would doubtless maintain a fair and almost constant price for all staple articles of food. [Applause.]

[Mr. HELGESEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, $19,702,712.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to these requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the plant-quarantine act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of August 20, 1912, as amended March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the sale or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and also——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 2, by adding at the end of the line, after "$50,000," the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the sum in this paragraph or this act appropriated shall be used or expended in the enforcing of any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture which have for their purpose an intention to, and do in effect, give preference to the ports of one State over those of another."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we ought to have some understanding as to the time to be allowed for this debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. This is an important matter, Mr. Chairman, and my colleague has not interfered much with this discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that; but we ought to have some understanding about the close of debate.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have not opened my mouth to-day, and there are many gentlemen who have talked repeatedly on the bill, among them my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who wants to limit debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; he does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I do not wish to cut off the gentleman. We do not want to lose our suppers and our sleep as well.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate close on this paragraph and amendments thereto in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the chairman of the committee that he must recognize the importance of the matter that the gentleman from Georgia is talking about.

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] to have ample opportunity to discuss it; and if he is allowed that opportunity, I promise that I shall not speak on it myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend from Georgia that in his State the sea-island cotton that is produced there, and that which is produced in South Carolina and Florida, serves the purpose of the long-staple cotton, and we do not want this long-staple stuff coming there from abroad if it will be in the least dangerous.

Mr. SISSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. I hope my colleague from Georgia will not be lost in the shuffle.

Mr. LEVER. It is now nearly 6 o'clock.

Mr. SISSON. I understand that it is nearly 6 o'clock; but I am so much interested in the amendment that the gentleman from Georgia offers that I feel the House is entitled to know the full limitation of that amendment. I have no desire on earth to delay the proceedings. So far as I am concerned, I have no desire on earth to delay the bill. I have been here helping to make a quorum, and I have not discussed the bill, and I have taken up no time, but this is a matter in which I am very much interested.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement, I will modify my request and ask unanimous consent that the debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. With the understanding that I may get unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does that take care of the extension of the time of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT]?

Mr. LEVER. That will be included.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina state his request again?

Mr. ADAMSON. That all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. That does not include argument on the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to proceed myself for 10 minutes, and if he will include in his request that I may have 10 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will take care of itself.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will withhold his request, Mr. Chairman, I will make a personal request that I may be permitted to address the committee for 10 minutes on this amendment, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. STAFFORD. There is one question pending before the House, and I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina withhold his request?

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ADAMSON. The request I made was, first, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] first, in the hope that some definite time could be agreed upon.

Mr. SISSON. I shall have to object, unless I can get consent to address the committee for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. That time can be yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will not object, he can get his time.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection, if I can get the time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Following the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not permitted under the rule to yield to any gentleman more than five minutes without unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection to the gentleman having 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. With the understanding that I may have 10 minutes——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Regular order.

Mr. SISSON. If I can not get my request——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Chair is absolutely powerless to give him that assurance.

Mr. SISSON. I am trying to get the committee to give me that courtesy.

Mr. LEVER. Recognition is the right of the Chair.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman modify his request so as to give the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] 5 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi 10 minutes?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, the regular order has been called for.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order has been called for. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order having been called for, the gentleman must either object or not object.

Mr. SISSON. Then I object.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word. The gentleman from Georgia referred to me a moment ago——

Mr. BARTLETT. I should not if the gentleman had not "butted in."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to "butt in" whenever I hear a speech made directly antagonistic to the best interest of the cotton producers of the South. I did not mean to be discourteous to my good friend from Georgia in "butting in" as he calls it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that he is any more interested in the cotton raisers of the South than I am? My State raises one-third more cotton than does his.

Mr. HEFLIN. That may be true, but I think if the cotton producers of the gentleman's district were permitted to determine just now who is their best friend, the gentleman or myself, I am inclined to the opinion that they would decide in my favor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this Government exercising the authority that it has to prevent the shipment of fruit trees affected with deadly parasites into the various sections of this country. I think the Government has a right to prevent cattle and other animals that have the foot-and-mouth disease from coming into the various sections of our country, and I think that this Government has the right, and it ought to exercise that right, to prevent the coming into the South of cotton from Egypt affected with the pink boll worm, and in the name of twenty-seven millions of people interested directly in the cotton industry I protest against the bringing of the Egyptian pink worm into the South. We have had enough trouble with the boll weevil without having the Egyptian pink boll worm turned loose upon us.

Mr. Chairman, we are producing in the gentleman's own State of Georgia some of the finest sea-island cotton in the world, and we grow some of it in South Carolina and some in the State of Florida, and now to permit the Egyptian cotton, with its pink boll worm, to come in in competition with our long-staple cotton seems ridiculous to me. No, Mr. Chairman; it is not to the interest of the cotton producers to bring these pink boll worms into the South in order that two or three mills may have the opportunity to spin a little Egyptian cotton. We can produce the finest short-staple cotton in the world, and now we are growing some of the finest long-staple cotton to be found anywhere. I plead for the exercise of the quarantine power of the Government against this infected Egyptian cotton going into the South. Hold it for 24 months? Yes; 48 months, if necessary; long enough to destroy the boll worm and the eggs; and that is the purpose of the provision that the gentleman talks against.

I can not see to save my life why the gentleman pleads for the nonenforcement of a provision like this. The course that he would have us take in this matter is not in the interest of the masses of the people in the cotton-producing States. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, practically all I have is invested in raising cotton. I produce principally what is called good bender or staple cotton, but this amendment I favor, first, because it limits the expenditure of this appropriation by the department in accordance with the Constitution. Now, if this board sees fit to establish a quarantine and close all the ports of the United States to cotton, and they feel that that is proper, then they should assume the responsibility, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to say, by voting this amendment down, that that provision of the Constitution which provides that no preference shall be given to one port of one State over that of another port is constitutional. My own private interest, and that of my section, could be advanced by shutting out all foreign cotton, but we can not afford to violate our oath of office, even to do that.

When I voted against the proposition to vest the Secretary of Agriculture or this board with this enormous power I anticipated in the exercise of that power something like this might

happen. If this precedent is to be set, then you vest with this board the power of quarantining to that extent that they can discriminate and force all the cotton imported into the United States to come to one particular port.

If I understand the order properly now, it provides that the importation of cotton into the United States will come into the port at New York or Boston or San Francisco, thereby excluding the importation of cotton into any other port of the United States. Not only that, but it provides that after the cotton shall have been imported into the United States, whatever may be the effect upon any mill in the South, this cotton shall be kept two years. So under the guise of these quarantine rules you are preventing the southern cotton mills from securing any of this cotton they may desire to secure.

Another thing is it increases the amount of freight that must be paid from the port of Boston or New York to the southern mill. I would not place that extra burden upon any mill in any section of the United States. I do not believe that under the Constitution they have the right to expend the money in this way, and this limitation is one which says that you can not expend this money in violation of the Constitution of the United States. If they want to protect the cotton, it is their duty to prevent this importation of cotton altogether, but by an order of the executive department, something this Congress can not do, you are vesting that board with a power that Congress itself has not the power to enforce.

But I am unwilling to give that much power to any single department of this Government. I do care how it may affect the southern cotton interests so far as this bill is concerned. I will support the Constitution of the United States. But the Secretary of Agriculture should, by the proper means, ascertain whether or not the cotton so imported has been exposed to this weevil or worm, and then should shut out altogether, as he ought to do under his oath of office, the cotton which has been exposed to this worm. But cotton which has not been exposed to this worm and tends in no way to bring the weevil into this country should be shipped into all the ports of all the States just alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I presume the gentleman will be able to conclude in those five minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to suggest one thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in six minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want a couple of minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in——

Mr. LEVER. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now the question is on the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that he be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have two or three minutes on this.

Mr. LEVER. The time is in the control of the Chair, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. I understood that the gentleman intended to grant two minutes to the gentleman behind him.

Mr. LEVER. He said he is not certain he may need it. I will give the gentleman one minute.

Mr. MOORE. This, I understand, is the selection of certain ports through which the exports of this country shall go?

Mr. SISSON. The amendment was to prevent it.

Mr. MOORE. The amendment indicated that no money shall be spent for the purpose of particularizing with regard to ports.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will say the amendment, as I understand it, is against the cotton coming from an infected region.

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not say anything of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina has not been objected to. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the agreement may be modified as to time and make it 12 minutes, so that Mr. MOORE may have 2.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. SISSON. For a short question.

Mr. ADAMSON. If cotton or any other property or individuals are required to perform quarantine, must not that be done first?

Mr. SISSON. Absolutely.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let that be done first and then give equal right of access to all ports.

Mr. SISSON. That is my position exactly. Now, gentlemen, if you will note the order of the Agricultural Department, it excludes the importation into this country of all cotton, whether infected or not, named and specified in the order, and that is all the cotton that is raised in the world except Indian cotton, and it prevents it from coming into ports except those three ports—Boston, New York, and San Francisco. Now, my position is that in the exercise of quarantine power of the United States you must first ascertain that there is something wrong with the subject matter quarantined. If a man can by a proper regulation act certify under proper authority that the cotton he endeavors to ship into any port of the United States has not been infected by the boll weevil or the pink boll weevil, then I say in the name of justice, in the name of the Constitution, he has the right to import that cotton into the United States. And I am unwilling that a body of men who are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, vested under the statute with certain powers in reference to quarantine—that they may set aside a specific provision of the Constitution under the guise of quarantine regulations. Now, if the cotton is infected, no man wants that cotton imported into this country, and if they will make an order in accordance with such authority unquestionably all the cotton growers of the South will be absolutely protected. Now, I have declined to vote for a duty on cotton. I raise cotton which is a long-staple cotton, which could be protected 5, 6, 8, 9, or 10 cents a pound. Whatever amount of protection is placed upon it would inure to my private benefit, because we raise a million bales less long-staple cotton than actually comes into the United States, but you are putting a quarantine upon cotton and making an absolute prohibition on the cotton, except you ship into these two favored ports on the eastern seaboard and one on the west.

Now, gentlemen, I do not believe that I am looking in the face of men who are willing to say that this amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], which provides that none of this money shall be expended for the purpose of evading the provision of the Constitution which says that no port in any one State shall receive preference over another port, and if the quarantine authorities want to see a quarantine so as to protect the southern cotton grower, let them require a proper and safe provision that the cotton shipped into any of these ports is not infected by the boll weevil, and it will come.

And then, when that is done, I want to see the ports of Delaware and the ports of Pennsylvania, and the ports of all New England, and the other ports where it would not affect them—I want to see all those ports receive absolutely the same treatment. The cotton that would be infected, if you please, could be admitted, if they saw fit and proper, into those ports where the boll weevil could not spread to that cotton which is not affected. I take it that no man will hold that the infected cotton should be subject to quarantine regulations if that cotton is not shipped into all the ports of the United States alike. Then you would not be violating the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

I do not know anything personally about the effect of the pink boll weevil, but I do know that they are raising a great deal of cotton in Egypt. I do know that Egypt is prospering in the cotton-raising business, notwithstanding the weevil. I do know that the islands of the sea, where they say they have it, are producing about a million bales, which is being imported into the United States every year. If that be true, it is not doing much harm. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. Some of you remember the difficulty we had in securing passage of the Simmons law, which came from the

Committee on Agriculture, the law under which this quarantine board was established. When the bill was before the House you were given facts and conditions which showed the necessity of enacting it into law. You were told that nearly every one of the pests and diseases which prevail in this country was brought in from a foreign country, and that its coming might have been prevented if we had had such a law as this Simmons law and a quarantine board such as has been organized under that law, so that foreign pests and diseases could have been shut out. Their coming has caused a loss of millions of money and the destruction of untold millions of property. This quarantine board inspects products coming or offered for import from foreign countries, and forbids altogether the entry of those which are very dangerous. The board is composed of well-informed and intelligent men, and is doing its duty. Do not tie the hands of these men in this important matter.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I can not yield in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Do not yield to a demand based on nothing except local pride or a desire to secure temporary local advantage. If you embarrass this board or interfere with or prevent its free and vigorous action you may be opening the door for the introduction into this country of a new cotton pest more dangerous to and destructive of our cotton crop than even the boll weevil or any other cotton pest with which we now have to contend. I urge you not to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan used only one minute. The Chair will yield one minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. My colleague [Mr. SISSON] is a constituent of mine [laughter], and I want to protect him from this pink boll worm which has wrought such frightful havoc in the cotton fields of Egypt. While I commend my constituent, of course, for his stand in behalf of the Constitution and his effort to protect the Constitution from the ravages threatened by the Committee on Agriculture, yet I feel that my duty to him as a constituent requires me to plead with this House to protect him and his delta plantation from the ravages of this Egyptian pink worm, which if it is imported into this country will add one more tremendous burden to the cotton farmers of the South and to my district.

As I understand his contention, it is, because the Constitution forbids that any preference shall be given one port over another port, that therefore no quarantine can be declared or enforced at one port unless it be similarly enforced at all other ports. If a quarantine is established at New Orleans or Galveston against yellow fever, then Portland, Me., and Juneau, Alaska, must be quarantined also. I can not believe that this argument will appeal very strongly to the southern cotton growers as a reason for leaving the southern ports open for the importation of this new plague of Egypt, which the department experts declare is more destructive to the cotton plant than the boll weevil.

The department, under the bill as it is now, will quarantine against importations of Egyptian cotton into any southern port where this pink worm can live, and it will do so because it has been discovered that in this way this pest has actually been brought across the seas from Egypt to Boston. If that were the end of it, all would be well, because the worm can not live in New England and reproduce its species; but because some cotton mills in the South are beginning to spin Egyptian cotton they are protesting that this quarantine against southern ports is giving a preference to ports of New England, and this amendment, if adopted, would prevent it.

My colleague says he does not object at all to Egyptian cotton being imported into this country, although it does compete directly with the Bender cotton of the Mississippi Delta. His sole objection is that the law which will forbid the importation through southern ports is unconstitutional.

Then, too, he discounts the damage which this pink worm can do. He says they raise cotton in Egypt in spite of the worm. I may say they raise cotton in Texas in spite of the boll weevil, yet my colleague has always voted for appropriations to prevent the spread of the boll weevil.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, there has been a decided increase recently in importations of Egyptian cotton. I do not wonder that our southern friends are alarmed at that fact. There was also a great increase in the importation of Irish and Bermuda potatoes, and I do not wonder that our friends on the other side, and their Department of Agriculture, took occasion to levy a quarantine up yonder in the State of Maine to protect the Maine farmer from the disastrous effects of a low tariff.

But what I object to in this particular matter is that we should allow one of the departments of this Government to fix the channel depth of our ports and centralize our business at three places. There has been no great alarm over the Egyptian boll weevil. That is largely imaginary, or has been up to this time. In our part of the country we need the raw materials, and we want to buy them and keep the mills going. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] that all our ports should be treated alike. There is not one port from the extreme southern point of the Atlantic coast up to New York that equals in depth of water the ports of New York and Boston, and the department order which the gentleman from Georgia proposes to restrict therefore would close out the other ports where the business of cotton manufacturing along the Atlantic seaboard is conducted. The great ocean leviathans that go into New York can not go into a single South Atlantic port. What we need along the coast is not monopoly at one or two ports, but wholesome competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important proposition which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has sprung upon the House. The Egyptian pink worm is described to me by experts of the Department of Agriculture as being a cotton pest much more destructive than the boll weevil. Now, what they have done is to quarantine certain southern ports against the importation of Egyptian cotton seed or Egyptian cotton. It is not for the purpose of playing any favoritism to anybody, but for the purpose of protecting our cotton growers of the South, and in my opinion there could not be a worse amendment proposed, as far as the cotton growers are concerned, than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. We have enough of pests now. We are spending thousands of dollars in this bill to fight cotton pests and potato pests and all kinds of pests, and now for us in this amendment to throw the doors wide open to the world and say, "Bring in your pests"——

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not do that——

Mr. LEVER. It does not seem to me to be in keeping with the logic of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the amendment read again, so that the committee may see that the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from South Carolina have misstated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 2, by adding at the end of the line, after "$50,000," the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the sum in this paragraph or this act appropriated shall be used or expended in the enforcing of any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture, which have for their purpose and intention to, and do in effect, give preference to the ports of one State over those of another."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to see who will vote for the Constitution. Mr. Chairman, and I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 63.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Domestic potato quarantine: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with those States in the inspection of Irish potatoes where a quarantine has been or hereafter shall be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, prohibiting the movement of such potatoes from any State into any other State, District, or Territory of the United States except under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and for the enforcement of such rules and regulations, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, $50,000.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 13, by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in place thereof "$100,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds I ask unanimous consent that debate on this pargaraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, last year there was an appropriation of $50,000 for the inspection of potatoes in Maine under the quarantine regulations. That was for the fiscal year 1915. Up to the 1st of last December the department was able, with this appropriation, to take care of all the expenses of the inspection. Since December 1, owing to the insufficiency of the appropriation, it has been found necessary to impose a tax of $2 per car on the potato shippers, which will result, before the Maine crop is moved, in the shippers having to contribute nearly $50,000 to carry on the Government inspection. In order to prevent that recurring next year I have offered this amendment to increase this appropriation to $100,000, the amount that is estimated and recommended by the horticultural board.

I believe that the Federal Government should assume the entire expense, for the reason that in the inspection of meats which enter into interstate commerce the Government pays the whole bill. We inspect grain which enters into interstate commerce, and the Government pays the whole bill. Both of these are food products. Potatoes are a food product. The potato shipper in Maine, in my opinion, should be accorded the same treatment that the beef packer and the grain-elevator man receives. I hope that the chairman of this committee will not oppose this increase, which is absolutely necessary to provide sufficient funds for the department to pay the whole expense of the inspection and moving of the potato crop in Maine and relieve the burden now imposed upon the shippers, a burden that in equity should be borne by the Government, as a very small proportion of the great potato crop in Maine is to-day infected; nevertheless the entire crop has to be inspected and will until the quarantine is raised. It costs a good deal to inspect thirty or forty million bushels of potatoes. I appreciate the fact that the department, through the well-directed efforts of the members of the horticultural board and W. Blair Clark, superintendent of this service in Maine, is doing excellent work, and with this appropriation will wipe out the last suspicion of infection and give to Maine potatoes what is their due—a clean bill of health. This inspection is in the interest of the whole country, as Maine seed potatoes enter many States. For that reason the whole expense should be assumed by the Federal Government.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I will yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. The farmers themselves are paying the excess over the appropriation of $50,000 of the expense not required to make the inspection?

Mr. GUERNSEY. The shippers and the farmers will during the next few months as the crop is shipped from the State.

Mr. MOORE. They have arranged to pay that out of their own pockets?

Mr. GUERNSEY. They will be assessed $2 a car.

Mr. MOORE. Which is a condition that does not prevail in any other State that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I know of no such situation elsewhere; in fact, as I have already pointed out, the Government in other inspections of food products for shipment pays the whole expense, as the inspection is for the protection of the whole country. If the additional amount is not allowed here, we will have to ask the Senate to make allowance; but the House should provide for it now.

Mr. BRYAN. Maine is a prohibition State. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GUERNSEY) there were—ayes 15, noes 50.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Denver, Colo., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid region of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $20,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. When is this congress to be held?

Mr. LEVER. It is to be held during the year.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the Secretary of Agriculture state to the committee that it was useless to make this appropriation now?

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary made no recommendation whatever; but I will say to the gentleman that there have been held about five of these international dry-farming congresses, starting somewhere in Canada. Usually this provision has been put in on the Senate side. Our committee heard gentlemen interested in this proposition, and believing that the item would be put into the bill in the Senate, and believing that it was a good item, agreed to report it. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. It was my impression that the Secretary stated that it would be too late when this congress was held for the appropriation to do any good.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary of Agriculture did not estimate for this and made no statement about it one way or the other.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. I make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order just a moment?

Mr. BOOHER. I will reserve the point of order for the present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the International Dry Farming Congress was organized some 10 or 12 years ago and has been doing a great work in the West. I think four years ago we made the first appropriation for representation at that dry-farming congress. Last year we made an appropriation of $20,000 for the congress at Wichita. At that congress, in my absence, the presidency of it was wished onto me. I may say, therefore, that I am somewhat responsible for this item. It is a great work that is being done out there under the auspices of this congress. We have been appropriating for it in the past. I believe it is a good item. I do not want to ask the House to provide for it on the ground that I am officially connected with the congress, but I want to suggest, as my friend the chairman of the committee has suggested, that the item will probably be put in at the other end of the Capitol in any event, and it seems to me we might quite as well take care of it here. It is a worthy work, and a splendid exhibit will be made.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to him that this congress was held in Kansas last year at Wichita, and the item was put in on the floor of the House largely as a recognition of the personal friendship of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], although all of us recognized that it was really a good educational proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to my friend, further, that the dry-farming congress is to-day doing a work that is adding to the agricultural, particularly to the grain-producing area of the country, vast acreages that heretofore have been considered only useful and valuable for grazing. The dry-farming movement has added a great many more of grain and cereal products to the country and will add a greater area. It deals with the intensified, scientific, thorough farming methods, methods valuable not only to that dry region, but in the country at large. It is a great work, a work that is adding more to the agricultural acreage of the country than any other that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his point of order?

Mr. BOOHER. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams: For cooperation with any State or group of States in the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of navigable streams under the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," $100,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 75, by inserting after line 15 a new paragraph, as follows:

"EXPERIMENTS IN DAIRYING AND LIVE-STOCK PRODUCTION IN SEMIARID AND IRRIGATED DISTRICTS OF THE WESTERN UNITED STATES.

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations and experiments in problems connected with the establishment of dairying and meat production enterprises on the semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States, including the purchase of live stock, the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $87,500."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman is going to make the point of order, I want to be heard. If he does not intend to make it, I do not want to take up the time.

Mr. LEVER. I will state the proposition in the committee and let the committee vote on it.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think the paragraph is subject to a point of order, and I do not care to take up the time with the discussion of it unless the gentleman seriously makes it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from South Dakota is so fine a man that I am going to withdraw the point of order and put the proposition up to the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will withdraw it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time to discuss the point of order unless it is made, in which case I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture made a request for this item as the result of a committee investigation from his department. There is a full statement of the merits of the item in the hearings before the Agricultural Committee. The Secretary asked for two items of this general character. This one I have referred to for dairying in connection with certain public farm experiment stations that the Government is maintaining in the West, one in the Panhandle region in Texas, and the others farther north, covering the Great Plains and some arid regions. He asked for $60,000 for similar experimental work in the cotton and cane growing regions of the South. In the language of the Scripture, one was taken and the other left. I desire you to consider the request of the Secretary. In his estimate is the following note, which I will read:

NOTE.—This is a new item, and carries an increase of $87,500. The field stations of the department in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States have in the past been devoted almost entirely to the production of crops. Methods have been established on these stations that make it possible now to produce large forage crops in these districts with a considerable degree of success; but such crops are not marketable, for the reason that in most cases there are no near-by cities and there is no demand for them in the immediate neighborhood in which they are produced. The profitable utilization of these crops on the farm, therefore, is essential to successful farming in these regions. For the purpose of establishing proper methods of feeding, along with the natural grazing that is afforded, it is the desire of the department to place live stock at several of the field stations in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States, and thereby make the production of field crops profitable and at the same time increase the production of live stock. If this work is provided for, attention will be given both to dairying and meat production, and this will make these field stations serve as guides to the farmers in these regions not only in crop production but also in the profitable utilization of these crops for the production of live stock.

I may say that in the Great Plains area, covering something like 500,000,000 acres, upon which the Government still has in the neighborhood of 300,000,000 acres of public land, there are being carried on efforts to utilize these vast regions by dry-farming methods and otherwise. We have established certain stations for dry farming and experimental work, and they are succeeding in growing varied crops, and every man who goes there—every individual farmer as well as the Government—must depend ultimately upon the utilization of the forage crops far from market by raising live stock and the promotion of dairy interests. The proposal is to carry on dairying in experimental work at these stations, and in that way have some valuable data to pass on to the settler as he comes into the country and help him solve the problem.

In other words, the Government, in an experimental way, is reaching out to conduct this work in aid of the settler because he is not able, in many instances, to do this practical work for himself. They are seeking to learn how to grow forage crops in this area and the use of them, in the way of selection of proper breeds of stock and data of a scientific and statistical kind that will tell the settler, the farmer, whether certain classes are profitable and what are unprofitable, and so help him to solve this great problem, in which the entire country is interested.

The Department of Agriculture, in its efforts to make the results of its work of practical benefit not only to the experiment stations but of practical value to the men who are to be guided by their efforts, should have some opportunity to make these experiments with dairy and other live stock——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting to this committee that they have made a distinction against one section of the country over another, but because of the vast merits of this question I do suggest that if we are to expend money in only one locality, in an effort to enlarge the stock production and dairy production of this country, it ought to be spent in this vast area of the West, the natural home of the live-stock industry, rather than to put it down in the cane and cotton-growing sections of the South, where there is great doubt whether we can ever develop a great live-stock country or not. The mere fact that the committee put in an item of $60,000 for this work in the South a year ago, and submits another item appropriating $60,000 in the next section of this bill, is no reason why the work in such direction should be confined to that section of the country. It is desirable to place a fund in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture to do this experimental work, of value not only to the department but to the settlers who are pioneers of the country in building up these new communities.

Mr. STAFFORD. On the reservation of the point of order, is the gentleman ready to submit the matter to a vote?

Mr. LEVER. I only desire to make a brief statement of one minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. It is true the Secretary of Agriculture estimated for it; but the committee in making up this bill did not allow any new projects whatever, although many of them were meritorious, unless the project was in the nature of an absolute emergency. Therefore I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $60,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the item.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is fair after the treatment that has been given the gentleman. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, what disposition was made of the item? Has the paragraph gone out?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph went out.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment, which I will offer as a new paragraph, and I wish to have it amended so it will read $10,000 instead of $70,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment with the necessary correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY: Page 75, line 26, after the word "elsewhere," strike out "$60,000" and insert "$10,000," and add the following language: "*Provided*, That of this amount $10,000 may be used in one or more of the States in which sugar beets are extensively grown, to make investigations and experiments to determine the value of sugar-beet tops for the feeding of cattle and other live stock."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask where this amendment comes in?

Mr. FORDNEY. The amendment is to the paragraph which was stricken out, but I offer it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I know, but it provides of this amount, and the amount has been stricken out.

Mr. FORDNEY. I offer it in the sum of $10,000.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell in the open market or to exchange for other live stock such animals or animal products as cease to be needed in the work of the department, and all moneys received from the sale of such animals or animal products or as a bonus in the exchange of the same shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 7, page 76, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on experiments and demonstrations in live stock in the Eastern States, including the maintaining in these States breeding animals, to promote the raising of

beef cattle, and to offer prizes and bounties in counties or other subdivisions of the States to encourage the development of the beef-raising industry of these States, $50,000.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not come in where I expected it might, as the paragraph which related to a similar subject was stricken out on a point of order; nevertheless I wish to address the House briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina reserve the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUERNSEY. For a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to know if the gentleman agrees to add five thousand to experiment in dairying.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, the reasons I offer this amendment are these: The Secretary of Agriculture in his recent annual report stated, with reference to the decrease of our meat supply, that we could no longer look to the ranges to settle this question; we must look to the settled farming areas of the country for an increase in our meat supply. In order to awaken interest in the raising of more beef in the settled farming areas it seems to me that some action must be taken by the Federal Government.

The proposal set forth in the amendment is just a suggestion of what the Secretary of Agriculture might be authorized to do toward encouraging the raising of beef cattle; Federal prizes and bounties should be much sought after, and undoubtedly would awaken great interest among breeders, and breeding stations established by the Government in the States, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, might be of great value in establishing the right breeds of beef animals.

In New England within the last 20 years they have fallen off something like 250,000 head, and what is true of New England is true also of all the Eastern States, where during that period the shrinkage has been near a million head. If the Federal Government should take some steps that would encourage the industry, or that would attract attention to it, they might revive it in those States, where a very large proportion of our population is and always will be. In the near future I hope to address the House more fully than the present time permits relative to the proposal set forth in the amendment that I have offered.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting some data on the number now and in the past in the Eastern States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Following are the figures referred to:

Number of cattle on farms and ranges (excluding calves).

States.	1890	1900	1910
New Jersey	212,052	200,299	195,055
Pennsylvania	1,706,418	1,475,524	1,350,863
Delaware	51,844	44,817	47,833
Maryland	267,189	237,181	248,687
Ohio	1,763,387	1,558,729	1,581,925
Maine	299,110	277,053	224,622
New Hampshire	222,898	186,358	149,228
Vermont	395,288	400,356	362,741
Massachusetts	256,128	242,323	226,845
Rhode Island	34,777	30,696	30,375
Connecticut	203,661	179,758	174,717
New York	2,131,392	2,089,249	1,984,674
Total	7,544,136	7,022,343	6,577,575

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval stores investigations: For investigating the grading, weighing, and handling of naval stores, and preparation of definite type samples thereof, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $5,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the gentleman will not make a point of order to that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Five thousand dollars is not sufficient to start a bureau.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. This is a very important provision. It only carries $5,000, and means much to the naval stores industry of the South.

Mr. MOORE. That is the whole trouble. Five thousand dollars would not begin to start a bureau like this, but if the gentleman wishes to make a statement, I will reserve the point.

Mr. HARRISON. If the gentleman would investigate, he would not make a point of order against this provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a similar provision authorizing a leather investigation went out on a point of order, and I think a point of order should be made on this.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not make a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am merely making a statement for the information of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. This item was carried for the first time in the last Agricultural appropriation bill. It affects an industry that has been crippled probably more than any other industry in the country recently. The products of the naval stores industry have just been declared to be contraband of war. They are not allowing resin and other naval stores products now to be shipped to Germany or Austria, and therefore, to a very large extent, the markets of the world have been cut off from the manufactures in this country. They are having a hard time, and everything should now be done to encourage and aid them.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. If I have the floor I will.

Mr. MOORE. Does the grading and handling of naval stores in any way affect the farmer, or the forester, or the man who owns the timber?

Mr. HARRISON. It benefits the man who owns 120 or 160 acres of timberland as well as the manufacturer and the employer in the industry. They have what they call a southern grading of resin and what they call a New York grading—one is a cheaper grading than the other. In other words, the producer might sell his products on the southern grading and the broker resell on the New York grading, thereby obtaining a better price on the grading, where there is little difference in the grading and quality, than the producer obtained. This appropriation is to investigate that difference in the grading and obtain if possible a universal standard of measurement and grading and classification.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman this question, and then I will be through. Is the weighing, grading, and handling of naval stores of more advantage to the farmer or the man who owns the forest and caps the trees than it is to the man who has been heralded here from time to time to-day as a speculator?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, the speculator gets nothing out of this $5,000 appropriation. It is to protect the producer of resin and spirits of turpentine and aid the men who are actually and bona fide in the business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman conclude if I withdrew the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. To be sure; yes. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his point of order. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That not to exceed $55,000 of the lump-sum appropriations now available or herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles and boats, and that such vehicles and boats shall be used only for official service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall on the first day of each regular session of Congress, make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the matter is not subject to a point of order at all. I hope the Chair will pass upon the proposition. I insist that the Chair rule upon the proposition.

Mr. MOORE. This is new legislation, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. No. Two or three Chairmen have ruled on it. I do not care to argue the question. The Chair is familiar with it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire, before the Chair rules, whether this has been provided for in the law; whether there is any statutory law justifying the admission of this new item as legislation upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. LEVER. I hardly think it is necessary to argue the point of order to the Chair. It was passed upon in connection with the Indian appropriation bill and later on the Army bill and held to be in order. I think it is in order on this bill. It is nothing more nor less than a segregation of appropriations.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to produce the statutory law which provides for the inclusion of this item in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair wants that, the gentleman can give it to him.

Mr. MOORE. I ask that because the gentleman does not explain the item and wants the Chair to rule.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair has not the law before him, it is section 5 of the legislative appropriation act for the current year.

Mr. STAFFORD. But, Mr. Chairman, that law that the gentleman from Illinois refers to has no applicability to the Agricultural appropriation bill.

If the Chair will indulge me, the Chair has ruled on the question referred to by the gentleman from Illinois, as a limitation on the action of the department heads in the disbursement of lump-sum appropriations, that there must be specific appropriations for automobile service before the department heads will be authorized to spend the money for that character of service.

Now, the question before the Chair is whether there is any authority in law for the Agricultural Department to invest moneys in automobiles. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has frequently relied upon the organic act, that its purpose is to acquire and diffuse useful information relating to agriculture. It must be a very far-fetched argument to hold that on that ground you can justify the purchase of anything and everything for the dissemination of information. As far as the Indian Service and the war service and the Postal Service are concerned, it has been held that the character of those services naturally presupposed the having of conveniences, like automobiles, for the use of those services; but I question whether there is any substantive law which authorizes the Agricultural Department to purchase automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman this question: If the law directs the Department to do certain things, does it not imply the right of Congress to furnish the means to carry out the duties which the law imposes upon the head of that department?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the Chair is going pretty far in holding——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not held anything yet. The Chair is asking the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should say that any Chairman would be going pretty far to authorize anything which might be held to be a means of conveyance or communication.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the matter is very simple. It would be silly to say, first, that the Department of Agriculture could not expend any money for transportation. It would be ridiculous to say that they could not spend any money for the payment of freight charges. Yet there is no distinction between one kind of transportation and another. Years ago, on the military bill, the Chairman held distinctly that Congress had the same power to provide motor vehicles that it had to provide for the payment of freight charges; that it was all transportation; and that same ruling has been followed ever since. It is only for Congress in its judgment to determine how much the appropriation shall be. We could segregate the amount which we would allow to be expended for freight charges, as far as the appropriation is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is no doubt that this provision is in order, for the reasons heretofore given, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 19, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what the boats are used for that are authorized to be purchaseed under this section of the bill?

Mr. LEVER. There will be 3 used in the Biological Survey and 26 of them in the Forest Service. They use a great many motor boats in the Forest Service in Alaska and Florida.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman having reduced the amount available for the purchase of new boats, does he mean to leave the same amount available for the general purposes of the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I do, for the reason that after the bill was printed it came to my information from the department that the maintenance allowance was not sufficient, and I looked into the matter thoroughly and became satisfied that that statement is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all moneys received from, or deducted in settlements with, carriers on account of the loss of, or damage to, any property of the Department of Agriculture shall be credited to the appropriations or funds out of which the same was purchased.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter, in case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during each fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the purchase and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of property contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease: *Provided*, That any such expenditure may be made only upon the written assent of the President: *Provided further*, That a detailed statement of any such expenditure shall be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it, and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from South Carolina offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during the fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the purchase and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of property contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease: *Provided*, That any such expenditure may be made only upon the written assent of the President: *Provided further*, That a detailed statement of any such expenditure shall be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. I do not see that it differentiates from the paragraph that just went out on a point of order, except that the paragraph undertook to make it permanent law, whereas this is new legislation and is legislation on an appropriation bill, not estimated for, and there is no law for it. On that ground I make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I presume the provisos are subject to a point of order. Certainly the last one is; but I take it the gentleman has no desire to strike out the provisos if the rest of the amendment goes in.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; that would not effect the purpose I have in view.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order on the proviso?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; I make the point of order on the amendment as a whole. If one goes out, all go out. I make the point of order on the entire paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Of course the proviso is subject to the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. And therefore the whole amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will not the gentleman from North Carolina reserve the point of order one moment?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Of course.

Mr. LEVER. In order that I may make a very frank statement.

Mr. MANN. Let us offer such an amendment that we can get a ruling on the question, and not on an incident.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, and offer the following amendment. Will the Clerk read the amendment again, striking out both provisos?

Mr. MANN. Offer an amendment down to and including the word "disease," in line 15.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the Clerk report the amendment as now offered?

Mr. LEVER. It is to strike out the word "hereafter" in line 6, page 77, and on line 11 insert the word "the" for "each," and put a period after the word "disease" in line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after line 5, page 77, the following:

"In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during the fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, frankly I do not think that the point of order would lie against that amendment and I do not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 77, after line 22, the following paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out an agreement heretofore made by and between him and the State of Washington, through its proper officers, looking to the exchange of lands and indemnity rights with said State, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available until expended when the said State shall have made available a like amount to be used for carrying out the aforesaid agreement: *Provided*, That such exchanges shall be made on the basis of approximately equal area and value."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will only take a minute or two to explain this. This is offered at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the reason why it was not included in the original bill was that the agreement between the department and the State of Washington was not entered into until the bill had been reported.

In the exterior limits of the forest reservations in the State of Washington, including the Olympus Monument, is 500,000 acres that belonged to school lands of the State of Washington. For several years we have been trying to reach an agreement whereby the land could be exchanged so as to be in a compact body, in order that the State might be able to make use of the lands and in order that the Government might not be put to the expense of caring for that 500,000 acres. This is quite a burden resting on the National Government in protecting it from fire. The State is willing to bear this expense when they take charge of it. In addition to that, the State is prohibited from cutting the timber on the land, and much of this is already overripe.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I wish to say to the gentleman that South Dakota effected an exchange exactly as is proposed by this amendment for the State of Washington. The Secretary of the Interior has recently held that he will not ratify the exchange, for two or three reasons. Among others is the reason that under the constitution of the State of South Dakota, which is identical with that of the State of Washington, the school lands could not be disposed of for less than $10 an acre, and that the State of South Dakota could not convey to the United States a good title in exchange, such as proposed by these exchanges that are contemplated and that have been made.

In connection with the proposition of South Dakota, we had expected to offer an amendment to this or some other bill, but we were advised by the Interior Department that they would oppose it, and that they thought the matter ought to go over until it had been fully looked into and until it was decided just what could be done in order to make the exchange valid. I doubt very much, if the proposition of the gentleman should become a law, whether it would accomplish what he is attempting by this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary has asked for it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What Secretary?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What does the Secretary of the Interior say about it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this question is of too much importance to be decided at this point and at this late hour, and I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will withhold it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold it if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not much more to say, except that this is an advantage both to the Government and the State of Washington. This appropriation has to be made before the State appropriates its part. The State of Washington appropriates an equal amount to survey these lands. The conditions are that a great deal of timber is being wasted, timber that is ripe and can not be cut; and also timber killed by fire that can not be used.

The Government would save enough money in two or three years to pay its part of the expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to pass on the merits of this proposition to-night, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There have been half a dozen like cases within the last hour; why did not the gentleman make a point of order against them also?

Mr. STAFFORD. This matter has been up in the committee, as I understand, and some members voted adversely on it, and, therefore, there are two sides to the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. All right, if the gentleman constitutes himself the guardian of these matters; but he ought to be fair about it and not single out one item and make a point of order against it and let the rest be passed upon by a vote of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, $22,627,712.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the close of the bill in order to put in some very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the last item in this bill reads: "Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, $22,627,712." This amount, together with about $5,000,000 permanent appropriations, makes the grand total of about $27,000,000, in round numbers, appropriated for agriculture for the next fiscal year. I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that this money brings the best returns of any money appropriated by Congress.

When I first came to Congress the appropriations for this great business of agriculture amounted, in round numbers, to about $3,000,000. From year to year I advocated an increase of this amount, in proportion to some extent at least, to the increase and development of the great agricultural interests throughout the country, and I am glad that my efforts, together with others who agreed with me in this regard, have not been in vain, but have borne fruit to the benefit of all the people. I am a strong believer in this great department and its great work and increasing usefulness. In my judgment no department does as much for the general welfare of all the people as does this department of our magnificent Government. I read some statistics a few days ago which to me were very interesting. They are as follows:

A HALF CENTURY OF AMERICAN PROGRESS.

Since 1850 the population of the United States has more than quadrupled; there are now more than 100,000,000 people in this country.

During the past 50 years the foreign commerce of the United States has grown from $318,000,000 to $4,259,000,000, and the per capita value of exports from $16.90 to $23.27.

The national wealth has increased from $7,000,000,000 to $140,000,000,000.

The amount of money in circulation has increased from $279,000,000 to $3,419,000,000.

The value of farm property has increased from $4,000,000,000 in 1850 to $41,000,000,000 in 1910.

In 1850 there were 9,021 miles of railways in operation in the United States, and to-day there are approximately 260,000 miles.

The yearly output of factories in 1859 was $1,000,000,000; now it is over $20,000,000,000.

These statistics should be, and no doubt are, very gratifying to every true American citizen.

Whence comes this marvelous increasing wealth? Primarily, from agriculture, because it is the foundation of all our prosperity. Take away our farmers and agriculture, the result of their labors, and we would have no foreign commerce, no farm property, no railroads, no factories, no cities; but our onward march would cease, our foreign commerce would disappear, our factories would go to ruin, our railroad trains would stand still, and our centers of trade would become waste places.

[Applause.] Therefore the necessity of this great department and the manifest justice of the appropriations to sustain it in its great and continually expanding fields of activity.

In this connection I commend to the membership of the House the following poem written by S. E. Kizer, of Chicago, the city of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MANN]. I clipped it from the Industrial Educator, of Tippah County, published at Chalybeate, Miss., which paper was sent to me by my good friend, Mr. John D. Bell, of Walnut, Miss. I commend it to you not alone for its beautiful sentiment, but because of the genuine truth it contains. It is as follows:

THE MAN BEHIND THE PLOW.

[By S. E. Kizer in Chicago Herald.]

They sing about the glories of the man behind the gun,
And the books are full of stories of the wonders he has done;
There's something sort o' thrillin' in the flag that's wavin' high,
And it makes you want to holler when the boys go marchin' by;
But when the shoutin's over and the fightin's done, somehow
We find we re still dependin' on the man behind the plow.

In all the pomp and splendor of an army on parade,
And through the awful darkness that the smoke of battle's made;
In the halls where jewels glitter and where shouting men debate;
In the palaces where rulers deal out honors great,
There is not a single person who'd be doin' bizness now
Or have medals if it wasn't for the man behind the plow.

We're buildin' mighty cities and we're gainin' lofty heights,
We're winnin' lots of glory and we're settin' things to rights;
We're a-showin' all creation how the world's affairs should run;
Future men'll gaze in wonder at the things we have done,
And they'll overlook the feller, just the same as they do now,
Who's the whole concern's foundation—that's the man behind the plow.

[Applause.]

How true it is that "there is not a single person who'd be doin' bizness now or have medals if it wasn't for the man behind the plow." For this reason I have fought for his interest, welfare, and prosperity as best I could since I have been in Congress, and expect to continue to do so so long as I am honored by a seat in this historic hall of the House of Representatives. In helping him I help everybody in my district, State, and Nation. I will never consent to take anything away from him he now has, but will always help to aid him in every possible way in his manly fight for humanity and this great Republic. I will not even consent to deprive him of the garden and flower seed, but permit me to say that it gives me pleasure to send them to every man, woman, boy, and girl in my district who will write me a postal and request me to send them a package. From the smallest to the largest benefit we can bestow, I am for them all. I am just as ready to serve all my other constituents, as I feel sure they would readily testify, because nothing makes me happier than to be useful to them all and to "scatter sunshine in the pathway of all" and bring gladness and joy to their hearts and happiness to their homes every time it is possible to do so. Allow me, in conclusion, to thank all who have aided us of the Committee on Agriculture to pass this splendid bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 74, the paragraph beginning in line 21, for the purpose of withdrawing a point of order which was made against the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer an amendment that went out on a point of order making appropriations for an exhibit at the International Dry Farming Congress, at Denver, Colo., in October, as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri made a request for unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 74. Was there objection to returning to it?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman did not understand my request. My request is for unanimous consent to offer this as a new paragraph at this point at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time at the end of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain his amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. It is a paragraph against which a point of order was made.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is all right, Mr. Chairman, I think.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HEFLIN. This proposition went out on a point of order of the gentleman from Missouri, and he desires to return for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to let it go back in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman will not object. The gentleman probably does not understand it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment at the present time. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry: Is it necessary to get unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that it is not.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and report the bill and amendments to the House with recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is there not a motion now pending? There certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Washington made a motion to amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not offer an amendment but submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. I offered the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late; the gentleman from South Carolina has made a motion.

The question was taken, and the motion that the committee rise was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20415, and had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment. After line 20, page 74, I move to insert the following.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, on page 74, insert the following:

"International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Denver, Colo., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid region of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $20,000."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it has been held out of order in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. It was ruled out of order.

Mr. LEVER. It is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RECONSIDERING ACTION ON H. R. 20818.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday we passed the bill H. R. 20818, which was a bridge bill, and in the bill it refers to the general bridge act as an act approved March 29, 1906. It is a typographical error and should be the act of March 23, and I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings sending the bill to engrossment and third reading and passage be vacated and that the error be corrected by making it March 23, and the bill be again put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all proceedings on the bill H. R. 20818 be vacated back to the amendment period. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois is agreed to, and without objection the bill is ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

There was no objection.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, upon the request of Mr. NEELY of West Virginia, Mr. BROWN of West Virginia was granted leave of absence for one week on account of personal illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, January 29, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and lists of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1528), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5495) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1331), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21159) to amend section 4 of the act of April 21, 1910, entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1332), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARNER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 672) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives all facts in his possession with reference to the conduct of the collector of customs of the Laredo district, in the State of Texas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1329), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3878) to validate certain homestead entries, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1336), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21126) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *General Garretson* to *S. H. Robbins*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1330), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1328), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1334), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12075) to correct the military record of A. W. Sudduth, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1335), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18884) for the relief of Daniel Jordan, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1333), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20908) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wilkinson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 21219) providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in measurement of vessels for imposing tolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 21220) to amend paragraph 2 of section 3264 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, and as further amended by the act of Congress approved June 22, 1910, and to amend section 3285 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 3 of the act of May 28, 1880, and as further amended by the act approved June 22, 1910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21235) to detach Pecos County, in the State of Texas, from the Del Rio division of the western judicial district of Texas and attach same to the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 21236) to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY: Resolution (H. Res. 714) authorizing the printing of President's message vetoing immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 21221) granting a pension to John F. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21222) granting a pension to Frank E. Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 21223) granting a pension to Carolina Reichold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21224) for the relief of Carrie Stevens Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 21225) granting a pension to Ellen Hammon Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 21226) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21227) granting a pension to Nancy Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 21228) granting an honorable discharge to John Berrien; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21229) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21230) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Shock; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 21231) granting a pension to Mahala Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 21232) granting a pension to Smith Gee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 21233) granting a pension to Charles Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 21234) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Jamart; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of H. R. 18666, S. 6856, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of German-American Alliance of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petition of citizens of Broadlands, Ill., favoring embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANTOR: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill, H. R. 18666; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Herman Valet, Robert Podratz, Frank Hoppe, Henry Kammerer, P. O. Phillips, Richard Becker, Frederick Raduege, and 361 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, in the State of Wisconsin, indorsing and urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHOE: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of German Methodist Episcopal Church, of Paterson, N. J., favoring passage of bills to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring an embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of I. S. Freeland, of Change, N. J., and F. E. Langstrath, of Montclair, N. J., favoring the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of St. Stanislaus Society, Polish National Alliance, and Polish Roman Catholic Associates, all of Old Forge; Polish National Alliance of Throop; John Gasienco, of Carbondale; Polish National Alliance of Minooka; Zwiazku Narathowego Polskiego, Lackawanna County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Hoffman, Lafayette County, Shumway, Centralia, Effingham County, and Wakefield; Catholic Union of Effingham; citizens of St. Peter; and Central Verein of America, of St. Rose, all in the State of Illinois, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of Matthew Kilguss, Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Kent County Pomona Grange, Hope, R. I., protesting against rural free delivery being conducted on a private-contract basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Martin S. Fanning and Karl P. Wallin, of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of civil-service-reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Henry P. Ryder, Patrick S. Donlan, Joseph E. Donahue, James P. Walsh, Arthur L. Conaty, and James J. Daly, of Providence, R. I., urging the protection of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Louis A. Woll, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Wesley M. Oler, New York City, and Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against the export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of Louis H. Meyer and other citizens of Missouri, favoring House joint resolution 377 to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of citizens of Lutherville, Ark., to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Polish National Alliance, Local 940, Denning, Ark., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, protests of D. C. Porter, of Little Rock, and J. F. Williams, of Center Ridge, Ark., against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Polish Federation, U. S. A., 70, headquarters Argenta, Ark., against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEISTER: Memorial of mass meeting at Monessen, Pa., favoring amendment to abolish polygamy in United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Italian Protective Association, of Greensburg, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Patrick A. Donlan, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the treatment of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 24 citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring an embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Joseph Mackay, South Norwalk, Conn., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of S. S. Thompson Co., New Haven, and the Bridgeport Hardware Manufacturing Corporation, Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Francisk Ryter, Hartford, Conn., protesting against passage of Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Memorial of Forest Park Business Men's Association, urging the adoption of House joint resolution 372, for national security commission to inquire into preparedness of the United States in case of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petitions of citizens of Norwich, Conn., and vicinity, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of St. Stanislaus Society, of Norwich, and the Polish Catholic Society, of Rockville, all in the State of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Grand Haven, Sparta, and Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill, House bill 18666; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring Hamill civil-service reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring protection for the Catholic clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Carl Kruger and other citizens of the United States, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of citizens of Slayden, Tenn., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Slayden, Tenn., favoring rural-credit legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of Tw. Swt. Jozefa, Jamesburg; St. Joseph's Society, Perth Amboy; and Polish Roman Catholic Union, Sayreville, all in the State of New Jersey, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies of the State of California, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Society T. Kosciusko, Branch 1751, of the T. National, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Don S. Ford, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Pasadena (Cal.) Audubon Society and Alice W. Pitman, Elizabeth P. Evans, Lydia Pike, and Ellen L. Garwood, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipment of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., urging Congress to invite all nations to join us in a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Harvey H. Duryee, of Los Angeles, Cal., relative to the Zeppelin raid on England and urging protest by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of supervisors of Solano County, Cal., favoring passage of civil-service retirement bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 31 American citizens and citizens of Mankota and vicinity, to lay an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 29, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	James	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Catron	Johnson	Overman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones	Page	Stone
Chilton	Kenyon	Perkins	Swanson
Culberson	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Cummins	La Follette	Ransdell	Thompson
Dillingham	Lippitt	Reed	Thornton
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	Tillman
Gallinger	McCumber	Saulsbury	Townsend
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gronna	Myers	Sheppard	White
Hitchcock	Nelson	Simmons	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had intended to continue the discussion of the bill this morning, but I gladly yield to the Senator from Nebraska, and will follow the Senator from Nebraska when he concludes.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I ask consent to have printed and lie on the table two amendments to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I take it that all of us, without regard to party affiliation and without regard to the section of the country from which we come, are in favor of building up our merchant marine and are also in favor of lending whatever legitimate assistance we can in a legislative way to the upbuilding of American shipping on the high seas.

As to the methods that we should follow in improving our merchant marine or building up our shipping, there is great difference of opinion. I desire to concede, to begin with, that there is ground for difference of opinion. I have always been one of those who have opposed the building up of our merchant marine by a subsidy from the Treasury. I concede, however, that there are two sides to that question, and I am not questioning the fidelity or the patriotism of those who think we ought to resort to a direct subsidy. I have opposed this method, however, ever since I have been in Congress, and I formed the opinion myself several years ago that a better and more practical way would be for the Government itself to build such ships as might be necessary for our Navy in time of war, and that those ships, in time of peace, should be used through the instrumentality of a governmental corporation or some other method that would put them in use. It has never seemed to me proper to pay enormous subsidies to private parties to keep their ships on the high seas and then when we needed them, if ever, in time of danger we would be compelled again to pay for the ships themselves.

Several years ago I offered an amendment in the House of Representatives to the naval appropriation bill, the substance of which and the effect of which would have been, if adopted, to provide for the building of vessels by the Government and their use in time of peace through the instrumentality of the Panama Railroad Co. When the Alaskan railroad bill was before the Senate I offered a similar amendment here. It was, however, defeated by quite a large vote.

These introductory statements I make simply to show that I feel friendly to the method provided in this bill for the building up of a merchant marine through the instrumentality of a corporation. If I had my way about it, I would change the bill in several respects regarding this corporation with a view of keeping it from under the control of political influence, but my objection to the details of the bill in that respect are not sufficient to preclude me from voting for the bill if it had attached to it two amendments of which I desire to speak this morning.

I think it is to be regretted that this measure is made a partisan one and that it is drafted in caucus so that any amendments which may be offered here will necessarily be voted down unless they are taken up by the committee and by the committee referred to the caucus and receive favorable action there. I am in earnest about the amendments I am suggesting, and I wish it were possible that they might be taken up in this way with a view of having them considered. I have just as much interest and I think others have the same interest in the drafting of a proper law and in its proper consideration as anyone on the other side of the Chamber.

There is one respect in which I differ very materially from the President in his advocacy of a measure of this kind, and one of the amendments that I had printed yesterday, and which is now on the desks of all Senators, has to do with that part of the bill carrying out the President's idea that when through the instrumentality of this corporation we engage in business and build it up and make it profitable we shall immediately withdraw from it and let private parties take it up. My own idea is that if we go into the business and build up a line of trade or commerce with any of the foreign countries of the world or of domestic commerce and it becomes profitable we should, through the instrumentality of this same corporation, remain in the business and let the taxpayers of the country share the profits as well as bear the losses incidental to the building up of the business.

I believe the idea of the President in his message was not that we should make money out of the transaction, and I am not advocating going into it because I would like to see the Government make money out of it. There are two objects in view—one to build up the merchant marine and the other to put these ships to beneficial use when they are not needed as a merchant marine. Incidentally it will improve our shipping; incidentally it will perhaps decrease the rates somewhat; but I believe it ought to be the permanent policy of the Government. I am not in favor of going into it as a temporary proposition, and would rather stay out of it entirely than to go in only to build up a profitable business for somebody else to reap the benefit at the expense of the taxpayers of the country after it has been built up.

The President, in his message delivered on the 8th day of December, in speaking of the desirability of this kind of legislation, used the language I shall read. I will quote that particular part of his message in which he lays down the idea that we should not remain permanently in the business. The President said:

> It may seem a reversal of the natural order of things, but it is true, that the routes of trade must be actually opened—by many ships and regular sailings and moderate charges—before streams of merchandise will flow freely and profitably through them.

Again, he said:

> The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable.

That far with the President I most heartily agree. I think it must be conceded that when we undertake to open lines of trade and of commerce where there are none now we will necessarily lose some money in the venture. But even though we do lose it the theory is, and I believe it is a good one, that since it is almost imperative that we must have a merchant marine so that our Navy can be of any practical benefit in time of war we must make some provision for the merchant marine. It will be expensive, it will cost money, and when these ships are not in use as a merchant marine they would be idle unless some provision was made for their use.

But what the President says further, it seems to me, is wrong. He goes on:

> And then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw. I very earnestly hope that the Congress will be of this opinion, and that both Houses will adopt this exceedingly important bill.

It seems to me in that respect the President is wrong and in that respect this bill is wrong. The particular language of which I complain has been in every print of the bill. The President's message was delivered on the 8th day of December, 1914; the bill now under consideration was introduced on the 9th day of December, 1914—the next day; it was reported from the committee with quite a number of amendments on December 16, 1914; it was made the unfinished business on January 4, 1915. On the 6th day of January, two days thereafter, the committee withdrew its amendments which it had offered, and offered a new bill by way of a substitute. Again, on the same day, the committee withdrew its substitute and offered another new bill by way of substitute. In each one of those prints, in each one of those bills, somewhere in the bill was always contained language that would enable this governmental corporation provided for in the bill to withdraw from the business. It was not declared in the bill as the open policy, but it has always been there. I think it is the joker in this bill, and thus far in this debate it has not been noticed.

Mr. SIMMONS. To what provision of the bill does the Senator from Nebraska refer?

Mr. NORRIS. I am coming to that now. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that in the last print, the last substitute that was offered, it is found on page 2. It is part of the charter of the corporation provided for in the bill. I want to read that. In order to get the connection, I will read some other parts of the provision in reference to the corporation:

> Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes—

Under the authority contained in this charter this corporation could purchase ships, could construct ships, and could charter ships—purchase, construct, and charter; in other words, they could purchase the ships outright, they could build them, or they could lease them.

The next clause, however, gives the corporation authority to dispose of these ships, and that is the particular language to which I object. It is the clause in this substitute, and which in substance has been in every one of the bills, which enables this governmental corporation to practically go out of business whenever the President desires it to do so; for while this is done through the shipping board, the shipping board provided for in the bill is, of course, under the control of the President. Two members of the shipping board are members of his Cabinet, and the other members of the shipping board are appointees of the President. That is the language following that which I have just read, and reads as follows:

> And to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, organized under the laws of a State—

In other words, all of these ships, with the exception of ships that they might rent, this corporation can at any time lease out to other private corporations. They can lease every one of these ships for 99 years or for any other length of time. They have, so far as the practical operation of the business is concerned, power to sell them. The only reservation would be that these ships could be taken in time of war as part of our merchant marine.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will not agree that it is important that the corporation should have the power to charter or lease vessels under its control? There might be times when, for instance, a regular line operating ships to South America would be crowded with business and would not be able to take care of the cargoes offered. Is it not important for the corporation to be in a position to charter one of its ships to such line for a voyage, for instance? These charter parties do not generally extend over a voyage, or perhaps to three round trips. The purpose of the bill is to put the corporation in a position where, if it becomes important to serve commerce by chartering one of their vessels to a regular line doing business, as may be needed——

Mr. NORRIS. For temporary purposes?

Mr. FLETCHER. For a voyage, or even more than a voyage.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. Now, let me ask the Senator if it is the purpose of the language to enable this corporation to do that?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the main purpose, I think.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that the only purpose?

Mr. FLETCHER. Well, I do not know what contingency might arise. I would not want to say that that is the sole power or that that is the extent of the power or the extent of the purpose; but so far as I know it is the purpose to give the corporation the power to make these charters or leases as conditions may warrant. Of course, we can not tell what situation may develop.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say to the Senator that I am in entire sympathy with that purpose; I have no objection to giving this corporation the power that he has outlined; but if that be the purpose of those who are behind this bill, and there is no intention to permit the making of a lease that will be so long that it will have the practical effect of a sale, then the Senator can easily provide by a very simple amendment that such lease shall not extend over, say, three months or over a voyage, or something of that kind, or that it should only be a temporary lease; in other words, to declare the policy that this governmental corporation shall not go out of business unless the law is changed. Of course, it would always be in the power of Congress to do that.

Mr. FLETCHER. The main objection I have to that is that I would hesitate to hamper or embarrass the reasonable and proper operation of the line.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to do that. I would not object to any reasonable provision which might be put in the bill for the purposes which the Senator has outlined; but this language goes a great deal further. Even if we declared in the law that it was the intention to permit such leasing only for temporary purposes and that the intention of the law was that this governmental corporation, when it got into business, should remain in it permanently, it would relieve the objection.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The permanency which the Senator from Nebraska asks for is permanency of operation of these vessels by the Government, and not simply permanency of ownership?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not agree to that statement, because that means that they could be leased out for 99 years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the Senator from Nebraska misunderstands me.

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The permanency which the Senator from Nebraska desires is permanency of actual operation of the vessels by the corporation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is not satisfied simply with the permanency of ownership if the vessels are to be leased out?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I am not satisfied to give this corporation the power to lease out these vessels to various other corporations indefinitely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator, then, differs radically from those of us who would vastly prefer an assurance that they would not be operated at all.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is in favor of the Government constructing these vessels and then not operating them, if that is what he means, then I do disagree, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I mean exactly. I would vastly prefer an assurance that the Government would never operate them at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, if the Government is not going to operate them through the instrumentality of this governmental corporation, then, in my judgment, it never ought to build them. It seems to me it would be an economic waste to build a lot of vessels and not use them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How would it be an economic waste if the Government built them and leased them on a basis that would pay the Government 4 per cent rental on the money and 5 per cent per annum for depreciation and turn them into the

control of separate companies to stimulate the development of individual enterprise?

Mr. NORRIS. I see the Senator's point, and, of course, a great deal can be said in its favor. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has introduced an amendment as a substitute that will have that effect; but if the Senator believes that, then he is in reality opposed to the fundamental principles underlying this bill. There is no use of this governmental corporation being organized if we are not going to use it. The Government can build the ships and lease them direct without the interposition of the corporation provided for in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think so.

Mr. NORRIS. To that policy——

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator. To that policy I do not agree; that is, I would prefer that the ships be operated through the instrumentality of the corporation to be organized. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to make this suggestion, that the idea of leasing these boats instead of the Government operating them proceeded upon the conception that by leasing the boats to different companies and groups of men they would compete with each other and, by their competition, lower rates. We have tried that idea to a legitimate conclusion and have found that it is not sound. We have found that different groups in the United States, in England, in Germany, in France, in Italy, in Belgium, and in Holland instead of having free competition have an international trust; and why should we contribute $40,000,000 to enlarge a system that already exists?

If we were to lease these boats at 4 per cent rental and 5 per cent depreciation—9 per cent altogether as interest and as maintenance—the very men obtaining such leases would be the instrumentalities of a trust existing now. The very trusts existing would send individuals to make these leases and back them up. You would be able to trace the transaction with the very greatest difficulty. It would be almost impossible, and I may say practically impossible, to do so. They would act exactly as was done in Oklahoma, where the trust grabbed the oil under color of a lease through the medium of thousands of men acting under shelter, under the blanket, and operating for the Standard Oil Co. and for the Prairie Oil & Gas Co. under rules intended to establish free competition, but under a system that actually works out an absolute, grinding monopoly in the transport of oil out of that country through a series of pipe lines that have a perfect understanding with each other.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I take it, from what the Senator from Oklahoma says, that he is in favor of the amendment that I have proposed to strike out the language that gives this governmental corporation the power to lease these ships to others.

Mr. OWEN. I thoroughly agree with the idea which the Senator has, but I think to make it so drastic as to say that the shipping board should not under any circumstances make a lease would be going rather further than practical administration would require. I think the purpose of this bill, the intent of this bill, is not to permit leasing except under some exigency which would justify it, separate and apart from the conception of establishing free competition through a system of leasing.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, then, would at least favor an amendment such as I have suggested to the Senator from Florida, which would, of course, be entirely satisfactory to me. The Senator must understand that I have no objection to a temporary lease if it shall become necessary. I do not know that it ever will be necessary; but if such a contingency should arise, if this governmental corporation were operating a line of ships and they had no particular use for some vessel and some other corporation wanted to lease it to make a trip, as the Senator from Florida suggests, I certainly would have no objection to giving them the authority to do that; but under the bill as it stands this corporation could lease out every one of these ships for 99 years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, not only is that true, but is it not also true that the spirit of this bill contemplates that they shall be leased if practicable?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so. I think the Senator is perfectly fair, and that is the reason I read, to begin with, the message of the President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is the reason I can vote for the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Where the President outlined that course, and here comes the bill introduced the next day to carry out the President's idea containing this provision. So I take it that it would be the policy of the President when he built up through the instrumentality of this corporation a line of business which became profitable, then he would lease all these vessels for a long term of years to private corporations and practically withdraw from the business. That is what I object to.

I am perfectly willing, if Senators think there should be some clause in the bill providing, in case of an emergency, for a temporary lease, or something of that kind, that it should be in the power of the shipping board to make it; but what I desire to take away from this governmental corporation, what I desire to take out of the charter of this corporation, is the power to lease for an indefinite length of time, and practically put the corporation out of the shipping business, and I am glad to know that in that I have the entire sympathy of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I appreciate, as I am sure all Senators on this side do, the spirit of fairness with which the Senator from Nebraska is discussing this bill. I think we ought to have a clear understanding as to the purpose of this side of the Chamber, with reference to the provision which the Senator is discussing.

It is well known that there have been two lines of thought in this Chamber with reference to the ownership and operation of these vessels. One group have insisted that the Government should buy and operate, while the other group have insisted that the proper method would be that the Government should buy and own and not operate but lease. It has been my understanding that a large number of Senators on the other side of the Chamber who are opposed to the bill in its present form would not be disposed to offer any serious objection to it if it provided for the ownership by the Government, and that the Government should not undertake at all to operate, but in every instance lease, leaving the operation to private capital. There are on this side certain Senators who have taken that view of it, and who have insisted quite strenuously that the Government ought not to operate these vessels; that it ought to purchase them in order to meet an emergency; but that as soon as it purchased them it should lease them to private companies to be operated by them.

I think it is due, in fairness to this side of the Chamber, to say that that view has not met the approval of the majority on this side of the Chamber. It did not meet the approval of the committee. It did not meet the approval of the caucus, if I may speak frankly. I do not think this bill would receive any very hearty support on this side of the Chamber—although it would receive very enthusiastic support from some of the ablest Senators on this side—if it was understood that the Government was to lease these ships; that the Government was not to operate them at all, but merely to hold the ownership of stock in a corporation purchasing ships and leasing them to private individuals.

From that statement the Senator will see, I think, that it was not our purpose, in using the language to which he has called attention, to provide for Government ownership and private operation. Still we thought conditions might arise where the corporation would find it wise to charter this ship or lease that ship, just as any shipping company operating its own ships now and then finds it expedient, wise, and good policy to charter or lease some of its ships. Therefore we have not denied the board the right to lease, as we denied the board the right to sell the stock.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment; let me finish this statement. The Senator will discover in section 7 of the bill, I think, that while authority to sell the stock is conferred upon the board, it is upon the condition that the board shall have the approval and sanction of Congress; or, in other words, the board may sell the stock with the consent of the Congress, requiring additional legislation. We have not seen fit to put in that condition with reference to the power to lease. The board may lease, but it was not and is not the thought or the purpose of this side that this corporation shall simply hold the ownership of these ships for the Government without undertaking to operate them themselves, and shall lease them. That is not the thought, that is not the purpose of this side.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Just let me answer the Senator. I will yield to the Senator from Georgia later.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was not the purpose. It was sought to have the bill so framed that the board should be compelled to lease these vessels, provided they could secure reasonable rental, but that thought and that proposition did not prevail.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator has the right theory of it, if the purpose of this bill be as he states, that these ships shall

not be leased out indefinitely or for long terms to other corporations, then why not say so in the bill?

We are brought face to face with this condition: The Senator says it is not the intention to lease out these ships indefinitely; and yet there are Senators on that side of the Chamber supporting the bill because they are in favor of having them leased out indefinitely, and they see in the very language to which I have called attention the right so to lease. They support the bill, therefore, on the theory that these ships are going to be practically sold, leased out indefinitely, to other corporations; and then you are getting other Senators to support it on that side, I presume, from what the Senator from North Carolina says, because they conceive there will be a contrary policy. So you are getting both extremes with that kind of language. You are attempting to catch them coming and going.

Now, let us make it certain. Let us be fair. If we are going to lease them out, if that is going to be the policy, let us say so. If we are not, let us say so in the law. I think the Senators on that side who are supporting the bill believing that the proper policy is to lease out these ships permanently have the best of the argument, because it is undisputed that this language will give the board that power. It is undisputed that the President will control the board. It is undisputed that the President is in favor of that kind of a policy as soon as the business becomes profitable.

Now I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is it not true that the language used in this bill is very different from the language of construction which the Senator from North Carolina has placed upon it?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Instead of simply not denying the board the privilege of leasing out the vessels, it broadly gives them the privilege, and broadly encourages their lease.

Mr. NORRIS. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say that there certainly are Senators upon this side who supported the bill in the hope that but little operation will be necessary and that, practically, the result will be that the vessels will be leased to private enterprise.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a complete answer to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. WALSH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The thought I wanted to get into the Senator's mind is that it had been seriously and strenuously urged upon this side that we should incorporate in the bill a provision that these ships should be leased out, and that this side of the Chamber did not approve of that proposition; on the contrary, it emphatically expressed its dissent from that proposition; but that we thought it advisable to permit the board under certain conditions, such as may arise in the operation of any enterprise of this sort, to make a lease, and that the purpose was not to deny the board the right to meet those conditions and those circumstances by withholding from them the power. That is my idea of the thought we had in incorporating this provision in the bill.

I am glad the Senator is discussing it in the way he is discussing it. It may be that to carry out the views of, I think, a large majority on this side it may be necessary to modify that language somewhat. I am glad to hear the Senator discuss it, and, so far as I am concerned, I am listening to him with an entirely open mind.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, I understand the Senator is. The Senator understands, of course, that I would be delighted if such an amendment could be offered and adopted.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me say that my idea was that the bill was so framed that the board, and the directors of the corporation that they might select, would see that it was the purpose of the Government to own and operate these ships. We have denied them the power to sell the stock without the consent of Congress. The sale of the stock would have put the Government absolutely out of the business altogether. We have refused to incorporate in the bill a provision that they should be compelled to lease, notwithstanding that was insisted upon, provided they could secure reasonable rates, and we thought it might answer the purpose and meet the situaton if we left that question to be determined by the shipping board, composed as it will be of two of the leading members of the President's Cabinet and three other gentlemen selected by the President himself and confirmed by the Senate. We felt that we might safely trust them with a discretion to determine at all times while this measure should be in operation how many of these ships it was wise and expedient to lease and how many it was wise and expedient for the Government to operate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Let me first answer the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one moment, if the Senator will permit me. So far as I am concerned, I have seen in this legislation a larger emergency than that of simply supplying the present scarcity of ships to transport the products of this country to foreign markets. I see another emergency—an emergency of deep import and importance; an emergency not temporary in its character; an emergency which has not come upon us suddenly, but which has existed for years; an emergency that will continue to exist until our merchant marine is rehabilitated. It is the emergency of this Government's acquiring, either by Government ownership or through the ownership of citizens of this country, a sufficient control of sea transportation to make this Government and this people at least measurably free from the exactions and handicap of their competitors controlling the transportation facilites upon which they must rely.

Until that emergency is met I do not think myself the emergency which calls for this legislation will have passed. When we have secured a sufficient control of sea transportation to make us, to some extent at least, possessors of our own transportation to those open and neutral markets of the world where we have to meet the world in competition. Until we have been able to secure, I say, reasonably the possession and control of our own transportation to those markets and our relief, and to relieve us from our dependence upon our competitors in those markets for our transportation, I do not see how we can hope to meet their competition upon equal terms or successfully; but when we have accomplished that, then the emergency feature of this matter will have passed, and to my mind it will not have passed until then.

Mr. NORRIS. That means that it never will have passed, in my judgment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, I do not know how far that will go. I do not know how long it is going to take.

Mr. NORRIS. I am in favor of what I have outlined as a permanent policy. I am not in favor of going into this business and then backing out as soon as it becomes profitable, and letting somebody else who did not share the danger of losses in building it up take all the profits. I believe the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] is in harmony with me, as well as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], on this particular part of the bill; but the Senator from North Carolina can not fail to notice what has been said by his colleague from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], whose support of this bill, as I understand, was brought about because this language is in here. He believes in leasing these ships all the time to some other corporation, and he is supporting this bill because such authority is in the bill. I presume he takes into consideration, too, the fact that the shipping board provided in this bill is already on record as being in favor of such a policy, through the message of the President of the United States.

So it seems to me those Senators really have the better of the argument. Now, if it is the policy on that side that these leases should be made only for temporary purposes then this bill ought to be amended, perhaps not by the adoption of my amendment that strikes out the language giving this authority, but in a modified form as I have suggested.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. That would suit me just as well as the amendment I have proposed.

I want to assure the Senator from North Carolina that I do not want to take away from this shipping board, however it may be constituted, a reasonable discretion. I know that this corporation can not do business if its discretion is entirely taken away. I have no disposition, and it is not my intention, to interfere with a reasonable discretion; but we are giving the board a power to nullify this act if the construction placed on it by the Senator from North Carolina is proper.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. They will have authority practically to nullify it. The President, as soon as it becomes a profitable business, will be in favor of so doing, and they can readily say: "Why, this bill that you have passed gave us this authority. It was introduced to carry out the recommendations of the President, who himself made that kind of a recommendation. Therefore

we are entirely within the scope and the spirit of this act," if it is passed in this form, "if we lease for 99 years every ship that this Government corporation owns."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I dare say the Senator from Nebraska is not unaware of a fact, information of which was conveyed to the public through the press, that in the Democratic caucus the Senator from Georgia was one of three who stood for the sentiment he has expressed upon this floor. That was the occasion that brought me to my feet.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, he is incorrect in that statement.

Mr. WALSH. I am not incorrect in what the newspapers said.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was not the newspaper statement. I was one of three who opposed making this bill a party measure, and thought that the entire subject should be left free to amendment by all Senators. That was not the vote upon the proposition to restrict operation by the Government.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Georgia is speaking now of the newspaper report of the caucus or of the fact.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am speaking of the newspaper report and the fact, too.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment. The Chair wants to make an observation at this point. The Chair has heretofore ruled, and been sustained by the Senate, that if a Senator on the floor yields for any purpose except for the purpose of a question he yields the floor. That ruling would have to be made upon a point of order being made.

Now, the Chair wants to say that he is not going to enforce that rule of order if the Senate does not assist him in enforcing it. He can not go along here a part of the time with speeches being interjected in the argument of the Senator who is supposed to have the floor and no point of order being raised, and when a Senator wants to raise a point of order it must be enforced. It must either be raised regularly or the Chair will not enforce the rule.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I understand the Chair and I ask for information, I know the ruling has been as the Chair has said, but I have gone on the theory that unless some one objected or made the point no notice would be taken of it. I have no objection to the interruptions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The interjection of the Chair is for the protection of the Chair. He does not choose to be placed in a position of seeming partiality by any ruling upon this question. The Chair has once ruled and has been sustained by the Senate, and the Chair believes that it is the duty of the Senate to enforce that rule or to abrogate it.

Mr. WALSH. I rose for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Unless the Senator from Nebraska misquoted himself in saying——

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator now, after the admonition received from the Chair, must ask me a question or I can not yield.

Mr. WALSH. Very well. In saying that the President of the United States was committed to the policy of leasing these ships for a long or a short term, will the Senator kindly call our attention to that portion of the message of the President to which he gives that interpretation? I was not able to give it to any portion of the message to which the Senator now calls the attention of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, I presume, was here when I read from the message. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate to repeat it.

Mr. WALSH. I simply inquire whether it is the understanding of the Senator from the extract he read that the President is committed to the policy of leasing these ships for a long term.

Mr. NORRIS. The President is committed to the policy of this governmental corporation going out of the shipping business just as soon as the business becomes profitable. That is what I take the message to mean.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I was——

Mr. NORRIS. And I believe this language gives this corporation the right to practically go out of the shipping business by leasing all these ships for an indefinite number of years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I wish to ask a question, but rather of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. NORRIS. I presume I could not yield for that purpose. I would be glad to yield if it were not for the parliamentary situation, but I suppose that would take me off the floor.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me, he having the floor, I am quite sure that the President has meant all he said in his message in reference to——

Mr. NORRIS. I have not yielded to the Senator. I would be glad to yield, but under the ruling I am not allowed to do so.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to say——

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, if the Senator insists on talking, I can not help it, and personally I do not object to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. What I wanted to say was, that while I think the President may have some idea, as his message indicates, that the Government at some time will go out of this business, I think the President feels like a great many others of us, that so long as the Government does remain in the business it shall operate these ships and not lease them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the remark of the Chair somewhat different from the Senator from Nebraska. I understood the Chair to say that he has made a ruling and has been sustained by the Senate, but that the Senate is violating the rule so constantly that the Chair will not undertake to enforce the rule unless he is sustained by the Senate, and the point can only be raised by some one making a point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. I had supposed the Chair would not be called upon to rule unless some one made the point.

Mr. POINDEXTER. However, I wanted to ask a question. I am sorry the Senator from North Carolina has disappeared from the Chamber just as I wanted to get some information from him, but the Senator from Nebraska probably can answer it.

Of course, this is a legislative matter that has just been discussed between the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Nebraska, as to whether or not the Government shall remain in the business of operating these ships. That is a vital principle of the bill which is before Congress for determination as a legislative matter. Now, I should like to understand if the proposition is to transfer that legislative power and legislative discretion in effect to this board, divesting Congress of it. That would be the result if the board is going to have the discretion of quitting the business at any time it sees fit. If the board can do that, it can, in effect, repeal this law, if the purpose and intention of those passing the bill is what is stated by the Senator from North Carolina. He states that it is the purpose and intention that the Government, acting through this corporation, shall continue in this business until the emergency disappears. The whole bill is based on the proposition of an emergency existing. Congress is now debating the proposition as to whether there is an emergency. Congress is to determine whether an emergency exists which justifies the Government going into this business.

The Senator from North Carolina interprets this bill so that when Congress has passed the bill, perhaps when Congress has adjourned, at any time—it may be in a few weeks or a few months or a few years—the board created under the bill will take up then and discuss and determine the exact question which Congress is now debating under the conditions existing now. It will determine, under conditions existing then, the very proposition which is involved in this whole measure, as to whether the Government shall operate merchant ships.

Now, there is a little further inquiry I should like to make.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's question is already long enough, and it will take some time to answer it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator declines to yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I have really forgotten just what the question was. The Senator will have to repeat it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will not undertake to repeat it. I will repeat it in my own right at some future time.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe the clause the Senator refers to—the particular clause to which I have called attention—is delegating legislative authority to this board. It simply provides in the charter of this corporation that the corporation itself shall have the right to lease the vessels that it owns. I do not believe that is a legislative act. It does not appear to me that it would be subject to the objection that it was unconstitutional because it was a delegation of legislative authority.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Would not the effect of it be just as much legislative as the bill is if they lease all the vessels and go out of the business?

Mr. NORRIS. This legislation gives the permission to do that. We can provide by law for the building of vessels and then leasing them. We can provide that they shall be built by the Government and then leased to private corporations. We can provide that they shall be constructed and built by the Government and given to this corporation and by them leased to some other corporation. That is what this bill does.

It seems to me, from the admissions made on the other side of the Chamber, that this bill is so framed as to be guilty of the charge that it is obtaining votes under false pretenses.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. It gets the support of one man because he is in favor of all these vessels being leased as a permanent policy, and it gets the support of another man because he agrees with me that the policy ought to be that these ships shall be operated through the governmental corporation provided in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I submit to Senators that is not a fair way to legislate. We ought to do one or the other. While I am opposed to one and am in favor of the other, at the same time there ought to be no doubt about this bill, if it is enacted into law, as to what it means. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is not this a fairer statement of the effect of the bill. It gives unlimited discretion, does it not, to this board?

Mr. NORRIS. I think it does.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Either to operate or to lease?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Those who entertain the view I have upon the subject vote for the bill upon the ground that we believe this board, if not satisfied from the start that they ought to lease the vessels, will, from their experience, quickly realize that they ought to lease them, and that the result will be that the vessels will be chartered or leased and not operated by the Government.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator has made a very fair statement. I presume that is what has moved the Senator in his support of the bill. It all goes to show that some amendment along the line I have suggested ought to be adopted, or if the majority party in caucus favor the theory outlined by the Senator from Georgia, they ought to say so in this bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I merely wish to ask the Senator if it is not clear that when the operation of the ships becomes profitable, a President holding the views of the present Executive would then force the leasing of the ships.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think so. I would if I were President, and if the President did that after the message he delivered to Congress, and we passed this law as we have it before us now, I should say he was perfectly justified in doing it, although that is a policy in which I do not agree with him.

Mr. JONES. If we were to elect a President in 1916 who was opposed to the Government operating the ships, whether they are profitable or unprofitable, immediately upon his inauguration a shipping board would be selected that would lease the ships whether they are profitable or whether they are not profitable.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and if the next President who was elected was of a different faith and policy and believed the Government ought to operate them, he would immediately proceed to cancel all the leases, if he could, if he had the power under the leases or the law, and so we would have a checkered policy changing every time there was a change in the occupant of the White House.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield again to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. Would not that necessarily bring the matter into politics?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think so. I think it is already brought into politics a great deal more than it ought to be; but that would, of course, plunge it into every campaign that would come up, and the business, in my judgment, with that uncertainty would be a failure.

If the view of those in favor of building these ships by the Government and leasing them to private corporations prevails and that is enacted into law, then, of course, as a patriotic citizen or as one of those public officials, I would do everything I could to see that that policy was carried out in good faith, although I do not agree with the policy. At least the permanent policy of the Government ought to be announced in this law, and that is the object of the amendment.

The Senator from North Carolina has said that in section 7 the bill provides that the stock of the corporation can be sold with the consent of Congress. Of course that would be true, even if it was not there; Congress could amend the law, but when I read section 7, providing as it does that this board can sell any part or all the stock the Government owns in this corporation whenever Congress consents to such sale, I could not see why they did not say in the same section that they could not only sell the stock but they could sell or lease the property, the ships of this corporation, with the consent of Congress. That would mean that the law would have to be changed before these ships could be leased for an indefinite term. You can lease all the ships and still own all the stock, and while you practically put the corporation out of business technically the stock is already in existence and the corporation is still alive.

Instead of strengthening the idea of the Senator from North Carolina, that because we say in section 7 that the stock can not be sold without the consent of Congress, it would necessarily imply that the vessels could not be disposed of by long-term leases, I look at it just the contrary. If we leave the bill as it is, any President who wanted to lease the ships after they had been in operation for some time, after they had been built and owned by this governmental corporation, could say, "Well, I will lease these ships for 99 years. If Congress did not intend that I should lease them for an indefinite term, they would have said in section 7 that not only the stock could not be sold but that the ships could not be leased or sold without the consent of Congress."

Mr. President, I want to take up another amendment. I offered yesterday and had printed another amendment that I expect to offer and to which I desire to call the attention particularly of the Members on the other side, with a candid hope that they may take it into consideration through the instrumentality of the caucus, if that is the only way that it can be reached, and either adopt it or some other similar amendment having the same purpose in view. This amendment is intended to be offered as an amendment to the last substitute of the bill reported by the committee. On page 5 of the substitute, at the end of section 3, I propose to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no vessel shall be purchased under this act, which sails under the flag of any nation at war with any other nation which is at peace with the United States, unless prior to such purchase an understanding or agreement shall have been reached that will avoid any international difficulty or dispute regarding such purchase.

To my mind, Senators, there is great danger ahead of us, great danger of international difficulty, if not of war, if we pass the present bill without some amendment similar to that one. Men may disagree, do honestly disagree, I presume, as to whether the purchase of a belligerent ship after the breaking out of hostilities is an unneutral act. To my mind it is clear—under international law I can not see any possibility of doubt—but there are other men more able and wise than I am who take the opposite view. I had assumed up to yesterday that Senators on that side agreed with the proposition that under international law any ship flying the flag of a belligerent nation could not be purchased by a neutral nation and avoid the possibility—or the right, rather—of capture of the ship if it were used on the high seas, because in a colloquy that I had with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], joined in later on by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], I formed the opinion that they believed that was international law, but that if this bill were passed, it being provided that the Government shall purchase the ships and then turn them over to the shipping board, there would be no danger of our Federal officials purchasing any such ships to be transferred to this governmental corporation; but yesterday we listened to an able argument of considerable length by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in which he took the view, in a general way, as I understand, that there was no doubt we had a right to purchase such ships and that, as a matter of fact, we ought to purchase them and have the question tested and settled. He was satisfied that we had such a right, that we would be able to maintain it and establish that kind of precedent in international law.

It has been my understanding that, under international law, a ship sailing under the flag of a belligerent nation could not avoid the liability of capture by such transfer either to a neutral nation or to the citizens of a nation that was neutral. There are some exceptions—and I think it always has been conceded that there are some exceptions—which I am not going into now. A few years ago all the leading civilized nations of the earth met in a great conference in London and adopted what is known as the Declaration of the International Naval Conference. This conference was held in London, England, from December 4, 1908, to February 26, 1909. This conference, as I said a few

moments ago, was participated in by practically all of the civilized nations of the world, including our own. I have a list of them here, but I do not know that it is important to put it in. It is sufficient to say that Russia, England, Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Italy were represented there, and all joined in this declaration.

I believe it is fair to say that under international law each nation has a right to determine for itself the course that shall be pursued in time of war with regard to contraband and a great many other things, including the right to transfer ships during hostilities from a belligerent nation to a neutral nation. That being true, even without this declaration of London in this naval conference, each one of the belligerent nations would have a right to declare for itself in the case of hostilities what its policy should be. While this declaration was agreed to by all of the representatives there—as I understand, it was a unanimous agreement—there was no action taken by the nations afterwards in formally approving it; but England has declared her intention of abiding by the conference, with certain exceptions that she noted in the various declarations she has issued since the war. I understand that this declaration was also approved by Germany, by France, and by Russia. Article 56 of the declaration reads as follows:

> The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.
>
> There, however, is an absolute presumption that a transfer is void—
>
> (1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port.
>
> (2) If the right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor.
>
> (3) If the requirements of the municipal law governing the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled.

I am not now contending that any of the ships of which I shall speak in a general way are included in any of the three presumptions here, which are absolute. I am confining myself entirely to article 56 itself, wherein it is stated that—

> The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag * * * is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel as such is exposed.

There will be two things to prove if article 56 is brought into question. Supposing we pass this bill without making any changes in this respect, that we buy through this governmental corporation provided for in the bill some of the hostile ships of any of the belligerent nations, that we then take one of such ships out on the high seas, and that some other belligerent nation takes it as a prize on the ground that the transfer to this corporation of ours was void under article 56 of the London declaration—an article that no one of the belligerent nations on any side has modified, but which they have accepted and declared to be the law in full force—what would we have to prove under those circumstances?

I think it would be fair to say that there would be two things incumbent upon us to prove in order to escape the liability of giving up the ship as a prize. First, we would have to prove our good faith; we would have to prove that we bought the ship in good faith. I concede that would not be difficult to do, for I am going on the theory that the Government would not purchase a ship in any other way; that, so far as we were concerned, we would be acting in good faith. But, Mr. President, that is not all of the proof which we would have to offer and establish. Not only would we have to show our good faith, but we would be confronted with the proposition of proving that the vendor of the vessel in selling it to us had no intention of escaping the liability of capture at sea of his vessel, that he did not intend "to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel as such is exposed."

Mr. President, why are any of these vessels now interned in American ports? This is the most profitable season in the shipping business that has existed for a century. A man with a vessel that is able to carry produce from our shores across the Atlantic Ocean now, of all times under the sun, would be busy with that vessel, because there is now more cargo to carry at a higher rate than ever before existed in the life of any man who lives to-day. The very fact that his vessel is interned, the very fact that his vessel is not on the high seas earning large profits for its owner, is evidence of the fact that the owner is afraid of its capture at sea. The interned vessel is not only idle, but its owner must pay for having the right to keep his ship in a neutral port tied up to a dock that can not be used for any other purpose while the vessel is there. Its idleness therefore is a source of expenditure to him. Then, it seems to me, it would follow as logically as the rising and setting of the sun that under those circumstances his object in selling the ship would be, as article 56 says, "to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed."

Under no other circumstances that I can conceive of would he offer a vessel for sale, and under no other circumstances would his vessel remain there idle when it might, if it were not for that one thing, bring greater profit and benefit to him than at any other time he had owned that vessel or any other vessel. So, it seems to me, that as to one of these propositions we would absolutely fail of proof; we could not produce it, because it would be impossible of proof. We could not produce it, because the opposite is true and apparent to every man, it seems to me, who will look at it reasonably and fairly in the face.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska has not forgotten the circumstance, how would he account, upon his theory of the position which Great Britain is likely to take, for the statement which her own representatives made three days after the conclusion of the conference in the formal representation they made to their Government, that all that was necessary to prove under article 56 was that the sale was bona fide?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have not seen that statement and did not know of it, except as the Senator gave it to us yesterday. I assume that it is correct in all respects, of course, but I thought yesterday, when the Senator gave that statement to us, that it is an opinion expressed by some individual citizens of Great Britain.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Although they happen to hold high official position.

Mr. WALSH. And they were acting under the immediate direction and in absolute conjunction with Lord Grey, the official representative of the British Government.

Mr. NORRIS. That has no more effect than if, when we pass this bill, some one should say, "Why, the Senator from North Carolina said if this bill were passed the policy clearly outlined meant that the Government corporation should remain permanently in the business when it once entered upon it," and some one else should say, "Another Senator on an equal footing and standing with the Senator from North Carolina made the statement that if this bill should be passed there would not be any question on earth that the President of the United States and the shipping board could, without any inconsistency whatever, lease every ship that we had purchased." When the law came to be tested, what the Senator from North Carolina had said or what the Senator from Georgia had said would not be evidence. The court, as the Senator from Montana himself yesterday pointed out, would not take their opinion, great and able as they may be.

Great Britain has, since the beginning of the war, actually declared to the world that the London conference is in full force and effect excepting as she has modified it in her various proclamations; and in no proclamation has she ever modified in any particular whatever article 56. So article 56, whatever it means, according to the official declaration of the Government of England, is in full force and effect, and the same can be said of Germany, of France, and of Russia.

Mr. WALSH. But, let me ask the Senator, why does he assume that the Government of Great Britain will not take exactly the view that her representatives took concerning the meaning of this article?

Mr. NORRIS. Well, in the first place, I take it, Mr. President, that any man who reads the article can not possibly, as I view it, give it any other construction than the one I have placed upon it. It seems to me it is plain. The Senator must remember, however, that the officials of Great Britain who made the declaration of which he speaks, simply said, as I remember, in effect that this did not change the law as heretofore existing; that it did not change the position heretofore taken by Great Britain.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly.

Mr. NORRIS. That was it in substance. The position Great Britain has heretofore taken is at issue in that statement as well as article 56.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will excuse me, let me correct him. The representatives of the British Government declared:

> The provisions under this head are practically in accord with the rules hitherto enforced by British prize courts.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. There was not any doubt about that, was there?

Mr. NORRIS. There could be a great deal said on both sides of the question as to just what were all of the rules that were enforced heretofore by the English prize court.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Nebraska does not want us to understand that prior to that time there was any doubt about what were the rules established by the English prize courts upon this particular subject, does he?

Mr. NORRIS. I think there is some doubt.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator tell us of some case in which the doubt was expressed?

Mr. NORRIS. No; for the sake of argument, I am going to assume the literal correctness of the statement of the Senator from Montana. I am going to argue it from that standpoint. At most, it could be said that some official of England, after the declaration of the London conference had been agreed to, had said—and it was not an official who took part in the conference, either, as I understand——

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will excuse me, the statement was made by the English delegates to the conference——

Mr. NORRIS. That makes it all the better.

Mr. WALSH. Sitting, bear in mind, in the foreign office in the city of London, under the immediate direction and in immediate communication with the foreign secretary. It was made by the delegates to the conference in their official report made three days afterwards.

Mr. NORRIS. That makes it all the stronger, if it comes from that source. Here was a man who had represented Great Britain in this great international conference. He, of course, was anxious to have his Government pleased with the work of that conference in which he had taken such an active part. Naturally and properly he wanted to have it approved by his Government. It was the same with every other delegate from every other country; and anything that he could say that would have a tendency to bring approval from his countrymen he would say if he could consistently do so with his idea as to what had been accomplished. So that we must take his statements with that kind of an allowance, and then take the statement itself where it says there was "practically" no change. In my judgment there was some change. I do not think there was as big a change as the Senator from Montana argued yesterday, but I think that is quite immaterial, because the Government of England afterwards, through her proper authorities, through her regular legal channels, announced to the world the approval of this conference, and made no exception to article 56. When it comes to be construed by an English prize court, will that prize court say: "We are going to put a construction on this language that was put on it by a man who was a member of the conference"? They will not do so. They will cite the same authority the Senator from Montana cited yesterday—the Supreme Court of the United States—wherein it said that, in construing an act of Congress, the individual opinions of Members on the floor when they were arguing would not be taken into consideration. They will take the language, and I ask Senators to take the language. There is not anything doubtful about it. There is not anything covered up. I can not conceive of language being plainer. It seems to me there can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man what it means. Let me read again that part of article 56 that is now under discussion:

> The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void—
>
> The presumption is that it is void—
>
> unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

I do not believe there can be any doubt in any man's mind that when a ship which has been taken off the seas and hid in a port at a time when it would be more profitable than at any time in a hundred years to be out on the seas doing business is sold the sale was, on the part of the vendor at least, with a view of evading "the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, would be exposed"; and we would have to prove that such was not the case.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, just one other question.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to know whether the Senator from Nebraska desires to convey to the Senate the idea that he is of the impression that Desart, the English representative, sought to deceive Lord Grey, and that Lord Grey was deceived, as to the meaning of this article?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no. I do not believe the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] sought to deceive the Senate this morning when he gave his construction of another part of this bill; neither do I believe that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], who gave an exactly opposite construction, desired to deceive anybody.

Mr. WALSH. That is, the Senator thinks that Desart honestly believed that was the proper construction of the article and that Grey honestly believed that was the proper construction of the article?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is that what the Senator desires to say?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must remember that they did not say that there was no change. If you take their own language, they did not say that; they said "practically" no change; but my proposition is that it does not make any difference what they said. Here is the language. They are not going to pass on it. They will not be the prize court. While I may be mistaken about this, I believe it has already been stated on this floor that word has already reached our Government that the British Government will not consent, at least in one instance that has been put up to it, to the transfer of one of these interned vessels.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator would not consider that that settled the thing, would he?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I would not consider that that settled it.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that just as soon as we get doubt on this question, as soon as there is in the mind of any reasonable man any honest question as to whether we have a right to do this thing, and that the consequences of doing it might bring us into the present war, we ought to hesitate long and consider well before we take the step. The Senator from Montana himself, the only Senator so far that I have heard who has defended taking that kind of a course, has practically, in his argument, admitted that there would be a controversy. He says that if the prize court decides against us, that does not end it. That is true. He says we can take it up through diplomatic sources and settle it in that way, if possible; and if it can not be settled in that way, there is still another place to go, and that is arbitration. Now, that is all true. There is still another place to go, and that is to the battle field.

Suppose you pass this bill with this provision unamended, and one of these interned vessels is purchased, goes out on the high seas, is seized and taken into the prize court of a foreign nation, and is condemned, as I believe it will be, as a prize of war. What are we going to do about it? We can remain silent and let it go if we want to. If that is the case, we have lost our vessel and all the money we put in it. We can, after fighting through the prize court and getting beaten there take it up, as the Senator from Montana says, through diplomatic channels. What courses are left open to us? We can either quit and do nothing, we can ask for arbitration, or we can go to war.

I assume we would ask for arbitration. Let us see what kind of difficulty we would get into. What nation in Europe can furnish a citizen for that arbitration tribunal? Where are we going to get a tribunal to arbitrate the question? If the dispute was with Germany, do you suppose Germany would consent that a citizen of France or of England or of Russia or of Italy should be put on that tribunal? If the dispute was with England, would we consent that a citizen of France, of Russia, or of Italy should be put on the tribunal—nations standing for the same thing that England is standing for? Would England in that case consent that a citizen of Germany should be put on the tribunal?

So that arbitration begins to get in the distance to quite an extent. Suppose we consented to citizens of some of these belligerent nations going on the tribunal and we were beaten in the arbitration, what would our citizens think? What effect would the judgment of that tribunal have upon our citizens? They are already divided between these contending armies in Europe. The sympathies of millions of our citizens are on one side or the other in that controversy. What would they demand? Why, I fear there would come a demand that would say: "We must defend our rights. We will not submit this question to a biased tribunal, and we can not get any other. We will send with these ships the vessels of our Navy." There is where the demand would come.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is it disagreeable to the Senator to have me question him?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. I inquire of the Senator whether he would not regard all of the nations engaged in the present war as excluded from the arbitration?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I should think so.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly. Then does the Senator feel that it would be difficult to select arbitrators from the neutral nations—Italy, Spain, all of the South American Republics?

Mr. NORRIS. Well, let us take the first one the Senator mentions—Italy. Do you suppose that Germany, if we had

a dispute with her, would consent to that? And if we had a dispute with England, would we consent to putting an Italian on the court of arbitration?

Mr. WALSH. Let us exclude Italy, then.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. There is Spain.

Mr. NORRIS. The same thing is true of Spain. There is not a nation in Europe, whether she is engaged in war or not, but that would raise suspicion upon one side or the other.

Mr. WALSH. Well, assume that that is the case.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is fair to do it.

Mr. WALSH. I see no reason at all why any of these nations should object to a representative from Spain, from Denmark, from Norway, from Sweden; but in addition you have all the South American Republics, all of them or many of them furnishing some of the great standard writers upon the subject of international law.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but let us see what we would come up against there. Would any European nation consent that a European question should be settled by American or South American citizens? Immediately you run up against that prejudice. I want to say to the Senator that I believe it would be very difficult to agree upon an arbitration tribunal.

Mr. WALSH. We would have no difficulty in picking out arbitrators.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, we would not object to some, but we would object to some others, and what we did not object to they would object to.

Mr. WALSH. The statement of the Senator, then, is that England would refuse to arbitrate?

Mr. NORRIS. Possibly not; but after she agreed to arbitrate, the selection of the arbitrators would still be an undecided question that might defeat the arbitration itself.

Mr. President, I have been discussing a case with England. We have got that along to arbitration; but we will say this bill is passed, and we have bought a whole lot of ships. England got the first one that went out, which was a German ship. England captured it. It went into a prize court in England. The next ship that went out was one that had formerly been sailed under the English flag. Germany, we will say, captured that ship, and it went into a German prize court. The next one might have been a German ship, again, and a French man-of-war captured that and took it into a French court; and Russia captured another one. So we would have ourselves in every prize court on the face of the earth, contesting for something that all these nations are opposed to.

Is that where we want to go? Is that what we want to do? Can we afford to do it—the only great Nation under the shining sun now at peace with all the world? Can we, as such Nation, afford to take a chance of that kind?

Why, Mr. President, for the sake of a few paltry dollars we would jeopardize our good standing with the world, and, in my judgment, in the end would bring ourselves into this great, foolish, illogical contest that is now going on upon a hundred battle fields across the water. We can not afford to do it. I appeal to Senators on that side, let us not take a step that will by any possibility put us in a position where we will get into that kind of a difficulty.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that the Senator from Montana is right in every respect. Let us assume that. He admits that it will get us into difficulty. He admits that we will get into arbitration, and I think it will follow that we will be in a controversy not with one nation but with five or six nations, every one of them against us. Do not let any man get the idea that only England is against this idea. Germany, her enemy, is likewise against it. The Senator devoted most of his attention to England's position. Why, we are not confined to that. There is not any doubt in his mind of the position of France being exactly against it before the London conference, although he said it was ancient. Suppose one of these ships goes out on the high seas and is captured by a French man-of-war, and then we go into a French prize court. Does the Senator contend that what Lord Grey or somebody else said over in England is going to influence that court? Is there anybody here or elsewhere who contends that France could not consistently enforce article 56 of the London declaration? No man so far has made any such claim.

Suppose the vessel is captured by a Russian man-of-war. It is not so apt to take place, I concede; but if that is the case, we go into a prize court in Russia. Is there any danger of this? The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said the other day that there was not any, because nobody would be so foolish as to buy one of these ships unless, he said, they had an agreement with the other nations that they would not object. Then why not put it in the law? Why not write it in the statute, if that is what you believe is going to be done? Let us take no chances.

Why, I thought when I heard the Senator from Mississippi that possibly he was speaking for the administration, but it was said by the newspaper men who interviewed the President the next day that he was not representing the administration. I assume that the administration inclines more to the theory of the Senator from Montana, and I do not criticize any man for taking that position. Do not let anyone misunderstand me. He has a right to take it. I assume when he takes it there is a prima facie case against opposition to this amendment that I have offered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator refers to when he speaks of the newspaper statement of the attitude of the President. It may have appeared differently in different papers. I only saw it in one paper, and I gathered from that paper that what the President had said was that if this bill was passed and these powers of purchase were conferred, no one need apprehend that anything unneutral would be done in connection with the purchase of those ships.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what the Senator from Mississippi said, in effect. He said that there would not be any danger, because nobody would be foolish enough to do it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what the newspaper I read represented the President as saying. I do not know what he said. I do not know what his position about it is.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Perhaps the newspapers did not properly reflect the attitude of the administration, but Secretary McAdoo must reflect the attitude of the administration. There is no question about that, is there? I ask the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Why, Secretary McAdoo is a leading member of the Cabinet.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is he not the most potential figure in the administration outside of the President?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would not care to say that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator is the only Democrat who will not admit it; but I wish to suggest that when asked before the House committee as to whether the purchase of these interned bottoms might not bring us trouble, and when Mr. SAUNDERS said:

> It has been suggested that there would be grave objection to our undertaking to purchase German bottoms.

Secretary McAdoo, with astonishment, said, "Why?" And while dismissing the question of the diplomatic policy of the administration with the suggestion that he did not want to discuss it, he ventured to say:

> That is a question altogether aside, I think, from the issue. I believe that it can not be successfully disputed by any individual or any nation that this Government or any Government has a right to buy merchant ships, provided it buys them in good faith and for a neutral purpose, and that is exactly what would be done in this case.

There is no question about the attitude of the administration. The Secretary is astonished at the suggestion that you could not buy the ships of belligerents.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think the Senator read all of Secretary McAdoo's testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have read every word of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Somewhere in Secretary McAdoo's testimony, speaking about this very matter, he said that in view of the President's record upon these questions he did not think any one would doubt that the President would pursue a policy which would not violate our neutrality with other nations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, yes; if the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is all I said that I understood the newspapers had represented the President as saying about this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Secretary McAdoo did wind up his statement with a brilliant eulogy of the President of the United States, as he always does whenever he speaks regarding the administration; and he did attribute to the President discretion and judgment and care in making these investments; but you may rely upon him at all times to attribute to the President of the United States infallible qualities with respect to the exact attitude of foreign nations as to any question of this character.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senators will not engage in a colloquy outside of my remarks here. I should like to proceed. I do not want to consume too much of the time of the Senate, and under the admonition made by the Presiding Officer some time ago I do not want to get in a position where I might violate the rule.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course, if the Senator objects I will not interrupt further.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator for a question. He can put it in the shape of a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. All I desired to say was that I had understood the Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony—and I have read his testimony—as saying, in substance and effect, that we can safely trust the President in this exigency to do nothing which would violate the neutrality of this Government.

Mr. NORRIS. I think he said that. That has been said repeatedly by a good many people.

Mr. SIMMONS. And I think that is what the President is represented by the newspapers as saying in the interview—that nothing would be done by him that would violate the neutrality obligations of this Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, the President said he could be relied upon, but it is not the first time he said it. He said that he could be relied upon in the Mexican situation to prevent any difficulty, and he was not a good prophet.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was about to give the source of my information when the Senator from North Carolina interrupted me, but the controversy went on and I was not able to do it. I was speaking of what the Senator from Mississippi said, in substance saying that there was no danger of anybody buying any of these ships where there might any question arise, and if he had the buying of them he would not buy an interned ship unless he got the consent of the other nation.

I say that the President, in talking with the newspaper men the next day, said that the Senator from Mississippi was not speaking for him or for the administration. I got my information from a newspaper man who was there. I did not happen to see anything about it in the newspapers. That is no reflection on the President. I offer it simply to show that when the Senator from Mississippi rather conveyed the idea that he thought there was no use paying any attention to this because nobody had tried to do anything of this kind, he did not claim to be representing the President, but the President has declared, as I understand it, that he was not representing him, which I presume was the fact, going to show, at least being some evidence to show, that the President did not agree with that statement.

I was about to offer, and I shall offer, some additional evidence on that subject. We have an opinion given by the Solicitor for the State Department to the State Department which rather bears out the theory advocated by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. This was printed here. You will find it in Senate Document 563, Sixty-third Congress, second session, printed as a Senate document August 11, 1914, in which the Solicitor for the State Department expressed the opinion which I will read:

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE MEMORANDUM ATTACHED.

1. Merchant ships of a belligerent may be transferred to a neutral after the outbreak of hostilities.

2. If the sale of the ship is made in good faith, without defeasance or reservation of title or interest in the vendor, without any understanding, expressed or tacit, that the vessel is to be retransferred after hostilities and without the indicia or badges of a collusive or colorable transaction.

3. But transfer can not be made of such vessel in a blockaded port or while in transitu.

4. The transfer must be allowable under and in conformity to the municipal regulations of the country of the neutral purchaser.

5. The declaration of the London convention that transfers of an enemy vessel to a neutral during war will not be valid unless it be shown that the same was not made to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed, if it were controlling of the question, relates only to the good faith of the transfer and not to the ulterior motive of the parties to reap the natural advantages to flow from the operation of the vessel under the flag of a country not at war, while it inverts the burden of proof of the good faith of the transaction.

So I say the State Department has already been advised as indicated here.

I said at the beginning of my remarks to-day that in my judgment this advice was wrong, contrary to the declaration of London, contrary to article 56, contrary to international law; but it shows that the adviser of the State Department holds a different opinion. He is in error when he says:

2. If the sale of the ship is made in good faith, without defeasance or reservation of title or interest in the vendor, without any understanding, expressed or tacit, that the vessel is to be retransferred after hostilities and without the indicia or badges of a collusive or colorable transaction.

The good faith, as I pointed out, and I am not going over it again, provided for in article 56 is not only on the part of the purchaser but on the part of the vendor as well. He must have made this transfer without any idea of evading the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed. It makes absolutely no difference whether we pay the full price of the vessel, whether, as far as we are concerned, it is absolutely bona fide, although we must prove that. I am assuming that we will be able to prove that. I do not suppose our Government would buy a vessel except it acted in good faith. But whatever good faith we may have can not apply to the man who owns the vessel. We can not get down into his heart and find the reason why he transferred it. But it is quite apparent that he transferred it to avoid its capture on the high seas, especially if his vessel is interned and held in idleness at a time when it would be earning him much money.

But, Mr. President, that is not the only evidence the administration holds to the idea of the Senator from Montana. The Senate received an official communication on the 26th day of January, 1915, signed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury, two members of the President's Cabinet, both of whom will be members of this shipping board if this bill passes unamended In that official communication they say, in disputing the charge that has often been made that the only vessels that could be purchased if this bill were passed are German vessels that are interned in American ports—they say that is not true, that there are other vessels which can be purchased, as well; and they say:

There is attached to this report as Exhibit 76 a list of ships offered by the Merchant Marine Agency, J. V. McCarthy, manager, Boston, Mass., from which it will be seen that there are 15 ships of English registry and 7 of German registry which he proposes to sell.

Further, where we get Exhibit 75, we find a minute description of each one of those vessels—15 under the English flag and 7 under the German flag—that one man has for sale and wants to sell to this new corporation.

Mr. President, let us not get the idea that it is going to be confined to vessels of one nationality alone. We will have various kinds of ships that, if we purchase, will be subject to seizure.

It seems to me, taken in connection with the address of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the statement of the President, that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the statement referred to did not represent the administration. The statement read by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] from the Secretary of the Treasury, the official letter of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury, giving us the list of these ships, all taken together, demonstrate absolutely that we are sailing on the rocks if we pass this bill unamended. If Senators believe that our Government should not purchase ships sailing under the flag of a belligerent nation without the consent of the other nations, then there can be no objection to this amendment.

Some Senators have said if we purchase, for instance, German vessels interned in our ports, England would be glad of it. It may be she would in some instances; I do not know. There might be cases; it may be it would be so in all of them. If that be true, then why should this amendment not be adopted?

Some Senators say, "Why, before the President would purchase a German vessel he would get the consent of England, and England would not object, because she would rather the vessel would be sailing under our flag than after the war to be back under the German flag, and besides, it would help in carrying produce to England." Assuming that to be true, what is the objection to the amendment?

If the Senator from Montana has the right position the President will not take that course. He will want this question settled, and the way to settle it will be to take a ship without the consent of anybody, just the same as we were going to have free coinage without the consent of any other nation on earth. That will settle it; it will be determined. The fact that that difficulty will arise, and it is practically undisputed that it will arise, is a sufficient reason for the adoption of this amendment.

But take the German vessel. Suppose England does consent, what about France or Russia? Suppose France says no and France seizes the vessel, and there is much more danger of our being defeated in a prize court and in arbitration if France seizes it than if it was seized by England, because there is no dispute but what France itself before the declaration of London held that th transfer under such circumstances of the ship of a belligerent nation to a neutral one was void and did not relieve her from capture on the high seas. France at least will not have to take a step backward. France at least is consistent in that course.

Mr. President, I know the amendment offered by me can not be adopted on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], one of the leading Senators on the other side, has very kindly given me credit within the last hour for being fair in this discussion, saying, in regard to the other amendment, that he did not know but what it ought to be taken up and considered by the committee. I want to appeal to him as a patriotic citizen to take the same course with regard to this amendment. If we must be ruled by caucus action, which

of course I do not agree to, I submit to it because I must submit to the inevitable, but if we must be ruled by caucus action, then in the name of peace I ask the Senators on the other side to give consideration to this question.

It is no reflection on the President; it can not be construed as such, to put into the law what we think ought to be there, and it is no reflection on the President if he thinks we have a right to go and take these ships without anybody else's consent. I concede he has a right to that opinion. I no more find fault with him if he holds that opinion than I do with the very able and distinguished Senator from Montana who holds that opinion. But it seems to me that before us there is a difficulty that will lead us, because of the difficulty of obtaining arbitration, to one of two dilemmas. It seems to me either that we will let these ships go to the prize court and abide the judgment of the prize court without any controversy afterwards or we send our Navy out on the seas to defend these vessels against all other nations.

Mr. President, even if you assume that this bill, unamended if enacted into law, will not bring about difficulties because the President will never purchase a ship of a belligerent without the consent of the other belligerent, you have not answered the argument fully, because I say the passage of this law without some statement in it in regard to the position of the American Government will of itself create an international suspicion against us all over the civilized world.

We sent our representatives to London who took part in that conference, a conference participated in by all the world, and practically all the belligerents of the world announce that they uphold that conference with certain exceptions in regard to contraband which they enumerate. We alone would stand out and say to the balance of the civilized world, "Article 56 is not in force; we will not abide by it; but for the sake of a few paltry dollars we will defy civilization and go back of the conference and stand out alone against the world in favor of our right to purchase these contraband ships."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it the view of the Senator that we should go to the extent of excluding the purchase of any belligerent vessels or simply that we should follow the article he has just referred to in the London conference, and exclude any vessel the purchase of which is denied by that provision?

Mr. NORRIS. The amendment I read at the beginning of my remarks I will read again, because it will answer the Senator's question, and then I have just a few words to say in regard to the amendment and I am done. This I propose to put in the bill at the end of the section where provision is made for the purchase.

Provided, That no vessel shall be purchased under this act which sails under the flag of any nation at war with any other nation which is at peace with the United States, unless prior to such purchase an understanding or agreement shall have been reached that will avoid any international difficulty or dispute regarding such purchase.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Would it not be amply far enough to limit the purchase according to the language of the London conference? Would not that be just as far as——

Mr. NORRIS. To me that would be sufficient, but I understand there are men—able men like the Secretary of the Treasury, the Senator from Montana, and the legal adviser of the State Department—who contend that even under the London conference we have a right to purchase these vessels. I do not see how anyone can contend that. I can not get that out of the language, but I concede, of course, the fact that I may be wrong and the others right.

I want to say in regard to this amendment I had first prepared it to simply prohibit the purchase of these vessels. For instance, the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] prohibits absolutely the purchase of these vessels, and prohibits as well the purchase of any vessels from a nation that gives a subsidy. I, of course, am not in favor of that amendment. I thought if the amendment provided that no vessel flying the flag of a belligerent nation should be purchased, and just make it absolute, it would be sufficient; but I have talked with some Members of the majority in this body and some Members on this side in regard to such a provision, and they have agreed that there might be cases where that kind of a rule would be too stringent. As was said by the Senator from Mississippi, perhaps these other Governments would not object in case of our purchasing the vessels, and if they do not, certainly there ought to be no prohibition against their purchase, and I agree to that. So I have drawn this amendment with that in view. If it does not express the idea, if some other idea that will carry out the theory just as well can be better expressed, as no doubt may be true after you consider it in committee or in caucus, of course it will be satisfactory to me. But it seems to me that it is your duty, having this responsibility on you now, to so shape this bill that there will be no danger even of a serious international dispute arising out of it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. There will come a time—I hope it is not far in the future—when this furious war will draw to a close and when the world with one acclaim will be looking to the United States to take the lead in bringing about peace and the ceasing of hostilities. Let us take no step here that will either directly or indirectly cause any ripple of suspicion in the civilized world against our good intentions.

Senators, when that time comes we can not say now how great may be our responsibility. There can be no reason now why we should not strengthen our good standing with all the belligerent nations by putting in the law this amendment either directly or in substance. It will elevate us in their minds. It will place us above suspicion. No man can then point the finger of suspicion at us and say, "You passed this legislation, running the risk even of going to war, in order that you might make a few dollars in commercial transactions."

I yield to the Senator from Montana for a question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska has suggested that some serious difficulty may arise in respect to the choice of arbitrators if this matter should eventually go before arbitrators, I desire to inquire of him whether he has in mind these provisions of The Hague convention of 1899:

ARTICLE 23.

Within the three months following its ratification of the present act each signatory power shall select four persons at the most, of known competency in questions of international law, of the highest moral reputation, and disposed to accept the duties of arbitrators.

The persons thus selected shall be inscribed as members of the court, in a list which shall be notified by the bureau to all the signatory powers.

Any alteration in the list of arbitrators is brought by the bureau to the knowledge of the signatory powers.

And the succeeding paragraph:

ARTICLE 24.

When the signatory powers desire to have recourse to the permanent court for the settlement of a difference that has arisen between them, the arbitrators called upon to form the competent tribunal to decide this difference must be chosen from the general list of members of the court.

Failing the direct agreement of the parties on the composition of the arbitration tribunal, the following course shall be pursued:

Each party appoints two arbitrators, and these together choose an umpire.

If the votes are equal, the choice of the umpire is intrusted to a third power, selected by the parties by common accord.

Our Government has appointed as members of that permanent tribunal Mr. George Gray, Mr. Oscar S. Straus, Mr. ELIHU ROOT, and Mr. John Bassett Moore, and the other signatory powers have completed their quota of members of the court. I desire to inquire of the Senator whether he still has apprehensions about the possibility of organizing an arbitration tribunal?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, Mr. President; I still have apprehensions about the possibility of organizing an arbitration tribunal. I suppose, of course, that the Senator from Montana knows that I have always been in my weak way an advocate of international arbitration. I favor it; I believe in it; and I do not say now and I have not said in the course of my remarks that we would absolutely not be able to get an arbitration tribunal under the present conditions. But I did say that it would be extremely difficult. It might result in an impossibility. It would with most of the signatory powers to that convention at war with each other.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator pardon me until I read the list of the signatory powers?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator can, but I do not care to take up the time. I think we all know in a general way.

Mr. WALSH. We start in with Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, German Empire, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Servia, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose we eliminate those that are either directly or indirectly interested, what have we left? We have Mexico left. Do you say it would be possible to get persons out of Mexico now to settle an international difficulty, and would we want to submit it to them if we did?

Mr. GALLINGER. China.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests China. We can get one from Ecuador. There are several countries where we can get them to settle the difficulty all Europe is interested in. Do you suppose they would agree to it? Do you suppose we would ourselves demand it?

It all goes to prove, Mr. President, that right ahead of us is this difficulty that I have pointed out in my weak way. But the Senator really admits it, although he minimizes, I think, the difficulty that will come; there is no escape from it, Mr. President. Every time the Senator interrupts and asks a question he only leads us further into that difficulty. It is only an additional demonstration that trouble is ahead if we do not amend this bill.

This amendment would not appeal I know to the Senator from Montana, because it would avoid a question that he wants to settle. The Senator is so belligerent in his good-natured way that he sees here an opportunity for a discussion and a debate and he wants the Government to get into it right away. But at the other side of that discussion and that debate there is danger of war even though we take some time in reaching it. In any case there is this thing sure, that in the eyes of the world the American Government has gone down by leaps and bounds.

Mr. WALSH. Let me inquire of the Senator from Nebraska, then, whether he believes that Secretary Marcy, Secretary Cass, Secretary Fish, and Secretary Evarts all pursued a most unwise policy in counseling the purchase of such ships?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no. I have always felt pretty good when I read about our great statesman who preceded all of us a good while who said, "Millions for defense but not a cent for tribute." I do not want the Senator to get the idea that I think the American people ought to be cowards. I do not want the Senator to get the idea that I am not in favor of defending ourselves on all occasions where we conscientiously believe we are right. But I want to be just as careful that we do not put a chip on our shoulder and walk out into the international world and say to all the balance of the world, "Knock it off." The man who puts a chip on his shoulder and the man who knocks it off are probably both at least inviting trouble. We ought not to do it. It is no indication that we are cowards or that we lack either the energy or bravery or the courage to defend ourselves and our flag when we put into a law of this kind a provision that will keep us out of international difficulty that everybody admits we will get into without it. We ought to avoid a quarrel.

I believe we ought always to keep in mind, as I said a while ago, the fact that we are almost alone among the leading nations of the world at peace. Everybody else is quarreling. We are going to have a responsibility before long undoubtedly on our shoulders to help to bring about the settlement of this great strife. We can not afford for the sake of settling a question about which I do not believe there can be any doubt to begin with, or for the sake of making a few dollars, to run any risk of putting ourselves in disrepute before the world or endangering our country and our flag, as I believe this measure will do, even to the extent of getting into war.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who has just taken his seat, did not intend to misrepresent my position with reference to the ownership of these vessels, and yet sometime ago he made a statement as to my position that does misrepresent it. I simply want to make my position clear.

The Senator stated that I had said I wanted the Government to remain permanently in the shipping business. The Senator misunderstood me if he understood me to say that. What I did say was that we were not going into this business, from my standpoint, simply to meet the emergency of a present scarcity of ships. I said that in my judgment there was another and a broader emergency, and I undertook to describe that emergency. I said that until these two emergencies were met and remedied I thought the Government ought to remain in the business and operate these vessels through the corporation provided in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. ASHURST.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to inquire if there has been any business transacted since the last roll call? If so, I do not now recall what it was. Will the Senator from Utah indicate what he has in mind?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] introduced a couple of amendments after the roll was last called.

Mr. SIMMONS. Was he recognized to introduce them and did he introduce them?

Mr. SMOOT. He did introduce them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I withdraw the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Borah	Gore	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	Owen	Stephenson
Bryan	Hitchcock	Page	Sterling
Burton	Hollis	Perkins	Swanson
Catron	James	Pittman	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Pomerene	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Reed	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Colt	Lodge	Shafroth	Warren
Culberson	McLean	Sheppard	White
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Williams
Dillingham	Myers	Simmons	Works
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to state that my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], is detained from the Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who is detained on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I know that rumors should always be taken *cum grano salis*, but the word has been passed around the Senate that we are to be kept here all night, and that we are likely to see the sun rise before we are permitted to go to our homes. In that connection it has been very strenuously urged that we are engaged in a filibuster on this bill, and from certain Democratic utterances the country would be led to believe that a filibuster is a very unusual thing in this body.

Mr. President, I have listened hour after hour to Democratic Members of this body engaged in what we supposed was a filibuster, who, taking their utterances now, one would suppose that if they should meet a filibuster on the street they would call upon the police to rescue them from it. We have had a good many filibusters during the 23 years that I have been a Member of this august assembly, and I want to call attention very briefly to a few of them. It will be remembered that in the closing days of the last administration we had over 200 filibusters in this Chamber, one succeeding another, when our Democratic friends marched in solemn column to the cloakroom, preventing us from getting a quorum, and then marching solemnly into the Chamber when it suited their purpose to do so. They have forgotten that, very likely, and hence they look with great concern upon the so-called filibuster that is now going on, when in reality we are trying by legitimate debate to defeat an utterly obnoxious and dangerous piece of legislation.

The length of time that we have taken to discuss the pending bill, Mr. President, which, from my viewpoint, has done a great deal of good, is a very short period compared with what we have taken to discuss other bills in the past. A tariff bill in 1883 was debated in the Senate 33 days. My friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] remembers it well. The Mills bill, in 1888, was debated 10 days in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress and 31 days in the second session—41 days. The McKinley bill, in 1895, passed the Senate after 44 days' debate and 2 days' debate on the conference report. The Wilson-Gorman bill was debated in the Senate 3 months and 1 day in 1894. The Dingley tariff bill, in 1897, passed the Senate after 37 days' debate on the bill and 5 days' debate on the conference report. The Panama Canal tolls bill was considered in

the Senate from May 29 to August 26 in 1912, almost 3 months. The Canadian reciprocity bill was debated in the Senate from May 1 to July 22, 1911—2 months and 21 days.

Mr. President, I recall some of the noted speeches made in this body on some of those bills.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Wyoming

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator remember—I am not quite certain whether or not he was then a Member of this body—the contest over the so-called force bill 24 years ago, which extended through December and January, during which the carpet on the floor fronting the cloakroom on the other side was worn out with Senators passing in and out to break and make a quorum?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was a Member of the House of Representatives in the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses. At the end of four years' service I seriously came to the conclusion that I ought to return to my profession, in the practice of which I could care for my family better than I could in public life, and I was absent from public life for two years. So I was absent and not a Member of either House during the debate on the force bill; but I read about it, and I know that one Senator spoke 13 hours on that bill without cessation, and that many other Senators did the same thing; that the quorum was broken time after time and the roll was called every little while.

I remember that one Senator spoke 14 hours on the bill to repeal the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman law; one Senator spoke on the river and harbor bill 14 hours; another Senator spoke 18 hours and 20 minutes on the currency bill, during which 39 roll calls for a quorum were made in a single day; that a merchant-marine bill was defeated by a filibuster carried on by two Senators on the other side; that another Senator spoke for 8 hours and 5 minutes on the adoption of the resolution declaring Senator Lorimer entitled to a seat in the Senate; that another Democratic Senator spoke 12 or 13 hours on the resolution approving the constitution adopted by the constitutional convention of the Territory of New Mexico; and we all know that another Senator occupied quite a little time in a discussion of the river and harbor bill at the last session.

Mr. President, when filibusters were carried on by our Democratic friends when they were in the minority we were constantly told that that was the only protection the minority had against the aggressions of the majority; that it was the only weapon they had to defeat bad legislation; and that they were justified in using it to the fullest extent. I never felt like quarreling with that declaration, because really it seems to me that when some great fundamental or constitutional question is involved to which the minority is firmly opposed the fullest possible latitude of debate ought to be allowed until the country is fully informed concerning the matter.

The late John B. Gough, one of the greatest orators that this country has produced, in one of his impassioned addresses spoke of the minority, and inasmuch as our Democratic friends have been in the minority most of the time I know it will appeal to them. This is what Mr. Gough said:

> What is a minority? The chosen heroes of this earth have been in a minority. There is not a social, political, or religious privilege that you enjoy to-day that was not bought for you by the blood and tears and patient sufferings of the minority. It is the minority that have vindicated humanity in every struggle. It is a minority that have stood in the van of every moral conflict and achieved all that is noble in the history of the world. You will find that each generation has been always busy in gathering up the scattered ashes of the martyred heroes of the past to deposit them in the golden urn of a nation's history. Look at Scotland, where they are erecting monuments—to whom? To the Covenanters. Ah, they were in a minority. Read their history, if you can, without the blood tingling to the tips of your fingers. These were the minority that, through blood, and tears, and bootings, and scourgings—dyeing the waters with their blood and staining the heather with their gore—fought the glorious battle of religious freedom. Minority! If a man stand up for the right, though the right be on the scaffold, while the wrong sits in the seat of government; if he stand for the right, though he eat, with the right and truth, a wretched crust; if he walk with obloquy and scorn in the by-lanes and streets while falsehood and wrong ruffle it in silken attire, let him remember that wherever the right and truth are there are always "troops of beautiful tall angels" gathered round him, and God himself stands within the dim future and keeps watch over His own! If a man stands for the right and the truth, though every man's finger be pointed at him, though every woman's lip be curled at him in scorn, he stands in a majority, for God and good angels are with him, and greater are they that are for him than all they that be against him.

Mr. President, I have called attention to the fact that the minority have rendered both the country and the majority in this body great service by discussing the pending bill and thus giving to the majority time to reconstruct it, which they have done at least three times.

The able speech just made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] opened new avenues of thought, which led the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to admit that possibly other amendments to the bill may be desirable.

Mr. President, in picking up the morning paper my attention was attracted to two or three matters that struck me as being of very great interest at the present time. The heading to the first article is, "Mexico City falls to Carranza army"; in other words, the conflict in Mexico, in which we intervened and from which we retreated, is going on; bloodshed is rife throughout that unfortunate Republic. What does it all mean? What does it mean, Mr. President, that this country has said to the nations of the world that we will take care of their interests in Mexico as well as our own? Why have we, under the Monroe doctrine, kept England and Germany out of Mexico and prevented them from redressing their wrongs and securing their rights? We all hope that that fearful struggle in Mexico will at some time come to an end; but when it comes to an end, Mr. President, in view of the attitude our Government has taken on that question, who is wise enough to know what indemnity will be demanded of the United States by England, Germany, and possibly other nations?

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator what he thinks would have happened if the United States had landed an army and with its naval vessels had blockaded a port on the coast of England and, having taken possession of a port of that country and collected a million dollars of the money of the people of England, had then sailed off to the United States with its army and vessels and the money? What does the Senator think would have happened to our country in such a case?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, Mr. President, we would have been at war with England, but, in my opinion, we would never have had a chance to sail away from a port of England with either the ships or the money.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will allow me further, does he think that it would have been impossible for us to have done the same thing to a port of England that we did to a port of Mexico?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, we did it to Mexico because Mexico is a weak nation, unable to defend herself from our aggressions; that is all there is to it. We would not have done it to any great maritime power in the world—certainly not without war.

Mr. BRISTOW. What does the Senator think the civilized judgment of mankind will be as to the episode of our Government making war on Mexico, robbing her revenues of a million dollars and then carrying it off?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITE. My understanding is that under the rules a Senator may ask another Senator a question when that Senator consents to the interruption.

Mr. GALLINGER. Where does the Senator find that rule?

Mr. WHITE. That a Senator may ask questions of a Senator who is on the floor?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Well, it is the practice here, and I suppose there is a rule to that effect; but what I am objecting to and the point I make, is that the Senator from Kansas has no right to ask the Senator from New Hampshire to prophesy; he has no right to call for prophecies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, that decision will be historical. We had a very interesting discussion this morning when the Senator from Nebraska was speaking. There was a free interchange of opinion between Senators. The Vice President was in the chair, and he did not call any Senator to order.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has the floor, the Senator from New Hampshire having yielded to him.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not ask the floor. I want to ask permission of the Senator from New Hampshire to ask him a question.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire yields.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to say, on the question of the point of order, that what the Senator from New Hampshire refers to took place by unanimous consent. In case of objection I think the ruling still holds good that an interruption can be made only for a question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Florida please point us to that rule?

Mr. FLETCHER. I refer to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will ask the Reporter to read the last question I asked the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will suspend a moment, I am told that the Vice President admonished the Senate this morning on that point. I was not present. It is an unfortunate ruling that we are not permitted to indulge in debate, as we always have done in the Senate for 23 years to my knowledge, but if a different ruling has been made, I yield to it. But I do not see that even that ruling has been violated. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas for a question.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will ask the Reporter to read the last question which I asked the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reporter will read as requested.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. BRISTOW. What does the Senator think the civilized judgment of mankind will be as to the episode of our Government making war on Mexico, robbing her revenues of a million dollars, and then carrying it off?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, recognizing that as a proper question, I reply that, in my judgment, we will not stand very well in the eyes of the civilized world so far as that episode is concerned.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I ask the Senator another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire further yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. For a question, yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator advise the Senate in what respect he regards the action of our Government in the taking of Vera Cruz and the securing possession of the customs collected there as different from the action of any pirate taking possession of a port and committing a similar wrong?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I will let the individual Senators and the country form their own judgment as to a proper answer to that question. I think I know what the answer will be.

The point I was making is that, having assured the civilized world that we under the Monroe doctrine would protect the interests of other countries in Mexico, after this unfortunate war ends we are likely to be called upon for an indemnity that will make it rather necessary that the $30,000,000 that we propose to invest in interned ships shall be in the Treasury of the United States; and I think the Government will be disposed to thank the minority of this body for having saved $30,000,000 during the last session in reducing the appropriations carried by the river and harbor bill. Those $30,000,000, in my judgment, will come in handy when we are called upon to settle with great Britain and Germany because of the injury that has been done to their property and their subjects during the Mexican war.

I notice, Mr. President, another rather startling headline, which reads: "Deficit must stand."

It seems that on yesterday there was a little conference at the White House. Mr. UNDERWOOD, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, was there, and Mr. FITZGERALD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, was there. In conferring with the President they told him that it was impossible to reduce the appropriations in the present Congress beyond the point that had been recommended, and that the deficit of $80,000,000 in the revenues of the Government, to which attention had been called, must remain and must be added in due time to the debt of the Government. It is a rather startling thing to some of us that after the tariff bill that is on the statute books was passed and the predictions concerning the revenue-producing qualities of that measure were heralded to the world, we found ourselves in a position where we had to impose upon the taxpayers of this country a so-called war revenue tax of $100,000,000, and that now we are informed that $80,000,000 more will have to be raised in some way to meet the deficit that is imminent. It will be remembered that there are yet several months of this fiscal year, and the $80,000,000 is likely to be doubled, if not trebled, before the fiscal year comes to an end.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas for a question.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator if the writer of that article did not, in connection with his comment, take the position that sugar was on the free list, and that we had lost $50,000,000 revenue from that source, when, as a matter of fact, sugar is not on the free list, and that additional deficit in the Treasury is yet to come?

Mr. GALLINGER. A portion of it; yes. That is true. No one can prophesy what the amount of the deficit will be on the 30th day of June, any more than any man can prophesy what amount will be demanded from this country on the part of Great Britain and Germany because of the losses incurred by them in Mexico, so far as property is concerned, and the losses of the lives of their citizens.

I find another very interesting item on the front page of the Post. There is also a very illuminating editorial in this number of the Post. When I quoted the Post the other day as being against the shipping bill, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] promptly said that some days after that editorial had been written the Post had an editorial of a different tenor. I had not observed that; but I will direct the attention of the Senator from Florida to an editorial in the Post this morning, which seems to indicate that the editor has gotten back to his desk again, and that he is again writing very vigorously against this shipping measure. But the item that interested me was on this question of neutrality on the part of the United States, which has been discussed this morning. It is said that the President can be safely trusted to observe the strictest neutrality between the contending nations of the world, and I am inclined to think that is so. My impression that that is so comes from reading this article:

HOLDS TO NEUTRALITY—PRESIDENT WILL NOT ATTEND UNVEILING OF MONUMENT TO HERO OF REVOLUTION.

RALEIGH, N. C., *January 28.*

Declining an invitation to attend the unveiling of a monument at Guilford Courthouse, N. C., to Gen. Nathanael Greene, who won a battle over the British in the Revolutionary War, President Wilson gave as his reason that he thought it would be unneutral for him to participate in such a demonstration.

The delegation which extended the invitation to the President consisted of United States Senators OVERMAN and SIMMONS, of North Carolina; Secretary of the Navy Daniels, President Graham, of the University of North Carolina, and Prof. George Howe, a nephew of the President.

At Raleigh to-night it was stated that the President's decision, together with the reason he gave, caused surprise and disappointment in North Carolina.

Well, I should think it would. One of the leading generals of Washington's army, a man who distinguished himself on all the battle fields of the Revolution, a man whose name has gone down in history as one of the greatest heroes this country ever produced, is to have a monument erected to his memory at Guilford Courthouse, N. C., and the President of the United States will not attend that dedication because he is afraid it will be an unneutral act! Unneutral to whom? To England, of course. What other country could find fault?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going to ask the Senator if he knows whether that letter has been printed? It would be extremely interesting to see a written statement from the President of the United States declaring that it was not proper for us in the conduct of our foreign affairs to participate in celebrations of Revolutionary generals. It would amount to a repudiation of the most interesting period in our history. It would amount to a statement that in order to be loyal to our international obligations we must be disloyal to our own origin and the founders of our Republic.

Mr. GALLINGER. I apprehend that no letter has been written. This delegation of distinguished men, according to this dispatch, called upon the President, and he gave that as his reason—that he was afraid it would be an unneutral act, according to his judgment, to participate in that celebration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It sounds more like a statement coming from the Carnegie Peace Society than from the President of the United States, and like an echo of the message in regard to the Panama Canal.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it means just this, that if that is a proper attitude for the President of the United States to take we will have the flags on the White House and on this Capitol Building hauled down on the 4th day of July. They ought to be hauled down.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator who says the President takes that position?

Mr. GALLINGER. A dispatch from Raleigh, N. C., which has not been denied The Senator will find it on the third column of the first page of the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of this morning? They have not had very much time to deny it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator does not know the party sending the dispatch or purporting to send it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator deny it on behalf of anybody?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I never heard of it before.

Mr. GALLINGER. I give it, then, for what it is worth. I do not vouch for it.

Mr. FLETCHER. But I hesitate to believe a newspaper article making a statement of that sort.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am afraid the Senator is violating the ruling of the Chair. I yielded to the Senator for a question.

Mr. President, I shall await with a great deal of interest a denial of this dispatch from Raleigh. It is very specific. It says that two Members of this body, the Secretary of the Navy, the president of the University of North Carolina, and another gentleman, a nephew of the President, called on him, and that the President gave that as his reason; and at Raleigh last night it was stated, so the dispatch says, that the President's decision, together with the reason he gave, caused surprise and disappointment in North Carolina. I should think it would.

There is another matter discussed on the front page of this paper that I desire to call attention to, because I want to correct some history in reference to it. On yesterday a presidential message was sent to the House of Representatives vetoing the immigration bill. A President representing the party to which I belong vetoed a similar bill on the same ground, and it was a matter of profoundest regret to me that he did so. It is a matter of equal regret to me that a President of the Democratic Party has vetoed the bill, putting the veto upon the same ground that President Taft did. As the House of Representatives may not pass the bill over the veto, and it may never come here officially, I feel that it is my duty to read this message to the Senate so they will all understand it. The veto message is in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and perhaps that is too recent for me to read with any degree of authority, but I assume that it is accurate. The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a Nation, would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek—the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1915.*

Mr. President, this bill is vetoed fundamentally upon the proposition that we ought not to require immigrants coming from southern Europe and elsewhere to be able to read a sentence in some language—not in the English language, not in the French language, not in the German language, not in the Russian language, but in some language—their own language. Why, there is not a lad in any country on all this earth who can not qualify himself for that test in three or four months. There is not a young man or an old man in southern Europe to-day who desires to find asylum in the United States who can not qualify himself to read a sentence in his own language in a few weeks. To give that as the reason for the veto of a great bill which is designed to bring so much benefit to the people of the United States, that will so greatly conduce to their benefit and their happiness is, to my mind, a very unfortunate circumstance. But I want to call attention to the mistake President Wilson has made in this veto message.

President Wilson is a historian. He prides himself upon that fact; and while I think the histories he has written have not always been accurate, there is such a glaring mistake in this state paper that I would be doing myself an injustice if I did not call attention to it. Listen to the President:

> Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter—
>
> That is, as to requiring incoming immigrants to read—
>
> gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation?
>
> I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect.

Mr. President, I turn to the platform of the Republican Party in 1896. The platform of the Democratic Party that year, while it is not so pronounced as that of the Republican Party, distinctly utters a note of warning against bringing immigrants into this country to disturb the relations of our workingmen and to affect their welfare; but the platform of the Republican Party went further than that. It says:

> For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

The President said that this mandate, if it is to be heeded, ought to be found in the platform of some political party. It will be seen that it was in the platform of the great Republican Party of 1896, and upon that issue the party went before the country asking for its suffrages. What was the result?

The President evidently wants a referendum on this bill. He says there is no evidence that the people want it. If that be so, the only way to determine that matter directly is to refer it to the people of the United States. But the President of the United States did not contend that there ought to be a referendum on the tariff bill that is now on the statute book—something that affects the welfare of every citizen of the Republic. He did not ask for a referendum on the currency bill or the

trade commission bill, or those other measures which he advocated with so much earnestness and with so much potential force. This bill that he has vetoed was passed through the House of Representatives by a two-thirds vote. That body is made up of men, as we are frequently told, who come fresh from the people. Is it to be supposed that they did not represent the feelings and views of their constituents when they voted? Is it to be suggested that they voted against either their own convictions or the feelings and convictions of the men who sent them to the Congress of the United States?

I do not know any evidence that could be presented to the President of the United States with more force than the fact that that great body of representative men passed the bill by a two-thirds vote; and I hope they will pass it over the veto by a vote equally strong.

The President, as I have said, says that no political party has had this plank in its platform and gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control its legislation, and he says:

I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect.

The President does not say that the declaration must be in a Democratic platform; but in view of the fact that almost every plank in the last Democratic platform has been repudiated by the Democratic Party, why should great stress have been placed on that suggestion even if the President had made it? But he says it has not been in the platform of any political party and indorsed by the people of the United States. Let us reply to the President's challenge.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator, with pleasure.

Mr. O'GORMAN. My distinguished friend from New Hampshire knows I opposed the literacy test.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. O'GORMAN. And I am, consequently, more than gratified with the veto of the President; but in connection with the statement made by the Senator that in 1896 the Republican Party declared itself in national convention as favorable to an educational test, and the further statement that the party went to the country on that issue and succeeded, I am prompted to inquire why the party at that time, if it succeeded on that issue, did not enact such a law?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I expected that that question would be asked. We might ask the same thing about every law that is on the statute books of the Nation—why, it was not passed offhand, the first day or the first month or the first year that it had been suggested. It takes time to enact laws in this country. There was great opposition in both Houses of Congress to legislation of that kind; and the Senator from New York, able and influential as he is, if the attempt had been made at any time from 1896 to the present time to pass a law of that kind, would have opposed it with the same energy that he opposed the bill the President has vetoed.

Mr. O'GORMAN. But the Senator surely will not claim that the Republican Party, during the past 16 years, has not been in a position to enact into law any policy which it seriously advocated and believed in?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Republican Party has been struggling for nearly 16 years to pass a merchant-marine bill. The party has had it in its platform at every national convention, and the party believes in it, but it has not been able to pass a measure of that kind through both Houses of Congress.

Mr. O'GORMAN. But the Republican Party, during most of that period, was in absolute control of both branches of Congress, and in charge of the Executive.

Mr. GALLINGER. So it was; and the Democratic Party was almost unanimously opposed to the legislation, and a few Republicans were opposed to it. Now, there is no concealment about that matter, but the Republican Party as a whole was for it. The Republican Party put it in its platform every four years, and we have been struggling to enact it into law, and the Democratic Party has not allowed us to do so.

I want to call attention to what happened in 1896. This plank was placed in the Republican platform. Mr. McKinley was nominated by the Republican Party, and Mr. Bryan was nominated by the Democratic Party and the Populist Party, and we went to the polls on that, with other issues, and the record shows that the total vote cast was 13,952,179. Mr. McKinley, Republican, received 7,107,304 votes; Mr. Bryan, nominated by the Democratic Party and the Populist Party, received 6,533,080 votes—a Republican plurality of 554,224. The electoral vote was McKinley 271, Bryan 176—a majority in the electoral college of 95; and yet the President tells us that that matter never has received the indorsement of the American people.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. I always yield with trepidation when the Senator from New Jersey rises, but I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the gentle Senator from New Hampshire how it is that he has gotten off on this tack? This is a shipping bill. How has the Senator gotten off on this tack, instead of devoting his skill and ability to the shipping bill? He seems to have launched out into a general lambasting of the President and the Democratic Party, and he says that we were not approved by the people in the matter of the veto of the President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Where will the question end, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The question is just this: How is it when you are debating a shipping bill that you have gotten off to a general lambasting of the Democratic Party?

Mr. GALLINGER. There are a great many hours between now and sunrise. Our Democratic friends say they are going to keep us here that long, and I will educate the Senator on merchant-marine matters before I get through.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There is no more——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There could be no more agreeable tutor than the Senator from New Hampshire. He says that there has been no evidence that the Democratic Party or the people wanted the veto that has been sent in by the President. I can not see just what connection that subject has with the shipping bill, but still I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that great meetings have been held since that bill, iniquitous as it was in that particular provision, passed the Senate. Meetings have been held all over my Commonwealth and in the city of New York. Monster meetings have been held in protest of the immigration bill, and that particular feature of it—the literacy test—has been denounced most roundly. I feel highly gratified and feel that the President was richly justified in his veto of that particular measure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I believe, Mr. President, they must have been monster meetings—possibly monstrous meetings.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes. I will say further, as to this particular bill—the shipping bill—if a meeting was held in approbation of it it would be a monster meeting in the great metropolis of New York. It is true a meeting might be gathered down at the corner of Broadway and Wall Street, under the shadow of the Holy Trinity Church, that might protest—which with bleared eyes might clog the mind of every man and stifle its reason.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the allusion to the Holy Trinity Church is unfortunate. It seems to me so. I will try to accommodate the Senator from New Jersey before I get through in discussing the shipping bill. There are a good many angles to it, and I am going to pay attention to some of the angles.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted, much to my regret——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I am sorry that the Senator regrets it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not refer to the interruption of the Senator. The Senator does not understand me. When I was interrupted, much to my regret, on Wednesday evening——

[Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will suspend for a moment. Let there be order in the galleries. Under the rules of the Senate any expression of approval or disapproval of any remark is forbidden by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. When interrupted at that time I was reading Calendar No. 737 of the Sixty-third Congress, third session, Senate Report No. 841, on a bill for the promotion of foreign commerce of the United States by providing adequate shipping facilities. I had got through that report up to page 30, where a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, dated December 28, 1914, to Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER is inserted and made a part of the report. I do not know that I ought to read this letter from the Secretary of Commerce, because he is on the stump advocating this bill. We hear from him every morning, telling the country the great advantages that will result from this legislation, and he is likewise telling the country of the marvelous prosperity that is to come to the com-

mercial and industrial interests of the country because of the tariff law that is on the statute books. If I should take up that subject the Senator from New Jersey would say I was departing from the shipping question, so I will not do it. We will take that up a little later on. I will read the letter of Secretary Redfield:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 28, 1914.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am drafting this letter to you to convey certain ideas respecting the merchant marine which you may or may not care to introduce into your report, but which you are free to use in any way you see fit.

I knew, Mr. President, that that report was a composite production, and I have no doubt the Secretary of Commerce made a valuable contribution to it.

We have gone along for years with all our ocean shipping facilities in the hands of our competitors.

How often I have said that, Mr. President, in debate in this body. How often I have pictured the fact that we were absolutely at the mercy of the shipping combines of foreign countries, and that our ships had been driven from the seas of the world by unfair competition on the part of England, France, Germany, and other European nations.

As some one has well said, we have been like a department store without a delivery system, except such as our competitors were willing to supply us so long as it was to their interest or advantage to do so.

I wish I had a speech at hand that I made a few years ago in which I made that exact statement. The Secretary of Commerce has been cribbing. He took it from my speech, undoubtedly.

While the thing worked it seemed to do fairly well, particularly so long as we did not enter largely as a competitor with the nations which owned the ships in the markets they were themselves striving to secure.

About 20 years ago, the precise date does not matter, we began to sell abroad the products of our factories, and this process grew till in the largest exports we ever had the sales of manufacturers were the largest item. One did not need to be much of a prophet to see that this, if continued, must mean, could not help but mean, that when our competition became too strong our foreign competitors would hardly continue to help in transporting our goods on terms favorable to us, but to their own discomfiture. If anyone doubts this discomfiture, let him look at our displacing Germany from second place in South Africa and taking it ourselves, or at our sales in recent years in iron and steel abroad in competition with England and Germany.

It has been in the nature of things that sooner or later it would no longer be convenient for our competitors to do our transporting on a basis satisfactory to us. It would be promoting their shipping interests at the expense of their industrial interests, and their shipping interests, though large, are smaller than their industries and are the servants of the latter and can not long be put to the work of serving their competitors. In other words, you can not as a matter of economics imagine Germany or England continuing permanently to transport on favorable terms to us American goods on any such scale as to seriously threaten German or English industrial markets. They would put an end to that in self-defense and in so doing would remove or injure our transit facilities, unless we were prepared to supply them ourselves.

Apart from this, however, we have, like an ostrich with its head in the sand, put our money and our merchandise at the risk of European war and quite outside of our own control while under such risks. To illustrate, American capital invested in ships under European flags can be and has been destroyed by the acts of hostile cruisers. Two vessels on their way to be transferred to our flag were thus sunk.

I will venture to suggest that if this bill passes, there will be a good many other vessels transferred to our flag from the fleets of belligerent nations that will be sunk before they ever reach their port of destination.

American capital in goods transported in vessels under foreign flags which were not owned by American capital has been lost or injured when such vessels have been sunk or held up, and American goods for which Americans long since paid are to-day lying in foreign harbors merely because they are in ships under the flag of a belligerent. Our merchandise being carried chiefly in English ships and in ships of the other belligerent nations is to-day dependent for its security upon the control of the sea by the navies of the powers whose merchant vessels carry our goods; a humiliating and expensive situation for Americans. Cruisers hostile to the belligerents whose vessels we utilize find it their duty to sink those vessels, and we stand helplessly on the shore and watch the process go on. We know now, therefore, that our commerce while ocean-borne is subject to war risks not of our making and not under our control, but by which we suffer. The time has been when war risks shut off the movement of American wheat and delayed the movement of American cotton, and it is quite within the range of possibilities that such a time may recur. Both on basic economic grounds and on grounds of self-insurance against war risks not of our making, an American merchant marine is a necessity and can not be had soon enough to relieve us from the jeopardy in which we have stood and in which in some measure we now stand.

Therefore we can not await the long process of evolution, the patient untangling of the conflicting views of rival interests, which interests in the aggregate are infinitely less than the importance of the subject to the free flow of American commerce. The inclosed statement shows what the flow is within recent weeks. We have paid since September 1 our whole floating indebtedness abroad in goods, and it looks as if the month of December alone, even with cotton moving slowly, would show a favorable balance on merchandise transactions of $100,000,000. Indeed, so vital is the present time to America that it seems as if we were in the very transition from being a debtor to a creditor nation, and the possibility opens to our lending that hand of financial fellowship to our fellow Republics in Latin America which they so much need, for which they so eagerly look, and by which we should tie them to ourselves in commercial bands of steel which would endure to the great gain of all our people.

But one thing more than all others which hampers this evolution now is the absence of ships in which to transport the goods we have to sell and which others want to buy to the markets that eagerly wait for them. This is not all. Not only are these goods hampered by absence of shipping, but they are also hampered by the rates which are out of our control but which are now charged on such shipping as takes place. Our competitors who control our ocean terminal facilities (for such and no more are ocean steamship lines as related to our railways) have seen fit for their own profit to advance their rates from one-half to double or more. There are ports in Europe to-day that eagerly seek our cotton, and we all know our brethren in the South anxiously desire to sell their cotton, and the price abroad is such as our producers would be thankful to receive. Between these two stand the excessive rate and the scarcity of ships. The reasons must be mighty and compelling which would lead anyone at this time to interpose between the flood of American commerce seeking to be free and the needs of foreign buyers seeking for our products the interest of any one or two or more groups of our people. It is time to think of the whole and not of a part.

I do not speak, you will see, of a merchant marine as a thing so much to be desired by itself alone, certainly not as a thing upon whose separate profit or loss we in any large degree depend, but as a servant whose presence now we need quite regardless of the compensation that for the hour can be paid. The work this servant should do is what we now want done, and the question of his compensation is a relatively small affair.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, *Secretary.*

Hon DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Following that letter is a table of imports, duties collected, and exports for the week ending December 19, 1914, at 13 principal customs districts which I ask to have inserted without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

Imports, duties collected, and exports for the week ended Dec. 19, 1914, at 13 principal customs districts.

Districts.	Imports.	Duties collected.	Exports.
Georgia	$538	$304	$2,164,411
Massachusetts (Boston)	1,413,076	224,826	1,532,375
New York	13,955,724	2,525,473	20,092,628
Philadelphia	858,645	158,396	737,302
Maryland (Baltimore)	372,146	42,552	3,938,553
Virginia (Norfolk)	78,749	2,423	1,101,196
New Orleans	1,909,454	27,360	6,593,949
Galveston	161,424	5,372	8,130,728
San Francisco	706,062	63,297	1,517,912
Washington (Seattle)	1,377,838	18,799	781,966
Buffalo	572,729	16,231	1,262,240
Chicago	579,590	176,284	
Michigan (Detroit)	426,004	36,151	1,561,182
Total	22,411,979	3,297,468	49,140,242

The above figures are for 13 principal customs districts, the district of Georgia having been added to the 12 formerly reported. The table shows a favorable balance on merchandise transactions for the third week of December in the 13 districts of $27,028,263. The 13 districts cited ordinarily do about 88 per cent of the import business and about 35 per cent of the export business of the country.

The exports of cotton for the week ended December 19 amounted to 286,315 bales.

The table below shows that for the first three weeks of December, in which is included the last day of November, the excess of exports over imports has amounted to $69,870,091 at the principal customs districts of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not propose, Mr. President, to weary the Senate or burden myself with reading many additional editorials from the great newspapers of the country against this bill, because I propose to conclude my remarks before the day ends; but my attention has been particularly directed to an editorial in the Daily Press, of Newport News, Va., a very strong and influential Democratic newspaper, which I feel I ought to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is headed "An un-Democratic measure," and is as follows:

Aside from the danger of international complications, aside from the question as to whether or not it would pay, we regret that the Democratic administration and the Democratic Members of Congress should have committed the Democratic Party to the policy of Government ownership and operation of ships of commerce. It is well enough to plead that this is an emergency project and that the ships will be transferred to private interest after the crisis shall have been safely passed. The party has committed itself to a definite policy and has established a precedent from which it will not easily break away hereafter. It is the biggest sop ever thrown to socialism.

We recognize the urgent need of a merchant marine, and it is no new thought with the Daily Press. There has been no session of Congress in 15 years that this newspaper has not urged the Members to take such action as would induce private capital to invest in American ship lines.

But is it possible that Congress can not devise a plan under which private interest would engage in the over-sea traffic, as they have already engaged in the coastwise trade? Is it not a poor confession that the Government must undertake this work on its own account because our laws and our general policy toward the merchant marine are such as to

preclude private investment? And is it possible that private capital, which is already timid, will be induced to enter in competition with the Government?

"The Democratic platform upon which Mr. Wilson was elected declared: 'We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that there is no declaration in that platform for Government ownership. The President vetoed the immigration bill largely on the ground that there has been no declaration in the political platforms in favor of the literacy test, and yet he advocates this bill with great zeal; but we do not find any declaration in the platform or in any platform in favor of Government ownership. The editorial continues:

But what has been done to redeem that pledge? The Underwood law granting discriminating duties in favor of American ships was set aside by the President on the ground that under our treaties with foreign nations the discrimination would be enjoyed equally by foreign ships as well as by domestic ships. But that was not the case with the ships of Great Britain; and if that law has been enforced, there is good reason to believe that large numbers of British ships would have rushed to cover under American registry.

The passage of that bill was in direct line with the declaration of the Baltimore platform. But the platform certainly gave no token that the merchant-marine plank committed the party to Government ownership and operation of ships of commerce.

It is folly to contend that the President's project would build up private ship lines. The best that can be claimed for it is that it would build up Government lines at the expense of the people. But that is not everything it would build up. It would build enormous Government patronage and to increase the power of the centralized Government. That may be all right so long as Wilson and the Democrats are in power, but how would it be with a Roosevelt in the White House?

Opposition to centralization is a Democratic fundamental, and yet the Hearst newspapers, which, strangely enough, are the particular champions of the President's shipping bill, rejoice greatly in the belief and in the bold prediction that this is but the first step toward Government ownership and operation of all the means of transportation, on sea and land—of railroads as well as of ship lines.

How is that for "Democratic simplicity"? Surely the Democratic ship of state has been launched into strange waters, and we believe there are breakers ahead.

A wise prediction.

We denounce this partisan measure as being undemocratic, as a menace to the peace of the Nation, as a bar to private enterprise, and as a measure in conflict with the declaration of "new freedom" which the President has so earnestly invoked in behalf of American business.

We have the highest regard for President Wilson, and we are disappointed that he should have championed a project so inconsistent with the Democracy of Jefferson.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. My question is, how does the Senator reconcile his assertion some days since, that all the great newspapers of the country were condemning this proposition, with a little editorial that appeared on January 27 in the New York World. That certainly is one of the great newspapers of the country. Will the Senator permit me to read it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I can not under the rule, Mr. President.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I ask that it go in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I must object to that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am sorry that my distinguished and universally generous friend seems so cross-grained to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is no more amiable man in the Senate than I am.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I agree with that.

Mr. GALLINGER. But when I am talking to one lone Democrat I do not want that lone Democrat to give me instructions as to how I shall proceed. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to call the attention of the occupants of the galleries again to the rule of the Senate that they must keep quiet.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Boston Transcript of recent date very pertinently says that we have a bill which hardly anybody but the President wants occupying the attention of Congress to the exclusion of all other business. The peculiarity of the situation is due to two causes—to President Wilson's stubborn conviction that to have a mind of his own he must not consult the minds of others, and to the abdication by Congress of its law-making powers to such an extent that it has become a great registration office for the program of the White House. If Congress would stand up for its constitutional functions, if it would insist that the President as the Executive is primarily to carry out the laws Congress makes, we should be spared such a spectacle as is now presented at the Capitol.

Mr. President, I have read the report of the majority of the Committee on Commerce in favor of this bill. I read it, as I stated the other day, because I felt sure very few of the Senators had read it, and I wanted to acquaint the Senators who were then giving me their attention with the terms of that report. It is a very ably written document and presents the side of the proponents of this bill very vigorously and forcibly. It would be invidious, Mr. President, if I did not read the views of the minority, submitted by a man who is distinguished in public life and who has made a more careful study of matters relating to the rivers and harbors, the commerce of the country, and the shipping interests of the country, than any other man has during the last 25 years—Mr. BURTON, of Ohio. Here it is:

The undersigned present a minority report on Senate bill 6856.

The purpose of the bill, as stated in its title, is to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation, to be organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes. The following are the essential provisions of the proposed bill:

Section 2 provides that the initial stock of such corporation shall not be over $10,000,000, to be increased as the interests of the corporation may require of which the United States shall subscribe 51 per cent at par, and the remainder shall be offered for public subscription. In contemplation of a probable failure to obtain subscriptions from the public, it is provided that the United States may further subscribe at par for the remaining 49 per cent. By amendment this section also provides that the vessels owned or used by such corporation may be leased to other corporations or individuals to be used for the purposes contemplated by the act.

Section 3 authorizes the sale of the so-called Panama Canal bonds to a total amount not exceeding $30,000,000, for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels.

Section 4 provides for the transfer of boats by the shipping board to the corporation in exchange for 4 per cent gold bonds, constituting a first lien thereon.

Section 5 authorizes American registry for such vessels and limits their trade to foreign countries, excepting the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila.

Section 6 provides for the voting of stock by the shipping board, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, and section 7 for the sale of same, with the approval of Congress.

Section 8 provides for the charter, lease, or transfer of naval auxiliaries and military transports not needed for military purposes and also vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co. to any corporation now or heretofore organized as in this act provided. This section also contains provisions that vessels purchased or constructed by the United States shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

Section 9 provides that the President may requisition for use as naval auxiliaries or for other purposes any vessels used by such corporation at a reasonable price or rental.

Section 10 provides that a detailed statement of all expenditures and receipts shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Section 11 makes an appropriation of $10,000,000.

The bill may be considered either as an emergency measure required to meet an extraordinary situation, and intended to be operative only so long as the exceptional conditions continue, or it may be considered as the initiation of a radical change in the traditional policy of the Government in relation to one, perhaps to a number, of our great industries.

If the bill is designed as an emergency measure, then it can be justified only on conclusive evidence, first, that a real emergency exists, one that threatens seriously the industrial and shipping interests of this country, and one which can be met successfully and adequately in no other way than by Government intervention, and, secondly, that the remedy proposed will be effective and one that can be withdrawn upon the return of normal conditions without the disruption or serious disturbance of the ordinary instrumentalities of trade.

Perhaps there is no error to which we are more prone than to magnify the evils of a sudden disaster and to exaggerate the weakness of our political, social, and industrial institutions when subjected to some unforeseen and unusual strain.

If the courts have rendered an unpopular decision in some case of general interest, there has always been some one to propose that we pull down about our ears the temple of justice, reared at infinite pains by succeeding generations. We have never passed through a financial depression but there have been those who have proclaimed the failure of our monetary system and advocated the adoption of some wild scheme of banking, currency, or coinage. A time of stress is nearly always a poor time to surrender or revolutionize tried institutions and intrust ourselves to the uncertainties of untried schemes.

The shipping trade is an ancient enterprise. It has developed gradually through the centuries, it has adjusted itself to every wind of fortune and misfortune, it has expanded wondrously to meet the constantly increasing demands of international and domestic trade, it has laid hold of every new facility to increase efficiency and followed with unerring compass every new route of trade, it has developed trade where none existed, and has generally outrun in tonnage the reasonable expectation of freight. While rates have sometimes been unduly raised and competition limited or avoided by conference agreements, they have usually been reasonably satisfactory. The sea is an open highway, and an excessive rate or exceptional profits have always afforded an alluring invitation to enter the field.

Such an unprecedented condition as now exists must inevitably cause serious disturbance. It would be easy, however, to overestimate the difficulties and fly to remedies which would eventually prove more disastrous than our present evils.

The facts in regard to the present situation in relation to shipping seem to be about as follows:

According to a report of Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, filed with the Committee on Interoceanic Canals on April 20, 1914, the gross tonnage of merchant vessels of the several countries as recorded in Lloyd's Register for the current year amounted to 46,970,113 tons, being the aggregate of a total of 30,591 vessels, including both steam and sailing craft.

I will ask permission to insert that table without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Number and net and gross tons of steam and sailing vessels of over 100 tons of the several countries of the world, as recorded in Lloyd's Register for 1913–1914.

[Report of the Commissioner of Navigation (1913).]

Flag.	Steam.			Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	*Net tons.*	*Gross tons.*	*Number.*	*Net tons.*	*Number.*	*Tonnage.*
British:							
United Kingdom	8,514	11,109,560	18,273,944	700	422,293	9,214	18,696,237
Colonies	1,495	915,950	1,575,223	578	160,083	2,073	1,735,306
Total	10,009	12,025,510	19,849,167	1,278	582,376	11,287	20,431,543
American (United States):							
Sea	1,209	1,280,958	1,971,903	1,487	1,026,554	2,696	2,998,457
Northern Lakes	593	1,724,566	2,285,836	34	96,854	627	2,382,690
Philippine Islands	69	27,080	44,555	8	1,934	77	46,489
Total	1,871	3,032,604	4,302,294	1,529	1,125,342	3,400	5,427,636
Argentinian	236	107,172	180,576	72	34,259	308	214,835
Austro-Hungarian	419	629,444	1,010,347	8	1,067	427	1,011,414
Belgian	164	186,581	296,196	8	8,190	172	304,386
Brazilian	402	188,645	313,416	57	16,221	459	329,637
Chilean	95	68,834	108,491	36	31,301	131	139,792
Chinese	66	55,375	86,690			66	86,690
Cuban	55	37,902	60,895	4	641	59	61,536
Danish	552	415,880	711,094	259	50,960	811	762,054
Dutch	662	794,840	1,286,742	97	23,107	759	1,309,849
French	987	1,029,113	1,793,310	565	407,854	1,552	2,201,164
German	2,019	2,877,887	4,743,046	302	339,015	2,321	5,082,061
Greek	365	443,771	705,897	77	16,885	442	722,782
Haitian	5	2,017	3,387			5	3,387
Italian	591	773,848	1,274,127	523	247,815	1,114	1,521,942
Japanese	1,037	956,702	1,500,014			1,037	1,500,014
Mexican	43	22,838	37,920		2,129	52	40,049
Norwegian	1,597	1,122,577	1,870,793	594	587,097	2,191	2,457,890
Peruvian	20	13,352	25,814	40	19,700	60	45,514
Portuguese	105	55,903	92,636	103	27,943	208	120,579
Roumanian	32	25,011	45,123	1	285	33	45,408
Russian	716	463,022	790,075	500	184,103	1,216	974,178
Siamese	12	7,955	12,936			12	12,936
Spanish	547	506,073	826,261	60	14,734	607	840,995
Swedish	1,043	551,964	943,926	393	103,344	1,436	1,047,270
Turkish	135	65,402	111,848	137	45,450	272	157,298
Uruguayan	50	38,360	62,215	15	13,316	65	75,531
Venezuelan	8	2,420	4,232	5	679	13	4,911
Other countries: Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Liberia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Persia, Salvador, Samos, Sarawak, Tunis, Zanzibar, etc.	54	16,027	29,769	22	7,123	76	36,832
Total	23,897	26,517,029	43,079,177	6,694	3,890,936	30,591	46,970,113

Mr. GALLINGER (reading)—

It will be noticed that this report includes all vessels of over 100 tons burden, and that a considerable percentage of it must naturally be engaged in domestic or coastwise trade.

It is difficult to determine what portion of this total has been withdrawn as the result of the war. A circular issued by the Boston Maritime Association under date of December 15, 1914, gives the following estimate:

	Tons.
German and Austrian steam tonnage, 2,438 vessels	3,507,331
British vessels under Government charter, 500 vessels	1,700,000
British vessels seized	265,000
Vessels lost by mines, etc	330,683
Total	5,803,014

The feature of the shipping situation which has attracted the most attention, as indicated in the estimate quoted above, has been the alleged scarcity of tonnage due to the seizure of numerous German and Austro-Hungarian ships and the withdrawal of the remainder from service, also the chartering by the British and French Governments, especially by the British, of a considerable share of the tonnage of those countries for military and naval purposes.

The per cent of loss in the carrying capacity of ocean trade due to these causes has been variously estimated. Any considerable reduction would, of course, naturally produce serious consequences. It should not, however, be forgotten that the normal results are to a large extent offset by other considerations. No doubt the export of certain classes of commodities from the United States to foreign countries has somewhat increased because of the exceptional demands for munitions of war and other materials, of which an increased supply is needed or which were formerly supplied from other sources. There is also an increased demand for food products. Some commodities which were usually carried directly into such countries as Denmark, Holland, France, and Germany are now sent from the United States, as in the case of tea, coffee, or cocoa. Other countries near to the theater of war are seeking to secure a supply of certain articles with a view to providing against such exigencies as may arise.

On the other hand, there is not merely a decrease in the exports and imports from Germany and Austria, but their foreign trade by sea has practically disappeared. This operates as an offset to the shortage of vessel tonnage. Also in other localities, especially in South America, financial conditions and the withdrawal of credits usually extended have limited buying capacity and consequently exports to those countries, which formerly consisted largely of material for railways and public-service improvements have diminished considerably. It is not improbable that on the whole the world's trade has diminished in a ratio commensurate with the loss of ocean tonnage. So far as the United States is concerned this loss is further compensated by the fact that such vessels as are able to continue in the trade naturally seek the more profitable freight of a neutral country. The number of ships which have entered American registry since the outbreak of the war and the domestic shipping which has engaged in the foreign trade are evidences of this fact.

That there has been a very considerable increase in freight rates along some routes and for certain commodities is not to be denied. It would, however, be easy to draw the incorrect conclusion that this is wholly due to lack of available tonnage. As a matter of fact, at least until very recently, there has been an abundance of unchartered tonnage available at American ports. The same bulletin of the Boston Maritime Association, already quoted, contains the following paragraph:

"Repeated offers of sail tonnage for coal to South American ports at equitable rates have no results, and there are at present tied up in Boston four steel ships for which payable business can not be obtained. This association has given a list of Boston-owned tonnage to the Secretary of Commerce, representing over 200,000 dead-weight capacity, which could be chartered foreign if rates could be obtained that would pay for round."

The actual reason for the increase in freight rates does not seem to be the result of the lack of tonnage. The existing war furnishes other adequate causes for the present situation. The following are the abnormal or exceptional conditions created by it:

1. The derangement caused by the war, which includes the danger of capture or detention and the scattering of mines near to harbors and along navigable routes. All of these greatly increase the risk of navigation and consequently the cost of carrying freight.

2. The probable delay in the handling of boats engaged in trade with countries involved in the war, due to the fact that the harbors of the belligerents are congested by the presence of large fleets of vessels. It is also difficult to obtain men for loading and unloading and for necessary repairs. There is a further difficulty in obtaining access to wharves and dry docks. As illustrations of the congestion and delay in foreign ports the following specific cases may be mentioned: A ship sailed from Baltimore to Havre, the voyage occupying about 14 days. Under normal conditions she would have discharged her outgoing cargo and be ready to return with whatever cargo was obtainable in 7 to 10 days. The boat arrived at Havre at the end of November and was detained there over 20 days. It is not certain that she has left yet, as she was compelled to go to Cardiff for coal, which caused additional delay.

The ship *Missourian* sailed from New York November 29 for a French port. She carried some 1,500 horses and could have carried 8,000 tons of cargo at $8 a ton. It was ascertained that she would be detained in the discharge of her cargo and there would be no profit for the freight carried, even at the unusual price named. Instances have occurred in which boats have been detained in port for almost 60 days in discharge of general cargo.

3. When a boat sails to a foreign port there is no certainty that she can obtain a cargo or supply of coal for the return voyage. It is desirable to carry coal for a round trip from the port of departure, which, to the same extent, reduces cargo capacity.

4. The additional cost of war-risk insurance, ranging from a minimum of three-eighths per cent for the round voyage upon cargo or vessels engaged in trade in the Western Hemisphere to 3 per cent for the round trip to Rotterdam and 5 per cent for the round trip to Bremen, and the limit of the amount to $750,000 which the Government War Risk Bureau will place on both ship and cargo.

5. At the beginning of the war the situation was complicated by the breakdown of exchanges and credits. This condition still exists in some localities. The factor which prevented the carrying of exports abroad was by no means scarcity of boats; the problem was rather a financial one. Indeed, in the early months of the war there was a large amount of shipping in ports of the United States, not only upon

the Atlantic, but even more in Gulf ports. These boats awaited cargoes, chiefly grain and cotton, which under normal conditions would have been sent at that time, but which were withheld for reasons other than lack of tonnage. An important feature of the situation relating to the cotton trade was the determination of the Liverpool Cotton Exchange not to make purchases. It will be particularly noted that none of the causes of increased freight rates will be remedied by an increase in the number of available vessels.

As a matter of fact, except in relation to consignments to ports of belligerents which are regarded as especially dangerous, notably those in the North Sea, and in relation to cargoes of doubtful character—that is, those that might be construed to be contraband—the rates have not increased in as great a degree as seems to be popularly assumed.

A special bulletin regarding the foreign shipping situation issued by R. G. Dun & Co., under date of October 19, 1914, contains the following paragraph:

"Maritime freight rates in general have declined as compared with three weeks ago. To Europe the excess over normal rates does not exceed 25 per cent on the average. To Asia, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand the premium varies from 20 to 25 per cent. * * *"

Special bulletin of R. G. Dun & Co., under date of December 29, 1914, contains the following items:

"The ocean rates to Asia, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand are, as a rule, either no higher or somewhat less than they were last October. To the west coast of South America the rates are very nearly what they were prior to the outbreak of the war.

"Rates of war-risk insurance have, on the whole, declined in the last two months."

Both these bulletins indicate that from all the more important ports of the United States regular sailings have been resumed, and that, generally speaking, there is sufficient tonnage to meet all demands.

The tables at the end of this report indicate in detail changes in freight rates which have occurred for the dates specified. It will be found upon examination of these tables, which display rates between New York and European ports, and between New York and South American ports, that, generally speaking, rates of freight have not increased more than 25 per cent during the war period to any South American port. In many instances the increase is very slight.

While the rates to European ports have, naturally, increased in greater ratio, the increase has not been as exceptional as might have been expected. In fact, the increase has not been disproportionate to increases which have occurred in times of peace. It will be noticed, for example, that the average rates on grain and flour from New York to London for the year 1912 were nearly double those for 1911; also that rates on grain from New York to Liverpool were, at some time during the quarter, quoted as low or lower during the last three months of the year 1914 as the maximum rate for the same period of the year 1912.

In its more important features the above is substantially the situation with respect to which the proposed bill must be considered. In the first place, it is doubtful whether the conditions outlined constitute an emergency calling for a departure from all former policies of the Federal Government in relation to American industries. In the second place, if this be conceded, will the provisions of the proposed measure effect a satisfactory remedy, waiving entirely for the moment all fundamental questions as to the expediency of Government ownership? The advocates of the measure undoubtedly expect to accomplish two main purposes—one to promote the development of trade with Central and South American countries and the other to lower freight rates on American commodities to European ports. It is quite out of the question that the means proposed in this bill will accomplish either. In the first place it would be impossible to build sufficient ships in a short period of time to produce any material effect upon the amount of available tonnage. It is generally agreed that nothing effective could be accomplished by this means in less than 18 months.

To merely transfer ships from private to public ownership would accomplish nothing. The only other course apparently open is to purchase foreign tonnage now interned as the result of the war. It is, of course, open to question whether this could be accomplished without serious complications. Even if we persisted in our right to make such purchase it would be entirely possible for any offended nation to retaliate in a manner which would affect our foreign trade much more seriously than any real or imaginary lack of tonnage. It would therefore seem that the opportunity of materially changing the economic situation by increasing tonnage is quite impracticable. If such an outcome were seriously contemplated by the authors of the bill the initial capitalization proposed is nothing short of absurd. The results that could be produced within the limits contemplated would be insignificant. So far as the difficulty arises from shortage of tonnage, the only really practical suggestion in the bill is to release any unnecessary tonnage now utilized for auxiliary naval purposes. This could be readily accomplished without resorting to the doubtful machinery of the proposed bill. Let any such ships be chartered directly to such private agencies as may require their use.

If the reduction of freight rates is seriously contemplated in the proposed measure this could be much more effectively accomplished by more direct means, two or three of which may be suggested. First, the control of rates might be vested with the Interstate Commerce Commission as proposed in the recent report of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals of the United States Senate and in the majority report on this bill in the House of Representatives. A less mandatory means might be found in chartering public vessels to private concerns with restrictions on freight charges. It has been suggested that if the Government wished to lend financial aid without resorting to direct or indirect subsidies, a provision might be made to loan at a small rate of interest, say 3 to 4 per cent, an amount equal to not more than 50 to 60 per cent of the cost of the ship. This advance would, of course, be adequately secured by first mortgage and suitable insurance. Postal savings funds, it is conceivable, might be used for this purpose. Under present conditions the most serious handicap so far as some of the more important European ports are concerned is the excessive cost of insurance. At any rate much simpler and more direct means can be devised to accomplish the purposes sought than those proposed in this bill.

In so far as it is the purpose of the bill to promote trade in Central and South America, it is again peculiarly ill adapted to the purpose. The history of trade development clearly indicates that it may not be expected to follow the mere opportunities of transportation. A great many other factors enter into its creation. It is a significant fact that quite a number of the more conspicuous transportation companies have developed from trading companies or associations of merchants. For example, one of the more important lines trading with the west coast of South America grew out of a concession by certain South American countries for the production of and exportation of nitrates. Having developed this business and secured a market, it was quite desirable to develop an outgoing traffic, resulting eventually in the establishment of a successful line of merchant vessels. Similarly the United States & Australian Steamship Co. is said to have resulted from a combination of merchants who, having developed certain trade, found it desirable to charter ships for transportation.

No doubt other equally conspicuous examples could be cited to show that merchants' or traders' activities must precede or at least be intimately associated with the development of a successful transportation line. New trade routes are most apt to be built up with countries whose resources are just being developed. Such countries usually lack capital, and not infrequently transportation companies when not the owner of the product must advance capital to those who are developing natural resources and producing merchantable products. It is said that the success of the Germans in developing trade has frequently depended on processes of this sort.

Can it have been contemplated by the proponents of this measure that the United States would embark upon trading enterprises? If so, the details of such a plan should certainly be revealed. It would be interesting to know exactly how this is to be accomplished. If such a course is not contemplated, then the expectation of stimulating our trade relations by the provisions of this bill would prove utterly futile.

Taking up the alternative supposition, namely, that the bill contemplates a permanent policy of the Government, inevitably raises the whole question of the expediency of Government ownership. The general arguments against this policy run with full force against this particular application of it. We may briefly state the principal objections to the general policy of Government ownership as follows:

(a) Subtraction from the field of personal endeavor, (b) destruction of individual initiative and motive for effort, (c) the constant tendency to maximum costs, (d) multiplication of Government employees and officials, (e) increased opportunity for corruption, (f) labor problems, (g) administrative and executive inefficiency, (h) restriction of the motive to invent and improve the facilities of service, etc.; and in general it may be said that industries reach their highest perfection and greatest efficiency when allowed to develop in the free play of economic forces. This is a process of constant change and adaptation calling for high executive ability and the utmost freedom of action, while Government agencies are necessarily sharply limited by absolute law and tend to become stereotyped, cumbersome, and immobile.

It is, however, to the special objections to the scheme of Government ownership proposed in this bill that attention is directed. With the exception of those who favor Government ownership in whatever form because it accords with their belief in a socialistic state, even its most radical advocates have limited its scope to two classes of industries, (a) public-service enterprises which naturally tend to become monopolistic, and (b) certain activities supposed to be closely associated with the moral or social interest of a community. Of the latter class may be mentioned bathhouses and lodging houses in some instances owned by municipalities.

The essence of the argument for public ownership of certain public utilities is that their highest efficiency and minimum costs are attained under monopolistic conditions. With the element of competition removed as a check on charges and deterioration of service the necessity of public control immediately arises. Under such conditions the expediency of public ownership may be argued with considerable plausibility. It is to be noted that such activity is exclusive in the given field and thus eliminates entirely competition with private interests and modifies materially other difficulties, such as labor problems, etc.

The experiment in Government ownership as proposed in this bill can not be justified by any of the arguments which apply to the taking over in its entirety of a naturally monopolistic public enterprise. The field which it invades is as far from naturally monopolistic conditions as could be selected. No public franchises are required, no streets are occupied or torn up or other public property laid under tribute, no special privileges are granted, nor uniformity of service required.

The bill provides merely a plan by which the Government may become a competitor in the shipping business with private shipowners, and at least for a considerable time a comparatively small competitor. Only one of two results could follow: If the Government should go into the business expecting to earn a reasonable profit, such as the minority stockholders, as provided for by the measure, might reasonably anticipate, and should fairly subject itself to all the economic conditions of the trade in buying, maintaining, and operating a fleet of merchant ships, making adequate provision for depreciation and obsolescence and for ordinary and the present extraordinary risks and losses, it would not materially change the existing status.

If, on the other hand, the Government should pursue the policy of operating its boats on a no-profit basis, it would of course have the result of immediately driving private competitors off any route it chose to invade. It would also immediately check or stop the investment of private capital in the shipping trade. In short, instead of increasing tonnage, it would very soon reduce it, eventually doing more harm than good. The testimony of Mr. Huebner before the Committee on Interoceanic Canals of the United States Senate, as recorded in the hearings on H. R. 14385, on pages 100 and 101, indicates that such Government-owned merchant vessels as already exist, in order to promote the general interest of shippers as well as shipping, have been obliged to enter conference agreements or at least tacitly concur in such arrangements.

This by no means exhausts the difficulties to be encountered by the Federal Government in becoming a competitor in the shipping trade. If such vessels were to engage in foreign trade, they would almost surely come in competition with the foreign-owned lines. Should they attempt to establish unprofitable rates in order to promote American trade, it is easy to predict that foreign Governments would devise retaliatory measures, which would more than offset the advantage sought.

One of the provisions contained in the bill for securing ships aggravates the dangers of international complications. Undoubtedly it was one of the inspiring motives for those who framed this bill to release boats which have been interned as a result of the war. Whether such vessels could be purchased without giving offense is a delicate question. One of the policies of the present administration accorded universal approval is that of maintaining the most circumspect neutrality. The President has gone to the almost unprecedented limit of using his utmost endeavor to discourage private loans to belligerents. Is it consistent with so strict an application of the policy to make—at least indirectly—available to one of the belligerents many millions of dollars which had been made unavailable by the incidents of war?

Perhaps a still more perplexing problem would arise out of questions incident to the status of Government-owned merchant vessels.

Determination of questions of this sort would certainly subject international law and international customs to wholly new circumstances. Would such boats have the quality and be subject to the amenities due to war vessels or would they subject the dignity of the United States to the treatment accorded to privately owned merchant craft on the high seas? Undoubtedly the most disturbing element of the present conflict so far as the United States is concerned is the attitude taken by one of the belligerents toward the shipping of neutral nations. This has been the subject of repeated protests and has recently caused the President to file with the Government referred to a note of emphatic disapproval.

It is not necessary to enumerate in detail the difficulties to be encountered. The right of search now maintained would certainly subject a Government-owned vessel to serious embarrassment. Even the fact that such vessels might be expected to maintain exceptional precautions as to their cargo and manifests, yet the constantly changing character of contraband goods, being apparently limited only by the declarations of belligerents, would be a constant source of uncertainty and irritation. In short, every such craft set afloat would add one more risk of our being drawn into the present war, to avoid which is the most united and fervent desire of all American citizens.

Another serious objection to the measure arises from the necessity of experience and expert knowledge in any commercial or industrial enterprise. It is a grave error to suppose that the Government or any other untried agency can enter the shipping business and make a success of it. It is not only necessary that any transportation line should own or control ships, it must own or have the use of necessary wharves; it must also have affiliations with shippers; it must have that familiarity with the course of trade which is acquired by long experience. This includes an acquaintance with shippers and a careful study of the demands of shipping and of the carrying of exports and imports. Established lines have agencies all over the world. Any corporation, such as that contemplated by the bill, would be entering upon a new field and be compelled to act under very great disadvantages, because placed in competition with those who have had long experience and have gained skill in the business contemplated.

In view of the above considerations and other facts and arguments which will no doubt be presented in a more extended discussion of the bill, the undersigned recommend that Senate bill No. 6856 be not enacted into law.

THEODORE E. BURTON.
KNUTE NELSON.
GEORGE C. PERKINS.
WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH.
GEORGE T. OLIVER.

Mr. President, there are certain tables accompanying this report, which I ask to have inserted without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The tables referred to are as follows:

APPENDIX I.

Freight rates from New York to Brazil.

[Furnished by Paul F. Gerhard & Co.]

	1892				1912			
	Pernambuco.	Bahia.	Rio de Janeiro.	Santos (landed).	Pernambuco.	Bahia.	Rio de Janiero.	Santos (landed).
Flour, barrel	$1.20	$1.40	$1.30	$1.70	[1] $0.80	$0.80	$0.80	$0.80
Flour, sack (100 pounds)	.60	.70	.65	.85	[1] .40	.40	.40	.40
Gasoline, case					[2] .60	.60	.60	.60
Kerosene, case	.40	.45	.45	.55	[1] .30	.30	.30	.30
Cottonseed oil, per cubic foot	.20	.22½	.22½	.27½	[2] .20	.25	.25	.20
Lubricating oil, barrel	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.50	[2] 1.80	1.80	1.80	1.50
Lubricating oil, cases, per cubic foot	.20	.22½	.22½	.27½	[2] .15	.15	.15	.12
Turpentine, case	.40	.45	.45	.55	[2] .71	.60	.60	.60
Rosin, per 280 pounds	1.10	1.20	1.20	1.50	[1] 1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
White pine lumber, per M square feet	25.00	25.00	25.00	30.00	[1] 16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Codfish, tubs, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	.70	.73	.75	.90	[2] 1.10	1.25	1.25	1.25
Codfish, drums, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	.70	.73	.75	.90	[2] .85	1.00	1.00	1.00
Codfish, ½ drums, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	.70	.73	.75	.90	[2] .42½	.50	.50	.50
Hardware, per cubic foot	.25	.30	.35	.45	.30	.35½	.31½	.27
Cement, per 100 pounds	.75	.90	1.05	1.35	[3] 6.00	6.00	6.00	8.40
Automobiles, per cubic foot	.25	.30	.35	.45	.24	.28½	.24	.24
Barbed wire, per 100 pounds	.75	.90	1.05	1.35	[3] 4.00	4.80	4.00	4.20
Plain wire, per 100 pounds	.75	.90	1.05	1.35	[3] 4.00	4.80	4.00	4.20
Electrical material, per cubic foot	.25	.30	.35	.45	.30	.35½	.30	.30
Tin plates, per 100 pounds	.75	.90	1.05	1.35	[3] 10.80	10.20	8.40	8.40
Machinery (up to 2 tons), per foot	.25	.30	.35	.45	.24	.28½	.25	.25

	June and July, 1914.				December, 1914.			
	Pernambuco.	Bahia.	Rio de Janeiro.	Santos (landed).	Pernambuco.	Bahia.	Rio de Janeiro.	Santos (landed).
Flour, barrel	$0.60	$0.70	$0.70	$0.70	$0.75	$0.75	$0.75	$0.75
Flour, sack (per 100 pounds)	.27½	.30	.30	.30	.35	.35	.35	.35
Gasoline, case	[1] .17	.17	.17	.17	.28	.28	.28	.28
Kerosene, case	.17	.17	.17	.17	.28	.28	.28	.28
Cottonseed oil, per cubic foot	.22	.31	.18	.21	.29½	.38¾	.22½	.20½
Lubricating oil, barrel	2.52	3.96	2.52	2.52	3.15	4.97	3.15	3.15
Lubricating oil, cases, per cubic foot	.21	.33	.21	.21	.26½	.41½	.26½	.26½
Turpentine, case	.55	.55	.55	.61	.68¾	.68¾	.68¾	.70½
Rosin, per 280 pounds	.90	.90	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
White-pine lumber, per M square feet	22.00	30.00	22.00	18.00	27.50	37.50	27.50	22.50
Codfish, tubs, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	1.26	1.35	1.05	1.05	1.57½	1.68¾	1.31½	1.31½
Codfish, drums, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	1.02	1.02	.85	.85	1.27½	1.27½	1.06¼	1.06¼
Codfish, ½ drum, per 100 pounds (1892 only)	.51	.51	.42½	.42½	.63¾	.63¾	.53	.53
Hardware, per cubic foot	.39	.46½	.36	.39	.48¾	.58	.45	.48¾
Cement, per 100 pounds	5.40	5.40	3.60	4.20			6.00	6.50
Automobiles, per cubic foot	.30	.37½	.27	.30	.37½	.47	.33¾	.37½
Barbed wire, per 100 pounds	7.20	6.00	5.40	6.00	9.00	8.25	6.75	7.50
Plain wire, per 100 pounds	7.20	9.00	5.40	6.00	9.00	10.75	6.75	7.50
Electrical material, per cubic foot	.39	.46½	.36	.39	.48¾	.58	.45	.48¾
Tin plates, per 100 pounds	11.40	10.80	7.20	8.40	14.25	13.50	9.00	9.50
Machinery (up to 2 tons), per cubic foot	.33	.43½	.30	.30	.41¼	.54½	.37½	.37½

[1] Ffa. [2] Landed. [3] Per 2,240 pounds ffa.

NOTE.—For year 1914: Bahia, plus 84 cents per ton, weight or measurement, new port tax charge; Rio de Janeiro, plus $1.80 per ton, weight or measurement, landing charge on all landed cargo.

Freight rates from New York to River Plate.

	1901			1912			June and July, 1914.		December, 1914.	
	Montevideo.	Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo.	Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo and Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo and Buenos Aires.	Rosario.
Agricultural implements, per cubic foot	$0.15	$0.15	$0.18	$0.20	$0.22½	$0.26½	$0.20	$0.24	$0.25	$0.30
Canned goods, per cubic foot	.24	.24	.27	.32½	.35	.40	.32½	.36¼	.40¾	.45¾
Leather, per cubic foot	.29½	.29½	.35¼	.37½	.40	.43	.37½	.41½	.47	.53
Kerosene oil, per case	.21			.21			[1] .17		[1] .21½	
Naphtha, per case	.27½			.40			[1] .17		[1] .21¼	

[1] Montevideo only.

Freight rates from New York to River Plate—Continued.

	1901			1912			June and July, 1914.		December, 1914.	
	Montevideo.	Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo.	Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo and Buenos Aires.	Rosario.	Montevideo and Buenos Aires.	Rosario.
Cottonseed oil, per cubic foot	$0.14	$0.14	$0.17	$0.15	$0.15	$0.19	$0.15	$0.19	$0.18½	$0.21½
Cereals, per cubic foot	.24	.24	.27	.30	.32½	.36½	.32½	.36½	.40½	.45½
Machinery, per cubic foot	.21	.21	.24	.25	.27½	.31½	.20	.24	.25	.30
Lubricating oil, per cubic foot	.14	.14	.17	.25	.27½	.31½	.15	.19	.18½	.23½
Paint, per cubic foot	.25	.25	.28	.20	.22½	.26½	.20	.24	.25	.30
Turpentine, per case	[2] 20			.45			[1] 25		[1] 31½	
Automobiles, per cubic foot	.30	.36	.36	.22½	.22½	.26½	.20	.24	.25	.30
Barbed wire, per 2,240 pounds	2.40	2.40	3.60	7.20	8.20	9.40	4.20	5.04	6.60	7.80
Plain wire, per 2,240 pounds	2.40	2.40	3.60	6.00	7.00	8.20	4.20	5.04	6.60	7.80
Sulphate of copper, per 2,240 pounds	8.40	8.40	9.60	8.00	9.00	11.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	12.50
Cart material, per cubic foot	.15	.15	.18	.25	.27½	.31½	.25	.29	.31½	.36½
Hardware, per cubic foot	.21	.21	.24	.32½	.35	.40	.32½	.36½	.40½	.45½
News printing paper, per 2,240 pounds	4.50	4.50	5.70	11.00	13.00	16.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	9.00
Furniture, per cubic foot	.27½	.27½	.31½	.20	.22½	.26½	.20	.24	.25	.30
Drugs, per cubic foot	.29½	.29½	.35½	.37½	.42	.46	.37½	.41½	.47	.52
Cotton bags, per cubic foot	.18	.18	.21	.35	.40	.43	.20	.24	.25	.30
Cotton yarn, per cubic foot	.21	.21	.24	.32½	.35	.40	.20	.24	.25	.30

[1] Montevideo only. [2] Per cubic foot.

APPENDIX II.

Rates of freight, New York-Liverpool and New York-London, for the years 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914, stated quarterly.

[Furnished by P. A. S. Franklin of the International Mercantile Marine Co.]

NEW YORK-LIVERPOOL.

	Provisions.		Grain.		Flour.		Lumber.	
	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.
1911.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Pence.*	*Pence.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
First quarter	[1] 16.88		2d. and 5 per cent per 60 pounds.		9	6	14	9
Second quarter	[1] 16.88		1¼d.		8.44		14	10
Third quarter	[1] 16.88		2¾	1½	8.44		16.88	10
Fourth quarter	[1] 16.88		3½	2¼	12	10	16.88	10
1912.								
First quarter	[1] 19.69		5	2½	13	8½	16.88	10
Second quarter	[1] 19.69		3½	2¼	12	10	15	11
Third quarter	[1] 19.69		4¼	4¼	12	12	17	11
Fourth quarter	[1] 19.69		5½	3½	18	12	17	12
1913.								
First quarter	[1] 22.5		4½	2¼	16	16	19	15
Second quarter	[1] 22.5		3¼	3	16	16	20½	17
Third quarter	[1] 22.5		3	2½	16	16	20½	17
Fourth quarter	[1] 22.5		3	2	14	14	20½	15
1914.								
First quarter	[1] 22.5		3	1½	14	14	22½	18½
Second quarter	[1] 22.5		No grain.		12	10	18½	15
Third quarter	45	22½	2½	1½	20	12	18½	15
Fourth quarter	33¾	28¼	8	5	26	21	29	15½

NEW YORK-LONDON.

1911.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Pence.*	*Pence.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
First quarter	[1] 16.88		1¾	1½	8	8	18	13
Second quarter	[1] 16.88		1¾	1½	8	8	18	13
Third quarter	[1] 16.88		2	1½	10	8	18	13
Fourth quarter	[1] 16.88		3½	1¾	11	8	18	13
1912.								
First quarter	[1] 19.69		5	2½	15	9	20	16
Second quarter	[1] 19.69		4	3	15	14	20	16
Third quarter	[1] 19.69		5	2½	16	11	20	14½
Fourth quarter	[1] 19.69		5½	3	20	14	22½	16
1913.								
First quarter	[1] 22.5		5	3½	20	18	22	17½
Second quarter	[1] 22.5		3½	1½	18	16	22	17½
Third quarter	[1] 22.5		3½	1½	18	16	24	17½
Fourth quarter	[1] 22.5		3	2½	18	15	24	17½
1914.								
First quarter	22.5		2½	1¾	18	12	24	19½
Second quarter	22.5		1½	1¼	13	11	24	17½
Third quarter	45	22½	6	1½	21	11	32	17½
Fourth quarter	45	28¼	8½	3	26	13	40	17½

[1] Per 100 pounds.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I now propose to turn my attention to a discussion of the merchant-marine question in its larger sense, a question that has engaged the attention of Congress in former years and which is engaging the attention of Congress at the present time. Whether or not what I have to say will interest Senators I do not know, but I feel that it is important that certain facts relating to this great question and to the scheme that is contemplated in the bill now under discussion should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and before the American people.

The proposition that the Government shall purchase or lease vessels and put them in the over-seas trade is, in the first place, a complete reversal of the policy of our Government in matters of that kind. It is a distinct and unqualified recognition of the

principle of Government ownership, and for that reason is, to my mind, utterly objectionable. From my viewpoint there never has been a time when by a reasonable outlay on the part of the Government we might not have had an American merchant marine, the simple method being to somewhat increase the subvention provided for in the ocean-mail act of 1891, for the carrying of our mails to foreign countries, a policy adopted by all maritime nations. Had that policy been adopted, which I have advocated persistently for many years, there would have been no need of legislation such as is now proposed in the bill under consideration. Being opposed in toto to the principle of Government ownership, I oppose the bill on that ground, and on the further ground that I am fully persuaded that if the project is entered into it will prove to be a flat failure financially and may involve us in serious international complications.

In the hearing before the House committee Secretary McAdoo frankly admitted that the ship lines that are in contemplation will probably not be self-sustaining, and it goes without the saying that if the Government engages in business in competition with private enterprise and loses money in the operation the taxpayers of the country will not long submit to a business experiment of that kind.

In every effort that has been made to secure legislation in the interests of the American merchant marine by granting a postal subvention a provision has been inserted in the bills to the effect that the vessels should be constructed according to plans and specifications furnished by the Navy Department, and that they should be so constructed as to be available in time of war. In the present bill no such provisions are made. The proposition is to purchase a fleet of old ships, most of them constructed for transportation purposes, the value of which as auxiliaries in time of war would be, at the best, negligible. It seems to me the part of wisdom for Congress to reject this proposition and to then make adequate appropriations from the Public Treasury, either by increasing the mail subvention or by direct subsidies sufficient to enable private capital to build ships so constructed as to not only serve the purposes of over-seas transportation but to be of real value to the country in time of need. Who can tell the amount of money that will be required to rebuild the ships that it is proposed to purchase, so as to make them available for our purposes? The whole scheme is chimerical, and if this legislation succeeds it will be at best a tremendously expensive and foolish venture.

It should constantly be borne in mind that there is a Government-owned steamship service in existence at the present time, but it is not exactly a favorable precedent for new legislation.

The Panama Railroad steamship service has been operated by the Government in large part as an auxiliary to the work of canal construction. Its vessels have had the preference in the carrying of canal supplies and material, particularly of the cement, of which so many thousands of tons were used in building the locks of the great waterway. This Government line has in every possible way been favored by the Government, and yet it appears from its annual reports that the net result of its operations during the three years 1911, 1912, and 1913 is a deficit for these three years of $12,365.54.

But this deficit does not tell the entire story of Government ownership and management of the New York-Colon line, for this Government line is not run on the ordinary accepted methods of the steamship business. No money is paid out by the Government line for insurance; a commercial company would have to pay about 3 per cent a year. The Government line does not make any allowance for the depreciation of its floating property; a commercial company would make an allowance annually of 5 per cent. Finally, so far as is known, the Government line is not charged up with any interest, but this is a fixed obligation of a commercial company, and the rate paid probably would be 6 per cent.

To be exempt from insurance charges, from depreciation charges, and from interest charges, and yet to show a net deficit for the operations of three years, is not a brilliant record—not a record calculated to encourage the American people to desire to have their Government go into the steamship business on a larger scale. Any commercial company in the place of this Government line and managed in the same way, having to pay insurance and interest, and having to mark off 5 per cent annually for depreciation, would have gone into bankruptcy long ago. But, as a matter of fact, the American steamship companies that have been carrying goods in competition with the Government line between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts via the Isthmus of Panama, or until recently via the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, are supposed to have been doing a reasonably prosperous business, and they have been doing this because commercial steamship companies are in a position to do business very much better than is the Government. There is no suspicion of graft or wrongdoing of any kind in the management of the Government-owned line to Panama. There are trained steamship men at the head of it. But the relative lack of success of this one Government line is believed by those familiar with the shipping trade to be due to causes inherent in Government ownership and management of business enterprises.

A few years ago there were bills before Congress, resulting from the inquiry of the Merchant Marine Commission, that provided for the payment of adequate compensation under the terms of the act of March 3, 1891, in order to create national lines of American-built steamships owned by commercial companies under contract with the Government, from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States to the principal ports of South America, and across the Pacific to Japan, China, the Philippines, and Australasia. It was the expectation and the estimate of practical merchants, bankers, and shipping men that an expenditure of $2,000,000 a year, in addition to what is now being paid, would suffice to establish and maintain a swift postal service under the American flag to all the countries mentioned, and that this service would require the construction and employment of at least 30 American steamers, ranging in size from 6,000 to 15,000 or 20,000 tons, and costing from $750,000 to $3,000,000 each, or a much larger fleet if the ships were of less tonnage. These ships, it is true, would be owned by commercial companies, but they would be serving the postal and trade needs of the United States and under the terms of the law would be as surely available for naval auxiliary service in time of need as if they had been owned by the Government.

If those bills had been enacted it is probable that Congress would not now be confronted with this proposition to invest $30,000,000 or more of money, to be borrowed by the United States, in order to qualify the Government to embark in the ocean steamship business, and it is conceded that this will be but the beginning of the enterprise.

It is manifestly going to cost a great deal more money now than it would have cost if the other plan had been adopted several years ago. Apparently the Government now is going to buy and own the ships outright. It will be found that $30,000,000 will not go so far in the purchasing of ships as may be imagined. Assuming that the newly acquired vessels will cost each $1,000,000—not an extravagant supposition—it must be remembered that it will not be safe for the Government to put all of the $30,000,000 into ships, as something must be kept in reserve as working capital. Therefore it is probable that no more than 15 or 20 vessels can be added to the merchant marine by this extraordinary expedient of Government ownership, or distinctly fewer than would have resulted from the passage of the ocean mail bill of several years ago.

It was stipulated that those ocean mail ships should be built in American shipyards. They would have provided employment for several years to thousands of skilled American mechanics. But it appears to be contemplated in the present movement to purchase cheap ships of foreign registry—so that American labor will fail to procure any employment in the construction of the proposed fleet for Government ownership. It is quite possible that these vessels may be cheaply bought, but if this is so, it should be borne in mind that it is at the expense primarily of the workers in our shipyards and allied industries, and to the practical destruction of private shipping.

The way will be open for the foreign steamship companies that may sell their ships to the United States to build new, larger, and more economical vessels when the war is ended—vessels with which the older craft of the proposed Government fleet can not compete in international commerce. What would then become of this Government fleet—what use or refuge would there be for it? It has been suggested that the ships could be used as transports, and it is an unfortunate fact that almost any old thing seems to be regarded as good enough for carrying the soldiers of the United States. Thus the old foreign-built transports that were acquired before the outbreak of the Spanish War are still being kept ready for service, though any commercial company compelled to work its way and bear the stress of competition would long since have relegated such old hulks to the scrap heap. Again, what say our Democratic friends to the proposition to buy old ships built in foreign shipyards where the eight-hour day does not prevail, and put them in competition with American ships constructed under the strict terms of the American eight-hour law?

It is stated that the purpose of the bill establishing the Government in the steamship business is to provide facilities for the export of grain, cotton, and other products of the United States to the ports of Europe. Have the champions of the proposed legislation considered the international aspect of that

undertaking? Already it is intimated that the British Government will not look with favor on the purchase of German steamships lying idle in our ports and the operation of them under the American flag in competition with British and French steamers.

Do the promoters of the legislation intend that the Government shall buy the German steamers of the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd Steamship Cos.? Is it not well known that these two German steamship companies maintain peculiarly close relations with the Imperial Government? Has it not been repeatedly stated that the German Emperor himself is a large stockholder in the Hamburg-American Co.? To whom would the money go if some millions of dollars were taken out of our Treasury and used for the purchase of these German ships? Would not Great Britain and France be in a position to complain that we were replenishing the German war chest and strengthening the resources of their enemy? Would it not be very difficult under these circumstances for us to continue to maintain the correct neutral attitude desired by all Americans?

These Government-owned ships of the United States will have a character before the world entirely unlike that of ordinary merchantmen. They will be regarded as almost a part of the United States Navy—they may perhaps be commanded by naval officers, for the plain warning comes from Europe that if they are brought under our flag they must be officered by Americans and not by the men who now have charge of them.

Assume that these German ships once purchased are loaded at New York with foodstuffs and are sent thus laden to the open ports of the British Isles. Is there not some serious danger of a remonstrance from Germany that we are feeding her enemy, and that the next time the ships should be sent to Bremen, Hamburg, or Trieste? What will the answer of our Government be if a representation of this kind is made to the State Department? It will be a matter of common knowledge all over the world that the United States Government is directing the movements of these ships and is responsible for the service which they may undertake. How can these national vessels be used to feed a nation on one side without great peril of provoking the resentment of all nations on the other side? Is not a Government fleet of steamships a most fruitful source of discord under present conditions between the United States and the belligerents of Europe? The export of some thousands of bales of cotton or bushels of wheat would have been dearly purchased if it involved us in war or risk of war.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts and the senior Senator from New York have discussed the international aspect of the question so ably and unanswerably that nothing further need be said on that ground.

In the Boston Commercial Bulletin of Saturday last, a leading trade journal, was an editorial that will bear reproduction. It is headed: "Shall it be war for us?"

I will say that the editor of that paper has represented the United States Government as an ambassador to one of the present belligerent nations. The editorial reads:

Secretary McAdoo assures the country that there is no ground whatever for the fear that the sovereignty of the United States Government would be involved if one of the ships which are provided for by the shipping bill now before Congress were seized by a belligerent. He admits that if the ships in question were operated outright by the Government, an awkward situation might arise; but where the Government, he declares, is merely a stockholder in a private corporation, no question as to the Government's sovereignty arises in the event of the seizure of the property of the corporation. "The Government," he argues, "would stand in relation to such a corporation exactly as any individual stockholder does to a corporation in which he is interested. A suit against the corporation does not necessarily involve the shareholders."

What arrant nonsense. Does anyone suppose that the seizure by a foreign Government of the Suez Canal, which is owned by a private corporation in which Great Britain has a controlling interest, would not be considered a direct challenge of the sovereignty of England? Would that country calmly consent to have the justice of the seizure thrashed out in some court, or rather would not her answer be a prompt declaration of war?

The Panama Railroad Co. is another private corporation, but its entire capital stock is owned by the United States Government. Is there anyone in this broad land who can demonstrate to his own satisfaction that the forcible acquisition of that property by a foreign country would not be an act of hostility against the American Nation?

The President's shipping bill provides for a corporation to be created by the Government, to be owned by the Government, and to be managed by the Government. Panama Canal bonds, which, of course, are a Government security, are to be issued to the amount of $30,000,000 for the purchase or construction of ships. The affairs of the corporation are to be managed by a shipping board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General. In other words, we are to have nothing less than a Government institution whose every activity will have, and, indeed, must have, the sanction of the Government itself. To aver, therefore, that foreign interference with the affairs of such an enterprise could not possibly involve the sovereignty of the United States Government is worse than fallacy. It is drivel.

The President has declared that those who oppose his shipping bill must answer for the grave economic consequences of the defeat of the bill. But do those who intend to support the bill stop to reflect that they may well have consequences infinitely more appalling to answer for?

That the country's internal and external trade is seriously hampered by the lack of adequate shipping facilities no one will deny. The loss which it spells for the southern cotton grower is especially severe. Yet, viewing the matter broadly, not even the prospect of complete economic relief to all classes in the community would justify the taking of steps which might be calculated sooner or later to plunge us into the hell broth in which European civilization is to-day stewing.

The danger is not exaggerated. Greatly as it is to be deplored, the fact remains that the international peace propaganda of recent years has not appreciably changed human nature. The past 20 years alone have been marked by no fewer than seven wars of the first magnitude, culminating in the bloodiest conflict in human annals. That is to say, nations have sprung at one another's throats on an average of once every three years. When, in addition to this, it is borne in mind that there have been many occasions when other wars have been happily averted by the veriest good luck, it will be seen that for this civilized world of ours the past quarter of a century has been a period of constant war or of danger of war. The world has, indeed, been a veritable powder magazine to which the spark has been applied on more than one occasion while rulers and ministers were still engaged in exchanging with one another assurances of the most pacific intent.

Let us not be too sure, therefore, that we, too, shall not yet be drawn into that circle of fire. Human passions and prejudices and hatreds have been raised to a pitch which renders calm judgment next to impossible. Nations with their backs against the wall, fighting for their very existence and sending the flower of their manhood to inevitable slaughter can not be expected unerringly to discriminate between fancied grievances and real grievances or to have the same finical regard for the proprieties that would characterize them in time of peace. Indeed, under such conditions everything else is subordinated to the requirements of the first law of nature, viz, self-preservation. Let no neutral nation, whether intentionally or otherwise, do aught that collides with that law, for as surely as there is a sun in heaven that neutral will be called upon to choose between a humiliating backdown and the sword.

That, then, is the point toward which this monstrous Wilsonian policy is sweeping us—us who are as pitiably prepared for a death grapple with a first-class power as we were to prevent the collapse of our foreign trade on the outbreak of the present war. That any person who sees the chasm yawning in front of us will be dissuaded from opposing the shipping bill by the violent and wicked maledictions of the President is unbelievable. Now if ever is the time for sound common sense and all the forces of patriotism to assert themselves. If that means to open the floodgates of Mr. Wilson's wrath, so be it. What is either his good will or his ill will when placed on the scales with the country's permanent welfare?

I do not propose to weary the Senate, as I said a moment ago, with making any extended quotations other than I have made from the newspapers of the country; but I have quoted very freely from Republican and from Democratic papers, all of which oppose this bill with great resoluteness. I now feel that I ought to quote at least from one Progressive newspaper. The Boston Evening Record, owned and controlled by Mr. Bird, recently the Progressive candidate for the governorship of Massachusetts, has this to say in an editorial two or three days ago, the caption being the simple but suggestive word "Danger":

Senator ROOT drives home the note of warning—we buy a quarrel with every ship bought under the proposed ship-purchase bill.

While lawmakers are debating the legal points and trying to decide whether one or another party or the independent Member of Congress is the most expert in the technicalities of international law, one fact remains clear as daylight, and as difficult to snuff out or hide. By changing our policy in the midst of the war we shall lay ourselves open to the charge of insincerity and national humbug, and play directly into the hands of anyone who suspects our motives and intentions. Let's keep the country clean. Let's avoid the obvious criticism that we are making a national move for the direct benefit of one of the belligerents.

The point is not that by the passage of the ship-purchase bill we should bring money and relief to Germany, but it is that by passing that bill now we adopt a course which was not considered before the war began, and therefore are, in the midst of the conflict, selecting a new attitude which by no stretch of the powers of logic can be construed as neutral.

President Wilson has been much praised for his attitude in this war. Why? Because it has been the opinion of the country that he has resisted all temptations and dangers of bias and has kept the Nation on an even keel of impartiality and strictest neutrality. Now, what becomes of that attitude? Obsessed by the project of ship purchase, he has abandoned all his groundwork of sane statesmanship and would plunge the United States into a course and undertaking not only practically hazardous but manifestly opposed to our national professions and our national reputation for square dealing.

"We can not," says Senator ROOT, in words that will ring in history, "measure the number of our steps. One unneutral step will lead to further unneutral steps, until we are in the thing."

Every American must heed those words and that thought. Thus far in the grim and portentous history of this bleak year we have walked unscathed and honest. We can not afford to smash that record of sanity and honor. We can not afford to pander to the pocket and sell the soul of this Nation. We can not afford to substitute a plunge into speculative business for the sober investment of the Nation's character in the gold bonds of a people's integrity and good faith.

We have no part in the great quarrel of Europe. Our duty is clear, plain, inevitable. It is to walk straight, mind our own business, protect our incontestable rights, and do no man and no nation injury undeserved. Be honest! Let it be said of this Nation:

His strength was as the strength of ten
Because his heart was pure.

We must keep the faith. We must be neutral not simply in profession but in act, and our acts must be bred in conviction. Our duty is clear. It remains to follow it. Senator ROOT's warning of the consequences of subversion of principle is pertinent and historic.

Very different from the splendid progress of our great coastwise shipping is the story of our overseas shipping in its long and sad decline. As far back as 1810, under the favoring preferential customs duty and tonnage tax laws of Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison there were 981,019 tons of American shipping registered for foreign commerce. That fleet gradually increased to 2,496,894 tons in 1861. Now our registered fleet has dwindled to 1,027,776 tons. But that figure, though actually less than the total of our registered tonnage 104 years ago, does not tell the entire story, for it is well known that a large part of our present registered shipping is seldom or never engaged in actual foreign trade. Many vessels plying along the Canadian border sail under registry instead of under coastwise enrollment, from habit or convenience. Many more ships engaged in the longer coastwise voyages, especially in connection with the railroads across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and the Isthmus of Panama, also sail under registry, because their voyages carry them along the coasts of foreign countries. Other vessels are employed on infrequent voyages in foreign and frequent voyages in coastwise carrying. It is a fair general estimate that the amount of American shipping now actually and constantly engaged in foreign commerce does not far exceed 500,000 tons, or about one-fourteenth of the shipping enrolled and actually employed in our domestic trade; that is, for every ton of shipping engaged in foreign commerce the United States has approximately 14 tons engaged in domestic commerce. In 1861, as has already been said, our overseas shipping and our coastwise shipping were substantially equal in tonnage.

Since 1861, in spite of the wonderful growth of our railroads, the coastwise shipping of the United States has almost trebled in tonnage. Our foreign commerce, our exports and imports, have increased tenfold since 1861. If American shipping in the foreign trade had grown as it ought to have grown in the same proportion we should now have a fleet of 25,000,000 tons, challenging the supremacy of Great Britain on the ocean. Instead, as has been said, our overseas fleet has shrunk to a nominal 1,027,776 and an actual 500,000 tons of shipping engaged in the foreign trade. This is the only great national industry that has declined—the only one that has not grown rapidly and constantly to immense proportions. What are the causes of this economic phenomenon? It is sometimes said that a great cause was the Civil War and the depredations of Anglo-Confederate cruisers. That was a brief, temporary cause. It was ended by the war, and the actual capture and destruction of American ships in that conflict did not exceed 110,000 tons, out of a total registered fleet at the beginning of the war of nearly 2,500,000 tons, though during the war, as an indirect result of the depredations of British-built armed craft under Confederate colors no less than 751,595 tons of American shipping were sold and transferred to foreign flags. Yet when the war ceased American overseas shipping again began to grow, increasing from 1,387,756 tons in 1866 to 1,515,648 in 1867; and then, with some fluctuations, to 1,589,348 tons in 1878. Since that year the decline has been almost constant to the present time.

The Civil War was but a temporary factor; it was not permanent. It is sometimes said that the decline of our ocean shipping and the gradual loss of our carrying trade have been due to a mere change in materials of shipbuilding from wood to iron and steel and in form of propulsion from sail to steam. But American shipowners and builders had begun to launch steamships, both of wood and of iron, before the Civil War, and some of those steamships were among the most efficient and successful in the world. American sailors in the handling of vessels under canvas, be they frigates, merchant ships, or yachts, have always been acknowledged the most capable men of their calling. But the history of mechanics and inventions shows, too, that the American race has a genius for metal working and machinery. The voyage of the American battleship fleet around the world, with a trivial expense for repair to boilers and engines, is well regarded as the most significant triumph of marine engineering in our time—every one of these battleships was built and engined in an American shipyard.

The shipwrights of this country were famous men in the working of oak and pine and hemlock, but their successors are equally famous and successful in the working of steel. For many years the United States has been the world's great steel and iron workshop. The plates, angles, and beams for shipbuilding—the raw material of the completed modern ship—have been, on the whole, for 20 years as cheap and abundant in America as in Europe. Indeed, for a large part of this time American steel for shipbuilding has been quoted at a lower price, and for a quarter of a century this material for ships for the foreign trade has been on the tariff free list, as it is now on the free list for both ocean and coastwise ships.

The explanations sometimes given—very persistently by the attorneys of European steamship companies—that the decline of the American merchant marine in ocean trade has been wholly due to the change from sail to steam and from wood to iron and steel, are superficial explanations. They do not explain at all; they do not reach the real heart of the problem. The advantages of steam over sail were recognized first in the United States as far back as the day of the *Clermont*. In the decade between 1850 and 1860 the swiftest and most popular steamships in the great trans-Atlantic passenger service were American vessels, built and engined in the United States. The records for passages between Europe and America were held then, as they had been held before in the days of the sail packet and clipper ships, under the Stars and Stripes. A high officer of the British Navy, after voyages of observation in both the British and American liners, declared shortly before our Civil War that "there are no ocean steamers in England comparable with the *Baltic* of New York." The historian of British merchant shipping, Lindsay, who had been a sailor as well as a shipowner, and had eulogized the "superior education and more rigorous discipline on board American vessels," frankly acknowledged the superior engineering efficiency of those early American steamers in the trans-Atlantic trade, attributing it to their "effective boilers and ability in their preparation." Dr. David A. Wells says of this critical period in "Our Merchant Marine":

> During the single year 1849–50 we increased our ocean steam tonnage 113 per cent, and the seagoing qualities and performances of our vessels were so admirable that the Cunard Co., which had then been in operation 10 years, was obliged to bring out new ships to compete with them.

In 1849 our deep-sea steam fleet amounted to 20,870 tons. By 1855 it had increased to 115,045, practically equaling the deep-sea steam fleet of Great Britain. Our ship owners and builders were beating their British rivals in steam shipping at that time exactly as they had beaten them in sail shipping. Later on, after the Civil War, American iron for shipbuilding purposes was acknowledged here and abroad to be superior to British iron. The American iron at first bore a higher price, but later, as the records show, American iron and steel for shipbuilding purposes were little, if any, dearer and finally cheaper than the British material.

The pleas so often heard, so often sounded in this Chamber, that the decline of American shipping in foreign trade has been due to "natural causes," the change from sail to steam and from wood to iron and steel, are without historic foundation. The coastwise trade, protected by our national laws, adapted itself to the new conditions. First iron steamships and then steel steamships were constructed in great numbers for the coastwise lines, and in these steamers, as had been done in the sail ships before them, a distinct American type and model were developed combining good carrying capacity, steadiness, and stanchness with a power and speed marking them superior to foreign vessels of the same period and of similar service.

These American merchant steamships were created in the same shipyards, by the same race of men who built the *Oregon*, the *Olympia*, the *Kearsarge*, and the *Kentucky* for the Navy of the United States. It was the coastwise trade that had kept the art of shipbuilding alive and that had made the building of our first steel battle line possible. The delusion sometimes appearing in our newspapers and sometimes heard in the Halls of Congress that the American flag has vanished from the high seas because American workmen could not build ships of iron and steel with boilers and engines is a myth too flimsy to stand serious examination. It may be an easy and plausible theory, very comforting to advocates of a drifting, do-nothing policy and to the foreign steamship companies who carry 92 per cent of our imports and exports and derive from this a revenue of $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year. But this theory is pure theory without foundation in fact, and the time has come when it must be abandoned.

And with this must go that other plausible theory that the ocean carrying business is not profitable and not worth the time and labor of Americans. This is another delusion which the foreign steamship corporations and their friends and allies in this country are very solicitous that the American people should accept. It is not true, and no one knows better that it is not true than these foreign steamship corporations themselves. Not only is the ocean shipping business profitable to foreigners who are engaged in it, but there is every reason to believe that it is profitable to some American steamship companies engaged in our West Indian trade, and that it can readily be made profitable to others also.

The Hamburg-American Steamship Co., of Germany, enjoying the favor of the Imperial Government and with the loyal sup-

port of the German people behind it, declared last year a dividend of 10 per cent. The North German Lloyd, another great German corporation, paid 8 per cent. The Peninsular & Oriental, British, paid 15 per cent. The Holland-America Line paid 15 per cent. The Japanese Nippon Yusen Kaisha paid 10 per cent, and like earnings are credited to other great steamship companies of the world. There is reason to believe that in the last two or three years before the war the dividends of most of the prosperous foreign steamship lines have exceeded the dividends of the most prosperous American manufacturing industries. If the ocean shipping business as conducted by our rivals in trade were not profitable to those people the business would not be continued, new ships would not be built, and new steamship lines would not be constantly extended to all quarters of the world. An Englishman or Frenchman or German or Japanese will no more carry on a losing trade than will an American. The notion that the ocean shipping business is not profitable is a delusion equal with that other myth that Americans can not build steel steamships and operate them. These theories are fiction pure and simple, exploited by foreign shipowners or by persons acting in the interests of foreign shipowners to discourage even the making of an effort to build up ocean shipping on the part of the United States.

How hopeless, how absurd, this theory is that Americans can not afford to go into ocean shipping is strikingly demonstrated by the fact that a huge sum, estimated at $200,000,000 of American money, is now and long has been invested in shipping under foreign flags. One company, in which American capital is a large if not a dominant factor, controls a hundred ships in the north Atlantic trade. Another operates 50 ships between our ports and the West Indies and Central and South America. If there is no money to be made in ocean commerce, why do these Americans put their money into it and increase their investments from year to year—in foreign ships, under foreign colors? All we need is sufficient encouragement from the Government to equalize conditions. That is all.

Right at this point it may be well to say that the Merchant Marine Commission asked the principal American shipowners operating vessels under foreign flags, and also leading capitalists in New York and Boston, whether they would bring their ships under the American flag and continue to engage in the foreign trade if we should recommend to Congress a free-ship law that would give them an opportunity. Every one of these shipowners and capitalists in reply to our definite question answered squarely in the negative. That is why the Merchant Marine Commission of 1904–5 did not recommend free ships. Absolute confirmation of our judgment and of the honesty of the replies of these steamship managers is to be found in the fact that, though Congress in the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, did pass a free-ship law offering American registry for the foreign trade to modern vessels built or owned by American citizens, little benefit has come from that legislation. The free-ship policy, tested by a year and a half of experience, has proved a failure as an expedient for the restoration of our merchant marine, just as the Merchant Marine Commission of Senators and Representatives predicted, and yet it was confidently asserted by the Democratic side of this Chamber when merchant-marine bills have been under consideration that if our navigation laws were amended and the purchase of ships from abroad permitted the whole problem would be solved. It is well that that Democratic fallacy has been exploded.

This brings us right to the real heart of the problem. American shipowners operating vessels under foreign colors in time of peace would not give up the foreign subsidies which they happened to enjoy—the privileges, favor, and encouragement of foreign Governments. These subsidies are not given to all foreign ships, but all foreign ships, without exception, do possess another important advantage over our American merchant marine; first, in the cheap wage scale on which they are constructed and, second, in the cheap wage scale and maintenance cost on which they are navigated. The recent Tariff Commission, in its careful examination of the woolen manufacture in the United States, disclosed by actual estimates secured in England and in this country that the cost of building a woolen mill and equipping it with the requisite machinery is from 43 to 50 per cent greater in America. The Merchant Marine Commission in 1904–5 learned that the cost of building an ocean ship in the United States was from 40 to 50 per cent greater, on the average, than in the United Kingdom, a difference due almost wholly to labor, for the steel materials were then and are now as cheap here as abroad. At the present time it is estimated that the cost of ship construction in the United States has been so lessened that the difference may range from 25 to 40 per cent, though greater, doubtless, in some special types of vessels.

But even if "free ships" put American and foreign shipowners on an equality, so far as the first cost of their vessels is concerned, our actual experience under the free-ship policy proves that this is not of itself an adequate solution of the problem. A foreign-built steamer naturalized beneath the American flag comes under American laws for officering, manning, and maintenance. Unless the steamer is a high-class craft for service on the national mail lines, under the law of 1891, not one man of her crew below the higher officers need be an American citizen. Our Government requires only that the captain, his mates, the chief engineer, and the assistant engineers in charge of a watch be Americans, and this is in accord with the general practice of the maritime world. Laws recently enacted by Congress and regulations of the Steamboat-Inspection Service under them do, however, require that American vessels, whether native built or foreign built, shall carry more officers than foreign ships. If this is a burden it is one of deliberate making by Congress. A shipowner of New York, Mr. Ernest M. Bull, of the A. H. Bull Co., gives an interesting example of the effect of our American legislation:

> We have eight ships in the Atlantic coast trade. Frequently on one side of a dock in Brooklyn is one of our ships loading an American cargo for Cuba. On the other side is a British ship of the same tonnage and practically the same type also taking on a cargo of American-made goods for the same port. We are forced to carry three more men in the engine room, more seamen, and a third mate than the British vessel is required to ship.

Capt. Robert Dollar, of San Francisco, a shipowner of wide experience, owning and operating vessels both under the American and under the British flag, makes this comparison of the required crew of a 10,000-ton cargo steamer:

	American.	British.
Water tenders	3	
Engineers	4	3
Oilers	3	[1] 2
Firemen, white crew and coal passers	12	9
Storekeepers	1	1
Donkey men	1	1
Total	24	16

[1] Who are shipped as firemen.

In the old days of the sail ships before the Civil War American vessels, as a rule, carried fewer men than their foreign competitors. The laws of the United States then permitted it. Now American laws and regulations require American vessels to carry more officers and men than their foreign competitors. These laws have been enacted under the plea of providing increased safety and efficiency in navigation. Only a few months ago the Senate passed a bill demanded by the sailors' unions which would add still further to the cost of operating American ships and place further burdens on American shipowners.

A large part, therefore, of the responsibility for driving the American flag from the high seas rests upon the Congress of the United States. It has deliberately handicapped American shipping in competition with the fleets of foreign Governments.

Foreign shipowners, who now convey 92 per cent of our imports and exports, have secured this monopoly of our ocean trade in large part through the employment of Lascars and Chinese as sailors and firemen. The wages of these Asiatics are not far from $8 a month, or one-fourth or one-fifth of the wages of white seamen in the ports of the United States. Capt. Dollar, who gave valuable testimony before the Merchant Marine Commission, stated recently that the cost of a Chinese crew of 42 men carried on an 8,000-ton cargo steamer would be about $500 a month, and out of this the Chinamen would board themselves, while an American or white crew would cost $2,630 a month on the Pacific coast and their food would be provided by the ship, making an annual difference in the operating costs of an 8,000-ton steamer of about $25,512. Indeed, Capt. Dollar declares, the difference would be greater than this, for his estimate does not include the extra men required by American regulations.

Now, the question of the merchant marine is intimately involved with the question of how this difference in wages between the Asiatic and the white man is to be met. We exclude Asiatic labor from the United States in order to preserve the standards of our own labor, but we allow foreign ships owned in Europe or Japan to come freely into the ports of the United States manned with this same Asiatic labor and steal the carrying trade of the United States away from American citizens.

But it is not only the Asiatics whose labor on shipboard underbids American labor. The seamen of the maritime coun-

tries of Europe receive wages which compare with the wages of seamen on American ships exactly as the wages of workers in European factories compare with the wages of workers in American factories. This is true of the great, luxurious passenger liners running to and fro across the North Atlantic. It is true also of the typical cargo steamships plying in and out of our North Atlantic ports. A well-known firm of New York shipowners, operating freight vessels under both the American and foreign flags, furnishes the following precise comparison of the wages of the crew of an American and of a British steamer—ships of the same type and of equal dead-weight capacity of about 4,900 tons:

	American—wages per month.	British—wages per month.
Master	$175.00	$100.00
First officer	90.00	63.18
Second officer	70.00	43.74
Third officer	60.00	.....
Carpenter	40.00	31.59
Boatswain	35.00	29.16
Quartermasters (2)	35.00	.....
Sailors (5)	30.00	(9) 24.30
Chief engineer	150.00	97.20
First assistant engineer	100.00	68.04
Second assistant engineer	90.00	48.60
Third assistant engineer	80.00	.....
Oilers (3)	40.00	.....
Donkey men (2)	40.00	(1) 31.59
Firemen (4)	35.00	(6) 29.16
Coal passers (2)	30.00	.....
Steward	60.00	38.88
Cook	45.00	34.02
Mess man	20.00	15.00
Cabin boy	20.00	.....

Total American crew, 32 men.
Total American pay roll per month, $1,655.
Total British crew, 27 men.
Total British pay roll per month, $994.66.

It will be observed that the American steamer carries a total crew of 32 men while the British steamer carries 27. American law and the regulations of our Steamboat-Inspection Service require the American ship to carry a third officer, which the British ship is not compelled to have, and a third assistant engineer, and three oilers, which the British steamer does not carry. To this extent the American ship is deliberately handicapped by the American Government in competition with the foreign vessel. In other words, our Government itself to this extent discriminates against the American flag in overseas competitive trade.

But even if our laws and regulations were so changed as to allow an American steamer to be navigated with the same number of officers and men as a British steamer of like character and tonnage, the American ship would still be handicapped by the far higher rate of wages which prevails in the United States—wages fixed by our American standards of living and by the earnings of other occupations on shore. It will be noted that the master of the American ship is paid $175 a month, as compared with the $100 salary of the British master; that the American chief engineer is paid $150 a month, as compared with the $97.20 of the British chief engineer; and so on in proportion. Remember that these wages are given to ships of exactly the same capacity and character, running side by side in the same competitive trade from New York to the West Indies. The American steamship is handicapped in the wages of her crew alone to the amount of about $660 a month.

It is manifest that the same wage difference exists between the American and the British steamship as exists between American and British factories. But the difference is made up to American factories, or has been in the past, by the American protective tariff, which equalizes conditions and gives fair play to American manufacturers and their employees. There is no such compensation to the American shipowner, who is compelled to carry on his business, if it is over-seas business, on conditions of free trade, or of worse than free trade if his British or other foreign competitor is in receipt of a subsidy from his Government. In this particular case no subsidy is enjoyed by the British steamer, but the advantage of a lower wage rate is decisive and indeed overwhelming.

In the early years of the Republic, when our merchant marine carried 90 per cent or more of our imports and exports and our merchant tonnage was most rapidly increasing, the higher wages of American officers and sailors—not so much higher as they are now, but higher even then than the wages of their foreign competitors—were offset by the 10 per cent preferential customs duty on imports in vessels of American registry. This 10 per cent preferential duty encouraged or required our merchants to employ American ships for their inward cargoes, and thus made it advantageous for them to employ American ships for their outward cargoes also. In other words, the American merchant marine in those days, when its white sails were set on every sea, was a protected industry. Being protected it prospered then, and if protected it will prosper again.

The American merchant marine alone of all our great industries has declined, for the simple reason that alone it has for many years been left unprotected by our Government. Let us remember that the preferential duty, with its beneficent effect upon American shipping, was not wholly abandoned against Great Britain, our chief competitor, until the year 1849. Up to that time American shipping in the grandest branch of our ocean carrying, the East India trade, was protected by preferential customs and tonnage rates which made British competition impossible. In the year 1849 there began the great clipper trade to the gold fields of California, which gave our shipping a temporary stimulus. But the zenith of our ocean trade was really attained in the year 1855. When the California gold trade and the Crimean War that followed had ceased to stimulate American shipbuilding, the total tonnage launched in our ports fell off significantly from its maximum of 583,450 tons in 1855 to 156,602 tons in 1859—the sharpest and most disastrous decline in our maritime history—and this, it is to be marked, under a Democratic administration and through the years of probably the lowest, least protective tariffs in our national existence.

These facts are recalled because in this Chamber and elsewhere we have too often heard the misleading assertion that the decline of the American merchant marine was due to the Civil War or to the Republican protective tariff policy. Neither one nor the other of these familiar assertions has any foundation in historic fact. They are iterated and reiterated either recklessly for political effect or through design by the agents, attorneys, and sympathizers of the European steamship combinations that now control more than nine-tenths of our ocean-carrying trade—a rich prize not to be regained by the American flag without a struggle.

The maritime Governments of Europe and Japan, as reports of our Bureau of Navigation and the British Board of Trade show from year to year, are now paying in mail and other subsidies, bounties, and subventions a total sum of from $45,000,000 to $50,000,000 annually, of which the British expenditure is nearly $10,000,000. These payments, whether ostensibly for mail or admiralty purposes, or for bounties outright, are given to encourage and develop shipbuilding and navigation, exactly as our protective tariff duties have been intended to encourage and develop manufacturing and agriculture in the United States. What is more, these foreign subsidies, bounties, and subventions are year after year achieving their object of giving the nations that bestow them command of the ocean commerce of the world. All the maritime governments of the world without exception now subsidize either their principal national lines of steamships or all their steamships. All alike regard the policy as wise, necessary, and profitable. Away from the shores of the United States there is no more questioning of the value of a policy of steamship subsidies properly bestowed than there is a questioning of the soundness of the gold standard of value.

It is the three factors of foreign subsidies, foreign low wages in shipbuilding, and foreign low wages in ship navigation that have driven the American flag almost wholly off the high seas, and which keep it off the high seas except as borne by our ships of war and the ships of our few national mail lines.

There is in the United States the capital requisite to restore our mercantile marine, the nautical skill and aptitude requisite to restore it, meeting the need of our commerce and the need of auxiliary national defense. But there must one thing more, and that is broad, brave, positive national legislation. We must make up our minds to protect and encourage the national maritime industry exactly as other national industries have been protected and encouraged. The men in American shipyards, the men on the docks and in the engine and fire rooms of American ships are equally deserving of national consideration with the manufacturers of the country, or the men on the farms, who are entitled to adequate protection, whether they are getting it now or not. The restoration of our merchant marine is not a question for the people of the seacoast and the maritime States, though within these maritime States there live more than half of the total population of this Union. This question of American shipping is a national question of as much importance to the Mississippi as to the Hudson, the Delaware, or the Columbia. A subsidy or subvention in some form to ships is as

justifiable and even more necessary than any of the millions given as a subsidy, direct or indirect, to any other industry in the United States.

I commend to the attention of the Senate the brief, specific bill which I have again introduced for national encouragement of national steamship lines carrying the United States mails and constituting a United States naval reserve to South America, Australasia, and the Orient. This bill, which has more than once received the sanction of the Senate, does not wholly solve the problem of an American merchant marine, but it is a long step in that direction and a step in a field where our national needs are first and most urgent.

As already suggested, the bill under consideration embodies an effort to embark the Government of the United States in a commercial business—the carrying of merchandise or of merchandise and passengers overseas—which, in other great mercantile countries and thus far in our own country, has always been left to private capital and personal initiative. The ownership and operation of the Panama Railroad Steamship Co. between New York and Colon has been cited as a precedent, but it is not a precedent. This steamship company was acquired as a part of the property of the old French canal company in 1903. It has been operated as an incident to the construction of the canal, and the bulk of its business has been distinctively Government business—the transportation of machinery, materials, and supplies for the canal and of United States officials and employees connected with the undertaking. No insurance has been paid on these canal ships; there has been no allowance for depreciation, and no charge for interest on capital. From these imperative obligations of commercial shipowning this one Government line has been exempt, and yet its experience, as will be shown further on, has not been such as to encourage a more extended investment in the ocean-steamship business by the United States.

Thus far no political party in America has declared for or favored Government ownership of steamship services. This present proposal has sprung up suddenly in the excitement attending the great European war.

I want renewedly to call attention to the fact that the point the President of the United States made in his veto of the immigration bill—that it never appeared in a party platform and never received the indorsement of the people of the United States—is equally applicable to the bill now under consideration. The fact is that the clause upon which the President vetoed the immigration bill, as I showed a little while ago, did appear in the Republican platform of 1896, and was indorsed by the people of the United States. But the question of Government ownership has neither been in any political platform I have any knowledge of, nor has it ever been submitted to the people of the United States for their consideration.

This bill is described as an emergency measure, but the policy which it outlines is apparently permanent. Once in the steamship business, the Government is committed to that business. There is no probable way in which it can possibly draw out, notwithstanding the suggestion is made that it may do so. Indeed, it is unquestionably the purpose of many of the proponents of this measure to put the Government into the ocean transportation business as a preliminary to general Government ownership of railroads and other public utilities. The question will inevitably be asked: If the Government operates or controls transportation facilities by sea, why should it not control transportation by land also?

This Government-ownership plan is unmistakably a step toward the goal of which some ardent minds have long been dreaming—Government ownership and monopoly of all transportation, both by sea and by land. It involves in its ultimate form a tremendous magnifying of Federal authority. Time was when the Democratic Party was supposed to cherish a fine balancing of the powers of the Nation and the powers of the States as the very palladium of our liberties, but this proposal of Democratic leaders in Congress, sustained by the national administration, would throw that older Democratic dogma to the winds. There are now 1,700,000 employees on the railroad systems of the United States. Put this army on the Federal pay roll, and add under this proposed bill another army of employees on Government steamships, and no administration, once in power, need ever dread a loss of power in this country. With this immense voting force behind it, drilled and led by astute politicians, a Federal Government of either political party would be far more securely intrenched than any Roman absolutism upheld by the spears of the Pretorian Guard.

The one justification urged for this scheme for Government ownership and operation of steamship services is the alleged justification of necessity. We are told that we need ships to convey our cotton, corn, and wheat overseas to foreign customers, that such ships owned under our own flag are not forthcoming, and that foreign ships are insufficient or absent because of the demands or hazards of the European war. Granted that the necessity does exist, who are responsible? Is it not a matter of official record, in the annals of Congress, that the earnest recommendations of three successive Republican Presidents—McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft—that sane and vigorous steps be taken by patriotic legislation in this and the other House of Congress to create an adequate American merchant marine have been defeated year after year by the lukewarmness or downright opposition of the Democratic Party aided by a few Republicans? On one occasion a bill that in the judgment of the best-informed men in America would have established swift lines of capacious American steamships to the principal South American countries and to the Orient was passed in this Chamber without a dissenting vote, only to meet obstruction and defeat in the House of Representatives.

On another occasion a similar bill had successfully run the gauntlet of opposition and had passed the House, only to be killed by a persistent Democratic filibuster in the Senate in the closing hours of Congress. There are Senators now in this Chamber who remember that event. There are Senators whose faces were wreathed with smiles of satisfaction when the object of the filibuster was accomplished and the ocean mail bill was defeated.

What is their judgment now in the unfolding of subsequent events, in the light of history? What would not the American people now give for the great fleet of American ocean steamships—built, owned, officered, and manned by American citizens—which that measure, filibustered to death, would have constructed? And that bill would have done all this for a fraction of the cost of the radical proposal which we are now expected to approve here—a proposal repugnant to Democratic and Republican traditions alike. In those great debates the very condition that exists now was pointed out, but the warning went unheeded.

Admitting, for sake of argument, that a necessity exists—that we have not enough American ships and that we must have ships to convey our cargoes and extend our trade—is there no other way in which the emergency can be met but by this revolutionary proposal of Government control and operation of steamship services? Let us recall that only a few months ago, at the outbreak of the present war in Europe, an emergency law was passed here greatly broadening the "free-ship" privilege originally extended in the Panama Canal act of 1912, and admitting freely to American registry for participation in the foreign trade all foreign-built ships, regardless of age, owned by American citizens or corporations. This emergency law also empowered the President to suspend the requirement that foreign-built ships thus admitted to registry should be officered by American citizens and be navigated in compliance with the inspection, survey, and measurement laws rigidly enforced upon American-built vessels.

Many Senators viewed that measure with serious misgivings, of which I was one, but refrained from opposing its enactment, resisting only an unnecessary and dangerous effort to extend its provisions to the coastwise trade, unaffected by the war, where American shipping was known to be sufficient. That effort to invade the coastwise trade was decisively beaten in this body by a vote of two to one, and there was then no objection to the passage of the original measure recommended by the President.

That free-ship law has now been several months in operation, and some foreign-built steamships owned by American citizens or corporations have sought the shelter of our flag. Has the time yet come to assume that this legislation has exhausted its anticipated benefits? Has a most liberal free-ship policy applied under most favoring conditions so quickly proved a failure? Are the ardent advocates of that policy in this body prepared so soon to acknowledge that free ships are powerless to solve the problem of rehabilitating our mercantile marine?

Those of us on this side of the Chamber who long ago sounded a note of warning that the free-ship policy would prove a failure, if it should ever be tried, are not disappointed in the result, but I should hope that the advocates of that policy who at any time when an attempt was made to pass a bill which some of us believed would tend to rehabilitate the American merchant marine have met us with the cry that the only reasonable and rational solution of the problem was to give Americans an opportunity to buy ships abroad would now see their error. We have given them that opportunity. In our legislation we have gone further than that, and we have actually discriminated against our own merchant marine by granting them the right of putting those ships into the trade without the restrictions that our laws impose upon American ships, and yet that policy is a failure.

It is true that applications for American registry for foreign-built vessels have become fewer and fewer in recent weeks, but it is significant that this decrease of applications has been contemporaneous with renewed official advocacy of this proposal for Government ownership. What sagacious merchant or capitalist would care to have the Federal administration and its vast powers and resources as a competitor? The prospect of having to face such competition has dismayed prospective shipowners, and will continue to dismay them. If the agitation of this subject is continued in Congress, there can be no doubt that one result will be the virtual nullification of the free-registry law and the complete cessation of efforts to bring more foreign-built ships beneath the American flag. Yet, it was only a few months ago that the Federal administration was urging this free-registry measure as the surest and most effective expedient to provide the country with a great merchant shipping. The President was given the legislation for which he asked; many Senators who questioned the soundness and efficacy of it nevertheless were unwilling to oppose it in the face of an emergency. The law was passed; it ought to have a fair chance to justify itself before being superseded by a new and untried plan, for which there is no demand and no precedent in the experience of nations.

It has always been a maxim of American statesmanship that the Government should do nothing that could be done by private enterprise. There is essentially no more reason why the Federal administration should buy, build, and operate commercial steamships than that it should undertake to grow the wheat of the country or grow and manufacture cotton. Do Senators from the States of the Middle West and Northwest wish to have the United States Government embark on a large scale in the farming business as a competitor of their constituents? Do Senators from the South desire to have the Government undertake to raise next year five or ten million bales of cotton? Is any Senator from any State in favor of authorizing the Federal administration to take over a part or all of any great business in which the labor and capital of his own people are invested?

Why, then, single out the merchant marine in over-seas trade, the industry of all industries that has received the least consideration and encouragement from the Congress of the United States? Of all our great industries exposed to foreign competition this one of ocean shipowning has alone been left unprotected—unprotected alike against the cheap wages, the subsidies, and the bounties of other lands. It is no fault of our shipowners that there are not enough over-seas ships to-day to carry American commerce. It is no fault of our shipbuilders or our seamen. They have appealed in vain for legislation that would put them on an equality with their foreign rivals and give them a fair and even chance to carry the ocean mails, passengers, and freight of the American people. They have given the country an ample warning of the inevitable result of a war like that in which the chief European nations are now engaged—the very nations upon whom we have foolishly depended for our ocean carrying. The shipowners, the shipbuilders, and the seamen of this country can not be blamed—the responsibility for any loss to American farmers, manufacturers, and merchants that may now ensue from the lack of American shipping rests squarely upon the American Congress, upon those Senators and Representatives who have obstructed legislation that was urged by men who knew the shipping business and was sanctioned by the successful experience of all other maritime Governments of the world.

It is significant that there is no complaint of any shortage of American vessels to convey the coastwise commerce of the United States; yet, Mr. President, on this very bill there is a provision which, if it becomes a law, will open the coastwise shipping of the United States to foreign-built ships. It is a vicious provision, so vicious that of itself it ought to be enough to defeat this proposed legislation. That coastwise commerce has been greatly increased by the opening of the Panama Canal, but the American vessels to convey this new coast-to-coast trade have been forthcoming. Five or six separate, competing American lines of freight steamers are now being operated on regular schedules through the canal between American ports on our Atlantic and Gulf coasts and American ports on our Pacific coast and Hawaii. Lumber, grain, fruits, sugar, wines, and other Pacific products are coming eastward and manufactured goods and coal are going westward—an all-American commerce under the American flag. Sailings are so frequent that there are enough American steamers to leave the Atlantic for the Pacific or the Pacific for the Atlantic on every business day. This coastwise traffic has been reserved for American shipowners, and they are "making good" in the carrying of this commerce, furnishing ships enough, and more.

Some of these Atlantic-Pacific coastwise companies have not only taken care of their own trade, but have supplied spare ships to carry cotton, grain, provisions, or animals to Europe. Other coastwise companies on the Atlantic have put into the European or South American export trade all tonnage that was not absolutely required to maintain the regular service—that is their first and imperative obligation. The American people in this European war have had new and convincing proof of the wisdom of the policy initiated by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison of reserving American domestic trade to American ships, on river, lake, and ocean. Unlike the unprotected branch of our merchant marine—that branch engaged in foreign trade—our coastwise shipping has grown steadily since, as before, the Civil War, from 2,752,938 tons in 1860 to 6,726,340 in 1913—an increase all the more notable because the steam vessels of which the present coastwise fleet is chiefly composed mean an even greater advance in carrying power and efficiency.

Week after week coastwise steamers not needed on their regular routes because of the serious depression in domestic business have been chartered for foreign voyages with cargoes of American products. As neutral vessels, least subject to arrest and detention by belligerents, these American ships have commanded the lowest war insurance rates, a preference which in the present emergency has been equivalent to a subsidy, and thus has offset the high wages of officers and crew and the higher cost of maintenance.

If American ships registered for foreign commerce had increased in the same proportion as American ships engaged in coastwise commerce, there would now be no interruption in our export trade; there would be enough American ships to handle all cotton and grain and provisions offering for foreign markets. The entire country, all the American people, have now learned, though at a heavy cost, that an American merchant marine is not of benefit only to New England, New York, Pennsylvania, California—not to the seaboard only, but to the cotton States and the wheat States and the corn States also—to all of the people in all trades and industries throughout the Union.

The magnificent development of American coastwise shipping, which is five times the coastwise shipping of any other nation and larger than the whole merchant fleet of Germany or any other nation except Great Britain, shows of what American shipowners, builders, and seamen are capable when given a fair and equal opportunity. There have been fair and equal conditions in this coastwise trade. American shipowners have been able to construct their ships and employ their crews on an even basis, without the handicap of competition with the low wage scale and meaner living conditions of Europe and Japan. And there has been no further and overwhelming handicap from European and Japanese subsidies and bounties.

American shipowners in the over-seas trade have been confronted by these cheap wages and these bounties and subsidies and have been almost driven from the ocean. Until the present war the only American ocean steamship services that survived were either those in receipt of moderate mail subventions under the ocean mail law of 1891—the one American line to Europe, several lines to the West Indies or Venezuela, and a line to Australia—or the two trans-Pacific lines sustained by the pride or interest of great transcontinental railroads. Other American shipowners, unaided, though the most enterprising men of their vocation in the world, had been forced off the seas and out of business.

This was no fault of theirs; it was the fault of their Government. And if that Government under the pending bill should now embark in the over-seas shipping business, it will find confronting it the same economic conditions that have made private American competition impossible. These Government lines, face to face with cheap-wage foreign lines, or foreign lines with both cheap wages and subsidies, will be forced to conduct their business at a tremendous loss. But there will be this difference, that while the private-owned American lines have pocketed their losses and withdrawn, the losses of the Government lines will be made up out of the Federal Treasury. In other words, the enhanced cost of operation of the Government-owned American ships will be provided by congressional appropriations, to be paid for by the taxpayers of the country.

It will be readily recalled that when an ocean mail bill was under consideration in this Chamber only a few years ago there was violent objection from some Senators to the proposed subventions on the ground that they involved the use of Government funds to make up the cost of a losing business. If that objection was valid then it is valid now, and no Senator who opposed that ocean mail measure as a "subsidy" can con-

sistently support the present proposal, though its foremost sponsor is the President of the United States.

If that ocean mail plan was a "subsidy," then this new plan is even more so. That earlier measure was in form an amendment of existing and well-tried legislation, involving no departure whatever from established national policy. It provided a moderate increase of compensation for the carrying of the United States mails on routes to South America, Australasia, and the Orient, where the existing rate had not sufficed to establish and maintain a service. The ships receiving this postal payment were required to be built by American labor in the United States on designs approved by the Navy Department with reference to their prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary cruisers, transports, or supply ships in time of war. All their officers and an increasing proportion of their crews were to be American citizens, who could be relied on to serve their country's flag in such an emergency. The ships were to be operated by practical shipping merchants under rigid contracts to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after due public advertisement. All were to be steamers of more than the usual commercial speed.

That was a carefully guarded, conservative measure, protecting the public interest. The bill now proposed is, by comparison, indefensibly loose and dangerous. It does not stipulate any speed. It does not require that the ships shall be constructed on designs approved by the Navy Department and thus be sure to be of value to the national defense in war. It does not require that the ships shall even be of American construction, so that skilled American labor may derive some advantage from the legislation. As a matter of fact, under the policy of the free-registry law, the ships would certainly be built or bought abroad, and under that law all their officers and crews might be, and presumably would be, foreigners, owning allegiance to belligerent and other foreign Governments. But though foreigners, these men—judging by experience thus far under the free-registry law—would demand the full American wage rate or refuse to sail; so that these ships, though there was not one American citizen on board, would cost as much to maintain or operate as a real, thorough-going American vessel, and, of course, would be under the same handicap against a cheap wage or subsidized vessel of foreign registry.

Therefore, if this bill should become a law, the Government of the United States would be called on to provide just as much money to cover the loss in operation as if the vessel were in receipt of subsidy under private ownership. In fact, there can not be the slightest question that the loss would be greater and the requisite subsidy or compensation greater—much greater—under Government than under private ownership, for all history proves that no Government can run a sharply competitive business as economically as a trained business man or corporation familiar with the business and entirely dependent on it for livelihood or dividends.

An experienced steamship manager of New York, Mr. Daniel Bacon, has lately published—in the Journal of Commerce of November 7, 1914—an analysis of the operation of the one steamship service owned and managed by the United States Government—the Panama Railroad Line from New York to Colon, already mentioned. This Government service, as has been said, was acquired as a part of the assets of the old French Canal Co., and it has been under the control of the War Department. It has been in competition, between New York and Colon, in part with foreign steamers, carrying freight and passengers to and from Central and South America, and in part with American coastwise steamers, carrying freight between Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, transshipped across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec or sent through the Straits of Magellan, before the opening of the Panama Canal.

This Government steamship line did not insure its ships, which would have been an annual charge of 4 per cent. It did not make any allowance for depreciation, which would have been 5 per cent. It did not have to pay any interest on capital, which would have been 5 or 6 per cent additional. This Government line was given the carrying of as much as possible of the machinery, supplies, and materials for the canal, and the carrying also of officials and employees of the Canal Commission.

In other words, the Government line was favored in every possible way, and yet Mr. Bacon, in his analysis of its workings, shows that its entire profits from the year 1905 to and including the 11 months of 1914 were $735,723, a fraction over 20 per cent in a period of nearly 10 years on the book value of the fleet—$3,574,713—or a profit of a little over 2 per cent a year. If the Government line had had to bear the charges of 4 per cent for insurance, 5 per cent for depreciation, and 5 or 6 per cent for interest, which would have to be borne by a commercial line, of course there would have been in these 10 years no profit even of 2 per cent, but a great and crushing deficit, which would inevitably have meant bankruptcy and dissolution.

It has been asserted that this accidental Government line to the Isthmus of Panama served to regulate competition and reduce freight rates on cement particularly. But Mr. Bacon, a practical ship manager, citing the figures reported by the Government line itself, declares that the cost of transporting cement was greater instead of less after the Government line steamers undertook it. Mr. Bacon quotes further the testimony of the manager of the Government line, given in the Federal court, that—

> A steamship line has to earn from 12 to 20 per cent to make it equivalent to 6 per cent earned by a railroad.

Not one of the great maritime nations of the world, solicitous for the promotion of the ocean-carrying trade, has chosen the method of Government ownership.

On a former occasion I called attention to the complete failure in Europe of the operation by the Government of the telephone lines, and also in certain parts of our own country of public utilities by municipal ownership. Now, I propose to give an illustration of the failure of a steamship line which was fostered by the Government of Australia.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. OVERMAN. My attention has been called to the fact that while I was out of the Chamber the Senator used certain words in his speech, as follows:

> One of the leading generals of Washington's army, a man who distinguished himself on all the battle fields of the Revolution, a man whose name has gone down in history as one of the greatest heroes this country ever produced, is to have a monument erected to his memory at Guilford Court House, N. C., and the President of the United States will not attend the dedication because he is afraid it will be an unneutral act. Unneutral to whom? To England, of course. What other country could find fault?
>
> If that is a proper attitude for the President of the United States to take, we will have the flags on the White House and on this Capitol hauled down on the 4th day of July. They ought to be hauled down.
>
> I shall await with a great deal of interest a denial of this dispatch from Raleigh. It is very specific. The dispatch says that the President's decision, together with the reason he gave, caused surprise and disappointment in North Carolina. I should think it would.

I suppose the Senator did make those remarks; and I want to say, Mr. President, that I do not know how that dispatch happened to come from Raleigh, N. C. I was present, however, when the delegation visited the White House and extended an invitation to the President to attend the exercises in connection with the dedication of the monument to Gen. Nathanael Greene at Guilford Court House and know what was said and the manner in which it was said. What was said in regard to being unneutral was said purely as a joke, in this way: When the invitation was extended the President asked if we would guarantee that the war would be over at that time. He said, "I might go down there and say something unneutral," and he laughed, and we all laughed. It was said in a perfectly joking way. There was nothing serious about it.

I know the Senator would not want to criticize the President unjustly, and yet I think what he said was merited by the dispatch that came from Raleigh. I do not criticize the Senator, but I want to set the matter right, because I was present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very happy, indeed, to have the statement of the Senator from North Carolina made. I simply took it from this newspaper dispatch, and inasmuch as one of the gentlemen or perhaps two of the gentlemen who are said to have visited the President are residents of North Carolina—President Graham, of the University of North Carolina, and Prof. George Howe—I assumed that they carried the news back to Raleigh.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see how they could have possibly gotten back to Raleigh in time to have given out that dispatch, because it occurred, as I remember, yesterday. How those things are carried I do not know. They may have gotten back to Raleigh, but I do not see how they could.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I certainly had no intention——

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, I do not blame the Senator, because the article in the paper probably justified such criticism; but I want to set the matter straight in the RECORD, and I know the Senator does not want to do an injustice to the President.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have several times said in the discussion of this question—in fact, I said it to-day—that I took newspaper articles *cum grano salis*, that I did not think they ought to be relied upon without confirmation; and yet this dispatch was so specific that I assumed that it was correct. I am very glad to have the Senator state in my time that it was a joke

rather than a serious observation on the part of the President, and I am glad that the disclaimer will go in the RECORD.

I will return to the paragraph I was reading and read it again.

Not one of the great maritime nations of the world, solicitous for the promotion of the ocean carrying freight trade, has chosen the method of Government ownership. Germany and France own railroads, but not commercial ships. They have not found such a radical departure wise or necessary. Only in western Australia has the experiment been attempted, and there the results have proved disastrous. This is a record of that Government-owned steamship line, as described a few months ago in the Liverpool Journal of Commerce:

The Government of western Australia, rudely awakened to a realization of its limitations, is evidently summoning grace and courage to abandon the rôle of shipowner. It dabbled pretty heavily in the State-owned steamer experiment, and that the outcome was disastrous is made clear beyond hope of disproof by the auditor general's financial statement. In 1912–13, according to the official figures, the steamers were run at a loss of $114,065, and it has been admitted that during 1913–14 the receipts were $387,805 and the expenditures $484,085—a deficiency for the 12 months of $96,280.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I would like simply to ask the Senator whether the rates were lower? Has he any knowledge on that point?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not the least in the world. I know that the taxpayers of Australia had to put up $96,280 to make up the deficit of that steamship line.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. True; but in a thousand ways blessings might have accrued that would have been more than equivalent to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, Mr. President, they might; but they probably did not. The article continues:

Clearly the unfortunate experience of 1912–13 has had no salutary effect in 1913–14, in spite of the fact that the Government of Western Australia, for the sake of its own credit, must have put forth a very strenuous effort considerably to reduce its losses, even if it could not make a profit. As some sort of reply to unceasing hostile criticism, the Government, it is presumable, made attempts at reorganization and retrenchment, but the now too patent futility of this course of action points to the conclusion that the State-owned steamship plan was excessively ambitious and ill considered in conception and woefully managed in operation.

Even if the Government merits the charitable supposition that it tried to put things on a better basis, the force of the moral is not one whit lessened, and the moral is that Western Australia, at any rate, can not hope to run steamships. In two years the undertaking has involved a loss of at least $210,000, which is nearly half the value of the vessels, and a Perth contemporary puts it on record that the premier airily admitted that the good ship *Western Australia*, "the pride of the anfinancial fleet," was continuing to cost more than she was bringing in, a process which will doubtless last until a new government comes along or someone buys her—the vessel is for sale—at a considerable sacrifice for cash.

Mr. President, I said yesterday, or at some time during this debate, that we probably will have a bargain-counter sale of the steamships that we propose to buy or build under this bill, if we ever buy or build any. I have no doubt they will be run at a loss, and they will be for sale to the highest bidder; and the taxpayers of the country will make up the deficit, as they are making up this $100,000,000 war tax that was levied upon them under the pretext that the war made it necessary, when the fact was that it was our tariff laws that made it necessary. In addition, the $80,000,000 deficit that has already accumulated, and which will probably be three times that amount before the fiscal year ends, will have to be paid by the taxpayers. The taxpayers will foot the bills, and the Government will have the glory of running a steamship line.

The Australian experiment has been even less encouraging and successful than the experience of the Panama Railroad steamship line in the United States. That Panama line has probably done as well as could be expected under the conditions of Government ownership. Col. Goethals is the president of the steamship company, and there is every reason to believe that his associates have been upright and industrious men. Yet the fact remains that the company, though favored to an extraordinary degree by the Government that controlled it, has not been profitable in its 10 years of operation and would have had to be abandoned if it had been an independent commercial enterprise. A part of the trade which this Government line served was the coastwise trade between the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards of the United States, where it had no subsidized or cheap-wage foreign competition. Is there any reason to believe that a Government line would be any more successful if extended to foreign ports on the west coast of South America, where it would have to meet the ships of an old-established British steamship line, the Pacific steam navigation service of the Royal Mail, which has been subsidized since 1840, and also the ships of Chile and Peru, both State-aided but not State-owned undertakings?

If we are going to have steam lines of our own to South America, why not adopt a policy that has been tested and approved by all the great maritime nations of the world, instead of a policy that in the two instances where it has been tried has been an acknowledged failure?

Lines of swift mail, passenger, and freight ships from the United States to Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Peru, comparable with the ships that have long been going out to those countries from Europe, could not be established and maintained without a considerable deficit. Even the ablest practical steamship managers will not undertake it. This is sufficiently demonstrated (first) by the fact that the United States of America, with abundant capital, great shipyards, a vast coastwise and West India fleet, and the most enterprising merchants and manufacturers in the world, has gone for 50 years without such a service to South American ports, and (second) by the fact that those European nations, our competitors in trade, that have enjoyed such a South American service have created it by mail or other subsidies or their equivalent.

Why should not we do the same? There are Senators who have said that they objected to subsidy on principle; that they were opposed to it as a form of protectionism. But can a mail subvention, paid under rigid contract to the lowest responsible bidder, for a service in ships of far more than the usual commercial speed—ships designed and built and held ready, with American officers and crews, for the naval reserve—can such a subvention be rightfully regarded as a subsidy in any obnoxious sense of that term? If it is protectionism, and so to be resisted, why have $400,000,000 in mail subventions been paid by the outright free-trade Government of Great Britain to steamship services to all quarters of the globe? Are there Senators who will confess that in matters of protection and free trade they are more strict constructionists than members of the British ministry or the British Parliament?

This has not always been so with the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party in the United States. When Great Britain in 1840 and afterwards began to create her great mail-subsidized steam lines and to extend them to the West Indies, the East Indies, and South America, it was southern Democratic Senators—Thomas Butler King, of Georgia, and Thomas J. Rusk, of Texas—who were the pioneers in all this country in urging the adoption of a similar policy by the American Government. It was a Democratic President, James Knox Polk, who in a message to Congress declared that "the enlightened policy by which a rapid communication with the various distant parts of the world is established, by means of American-built steamers, would find an ample reward in the increase of our commerce and in making our country and its resources more favorably known abroad"; but another advantage of great importance was "the privilege of taking the ships already equipped for immediate service at a moment's notice, which will be cheaply purchased by the compensation to be paid for the transportation of the mail, over and above the postage received. A just national pride, no less than our commercial interests, would seem to favor the policy of augmenting the number of this description of vessels," said President Polk.

A Democratic Congress granted the compensation, and lines of "American-built steamers" were established to Europe, to the West Indies, and to South America, at the Isthmus of Panama. Our deep-sea steam fleet grew more rapidly than Britain's. As Dr. David A. Wells says of this period in his study of our merchant marine:

During the single year 1849–50 we increased our ocean steam tonnage 113 per cent, and the seagoing qualities and performances of our vessels were so admirable that the Cunard Co., which had then been in operation 10 years, was obliged to bring out new ships to compete with them. The prospect, therefore, at one time was that the United States, although late in the start in this new department of foreign shipping, would soon equal, if not overtake, her great commercial competitor.

Later on, in the unfortunate struggle in Congress over slavery that preceded the Civil War, the policy which Polk had advocated and established was overturned, just as the historic policy of strengthening the Navy was abandoned. But in these years of peace and reunion there is no longer any sectional or partisan quarrel over the Navy, and there should be none over the merchant marine. A policy championed by a Democratic President, established by a Democratic Congress, of mail and naval reserve subventions adequate to create swift lines of American steamships, that was orthodoxy in 1847 ought not to be heterodoxy in 1914, and it ought to be preferred a hundred times to a wild scheme of Government ownership that in all the past has been utterly repugnant to all Democratic principles.

It has been pleaded by those who are advocating this new and strange doctrine that Government steamship lines to South America can not put the Federal power into competition with private American shipowners, because there are no American ships in those distant waters. That was true a few years ago, so far as concerns Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Peru. It is true to-day in the sense that no swift, regular line of passenger, mail, and freight carrying steamers runs southward of Venezuela on the Atlantic and Panama on the Pacific. But a year or two ago an American freight service, in good though not fast cargo-carrying ships, was established to Rio de Janeiro and Santos—the United States and Brazil line. Later, after the outbreak of the European war and because of that war, freight steamers of American registry were put on the routes, not only to Argentina and Uruguay but to Chile and Peru, by several New York shipping houses. These vessels do not meet the need of a swift postal and passenger service, such as is possessed by the great nations of Europe, but they may be the nucleus of such a service, and they would assuredly be very seriously embarrassed and injured by Government lines operated without regard to expense and without hope of profit by the Government of the United States.

Which is the better way, the fairer way, the more thoroughly effective and American way—to put the Government into this steamship business, and thus make it a Government monopoly by driving all American citizens out of it, or to offer a reasonable compensation, after the example of other nations and the earlier policy of this Nation, for the building of steamships suitable for the naval reserve and the transportation of the United States mails in such steamships to the chief ports of the Southern Hemisphere, to Japan, China, Australasia, and the Philippines? This would recognize the enterprise and enlist the cooperation of the practical merchants who have already ventured into these difficult trades. It would be no dangerous new departure, but an application of sound, approved principles of statesmanship, in harmony with American traditions, without risk to the honor or the solvency of the United States.

This proposed bill authorizes an expenditure of $30,000,000 for the purchase or construction of steamers and of $10,000,000 for working capital—$40,000,000 in all—for an experiment of a kind that has had and can have no ultimate result but disappointment and disaster. The other plan would leave to experienced merchants the providing of all the capital and the building of the ships, and the cost to the United States would be simply an annual compensation for carrying the mails and for the obligation to maintain ships, officers, and men available for the Naval Reserve—a genuine national benefit that, as President Polk well said, would be "cheaply purchased" by the amount of the subvention. This compensation must be paid in any event to a Government steamship service, whose stock individual capitalists are to be permitted to hold to the extent of 49 per cent. Indeed, considering the waste and extravagance that seem inseparable from Government management of business undertakings, it is certain that, aside from the capital of $10,000,000 and the $30,000,000 for ships, the annual cost to the National Treasury of the inevitable deficits would be several times as large as any mail compensation that would have to be paid to experienced and capable steamship men whose life work had been the development of ocean commerce.

This is one of the most complex and absorbing vocations in the world and one of the most difficult and costly for the amateur experiments of a political government. Is the Federal income so redundant, the Federal Treasury so overflowing, that there are $40,000,000 to spend at once and millions more every year, while already overburdened members of the Cabinet, who may change every four years or oftener, are laboriously trying to master the ocean steamship business?

An amendment to the bill gives the President authority to charter, lease, or transfer vessels purchased or constructed, and such naval auxiliaries as are not needed, to shipping corporations for use in the foreign trade. Such ships would still be of Government ownership, but they would be operated by private persons or companies. This provision represents an effort to modify the radical character of the original proposal, but there is every reason to believe that the plan proposed—of leasing or chartering Government-owned ships—will prove impracticable unless, indeed, the ships are taken at a nominal price.

In the first place, no steamship company will charter a Government ship in order to run it on any route in competition with the Government. That would be manifestly hopeless from the outset. In the second place, a company chartering a Government-owned ship will have to operate that ship in a way that will return a reasonable dividend. But it is perfectly well known, from the experience of many years, that an American ship subject to American laws must pay higher wages to its officers and crew and offer a more liberal maintenance than foreign ships, to say nothing of the subsidies or subventions paid by the foreign Governments.

These factors in the situation are not altered by the terms of this Government-ownership proposal. Let us assume that the Government purchases a foreign ship, brings her under the American flag, and offers her for lease or charter to private steamship companies for employment in the foreign trade. That ship will have cost the Government as much as a similar ship would cost a foreign steamship company. But the American naturalized ship will cost an American company a great deal more to operate, and it will receive no subsidy or subvention, which may be, and in many cases is, afforded to the ship of foreign registry.

Therefore a private American company seeking to charter a Government-owned ship must overcome in some way the handicaps of cheap foreign wages and cost of maintenance and liberal foreign subsidies. These double handicaps are so severe that no American steamship company will seek a Government-owned ship on lease or charter unless it can get such a ship for a nominal price. In that case the Government will in effect be paying a subsidy or subvention for the two purposes for which such a subsidy or subvention has always been sought—first, to offset lower foreign wages and cost of maintenance, and, second, to offset foreign subsidies.

If a subsidy or subvention is to be given by our Government, why not pay it outright and be frank about it? Why should the Congress of the United States resort to any such subterfuge as is embodied in this Government-ownership proposal?

The President signally acknowledges the truth of the contention of those of us in Congress who have sought subventions for the encouragement of the American merchant marine when he brings forward this Government-ownership measure. He acknowledges that free ships alone will not suffice; that the favorite expedient of the Democratic Party has been tried and has not proved successful.

But though the President confesses the logic of the situation he will not travel our road; he insists on blazing out another path, untried, difficult, dangerous, and expensive. A well-considered policy of mail subventions would cost the Treasury something, but it will not begin to cost the Treasury so much as a scheme of subsidy or subvention by Government ownership, for the Government of the United States can never manage the steamship business with the enterprise, the efficiency, and the economy of men who have been brought up from youth in the shipowner's calling, and are dependent upon that calling for their livelihood.

Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Washington Star the following practical questions were propounded. I presume some Senators have read them, and I hope all Senators have read them, because they are pertinent to this discussion, and I shall try to answer them in all fairness.

The Star inquires:

(1) When was the United States at the maximum of its sea carrying power?

(2) What caused the decline to the present status, when the American is a stranger to merchant ships except of coastwise tonnage?

(3) What is the difference between that older time of pride for the country and the present time of helplessness and depression as respects sea routes, sea inducements, and sea advantages?

(4) What advantages are there to a country in a large and well-appointed merchant marine in addition to those bearing upon trade?

(5) Which are the greatest of the sea carrying powers, what the extent of their business, and by what means did they establish themselves, and do now maintain themselves, on the water?

(6) And if we are to build ourselves up into their class and maintain ourselves in their company—compete with them for sea traffic—what means should we, will we be obliged to, employ?

The Star continues:

We want and should have a merchant marine. It is a reflection on the country that it pays $300,000,000 a year in freight rates on goods carried in foreign bottoms, when every dollar of the huge sum might be saved and other dollars earned by making ourselves independent on the water. The Stars and Stripes flying over merchandise should be seen in every foreign port where business is a feature of life and other great nations are doing business. This should be achieved as a commercial advantage, aside from the value a merchant fleet is to a nation in time of a war in which that nation is involved.

In the preliminary skirmishes in the Senate Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. ROOT have shown a lively interest in this subject. All three understand it, and are among the Senate's ablest Members. If, therefore, when they come to speak at length, they give us the information the Star suggests and extended comment on it, they will instruct the public and advance their contentions. The war has made some action on our part imperative; and, of course, the action taken should be without partisan or sectional bias or influence. What is in mind relates to the benefit of all.

Mr. President, these are honest questions, dealing directly with the propositions contained in the bill now under consideration, as well as the broader question relating to the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine.

I will undertake to answer them, going back to the time before the Civil War and tracing the decline of the American merchant marine from that time to the present, treating the matter as briefly as possible.

A reply to these questions will necessitate some repetition of what has been already said, but the importance of the subject warrants it.

The United States was at the maximum of its sea carrying power in the year 1855, six years before the outbreak of the Civil War. In that year our country possessed 2,348,358 tons of shipping registered for over-seas commerce, and carried in its own ships nearly 76 per cent of its combined imports and exports.

In 1855 a huge fleet of 381 ships and barks, adapted especially for foreign commerce, was launched from American shipyards, and the total output of our yards that year was 583,450 tons, the largest in our national history up to that time.

It is true that in earlier years, notably in 1825 and 1826, 92 per cent of our imports and exports were carried in American vessels. But our total commerce was much smaller then. It had grown with the growth of the Republic, and American ships in 1855 were carrying not only 76 per cent of our own trade but a considerable share of the trade of less vigorous maritime nations.

In the year 1855 a series of fortuitous circumstances, beginning with the Irish famine of 1847 and an unusual European demand for our foodstuffs, then the discovery of gold in 1848 in California and the development of a great new carrying trade around Cape Horn, and later the Crimean War of 1854, had given a vast impetus to our shipbuilding and navigation. Another powerful influence was the ocean mail subsidies, first granted in 1845 on the recommendation of a southern Democratic President, Polk, and under the leadership of southern Democratic Senators and Representatives. These ocean mail subsidies, following the British example, rapidly created one line of American-built ocean steamships after another to Europe, to the West Indies, and to the Isthmus of Panama.

In 1847, before our new ocean mail lines were started, at the urging of a Democratic President, by a vote of a Democratic Congress, the United States possessed only 5,631 tons of steamships registered for over-seas carrying. In 1849 our ocean steam shipping had grown to 20,870 tons, and from that point for some years its increase was great and constant, to 95,036 tons in 1854 and to 115,045 tons in 1855. Great Britain had been the pioneer in shipping subsidies, but the United States had made far more effective use of them, and in 1855 was practically equal with her great competitor. American ocean steamships then, like the famous American clipper ships, were the fastest, the most efficient, and the most profitable in the world. A captain of the British Navy, appointed to observe the British Cunard and American Collins liners on the North Atlantic, declared, as a result of his investigation, that "there are no ocean steamers in England comparable with those of the American line."

These great, powerful ocean steamships were all of them built and owned in the Northern States. They sailed out of northern seaports and were manned by northern officers and crews. They were faster than the regular warships of that period. They were a formidable reserve of a fighting Navy. Unfortunately the slavery quarrel had begun to estrange the Southern from the Northern States. The South in Congress looked with concern on the increase of the maritime strength of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. The Middle West and Southwest demanded more and more Federal money for internal improvements. These sections, uniting, influenced Congress in 1856 to reduce the mail subsidies to our ocean lines, which were then fighting strongly and successfully the competition of the State-aided steam lines of Great Britain.

In other words, the Congress of the United States, under the short-sighted urging of the South and West, took protection away from American steam shipping in the very height of its struggle with British shipping. The result that followed was precisely like the result of the radical tariff reductions of 1894 and 1913. American industry was dismayed and crippled and foreign industry was encouraged and strengthened. The American Government was paying to the Collins Line of steamers a mail subsidy of $858,000 a year. The British Government was paying to the Cunard Line of British steamers $856,871 for a slower service in smaller and weaker steamships. The Collins subsidy amounted to $4.82 a ton of the American steam fleet; the Cunard subsidy to $5.75 a ton. In 1856, when Congress cut down the Collins subsidy by $473,000, it left a sum of $385,000, while the British Cunard Line was receiving, and continued to receive, $856,871.

That is, the British steamship service was adequately protected by its Government; the competing American steamship service was not. Great Britain stood by her shipowners; we deserted ours in that very crisis of the combat; and though the American steamship managers were far more enterprising, far more progressive, and on even terms far more successful, with the better ships and the better educated officers and sailors, our flag was driven from the steam routes of the world by the treasury of the British Government.

A great New York merchant and shipowner of that time—A. A. Low, father of Hon. Seth Low—gave this impressive testimony to a special committee of Congress:

> My own belief is that the policy of England, in subsidizing lines of steamers to the various ports of the world, has given her a prestige which is almost insuperable. * * * My own impression is that large subsidies should be given as an inducement, and that these subsidies, while they would cost the Government something in the beginning, would cost the Government nothing in the end.
>
> I only know the English have always, in peace and war, manifested a determination to hold the supremacy on the ocean, and the supremacy which they acquired by arms in war they have in peace acquired by subsidies. They have deliberately and intentionally driven the Americans from the ocean by paying subsidies which they knew our Congress would not pay. I believe it has been the deliberate purpose on the part of England to maintain her supremacy upon the ocean by paying larger subsidies than any other nation as long as subsidies were necessary to preserve their control.
>
> I believe that when the Collins Line was running the subsidy to the Cunard Line was renewed for the express purpose to enable it to run off the Collins Line. It was renewed several years before the expiration of the subsidy granted, so that the Cunard Line might enter upon contracts for new ships; and a committee of the English Parliament, similar to this committee, was employed to make the most minute investigation into the matter. It was after the most careful inquiry by that committee that the contract with the Cunard was renewed for the express purpose of enabling that line to run the American steamers from the ocean; and they have driven us from the ocean by that policy just as effectually as they ever did drive an enemy from the ocean by their guns.

That was an era when the sail ship in which we had excelled was going out, and when the steamship, in which we were equally excelling, was coming in. The British Government and people were exerting every effort to develop steam shipyards and engine works, and for this purpose large subsidies, ostensibly for the carrying of the mails, but actually for the encouragement of shipbuilding and navigation, were being paid year after year. The result of the sectional overthrow of our ocean mail system was written unmistakably in the records of American shipbuilding in the years from 1855 to 1860.

In 1855, as has been said, 583,450 tons of shipping, sail and steam, were launched. But in 1859 the output of our yards had fallen off to 156,602 tons, and it stood at only 214,791 tons in 1860—as has well been said, the swiftest and most alarming shrinkage in our maritime history.

Those were years of complete Democratic ascendancy in the National Government of the United States. They were years of a low tariff for revenue only. This unprecedented decline in American shipbuilding and navigation occurred before the enactment of the first Morrill tariff law, before the election of President Lincoln. The United States as a maritime power was on the decline before the Civil War. That war and the depredations of the Anglo-Confederate cruisers simply accelerated the tendency that had already begun. When the Civil War broke out, our trans-Atlantic steamship services, deprived of their subsidies while their British competitors retained theirs, wholly disappeared. There was in 1861 not one line of American steamships running regularly throughout the year between our ports and the ports of Europe. In 1855 American ships had carried, as has been said, 76 per cent of our imports and exports. In 1860 they were carrying only 66 per cent, though there was a slight nominal increase in American registered tonnage. Ships were still being built in 1860, but they were chiefly for the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, and for the great new trade from the Atlantic coast to California around the Horn or by connection cross the Isthmus of Panama—a trade which Congress had insisted on reserving as coastwise commerce, in which none but American vessels could participate. Many of these vessels in the coast-to-coast trade sailed for convenience as registered ships of the United States, or our tonnage nominally registered for foreign commerce would have been a great deal less than it actually was in 1860.

As already suggested, the decline of our merchant marine in over-seas trade is often attributed to the mere mechanical change from sail to steam, from wood to iron. There is no truth in this assumption. A respectable iron manufacturing industry had been developed in the United States, though it suffered severely under the low tariff for revenue only of 1846–1861. Our builders appreciated the use of iron and had begun to build iron steamships with screw propellers long before 1860. Some of these ships were the best of their type in the world. American

iron was found to be especially adaptable to the hulls of ocean ships; our naval architects pronounced it better than English iron. American mechanical genius devised efficient marine engines and boilers. Lindsay, the historian of the British mercantile marine, attributes the superiority of American ocean steamships in speed to their "effective boilers and ability in their preparation." The spirit of our people was alert and progressive—the same spirit and the same people that had created the packet lines and clipper fleet of the years before.

But the withdrawal of national encouragement by the repeal of the ocean mail subsidies had dealt a mortal blow to American maritime achievement. Our Government, in the years from 1856 to 1861, deserted its shipbuilders, shipowners, and seamen; abandoned American competition in steamship building and iron-ship building; and gave up the ocean to the British, and later to the German, French, and Japanese, who all made persistent and successful use of subsidies to develop their shipyards and maintain their shipping lines. The purpose of British subsidies, as of other subsidies, was frankly protectionist. As the British parliamentary committee on ocean mail contracts, in 1853, declared:

> The objects which have led to the formation of these contracts, and to the large expenditures involved, were to afford us rapid, frequent, and punctual communication with distant ports, which feed the main arteries of British commerce, and with the most important of our foreign possessions, to foster maritime enterprise, and to encourage the production of a superior class of vessels, which would promote the commerce and wealth of the nation in time of peace, and assist in defending its shores against hostile aggression.

From the American standpoint, the British policy is most admirably stated in the celebrated reply of Mr. Blaine to Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Blaine said:

> It will not escape Mr. Gladstone's keen observation that British interests in navigation flourish with less rivalry and have increased in greater proportion than any other of the great interests of the United Kingdom. I ask his candid admission that it is the one interest which England has protected steadily and determinedly, regardless of consistency and regardless of expense. Nor will Mr. Gladstone fail to note that navigation is the weakest of the great interests in the United States, because it is the one which the National Government has consistently refused to protect.

These British subsidies, which amount to not much less than $400,000,000 in the last 60 years, have been given nominally only to 30 or more British lines of mail steamers to all quarters of the globe. As a matter of fact, these subsidies have stimulated the whole body of British shipbuilding and navigation. As the report of the British Tariff Commission for 1909, in volume 4, "The Engineering Industries," says:

> The evidence shows the great stimulus given to the British engineering and shipbuilding industry generally by the system of admiralty contracts. In effect these constitute a rigid system of protection, since builders for the admiralty are expressly excluded from buying any materials except from British firms on the admiralty list. * * * Moreover, engineering and shipbuilding derive other considerable advantages from Government subsidies and Government mail transport and other contracts given to various shipping lines. During the past 10 years the Government money which has passed into the hands of the British steamship services in respect of these and similar services has amounted to nearly £2,000,000—or, in round numbers, $10,000,000—per annum.

Here is an official British acknowledgment confirming Mr. Blaine's famous declaration that on the ocean in maritime industry Great Britain has been the protectionist nation, while the United States, outside of its protected, great, and prosperous coastwise trade, has been a free trader—has practically denied protection to ocean shipbuilding and over-seas enterprise.

The effect of the Civil War upon American ocean shipping was severe, but has been exaggerated. The Anglo-Confederate cruisers from 1861 to 1865 destroyed 110,000 tons of American shipping and drove a much larger amount of shipping under foreign flags. But when the war ended other industries grew. Manufacturing and agriculture flourished, and the American merchant marine for a time advanced. In 1865 it carried only 28 per cent of our exports and imports, but in 1866 it carried 32 per cent; in 1867, 34 per cent; and in 1868, 35 per cent. In the year 1866 no less than 336,146 tons of shipping were built in American yards, and in 1867, 303,521 tons. Our foreign commerce steadily grew, and American shipping would have grown with it and beyond it if it had not been left unprotected, either by subsidy or in any other way—the one great unprotected industry in the United States and the one most sharply exposed to the keen and subsidized competition of foreign Governments.

It is a melancholy story, but there is no mystery about it. After the war, as before the war, the commercial and maritime States of the North strove for a fair recognition of their great industry. They asked Congress to establish a subsidy system after the example of Great Britain—after our own successful subsidy system of 1845–1856. But the South and a part of the Middle West and Southwest resisted this effort after the Civil War, as they had opposed it before. Great sums were spent for the development of transportation facilities, chiefly in the Middle West, for the deepening of the rivers and harbors of all sections of the country. But nothing was done to protect and encourage the American merchant marine in over-seas trade. Every Republican President urged that this should be done, but the South and a part of the inland States interposed a hostile majority.

From 1865 to the present year, 1915, the only important measure for the encouragement of American shipping in the foreign trade was the passage in 1891 of an ocean mail law providing modest compensation for American lines of steamships. Even this tardy and inadequate measure of justice was secured with serious difficulty. The proposed rates of compensation for the carrying of the mails in ships of various speeds, which had been originally set at a rate no more than was deemed necessary for the purpose, were cut down because of opposition in the House of Representatives before the bill became a law. That had all the effect of reducing a proposed protective tariff duty to an inadequate revenue basis. The rate originally proposed for the steamers of 20 knots speed and upward on routes to Europe was $6 a mile outward. This was cut by the House to $4 a mile, utterly crippling the measure in this respect. The rate proposed for second-class steamships of 16 knots and upward, suitable for the routes to South America and the Orient, was cut in the House from $3 to $2 a mile. That is the reason why we have no national lines of mail steamships to the principal countries of South America and no national lines under contract with the Government to Japan, China, and the Philippines. The same short-sighted sectional prejudice that crippled our ocean mail lines and destroyed our maritime supremacy in 1855–1861 was effective in 1891 in almost ruining the one important measure for the relief of the American merchant marine which the American Congress has passed in the past 50 years.

Now, after all these years the Middle West, with its corn and wheat and provisions, and the South, with its raw cotton, are the principal sufferers, sustaining the heaviest losses, because the great war in Europe finds us without an adequate American merchant marine—without the means of delivering our own goods under our own flag to foreign purchasers. This is indeed the irony of fate—a fitting example of long-delayed but inexorable justice.

It has sometimes been said that the progressive loss of our ocean shipping from 1855 onward and after the Civil War was due to the great development of the agricultural Middle West. But this is a fanciful, wholly erroneous assumption. The shipbuilders, shipowners, seamen, and fishermen of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania did not leave their trade for western farms. If they turned westward at all it was to reestablish themselves by the sea again on the shores of the Pacific.

There was money enough and there were men enough to maintain and increase our ocean fleet if conditions had been made propitious instead of adverse.

As a matter of fact, the shipbuilders, shipowners, and seamen made a strong, heroic fight after the Civil War in which they had done a manly part to save the Union. No sooner had peace returned than they tried to start new steamship lines to Europe, to South America, to China. American enterprise failed on most of these great ocean routes because on these routes it found itself confronted by the subsidies of European Governments, while sail ships and "tramp" steamships of American construction found employed against them the tremendous discriminating power of the British Lloyd's. The British Government and people were determined to rule the seas. That was the purpose of their subsidies; that was the motive of Lloyd's warfare, as described by Capt. William W. Bates, once former United States Commissioner of Navigation, in his work, "The American Marine." Capt. Bates has pointed out that in the years from 1882 to 1886 American ships, some of them wood, some of them iron, made their passage in the California grain trade around Cape Horn to Europe in time averaging five days less than that of British vessels, and, moreover, that the American ships met with fewer accidents and landed their cargoes in better order. But because Great Britain controlled the marine insurance of the world it was enabled to make discriminating rates against these American vessels in spite of their safer and superior performance. The result was that, while between 1881 and 1885 an average fleet of 100 American ships had sailed from San Francisco in the grain trade to Europe, in 1889 only 30 American ships remained, as compared with 167 British.

These American ships, because of the merciless power of the British Lloyd's, were forced to receive 15 per cent lower freight rates than European ships, although the American vessels made their passage to Europe in an average of 113 days, as compared with the 131 of their British competitors. As has already

been said, the American ships were the more skillfully and safely navigated, met with fewer accidents, and incurred less damage to their cargoes. In the year 1880 the British Government was paying nearly $4,000,000 annually in subsidies to its steamship lines. The United States was paying less than $200,000 for carrying its ocean mails, and four-fifths of this sum went into the pockets of foreign shipowners.

In 1855 American ships, as has been said, were carrying 76 per cent of our imports and exports; in 1860, 66 per cent; in 1880, 18 per cent. This proportion in 1914 was 9 per cent.

It is now being urged by the advocates of the proposed bill for Government ownership and operation of steamships in the foreign trade that this radical expedient must be resorted to because American capital and enterprise have failed to provide ships for the carrying of our commerce. American capital and enterprise have not failed; they have not for 50 years been given anything like a fair and equal opportunity. Our Government has protected and encouraged manufacturing; it has protected and encouraged agriculture. The Federal power and the Federal funds have been liberally invoked for every industry and every interest within our borders, but all this aid has stopped at the water's edge. Beyond the small sum paid for mail subventions under the act of 1891—a sum of not much more than $1,000,000 annually—the American merchant marine in over-seas trade has been left unaided to fight the cheap wages of foreign lands and the subsidies of foreign Governments. Need any man wonder why the Stars and Stripes have been almost driven from the seas?

The responsibility for the wrecking of the American merchant marine and for the fact that we lack ships to-day to convey our wheat and corn and cotton to Europe rests wholly and absolutely with the American Congress, and directly with those Senators and Representatives who have fought and blocked the constant effort of the maritime States to protect and encourage American ocean shipping as all our other great industries have been protected and encouraged, and thereby to maintain an ocean fleet adequate to carry our trade in peace and to help our fighting Navy to defend our coasts in war.

A merchant marine in over-seas trade, as all the world knows, is an instrumentality of self-protection as well as an agency of commerce. A nation which lacks ships must lack shipyards also, and shipyards in which battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines may be constructed are as essential to the national security as arsenals, gun works, and fortifications. No Government in the world maintains its fighting navy all the time on a war footing. The cost would be impossible. Every Government maintains a certain part of its ships in full commission, with a full complement of officers and men, and others in reserve with a partial complement.

This means that in time of war, to make the full fleet efficient, more officers and men, thousands more than those borne on the regular naval lists, must be forthcoming. But where are they to come from in a nation which has few or no ocean steamships, and therefore few or no ocean officers and sailors of its own, because it has allowed its trade to be conveyed by the ships and men of foreign Governments?

Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Japan—the powers engaged in this great European conflict—all understand the value of a merchant shipping as a means of national defense. Great Britain, Germany, and France particularly have fostered their mercantile marine as solicitously as their regular navy. Each of these nations has hundreds of naval reserve steamships and thousands of naval reserve officers and sailors. Many of these officers and men, because of our own lack of an over-seas marine, have been engaged in carrying American trade. That is, we ourselves, the American people, have been in part maintaining the cost and paying the expense of the naval reserves of Great Britain, France, and Germany, our ocean carriers. British, French, and German ships and the ships of other foreign nations have been receiving every year from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 for the carrying of our over-seas mails, freight, and passengers. We have been maintaining a naval reserve for these foreign Governments, while, except for our coastwise shipping, we have had almost no naval reserve of our own. Now that the war has come, these foreign carriers—ships, officers, and men—are recalled to their first allegiance, to their own flag and their own country. Many of them have left our waters and our trade altogether, and are no longer available for delivering our goods.

Said the Republican national platform in 1900:

> Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

The war that was foretold has come, and the results are what were then predicted. Of all the great sea carrying powers the United Kingdom is the first. The methods by which it has attained its strength are outlined in what has been said already about the vast, persistent expenditure for steamship subsidies on all the great routes of the world, stimulating shipbuilding and navigation and indirectly encouraging the increase of the slower "tramp" steamers. These subsidies and the vast power of the British insurance agency of Lloyd's, with its historic discrimination in favor of British ships and British yards, explain the predominance to-day of the British flag in over-seas carrying. In natural ability British shipbuilders and seamen are not the superiors of American shipbuilders and seamen. British merchants and manufacturers are no more enterprising than our own. Wherever and whenever conditions have been equal, as in the years before the Civil War, when the United States as well as Great Britain subsidized its ocean mail lines across the Atlantic and elsewhere, it was American ships that ruled the ocean. It is historically true, as the New York Herald said in the height of the struggle for sea mastery before the Civil War, that—

> It must be a matter of sincere satisfaction to every American to know that in both sailing vessels and steam vessels we have surpassed the whole world.

A few years earlier De Tocqueville, struck by the vigor and enterprise of American sea commerce, had said:

> I can not keep from believing that the Americans will one day become the first maritime power on the globe. They are pushed on to master the seas as the Romans were to acquire the world.

Just as after a long period of neglect within a relatively few years we have developed a modern Navy which until lately was the second in size and power in the world and the first, we have a right to believe, in the efficiency of its ships, its officers, and its crews, so we can again develop, if we will, the best and greatest merchant shipping in existence. What Americans can accomplish when they are not harassed by foreign subsidies or the competition of cheap foreign "tramps" with Lascar and Chinese crews is demonstrated in the growth of the protected branch of our mercantile marine, the coastwise shipping of this country, which has advanced steadily, in spite of the formidable competition of our railroad systems, from 2,752,000 tons in 1860 to 6,718,974 in 1914.

The total domestic tonnage of Great Britain employed entirely in the coastwise or home trade, including ports on the Continent of Europe between the Rivers Elbe and Brest, or partly in the home and partly in the foreign trade, is 1,298,972. But in the matter of shipping employed in foreign commerce the advantage is overwhelmingly in favor of the United Kingdom against the United States. Lloyd's credits the United Kingdom in 1914 with a tonnage of 19,256,766, nearly all of it employed in over-seas carrying. Our tonnage registered for foreign commerce in the same year was only 1,076,152 tons, of which probably not more than 500,000 tons was actually employed all the year in foreign voyages.

The German Empire in 1914 had 5,459,296 tons of shipping, most of it employed in foreign voyages. France had a total merchant marine of 2,319,438 tons; Norway, 1,824,762 tons; Japan, 1,708,386 tons; and Italy, 1,549,887 tons.

These six nations are the world's greatest carriers. In every one of these nations the merchant marine for over-seas trade, instead of being almost totally neglected, as in the United States, has been a prime object of national solicitude. The lavish and persistent subsidies by which in large degree British shipbuilding and navigation have been developed have already been referred to. Germany also has made use of subsidies wherever necessary, notably to create her Imperial mail lines to the East Indies and Australia, to the Levant, and on the east coast of Africa. But Germany, through the powerful influence of the Imperial Government, has strengthened the credit of her two great steamship companies and encouraged their progress in many ways not publicly recorded, and has given a most important impetus to her merchant shipping and her over-seas trade by allowing rebates that left only a nominal freight charge on goods produced in Germany and shipped to German ports over the Government railways. The cash value of this encouragement to German shipping and commerce has been estimated from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 a year.

France long trusted to a free-ship policy and that alone, only to see her shipping dwindle from 1,072,000 in 1870 to 914,000 in 1881. Then, thoroughly discouraged with this expedient, the French Government adopted a liberal bounty and subsidy system under which French mercantile tonnage has more than

doubled, outstripping even the vigorous merchant marine of Norway.

The Norwegian Government, long content to see its shipping built in foreign yards, now grants bounties to encourage native shipbuilding, and out of a slender treasury subsidizes steamship services to New York, to the Gulf of Mexico, and to South America.

Japan as late as 1894 had only 200,000 tons of shipping and almost no shipyards. After the war with China the Japanese Government, realizing its maritime weakness, entered upon a system of bounties to encourage shipbuilding and subsidies to develop steamship lines, so that Japan now ranks among the great maritime nations with a considerably larger tonnage engaged in foreign commerce than that of the United States.

Italy had only 860,000 tons of shipping all told in 1894, but Italy, like other successful maritime Governments, has given generous national aid to her merchant marine, so that her over-seas fleet has steadily grown to a total not far below that of Japan.

All of these foreign Governments permit the registry of foreign-built vessels for foreign trade, as now does the United States. But it is a most significant fact that not one of these successful maritime Governments stops short with a free-ship policy. Every one grants subsidies besides, or encourages its merchant fleet with some equivalent assistance. Even the Dominion of Canada, which has a small fleet of its own, has been expending upward of $2,000,000 for several years in subsidies and bounties to British shipping, about twice the expenditure of the United States under the ocean mail law of 1891.

To sum up the situation, every maritime Government in the world, even though, as in the case of Great Britain, it is nominally a free-trade Government, applies a protective policy to the merchant shipping that serves its trade in peace and helps to protect its coasts in war. The United States, the greatest protectionist Nation of the world, strangely stands alone in this respect. It has protected its land industries—its manufacturing and its agriculture—and has seen them grow with a growth unexampled elsewhere. But the United States has left its ocean shipping, save for the inadequate law of 1891, unprotected and neglected. In these few words can be summed up the main cause why American ships carried 76 per cent of our imports and exports in 1855 and 9 per cent or less in 1914.

If the American people of to-day are to have an ocean fleet commensurate with the magnitude of their Nation and its interests, there is only one way in which they can secure that fleet—they must protect and encourage it as other nations have and as the United States has protected and encouraged all other industries. In the early years of the Republic protection was given to our ocean shipping by preferential customs duties and tonnage taxes. Our merchant marine was the strongest and most prosperous industry which we possessed from 1789 to 1855, and during a large part of that period it was the most highly and faithfully protected. The preferential duties were not given up by commercial agreements against our principal competitor, Great Britain, until the year 1850.

In the present tariff law there is a half-hearted effort to reestablish "the policy of the fathers" toward our mercantile marine. A reduction of 5 per cent of the customs duties is provided on goods imported in American ships. But, as Senators know, this provision has never gone into effect. It was suspended and referred to the Federal courts for decision whether, in view of our treaties with foreign Governments, this encouragement could be given to American ships.

In a speech at Chicago the other day the honorable Secretary of the Treasury declared, doubtless by authority, that a preferential duty system was now "unworkable." This may be interpreted as forecasting the probable decision of the courts, or what the executive department of the Government expects will be the decision.

By the emergency shipping law of August 18, 1914, a very liberal free ship policy was established in the foreign trade of the United States. Previous legislation in the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, granting free registry to foreign-built vessels owned by American citizens, had failed to bring so much as one ship beneath the flag. In this emergency legislation additional encouragement was given to the naturalization of foreign-built shipping by a proviso that such vessels, if owned by American citizens and granted American registry for the foreign trade, could be navigated without American officers and without compliance with our inspection and measurement laws. Under this authority and with the war and the value of our neutral flag as a powerful motive somewhat more than 100 foreign-built vessels, of a total tonnage of about 400,000 tons, have received American registry and hoisted the Stars and Stripes.

Nearly all of these ships were owned by American citizens before the war opened, notably by the United Fruit Co., the Standard Oil Co., and the United States Steel Corporation. The result of the free ship legislation of 1914, therefore, means simply a change of flag and not a net addition to the shipping resources of America, for these ships were employed in our commerce before the war began.

The very highest Democratic authorities—the President and the Secretary of the Treasury—regard the fruits of their free ship experiment as wholly disappointing. The Democratic panacea, urged for so many years as the sure remedy for our lack of an ocean shipping, has failed to effect the restoration expected. This fact is given by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury as justifying the heroic expedient of Government ownership.

But Government ownership, if it ever should be adopted, would fail, just as preferential duties have proved futile and free ships inadequate. The American merchant marine in over-seas trade will grow only and when it is a protected industry, as it was under Washington and Adams and Jefferson and Madison and Monroe and Jackson. American mechanics in our shipyards will not work for the same wage rate as mechanics in the yards of Europe and Japan. Nor will American seamen work for the same wages on the decks of the ships and in their boiler and engine rooms.

Moreover, American maritime enterprise unaided, as 70 years of history prove, can not withstand the potent weapon of foreign subsidies and subventions. American shipowners, officers, and seamen of this generation, like their fathers before them, are the most enterprising and efficient men of their calling in the world, but they can not be expected, and they ought not to be expected, to fight the treasuries of foreign Governments. As Senator Bayard, of Delaware, 60 years ago declared in this body, debating the mail subvention to the American Line to Europe:

> I am willing to trust American skill and industry in competition with any people on the globe when they stand nation to nation without government interference. But if the treasury of a foreign nation is poured into the lap of individuals for the purpose of destroying the interests of my country, or for building up a commercial marine at the expense of the commerce and prosperity of the United States, I, for one, will count no cost in countervailing such governmental action on the part of Great Britain or any foreign power.

In this same body during that same discussion another great Democrat, Senator Lewis Cass, of Michigan, declared:

> Well, sir, it is a question of protection—of high and important and holy protection—in the best sense of the term; the protection of our country, of our expatriated seamen, of our commerce, of our interests, of our honor, of our soil, of all that gives dignity and character to nations; protection against defeat, disgrace, and dishonor.

That was when the upholding of the American merchant marine had not yet become a party or a sectional issue in this Republic. If it had not become a party or sectional issue in the unhappy congressional quarrel over slavery that preceded the Civil War, we should be now, as we were then, the foremost maritime power on this planet—first in the progressive spirit of our shipowners and sailors, first in efficiency and success of the great trade of ocean carrying.

If we are to regain our old historic strength and glory on the ocean, we must put party behind us and section behind us and join in the spirit of these great Senators of an earlier time for "the protection of our country, of our expatriated seamen, of our commerce, of our interests, of our honor, of our soil, of all that gives dignity and character to nations." We must protect our merchant marine by subventions if need be, by some better method if it can be found. We must countervail the action of foreign Governments which have driven our flag from the seas, and, then, falling to war with each other, have withdrawn many of their ships and left us to our own devices.

This now proposed plan of Government purchase, ownership, and operation of merchant vessels is not opposed on this side of the Chamber because it is a Democratic plan, for it is not Democratic—there is no precedent whatever for it in Democratic history—it is opposed because it is contrary to all precedent, unsound, impracticable, ineffective—because it would fail to solve the problem though involving an enormous expenditure, and because, after the war is ended, we should be left exactly where we were before.

This side of the Chamber would be willing to have a fair test made of the preferential-duty policy, a fair test of the policy of free ships, as established by Democratic legislation. In doing this we are ready to forget all partisanship for the possible welfare of the Nation. But the proposition of Government ownership, unitedly opposed by the sagacious business men of the country, without an example in the history of other nations, is

a step into the dark which no prudent man, no patriotic man, can take.

Why not frankly abandon this expedient, so untried, so dangerous, and go with us back to the policy of 1845, of 1847, to the policy of a Democratic President, a Democratic Congress, and granting reasonable mail subventions on the long routes where no swift and regular service exists, where no ships but freighters, chiefly foreign, slow and cumbersome, run; establish a fleet of American steamers of the naval reserve to the far great countries of South America and increase the number of American ships plying across the Atlantic to Europe and across the Pacific to Australasia and the Orient? Every consideration urged by President Polk and his comrades in favor of such a national policy is as true to-day as when it was proclaimed; and, more than that, we are now in the midst of a great world-wide war, in which all of the great nations that are our principal carriers are participants.

As President Polk said in an annual message to Congress:

> The enlightened policy by which a rapid communication with the various distant parts of the world is established by means of American-built steamers would find an ample reward in the increase of our commerce and in making our country and its resources more favorably known abroad.

President Polk spoke further of the value of "having the privilege of taking the ships already equipped for immediate service at a moment's notice," an advantage which, he urged, "will be cheaply purchased by the compensation to be paid for the transportation of the mail over and above the postage received. A just national pride no less than our commercial interests would seem to favor the policy of augmenting the number of this description of vessels."

A message of this kind coming from the White House to this Congress, sounding the same note of far-seeing patriotism, would win an instant response. Party feeling and sectional feeling would dissolve before it, and once more the Congress of the United States could vote as it voted nearly 70 years ago for legislation that at the minimum cost would give our country a great, efficient, powerful merchant marine.

Mr. President, after reviewing the entire subject, I am fully persuaded that the most effective legislation is embodied in a brief bill introduced by me, and which is now before the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to pay for ocean mail service, under the act of March 3, 1891, in vessels of the second class on routes to South America south of the Equator, to the Philippines, to Japan, to China, and to Australasia at a rate not exceeding $4 per mile on the outward voyage by the shortest practicable routes, and in vessels of the third class on said routes at a rate not exceeding $2 per mile on the outward voyage by the shortest practicable routes: *Provided,* That, subject to the foregoing provisions, every contract hereunder shall be awarded to that responsible bidder who will contract, under penalties prescribed by the Postmaster General, for the highest running speed between the points named in the contract.

Mr. President, that is an amendment to the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891. As I fear Senators generally are not as familiar as they might be with that act, I ask permission, without reading, to insert it in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into contracts for a term not less than 5 nor more than 10 years in duration, with American citizens, for the carrying of mails on American steamships, between ports of the United States and such ports in foreign countries, the Dominion of Canada excepted, as in his judgment will best subserve and promote the postal and commercial interests of the United States, the mail service on such lines to be equitably distributed among the Atlantic, Mexican Gulf, and Pacific ports. Said contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder for the performance of said service on each route, and the Postmaster General shall have the right to reject all bids not in his opinion reasonable for the attaining of the purposes named.

SEC. 2. That before making any contract for carrying ocean mails in accordance with this act the Postmaster General shall give public notice by advertising once a week, for three months, in such daily papers as he shall select in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, St. Louis, Charleston, Norfolk, Savannah, Galveston, and Mobile, and when the proposed service is to be on the Pacific Ocean, then in San Francisco, Tacoma, and Portland. Such notice shall describe the route, the time when such contract will be made, the duration of same, the size of the steamers to be used, the number of trips a year, the times of sailing, and the time when the service shall commence, which shall not be more than three years after the contract shall be let. The details of the mode of advertising and letting such contracts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed in chapter 8 of title 46 of the Revised Statutes for the letting of inland mail contracts, so far as the same shall be applicable to the ocean mail service.

SEC. 3. That the vessels employed in the mail service under the provisions of this act shall be American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, in conformity with the existing laws, or so owned and officered and registered according to law, and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, to wit: During the first two years of such contract for carrying the mails, one-fourth thereof; during the next three succeeding years, one-third thereof; and during the remaining time of the continuance of such contract at least one-half thereof; and shall be constructed after the latest and most approved types, with all the modern improvements and appliances for ocean steamers. They shall be divided into four classes. The first class shall be iron or steel screw steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 20 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons. No vessel except of said first class shall be accepted for said mail service under the provisions of this act between the United States and Great Britain. The second class shall be iron or steel steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 16 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons. The third class shall be iron or steel steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 14 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 2,500 tons. The fourth class shall be iron or steel or wooden steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 12 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 1,500 tons. It shall be stipulated in the contract or contracts to be entered into for the said mail service that the said vessels may carry passengers with their baggage in addition to said mails and may do all ordinary business done by steamships.

SEC. 4. That all steamships of the first, second, and third classes employed as above and hereafter built shall be constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers, and according to plans and specifications to be agreed upon by and between the owners and the Secretary of the Navy, and they shall be of sufficient strength and stability to carry and sustain the working and operation of at least four effective rifled cannon of a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and shall be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce. And all vessels of said three classes heretofore built and so employed shall, before they are accepted for the mail service herein provided for, be thoroughly inspected by a competent naval officer or constructor detailed for that service by the Secretary of the Navy; and such officer shall report, in writing to the Secretary of the Navy, who shall transmit said report to the Postmaster General; and no such vessel not approved by the Secretary of the Navy as suitable for the service required shall be employed by the Postmaster General as provided for in this act.

SEC. 5. That the rate of compensation to be paid for such ocean mail service of the said first-class ships shall not exceed the sum of $4 a mile, and for the second-class ships $2 a mile, by the shortest practicable route, for each outward voyage; for the third-class ships shall not exceed $1 a mile and for the fourth-class ships two-thirds of a dollar a mile for the actual number of miles required by the Post Office Department to be traveled on each outward-bound voyage: *Provided,* That in the case of failure from any cause to perform the regular voyages stipulated for in said contracts or any of them, a pro rata deduction should be made from compensation on account of such omitted voyage or voyages; and that suitable fines and penalties may be imposed for delays or irregularities in the due performance of service according to the contract, to be determined by the Postmaster General: *Provided further,* That no steamship so employed and so paid for carrying the United States mails shall receive any other bounty or subsidy from the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. That upon each of said vessels the United States shall be entitled to have transported, free of charge, a mail messenger, whose duty it shall be to receive, sort, take in charge and deliver the mails to and from the United States, and who shall be provided with suitable room for the accommodation of himself and mails.

SEC. 7. That officers of the United States Navy may volunteer for service on said mail vessels, and when accepted by the contractor or contractors may be assigned to such duty by the Secretary of the Navy whenever in his opinion such assignment can be made without detriment to the service, and while in said employment they shall receive furlough pay from the Government, and such other compensation from contractor or contractors as may be agreed upon by the parties: *Provided,* That they shall only be required to perform such duties as appertain to the merchant service.

SEC. 8. That said vessels shall take, as cadets or apprentices, one American-born boy under 21 years for each 1,000 tons gross register, and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship, rank as petty officers, and receive such pay for their services as may be reasonable.

SEC. 9. That such steamers may be taken and used by the United States as transports or cruisers, upon payment to the owners of the fair actual value of the same at the time of the taking, and if there shall be a disagreement as to the fair actual value of the same at the time of the taking, between the United States and the owners, then the same shall be determined by two impartial appraisers, one to be appointed by each of said parties, they at the same time selecting a third, who shall act in said appraisement in case the two shall fail to agree.

Approved, March 3, 1891.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill I have offered simply proposes to enlarge the payment for mail service beyond that now allowed in the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891. I have already stated that when the original bill passed the Senate the rates of compensation were the same as those contained in the bill which I have just read, but, unfortunately, when the bill went to the other House a large reduction was made, which resulted in preventing the legislation fully accomplishing what was intended. The bill follows the line that all other maritime nations have adopted. Great Britain has been paying about $10,000,000 a year in subventions and subsidies of various kinds, largely for the carrying of the mail. This bill would probably not cost the Government much in excess of $2,000,000 per year for 10 years, and those most familiar with the subject believe that the service would then become self-sustaining. It is a simple, feasible, business proposition containing nothing new beyond the fact that it enlarges an existing statute. It is free from all the dangers of Government ownership, free from the possibility of trouble with foreign nations, and, as a matter of fact, would

prove to be infinitely less expensive to the people of the United States than the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there is but one sane and sensible thing for this body to do under existing conditions. There are 16 appropriation bills, all told, which ought to receive consideration before the 4th day of March. They are the supply bills, which provide for the needs of the Government in all its branches. One small bill, the urgent deficiency bill, has been agreed to, but all the rest are now either in one branch of the Congress or the other under consideration, at least two of them being ready for report. In addition to these bills it is urged that the rural credit bill and the conservation measures ought to have consideration during this session. It is a most extraordinary thing for bills such as the one under consideration to be pressed upon Congress during a short session, and I hope sincerely that those who are in the majority will see the futility of pressing the bill much further, and in that way endanger the passage of the appropriation bills and other needed legislation which could be passed without unusual delay. The country is taking note of what is going on, and the country will not sympathize with an effort such as is now being made to pass a bill that does not receive the support of a majority of the American people to the certain defeat of the great supply bills of the Government, which bills ought to take precedence over other less important subjects of legislation.

Mr. President, it is undeniable that many Senators on the other side of this Chamber do not look favorably upon the bill under consideration. The original bill has been changed three times, and possibly it is to undergo still further modification before it is ready to be acted on. I have reason to believe that not one-half of the Democratic Senators at heart believe in the measure. That most of them will vote for it is probably correct, but they will vote for it with serious misgivings and profound mental reservation. I will not stop to suggest the reason why they will give their assent to a measure that they regard as of doubtful advantage to the best interests of the country.

They know, as well as we, that if foreign ships are purchased from any one of the belligerent nations, and it is conceded that there are comparatively few ships to be bought elsewhere, that serious international complications will probably result. Already things are happening that ought to awaken the keenest possible interest along that line. If that program is carried out we are taking the first step toward a possible involvement of our country in the war that is now devastating Europe. Why should we take any risk of that kind?

I assume that the interview with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] published in the Washington Post of the 22d expresses the honest views of that militant Democrat, and it ought to be a warning not only to his own party but to the country of the dangers that confront us. Senator HARDWICK is quoted as saying:

> The objections to the pending ship-purchase bill continue to multiply and grow in strength day by day. In the first place, where and how will we get the ships if the bill should pass? By purchase? If so, from whom? Certainly not to any considerable amount or at anything like a reasonable figure from Great Britain, whose merchant marine must serve her own great commerce, and is besides now subject to demands made upon it for aid to the military and naval operations as well as an increased demand from the world's carrying trade growing out of the elimination of German competition.
>
> From Germany? If this be the purpose, or one of the purposes, of the bill, it seems certain that it will involve us in serious complications with Great Britain. It is not probable that the Government of that country will permit us to purchase and transfer to our registry the interned ships of Germany that could probably be bought at a most reasonable figure, and then operate them on the high seas.
>
> It seems certain that Great Britain will insist that if the transfer of the ship under the registry of one of her enemies is made to a neutral registry after the declaration of war, that Great Britain is neither bound to recognize nor respect such transfer and does not propose to do so.
>
> Besides, the transfer of these German vessels to a corporation, of which the United States is the principal, if not the sole, stockholder, will greatly add to the gravity of the situation by making this Government a direct party with an immediate interest of its own in the controversy, and will seriously endanger our continued peace.
>
> Therefore this step ought not to be taken lightly, and not at all unless we are prepared for any eventuality. If we can not safely buy these German vessels, then what ships are we to purchase under this bill, and from whom? From other neutral nations or their citizens? We can certainly hope to secure no considerable supply from that source.
>
> Nor can we hope to purchase these ships either from our own citizens or from the citizens of other countries, if it be true, as asserted and urged by the proponents of this measure, that the rates have risen so enormously and the profits of these ships increased so largely since this war began. If that be true, what inducement would be held out to private capital invested in this business to sell its ships just when they are reaping the richest harvest?
>
> Where, then, are we to get the necessary ships? Obviously by construction. And yet this measure is urged as a temporary one—a war measure, as it were, to be promptly abandoned when the war is over and the present emergency past—certainly as soon as it becomes a "profitable" enterprise again, and therefore becomes attractive to capital.
>
> The Congress of the United States in the recent tariff bill adopted a plan that in the past has proved most efficacious and practicable in building up and maintaining an American merchant marine, namely, a discriminating duty in favor of goods carried in American bottoms. The discriminatory rate may not be large enough to accomplish the purpose sought. If not, let us raise it. Certain treaties with foreign powers forbid its enforcement, the Attorney General held. If so, let us give the necessary notice to the powers in question to modify these treaties in this respect, and then proceed to enforce the law we have enacted and so restore our merchant marine.
>
> Long have we Democrats insisted that business and government should be divorced; that the Government should keep out of business and business should keep out of the Government. Were our protestations insincere? Were our principles unsound? I believe not.

Such a warning should not go unheeded, and it would be to the credit of other members of the majority party who hold substantially the same views if they should give unmistakable declarations of their real attitude on the question now under consideration.

Mr. President, I have honestly endeavored to point out the dangers of Government ownership and the perils that will visit us if this bill shall become a law. The country is not indifferent to what is going on here, and those who are pressing this legislation will not escape the responsibilities attaching to it. It is bad legislation, fraught with grave dangers to the peace of our country, and from an economic point of view it is calculated to do immense harm to the industrial interests of our people. I am not without hope that the measure will be defeated, and if that desirable result is attained the rejoicing will not be entirely on the part of those of us who are resisting the passage of the bill. Democrats will rejoice with Republicans, and the country will not fail to give credit to those who are so valiantly fighting to defeat the measure.

For the present, Mr. President, I am done; but later in the discussion I shall take occasion to present other views in opposition to what I regard as unnecessary and exceedingly dangerous legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BRANDEGEE (at 6 o'clock p. m.). Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. KERN. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], I vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

Mr. HOLLIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], but under the terms of the pair I may vote if my vote is needed to make a quorum. I withhold my vote for the present.

Mr. JAMES. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], and will state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. JOHNSON. I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. Has he voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. JOHNSON. I withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (after having voted in the negative). I am informed that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] did not

vote. Having a general pair with that Senator, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I observe that my pair, the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], is absent. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and let my vote stand.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to my colleague [Mr. STERLING] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS. Understanding that a quorum has not voted, I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON. I have a right to vote to make a quorum, and I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE. I transfer the pair which I before announced to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and allow my vote in the negative to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Brandegee	Gallinger	Norris	Smoot
Clapp	Kenyon	Oliver	Townsend
Crawford	Lippitt	Page	Warren
Cummins	McCumber	Root	Works

NAYS—38.

Bryan	Lane	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	Myers	Shafroth	Thornton
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	White
Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	
La Follette	Ransdell	Stone	

NOT VOTING—42.

Ashurst	Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Shields
Bankhead	Culberson	Lewis	Shively
Borah	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Fall	Martin, Va.	Stephenson
Burleigh	Goff	Nelson	Sterling
Burton	Gore	Newlands	Sutherland
Camden	Gronna	Penrose	Tillman
Catron	Hardwick	Perkins	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Hughes	Poindexter	
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Sherman	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, inasmuch as there has been so little interest manifested in the matter before the Senate, and it is getting somewhat late, I propose to call the attention of the Senate to another matter and ask for the consideration of another bill. I feel so confident that this bill has the approval of a majority of the Senate, and that its proper discussion would command the attention of the Senate, that I propose to ask for its consideration at this time. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, because it seems to me in my efforts to call this matter up in the past and secure its consideration it must have been because it is not yet properly understood, I desire to read to the Senate the bill.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator if he is discussing the unfinished business. I understood him to announce that he did not rise for that purpose.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not discussing the unfinished business now; I am making a motion.

Mr. STONE. Then let the motion be made. Nothing else is in order except the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has a right to make his motion to take up for consideration such measure as he sees proper, and when his motion has been made after 2 o'clock such motions are debatable.

Mr. STONE. But it has not been made. What is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. The motion should be made before it can be debated if the Senator is going to discuss the question which is proposed to displace the unfinished business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize the rule of the Senate. I desire to state what the bill is, in order that the Senate may understand what bill it is that I am asking to take up.

Mr. STONE. I make a point of order. I insist that debate is not in order on another bill until the Senate takes it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order of the Senator from Missouri is well taken. After the motion has been submitted to the Senate to take up for consideration a bill indicated by the Senator from Michigan he will then be in order to discuss the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until the motion is made it is not in order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I move to take up for present consideration Senate bill 392——

Mr. STONE. What bill is that?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Being Calendar No. 209.

Mr. STONE. What is it about?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is the bill which I sought to inform the Senator about before I made the motion. It is known as the Volunteer officers' retirement bill.

Mr. STONE. I move to lay on the table that motion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will first state the proposition. The Senator from Michigan moves to take up Senate bill 392; which motion is now before the Senate. The Secretary will read the bill, for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War Volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Michigan made a motion to take up a bill by the number of the bill and the number on the calendar, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will be recognized as soon as the bill is read for the information of the Senate. The Chair will then recognize the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. No one has asked for the reading of the bill. Under what rule is it to be read?

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the reading of the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask that it be read.

Mr. STONE. I make the point of order that the reading of the bill is in the nature of debate, and I move to lay on the table the motion to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been the custom of the Senate to read a bill if desired for the information of the Senate. As soon as the reading is concluded the Senator from Missouri will be recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has not the bill been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read twice and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It is not now in order, no motion being made for its third reading. Consequently, if there is objection to it, the reading of the bill is not in order. It has been read twice.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor. I make the point of order that I have the floor; and I rose to move the consideration of a bill. The Chair made a statement. I first addressed the Chair and was recognized, and I claim I have the floor by having taken it and presented this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that when a motion is stated by the Chair to the Senate, then it is the province of the Chair to recognize a Senator. If the Senate desires to hear the Senator, it can refuse to vote to lay the motion on the table. The Senator from Missouri was recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I take an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. JAMES. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I call for the yeas and nays on the appeal.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to call the attention of the Chair, before the ruling is announced——

Mr. REED. I make the point that the question is not debatable. This is plainly a filibuster, and the Chair ought not to tolerate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken—that questions of order to be decided by the Chair are not debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not denied that fact. I have simply tried to ask the Chair——

Mr. ROBINSON and others. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. If he would permit——

Mr. STONE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. Senators will not gain anything by calling for the regular order.

Mr. STONE. I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Kentucky moved to lay the appeal on the table. That is not debatable, even by consent of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the point of order is not debatable, as the motion of the Senator from Missouri is to lay the matter on the table. A point of order on an appeal is not debatable if the original motion is not debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not asked anyone but the Chair, and if the Chair refuses to hear me, then I have no other recourse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no authority to permit debate on questions of order to be determined by the Chair, if the regular order is called for because the Chair is obliged to carry out the rules of the Senate, which say that these matters must not be debated.

Mr. SMOOT. I have seen that done by the Chair here not once, but a hundred times.

Mr. ROBINSON. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that when he has not made up his mind as to a question and desires to receive debate to enlighten him, he will permit debate; but where it is proper and just, as in this case, the Chair will exercise his right and recognize the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Missouri has been recognized, and has moved to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. SMOOT. Upon that, Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I say that under the rules that motion is out of order, and I want the Chair to listen to the precedents and also to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I make the point of order that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] appealed from the decision of the Chair, and I moved to lay the appeal on the table, which is nondebatable, even with the consent of the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator moved to lay the appeal on the table when sitting in his seat. He did not have recognition.

Mr. JAMES. I rose to my feet.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did not.

Mr. JAMES. I rose to my feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has moved to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LIPPITT. My point of order is that when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] made his appeal he did not address the Chair, and I ask for the reading of the record. My point is that the Senator from Kentucky did not say "Mr. President," and did not address the Chair at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that is true——

Mr. LIPPITT. I ask for the reading of the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. If that is true, since the Senator from Kentucky has addressed the Chair, the motion is in order to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. When the Senator from Kentucky addressed the Chair the second time he did not make the motion. He said that he had previously made it. At the time that the motion was made it was not in order, and I ask for the reading of the record to prove what I say.

Mr. MYERS. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. LIPPITT. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has control of recognition, and the Chair has recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have made a point of order, and the Chair recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no appeal from the decision of the Chair as to recognition.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does the Chair refuse to have the record read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair, the pending question is the appeal from the decision of the Chair, which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has moved to lay on the table.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. I made the point of order on that ruling.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask what was the ruling of the Chair on the point of order made by the Senator from Rhode Island?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Rhode Island was that the Chair had not recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ROOT. I ask for the ruling of the Chair upon that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the ruling of the Chair that he had recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ROOT. I appeal from that decision.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that that is not in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A second appeal can not be added to a pending appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An appeal from the decision of the Chair as to recognition is not permissible. The Chair desires to be shown any authority holding that such an appeal is permissible by the rules. If that can be done, the Chair will recognize the admissibility of the appeal.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, it is not a question of recognition. The Senator from Rhode Island——

Mr. REED. I make the point of order that this question is not debatable.

Mr. ROOT. If the Chair is unwilling to hear me, I will take my seat; but do not let us get our record tangled up and make trouble for ourselves in the future.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] raised the point that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] had not risen in his place, addressed the Chair, and secured recognition, and the Senator from Rhode Island asked for a reading of the record as an evidence of that fact. I ask the Chair to state what the ruling of the Chair has been? I understood the Chair to say that the point of order had been overruled.

Mr. KERN. It had not been entertained.

Mr. ROOT. Now, I appeal from the decision of the Chair overruling that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from New York that recognition in the Senate, as the Chair understands, is left entirely within the province of the Chair, and an appeal from the recognition by the Chair of a Senator making a motion or rising to speak is not in order and can not be entertained.

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is——

Mr. SMOOT. For information, I ask if the Chair is sustained in the appeal, then will not the question revert to the motion made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to lay on the table the appeal made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If that motion carries, then the question will again come up on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator form Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

Mr. STONE. The Chair ought not to permit this kind of cheap nonsense to go on.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Chair is going to be dictated to by the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Chair ought to suppress the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LIPPITT. Who is the Chair—the Senator from Missouri or the gentleman occupying the chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STONE. I have no time to waste——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Rhode Island rise?

Mr. LIPPITT. I rise, Mr. President, to ask if the gentleman in the chair will permit me to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, last——

Mr. KERN. Regular order!

Mr. LIPPITT. A ruling of the Chair on precisely the same question as to which the present occupant of the chair has just ruled?

Mr. KERN. The regular order has been demanded, and until that is disposed of no debate is in order.

Mr. LIPPITT. I can only protest, Mr. President, against these rulings by the Chair.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks for the yeas and nays. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote.

Mr. WALSH (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's name was called). The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has been called from the Chamber on official business.

Mr. CHILTON (when has name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as upon the former roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], I vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as previously, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I make the same transfer of my pair as previously, which I desire to stand until I change it, and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as on the last vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the statement made by me upon the last roll call with regard to my pair and its transfer, and asking that that statement may stand for the balance of the day, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I am present, but I ask that I may be excused from voting on this question, with the consent of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I object.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to state the reason why I make this request.

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule provides that the matter must be decided without debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. The reason is this, that a few moments ago, in the course of the debate——

Mr. REED. I make the point of order that the Senator is out of order.

Mr. LIPPITT. As I understand, the Senator from Kentucky, sitting in his chair, without addressing the Presiding Officer, made a motion——

Mr. REED. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LIPPITT. Which subsequently was put——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. This matter must be decided without debate. The Senator from Rhode Island is proceeding out of order.

Mr. LIPPITT. Where is the rule under which I am not allowed to make a statement of the reasons why I ask to be excused from voting?

Mr. OWEN. The Senator has no right to make an explanation in the midst of a roll call.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a right to ask to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Rhode Island will listen, the Chair will read Rule XII, which provides:

> The presiding officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. I was stating my reasons. That is not debate. The rule distinctly says that I can assign my reasons, and I ask the privilege of assigning those reasons.

Mr. JAMES. I object.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the roll call been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has been completed.

Mr. GALLINGER. The result has not been announced.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I want, if I may be indulged, to call the attention of the Chair to the rule——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Which says——

Mr. STONE. Until the result of the roll call is announced I make the point of order that debate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I believe I have the floor to make a point of order, which is what I have risen to do, and I am calling attention to a part of the rule for the information of the Chair, which the Chair has not read, with a view of showing that the Senator from Rhode Island has the right, until the result of the roll call has been announced, to assign his reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule provides that the matter must be decided without debate, and the decision has been announced.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

Mr. LIPPITT. I did not understand the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was under the impression that the roll call had been completed, but he is informed by the Secretary that it has not been.

Mr. POMERENE entered the Chamber and voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LIPPITT. Have I not the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not the floor; the roll call has not been completed.

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the affirmative). I transferred my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. The Senator from Virginia has since entered the Chamber and voted. The understanding I have with my pair is that I may vote for the purpose of making a quorum. As it is manifest that my vote is necessary for such purpose, I allow it to stand.

The Secretary proceeded to recapitulate the vote, and said:

Senators voting in the affirmative are——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting on this question for reasons which I should like to explain to the Senate. In doing so I want, first, to call attention to paragraph 2 of Rule XII, found on page 13 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which says that:

When a Senator——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I make the point of order——

Mr. LIPPITT (continuing reading)—

> declines to vote on call of his name he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor——

Mr. REED. I desire to make a point of order——

Mr. LIPPITT (continuing reading)—

> and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement.

Now, the reasons which I want to assign—

Mr. REED. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. REED. The point of order is that the Senator is out of order in discussing this question in the midst of a roll call, and further that the Chair has already ruled that the Senator from Rhode Island is out of order, and it is now the duty of the Chair to compel the Senator to take his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that this question may be determined definitely and for the rest of this session the Chair submits the point of order to the Senate. Is it in order for the Senator from Rhode Island to proceed and make the statement he desires?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. OLIVER. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not possible——

Mr. BRYAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. BRYAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the call of the roll has been completed, has it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been completed.

Mr. BRYAN. If the Chair desires to submit it to the Senate, I presume the question is whether the Senator from Rhode Island shall be allowed to state his reasons for asking the Senate to excuse him from voting. The Senator from Rhode Island has the right to state his reasons, but he has no right to proceed to argue the question or to read the rule or to make a statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. The rule says that he shall be required to assign his reasons.

Mr. BRYAN. That is not assigning his reasons.

Mr. JAMES. That does not mean an argument, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, undoubtedly the rule makes it his right and his duty, if he desires to be excused, to state his reasons; but that is a matter of personal privilege, and it rests with the Senator certainly not to abuse it by en-

deavoring to make an argument. He states the personal matter that he feels should appeal to the Senate to relieve him from voting, and that is the extent of his right of expression, and that right is an absolute one under the rule.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the reason——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] made the point of order that the Senator from Rhode Island was not entitled to proceed, as the Chair understands. Of course, it is for the Senate to determine as to whether or not the Senator from Rhode Island is abusing the privilege extended to him under the rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. The idea of submitting to the Senate the question of whether or not a Senator is abusing a privilege! The rule is obligatory that the Chair shall compel the Senator to assign his reasons. No great progress will be made if the Chair is going to rule in that way.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, a point of order. If we are to do away with——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Rhode Island has a right to state his reasons for not voting. After they have been properly stated, it is for the Senate to decide whether he is abusing or exercising fairly the privilege given under that rule. The Senator from Missouri made a point of order that he was abusing the privilege. The Chair stated that if the point of order was made he would submit it to the Senate for decision. The Senator from Rhode Island evidently has a right to state his reasons.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Chair states that the Senator from Rhode Island has a right to state his reasons. It seems to me that the Chair is a little short of the language of the rule, which says that he shall be required to state his reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sees no occasion to require him to do so when he is doing so very fully and completely, and requires no compulsion.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if I may now be allowed to begin over again and find the starting point from which I was diverted a little bit by the storm that seems to have arisen on the calm seas of our deliberations, I was proceeding to say that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], without addressing the Chair, made a motion to lay on the table a certain motion that was pending before the Senate. I took occasion to call to the attention of the Chair the fact that the Senator from Kentucky had not addressed the Chair, and I asked that the record be read which would demonstrate or disprove the correctness of my position. The Chair declined to have that record read, and a few minutes subsequently, on a new demand on my part that it should be read, said that it was within the power of the Chair to decide whether or not a Senator had asked to be recognized.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state his point of order.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that the Senator is abusing the right of explanation of his vote and making an argument, which the rules do not contemplate, and which is in violation of the very spirit and letter of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And in contempt of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit this question for the decision of the Senate. The Senator will read what he has there.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to have the Chair show to the Senate the rule under which he submits this question to the Senate instead of disposing of it himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a question of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Presiding Officer is put in the chair, as I understand, to dispose of these questions, and I should like to know the rule by which he can relegate that ruling to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only thing that causes the Chair to feel a delicacy about it is the fact that the excuse is in connection with the Chair and a criticism of the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Chair is expected to stand criticism.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me a moment, I entirely agree with that proposition. The Chair has its duty as well as the Senate. The Senate is not the forum to which to submit the question whether or not a man is transgressing the privileges of the floor. It should be decided by the Chair; but it seems to me now most inopportune, because we are in the midst of a roll call, and the result of the roll call has not yet been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule says that it is before the announcement that the excuses must be made. It is after the roll call and before the announcement. The Chair rules that the Senator must give a legitimate and fair excuse to the Senate for asking to be excused from voting. If the point of order is made that the Senator at this time is transgressing that privilege and making a speech, which is not a fair excuse for not voting on this proposition, the Chair will state that the Senator is not proceeding in order, and he must proceed in order.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think, in all fairness, I would have concluded what I had to say 15 minutes ago if I had not been interrupted by the filibusterers on the Democratic side of the Chamber. I am trying to call the attention of the Chair and of this body to an occasion upon which I was turned down in the Senate for doing the very thing that the Senator from Kentucky is being allowed to do. I was simply stating the proposition.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator shows by his own statement that he is not proceeding in order. Therefore it is the duty of the Chair to rule that he is out of order and to let the result of the roll call be announced.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island must proceed in order. He must give his excuses for not voting.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I was trying to state the premises on which I wanted to be excused. I can not give the excuse without first stating what it is. Of course I am delighted to listen to the Senators on the other side, who are so anxious to consume time. I spent a whole week here in the Senate when they were not here at all——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Such remarks as that are not an excuse for not voting. I insist that the Senator be required to give his excuse for not voting, and confine himself to that. Our rules ought to be respected.

Mr. LIPPITT. I think so, too.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. And they ought to be enforced by the Chair. The Senator knows that that is not a reason why he should be excused from voting.

Mr. LIPPITT. Did the Senator from Virginia address the Chair when he rose?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator stated his reasons for desiring to be excused from voting?

Mr. LIPPITT. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator must proceed in order and give the reasons why he desires to be excused from voting.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then, may I ask the Chair that in doing so I may be protected from interruption?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will not be interrupted; but the Chair must enforce the rule.

Mr. LIPPITT. I quite agree with the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California submits a parliamentary inquiry; but the Senator from Rhode Island desires not to be interrupted until he concludes his remarks. The Chair can not permit him to be interrupted.

Mr. WORKS. Not to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California may address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, if the Senator so desires.

Mr. WORKS. The question, as I understand, is not whether the Senator shall be excused from voting, but whether he is abusing his privilege. My inquiry is whether that question is not debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit to the Senate the question whether he shall or shall not be excused when the Senator has made his excuses. The question is, Shall the Senator be excused from voting?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have not finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed in order.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, when I was interrupted by the Senators on the other side of the Chamber I had advanced to the point at which, as I recollect, I had stated what had occurred this evening on the part of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], the substance of which was that I had made the claim that the Senator from Kentucky had not addressed the Chair in making a motion, and the Chair had subsequently said that it was within his right to decide whether or not a Senator

took the floor without addressing the Chair. On the 14th of last August a controversy arose on account of my having risen and called for a quorum when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] was occupying the floor. The Presiding Officer——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I must renew the point of order that the Senator is not stating his excuse. He is plainly abusing the privilege the Chair extended to him. If he can persist in this way, he can persist indefinitely, and I make the point of order that the Senator is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Senator is not proceeding in order. He will proceed in order to give his excuses.

Mr. LIPPITT. Why, Mr. President, I am trying to state this question. I started to do so at 25 minutes past 6. I could have stated——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when a point of order is sustained a Senator must take his seat and yield the floor.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now, Mr. President, as I was saying——

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Undoubtedly the Senator is not proceeding in order. It is in order for the Senator to give a reasonable excuse for desiring the Senate to excuse him from voting.

Mr. GALLINGER. How will the Chair know whether or not it is reasonable until he states it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can rule, from hearing what a speaker is saying, that it is not relevant to the question that is before the Senate. It must be relevant.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if I may now go on——

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the Senator is not proceeding in order. Under the rule he must take his seat and can not proceed without the consent of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the Senator is not proceeding in order. His remarks are not in accordance with the spirit or purpose of the rule.

Mr. STONE. Well, then, let us have the announcement of the vote.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I object to Senators rising, as the Senator from Missouri just did, and occupying the floor without being recognized by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule requires them to address the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that I did address the Chair——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. REED. And the Senator well knows that I was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not refer to the junior Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair has declared that the Senator from Rhode Island is not proceeding in order.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I appeal from that decision.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will then try to proceed in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT. What is the appeal?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let us have the yeas and nays on that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to have a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will now, Mr. President, to the best of my ability, try to proceed in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Under the express rule of the Senate, when a Senator has been declared out of order it is his duty to take his seat, and he can not proceed without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is getting the rule to read to the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to have a ruling upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XIX, section 4, reads as follows:

> If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the presiding officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senator be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has been recognized.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thought he had finished. I should like to know whether I am recognized or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] appealed from the ruling of the Chair, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] moved to lay the appeal on the table. The question of order is that the motion of the Senator from Montana should now be put to the Senate.

Mr. ROOT. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator will permit the Chair again to read the rule:

> If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the presiding officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Florida has made a motion that the Senator from Rhode Island be permitted to proceed in order. That motion is the question now before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why, of course we will.

Mr. BRYAN. I hardly think that is fair. I did it to carry out the rules of the Senate, and as a courtesy to the Senator from Rhode Island. I did not do it to aid a filibuster.

Mr. JAMES. That is what the Senator did, though, when he made the motion.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion, because I really did not think that was the object of the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. I think the Senator ought to be allowed to proceed in order; but a call for the yeas and nays is manifestly a filibuster, and I hope that will not be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request. I simply said to the Senator that I had no idea that it was the object of the Senator to engage in a filibuster at all.

Mr. BRYAN. The Chair ruled that the Senator from Rhode Island was out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Florida. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. ROOT. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote on this question.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the former roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I do not know whether under the rules of the Senate I can vote, and I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to ask whether under the rules of the Senate I am permitted to vote on the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call can not be interrupted. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer that I made before, I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). My vote evidently will be needed for a quorum, and therefore I vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I desire to inquire whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. As my vote is needed to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Under the terms of my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] I am at liberty to vote when my vote is needed to make a quorum. I understand my vote is needed to make a quorum, and I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I decline to vote, and I desire to state my reasons for declining.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote has not been recapitulated.

The Secretary recapitulated the vote, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Bristow	Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Gore	Page	Smoot
Catron	Lane	Root	Warren
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Saulsbury	

NAYS—28.

Ashurst	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Stone
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Reed	Swanson
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thomas
Hollis	Myers	Shafroth	Thompson
James	Overman	Sheppard	Thornton
Johnson	Owen	Simmons	Walsh
Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.	White

Mr. JOHNSON. Has the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am paired with that Senator. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the roll call has been completed, I desire to now state my reasons for not voting.

Mr. ROOT. Will the Senator excuse me a minute?

Mr. REED. I make the point of order that the Senator can not voluntarily give his reasons; that that is a matter which rests with the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not rest in the Chair.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I desire to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. OLIVER. I call attention to rule——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been recognized. I have declined to vote, and, under Rule XII, I desire to state my reasons for not voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been a question of order raised which might affect the request of the Senator, and until it is stated it is impossible for the Chair to determine whether it does or not. The Senator will state his question of order.

Mr. OLIVER. My question of order is that the rule is imperative that when a Senator declines to vote he shall be permitted to assign his reasons therefor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly. It is for that purpose that I am on my feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has been recognized.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a little time ago the Chair announced that under the rules of the Senate he was entitled to recognize any Senator he saw fit. I wish to read a rule on that subject, Rule XIX:

> When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the presiding officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the presiding officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him.

Now, Mr. President, if the Chair is to claim that it is within his power to recognize any Senator he pleases, whether it is the Senator first addressing him or not, I decline to vote, and I shall continue to decline to vote until that decision is reversed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that the power of recognition is within the Chair, without the right of appeal.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the Chair is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The right of the Chair was exercised under that rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was wrong, when the rule says the Chair must recognize the Senator who first addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule is recognized by the Chair. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] was the only Senator who addressed the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the discussion which is going on here is entirely out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on excusing the Senator from New Hampshire from voting. Those in favor of excusing him will say "aye"; those opposed, "no."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a point of order first. There are other Senators who have declined to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can dispose of only one at a time.

Mr. OLIVER. If the Chair will allow me, I rather think the Chair is in error in that, because it says proceedings shall be had as to excusing a Senator after the roll call. If there is more than one Senator, the separate excuses must be received after the roll call is completed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely out of order, and he ought to be required to take his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The question is, Shall the Senator from New Hampshire be excused?

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has not the Chair announced the result after putting the question?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is most extraordinary if we can not demand the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Constitution permits one-fifth of the Senators present to make the demand.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from New Hampshire himself rose and made a very urgent and sympathetic appeal to the Senate to excuse him from voting, and after this side voted that that might be done he turns and takes the other side of the fight and tries to force a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. JAMES. I am not as much out of order as is the Senator in his present filibuster.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator wants a personal controversy, he is perfectly welcome. He is out of order.

Mr. JAMES. I do not fear a personal controversy. I will say that.

Mr. BRYAN. How is the Senate going to order another roll call when this one has not yet been determined? We were in the midst of a roll call and nothing is in order except for the Senator from New Hampshire to state his reasons for not voting and for the Senate without debate to excuse him or not excuse him after the call of the roll is completed. How can the Senate break in in the midst of a yea-and-nay vote and order another roll call?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly. That is what the rule says.

Mr. BRYAN. We can not have two roll calls going on at the same time.

Mr. GALLINGER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. BRYAN. Nothing is in order but to announce the result of the previous vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Seantor from Florida has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. The Chair should state the result of the vote on the roll call now pending.

Mr. ROOT. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to make a suggestion? I think the proposition of the Senator from Florida would be perfectly sound if it were the fact that we were in the midst of the roll call, but I understand the fact to be that the roll call——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. REED. The question is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is hearing the Senator from New York on the point of order raised by the Senator from Florida as to whether the announcement of the vote must be made before the various votes can be taken on excusing Senators. The Chair would like to hear the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York on that point of order.

Mr. ROOT. I am speaking in all sincerity with reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida. As I was saying, I think the suggestion would be perfectly sound were there not misapprehension in the mind of the Senator from Florida regarding the facts. As I understand it, the roll call had been completed but not announced, and that is the precise situation postulated by the rule. The second paragraph of Rule XII, after saying the President shall submit the question to the Senate, "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him,

be excused from voting?"—I follow the words—"which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedngs shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced."

I may be wrong, but I supposed that was the precise situation we have here. It seems to me the ruling of the Chair is clearly right.

Mr. SMOOT. It is perfectly right.

Mr. GALLINGER. I venture to submit to the Chair, if the Chair will allow me——

Mr. BRYAN. I make the point of order——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida had been recognized and still has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. The point of order is that we can not have two roll calls going on at the same time.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that the Senator from New Hampshire made this personal explanation to the Senate for filibustering purposes, for the purpose of delay, and not in good faith, as shown by his own action. He asked the Senate to excuse him, and after the Democratic side had voted to excuse him, and the ayes predominated, then he had sufficient of his own colleagues here to call for the yeas and nays and deny to himself the right to do what he had requested the Senate to allow him to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call the Senator to order under the rule.

Mr. JAMES. Therefore the point of order I make is that it is within the discretion of the Chair to decide when a Senator rises for the purpose of making an explanation of his reasons for refusing to vote. If the Chair believes that it is in good faith, it is the duty of the Chair to hear the Senator, but if the Chair believes it is in bad faith and that it is for the purpose of delay and filibuster, the Chair at least must know whenever this is done it is the duty of the Chair to refuse to recognize the Senator for the purpose of trifling with the Senate in such a fashion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is bringing the rules of the House over here.

Mr. JAMES. I am bringing the rules of the Senate here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule on this question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a question of privilege, and it is this——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the question of privilege.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is that under the rule of the Senate no Senator has a right to impugn the motives of a fellow Senator, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has just violated that rule and ascribed improper and unworthy motives to the Senator from New Hampshire. He has done it claiming to state a question of order when he himself was out of order under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate——

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to refer to paragraph 2 of Rule XII in answer to what the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] said. There are not two roll calls at the same time. One roll call had been completed according to the rules of the Senate, and the Chair, very clearly within his rights, ruled correctly when he stated that the first roll call had been completed and that the next roll call that had been asked for had been granted by one-fifth of the Senators present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read for the information of the Senate the rule under which we are now operating:

> When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and, having assigned them, the presiding officer shall submit the question to the Senate, "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement.

Clearly, under the rule the excuse must be heard and the decision reached before the announcement, and the Chair ruled that the present proceeding under that rule is in order. The only time it could be done would be before the final announcement, because the Senator might not be excused and his vote might affect the result. The rule provides that it must be done after the roll call is completed, but before the announcement is made by the Chair. The question is on excusing the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. On which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Regular order!

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair. Under that decision a vote having been taken by yeas and nays another roll call could be taken before the result of the previous vote was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule provides for this case. The yeas and nays can be ordered by one-fifth of the Senators present, and, having been ordered, the question will be taken by yeas and nays.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I raise a point of order. When a motion is made and put to the Senate and the vote has been taken on it and the vote is all one way, practically, and the Chair announces the motion carried, and then further a roll call is demanded on the yeas and nays, when there is no occasion to demand the yeas and nays, if there is no difference in the vote that has been cast, and in this case I do not think there was a negative vote——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Florida that the Constitution provides that upon all questions, when one-fifth of the Senators present demand it, the vote shall be taken by yeas and nays.

Mr. FLETCHER. Even though there is no vote to the contrary?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If one-fifth of the Senators demand the call, the Constitution provides that the roll shall be called, and that supercedes all other rules.

Mr. FLETCHER. In that event on every question Senators can demand roll calls whether there is a vote to the contrary or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Constitution provides that when it is desired by the requisite number that their record shall be made; they are entitled to it. The Secretary will call the roll on the question "Shall the Senator from New Hampshire be excused from voting?"

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). On this question I decline to vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before of my pair and its transfer, in deference to the Senator from New Hampshire I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Having a personal interest in this matter, I decline to vote.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). With the same transfer as on the former roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Believing that my vote will be necessary to make a quorum, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer which I previously announced, I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, for the present I withhold my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON. Making the same transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS. The senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] having entered the Chamber, I will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—9.

Bristow	Oliver	Root	Warren
Catron	Page	Smoot	Works
McCumber			

NAYS—37.

Ashurst	Lane	Pomerene	Swanson
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Reed	Thompson
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Walsh
Gore	Myers	Sheppard	White
Hollis	O'Gorman	Simmons	Williams
James	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson	Owen	Smith, Ga.	
Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—50.

Bankhead	Camden	Culberson	Goff
Borah	Clapp	Cummins	Gronna
Brady	Clark, Wyo.	Dillingham	Hardwick
Brandegee	Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	Hitchcock
Burleigh	Colt	Fall	Hughes
Burton	Crawford	Gallinger	Jones

Kenyon	Newlands	Shields	Sutherland
La Follette	Norris	Shively	Tillman
Lea, Tenn.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.	Townsend
Lewis	Perkins	Smith, S. C.	Vardaman
Lodge	Poindexter	Stephenson	Weeks
McLean	Saulsbury	Sterling	
Nelson	Sherman	Stone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon this question the yeas are 9, and the nays are 37. The Senate refuses to excuse the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] from voting.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators present and not voting, are the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], making a quorum.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, not having been excused from voting, I desire to know what was the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question was, Shall the Senator from Rhode Island be excused from voting?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. LIPPITT. That was not the question, Mr. President. The question was whether I should be allowed to give an explanation of why I did not want to vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Florida to allow the Senator from Rhode Island to proceed in order; he having been called to order, that he now be allowed to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair will ascertain definitely what the question is.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to vote, but I want to know what the question is.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Connecticut as soon as the Senator——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My parliamentary inquiry is whether the last question before the Senate was not whether the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] should be excused from voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] asks to be excused from voting upon is as to permitting the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to proceed in order, so the Secretary informs the Presiding Officer.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I vote "yea."

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if on that question the Senator from Connecticut declined to vote, he should be required to state his reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York insist that the Senator from Connecticut shall be required to state his reasons for not voting?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut should be required to state his reasons for not voting before the announcement of the vote on the roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not submitted any request.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not submit any request. If the Chair does not see that the rule is mandatory and that it is for the Chair to enforce the rule, I have no suggestion to make about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that this rule does not require the Presiding Officer to execute it. It simply says "the Senator shall be required." The Chair thinks that it is the Senate that is interested in the matter. The Chair will announce the result of the vote.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order, that under the second paragraph of Rule XII—

When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name—

As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has declined to vote on the call of his name—

he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced.

I demand that the Senator from Connecticut assign his reasons for declining to vote. The rule apparently requires that the Senator shall be required to assign his reason for not voting.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the result of the roll call has already been announced.

Mr. GALLINGER. No——

Mr. GORE. And the demand of the Senator from New York is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has requested the Senator from Connecticut to assign his reasons. The Senate has taken no action requiring the execution of the rule——

Mr. ROOT. I beg pardon of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consequently the Chair does not feel called upon to enforce the rule.

Mr. ROOT. I beg pardon of the Chair. I did not request, but I demanded that the Senator from Connecticut be required to state his reasons for not voting.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the rule be enforced.

Mr. ROOT. I demand that the second paragraph of Rule XII be enforced, and I should be glad of a ruling of the Chair upon that demand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that that is a rule of the Senate; and if the Senate desires to compel the Senator from Connecticut to give his reasons, it is the duty of the Senate to do so. Now, the Chair——

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, my understanding is, then, that the Chair declines to enforce the rule to which I have referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair declines, because when the Senate knows that the Senator from Connecticut has not voted and the Senate does not require him to give his reasons, there is nothing in the language of the rule which requires the Chair to do so.

Mr. ROOT. From that decision I appeal; and on the appeal I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAMES. An appeal is not in order on a question like this.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Oh!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question which has been decided was as to excusing the Senator from Rhode Island. Upon that question the yeas were 15 and the nays were 28, making 43.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. ROOT. I have appealed from the ruling of the Chair upon the enforcement of the rule, which requires that it be enforced before the announcement of the vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I resent the fact of the Chair sitting there, with a Senator on his feet time after time, saying "Mr. President," and the Chair deliberately going on without recognizing him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call can not be interrupted except by something that arises in connection with the roll call. The Chair has decided that the matter is not subject to a point of order. So the Senate declined to permit the Senator from Rhode Island to proceed in order. The question now is, Shall the Senator from Rhode Island be excused from voting?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Will the Presiding Officer state the question as required under Rule XII?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?

Mr. LIPPITT. A point of order, Mr. President. How can the Senate vote that I shall be excused or not excused for the reasons assigned, when I have just been refused an opportunity to give any reasons?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. LIPPITT. I certainly have the right to assign my reasons.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator will be excused from voting. The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

Mr. OLIVER. I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

Mr. JAMES. It is too late.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to lay on the table the appeal of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GALLINGER. On that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon that question the yeas were 37 and the nays were 2. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], the

Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], so the Secretary states to the Chair, were present when the roll was called.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do they vote "yea" or "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On that question they were present, but not voting.

Mr. KENYON. I rise to a point of order. I was not present, Mr. President, although I desired to be on the roll call. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and I were at luncheon at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can not recall definitely, as there have been several roll calls.

Mr. KENYON. I dislike to have the Chair say I was present when I was not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator says he was not present, the Senator's name will be excluded; but that still leaves a quorum, and the motion of the Senator from Kentucky is adopted.

The result of the roll call last announced was as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bryan	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Swanson
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Fletcher	Myers	Shafroth	Thompson
Gore	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Thornton
Hollis	Overman	Shively	Walsh
James	Owen	Simmons	White
Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	
La Follette	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	
Lee, Md.	Reed	Stone	

NAYS—2.

Smoot	Works

NOT VOTING—57.

Ashurst	Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman
Bankhead	Culberson	Lewis	Shields
Borah	Cummins	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Bristow	Fall	McLean	Sterling
Burleigh	Gallinger	Nelson	Sutherland
Burton	Goff	Newlands	Tillman
Camden	Gronna	Norris	Townsend
Catron	Hardwick	Oliver	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Page	Warren
Clapp	Hughes	Penrose	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Poindexter	
Colt	Lane	Root	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is——

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to ask, Is there a question now before the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the question now recurs upon the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. GALLINGER. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to be heard upon that point.

Mr. REED. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. GORE. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Presiding Officer to allow me to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator for five minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I object.

Mr. REED. I make the point of order that the Chair can not permit debate on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah, as the Chair understands, wants to raise the point of order that the motion to lay on the table is not permissible on a motion for consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I want to speak to, and I think it is of vital interest to this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Especially at this time of the night.

Mr. SMOOT. On February 15, 1875——

Mr. REED. That is debate on the main question, and I make the point of order that debate is out of order on the motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair to make an observation, the question before the Senate is as to whether a motion to lay on the table the motion made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] for the consideration of the bill named by him is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah insists that a motion to lay on the table a motion to take up a bill for consideration after 2 o'clock is not in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the question exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator for five minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Now I ask the Chair to turn to page 386 of Precedents, Decisions on Points of Order, in the United States Senate [Gilfry's Precedents]. At the bottom of that page there is, under the heading "Motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill can not be laid on the table," the following:

FEBRUARY 15, 1875.

[43d Cong., 2d sess.; J., pp. 270, 271.]

Decided by the Senate, on a question of order, that it was not in order to lay on the table a motion to proceed to the consideration of a subject. Question: "Is the motion in order?" Yeas 25, nays 29. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1277.)

Mr. President, I have the RECORD here. The Senate has not given me time to go into it, but I want to say to the Senate that there is not a question that it has been decided time and time again that such a motion can not be laid upon the table.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Are there not precedents to the contrary?

Mr. SMOOT. Not that I can find; but I have a great number of precedents, Mr. President, to show that such motions can not be laid on the table. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1275, volume 3, part 2, Forty-third Congress, second session, of February 15, 1875:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Is the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Indiana in order?

The question, being put, was declared to be decided in the negative.

That was to take up a resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the question? I did not hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whether the motion to lay on the table, the motion of the Senator from Indiana, was in order. The Chair will put the question again.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am quite sure the Chair was right in the first place. Let me put a case to the Senate. Suppose a Senator should move to take up some proposition that would lead to debate. A limited amount of debate is always authorized on a motion to take up a bill or proposition.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Not on its merits.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, on its demerits, or some other way. It is open to some debate. Suppose a majority——

Mr. EDMUNDS. The rule expressly prohibits debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be considered—the same eleventh rule.

Now, Mr. President, I want the Chair to turn to page 219 of Gilfry's Precedents. This is the only question involving a decision as announced by me, and this is upon the merits of the question—not as to the proposition of taking it up or considering it or discussing it:

[Thirty-sixth Congress, first session (J., pp. 224, 225), Mar. 6, 1860.]

A motion was made by Mr. Gwin that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the year ending the 30th of June, 1861; and a debate having arisen, and while Mr. Fessenden was addressing the Chair, Mr. Johnson, of Arkansas, raised a question of order: That, on a motion to take up the bill, discussion on the merits of the bill was not in order; and the President (Mr. Bigler in the chair) decided that the discussion was not in order.

The same thing happened on May 22, 1862. A motion was made by Mr. Wade that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 298) donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and the same decision was reached. I want to say to the Senate that we ought to——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if at any time in the procedure of the Senate a Senator has been stopped from speaking upon such a motion upon the ground that he was delivering a speech which was out of order?

Mr. SMOOT. I have never heard of it. I can not find it in the precedents.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it not the practice of the Senate, whenever a subject is debatable, for a Senator to speak on anything on earth that he desires, and is he at any time called to order and stopped by the Chair?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President. The question involved here is not such a question. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] was speaking upon the bill that he had moved to take up. When a Senator moves to take up a bill a motion to lay that motion upon the table is not in order, and it is so held by every decision I can find.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SMOOT. In five minutes' time I can not go into all these decisions; but I want to say to the Chair now that wherever a motion is made to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar after 2 o'clock it is debatable, and it was so held by the present President of the Senate not two weeks ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair, the Chair stated distinctly to the Senator from

Michigan at the time that the motion was debatable as soon as it was presented to the Senate, but a motion to lay on the table was made against the consideration of the bill, and under Rule XXII when any matter is pending before the Senate a motion to adjourn, and so forth, or to lay on the table is in order. The Chair rules that after 2 o'clock the discussion of a motion for consideration of a matter is always in order. Before 2 o'clock it is not, but the discussion has been stopped by the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay the motion for the consideration of the bill on the table. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. Right there, Mr. President, I wish to call the Presiding Officer's attention to Rule XXII, which says:

When a question is pending no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn.
To adjourn to a day certain or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

And these are in order:

To take a recess.
To proceed to the consideration of executive business.
To lay on the table.
To postpone indefinitely.
To postpone to a day certain.
To commit.
To amend.

Now, I will read the balance of it:

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment—

One.
to take a recess—

Two.
to proceed to the consideration of executive business—

Three.
to lay on the table—

Four.
shall be decided without debate.

But the balance of them are not to be decided without debate; and I say to the Chair now that every decision of this body has been that they are debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the motion made by the Senator from Michigan is subject to debate; but the Senator from Utah does not recognize the fact that the motion now before the Senate is a motion to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Which is out of order, Mr. President, by every precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that under Rule XXII when any matter is pending, a motion to lay on the table is in order. So many as are in favor of laying——

Mr. OLIVER. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second? Evidently a sufficient number.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Evidently a sufficient number. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. JAMES. What is the question?

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ASHURST, and he voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question to be voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan to take up Senate bill 392. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the Chair has ordered the Secretary to call the roll, and the Secretary has begun to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Connecticut was on his feet——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (continuing). Demanding recognition, before the Chair ordered the Secretary to call the roll; and this is equivalent to denying to a Senator his rights under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. JAMES and other Senators. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has been ordered. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). I decline to vote.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question of order will be heard when the roll call is completed.

Mr. OLIVER. The question of order is that——

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

Mr. OLIVER (continuing). When a Senator declines to vote, he shall be required to state his reasons; and I demand that the Senator shall be required——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order. It is not the time now. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I decline to vote on this motion.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as upon the former roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ROOT (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote; and at the time in the course of the proceedings specified by Rule XII, I will assign my reasons.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Under the terms of that pair I am at liberty to vote when necessary to make a quorum. That condition appears to exist. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the negative). Has the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have a pair with that Senator, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BRYAN entered the Chamber and voted "yea."

The Secretary recapitulated the vote, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Bryan	La Follette	Ransdell	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Reed	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thornton
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hollis	Myers	Simmons	Walsh
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	White
Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Williams

NAYS—3.

Page	Smoot	Works

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have declined to vote——

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa rise for the purpose of voting?

Mr. KENYON. I rose for the purpose of inquiring if a quorum has voted. If not, I desire to vote. Otherwise, I desire to be excused, as I am unable to find out what we are voting on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is impossible for the Chair to determine whether or not there is a quorum until the announcement is made. It is not customary for the Chair to announce whether or not a quorum has voted.

Mr. KENYON. I vote "yea," Mr. President.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I decline to vote, for the reason that I consider that the Chair—I assume, I do not doubt, without intention—has deprived me of my right as a Member of this body by requiring me to vote on a question that is not before the Senate. I decline because the true question before the Senate is upon an appeal which was taken from the ruling of the Chair upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Utah; and I wish to repel the idea that it is in the power of any Presiding Officer to exclude the Senate of the United States from voting upon an appeal from a ruling.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia and other Senators. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Senator——

Mr. ROOT. I ask that the Senate excuse me from voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the question in the language of the rule. The question is, Shall the Senator from New York be excused from voting for the reason assigned by him?

Mr. ROOT, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. GALLINGER called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I decline to vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement, I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this question I decline to vote for reasons which I will hereafter state.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Believing my vote will be necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before and vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I repeat the announcement made by me on a former vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). With the same announcement, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. Understanding that a quorum has not voted, I vote "nay."

The roll call resulted—yeas 6, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—6.

Kenyon	Root	Thomas	Works
Page	Smoot		

NAYS—35.

Ashurst	Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Bryan	La Follette	Pomerene	Stone
Chamberlain	Lane	Reed	Swanson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thornton
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hollis	Myers	Simmons	White
James	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Johnson	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—55.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lippitt	Sherman
Borah	Cummins	Lodge	Shields
Brady	Dillingham	McCumber	Shively
Brandegee	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Fall	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Gallinger	Newlands	Stephenson
Burton	Goff	Norris	Sterling
Camden	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Catron	Hardwick	Oliver	Tillman
Clapp	Hitchcock	Penrose	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Hughes	Perkins	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Poindexter	Warren
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Weeks
Crawford	Lewis	Saulsbury	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon the question of excusing the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] from voting the yeas are 6 and the nays are 35. Present and not voting: Senators BRANDEGEE, GALLINGER, MCCUMBER, and NELSON. So, the Senate refuses to excuse the Senator from New York.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire makes the point that there is no quorum voting?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum has voted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the roll be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Lane	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Reed	Thomas
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thompson
Gore	Myers	Root	Thornton
James	Nelson	Shafroth	Vardaman
Johnson	Overman	Sheppard	White
Kenyon	Owen	Simmons	Williams
Kern	Page	Smith, Ariz.	Works
La Follette	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the absence of the following Senators because of indisposition:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is out of the city.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably absent from the city.

This announcement may stand for the evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the absentees be called.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. The rule requires that the names of absentees shall be called before that motion is made.

Mr. KERN. I do not understand that the rule so requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know of any rule that requires it. It has only recently been adopted as a custom. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. CHILTON entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to state that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is detained at his home by sickness.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] are likewise detained by sickness.

Mr. HOLLIS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. O'GORMAN, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. CATRON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. KERN. I move the adoption of the following order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the order for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators; that warrants for the arrests of all Senators not sick nor excused be issued under the signature of the Presiding Officer and attested by the Secretary, and that such warrants be executed without delay.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. That is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under what rule, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule V provides that—

Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, as far as the rule goes, but there are other requirements in the order which are not in the rule itself, and therefore it becomes debatable.

Mr. JAMES. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware that the Chair is prepared to rule, but if the Chair will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Utah for a few minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it would not be debatable if it complied with the rule. The provisions of paragraph 3 are not only included in the order, as this is offered, but there are further provisions in the order which are not mentioned in Rule V, paragraph 3. That being the case, it does seem to me that there is no rule which says it is not debatable, and it must be a debatable question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair is satisfied that this body has authority to compel the attendance of absent Members, and all that is needed are warrants and the necessary process to enable the Sergeant at Arms to compel the attendance of absent Members. Consequently, the Chair decides that the order is in pursuance of the rule and is not subject to debate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I was going to say in that connection was that I fully agree with the Chair that the Senate can compel the attendance of a quorum.

Mr. JAMES. I ask for the regular order. The Chair has decided that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is on the decision of the question upon the order offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. We certainly have not had a quorum, Mr. President, and none has yet been developed.

Mr. JAMES. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule does not require a quorum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I move that the Senate adjourn, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I am interested, Mr. President, in having at least a shred of the rules left. We are in the midst of calling the roll.

Mr. JAMES. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the question on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that the Senate do now adjourn. That motion takes precedence of all others.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore announced, I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as previously, and will let that stand for the night. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I think it is apparent that my vote is necessary to make a quorum; and I vote, notwithstanding the absence of my pair. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Believing that my vote will be necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement as on the former ballot, I vote "nay."

Mr. HOLLIS. I understand a quorum has not voted, and I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Brandegee	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Bristow	McCumber	Root	Warren
Catron	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	Works
Gallinger	Oliver	Smoot	

NAYS—37.

Ashurst	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Bryan	Lane	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thornton
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Vardaman
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Gore	Myers	Simmons	White
Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
James	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson	Owen	Smith, Md.	
Kern	Pittman	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—44.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth
Borah	Cummins	Lewis	Sherman
Brady	Dillingham	Lippitt	Shields
Burleigh	du Pont	Lodge	Shively
Burton	Fall	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Goff	Newlands	Stephenson
Clapp	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Clark, Wyo.	Hardwick	Penrose	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Perkins	Sutherland
Colt	Hughes	Poindexter	Tillman
Crawford	Jones	Saulsbury	Weeks

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The Senate refuses to adjourn. The question is on agreeing to the order of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to compel the attendance of absent Senators. Those in favor of it will say "aye," those opposed "no." The "ayes" have it, and the order is agreed to. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order. Let the writs be issued.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I may have been mistaken as to the announcement made by the Chair; but as I remember, the result was—yeas 15, nays 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct—yeas 15, nays 37.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, as there is a quorum present, the order instructing the Sergeant at Arms to bring a quorum to the Senate has been executed, and the Senate is ready to proceed to business. I never have yet seen any other procedure in this body.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, under Rule V—

No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

Certain Senators are absent without leave, and they ought to be required and compelled to be here and to stay here.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the order, then, Mr. President, will apply to the Senator from Oklahoma in the future. I certainly know if it had been applied to him in the past he would have been arrested a good many times. But that is not the question, Mr. President.

Mr. OWEN. When I am really needed I am always glad to appear.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the question, Mr. President. There is a quorum of the Senate present; and there being a quorum present, the Senate ought to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the Senator from Utah, because the Senate, after the presence of a quorum had been disclosed, agreed to the order of the Senator from Indiana to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. What was the statement of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the Senator from Utah, for the reason that, after the roll call upon the motion to adjourn, the presence of a quorum being disclosed, the Senate thereupon agreed to the order presented by the Senator from Indiana to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say there were only 45 Senators who had answered to that roll call; the result was never announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will pardon the Chair a moment. The roll call upon the motion made to adjourn resulted—nays 37, yeas 15. Thereafter the Chair said:

The Senate refuses to adjourn. The question is on the order of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to compel the attendance of absent Senators. Those in favor of it will say "aye"; those opposed "no"; the ayes have it, and the order is agreed to.

That is all shown by the record. The Senator from Utah has overlooked the proceedings in the Senate following the time the disclosure of a quorum was made by the record vote.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The presence of a quorum being disclosed does not exhaust the order anyhow.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the regular order is to compel the attendance of absent Senators, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Florida that——

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if I am in order, I move that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] be laid on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts be laid on the table.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those in favor will say "aye"——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I demand the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those opposed, "no."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I demand the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Believing my vote is necessary to make a quorum, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. That Senator is absent, but, believing my vote to be necessary to make a quorum, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Repeating the announcement of my pair and its transfer as on a former roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as heretofore, and will let my vote stand.

Mr. HOLLIS. In order to make a quorum, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STONE. I transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as on former ballots, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ashurst	Lane	Ransdell	Stone
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	Myers	Shafroth	Thornton
Gore	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Walsh
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	White
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Johnson	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	
Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—16.

Brandegee	Cummins	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	Oliver	Townsend
Catron	Kenyon	Page	Warren
Clapp	La Follette	Root	Works

NOT VOTING—42.

Bankhead	Dillingham	Lippitt	Shively
Borah	du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Fall	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Goff	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Gronna	Newlands	Sterling
Camden	Hardwick	Norris	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Perkins	Vardaman
Colt	Jones	Poindexter	Weeks
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	
Culberson	Lewis	Shields	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. TOWNSEND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I offer and move the adoption of the substitute which I presented the other day, and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Florida.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation of the District of Columbia. Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes, and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, organized under the laws of a State, a majority of the stock being owned by citizens of the United States, firm or individual, citizen or citizens of the United States, to be used for such purposes and shall have power to carry out said objects and purposes: *Provided*, That the terms and conditions of such charter parties shall first be approved by the shipping board, the initial capital stock of which corporation shall not be over $10,000,000, of the par value of $100 per share.

The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, form a corporation of the District of Columbia, by making and filing a certificate of incorporation, as provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

The corporation so formed, its officers and trustees and stockholders shall possess all the powers conferred and perform all the duties imposed by said subchapter 4, except as the same are by this act limited or qualified.

The powers of said corporation shall be limited to the purposes of this act and to such as are necessarily incident thereto.

Said corporation may sue and be sued in any district court of the United States, and may remove to said courts any cause brought against it in any other court.

Said corporation may require any officer or employee to give security for the faithful performance of his duties.

Persons subscribing to the stock of said company shall pay for the same in full at the time of subscription.

The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

The officers and trustees of said corporation shall be citizens of the United States, but need not be citizens of the District of Columbia. Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stockholders at any meeting thereof.

Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

At no time shall less than 51 per cent of the stock of said corporation be held by the United States, unless the United States shall dispose of all of its stock.

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

SEC. 2. That the United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the initial capital stock of such corporation at par and the remainder thereof may be offered for public subscription at not less than par, and the United States may then further subscribe at par for any amount of such stock not taken by public subscription, but the shipping board may cause such corporation to begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States. The shipping board, with the approval of the President, may consent to or may cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time as the interests of the corporation may require, but without authority of Congress the portion of such increase to be paid for by the United States shall not exceed $10,000,000; neither shall the proportion of stock held by the United States at any time be less than 51 per cent: *Provided*, That a sufficient number of the shares of stock of said corporation shall be set apart for holding by the persons for whom the stock of the United States may be voted as trustees, and such shares shall be issued or transferred to such persons to qualify them as trustees of such corporation, and such shares shall be transferred to the successor or successors of any such person or persons.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board for the purposes of such corporation with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board and the approval of the President, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing and constructing such vessels: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section or other existing authority may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years: *Provided further*, That payments for such purchases or construction from proceeds of sales of bonds, or delivery of bonds in payment thereof, shall be made only as ordered and directed by the shipping board.

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds, bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to be secured by a first mortgage lien upon such vessels, severally, thus transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and the same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board; and all vessels acquired under this act, or in which the United States shall otherwise be interested as owner, in whole or in part, or upon which the United States shall have or hold any mortgage, pledge, lien, or other security, shall, when and while employed solely as merchant vessels, be in all respects subject to all laws, regulations, and liabilities governing merchant vessels, in like manner and to the same extent as merchant vessels in private ownership when duly registered under the laws of the United States.

All rules and regulations relating to or which affect shipping, navigation, or water-borne commerce of the United States heretofore made or published by authority of law shall only be and remain in force until midnight on the 31st day of December, 1915, and by proclamation of the President shall cease to have any force or validity at any prior date when new shipping rules and regulations shall as provided hereby take the place of those now in existence.

The shipping board herein provided for shall propose such rules and regulations applicable to the shipping and water-borne commerce of the United States in lieu of those now in force and covering matters of like character as they may determine suited to the present needs of such shipping and commerce, which, when approved by the President and published, shall apply and become of full force and effect in lieu of such rules and regulations as are now applicable thereto. In the rules and regulations hereby authorized to be adopted and put into force different classes of shipping, navigation, and water-borne commerce may be appropriately and differently treated and provided for. Such rules and regulations when promulgated may be modified, changed, or amended by the shipping board.

SEC. 5. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands of Porto Rico, Guam, and Tutuila, provided that the above restrictions shall not apply to such of said vessels as are built in the United States. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members, two of whom shall be of practical experience in the management and operation of steamships in the foreign trade, are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power, subject to the approval of the President, to vote the stock of the United States in said corporation, either as a body or by one or more of its members duly authorized by a majority, and to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States, said three additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of each of the three additional members of said board so appointed shall be $6,000 per annum.

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for military transports in time of peace, and to direct or cause to be chartered, leased, or transferred vessels

now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

SEC. 9. That the President of the United States, upon giving to any such corporation in which the United States shall be a stockholder, through its president, vice president, secretary, or manager, notice in writing for such reasonable length of time as in his judgment the circumstances require and will permit of his intention so to do, may take possession, absolutely or temporarily for use as naval auxiliaries, of any vessel or vessels owned or leased by or otherwise in the possession of said corporation, and said corporation shall be entitled to a reasonable price or rental therefor, to be fixed by the shipping board, with the approval of the President: *Provided*, That if in the judgment of the President an emergency exists requiring such action he may take possession of any such vessel or vessels without notice.

SEC. 10. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report of expenditures and receipts under this act and of the operations of any corporation in which the United States may have become a stockholder hereunder.

SEC. 11. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000,000, or, in lieu of such appropriation, the Secretary of the Treasury may sell Panama Canal bonds to the amount of $10,000,000 in addition to those provided for in section 3, and on the same terms, and set apart and use the proceeds thereof for such purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GORE. On that amendment I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma demands the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move to lay the substitute on the table; and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has asked for the yeas and nays upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question is, Is the demand for——

Mr. OLIVER. I move to lay it on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. That will not do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Evidently a sufficient number have seconded the demand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, pending that motion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending that the Senator from Utah has been recognized and has moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

SEVERAL SENATORS. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to ask the Chair whether it is now in order to move to amend the substitute by striking out all after the figures "$10,000,000," on page 11?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, if the Chair will hear me a moment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I realize that this is an experiment; that to commit this Government to——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I raise the point of order that a motion to lay on the table is not debatable, and the Senator is not in order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am confining myself to the parliamentary question.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The parliamentary question is not debatable. There has been a motion to lay the amendment on the table, and it is not debatable.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no, Mr. President; the Chair indicated his willingness to hear me.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask the Chair to enforce the rule. The motion is not debatable. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Not "one moment" at all. I ask that the point of order be disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Chair indicated his willingness to hear the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am not willing to countenance a violation of the rules. I ask the Chair to enforce the rule. The Senator is not in order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Chair will hear me make my point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Does the Senator wish to make a point of order against the motion to lay on the table?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to know whether it is now in order to move to amend the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not now in order, because a motion to lay on the table has been made by the Senator from Utah. It is not in order until that motion is disposed of.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The question is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah to lay on the table the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before, and I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Believing that my vote is necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I will ask if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. STONE. Announcing the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I vote "nay," repeating the same announcement.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. Understanding that a quorum has not voted, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] having come in since I voted, or at least being made aware of his presence since, I withdraw my vote, having a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and ask the Chair to count me present.

Mr. JOHNSON. I withdraw the announcement of my transfer and allow my vote to stand as necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. WALSH. I inquire if a quorum has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been customary for the Chair to announce whether a quorum has or has not voted. It is impossible for the Chair to ascertain the result until the call has been completed.

Mr. WALSH. I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. The terms of my pair entitle me to vote when my vote is necessary to make a quorum. I am not advised whether it will be necessary or not. It appears to me that it will be, and so I will vote. If it appears by the result that my vote is not necessary it is my purpose to withdraw it. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Brandegee	Gallinger	Smith, Mich.	Warren
Bristow	McCumber	Smoot	Works
Clapp	Page	Townsend	
Cummins	Root	Vardaman	

NAYS—40.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	La Follette	O'Gorman
Bryan	Hollis	Lane	Overman
Chamberlain	James	Lee, Md.	Owen
Chilton	Johnson	Martin, Va.	Pittman
Fletcher	Kenyon	Martine, N. J.	Pomerene
Gore	Kern	Myers	Ransdell

Reed	Sheppard	Smith, Md.	Thornton
Robinson	Simmons	Swanson	Walsh
Saulsbury	Smith, Ariz.	Thomas	White
Shafroth	Smith, Ga.	Thompson	Williams

NOT VOTING—42.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lippitt	Shields
Borah	Dillingham	Lodge	Shively
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Fall	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Goff	Newlands	Sterling
Camden	Gronna	Norris	Stone
Catron	Hardwick	Oliver	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Hughes	Penrose	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	Weeks
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Poindexter	
Crawford	Lewis	Sherman	

So the Senate refused to lay Mr. FLETCHER's substitute on the table.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that leave be granted me to withdraw my vote on the last roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote of the Senator from Montana will be withdrawn.

Mr. GALLINGER. In accordance with a proposition on my part to offer an amendment to the original bill, I offer the following.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire offer it as an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer it under Rule XVIII, as an amendment proposed to perfect the original text, which has precedence over the motion to strike out and insert under Rule XVIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will be received.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section at the end of the original bill, as follows:

SEC. —. That all ships purchased, chartered, or leased under the provisions of this act, if not constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers, shall be so changed before being put into the service in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Secretary of the Navy, and they shall be made of sufficient strength and stability to carry and sustain the working and operation of at least four effective rifled cannon of a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and shall be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce. Before being accepted for service they shall be thoroughly inspected by a competent naval officer or constructor detailed by the Secretary of the Navy, and such officer shall report in writing to the Secretary of the Navy, who shall transmit said report to the President; and no such vessels not approved by the Secretary of the Navy as suitable for the service required shall be purchased, chartered, or leased by the Government.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. STONE. Before that is done I desire to make a point of order, and before making the point——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. STONE. I desire to inquire whether the yeas and nays have not been ordered already on the main question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. STONE. On that state of fact, I make the point of order that while the pending question is still open to discussion at this stage an amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is mistaken, he would be very glad to hear any Senator who dissents from the decision of the Chair, but the Chair is satisfied that no amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is in order until the yea-and-nay vote has been taken. However, the Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is to perfect the original text, which would be voted on prior to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida, under Rule XVIII, and it being the general parliamentary law that the original text must be perfected before a substitute is voted on. The ordering of the yeas and nays will prevent any amendment being offered to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. STONE. Then, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think that precludes perfecting the original text, but the Chair would be glad to hear any authorities contrary to that decision.

Mr. STONE. I propose now, if the Chair will recognize me, to move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] had previously made that motion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been called for. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, Rule XVIII——

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to Rule XVIII. Under Rule XVIII not only can we perfect the original bill, but we can perfect the substitute. I hope there will be no decision to set that aside.

The rule is so plain that anyone can understand it. It has been held in this body always that not only can the original bill be perfected, but the substitute can be perfected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will permit the Chair to read the second clause of Rule XXI, which is as follows:

Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays, except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

Mr. SMOOT. The mover of this substitute has not asked to withdraw it; he has not asked to perfect it, but under Rule XVIII——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to hear any decision to the contrary, but the Chair is of opinion that if the yeas and nays have been ordered on a proposition if it is modified the yeas and nays would have been ordered on a different proposition if an amendment were made. If the mover of a resolution, under the rules of the Senate, can not modify it after the yeas and nays are ordered, it would seem to the Chair that any proposition upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered would be of equal dignity.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I have a right to ask that the rule be read, which I now do. The rule has been understood and never departed from in 24 years to my knowledge. If we are to have the rules revolutionized, we ought to know what they are.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make the point of order that there is nothing pending here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion now is simply to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. There will be ample time to look at that point of order when raised. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on former votes, I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as heretofore announced, I vote "yea."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], as I have heretofore announced. Not being able to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote, and ask to be counted for a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH. I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT.] Observing that he is not in the Chamber, I accordingly withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thomas
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thompson
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thornton
Fletcher	Myers	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gore	O'Gorman	Sheppard	White
Hitchcock	Overman	Simmons	Williams
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	
Kern	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	
La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—15.

Brandegee	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Clapp	McCumber	Root	Warren
Cummins	McLean	Smith, Mich.	Works
Gallinger	Oliver	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—44.

Bankhead	Catron	du Pont	Johnson
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Fall	Jones
Brady	Clarke, Ark.	Goff	Lea, Tenn.
Bristow	Colt	Gronna	Lewis
Burleigh	Crawford	Hardwick	Lippitt
Burton	Culberson	Hollis	Lodge
Camden	Dillingham	Hughes	Nelson

Newlands	Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	Sutherland
Norris	Sherman	Stephenson	Tillman
Penrose	Shields	Sterling	Walsh
Perkins	Shively	Stone	Weeks

So Mr. FLETCHER's motion to lay Mr. GALLINGER's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I submit another amendment, for the purpose of perfecting the text of the original bill, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire submits an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the original bill, the following:

SEC. —. That the ships purchased, chartered, or leased under the provisions of this act shall be officered by American citizens in conformity with existing laws, and the crew shall be composed of at least one-half citizens of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as heretofore and vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made on the last roll call, I withhold my vote, asking, if necessary, to be counted for a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted inadvertently, without announcing the transfer of my pair to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I desire to make that announcement and to state that the transfer holds good until changed.

Mr. HOLLIS. In order to make a quorum I vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Martin, Va.	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Myers	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Shafroth	Thornton
Gore	Overman	Sheppard	Walsh
Hollis	Owen	Simmons	White
James	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—18.

Brandegee	Kenyon	Oliver	Vardaman
Bristow	La Follette	Page	Warren
Clapp	Lane	Root	Works
Cummins	Lippitt	Stephenson	
Gallinger	McCumber	Townsend	

NOT VOTING—43.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Shields
Borah	Dillingham	Lewis	Shively
Brady	du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Fall	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Burton	Goff	Nelson	Smoot
Camden	Gronna	Newlands	Sterling
Catron	Hardwick	Norris	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Perkins	Tillman
Colt	Johnson	Poindexter	Weeks
Crawford	Jones	Sherman	

So Mr. FLETCHER's motion to lay Mr. GALLINGER's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, having made a substantial gain on the last vote, I offer another amendment by way of perfecting the text of the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the text of the original bill the following:

SEC. —. That each said vessel shall take as cadets or apprentices one American-born boy under 21 years of age for each 1,000 tons gross register, and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship, rank as petty officers, and receive such pay for their services as may be reasonable.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The Senator from Florida moves that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire be laid on the table, on which motion the Senator from New Hampshire asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as I previously made, I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLLIS. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Martin, Va.	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Myers	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Shafroth	Thornton
Gore	Overman	Sheppard	Walsh
Hitchcock	Owen	Simmons	White
James	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—17.

Bristow	La Follette	Page	Warren
Clapp	Lane	Root	Works
Cummins	Lippitt	Smoot	
Gallinger	McCumber	Stephenson	
Kenyon	Oliver	Townsend	

NOT VOTING—44.

Bankhead	Crawford	Jones	Sherman
Borah	Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Shields
Brady	Dillingham	Lewis	Shively
Brandegee	du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Fall	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Burton	Goff	Nelson	Sterling
Camden	Gronna	Newlands	Stone
Catron	Hardwick	Norris	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Penrose	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Perkins	Vardaman
Colt	Johnson	Poindexter	Weeks

So Mr. FLETCHER's motion to lay Mr. GALLINGER's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce that there are certain Senators who have planned to debate this bill, but they are unable to do so to-day, but will be ready to do so to-morrow; and there are likewise some here who are not ready to proceed to-day.

I offer, as a substitute, the amendment to the original text, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to pay for ocean mail service, under the act of March 3, 1891, in vessels of the second class on routes to South America, south of the Equator, to the Philippines, to Japan, to China, and to Australasia, at a rate not exceeding $4 per mile on the outward voyage by the shortest practicable routes, and in vessels of the third class on said routes at a rate not exceeding $2 per mile on the outward voyage by the shortest practicable routes: *Provided*, That, subject to the foregoing provisions, every contract hereunder shall be awarded to that responsible bidder who will contract, under penalties prescribed by the Postmaster General, for the highest running speed between the points named in the contract.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before, and vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair as before.

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I make the same transfer as before, and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as formerly, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Kern	Pittman	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thomas
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thornton
Gore	Myers	Shafroth	Walsh
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Sheppard	White
James	Overman	Simmons	Williams
Kenyon	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—15.

Brandegee	Lippitt	Page	Townsend
Bristow	Lodge	Root	Warren
Clapp	McCumber	Smoot	Works
Gallinger	McLean	Stephenson	

NOT VOTING—42.

Bankhead	Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Shively
Borah	Dillingham	Lewis	Smith, Mich.
Brady	du Pont	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Fall	Newlands	Sterling
Burton	Goff	Norris	Stone
Camden	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Catron	Hardwick	Penrose	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	Perkins	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Poindexter	Weeks
Colt	Johnson	Sherman	
Crawford	Jones	Shields	

So Mr. GALLINGER's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as a servant of the American people, I feel it my duty to do everything in my power to defeat the pending bill. It is undemocratic, unrepublican, un-American, vicious in its provisions, and will be dangerous and mischievous if it ever becomes a law.

From a political standpoint, Mr. President, and if that were all I had in mind, I would not oppose this measure. I would let the Democratic Party pass it, for I know that if it does become a law scandals will follow, there will be charges of a serious character made against the party responsible for its passage, there will be no doubt acts on the part of certain corporations and individuals that will demand investigation and will bring discredit to the Democratic Party and our country, and perhaps will involve the Nation in foreign complications.

I know what the program is, I think. I have been told by Senators upon that side of the Chamber that no matter what the rules of this body may be, this bill is going to be crowded through and will be in the House of Representatives by to-morrow night. If this statement be true, I want to say to my Democratic friends now that I will, to save the honor and dignity of the Senate, vote to expunge every high-handed ruling that has been made this night contrary to the rules of this body. They are no credit to the majority of the Senate. They are no credit to the Democratic Party. I want to say that the time will come when Senators will, no doubt, reflect most earnestly on their action of to-night, and it will be with no pride, but will be with humiliation.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. I do; for a question only.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly. While the Senator is engaged in the business of expunging, how would it suit him to expunge the disorderly and unseemly conduct of the Republican side in filibustering to-night?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we do not have to go very far back to point to a filibuster that was conducted upon that side of the Chamber. I remember two years ago, just about this time of the year, when the President of the United States was sending nominations to the Senate for positions that were vacant in the service of the United States, a Democratic filibuster was organized. The whole country knows what took place in executive sessions. Every day the newspapers of this country gave an account of exactly what transpired behind those closed doors, and there is not a man nor a woman in the United States but knows that there was a filibuster upon the part of the Democratic Party preventing the confirmation of the nominations that were sent to this body.

Why, talk of filibustering! The filibusters have always been upon the Democratic side of the Chamber, and I have no words of denunciation nor words of criticism so bitter as those that have been uttered by men upon that side of the Chamber when legislation was before this body for consideration that the Democratic Party undertook to filibuster against.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. For a question.

Mr. JAMES. Does the Senator see no difference between a filibuster to prevent a Republican President from appointing officials that were properly subject to appointment by an incoming Democratic President and a filibuster by Republicans in order to prevent the shippers and farmers and manufacturers of this Nation from having bottoms in which to ship their products to people abroad?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator forgets that the situation to-day is exactly as it was two years ago. An election has occurred recently. The people of this country have spoken, as the Senator from Kentucky so often said two years ago. The Senators on that side of the Chamber urged two years ago that the people had spoken, and that nothing should be done after the election until a new Congress was in session, and that those who had been elected should have the right to all political positions that might occur after the election and not after March 4, 1912, after the Democratic President's inauguration.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait until I get through answering his first question, I will gladly yield to him.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Kentucky now that the people have spoken in the last election. Neither the President of the United States, the Senator from Kentucky, nor any other Senator on that side of the Chamber, if they thought this bill could pass in the next House of Representatives, would be so insistent upon action at this time. I say the reason why they are trying to force action now is because they are fearful that such a wicked measure can not pass through the next House of Representatives, and the program is to jam it through to-night. The rules of this body are to be set aside, the steam roller is to be put in motion, and the precedents of this body are to be thrown aside and trampled under foot for the purpose of passing this measure.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Utah that being a member of the Democratic Party, I should not undertake——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. JAMES. That is all I am asking. This is merely a prelude.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not yield to the Senator from Kentucky to take me off my feet, which I know he would do very gladly.

Mr. JAMES. I will not take the Senator off his feet at all, but I merely——

Mr. SMOOT. I do not propose that the Senator shall.

Mr. JAMES. I wish merely to suggest that it comes with bad grace to talk of steam-roller tactics by the party that steam-rollered out of the nomination for the Presidency, admitted by all men, Theodore Roosevelt at Chicago. I want to suggest further to the Senator from Utah that while he states the people have spoken, that is true, and they have given control to the Democratic Party in both Houses of Congress, and increased our control at this end of the Capitol.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and, Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. The Senator states that we ought to wait. Wait for what? The shippers and the manufacturers and the people of this country who are interested in the sale of their products ought to wait to do what? Wait until next December before they can ship their products abroad that are rotting to-day upon the docks, or they are paying confiscatory charges to a ship monopoly that your party has been willing to give a subsidy to for all these years; and to-night you are filibustering for the purpose of continuing this loot that these men are taking from the wheat growers and the cotton growers and the tobacco growers and the manufacturers of this Nation. Yet you turn upon the Democratic side and say because we want to legislate by the will of the majority we are filibustering.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. JAMES. I am perfectly willing the Senator from New Hampshire should undertake to answer.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator for a question and then, if I can remember what this stump speech and political harangue of the Senator from Kentucky was, after I answer the question of the Senator of New Hampshire, I will try to reply.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply want to ask the Senator from Utah if he is not frightened? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor and the Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I would perhaps have been frightened if a similar action had not happened so often in this Chamber by

the same Senator. Therefore, there is nothing to frighten me. Since the actions taken already to-night I certainly shall not be alarmed at anything which may take place.

The Senator from Kentucky was asking about the steam roller at Chicago and his solicitude for President Roosevelt. It makes me almost weep to witness his concern in both. I can hardly express in words my admiration for his love for Roosevelt. He ought to love him, because Woodrow Wilson would never have been President of the United States if it had not been for Theodore Roosevelt, and I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Just let me answer one question of the Senator at a time, if the Senator please, and then I will yield willingly to him again.

Mr. JAMES. I will be delighted.

Mr. SMOOT. Very graciously I will yield. The Senator may feel that the steam roller was used at Chicago.

Mr. JAMES. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is what the Senator said.

Mr. JAMES. That is the conviction of everybody.

Mr. SMOOT. Of everybody the Senator may have in mind.

Mr. JAMES. Roosevelt admits that himself.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator, if he will allow me to proceed, that the steam roller at Chicago, if there was such a thing, is a mere toy compared with the steam roller the Senator and his party associates have put in force here to-night. The Senator from Kentucky a few years ago had much to say about the great big stick of Theodore Roosevelt, but——

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, that I must deny. I have always had genuine affection for Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. The Senator from Kentucky is violating the rules of the Senate, and I call him to order.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator from New Hampshire need not be the guardian of the Senator from Utah. He is, I hope, perfectly competent to take care of himself.

Mr. GALLINGER. I make the point of order that the Senator from Kentucky is out of order.

Mr. JAMES. What I was saying——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not yield. I am going to be the peacemaker.

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, I resent the imputation that the Senator has cast upon me.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am going to be the peacemaker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor and does not yield the floor.

Mr. JAMES. The point of order I desire to submit is whether the Senator can cast an aspersion upon a Democratic Senator, like myself, by saying I have been the bitter enemy of Theodore Roosevelt when I have always been a warm personal friend of that great citizen and have bitterly resented his being robbed of a nomination at Chicago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator rose for a question. The Senator from Utah is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah has the floor, and the present occupant of the chair can not take me off until I get ready to yield the floor. There are some things which can not be done, and that is one of them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator can not accomplish that by merely standing upon the floor. He must speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is entitled to the floor and has done nothing to prevent him from occupying the floor. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Missouri is rather facetious. I remember that not long ago the Senator stood on the floor for hours and he was interrupted and no one made a point of order against him.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the least objection at all to what the Senator from Missouri says, and I have no objection whatever to the Senator interrupting me for a question, but as long as I am allowed to speak here to-night I prefer to go on, because I have mapped out work that may take me at least a half an hour to conclude.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] was bemoaning the fact that they can not transport the wheat of this country to foreign lands because there are no bottoms to carry it. Mr. President, if only wheat had been involved in this question you would never have had such a bill as this before this body. The only question that brings it here is the question of cotton and tobacco. That is why the bill is here, and that is why the Senator from Kentucky is favoring it. There was just as much wheat and more, too, to transport while we were trying to establish a merchant marine in the year 1901 and on many other occasions when bills have been introduced in the Senate and have passed this body and lacked but a few votes of passing the House. The solicitation of the Senator from Kentucky for wheat is not even secondary.

I was looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-day, and what I have heard said in the past so often whenever there was a ship-subsidy bill before this body I call to the attention of the Senate now.

On February 6, 1901, the Republican Members of this body tried to pass a bill creating a merchant marine, and in this debate we have heard Senators upon that side of the Chamber quote remarks made by the Republican Senators in that discussion in support of the present bill, but every Democrat voted against the establishment of a merchant marine in 1901. Cotton was not involved then. What did the then Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Jones, when the Republicans were trying to hold sessions from 12 o'clock until 8 to pass the bill, complain of? He said:

> We believe on this side of the Senate Chamber that it is our duty to stand up for our right of free speech, for our right to discuss important measures, for our right to be heard as against bills that we believe to be iniquitous and outrageous. We are willing to meet here at any hour in the morning.
>
> I believe we meet at an unreasonably early hour now.
>
> Eleven o'clock—
>
> but I am willing to come here in the morning at any reasonable hour and to stay here through all reasonable hours, through unreasonable hours, for the purpose of taking up and passing the appropriation bills, for the purpose of taking up and considering any measure relating to the policy toward the Philippines and to Cuba. I am willing to come here and to give all the time necessary for the discussion of any measure in which the public has a legitimate interest or where the legitimate interest of the public is properly looked after.
>
> But, Mr. President, speaking for myself, and, I believe, speaking for those who sit on this side of the Chamber, I will not, so help me high Heaven, ever be a party, directly or indirectly, to this effort to throttle free speech. And we put you on notice now that if you propose to have these sessions you must furnish the quorum; you must have it here; you must keep it here in the Senate Chamber every minute of the time.
>
> Mr. GORE. Mr. President——
>
> Mr. SMOOT (reading)—
>
> It will not do to have your Senators in the cloakroom or in committee rooms or at their private houses.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?
>
> Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not yield.
>
> Mr. GORE. I desire to say——
>
> Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not yield.
>
> Mr. GORE. I wish to ask a question.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.
>
> Mr. GORE. I think the Senator proceeded——
>
> Mr. GALLINGER. I call for the regular order.
>
> Mr. GORE. I wish to ask a question.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.
>
> Mr. GORE. The Senator from Utah said he would yield for a question.
>
> Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is not in order if the Senator from Utah refuses to yield.
>
> Mr. SMOOT (reading)—
>
> It will not do to have your Senators in the cloakroom or in the committee rooms or at their private houses. It will not do to have you come here and answer, now and then, that you are here. You must have a quorum present, and have it all the time, as we do not propose to contribute in any way to bringing about what we believe to be an outrageous, tyrannical effort to suppress free speech by brute force. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. President, I have followed that debate all the way through, and the same motions made by the Republican Party to-night were made in that debate by Democrats; but, thank God, the rules of the Senate and the rights of the minority were respected by the Presiding Officer.

Senators, if I did not believe that the passage of this bill would be the entering wedge to further vicious legislation of the same kind, I never would take interest enough in it to discuss the question long before the Senate. But let me warn you, Senators, if you pass this measure and it becomes a law, before it is repealed the people of the United States will have become so disgusted with it and the evil results coming from it that they will rue the day that there was ever a Democratic Party in power.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Then let us vote on it.

Mr. SMOOT. I would do as the Senator from Arizona says if politics alone were involved. I would let you vote on it. But I say, Mr. President, that the American people look at this thing not from a political point of view, but they expect, if I am not mistaken, that the Senators who represent ideas contrary to the ideas expressed in this bill to do their utmost to defeat such legislation.

There is no pleasure to the Republican Members of this body in trying to defeat the measure. There is no pleasure, Mr. President, in talking night after night and day after day and being forced by brute force, as referred to by the then Senator from Arkansas in 1901, to discuss this question. But it is of vital interest to the American people. I do not believe that the American people want to adopt socialism yet, and from what I have heard Senators say there is a great majority of this body who do not believe in the measure. The only thing that I am hopeful for is that something will happen that Senators will vote as their judgment dictates in this matter and as they express themselves in private, and not as they are requested to do from the White House.

But, Mr. President, it is not to be debated like other measures are in this body.

You can not require a quorum here as was done in 1901, because if a Senator even suggests the absence of a quorum, Mr. President, it will be said that that is the end of the speech of the Senator on the floor, and he is taken from the floor. Such a thing never happened in this body before.

Suppose there should be a bill introduced in the Congress in 1917, when the Republicans will have the President, the House of Representatives, and the Senate of the United States; suppose that bill should provide for a reapportionment of the South and only allow the South representation in Congress according to the number of votes you allow to vote and not count the negro in your apportionment or representation; and suppose we should force the bill under the same ruling and the same tactics by which this bill is being forced through this body, no man in the South would like it. I want to say to my good Democratic brethren I would not like it, either; but you are to-night making rules and you are piling up precedents to accomplish that very thing. You will be the ones who will suffer for it, because this bill, if enacted into law, is only temporary; this proposed legislation can not help but fail, and you are wrecking the rules of this body to put through a temporary measure. If there were something in it vital to the Democratic Party or vital to the interests of the country there might be a little excuse for it, but there is no excuse whatever for your course.

Mr. President, 24 years ago on the day before yesterday there was a bill before this body known as the Force bill. Suppose the Republicans had adopted the same tactics as you have been pursuing to-night; suppose they had overridden the rules of this body and all of its precedents; suppose they had said, "This bill is going to be put through by to-morrow night, no matter what it takes to put it through," what would you have thought of it?

I say now to Senators upon the other side of the Chamber that if I had been a Member of this body at the time it was pending I would have voted with you on that question. I think it is my duty to call these things to the attention of my Democratic friends. I am a partisan, as you all know, but I shall never be such a partisan as to inflict a wrong upon the people of any section of the country. I am a Republican, but I am an American before I am a Republican. I am going to follow that course through life, and whether my years in this body shall be few or many, I shall not deviate from that course. I say another thing: There will never be a Republican President of the United States, if I am a Member of this body, who shall dictate to me as to how I shall vote.

The American merchant marine, Mr. President, has virtually been driven from the seas; we have little to-day. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has bewailed the fact that our ships could not transport the wheat and the other products of this country because of the lack of ships. Why, Mr. President, I have official reports from a number of the ports of foreign countries, and I desire to say to Senators here to-night that the difficulty arises not from the lack of boats for transportation but from a lack of facilities to unload cargoes in the ports of foreign countries.

Have you stopped to think of the ports that have been closed on account of the European war? Have you stopped to figure out how few there are to-day to which the commerce of the world may go and be discharged? There have been as high as 45 boats lying outside of some of the ports of foreign countries which have been unable to get berths to unload. Men can not be hired to unload them, for they have been called to this bloody war, and they are now engaged in murdering their fellow men. All Europe is mourning. Instead of the men attending to the commerce of the world, they are fighting. It is impossible to find men to unload the boats laden with the products of this country destined to feed the suffering hordes of people in unhappy Europe.

The American merchant marine in the foreign trade of this country has been in a state of decay for the last half century or more. One redeeming feature of this discussion is that both Democrats and Republicans recognize the necessity of doing something to rehabilitate our foreign carrying trade, so far as American participation in it is concerned; but I could not help but listen with astonishment when the Senator from Florida, in discussing this measure, disclosed his attitude and his position upon this great question.

Mr. President, there is not one particle of difference, so far as principle is concerned, between buying boats at Government expense, manning them with sailors, no matter from where they come, knowing in advance that it is impossible to pay expenses, and that there shall have to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars in order that we may compete with freight rates established by the merchant marine of foreign countries——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The Senator from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. STONE. Under the rules a Senator can not address the Senate sitting unless he is sick.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Senator from Utah will either take his feet or take his seat.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not sitting. I well remember sitting upon this side of the Chamber when the Senator from Missouri was engaged in a filibuster——

Mr. STONE. And I did not deny it.

Mr. SMOOT. And he sat not only upon the arm of his seat, resting upon it, but in his seat for hours at a time, and no one ever questioned his doing so.

Mr. STONE. I do not remember that.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember it well.

Mr. STONE. No; it never occurred. The Senator would never have permitted it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Alexander H. Stephens always sat in his chair when addressing the House of Representatives, as did Oliver P. Morton when addressing the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course this is only another attempt to exert brutal force to stop Senators speaking upon this bill.

Mr. President, I was saying, when my genial and personal friend from Missouri rose to make a point of order, that there was not so much difference, if any, and none in principle, between the paying of a subsidy direct and the paying of the deficit which will be caused through operating boats under this bill. It is a vicious measure. Nobody knows what it will cost, and nobody knows what trouble it will bring to our country.

I heard a prominent ex-Senator say the other night that if this bill passed it would not be 90 days until the United States would be at war. I do not know, Mr. President, whether that is true or not, but he has studied the war situation a great deal more than I have. I do know, however, that there is danger ahead; the signal is out, and representatives of different foreign nations have called attention to it; but we are rushing headlong into it. Mr. President, if this bill shall be enacted into law it may not only cost thirty or forty or fifty million dollars to the American people, but it may cost untold millions, aye, billions, of dollars, with the loss of an untold number of lives. What is the reason for this? Why take such chances? It would be cheaper for the United States to buy all the cotton in the South and make a bonfire of it than to undertake this legislation, and I would not be particular as to what price should be paid for the cotton, either.

We are going headlong into debt. This Government of ours is plunging ahead; appropriations are being made that not only run into the hundreds of millions of dollars at each session of Congress, but over a billion of dollars. Well may the President call his Cabinet around him; well may he ask of them where the end will be reached. Well may he ask the Post Office Department if it is not time to call a halt. The Republican Party has been out of power but two years. When they relinquished the management of the Government the Post Office Department was not only paying its own way but making money for the Government. Well may the President ask what makes this change. Where are you drifting and whether are you going? Is it not time to begin to pare down some of the appropriation bills? Yes; I expect there will be $25 taken off of somebody's salary before we get through with the passage of all the appropriation bills this session, but I expect in return

for that we will appropriate $25,000,000 for other unnecessary items. We are scrutinizing 5-cent pieces, but we are taking little notice of the millions.

I have, Mr. President, the daily statement of the United States Treasury for January 28, 1915. That is only yesterday; and, Senators, do you know that the net excess of all disbursements for the fiscal year 1915 to this date over the net receipts up to this same date a year ago is $90,184,438.74? And Senators, do you know that upon the same day a year ago the net excess of all disbursements over the net receipts for the fiscal year 1914 was $41,835,538.19? Let me go back one year further, Mr. President, and instead of finding a deficit, instead of finding our Treasury being looted and emptied and the Government running in debt, we find a credit balance, a balance upon the right side of the ledger.

Ah, Mr. President, the difference is in the management of the affairs of this Government. The difference is in the laws that the Republican Party put in force. Whenever they are in power our Treasury is full, our institutions are successful, our laboring men are working not only the regular hours but overtime. There are no soup houses. Every man that wants a job can get one. There are no organized charities, such as exist to-day in all parts of this country. There is no appeal for help to keep starving wives and children from death; but here we find that on yesterday there was a shortage of over $90,000,000, and the end is not yet, because this fiscal year has to run until June 30, 1915.

I do not blame the President for getting alarmed. I think it is time that a halt should be called. It seems the President has power to force general legislation through Congress, but I doubt whether he has power to limit appropriations. I have failed, as long as I have been in the Senate of the United States, to see anyone that had that power; and notwithstanding the present situation we have coming before us before long a river and harbor bill carrying nearly $40,000,000. We will have to appropriate to build railroads in Alaska. This bill provides for $50,000,000. If it were a bill appropriating $50,000, there would be hardly a Senator upon the floor but that would be questioning it; but as long as it is $50,000,000 it goes without a question by the Senators upon that side of the Chamber.

All these appropriations are coming, notwithstanding there was a deficit of $90,000,000 yesterday.

I wonder where the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is? I owe him an apology, and I want to make it now.

Mr. THORNTON. I will try to find him.

Mr. SMOOT. When we were discussing a bill during the last Congress, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asked a question about the Panama bonds. I remember telling the Senator from Colorado how many of those bonds there were that had not been issued, and at that time he expressed the fear that they would be issued for some cause or other at some time in the future.

Mr. THOMAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I said it was a year ago. It was two years ago, because the Republican Party was in power at that time. The Senator from Colorado will remember that at that time I expressed the opinion that nothing would ever happen in this country that would call for the further issue of Panama bonds. I owe the Senator an apology. The thing has happened. It is here upon us. The Democrats are in control of the country. I was mistaken, and I want him to forgive me.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. Only for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. I cheerfully forgive the Senator, and accept his apology.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, I could go on until to-morrow morning and discuss this question of appropriations and extravagance in Government expenditures, but that would do no good. I think it is an unwise policy for men in high places in this Government to undertake, as has been done in the last year or more, to impress, if possible, upon the people of the United States that there was prosperity on all hands. The claim of being out of work was "psychological." There was nothing in the claim. When a workman goes home and finds his wife and child nearly starving, and nothing with which to buy them bread, their condition is not real; it is "psychological." The mere fact that people are freezing for the want of coal is nothing if they knew it. They are not freezing. It is a mistake. They only think they are. The Secretary of Commerce is proclaiming aloud that prosperity is returning—returning! How could it return if it had always existed, as he has been claiming for the last 18 months. Have you ever thought of that?

I can tell the Senate when it will return, and I can tell the country when it will return. It will never permanently return until the laws that have been passed during the last 18 months, laws that have brought distress upon the American people, are repealed. It will not come under the fiscal policy of this administration. It is an absolute impossibility. The Democratic Party can thank God that the war in Europe came, because if it had not I say that we would have had too many Republicans in the House. The Republican majority there would have been top-heavy. As far as the last election of Senators is concerned, some four or five Republican States went by default.

The Evening Star of January 29, 1915, has an article by Mr. I. A. Fleming on Government finances. In it he says they are subject to scrutiny. The Presiding Officer of this body [Mr. SWANSON in the chair] knows that they ought to be scrutinized. Everybody knows that they ought to be scrutinized. This article says that the deficit for the fiscal year to January 27 was $89,074,148. It has increased in two days from that amount to $90,184,438.74; and if the Evening Star should publish an article on the 1st day of February giving the shortage on the 31st of January it would be an increase over the $90,000,000.

In the article I find this statement:

For the business day of January 27, latest reporting, the receipts of the Government fell short of the expenses by $1,218,866.40, making the deficit for the month of January up to that date $9,653,690.39, and for the fiscal year to that date $89,074,148.55, as compared with $39,749,-124.15, the deficit for the last fiscal year to the corresponding date.

Secretary McAdoo expressed the belief that $75,000,000 to $80,000,000 would be returned on account of income and corporation taxes with the advent of June.

Those who have kept posted on the gross earnings of railroads and other corporations, and on reductions in dividends and cutting off of dividends entirely, predict that there will be a great shrinkage in the corporation tax and the income tax as well, while the returns from internal revenue must also show lessening amounts with each addition of "dry" territory.

The United States Steel Corporation formerly paid $25,000,000 a year to its common shareholders; to-day it pays nothing.

Why, that sounds as familiar as the old cry of want whenever the party is in power. "Poverty" and "Democracy" are synonyms. I suppose the party is a necessary evil. I suppose if it were not for it the Republican Party would grow too arrogant. It is a useful minority party, and that is the only capacity in which it is really a benefit to the country.

The net earnings of this corporation in 1914 were $63,000,000 less than in 1913.

I want Senators to remember that the common stock is held by thousands of people in all parts of this country, and instead of their regular dividends for 20 years past they find themselves with none.

Scores of other big corporations have reduced or eliminated dividend paying entirely; the railroads have not commenced to show the increased earnings incident to higher freight rates, and the reports are showing continued decreases. In the month of December Baltimore & Ohio lost $1,378,401 in gross earnings, as compared with the same month of last year; Chicago & North Western gross earnings decreased in the same month $228,620; Central of Georgia's gross for the same month decreased $313,427.

Notwithstanding the business they have secured in increased freight rates upon the line of steamers that the road owns, still they fall short three hundred and odd thousand dollars in one month. During the time we had our Army down at Vera Cruz, Mexico, the boats belonging to this railroad were tied up at different wharves, the Government of the United States paying every day thousands of dollars to this company, and one of the boats was never used a single day.

Illinois Central lost over $580,000, and the entire railroad system of the United States, with few exceptions, showed more or less severe decreases, and these reports of reductions have been coming in month after month.

With the income tax of 1 per cent on gross earnings, it is not unreasonable to expect a loss of over 10 per cent in the corporation tax, especially when such great corporations as the Steel Co., the International Harvester Co., and other important industrial concerns have made such poor progress that their directors have found it necessary to cut down the incomes of millions of people by reduced and passed dividends.

And each dividend reduction, each passed dividend, makes a cut in the individual income taxes. While efforts are being directed toward bringing out a larger income tax, the chances are that thousands who contributed to the last income-tax payment will make no returns this year.

The next five months of the Government's fiscal year will probably show improvement, and there is some encouragement in that fact, but the improvement is just starting, and has so far made comparatively slow progress. Fortunately the exports far exceed the imports, although lessened imports, while aiding in holding a trade balance, cut heavily into the tariff returns.

It was stated by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time the war began, or shortly thereafter, that the receipts from customs would fall short something over $100,000,000 for the year. I made a statement upon the floor of the Senate questioning those figures. I notice that for January, up until the 28th, 1915, compared with the same number of days in January, 1914, there is a deficit of a little over $5,000,000. For the fiscal

year 1915, to January 28, as compared with the fiscal year 1914 of the same date, I find there is a shortage of some $57,000,000.

The American people have had placed upon them a burden of a war tax in time of peace of over $100,000,000, supposedly to pay for the shortage that would occur in our customs duties. I knew then, Mr. President, as I know now, that no such amount was necessary. I knew then, as I know now, that it was done to meet other extravagant expenditures of the Government. This burden was placed upon the American people with the knowledge, I believe, beforehand that it would more than cover the difference in our customs duties. The corporation tax, the war tax, taxes of all kinds become universal whenever the party now in control of the Government is in power.

STEEL COMMON, 40.

A new minimum of 40 was fixed by the New York Stock Exchange governing committee yesterday afternoon for steel common, and the stock sold there this morning to the minimum and slightly better, while the rest of the market was comparatively firm at about Thursday's figures. There are between 65,000 and 75,000 shareholders of the common stock of the Steel Corporation.

When this army of people have their annual incomes reduced by $25,000,000, it is but natural that they would be inclined to change their investments, even with slightly better prospects in view. When this disposition to liquidate is helped along by the heavy calling of loans secured by steel common as collateral, it produces more or less disregard of prices, selling being the chief desire. Thirty thousand shares sold within the first few minutes of to-day's session.

LOCAL SECURITIES.

There was no special change in the local stock market to-day, the only new feature being a little better demand for bonds. Potomac consolidated 5s at 99½, traction 5s at 106¾ to 106½, and railway 4s at 81 furnished the bulk of the day's business.

Small sales of Washington Railway preferred were made at 85. Bids on the common stock were 86½ and the asking price 90.

Washington Gas was firm at 76.

POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

Postal savings deposits have been increasing at the rate of about $3,000,000 a month during the last few months. During the entire fiscal year to June 30, 1914, the deposits increased $9,600,000, or 28 per cent; from July to January 1 the increase was $15,750,000, or about 58 per cent. Total deposits are $59,200,000, with 497,000 depositors and $119 as the average deposit.

This is the result, Mr. President, of conditions throughout the country. Poor people who have saved a few dollars are withdrawing them from the savings banks in the community in which they live, upon which they were drawing 3 or 4 per cent, and placing the money in the postal savings banks at a rate of 2 per cent, in order to be perfectly safe in these Democratic times. It only shows the distrust the people have. It only shows that they know the lack of prosperity in the country, and all the preaching and talking on the part of the Secretary of Commerce or anyone else supporting the administration can not fool all the people. Some of them can be fooled a part of the time, but they can not all be fooled all the time, no matter what the claims may be or what statements may be sent broadcast to the public with an idea of representing conditions that do not actually exist.

SCOUT TALK OF A DEFICIT.

Conservative Democrats in the House to-day are inclined to scoff at the talk of a defict, and go so far as to predict that there will be none. They base their hope on the assumption that the corporation and individual income taxes payable June 30 of this year will bring in $71,000,000 and leave a balance of $8,000,000 on the right side of the Treasury ledger.

Mr. President, yesterday our Treasury was over $90,000,000 short, and if there is collected all the Secretary of the Treasury states there will be, all that he predicts will come from the income tax, even if it were $71,000,000, there would be over $19,000,000 shortage yesterday, and it is piling up every day. Every day when the sun sets in the west we are a million dollars worse off than we were in the morning, and so it goes.

On the other hand, the gloomy ones believe that everybody will take advantage of the 10 days' grace for the payment of these taxes, which will put the collection into the next fiscal year and place a $63,000,000 deficit on the books.

PRESIDENT URGES STRICT ECONOMY.

The necessity for strict economy in all branches of the Government was impressed on the Cabinet again to-day by President Wilson. Although the Cabinet members took an optimistic view of the financial condition of the Government, it was said that the uncertainty about the length of the European war made it necessary to economize to make up for the lowered import duties.

What excuse on earth would the Democratic Party have if it were not for the war? Everything that happens they lay to the war. Their financial condition is on account of the war. Their deficits are on account of the war. The lack of employment of the people is on account of the war. I say to my Democratic friends that if it had not been for the war creating a demand for goods from this country, there would be to-day millions of men more than there are walking the streets without employment. I say millions, and I mean it. Many American people believe that the exportation of munitions of war to a belligerent country is a violation of our position of neutrality. Many American people believe that ammunition and war material of all kind ought to be prohibited from exportation to a belligerent country. Mr. President, if that happened, there would not be 10 per cent of our factories making the class of goods that have been declared contraband of war or conditional contraband of war that are running to-day. They would be closed, as they were being rapidly closed before the war.

I suppose, Mr. President, looking at it from a high moral ground, it would be proper for our Government to take the position that munitions of war and implements of war of all kinds that are used in warfare should not be allowed to be exported, but I believe that under our Constitution that is not permissible. It is generally believed that an individual citizen or a firm manufacturing such articles could under our Constitution export them to any country, whether that country was involved in war or not, without violating our position of neutrality. Be that as it may, Mr. President, the administration will have to lay down the rule on that subject, and I think they have done so. We do not want to make the situation worse than it is at present, and that is exactly what the bill now under consideration will do. That is why we on this side are so earnest in our opposition to it.

Some of the fathers of this Republic in the early days took occasion to encourage and develop the merchant marine with great success. As far back as 1826 American ships carried nearly 93 per cent of our imports and exports. A still larger percentage was carried in the earlier days of the Republic, but under the changes in our laws the percentage of our foreign commerce now carried by American ships has declined to about 8 per cent. America, growing by leaps and bounds in every other line of industry—our America, that has outstripped all other countries on earth in her civilization, in her advancement in the arts and in the sciences—has fallen so low in her shipping interests, in her over-seas trade, that we find even the small Scandinavian countries outstripping us. We have fallen nearly to the foot of the list.

Mr. President, every time that I go abroad, whether by way of the Pacific or the Atlantic, I look in vain for ships flying the Stars and Stripes. I remember upon one occasion traveling up the Rhine, and, as I remember, at Bonn I saw a large, beautiful, green lawn reaching to the river's edge, and within it was standing a small house. I caught sight of the Stars and Stripes flying at the top of a flagpole. It was the first American flag that I had seen aside from the ones at the homes of our foreign representatives during my visit upon the Continent. I do not know how other men feel, but when I saw Old Glory waving in the breeze in a foreign country from the top of a flagpole I could not help crying aloud "There is Old Glory; thank God for the Stars and Stripes. Would that all that that flag represents were the heritage of all mankind." I asked everybody in the party to go down and have dinner with me. They wanted to know why. I said "because I have just seen my country's flag floating in a foreign land, and I want to celebrate it." In every port that I entered, no matter where it was, I could see the flag of every other country except that of America. Boats owned by foreign countries were busy everywhere, but very seldom could we see an American boat carrying the American flag, manned with American crews, and I was humiliated to learn that upon the high seas and in all the ports of the world I could find boats owned by American capital but sailed under foreign flags and manned with foreigners, carrying the commerce of our country to ports in all parts of the world. Mr. President, that experience taught me a lesson, and I resolved that if I ever had a chance to do so I would support a party or a policy that would change those conditions.

We have protected nearly every industry, and we have seen many of those industries grow from nothing until they have become the greatest in all the world. We have seen industries under a protective policy spring into life and grow and grow, and, while increasing and growing, reduce the cost of articles to the consuming public. On the other hand, Mr. President, we have neglected absolutely the over-sea shipping interests of our country; we have placed them not only in competition with cheaper boats, with cheaper men, with cheaper material, with cheaper food to sustain the men, but we have put them in competition with boats which, in addition to all these advantages, have had subventions or subsidies paid by the Government under whose flag they were operating, amounting to millions of dollars annually.

Now it is proposed in this bill to throw the Government of the United States into that business. I was rather surprised to learn this morning from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] that it will be the policy of our Government, if this

bill becomes a law, to purchase these boats and lease them. Does any Senator think that American citizens will lease these boats and run them in competition with the boats of the world, paying a rental to the United States for them? I do not believe it is possible. It will be a failure.

If, Mr. President, under this bill the Government is to operate the boats, is it possible, is it thinkable that the United States will operate boats manned by the cheapest labor in all the world—Chinese, Japanese, Lascars, and that class of seamen? If such is contemplated, so far as I am concerned as a taxpayer of this country, I want now to declare that I would rather be taxed by the Government of the United States direct to pay the difference between the wage of a Chinese or a Japanese and a true-born American, and there is no question in my mind that the American people believe as I do on this subject.

Mr. President, I never want to travel upon the high seas, I never want to go to a port anywhere in the world and see the American flag flying at the mast of any ship unless that ship carries American seamen and American officers; and I know that can not be done without some kind of protection. Never should this Government undertake the operation of a line of boats unless it is known what it will cost directly, not indirectly, as this bill provides, but what it will take to make up the difference between the amount paid to the lowest class of labor and the amount paid to that class which lives and works in conformity with American standards.

It is humiliating enough to see a boat run by an American citizen with the lowest class of labor, but God forbid the day to come when our Government would undertake to do it! We are not that poor yet. I recognize the fact that our Treasury is getting lower every day this administration is in power. I wish now we did not have any authorization to sell Panama bonds. I have learned a lesson from the attitude of this administration regarding those bonds, and I hope that lesson will be of advantage to me and of advantage to the American Congress. I have learned the lesson that there is danger in an authorized bond issue beyond immediate requirements. There is danger in the Government of the United States having too much money on hand. That never happens, though, in a Democratic administration; only for a few months following their coming into power.

The mere fact that the American vessels engaged in foreign commerce amount to only 8 per cent of the carrying trade of this country ought to have appealed to my Democratic friends long before this, when we of the North and the West were asking, year in and year out, that a subsidy that amounted to a very little each year should be paid in order that the difference between building, running, and maintaining ships in this country and in foreign countries should be equalized. But every time a "ship subsidy" has been mentioned in this Chamber Democrats have condemned it, fought it, and claimed it was undemocratic.

How often have I heard the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] discourse upon the evils of the tariff, upon the evils of ship subsidies, and state that no business should be established in the United State unless it could stand upon its own bottom—no hothouse development, no hothouse production. We all remember how often he spoke of raising bananas in Alaska; and it is just such ideas, Mr. President, that have driven our over-sea trade from 93 per cent down to 8 per cent.

There is one thing I am glad of, and that is that something has happened that will draw attention to this fact. If this bill does not become a law the speeches that have been made upon that side in its favor will be a great help in supporting a true ship-subsidy bill carrying a small subsidy not equal to the subsidy that is granted by some foreign countries. Hereafter I shall look for some help from that side of the Chamber to pass a ship-subsidy bill.

This situation was brought about by the admission of foreign vessels to all of the privileges granted to American ships in the foreign trade. It is the one great industry that has been on a free-trade basis for a long period of time.

Mr. President, after we had spent $400,000,000 for the construction of the Panama Canal, the greatest engineering feat in all the world, built not only to enable this country to send her battleships from one coast to the other in a short period of time, but to assist our own shipping interests, what do we find? The Congress of the United States passed a bill granting exemption from tolls to our ships going through the Panama Canal. That was satisfactory to the American people. Why did we do it? Was there any justice in it? There were but few Senators who did not think it ought to be done. It was done in order that we might control in part the exorbitant freight rates charged by the great continental transportation lines of the country. The law was passed, but some one got busy, and before the shipping interests in this country could take advantage of it, before the canal was opened for business, the order came from the White House that the law must be repealed.

Was it repealed? Of course it was; and we find this situation existing: American boats are not on an equal footing with foreign boats. Under conditions existing they must pay higher wages, the laws of our land require them to carry more men, provide greater space and better food; and these are not all the handicaps, for there is hardly a foreign country in the civilized world that does not pay to her boats that may pass through that canal some sort of subvention or subsidy. Why, some of the countries go so far as to return to them the entire charge, whatever it may be. But every boat carrying the American flag, every boat upon which are found American seamen, every boat that is required by American laws to have a certain space for every employee and to have all the other requirements of the laws complied with must pay into the Treasury of the United States a toll tax for every ton that goes through the canal.

Things are not equal. No, Senators, we have been very solicitous indeed for the railroads of this country and for the foreign shipping interests. I wish we had more interest in our own institutions, in our own shipping interests and less interest in foreign shippers.

Why, Mr. President, there is no protection whatever to our ships in the ocean carrying trade. As a certain result that trade is passed over to foreigners and we are dependent on them to an extent that threatens disaster in the case of a great foreign war, such as the one now being carried on in Europe.

Before I get through with this discussion I hope I will reach the point where I want to call the attention of the Senate to what it has cost the Government of the United States in the past for being unprepared in time of war. Is it not a humiliating spectacle to see the greatest country in this world, the wealthiest in all the world, the most intelligent people of any country in all the world, the most civilized, the greatest in the arts and in the sciences—is it not humiliating when a former President of the United States decided that a few battleships make a tour around the world they could not start from our shores, could not run 24 hours, without hiring auxiliary boats from a foreign country? Without that we could hardly get out of the sight of land, certainly we could not have proceeded after the first cargo of coal was consumed. There was scarcely an auxiliary but what we had to hire from a foreign country. Run by Americans? No. Operated by Americans? No. The operation of the auxiliaries, the life of the battleship and all its precious cargo of lives, was in the hands of a lot of foreigners. Oh, how humiliating!

If we pass this bill and it becomes a law and through it we are drawn into war, when all Europe is mad, when, it seems to me, that the people of the world have lost their reason, where are we going to get our auxiliary ships? We will not have Mr. England to get them from, nor will we have Mr. Germany to get them from. They are in a struggle for their very existence; and God help the people. Some people say that their hearts are bleeding for the men who are in the trenches. Of course; but I want to say to you, Senators, my heart is aching for the wives and the children who are left at home fatherless. Then, think of what it will be before the war is over. Think of the mourning and the homes of those who are left without a provider, without a father, without a protector.

That is not all. I know what is coming to the American workman following the close of the war, and Senators here will realize it, if they do not do so at present. We may be making goods now for exportation, securing a few paltry dollars as profit upon goods that are being sent to the warring nations. It may continue for a year or two; but I want now to warn the American laboring man that when this wicked, unjustifiable war ceases millions of men who are now lined up face to face shooting and murdering one another will be called home. The poor will be poorer. The well-to-do and the rich will have nothing. The first thing will be that they must get to work. They will have to provide something to live on. They are going to make goods for exportation, and cheaper than ever before, and, Senators, their own purchasing power has gone. If those poor souls can make enough to keep body and soul together, they will be well satisfied for some years to come. It will not be a question of wage. It will be a question of doing something, and doing it quickly.

Senators, have you thought where those goods are to be sold? Is there any country in all the world outside of our own America that can purchase them? The warring countries are so burdened—and will be before this war is over—that I predict now there will be a repudiation of many of the present forced obliga-

tions made by them. The people can not stand the present load that is placed upon them. It is out of the question. There is one market, however, for these goods. It is America. We will not be worried very much about carrying goods to them. The question will be with them to get transportation for their goods to us. That will be the situation; and when that time comes I want to say it will not be a question of a 5 per cent reduction in the wage. There will be more than that or our mills will go into bankruptcy.

Senators talk about the farmers having an interest in this bill and in the conditions existing in the world. Of course they have. I say to Senators that the laboring man, the man who works at the forge and in the factory, the man who works in the mill, is just as much interested, if not more so, than any other class of people in the United States. He is going to be hit just about as quickly as any class of people.

I say now that the laws which have been passed by the present administration have got to be repealed or else goods made by the warring nations after the war are going to enter this country and take the place of American goods. This is January 29, 1915.

Mr. CLAPP. It is the 30th.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is after 12; it is the 30th.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is the legislative day of the 26th.

Mr. SMOOT. I am willing to have it recorded upon this day, and if it does not come true I want some Senator on the other side to remind me I am in error. In the discussion of this subject in Congress, Republicans have maintained that we paid foreign shipowners as much as $200,000,000 a year for carrying our imports and exports. How strenuously that has been denied by Members upon the other side of the Chamber! How strange it seemed the other day when the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was telling us how much would be saved to the American people if we had only 30 boats that would carry the products of foreign countries in those boats to America and from America to foreign ports. He tried to impress us that millions would be saved to the American people, and took the ground that every dollar which was paid to a foreign boat was lost to the American people.

Oh, what a different argument from that has been made in the past upon the other side of the Chamber, and how different it has been made by the Senator from Mississippi, for he has always claimed that we ought to buy in the cheapest market in all the world and sell in the dearest. He has always claimed that every dollar which has been given in the way of a protective tariff to a manufacturer in this country has been paid by the American people.

Then, strange to say, he tried to differentiate between the American people and the Government of the United States. If the Government of the United States paid millions and lost it that did not make any difference to the American people. Why, who is the Government if not the American people? Who constitutes the Government if not the American people? How could the Government of the United States pay any money from its Treasury unless it is paid by the American people? The proposition is so absurd upon its face that a person has difficulty in even considering it.

The statement that $200,000,000 was paid foreign shipowners by American importers and American exporters has been vigorously denied by Democrats who have made arguments in both Houses to try to prove the contrary. But now they design to have the Government enter into this industry as a competitor with private-owned ships. The Democrats assert that we pay to foreigners for this purpose from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 annually.

Is it the month of the year or the year itself that has made such a difference in their judgments? Is it some unforeseen influence, some unforeseen power, working upon their minds and intellects that has changed their former attitude? I leave every Senator upon the other side of the Chamber to answer the question for himself.

That statement has been included in reports in both the Senate and the House and is a part of the report on this bill, the report of the majority making the same statements that Republicans have made in the past, using the same arguments that have been used by the Republicans for over a quarter of a century, quoting from speeches made upon the floor of this Senate in favor of the ship-subsidy bill with a view of bolstering up this proposed legislation. I do not want Senators to think that I question the accuracy of the proposition. I only referred to it to show how our opponents live and learn. The payment of such an enormous sum as $300,000,000 annually is a tremendous tax on the people of the United States and goes far toward overcoming our favorable balance of trade.

Mr. President, the United States Government and its people would be wealthier by billions of dollars if the merchant marine had been established a quarter of a century ago. The pittance carried by any bill offered in either House of Congress as a subsidy would be a mere bagatelle compared with the millions of dollars which would have been saved. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] not only once but many times has introduced bills during his 24 years' service in this body with that object in view. No man could have been more persistent in presenting that question in this body and before the American people than has he; no man has had more patience with the subject. If his policy had been carried out, we would have been absolutely independent of all the world at this critical time in our history; instead of crying for more boats in which to carry our products, we would have had lines of them traversing the Atlantic, traversing the Pacific, and traversing every other sea and ocean in all the world.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields only for a question.

Mr. CLAPP. It has been impossible for me to listen to all of the debate, but I ask the Senator from Utah, if I am right in the conclusion which I have drawn from that portion of it which I have heard, that it is claimed by those who are opposing the bill that at this time there are ships to carry so far as carrying can at this time be done?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. I know it is claimed they charge exorbitant prices.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator it is true that the rates have advanced, but that would be the case even if this bill were passed.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; but that is not what I am discussing. The Senator from Utah has urged that, if certain policies had been pursued, we would have had abundant ships at this time in which to carry all the freight. I have understood that the argument has been made all the time that there are now ships enough.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but if we had adopted a subsidy policy in the past the boats would have been ours, rather than belonging to foreign countries as at present. That is what I wanted to impress upon the Senate.

I will say to the Senator that in many foreign countries to-day there are lying outside of their ports 20, 30, or 40 vessels unable to get berths and unable to get men to unload them; that is the present trouble. The men are off to the war; and before I am through I shall call attention to some of the ports and to the official reports showing upon certain days the number of ships that have been lying outside waiting to be unloaded. Of course the owners claim that that has to be paid for in advanced rates; they claim, and rightly so, that it is very expensive.

Not only that, I will say to the Senator, but it is a question now of supply and demand. Heretofore we had tramp steamers enough at every one of our ports begging for trade, offering the lowest prices, taking any kind of freight, in many cases to be used as ballast in return voyages to foreign countries. It is now different. The shipowners now select what they will carry and say what they will charge for carrying it. That is because of the supply and demand and the conditions existing at the different ports of foreign countries. Again, that comes about by so many ports being closed on account of the war, thereby throwing extra burdens upon the remainder of the ports that are open, and the men who used to be engaged in the loading and unloading of these vessels are to-day engaged in war and in murdering as many of their brothers as possible.

The war in Europe, by cutting off imports from Germany, Austria, and other countries engaged in the conflict, has assisted the Democratic administration in preventing some of the loss its laws have inflicted on the country. The effect has not been alone restricted to the countries engaged in the war, but it has extended to South America and to other parts of the world. A demand has been created for our food products by the countries engaged in war; but other industries have not profited to the same extent, although it has helped certain industries, as it has created a demand for the products of American factories making war goods for foreign countries. That demand has given the American workman something to do, and whenever he is a wage earner he is a purchaser to the extent of his wage; and that far, Mr. President, he assists other industries not en-

gaged in the making of goods for the belligerent countries in supplying goods for exportation to other countries which on account of the war can not supply their ordinary requirements as in the past because that great exporting country, Germany, is bottled up. The English fleet has all of her merchant ships and all of her warships bottled up in the different ports of the world, and the immense amount of goods that she has been exporting to foreign countries is now furnished by other countries or by our manufacturers.

It is true we get a part of that trade, but England is getting to-day the larger part. If you should go into England to-day, you would find industrial conditions in that country better than they have been for years and years past—aye, for over two decades. Their manufacturing institutions are running full time and overtime; the wages paid by them are higher than they have been; and while it is true that hundreds of thousands of her men have gone to war, it is also true that there are more men and women working in the industries of England to-day than there have been for many years past.

Howard Bradstreet, chairman of a subcommittee of the mayor's committee on unemployment in New York, of which committee Judge Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation, is chairman, said a few days ago that statisticians, who are ex-officials of the United States Census Bureau, after an investigation in New York City, reported that the increase in unemployment in that city was 200,000 above the total of last year.

Notwithstanding the extra employment that has come through the greater exportation of American goods caused by the war, in one city in this country there are to-day 200,000 more unemployed men than a year ago. The year 1914 was the most disastrous year to business and to laboring men that has happened in this country since the Democratic Party was in power some years ago. He stated that the problem was acute, and that it was unfortunate that city officials quibbled over the matter.

Senators, have you not noticed of late the effort that is being put forth by heads of different departments and bureaus of this Government to counteract the sentiment and the knowledge that is rapidly being realized in the United States—that conditions are not as they should be? I had the other day an analysis made, and I intended at some time when the occasion arose—and I hope that it will yet arise during this session—to call the attention of the Senate to some of the statements that have been put out under the guise of official statements. A half truth, Mr. President, is sometimes worse than an absolute untruth.

Max Heidelberg, another one of those interested in investigating the subject, told of finding more than 200 homeless men in a cellar, entered through a trap door at a Bowery mission. I suppose that Max will be charged by the administration as being a German, and therefore prejudiced against the present administration, and that this statement was made on that account.

No, Mr. President; it will not do to make such claims. I think it is far better that the conditions as they exist should be known rather than be covered up. I think that if they were known there would be a greater effort on the part of the charitable people of this country to take care of the unfortunates. In that cellar there was no ventilation, and he said that Charities Commissioner Kingsbury derided talk about a "cubic-foot-of-air" theory.

According to figures compiled for the public forum of the Church of the Ascension in Fifth Avenue, New York, of which the Rev. Percy Stickney Grant is rector, a partial list of the unemployed in Greater New York totaled 562,700 on January 12 of this year. The number of homeless persons in the city who have not the price of shelter is stated in that report to be 60,000. These figures were obtained by a gentleman employed to make the investigation by a committee of the public forum. I expect, Mr. President—and if what I have heard is true it is already here—there will be a flood of special agents from different departments of the Government going into the cities for the purpose of learning from their point of view whether the poor are really suffering or not and classifying them. Think of people who are in want being classified by a clerk drawing $900 a year! And I expect before long to see some glaring reports made denying in toto the reports that have been made by the charitable institutions formed in the different parts of this country with a view of ascertaining the number that are in want.

It is not only in one line of business, but we find it in all businesses, unless it happens to be a class of business that is exporting goods to a foreign country. You find the clothing manufacturers of this country, in Chicago, in Baltimore, in Cincinnati, in California, all in a deplorable condition. Why? Because the farmer is using his last year's suit. It is not only the farmer; it is all of us. Where men used to have two suits they now have only one. It does not apply only to farmers, but it applies to many, many men who have been considered well off in the past.

That is only an example, Mr. President. You could go through every industry in this country, with the exception, as I stated before, of those industries making war goods to be shipped to a belligerent country, and you would find the same condition of affairs. I expect to hear a wail go up here before long because the farmer is receiving a dollar and a half a bushel for his wheat. I suppose the Democratic Party is the same in every part of the United States. If the farmer gets 50 cents a bushel for his wheat, they appeal to him and say: "You are being discriminated against. The Republican tariff is robbing you. You are not getting what you ought to get." Then, if he gets a dollar and a half a bushel for his wheat, they appeal to the consumer and say: "See what you are paying the farmer for his wheat. The Republican tariff is the cause of the high cost of living." So it does not make a particle of difference whether the price is up or down, there is always a Democratic complaint.

This investigation, Mr. President, proved the truth about one thing that has been often wrongfully charged against employers, for the report shows that 60,000 men and boys are now being kept in employment by firms reluctant to discharge them, despite the fact that business conditions do not warrant their continued employment. Freight yards as well as cellars are used as sleeping apartments to accommodate this army of unemployed.

I do not often think it necessary to quote from Mr. Samuel Gompers, the well-known workmen's leader, but he says:

> From all over this land of ours come reports of need. There are great numbers of unemployed, of unknown men and women, in the bread lines of our cities. These people want work. They have hunted desperately for work, but work has been denied them.
>
> The Associated Charities of New York announced a list recently containing the names of 113 poverty-stricken families which are in dire need. The men and women of these families were willing to do anything to provide the bare necessities of life for their dependents. In Chicago on January 21 it was reported that over 100,000 persons were idle seeking work. Similar reports come from other cities. I have noticed in speeches delivered by Members of the House, as well as representative men outside, that they have placed the number of unemployed at the present time at 4,000,000.

That is the proof of the era of "great prosperity" which the Secretary of Commerce is traveling over the country to inform the people about! He is first down in the South and then in the West trying to impress upon the minds of the American people that there is an era of prosperity at hand.

The railroads of this country, as I called attention to shortly after 9 o'clock, were in a desperate condition, and of course something had to be done for them. I am not going to charge any ulterior motives on the part of any man to bring it about, but I felt positive that it would come, not from any particular testimony that had been given, but because I noticed from statements in the press that the administration was in favor of the increase. I knew what that meant. I suppose the increase was necessary. Be that as it may, they have received the advance, and I think that on account of that advance orders will be placed for railroad material, for extra cars, for extra locomotives, for steel rails, and for other betterments that have become absolutely necessary for the safety of the travel of the American people.

It is true that the freight upon the railroads for the last year decreased in tonnage, and that of course was necessarily so on account of the decrease of the purchasing power of the people in all parts of the United States.

The net revenues for the last fiscal year before the war in Europe began decreased $102,000,000. The freight revenues for May of last year were over $24,000,000 less than for May, 1913. That was long before war was even talked of in Europe, and it was wholly due to the change in the control of our Government and the policies inaugurated by it.

Now that the railroads are allowed to charge consumers and travelers over $100,000,000 more per annum to make up this enormous loss in part, it is heralded by the leaders as an evidence of great prosperity. In the same way, I suppose, the income-tax law and the $105,000,000 to be derived as intended from the alleged war-revenue tax will also be heralded as an evidence of great prosperity. Yet with all that and with all these burdens put upon the American people they will not meet the expenditures of the Government. There will be a shortage of not a few millions, but many, many millions of dollars. I see no immediate relief.

I could go on, Mr. President, and quote from Democratic authority as to conditions existing in certain parts of this country, but I do not care to do so to-night.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, it is not surprising that many Democrats differ from the administration as to

the policy to be carried out. This bill, like many others, including the tariff bill, is forced on Congress. It is not at all probable that any such measure would have been brought up, particularly at this short session, except it was forced upon Congress. As the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] remarked in his address on the bill recently, the Democratic Party in Congress merely registers the decrees of the President, in the same way that the French Parliament did under Louis XIV.

The President's recent address at Indianapolis, in which he favored a national employment bureau, shows that he has some realization of the army of unemployed brought by the Democratic administration. His warning to this body, to the effect that if they should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic team for any purpose or from any motive theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and responsibility, which will bring deep bitterness to them, is something unheard of in our Government since the days of Andrew Jackson.

I do not care, Mr. President, to take up that speech in detail, because I think that has already been done, and I do not think it would add anything to the questions involved in this bill. Therefore I shall proceed upon another matter entirely.

The record of this pending measure so far in the Senate shows the uncertainty of the majority party in this body in regard to it. The original bill was introduced December 9, and reported by the committee January 6. On January 25 another substitute was offered. What other amendments may be proposed is merely a matter of conjecture. I think we have the fourth edition now. That fourth edition is before the Senate at this time. It is very clear that there were no distinctive ideas on the subject among the Members supporting the measure in this body in the beginning. It has been quite evident that the President has had no business training, as he stated in his Indianapolis speech. I do not know but what the bill will be amended many times more, providing the Democratic caucus agrees to it, and reports it to the Senate as a substitute for the one we are now discussing. I can not help but think, Mr. President, that this is not the last one, and yet it may be. No one can tell what the action of the Democratic caucus will be. The measure was brought to the Senate for discussion with a warning from the Democratic leaders that there was no need of debate, with utterances from the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the effect that Republican discussion of the bill was not worth listening to, although he did not take the trouble to listen before he uttered his disapproval. I therefore feel that I should acknowledge with pleasure the presence of the Senator at this early hour in the morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not gotten very far along with what I have to say, but——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the question I should like to ask I will state that what the Senator from Mississippi did say was that no 13-hour speech and no 9-hour speech and no 10-hour speech was ever worth listening to at all. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Has he calculated the amount of money that he is costing the American shippers by his speech?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; but——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is $20,800 an hour. The Senator has now talked enough to have cost them a little over $40,000. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] talked long enough to cost them $250,000; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] long enough to cost them $150,000; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] long enough to cost them $200,000; and the Senator from Utah has thus far got up to $41,600. If it continues much longer, he will very nigh bankrupt them.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I have a very poor record in speech making——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from Utah remember that the Senator from Mississippi did not say that Republican speeches were not worth listening to, but that those particular Republican speeches made by those particular Republicans had not been worth listening to?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator should not——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One more question.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from Utah remember that most of their speeches were read out of things that all of us could have gotten?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will let me answer now, I will be very thankful to him. The Senator evidently was not in the Chamber when I discussed his mathematical calculations as to what would be saved to the American people if this bill passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were not mine. They were those of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator gave them as his.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Secretary of the Treasury would ever take the position the Senator has taken here.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. No man who knows anything about business would ever figure the way the Senator from Mississippi is figuring now. It costs the Government no more for a continuous session than if the Senator from Mississippi were at present in bed instead of being engaged in forcing a vote on this bill at 1 o'clock in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMOOT. For a question.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not think it is very fortunate for the Senate as a whole and Senators individually that there is no personal liability as to what it will cost the American public from time to time in debate? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, I do not yield. I do not want the Senator to get any further off now until I answer the question he asked me; nor do I want the Senator at this early hour in the morning——

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is not an early hour. It is a very late hour.

Mr. SMOOT. It is early in the morning. I notice that it is 10 minutes past 1, so that it is early in the morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator really think——

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Minnesota to get into any discussion that would lead my mind off from the subject we are discussing. Therefore I kindly ask the Senator from Mississippi not to reply to the Senator from Minnesota at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, if the Senator will let me go on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator if he does not think his saying I should wait for an answer to the last question until he had answered all the others was substantially saying that he never would answer any of them?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course that may be the result, but I did not have that in mind. If the Senator from Mississippi will be so kind as to call my attention to it before I close, I will assure him now that I will be glad to answer if the Senator from Mississippi is in the Chamber at the time I close. However, if the Senator from Mississippi now desires to ask me a question, I am perfectly willing that he should do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I have asked quite a number of questions. I merely intended to help you along.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You were worrying yourself considerably, and I thought I would ask you a question to give you a starting point.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, I do not yield to the Senator from Mississippi, because, Mr. President, I do not have to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator from Utah let me ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I refuse because the Senator from Mississippi may think——

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. That would take me off the floor and I will not yield for that reason. The Senator from Mississippi need not worry about my running out of material, for this bill is so vicious in its provisions, it is so un-American that there is plenty to say about the bill without anyone interrupting me with questions to take up the time.

The Postmaster General and others have proposed that the Government shall take over the telephone and telegraph lines. That is only another step toward socialism. It is not any worse step, however, than the one that is being taken in this bill. The result will be the same. The Government of the United States can not run business as cheaply as an individual or a corporation. No government on earth does it. Let the Government get into the business of operating ships. The appointments of the officers and men employed, if they were Americans, would be influenced through politics. Can not Senators see the trouble that would come? I believe that they do see it and they know it. If this proposition had been made three years ago by a Republican President, and if he had undertaken to force it through this body when the Republicans were in control, he would have found the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], particularly the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], standing upon that side of the Chamber denouncing it with all the force at their command, just the same as they have done in the past whenever the question of building a merchant marine has been under consideration. But the Democratic caucus report a bill that if enacted into law no one in this Chamber or anywhere else in this Government can tell what it is going to cost the Government of the Unted States. No one has ever suggested what it would cost, and they do not know what it would cost.

A measure to provide the way to Government ownership of the merchant marine would be very much better than the provisions of this bill. We are told by one Senator upon the other side that the object of the bill is for the Government to purchase the boats and then to lease them, and that unless the lease provision was in the bill he would not support it. Other Senators take the position that the Government is going to operate the boats, that it is not expected to lease them. And it is not an emergency matter. That the policy is a permanent one; the Government is going into this business.

Mr. President, if the Government is going into the business the Government ought to own the boats outright. They ought to operate them and they ought to be responsible in every way and not try to get under cover with a corporation of the District of Columbia. Some Senators upon the other side say that they do not intend to buy the German boats interned in the different ports of the world. Another Senator says that they have a perfect right to buy them and that no danger will come to this country from the purchase of the same.

No, Senators, there is no concerted thought or understanding as to what the bill is or what it is intended to accomplish. The only thing that they do agree upon is that the President wants the bill and he must have it.

If this bill becomes a law and is put in operation it will paralyze individual effort and increase the number of Government employees and the expense of conducting business so as to lead almost to a revolution.

Government regulation is all right, but Government ownership as a substitute for private business enterprise is a monumental failure. I want to register my protest against the Government of the United States going into the shipping business, the merchandise business, the lumber business, the clothing business, the manufacturing business, or any business other than that for which our Government was organized and which the Constitution of the United States gives it power to undertake.

I made the statement that it costs the Government more to run any business than it costs a private institution; and I think that is very easy of demonstration. I never heard it denied until this bill was under consideration. I never thought there was a Senator who believed otherwise from the experience that he has had with the departments of the Government. The Government, for instance, is conducting a printing office in this city at an expense of nearly a million dollars a year. That is outside of the cost of paper and of all other materials; it is solely for labor. I have no doubt that the actual work required to do that million dollars' worth of printing could be done in private institutions for much less. There are reasons for that which I shall not take time to discuss in this bill, but I hope before the close of this session that we shall pass the printing bill that is now upon the calendar. By passing that bill we should save to the Government every year nearly $800,000; but when it comes to a matter of saving money for the Government, that is a horse of a different color. Bills that take the money from the Treasury can receive consideration, but bills designed to save to the Treasury and for the Government can wait until the new Congress comes in!

The Postmaster General has recently declared that if he were allowed to contract for the parcel-post business and for the rural free delivery, he could save in the latter case alone some $18,000,000 a year. Is there any better testimony to show that the Government can not do business in competition with individuals or individual corporations? In this one item alone we were told that there could be saved $18,000,000. I have not made an investigation to ascertain whether or not it is true; but if the Government were placed upon a business basis, if it were run on business principles, if we had power and authority to direct, to appropriate, and to organize the business of this country, I have not a doubt in my mind that it could be done for 25 per cent less.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. STERLING. Very well. I do not know whether the Senator's attention has been called to a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter of January 27, and which has been on our desks since that date or the date of the 28th of January. I should like to ask the Senator a question concerning one statement which the Secretary of the Treasury makes, although it may be that the Senator has covered the point in his discussion so far. However, on page 17 of his letter I find the Secretary of the Treasury makes this statement:

> Grain, cotton, and other commodities are usually sold "delivered" at the port of destination. When steamship companies raise the cost of delivery of grain from 6 cents to 60 cents per bushel it makes a vast difference in the price the farmer receives for his product and when ocean freight charges on cotton are raised from $1.25 to $15 per bale the price at which the farmer sells his cotton is seriously reduced.

The question I desire to ask is as to whether the Senator from Utah thinks that the farmer has to take any less for his wheat on account of the higher freight rates, or whether the farmer is receiving any less for his wheat on account of the higher freight rates, or whether or not the higher freight rates are not paid by the consumer—the foreigner—who purchases the American wheat?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from South Dakota, I will state that the American farmer gets the same price all over the United States less the freight to some port for exportation. The prices referred to for transportation by the Secretary of the Treasury are prices for cotton from a port in the United States to Germany.

They do not charge any such price to any port of England or France. So it is with the 60 cents a bushel rate upon wheat; they do not charge that rate to Liverpool. If they did, then it would take 60 cents off the farmer's price; but they do not do it. That is merely one of the arguments that is made. I venture to say to the Senator that there has not been one cargo of cotton shipped at $15 a bale, and if it were shipped to Germany and a charge of $15 a bale were made the man who bought the cotton paid for it the same price as that paid for the cotton that goes to Liverpool, and Germany pays that extra $13.75 a bale.

Mr. STERLING. That is what I wanted to ask the Senator—whether or not the cotton producer was obliged to take any less for his cotton per bale because of the transportation charge?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I doubt, Mr. President, whether there has been a cargo of cotton shipped to Bremen, where this rate of $15 a bale has been charged. There is no such rate to Liverpool, and the only reason for advances of freight rates at all is because it is almost impossible to secure men to unload the boats. I will call attention to-night to the number of vessels which have been lying outside of the different ports unable to be unloaded.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say, Mr. President, to the Senator from South Dakota——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will be patient a moment, then I will yield for a question.

I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota, in answer to his question, that if a hundred bales of cotton should go to Liverpool and a hundred bales of cotton should go to Bremen at the $15 a bale rate the cotton grower in the South would receive exactly the same price, and the cotton shipped may come from the same warehouse, bought upon the New York market the same day for the same price. There is no doubt in the world about that.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator tells us that the freight rate makes no difference to the producer——

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not want the Senator to make a broad assertion of that kind.

Mr. JAMES. That is what I thought the Senator's argument meant.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I said——

Mr. JAMES. But aside from that——

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator wants to ask me a question, let him ask it and not make a speech.

Mr. JAMES. That is what I am predicating it on.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; the producer does not pay the 60-cent rate on wheat to Bremen or the $15 a bale on cotton.

Mr. JAMES. I am going to take you to another product that is a little closer to our hearts in Kentucky than either cotton or wheat, and that is tobacco.

Mr. SMOOT. I presumed the Senator had in mind tobacco or whisky; I did not know which.

Mr. JAMES. I refer to tobacco. The tobacco farmer formerly paid half a cent a pound freight from the East to Europe, but the freight rate has been increased to 3½ cents a pound. The tobacco buyers for France, Germany, and other foreign countries are telling our farmers that they must reduce the price of their tobacco 3 cents a pound below what they would otherwise get because of the freight rate charged to get their tobacco abroad, and they have consequently depressed the price of our tobacco to our farmers by reason of that fact.

If the Senator's argument is true that the freight rate does not affect the farmers at all, that it is paid by the producer, what would he say if the freight rate on tobacco were 50 cents a pound? Would that not affect the consumption of it, and would that not affect the demand for it; and if you affect the demand for it and the consumption of it, have you not thereby depressed the price?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, as usual, the Senator from Kentucky has built up a straw man and then commences to demolish him. The Senator from Utah has never said that the freight rates made no difference to the producer. It does not, however, make a difference where there are two rates such as are quoted by the Secretary of the Treasury. If there was a rate of 50 cents to Bremen and a rate of 10 cents to Liverpool on Kentucky tobacco, there would not be a difference of 40 cents a pound to the producer, because of the fact that there is a greater war risk to Bremen.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. Well, if the Senator's argument is true, Mr. President, if he will permit me——

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. STERLING. The question is this: If the expression as used by the Secretary of the Treasury, "sold, delivered"—the word "delivered" being in quotation marks—"at the port of destination," does not mean that the exporter of the product has sold it delivered, taking into consideration the freight rate?

Mr. SMOOT. And whatever risk there may be besides.

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield, I want to say that if the Senator's argument is true that the freight rate is paid by the consumer, then our farmers in their long and earnest advocacy of a board like the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate and to lower freight rates have been very foolish in their advocacy for all these years of lowering freight rates and regulating freight rates by authority of a board appointed through governmental action.

Mr. SMOOT. The trouble with the Senator is that he is arguing upon one subject while I have been answering the question submitted by the Senator from South Dakota upon another. We have war times now; there are war risks at present; and they all affect the price of transportation. The risks are not all the same. The risk of shipping to a German port is much greater than the risk of shipping to an English or to a French or to a Russian port. There is not a shipper who does not know that; and nothing goes from America to the ports of any of those countries that the smaller risk is not taken into consideration, and there is not a shipment that goes to Germany on which the risk is not greater, and somebody has got to pay for it; and who pays for it?

Let us take the case of copper. What is Germany offering for copper to-day? It is not a question of price; it is a question of getting copper. The exporter does not have to pay more for his copper that he buys from the smelters of the West if it goes to England or France or Germany, but Germany has to pay more. Why?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Because the war risks are greater, Mr. President, and Germany pays for the war risk, but England does not. England can buy the copper, and if she does it arrives with scarcely any risk attached. The insurance to-day upon shipments to England or France or Russia is very little more than it is in time of peace, and why should it be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait just one moment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, I am patient.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not think the Senator from North Carolina has been patient.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to be patient.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from Utah is the patient one.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have all been very patient with the Senator from Utah to-night, I am sure.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sure the Senator from Utah has been very, very patient with the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators injecting remarks into his speech.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am in favor of patience.

Mr. SMOOT. You know, I am not in the position of the Senator from Arkansas when you Democrats were filibustering in order to defeat the ship subsidy bill in 1891. He had the rules of the body enforced, and he warned the Republicans that, no matter if they were in the majority, they had to be in their seats, and it would not do to be in the cloakroom, nor would it do for them to go home, and if they did a quorum would be called.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish we could have a rule of that sort now, Mr. President, so that the Republicans would have to stay in their seats and not stay in the cloakroom.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but that rule would apply then to Democrats, as well.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a mighty good rule.

Mr. SMOOT. That rule then applied to majorities, and it ought to apply now to majorities.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it ought to apply to minorities, too.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it did not apply to minorities then. Mr. Jones, of Arkansas, could have taken the floor, and all the others, with the exception of one to suggest the absence of a quorum, could have gone home; and it was not held then that a man who, while on the floor delivering a speech, yields to a Senator and does not say in his statement that it is only for a question, is deprived of the floor. No, Mr. President; no such rule as that was ever enforced in this body before.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has been talking so fast to-night that I have no doubt he is tired, and would welcome suggestions.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I do not welcome them. Therefore I want to say to the Senator that if that is all the object he has in his request, I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has refused to yield twice to-night.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly I have refused to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. He has a perfect right to refuse the third time if he wants to; but I want to say to the Senator from Utah——

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have never refused to yield to the Senator from Utah since I have been a Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state to the Senator from North Carolina that the Senator from Utah refuses to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will desist if the Senator from Utah is not willing to yield to me.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not willing to yield to the Senator on the basis on which he puts it, because I am not tired.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will proceed. He is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, I want to say to the Senator that it is now only 20 minutes of 2 o'clock.

Mr. JAMES. I ask for a vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JAMES. No; I did not ask the Senator to yield. I thought he had yielded the floor. I was asking for a vote.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the way the Senator from Kentucky would force a vote. He asks a question to draw me off, and then, when I am trying to get back to where I was when he started, he calls for a vote.

Mr. JAMES. No, Mr. President; the trouble with the Senator is that he is not quite so easily drawn off from what he is talking about, because he has been rambling around all over everything——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have yielded to him when he has asked me to do so, and every time I yield to him he enters upon a long harangue, a political speech of some kind.

Mr. President, I was discussing the cost of the Government running a business as compared with the same business directed, controlled, managed, and operated by an individual or a corporation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMOOT. For a question.

Mr. WHITE. I just wanted to ask the Senator from Utah, when he was speaking about the cost of the Government carrying on business, if he had any reference to the cost of carrying on business in the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course I have heard that question asked very often, when it suits the convenience of Senators upon that side; but I do not think the Senator from Alabama has any advantage over the Senator from Utah in the length of time that is occupied by either one in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. I have been here only a very short time, Mr. President. I have hardly been in the Senate as long as the Senator from Utah has been talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may not have been in the Senate as long as I will be talking, but I certainly know that he has been in the Senate longer than I have been talking.

Mr. WHITE. I am sure I will not be in the Senate as long as the Senator will be talking, because I go out on the 4th of March.

Mr. SMOOT. I have really forgotten now what the Senator's question was, but I suppose it was of so little importance that the Senator does not care whether I answer it or not.

Mr. President, when the Senators get through with their hilarity, I will proceed; but not until they do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will proceed. There is no disorder in the Senate at present.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was referring to the statement made by the Postmaster General that if he were allowed to contract for the Parcel Post Service and the rural free delivery, he could save to the Government of the United States $18,000,000 a year. This is a confession on his part of the failure of the Government in that line of business, though he wants it to vastly extend its ownership by taking over the telegraph and telephone lines of the country. On the one hand he says that Government control is a failure, and on the other hand he asks for more power. He wants to take over the telegraph and telephone lines of the country, I suppose, to make another failure. If the little business referred to by him loses to the Government, in comparison with the business if maintained and operated by an individual, $18,000,000 a year, for Heaven's sake what would it be in case we took over the telephone and telegraph lines? Nobody could tell, but it would be millions and millions of dollars.

The Government of the United States can not conduct a shipping business without loss. The Government of the United States can not operate the shipping business as cheaply as it can be operated by private parties. This bill offers no hope for any relief to shippers excepting at public expense, and I defy any Democrat in this Chamber to say that these ships will be operated by the Government at a profit.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. For a question.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator has just made a challenge that I was going to answer; but since he limits it to a question, I will ask him if he is not aware of the fact that every nation in Europe, almost without an exception—I think without a single exception—certainly 14 nations do conduct their public utilities, such as telephones and telegraphs and railroads, more economically than they are conducted in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. The latter part of the question is well put in. Cheaper than in this country! I hope so. Public utilities in Europe! Has the Senator been to Europe and seen how they are operated? Has the Senator been there and seen the class of people that operate them? Does the Senator know what they pay those operatives? I hope it will never happen in my life that the Government owning and controlling the public utilities will undertake to operate them as they are operated in foreign countries.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to live to see the day when my children will have to work for the Government of the United States for the wage that is paid to the employees of public utilities owned by the Government of Germany.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he was asking a question when he addressed various inquiries to the Senator from Oklahoma, or whether he was making his peroration?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I was not asking a question, because I do not want to insult the intelligence of the Senator. He knows that there is a difference, and I know he knows it.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will proceed, Mr. President.

I make the statement again that this bill offers no hope for any relief to shippers except at public expense. Why, even the Senator from Mississippi acknowledged that; but he undertook to argue that if the people of the United States received cheaper freight, and if the Government of the United States had to pay the difference, that would be clear gain to the people. What a silly position! The people of the United States pay every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the United States in one way or another.

It would be like robbing Paul to pay Peter; like taking a dollar out of one pocket and putting it into another and claiming that you have made a dollar.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is denying the protective-tariff doctrine.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not denying anything relating to the tariff. If you want to enter into a tariff discussion to-night, I am perfectly willing to meet the Senator upon that question. There is no doubt about it; just wait until the American people get one more chance at the Democratic Party, and they will let it know who pays the tariff.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to ask the Senator why it is that the representatives of the present administration are so exceedingly anxious about the freight rates on the ocean while they are increasing the freight rates which the American people have to pay on land?

Mr. SMOOT. That is a question, Mr. President, that is worthy of a speech in itself. I say to the Senator that I would not feel like undertaking it unless I had at least two or three hours to discuss it. It is filled full of serious questions. It goes to the very heart of a number of questions that the people of the United States ought to know; the facts are leaking out little by little, and I think it will not be many years until the people will know the whole truth.

I do not know all that is back of this bill. We will learn after a while. We will learn what influences are pressing it and what they intend to get out of it. Take our experience in the War with Spain. We found ourselves helpless as far as auxiliary ships were concerned.

Mr. OWEN. We licked Spain.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; we licked Spain, because she was a poorly prepared country; but we had to go to a foreign country to get auxiliary boats, just the same as we would have to do at present if we became involved in war.

If I was going to be extravagant in Government appropriations it would be for our national defense. We should learn by the lesson that was taught us in the purchasing of ships during the War with Spain. In some cases the price that was paid for the ships was such that when they were sold, not two years later, they did not bring 10 cents on the dollar.

Mr. OWEN. That was in a Republican administration.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; it was; but if the Republican Party had had its way and used such rules as have been used in the consideration of this measure we would have had the merchant marine established, and we would have paid only a small subsidy to have done it. We would not have had to purchase the boats at the time we had trouble with Spain.

Mr. OWEN. You would have paid subsidies to the trusts?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how long it will take some Senators to forget the hackneyed word trusts, but there is never any legislation they are opposed to but what they cry "trusts!"

"trusts!" I think the people of the United States will know a little more about what party is fostering trusts after this bill passes than they have in the past. I think if the lobby committee that was appointed by the Democratic majority would get to work now they would find an insidious lobby in Washington, and that it had been here for months.

Mr. OWEN. Certainly the papers of Washington are against the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I insist that the rule shall be observed and that a Senator shall not speak when sitting in his chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule of the Senate is that a Senator must rise and address the Chair and get permission before he can speak.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a right rule and it ought to be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hopes that Senators will respect that rule. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not have thought about trusts or have mentioned them unless it had been brought to my attention by the fertile brain of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. When we were considering the bill granting free tolls for American ships through the Panama Canal I could not help, in following that discussion, to observe that my friends on the other side pleaded for free tolls in order that the unjust freight rates would be lowered and prevent the railroad trust from further robbing the people. When they were ordered by the President of the United States to repeal the law the same Senators argued that it ought to be repealed to cripple the shipping trust.

I say, Mr. President, I would like to have the lobby committee get busy. I do not think it would be very hard to find the lobbyists. I do not think it would be very hard to find men deeply interested in selling to the United States German interned boats. I do not think it would be very hard to find men with old painted tubs in different parts of the world here to sell them to this proposed shipping board. If they were first-class boats they would be in service. The owners of boats to-day all over the world are reaping a harvest because of the fact that they are in a position to dictate as to what freight rates they may charge. Mr. Irving T. Bush, president of the Bush Terminal Co., recently pointed out that England has 4,235 ships in the foreign trade.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SMOOT. For a question.

Mr. KERN. What is the name of the gentleman?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Bush.

Mr. KERN. Anheuser Busch?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; this Bush is spelt B-u-s-h. I am not a beer drinker, so I do not know how the Busch beer man's name is spelled. However, I do not believe it is B-u-s-h. I think it is B-u-s-c-h, and there may be a letter or two more in it. Mr. Bush points out that England has 4,235 ships in the foreign trade. Under this bill the United States might get 30 to 60 ships by the expenditure contemplated by President Wilson. Suppose you bought them all, suppose you could buy them all, you would have to buy ships that are in the trade to-day, and it would not relieve the situation at all.

What would 30 ships amount to in the commerce of the world?

Mr. President, it is perfectly absurd to think that it is going to have any influence upon rates. If we had 2,000 ships, if we controlled that number, there would no doubt be competition, but to think that 30 ships would influence the trade is absurd. It may, however, be sufficient to carry a part of the cotton, but as far as carrying the commerce of the United States to foreign countries is concerned, as far as taking care of our exportations as a whole is concerned, not for one section of the country but as a whole, it is ridiculous. Practically nothing could be accomplished by the expenditure of the amount provided for in this bill.

The great trouble with our competing in the foreign shipping trade grows out of the much higher wages paid in this country than elsewhere. The cost of constructing a ship is more in this country and the cost of operation is necessarily more. The fact that the Government operates a ship will not relieve that situation in the least. The Democrats have been legislating to meet that situation by admitting foreign-built ships and by allowing them to be manned by foreign crews and foreign officers, a policy, Mr. President, that never should have been allowed. But even with this poor policy, what has been the result? Has it assisted us to any degree in handling our over-sea trade? Let the figures speak.

If such legislation were taken advantage of to any great extent, the shipyards in the United States would necessarily suffer, because foreign ships would be obtained instead of American-built ships. Our shipyards could not compete with those of foreign countries without reducing wages to the foreign level. I have not heard any Democrat in this discussion claim that the wages were not less in foreign countries than in our own. I can take our own Government reports and show the class of employees upon the ships carrying our commerce on the seas, and I venture the statement now that there is not any class of employees on a foreign ship that receives anywhere near the same wage they receive upon an American ship of the same size and the same class of ships. Some countries do not pay more than perhaps 40 per cent. Some pay less than that.

That is only one item in the cost of operating ships. Our shipyards could not compete, as I have stated, with those of foreign countries without reducing wages to the foreign level. Is that what our Democratic friends want? That is what they are seeking to bring about; but so far their efforts have resulted in a miserable failure. Some foreign vessels have been brought under our flag, but in nearly every case they were vessels owned by Americans and manned by foreign crews, not by American crews.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OWEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to ask the Senator from Utah if he has figured out what percentage of difference there is in the wage cost, the labor cost of operating vessels under the American flag and under foreign flags—if he has arrived at that estimate?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to state the exact percentage, because that is necessarily different in different classes of vessels. It is different in a larger ship as compared with a smaller ship; it is different as to where the ship is built and what class of people man it. I have heard the Senator from Florida say during this discussion that there was only a difference of about from 5 to 10 per cent. On one occasion he did say 15 per cent.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the estimate of the committee that reported to the New York Chamber of Commerce, and I was arriving at the possible average. The Senator might state the average. I have seen it stated that the average difference would be about 18 per cent between the wages paid on American vessels and those paid on foreign vessels.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, there is not any country which does not pay 18 per cent less than we do, and there are countries that pay from 60 to 75 per cent less—that is, as to the wage of the crew. The difference, of course, is less as to the officers.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then, I will ask the Senator from Utah another question. The Senator has been making some observations with reference to the Democrats apparently favoring lowering the rate of wages paid on American vessels, and he seems to be very much opposed to that. I would ask the Senator if he would favor what is known as the seamen's bill, sometimes called the La Follette bill, which is pending?

Mr. SMOOT. Most of the provisions of that bill meet with my approval, as the Senator from Florida would know if he was present when the bill was being discussed. I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] knows very well my attitude upon the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator favor that provision of the bill which authorizes a seaman, shipped on a foreign vessel, arriving in one of our ports, to demand one-half of the wages earned and the privilege to leave the vessel and demand the proportion of the wages earned?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that is the vital part of the bill at all. I do not see that there is very much in that, and I never have thought there was very much in that particular point in the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is one of the main points insisted upon.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is one of the main points insisted upon by some of the conferees; I do not doubt that; but in my opinion it is not a vital part of the bill at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is not that the main point insisted upon by the people interested in advancing the cause of labor—the working people engaged on the ships?

Mr. SMOOT. That is one of the points; but I do not think it is the main point by any manner of means. They have never led me to believe that it was the main point at any time in any discussion that I ever had with any of them.

Mr. President, a change of the flag floating over the vessel amounts to nothing in the way of helping American business; and I think the Senator having this bill in charge will admit that what few vessels are flying the American flag to-day, and running under it, were before the European war operating under foreign flags and cut very little figure in the transportation of our products across the seas.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say with reference to that, if the Senator will permit me, that most of the vessels which were transferred to the American flag are owned by people engaged in business, and who are using them for their own business.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Such as the Fruit Co., the Standard Oil Co., and the Steel Corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. The United Fruit Co. and the Standard Oil Co. are the only ones that have come under our flag; and the prediction was made upon the floor of the Senate by those who were opposed to the measure that they would be the only ones to come under the American flag. I make another prediction to the Senator now, and that is, that just as soon as the European war is over and there is no risk, they will go out from under the American flag and will again operate under a foreign flag.

Mr. FLETCHER. In that situation, then, we have no hope that private enterprise will ever develop a merchant marine.

Mr. SMOOT. Not until there is some subsidy offered, which will make up the difference between the cost of operating ships under a foreign flag and operating them under American laws and under American conditions.

A subsidy to our shipping interests, I will say to the Senator, is the same in principle as protection is to any industry in this country; it is the same as protection is to the great product of Louisiana—sugar.

Mr. POMERENE. In other words, the Senator admits that protection is a subsidy?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I object to Senators sitting in their seats and making side remarks. It has been going on all night. I did not hear what the Senator said. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio if he wants to ask me a question, but I do object to him turning his back to me and also to the Chair and making some side remark that we can not hear.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that the Senator from Utah is "monarch of all he surveys," and I do not care to interrupt him when he is in such an amiable mood.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, the Senator was entirely out of order in interrupting me. I am perfectly willing, as I said before, to be interrupted if the Senator wants to ask me a question; but when the Senator turns his back not only to me but to the Chair and says something that I can not for the life of me hear, I do not think it is in order, and I object to its further continuance. It has been going on all the evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. I was saying, Mr. President, the question of a subsidy for the building up of our merchant marine is no different than a protective tariff to build up our industries in this country. The shipping business is in the same identical condition, because of having no protection in the way of a subsidy, that our sugar business will be in just as soon as the war is over.

When that time comes there will not be a sugar factory in the State of Louisiana that can successfully operate; and there will be very few sugar factories in any part of the United States when sugar beets are again raised in foreign countries now at war and sugar produced for themselves and for export.

I know that the beet fields of Belgium are trampled bare. The millions of Belgian people of that stricken country have been driven beyond its borders. The beet fields of Germany are not yielding what they have in the past; nor are those of France. The present price of sugar is due to a shortage in the world's crop, and when the war is over there is no question that, unless the provision of the tariff law placing sugar upon the free list to take effect in 1916 is repealed, the sugar industry of this country is doomed.

I only refer to this because the question was asked whether or not private initiative, private individuals, would build up our merchant marine. I say that they will not do it and they can not do it unless they receive a bounty, a subvention, or some sort of assistance from the Government of the United States. I have said, Mr. President, that the change of the flag floating over a ship amounts to nothing by way of helping American business. The Democrats have tried to get a measure through Congress taking away all the protection for our coastwise shipping. When that amendment was first offered in this body I thought it was done for delay. I did not think there were any Members of the Senate who would vote for such a proposition. Certainly no one who had studied the question would think of such action as that, because he would know that it would be the beginning of the end of our coastwise trade, a trade that has grown until it is the pride of the country, and acknowledged by all the world to be better than that of any other country, and yet we find introduced into the Senate amendments the effect of which would be to take away all protection to our coastwise shipping. A conference report for that purpose was brought before Congress at the last session, but fortunately it was not adopted and the measure did not get on the statute books.

Our coastwise shipping is something the country can well be proud of. We have 7,000,000 tons of coastwise shipping. Senators, would it not be a splendid thing if our over-seas trade had increased as our coastwise trade has increased? Would it not be a splendid thing if we had ships plying the oceans of the world, the fastest and the best in all the world, ships that we could call to the aid of our Navy in time of war, ships that would be at our command? I want to say to Senators that if we had taken the same course in the upbuilding of our over-seas trade that we have taken in building up our coastwise trade we would to-day be in an independent position as far as carrying our products to foreign markets is concerned.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I can not resist——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to ask a question of the Senator. With omnipotent authority in both Houses of Congress, pray God, why have you Republicans not built up such an establishment of ocean carrying trade?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, one reason——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. You have been derelict, then, in your duty, and you can not complain of us, for we have only had the reins of power for a year and a half, or thereabouts.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator will look at the records of Congress——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not want any record; I know the fact that you have not built it up, and why have you not done so?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will permit, I will gladly answer him. For one reason, we have not used the rules of this body the same as they have been used to-night. That is one reason. Another reason is that the Democrats have stood upon that side of the Chamber when they were in the minority and have filibustered to death bills providing for a merchant marine. I say to the Senator that we have had a President of the United States who would sign such a bill; we have had Senates that would have passed such a bill; but we have never yet had a bill pass the House and come to the Senate unless there was a filibuster to kill it by the minority.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, well, it ill becomes the Senator to argue against filibusters when his party, by a method that was infallible in its operation, carried on a filibuster.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will favor me with his presence——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have, very assiduously.

Mr. SMOOT (continuing). And be patient for a while longer——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, yes; I am going to.

Mr. SMOOT (continuing). I might take a little time in reading some of the Democratic filibustering speeches that have been made against establishing an American merchant marine. I want to get in the RECORD a little data on this point.

Why, Mr. President, I know of Senators that have based their claim for reelection on their filibuster record. I remember Senators who went home following a filibuster and told their people how they stood up on the floor of the Senate, and how every power they possessed, mental and physical, had been exerted in behalf of the people of their States to defeat a bill for the establishment of a merchant marine. Oh, the hills of their States rang with their filibustering achievements.

Mr. President, I stated, when I was interrupted, that a conference report for the purpose of depriving our coastwise trade of all vestige of protection had been proposed through an amendment offered in the Senate, and a conference report for that purpose was brought before the Congress at the last session—just the last session.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; but go back further.

Mr. SMOOT. Fortunately, however, it did not get on the statute books. No Republican Congress has ever suggested the repeal of our coastwise laws. No Republican Senator has ever suggested that that great industry be destroyed; but it would have been destroyed if this conference report had been agreed to a year ago. The Senator objects to conference reports of that kind, and so do I.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; I beg pardon, Mr. President, I only want to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (continuing). That that does not answer my question. I am talking of a time and a season far beyond that conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the rules.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I asked the question, and I repeat the question, why, with power omnipotent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey must address the Chair and obtain permission before interrupting.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize that, Mr. President. I ask that the Senator will yield for a question, which I will put again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield for a question to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; but I think it will be the same question that was asked and that I answered before.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It will be; but I have heard no answer.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator will have to wait until I reach the subject, because I am not going to be diverted at this particular time.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought this was just on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I will give the Senator all the evidence he wants before I get through. I assure him of that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator will not be able to do it between now and to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the only day that is left.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; nor next week, nor next year.

Mr. SMOOT. We have until the 4th of March.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Thirty years of dereliction can not be answered in 10 days.

Mr. NORRIS. Or ten times 10 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey must address the Chair.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, all right—or ten times 10 days.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have been diverted so many times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor, and will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. I was discussing the question as to the wisdom of withdrawing all protection from our coastwise shipping. We have 7,000,000 tons of coastwise shipping. It has doubled in 23 years. If we had no protection for it, instead of doubling in 23 years we would be carrying about 5 per cent of our coastwise shipping, or not to exceed 8 per cent, as 8 per cent is what we are carrying now of our overseas shipping. Since 1878 the coastwise shipping has increased 4,502,830 tons, but in the same time the shipping in the foreign trade has declined 570,183 tons up to 1913, so that the amount now employed in that trade, the whole of it everywhere, upon every sea, going to all the ports that the few ships we have go to, is only about 1,000,000 tons. Our coastwise trade is seven times the amount of our foreign trade.

The coastwise shipping is absolutely protected from any foreign competition, but the ocean carrying trade, as I stated before, has no protection. That tells the whole story. All the fine-spun arguments, all the speeches that may be made and prepared by interested parties, can not deny it. That is the story, told so plainly that a wayfaring man, though a fool, can understand it. The coastwise fleet is largely composed of steam tonnage, and 1 ton of steam tonnage is usually reckoned as equivalent in efficiency to 3 tons of sail tonnage. Our coastwise fleet, built up under absolute protection, is the greatest in the world. It is not merely a trade of short and sheltered voyages, as we often see stated, and he who states such a thing does not know the true conditions, or at least he is misinformed.

The distance from New York to San Francisco through the Panama Canal is 5,000 miles, or nearly twice the distance from Sandy Hook to Liverpool, and yet that is coastwise trade, taken care of by American ships. Freight rates have decreased; and in fact it will do the Senators an immense amount of good if they will take the time to go and get the rates that were charged from one port to another by our coastwise ships 20 years ago and follow them down to the year 1913. With the single exception of some extraordinary occasion, some unforeseen event, those rates have steadily declined. It is true that at times, as I have noticed and as everybody knows who has studied the question, the rates temporarily have fluctuated, but upon the whole they have been steadily declining, so much that in ordinary times the rates charged are so reasonable that you hear little complaint from the shippers of this country.

The papers of the country have not been filled full of complaints of exorbitant charges in our coastwise shipping. Appeals have not been made as they have been made in the case of the railroads of our country. I live in a State that never expects to enjoy special advantages from water shipments, but the merchants and people of my State have suffered long years from extremely high railroad rates. When we had the long-and-short-haul clause before the Senate of the United States, I showed to the Senate that in the case of a shipment of one carload of structural steel to San Francisco, a thousand miles beyond Salt Lake City, the freight rate upon that car was nearly $240 less than it would be if shipped to Salt Lake City. I showed at that time that certain buildings were being erected in the city of Salt Lake and that the freight charges upon the structural steel that went into one building alone would exceed by $20,000 the freight rates upon the same identical steel if it were shipped to San Francisco.

I have had men say to me, "Why do you take an interest in the shipping business? Your State is not interested in it, why should you be interested in the question?" Mr. President, I am interested in the question from principle, nothing less and nothing more. I have not a cent invested in a ship or a boat of any kind, never have had and never expect to have, but I do know enough about the business to know that unless there is protection given to that trade it can not exist, it is absolutely impossible unless—and I can not think of anything else—we descend to the same level of living, unless we place our laboring men in the same unfortunate condition that they are placed in abroad. It would be impossible for us to compete. No one goes into any business unless there is some chance of success. No one is going to build ships for the transportation of our products from this country to a foreign country unless there is some chance of financial returns. They may be loyal to the country, they may have the interest of the country at heart, but they will not go into business when they know it is absolutely impossible to make ends meet. Therefore, Mr. President, we have got to treat this subject upon the same broad principle that we treat other industries of the country which require protection as against conditions existing in foreign lands.

As I stated, I live away from the coast a thousand miles, but I am just as much interested in an American merchant marine as is the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], who lives right upon the water's edge. I am not a spotted protectionist. There is not an industry in the South that needs protection but what I would vote for it just as soon as I would vote for anything in which my State is interested. I do not care where the industry may be located, if it is an American industry I am for it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thoroughly believe, Mr. President, that the Senator is utterly sincere in that sentiment, and I do not disagree with him in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Therefore, Mr. President, I am sorry to see this bill before the Senate. I am sorry to see the question drifting into politics. It is something of more vital interest than politics. As I stated in my opening, if it were politics I would allow the bill to pass.

Some people have asked me, "Do you believe in a tariff commission? Are you afraid of an unbiased examination of the principles of protection?" No; Mr. President, I am not, and I would like to see a commission composed of men not biased politically, not a commission that can be dictated to. I would like to see a commission composed of men with the ideals of the men who composed the Interstate Commerce Commission when it was first organized. If we could have such a commission, I would not doubt, and I feel like saying I know, what the result would be. I am not partisan enough to wish to see that question continued in politics. I would like to see it settled, and I would like to see the future political battles between the great parties fought upon questions that involve the fundamentals of our Government. I believe, Mr. President, if that time ever comes, and I believe it will, there never will be a scene like the present.

Senators, this is the first time in my life that I have ever stood on the floor of this Chamber and discussed a question that I thought in my soul it was my duty to go to any length in fair and honorable debate to defeat. If I did not think that my country was in danger by the passage of this bill I never would say another word upon it. But it is filled full of risks, and if it ever enters upon the high sea of commercial life I hope that the overruling Providence that has held this land so long in the hollow of His hand and made it the cradle of liberty will guide it from the shoals and the rocks that lie in its course.

Mr. President, there are 24,756 vessels in our coastwise trade, and fully seven-eighths of our American officers and sailors are engaged in the coastwise trade.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the number the Senator gave include the vessels on the Great Lakes?

Mr. SMOOT. They are included in the number I gave.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator know how many are on the Great Lakes and how many are on the coasts?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked up the question with a view of ascertaining just how many. The rates have been greatly reduced in that trade and are more stable than in the foreign trade. That is natural. It is very natural, indeed, because in the foreign trade we have conditions affecting rates not only in this country but in every country in the world, whereas our coastwise trade is affected only by our local conditions. There always have been great fluctuations in the rates of our over-seas traffic. Sometimes there is a sudden increase of 100, 200, or 300 per cent, and under the present condition of war between all the great countries of Europe it has even increased more than that, particularly to points where boats have to pass through mined waters, and particularly where the product goes to a country the allies think is friendly in any way to their opponents.

In fact the only way we can obtain sailors and officers for ships of any sort in this country is from our coastwise trade. Our sailors are educated there. Our officers find employment there. You do not find any American officers on foreign ships. Germany never grants a subsidy to the owners of any particular line, but what she puts into the contract is a provision that all the boats shall be built in Germany. It was through that principle, and that only, that she has established her great shipping yards, and it was through that policy that she became one of the great carriers over the ocean to all parts of the world.

England, of course, has led her. In fact, the very existence of England depends to a large degree upon her shipping interests, and it necessarily must be so, Mr. President, for with those people, living as they do in that little island, not much larger than some of our States, compact, crowded, all struggling for an existence, as they expand there is not much else for them to do except to go upon the water; and they reach out for foreign business. They obtain it anywhere. They are the builders of cheap boats. They have cheap men to man the boats. They do not impose the restrictions upon their boats that we do. I believe in the restrictions that we impose, and I think they ought to be increased. Senators, I think that we all ought to feel that way.

I do not know whether I will ever want for anything in the world or not; I can not tell. I might lose all I have within a year. I and my family might be dependent upon a daily wage within that time. I am for the man who labors for a daily wage. I want my children to live in America and feel as I do. I never want to see the time come when the standard of citizenship, the standard of living is less than it is to-day; when the love of country will be less in the hearts of the people than it is to-day. Rather would I see it increase. Rather would I see the time come when every man and woman living under the Stars and Stripes shall be independent, so much so that not one of them will ever want for the necessaries of life. I believe, Mr. President, that that time will come, but it will never come unless the laws of our country are such as to equalize the higher cost of maintaining such standards as compared with foreign countries. I will support immigration laws that will raise the standard of American citizenship.

Mr. President, it has been stated that other countries do not assist their shipping by subsidies. A rose by any other name is just as sweet. I say now that there is not a civilized country on earth that controls any considerable part of the over-seas trade of the world that does not directly or indirectly pay a subsidy to its shipping interests. Great Britain followed that course for a great many years. After she got her merchant marine thoroughly established, far ahead of any other nation, subsidies were, to a limited extent, abandoned, but only to a limited extent. She has always paid subsidies, and is paying them to-day.

Oh, Senators, instead of throwing away by this bill $50,000,000 to begin with, why do you not pay a million or two million dollars in subsidies, and reach the same results without all of the dangers that this bill will involve us in? Is it because of the word "subsidy"? If it is, let us invent some other word that will accomplish the same results. Is it because of the platforms of the Democratic Party in the past? If it is because of the speeches that you have made in the past against subsidies, let us change the word and see if we can not get rid of the dangers involved in the pending measure.

England even loaned money to the Cunard Co. with which to build great steamships at a less rate of interest than the British Government had to pay to get the money. She also pays subsidies to that line and to other lines. She has been compelled of late to increase them. England is not afraid of the word "subsidy." England knows that that class of trade to which she pays subsidies is dependent upon subsidies. If she did not pay them, the shipping trade now enjoyed by her would be taken away from her by Germany, by Japan, by Austria, and a part of it by the little Scandinavian countries of the north.

We find ourselves, great America, with less shipping upon the ocean than has many of the smallest countries of the world. It is a shame. We would be in that same position, however, even if we did buy 30 ships, as is provided for under this bill. The trouble with this bill is that we would not only be liable to lose the most of the $50,000,000 to be invested in whatever second-class boats or tubs are purchased, but we do not know how much we are going to lose every year in operating them; we do not know, Mr. President, what trouble they may bring to us; they may cost us billions of dollars and an untold number of lives.

Germany built up her shipping interests under subsidies. She began them under Bismarck. She also adopted the protective tariff. The great prosperity that followed that policy is well known.

Mr. President, I remember well when France controlled the fine woolen trade of the world; I remember well when all of the patterns and all of the styles in woolens were made in France. We did not think we could get out a line of samples for the coming year without first securing from France the patterns of the coming season's styles. I have watched the transformation. That is not so to-day. To-day, or at least up to the time this war began, that work was done by Germany. The German people are the most methodical, the most systematic, and careful manufacturers in all the world. Why, Mr. President, they do not consider 25 years a long time in which to establish some new industry or discover some new article of commerce that will be of benefit to the world, and from which, of course, they expect to derive a profit.

The first time I visited one of the great chemical plants in Germany I saw a chemist in the employment of that great institution who had been set apart for one purpose—namely, to discover a dye that would take the place of indigo blue. It took 25 years to fully develop a substitute. The company did not give up the search in 10 or 15 or 20 years. It continued until success came, and when it did come it revolutionized the whole system of dyeing a fast blue. The Army of our country and of many of the old countries of Europe have adopted it in place of indigo blue, a color the world thought could not be duplicated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question about that. What color is that? I am very much interested in knowing.

Mr. SMOOT. Alazarin blue. So, Mr. President, that is only an instance to show the constant attention the German people give to everything they undertake to accomplish. They are a marvelous people and they stand high in all great industrial developments. For years past they have been reaching out and controlling the trade in many parts of the world. They spend a great deal of money every year in sending out representatives to all parts of the world, commercial attachés, with instructions to look up business conditions in the various countries and ascertain how the merchants of different countries desire their goods packed, in what shape they want them put up, to learn the customs of the people of the different countries, and Mr. President, they worked that system of extending their business just as perfectly and just as systematically as they did in working out the problem of making a synthetic dye to take the place of indigo.

Japan has built up a large shipping trade in a comparatively few years by the payment of subsidies and with the advantage

of her cheap labor. I do not believe that the proponents of this bill will claim that the seamen employed upon Japanese ships receive anything near the wages that the American seamen receive. Japan in the last few years has built up a merchant marine, which, if it continues to develop for another 10 or 15 years at the same rate, will be a marvel to the world. She does not confine herself to the Pacific Ocean. Her shipping trade now reaches all over the globe, and you hardly ever go into a port anywhere in the world without seeing, flying at the masthead of a number of vessels, a Japanese flag.

Mr. STONE. But you do not see the American flag.

Mr. SMOOT. We do not very often, and I am sorry to say it.

Mr. STONE. You ought to be, as you are very much to blame for it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have answered that suggestion already. This bill will never change that situation. There is only one way to change that, Mr. President, and that is to allow individual initiative, individual enterprise, coupled with a subsidy or protection that will make up the difference between the building and operation of boats manned and built by the Japanese and those that are built and maintained and operated by and under the American laws.

Germany even went so far as to use her railroads to help her shipping trade, by allowing goods shipped in German bottoms a lower rate to interior points of Germany. We could not do that, of course, under our laws, and the Government does not own the railroads as they are owned by the German Government. There are many things that are done in Germany that we can not do under our Constitution. The principle of the thing, however, is clearly shown, and the intent of the Government itself is clearly demonstrated by the results. She also gave favored rates on exports to her manufacturers that manufacture for home consumption, and she allows combinations and trusts to control the prices and distribution of goods made in Germany.

Mr. STONE. Do I understand the Senator to say that Germany gave a subsidy to manufacturers who manufactured solely for home consumption?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I said that Germany used her railroads to help her shipping trade by giving lower rates for export than for home consumption. If I did not express it in that way before, that is what I intended to say.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is becoming very weary and tired.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to yield for a speech, of course, because I do not want to be taken off the floor. France, Italy, and Russia and other countries pay subsidies, particulars of which were given in the speech of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], delivered on the pending bill. I shall not take time to go over the subject again. They are already in the RECORD.

Mr. STONE. Oh, put them in.

Mr. SMOOT. But I say that they are worthy of the consideration of the Senators upon that side of the Chamber. There is an untold amount of information contained in them—information that would be of service, and great service, to every Senator in this Chamber in arriving at what he ought to do in voting upon this measure. Moreover, those countries pay the tolls for their ships going through the Suez Canal, and some of them have already provided to pay whatever Panama Canal tolls are imposed. They did not hesitate to state what the appropriations were for. They make it known to the world. They never try to cover up anything; and, mind you, that was done before the bill repealing the free tolls for American ships passing through the canal was enacted into law. We knew at the time not only that these Governments had made provision that the tolls charged upon their boats going through the Suez Canal should be paid by the Government but we knew that they had also made provision to pay whatever tolls should be levied upon their ships going through the Panama Canal.

That is one reason why the act repealing that law was so unjust to our American shipping interests. American ships not only have to pay the tolls imposed by our Government but they come in direct competition with freight rates made by foreign shippers upon goods destined to the same ports that our own boats ship to. Their competitors have cheaper boats, cheaper men manning the boats, and cheaper provisions. Notwithstanding all these handicaps the party now in power, by a law passed at the last session of Congress, a law to which that party pledged its support in regard to passing coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls, was repealed.

That is one of the most extraordinary and shameless acts ever perpetrated by a political party in this country. American vessels now pay tolls, while foreign vessels have their tolls paid for them by their respective Governments or receive equivalent subsidies. We have thus built the canal, at the expense of over $400,000,000, largely for the benefit of foreign shipping. The British Government exercises absolute control over the Suez Canal, and will not allow vessels belonging to friendly or unfriendly powers to pass through that canal. But Great Britain claims that we have no right of that kind at Panama, although we built the canal and own it; and the Democratic Party agrees with that contention.

Our coastwise shipping would have received a great impetus had the Democratic Party adhered to its declaration in favor of the maintenance of the law providing free tolls for such vessels in the canal. I hope that I shall never be found in the same position that my Democratic friends placed themselves in. Just take the RECORD and look at it—Senators voting for free tolls at one session, speaking for it with all the enthusiasm and power they were capable of exercising, raking the poor railroads fore and aft, appealing to the people's prejudices against the railroads, and claiming that they were voting for free tolls to American ships passing through the Panama Canal in order to protect the people from excessive freight rates charged by the railroads. I agreed with them. I voted for free tolls for American ships through the Panama Canal; but within a very few months a change came over the President and his party. The law was not satisfactory to certain interests who evidently directly or indirectly secured a hearing at the White House. Influences were put to work. I do not know where they came from, but it has been charged upon the floor of the Senate and in the public press that they came from Wall Street circles. But be that as it may, we do know that it was only a few months after the passage of the law until it was repealed, and Senators who stood upon the floor denouncing the railroads and their oppression turned completely around, reversing their vote and argument, and denouncing those who were opposed to the repeal as favoring the Shipping Trust instead of the railroads of the country, which they denounced a few months before as the railroad combination or trust. It did not make any difference which side of the question they took; they had the same old cry, "Trust! Trust!"

If we are made dependent upon foreign shipyards for our shipping as well as our sailors, we will be in a despicable condition in case of trouble with a foreign nation. Shipyards can not be constructed in a day, and if shut out from foreign yards without proper accommodations at home we would be practically helpless. Germany, under the Bismarck policy, provided herself with her own shipping facilities—yards and all necessary requirements attached thereto.

What if Germany had relied upon a foreign country for her implements of war; what if she had relied upon foreign countries for her shipping.

Mr. STONE. What do we rely upon?

Mr. SMOOT. We rely upon foreign countries, I am sorry to say. We could not enter into war to-day without securing auxiliary ships from some foreign country. That has been demonstrated so many times, and has been so demonstrated within a year. We have been humiliated in the past by such a condition of affairs, and I believe it should be changed.

Mr. STONE. That is what we want to do now.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is not what this bill will do. Thirty ships——

Mr. STONE. I wish you would tell us how to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have told how to do it. The Senator has not been in the Chamber to listen to me, but I will repeat to the Senator in just a few words by way of repetition——

Mr. STONE. I will excuse the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The only way to do it is to do it like other countries, and that is by a subsidy, a subsidy that we know just what it will cost the Government. A plan, Mr. President, where politics will not be the first consideration, and where the question of what ships shall be purchased will cut no figure; a plan that will not fill the city of Washington with lobbyists for the purpose of selling to the Government beforehand, even before the bill was reported to the Senate or handed to the Senator from Missouri to introduce, boats, as provided for in this measure. I want a straight subsidy, and I would want to know exactly the amount of the subsidy and terms of the grant, and leave to personal initiation and the individual American how to work out the problem of operation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield only for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. For a suggestion?

Mr. SMOOT. No; just for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator states that he is in favor of subsidies, I believe?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I yield for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I say the Senator, I believe, states he is in favor of subsidies?

Mr. SMOOT. I am in favor of building an American merchant marine by granting of subsidies.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is a very distinguished member of his party, but, in favoring subsidies, he does not agree with some other very distinguished members of his party.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is impossible for every man in a party to agree upon every principle; but I want to say to the Senator from Arizona that the Senator from Utah never hesitates to let all the world know his position on any question, I do not care what it might be. My views, of course, may not coincide with the views of all members of the Republican Party.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment——

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. A very distinguished man, Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, Speaker of the House for some time, in denouncing subsidies, said:

> And these subsidy seekers came into this House, or rather, into Washington——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that what the Senator has so far stated is not in the form of a question. It is not a question; and I do not want to be taken off the floor by the reading of any speech made by Joseph G. Cannon.

Mr. ASHURST. It is just a line, and it will not take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not quite sure about that; the stage is all set for that to happen to-night. The Senator can not speak here for the Presiding Officer, and the course intended to be pursued has been demonstrated pretty thoroughly to-night, and I would very much rather the Senator would not go on. He can read it in his own time.

Mr. ASHURST. I am very certain if I should continue the Senator would be sorry I read it.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all, Mr. President. That is not the point. It would make no difference what Joseph G. Cannon said upon the question of subsidy; that is his opinion. The Senator knows what my opinion is; and neither Joseph G. Cannon nor any other man living can dictate to me and make me change what I believe to be right.

Mr. ASHURST. It may be that it would not require dictation; it might be that a suggestion would be sufficient.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask for order.

Mr. SMOOT. The vessels to be purchased under this pending measure, if it becomes a law, are principally German vessels. I know that has been contradicted here, but about the only man who has made a speech upon this question on the other side was the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana spent nearly his whole time in trying to show not only to the Senate but to the country that we have a perfect right to buy the German interned ships. A day or two before it was stated upon the floor that they were going to buy English ships and French ships and Italian ships, and had no intention of buying German ships. They did not say how they were going to do it. Every ship of the first three named countries is in use to-day. It is true if they had the men to unload the cargoes upon their arrival at the ports they could do more, but that condition exists. War exists in Europe, and the men who ought to be on the docks and attending to the commerce of the world have been called away from their vocations to the bloody conflict. As was shown by the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], there are very few of them who would be available for trade purposes. Germany would probably be very glad to get rid of her ships as long as they are interned. I have no doubt about it. If they are purchased, even if it be through Kuhn, Loeb & Co. or Max Warburg, they will never be sold for anything near what this Government will pay for them. That has been demonstrated a good many times in the history of our country.

I am going to tell the Senate of some of the purchases that have been made and what the sales were of those same ships. Interned ships are very expensive to their owners. One of the German companies owning interned ships—the Hamburg-American Line—if reports are true, has a man now in this country negotiating for their sale; and if the reports are true, they had him here before ever this bill was introduced into this body. This is the line that at the time of the Spanish War sold two of its best vessels to Spain to prey upon our commerce, and after it was found that nothing could be accomplished in that way the manager of the line took one of the vessels back. He afterwards came to this country to oppose a bill pending in Congress to give preferential duties to American shipping. To aid a company dominated by such a man would be in keeping with much of the other things that, if reports are true, have been done by the party now in power.

The Underwood tariff-law provision was made for preferential duties for American shipping, but that law was nullified by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President. The nullification of that provision and the repeal of the law providing for free tolls for coastwise vessels in the Panama Canal and the law admitting to American registry foreign-built ships with Lascars or Chinese crews and officers comprise the legislative acts of the party since it came into power in behalf of American shipping. Senators may believe that those acts are for the best interests of the American people. They may believe it just as firmly as I believe that they are not, and no doubt they do; but I am content, Mr. President, to leave that question for the future to decide.

As far as the first law mentioned is concerned, I think it is the almost universal opinion that it will have to be modified. If the Democratic Party does not do it, the American people will see that it is done. As to the other laws mentioned, it will not take very long until they demonstrate their wisdom or unwisdom. But take the second law mentioned, the law admitting to American registry foreign-built ships. What has the result been? Has it helped the American people? Has it given more ships to the commerce of the world? Mr. President, as soon as the war came on and there was a risk to run, the United Fruit Co. and the Standard Oil Co. took their ships and transferred them to American registry, flying the American flag. There is not a ton greater capacity for the transportation of the products of our country than there was before. The routes have not been changed. The boats are owned by the companies, run for their own business. Therefore, Mr. President, the second law has done no good for the body of the American people. It has been of no advantage whatever. But, I say, they are not so mischievous, they are not so dangerous, and they can not hurt the American people so much as this bill if it becomes a law can and, I say, will.

By the pending measure it is proposed to strike another blow even more powerful for destruction by having the Government go into competition with private owners in the shipping business. The war in Europe has caused the people of this country to realize the truth of what the great majority of the Republican Party has been preaching for so many years as to the danger of dependence on foreign shipping to do our carrying trade on the ocean.

This situation has been seized upon by our friends to bring forward this bill. It could not possibly remedy, within any reasonable time, the lack of shipping facilities. The great danger to which we will be subjected by the purchase of interned ships has been well pointed out by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and by other Senators on this side of the Chamber.

I do not believe that the American people yet realize what the provisions of this bill are. Our proceedings get very little notice in the press; but I am quite sure that if the people knew what the bill is and what the results of its passage would be they would be more eager than they are to-day to protest through their chambers of commerce and through the leading newspapers of the country against its passage.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator does not really desire to ask the question, I should prefer to go on.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask it, but I do not press it. I simply wish to know if the Senator can inform me whether he is filibustering or making this speech for circulation for campaign purposes?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can form his own opinion. Mr. President, I desire to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah declines to yield further.

Mr. SMOOT. I have taken some little pains, Mr. President, to collect newspaper articles upon this question from every State in the Union. If the editorials of the great newspapers of this country—and I do not mean those published only in large cities or those published where ports of entry are found, but I mean newspapers in every State of the Union—if their editorials are to be taken as expressing the opinion on the subject in the localities in which the papers are published, then the great majority of the people of this country are opposed to this measure. I think that that should have some weight in the consideration of the measure.

I think also that the position taken by the organizations in all the different States, expressing their fear of this measure, should be considered for what it is worth in determining what

is right and what is wrong to do in the passage of this bill or its rejection.

I have tried to figure out whether the ships obtained—provided they are obtained—could not be operated at a profit with American crews, cared for as required by our laws. My conclusion is that it is impossible. The Government might carry a limited amount of foreign commerce at low rates of freight and make up the loss by taxation. In what way that would differ from subsidies, of which the Democratic Party has been so liberal in its denunciation, would be difficult for any sane man to understand, with the single exception that in the case of subsidies we would know just what we had to pay, while under the provisions of this bill no living soul can even approximate what we should be called upon to pay.

Imagine the United States Government running a foreign ship, manned with a foreign crew and with foreign officers. But that is the only way it could be made to pay expenses, and it is extremely doubtful if a ship could be run even under those circumstances without a loss. I do not believe that the American people would approve of any such thing; I do not believe that the American people want the Government of the United States to purchase ships and man them with foreign officers and foreign crews for the running of a foreign ship purchased by the Government; but that is the only way, in my opinion, they could be made to pay expenses, and, as I have said, it is extremely doubtful if they would pay even then. Privately owned vessels would be obliged to reduce rates accordingly, and, having no Treasury filled by taxation from the people to fall back upon, the privately owned ships could do nothing but go out of business, and they would go out of busines as long as that condition existed, provided, however, there were ships enough owned by the Government to affect the rates or the trade as a whole. But this bill does not provide money sufficient to buy that number of ships. We need not worry about that. The number would only be a flyspeck compared to the number of ships that are in the transportation business of the world. Hence, instead of increasing our merchant marine, it would decrease it by this indirect method of subsidies to Government-owned vessels. It would result in a complete failure of privately owned American shipping in the foreign trade.

We have not very much of that kind of shipping to-day. It is so small now that it is worth little; but if under the provisions of this bill the amount to be subscribed were unlimited, as the original bill, the first substitute and the second substitute provided, and the Government purchased ships to the amount of $600,000,000, or I might say half of that amount, it would affect rates and at the same time it would drive out of business every American vessel now engaged in the over-seas trade.

We would not secure American vssels because there would not be time enough to build them to be of any advantage in this emergency. I say "emergency" because those defending this measure, including the President himself, state that it is an emergency measure, and if it is an emergency measure this bill can not assist the American shipper in his present unfortunate condition.

This is not the first time that the American shipper has been in an unfortunate condition. The war has intensified that condition; the advances in rates came a little quicker than advances generally come, but the result is very little different from what has happened to over-seas rates many times in the past. Our comparatively insignificant share of the foreign carrying trade, amounting only to about 8 per cent, might be wiped out, but it would be a shameless undertaking on the part of our Government. Not having protected them in the past, leaving them to fight their own battles against great odds—and as to those that did survive it was a case of the survival of the fittest—now, after they have struggled without making much of a success of their undertaking, it is proposed that our Government step in and purchase ships and place them in direct competition with her own citizens, and, as has been avowed by those who are defending this measure, to relieve them of all taxation, to relieve them of paying even the ordinary interest charges that every individual citizen, acting on his own initiative or through the combined initiative of more than one American citizen organized in a company and doing business as such is compelled to meet.

It is unfair. Is there a Senator here who believes that if such a proposition had ever been presented to any American citizen engaged in the shipping business, he or his friends, or the people who have purchased stock in those institutions, would have ever undertaken it? They would not have done so.

The stock owned in the companies doing a shipping business is scattered all over the United States. Much of it is held in the savings banks of the country. Great quantities are made up by little subscriptions held by the thrifty people of small towns. They have saved a few hundred dollars, through hard work, and, in some cases, by actual privations; and because of the confidence they had in the men that were directing the affairs of the company, they have placed their all in the business. Now we are asked, apparently in all sincerity, to pass a bill with the avowed purpose not only of robbing the companies doing business now of the meager profits they have made in the past, but of taking their all from them.

On the other hand, I suppose it would be just as well to say: "They are no better off, and should be treated no better, than some of the other institutions of the country." The papers tell us that this company has passed its dividends, this institution has failed to make its usual profits; and it does not apply only to one line of industry but, I am sorry to say, it has hit them all. There is no telling when it will cease.

Mr. President, I believe there is a slight revival in business, caused directly by the war in Europe. It is only temporary, and only in lines of trade that are manufacturing such articles as ammunition, implements of war, steel products for export that may be used for the purposes of war, automobiles used by the different armies, craft that fly the air and are used for the destruction of human life. I wish our increase in business were based upon a better foundation than this.

Mr. President, if we design to transport the products of our factories and farms, the Government would have to keep increasing the number of vessels employed, and thus virtually take possession of our foreign trade at a great loss, or we would be more and more dependent on foreign shipping. If we destroy what few boats we have—by our own action drive them from the ocean—we would be in a worse fix than we are to-day, for there are a few ships that we have a right to call on in case of war.

No, Mr. President. I believe in the position taken by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that if the Government of the United States is going into the shipping business it ought to go into it directly. It ought to build or purchase its ships and own them as the Government of the United States, and have every one of them subject to the call of our Government in case of war or any other unforeseen emergency.

I do not know from what fertile brain the idea sprang of forming a company—a corporation, if you please—with the Government of the United States as the principal stockholder. I do not believe there are any Senators who believe there will be one American citizen who will subscribe for the stock which is to be offered to the public, unless that American citizen has some motive other than would appear upon the face of the transaction. There may be men who would want to undertake such a thing as this, but I doubt it. They certainly would not go into it for the profit they would make out of the business; for we are told by the President of the United States that if it should happen to be profitable, just as soon as it becomes so we are to sell the Government's interest, and that interest is to be at least 51 per cent at all times; so the stockholders who go into this business as partners of the Government may be sold out, and to whom? To anybody this board that is provided for may choose. They may sell out to a foreign country; they may sell out to a foreign citizen; and that country or that citizen may have just one object in view—to freeze out the American citizen that went into this business as a partner with our Government. There is nothing in the bill to prohibit it, and we are told that if the business becomes profitable, that is what will be done. I can not imagine anyone that would enter into such a proposition.

If the Government goes into this business, it will not only be subject to international complications, so well brought to the attention of the Senate by others, but it will have to meet retaliation from foreign governments, to say nothing of the necessity of increased taxation here. Why would not such foreign countries retaliate? Why would not countries that have treaties with the Government of the United States retaliate if our Government went into the shipping business and, through rates made by our Government, placed the products of their country at a disadvantage? Why should they not retaliate?

It not only involves international complications, Mr. President, but it will involve our commercial relations with all the countries of the world. We take good care in passing our tariff laws to provide that in case we are discriminated against by any foreign country there shall be a penalty attached to that country in the way of an increased rate upon the goods that may be shipped from that country to our own. Before that provision became a law there was hardly a country on this globe that did not give preferential rates and make lower prices to other countries than to our own. They do not do it now, Mr. President, because we have protected ourselves.

Whenever any rates of duty are imposed upon importations by foreign countries now they are made equal for America and all other countries, with the exception of the preferential rate which may be given the dependencies of the country making the law, and that is a preferential rate to itself. As to all other rates for all other countries we must stand upon an equal footing, or else we impose the penalty upon all the goods coming from such a country into our own.

Mr. James J. Hill, the well-known western railroad man, has often been quoted by the Democrats in pushing their free-trade legislation to help them in their efforts in that direction. They have put much stress on Mr. Hill's views on that subject in the past. We never have heard them quote him on the other side of the Chamber in this discussion. What he says on this shipping bill ought at least to be heeded by our friends on the other side who have so often quoted him approvingly. Mr. Hill says:

There are but two recourses—one a merchant marine owned and operated by the Government, the other a merchant marine provided by and for the people. The former, just now urgently advocated, is unwise and would be certainly a disastrous experiment. Aside from the complications almost certain to drag us sooner or later into the European conflict owing to the uncertain and conflicting claims of national neutrality, this policy would be followed by the total destruction of the private shipping interests. Private enterprise can not possibly compete with the Government, which pays no interest on the cost of its ships and throws aside consideration of profit and loss. As Lincoln said that the Nation could not continue to exist "half slave and half free," so our merchant marine, if once the precedent is set, must inevitably become a Government monopoly.

Could anyone state the case more clearly, more succinctly, than Mr. Hill has done? No one here has tried to answer him in this debate, and I do not believe it will be undertaken. It is so plain, so simple, based upon the principles underlying business, that no one can misunderstand it.

I will say that in seeking to meet Mr. Hill's statement Secretary Redfield stated that he had offers to sell to the Government English, French, and other vessels. That may be, but if owners of vessels now engaged in the English trade, making as they are unheard-of and unknown profits, offer to sell those vessels to the Government of the United States, I predict now it will be at such a price that it will be prohibitory. English owners of ships are not going to offer them to America at a sacrifice. They are going to make out of them all they can. They have no regard for the Treasury of the United States, and in that particular they are a good deal like a great many Members of Congress. But, Mr. President, you can depend upon it that they will make a profit sufficient out of the sale of a ship to insure them in receiving as much profit from the sale as they would if they operated the ship.

The owner may also have the same opinion that the President expressed, that we will buy the ships, and if we are fortunate enough to establish a profitable business within a few months or a year or two we will sell them. The seller, no doubt knowing the history of the purchase of ships from Governments, would be in the field to buy with the same money he received from the Government of the United States as purchase price for his ships. He would want to buy the ship or ships back, but not for anything near what we gave. Some excuse or other will be made so that it will be sold for a nominal sum.

It is not improbable that if the Government will pay enough it may be able to buy vessels other than German, but the additional payment would be far in excess of the value of the ships. Nobody will deny that. That is just as certain as that the sun will rise this morning. It is just as certain as it has been in the past and will be in the future.

Welding Ring, a prominent shipper of New York, in replying to Secretary Redfield, said that the Government could not buy ships because they were not on the market. It could, for reasons already given, secure interned vessels, but not those free to sail on the ocean to-day. However, if the Government pays enough it could probably get such vessels, and it would be a case like that of buying transports at the time of the Spanish War.

I stated some seven or eight hours ago that I would call attention to the purchase of some of the ships required by our fleet and purchased from foreign countries or foreign citizens at the time we were engaged in the little skirmish with Spain. I did so in answer to a question from one of the Senators, and I am sorry he is not in his seat at this time in the morning.

We all know how those purchases turned out. The Government at that time paid $117,000 for a vessel which it named the *Hornet*, but after the war it sold it for $5,100. Senators, is that enough to convince you that when the Government of the United States purchases a vessel and then desires to sell it nobody is going to pay it what was paid for it originally? Our Government paid $201,000 for another vessel which it sold for $75,563. In another case it paid $87,597 and sold the vessel for $3,300. It paid $150,000 for another ship, which it sold for $4,663.

I wonder if my statement is challenged wherein I stated that in some cases we did not get 20 per cent of the original purchase price. Senators, we hardly got 3 per cent on some of them. The Government paid $150,000 for a vessel which it sold for $4,663. Another vessel for which it paid $350,000 it sold for $175,000, and another one for which it paid $267,657 it sold for $20,521. In another case it paid $35,000 and sold the vessel for $1,800.

That is about what would be the results now if the Government undertakes to buy vessels open to navigation without incurring the danger of capture by a belligerent nation because of a claim that we had violated the neutrality laws, and paying such exorbitant prices would make it all the more difficult to run the vessels without great loss. We have no money to spend for such a purpose when there is no need of it.

Mr. President, when I saw the morning paper day before yesterday, giving an account of the President calling his Cabinet together for the purpose of considering the financial condition of our country, calling attention to the reckless, headlong plunges that this administration was making in expenditures, I hoped that in their combined wisdom they would have said, "Let us save the $50,000,000 provided for in this bill." Evidently that was not the decision. I suppose the hand has been put to the plow must not be withdrawn.

Why, Mr. President, the statement that I called attention to to-night, showing that on the 28th of this month the excess of the expenditures of the Government over the total receipts was $90,000,000, only tells the story under present conditions. I call attention not to the little items, and yet the Good Book tells us that it is the litle foxes that spoil the vines, but it is the millions that are appropriated that are running us headlong into financial trouble.

Sugar, on which the duty has been greatly reduced, will go on the free list next year, unless the Treasury of the United States is in such a deplorable condition that the majority party decide that they have got to have the $50,000,000 received from that source in the past; but $50,000,000 does not amount to anything with this administration—that is a mere bagatelle. We shall have a pork-barrel bill to consider—the river and harbor bill—if they can crowd this bill through this session of Congress in time for its consideration. Then will be piled on the backs of the taxpayers of this country another $34,000,000.

It is the intention, and I will say under the law, of the administration to expend $35,000,000 in constructing a railroad in Alaska as soon as possible, even with the alleged war tax in effect—a mere subterfuge for increasing taxation. A large deficit is already a problem to overcome. With the loss of the sugar tax of over $40,000,000, to go into the shipping business presents a serious outlook for the American people.

I have just been handed the morning paper—the Washington Post of January 30—and the first thing that catches my eye is a heading, "Fear of bond issue." How natural—Democracy and a bond issue—twin brothers, always found traveling side by side, always existing at the same time.

[Special to the Washington Post.]

NEW YORK, *January 29.*

A Washington dispatch to the New York Herald says:

"Concern continued to grow to-day over the rapidly increasing excess in expenditures of Government funds over the receipts, which has grown to more than $70,000,000 in the last seven months."

If some one would hand me the statement of the Treasury Department for yesterday instead of the 28th instant, I would gladly call the attention of the country to the loss that happened upon yesterday.

The articles continues:

President Wilson met Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo before the Cabinet assembled at 11 o'clock. Discussion of possible reductions in expenditures occupied some of the time.

It does not say much of the time, and the word "some" is not underscored; but I have no doubt that that subject was discussed up to a minute before 11 o'clock.

In the House, where appropriation bills originate, the leaders held informal conferences on the subject of what could be done to prevent a tremendous deficit at the end of the fiscal year 1916. That there will be a deficit at the end of the present fiscal year (June 30) is generally believed, although the attitude is taken that it is a condition over which this administration has no control—a situation due to the disturbances in commerce and finances due to the European war.

The same old cry! If our birth rate increases, it will be due to the war; if it decreases, it will be due to the war; if the chickens fail to lay this coming spring as early as they did last spring, it will be due to the war; if our pigs are not quite so fat at killing time, it will be due to the war.

Everyone concerned in the conduct of the Government is aware that unless some vigorous policy of retrenchment in the appropriations for 1916 is adopted there can be no escape from a deficit of tremendous proportions. As the appropriation bills stand in Congress now they call for $70,305,134.38 more than the estimated revenues for 1916.

Well, since they saw the last report it has climbed up to ninety millions.

Plainly, it is necessary to cut the appropriation bills to fit the size of the national pocketbook.

Will they be cut? It is too late to start cheeseparing. To do any good, it ought to have been started before.

Unless a bond issue is to come. Nobody wants that.

Of course, no one does.

Further taxation is out of the question, politically and every other way. The only hope seems in the elimination of the "pork barrel" river and harbor and public building bills and a few others, which might make up the difference.

This bill with $50,000,000 is not enumerated. I say now that the only way the river and harbor bill will be defeated in the Senate at this session of Congress is to talk it to death. If it is ever allowed to come to a vote, it will pass; and no matter how unsavory the items in the bill may be, if it is left to a vote they will remain in the bill. I ask the Senators who are present to note that prediction and see when the vote is taken, if it is taken, whether I am wrong or whether I am right.

If politics were the only consideration in the discussion of this bill, it would be the duty of the Republican Party and the members of that party to let this bill pass; but there is a duty devolving upon a Senator of the United States greater than the duty that he owes to his party, and that duty devolving upon him is to protect the interests of the people of the United States. The United States is no different, so far as business is concerned, in its management, other than in size, than a business institution; and when a principle of business is violated the business in which the violation occurs must suffer. So it is, Mr. President, with the Government of the United States.

The rivers and harbors bill provides for an appropriation of $34,000,000; the public buildings bill for $12,000,000. Besides the $12,000,000, there has been appropriated by previous Congresses $21,000,000 which is yet to be spent for public buildings—$21,000,000 which eventually must come from the general fund of the Treasury, which now is about $57,000,000.

I think that is about right, although on January 28, 1915, the net balance in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States was $56,006,694.07. If you will compare that with the statement of two years ago to-day, I have no doubt in my mind that instead of $56,000,000 the net cash balance in the general fund at that time was over $100,000,000.

In a word, the hitch is political. There is going on one of the finest little games of "passing the buck" that ever could be imagined.

I do not know what "passing the buck" means, and, in looking around the Chamber, I do not see a Senator that I feel like asking if he knows its meaning.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I will repeat it to the Senator. It is as follows:

In a word, the hitch is political. There is going on one of the finest little games of "passing the buck" that ever could be imagined.

Mr. THORNTON. I do not know myself what that means.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I certainly do not know what it means.

In general, all eyes are cast on the "pork-barrel" bills—

We know what that is—

and all hopes are staked on their elimination. But who is to do the eliminating is the puzzle.

All the appropriation bills are based on estimates sent to Congress by Mr. McAdoo. Thus, plainly they have the approval of the administration, and originated with it.

On this theory the leaders of the House who have prepared the bills are willing to stand by them, and intend to stand by them, in their efforts to have them passed. The word has gone out, apparently from high administration sources, that the bills ought to be cut. The scheme is to have Congress do the cutting, leaving the administration with clear skirts and in the position of having approved projects which Congress eliminated without its sanction.

SUCH SUPPORT NOW NEEDED.

Some Members of Congress profess to see in this action an effort to keep friendly the "pork-barrel" feeders who might support the ship-purchase bill. This support might be lost if the administration were put in the position of refusing river and barbor improvements and public buildings in order to get money to invest in a ship line.

The House leaders who desire to cut out the "pork-barrel" bills do not desire to take the responsibility for this action in order to permit the passage of the ship bill. They would be the objects of attack from their colleagues and would not have the administration leaders to back them up. It is plain to see that in their present frame of mind the House leaders must have it known without question that the administration desires the elimination of the pork bills. Whether the administration will admit that it made a mistake in sending to Congress such large estimates for appropriations is doubted.

TARIFF LAW CHANGES FAVORED.

It developed to-day that there is a growing sentiment for a change in the tariff law to retain the duty on sugar at least until the European war is over and the Government's revenues regain normal proportions. Under the Payne law the sugar duties amounted approximately to $50,000,000 a year. The Underwood law reduced the tariff on sugar and will put it on the free list May 1, 1916.

Officials of the Treasury, who are in charge of customs affairs, said to-day that they expected that $28,000,000 would be added to the revenues through the importation of sugar when the shipments start in the spring. This probably will be the last money received in sugar duties unless the law is changed, for it is generally believed that next year the sugar importers will wait until May 1 in order to avoid the payment of duty. This, however, has been taken into consideration in the preparation of the estimates in revenues for 1916.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PREPARES.

At the Post Office Department there are preparations for the enforcement of a vigorous policy of retrenchment in order to keep the expenditures within the figure of receipts if possible. Letters have been sent to all the first-class post offices asking for suggestions as to how economies can best be effected in the various offices. Clerks and carriers are to be transferred to substitute rolls wherever it is possible to get along without their services.

Mr. President, if the time has arrived when they feel that they have got to get along without the services of men now in the employment of the Government, it seems to me conditions must be most critical.

I have not with me the list showing the number of additional Government employees who have been taken on in the last 18 months. The American people will wake up some time and find that through the appropriations made it has enabled an army of men to be appointed, and are now traveling over this country, not one or two but hundreds and thousands of them. I have not the time now to tell the Senate what their work and instructions are.

One great trouble in the shipping business at the present time, as pointed out by those engaged in it, is the lack of facilities for unloading ships, to which I have heretofore referred. One day recently 47 ships were lying at anchor at Genoa, Italy, waiting to discharge, because the warehouses and other such places were all filled. Mr. President, just think of 47 ships lying at Genoa waiting for berths to be unloaded! That does not look as though there was very much of a shortage of ships. It is a shortage of men; a shortage of capacity of storage.

Suppose we had 30 more ships and all of this money had been appropriated, and we had bought the German interned vessels and had them in service. We would not have as many ships as were lying at Genoa waiting to be unloaded. At the same time there were 21 vessels at Liverpool that could not get a berth in which to discharge. There was a lack of workmen, because of the war, which prevented vessels from discharging. A similar condition exists at other European ports. I do not think it would be interesting to the Senate to name each port and the conditions that have existed at those ports for the last month or two; but they are all blocked, and necessarily so, for the exportations from our country have greatly increased. The people engaged in war in Europe must be fed, and they are relying upon America to a large extent for this purpose. This congestion involves a great loss, while it takes the vessel from other uses, as I have already stated.

What possible advantage will the Government have in that respect over private shipowners? None whatever. If it had a thousand vessels, it would not help the matter at these ports. I have not heard anyone say that there is a lack of shipping facilities to transfer our products from this country to South American countries. The report is just to the contrary; and if the Government did have a thousand vessels at its disposal to-morrow, the situation existing in the ports of Europe would not be changed by such a condition, but on the other hand it would be multiplied.

Up to January 20 this country shipped 54,000,000 bushels of grain in excess of any corresponding time in the history of the country. That does not seem to show any great need of Government interference in this business—a burden of carrying 54,000,000 bushels of grain in excess of any corresponding time in the history of our country. The trouble has not been in getting the grain to the ships in America; the trouble has been in trying to land it in the ports of Europe. The vessel that is compelled to lie still for a month, waiting to be unloaded, with no berth for it to enter, must be at a frightful expense; and that of itself would be sufficient to justify increased rates.

This demand for Government purchase of ships largely grows out of the cotton situation in the South. The cotton growers think they will profit; but before this bill becomes a law and can be put in operation the cotton trouble will probably be over. There is, however, a lack of insurance to Bremen, and it is for the benefit of Germany and Austria that the cotton growers would sell their products if they had an opportunity. Senators, no matter what has been stated in this discussion as to the length of time to build a first-class boat, it is generally conceded by those who have had experience in this line of business that it takes at least 18 months to build a first-class ship. That

being the case, this bill is not intended to add to our merchant marine new vessels of that kind, and there are no first-class ships to be had except German ships interned in our ports. Are those ships of a class that we could use and that would be of profit to us? I say, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the great bulk of them are not the ships that any business concern in this country would think of purchasing. I want to call the attention of the Senate to a list of those ships and ask Senators if in their judgment they think they are of the class of ships they ought to purchase. I believe the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] called attention to this subject.

I find that the North German Lloyd Co. has 147,887 gross tons interned at New York, Boston, and Baltimore. The names of the ships are the *George Washington*, gross tons, 25,570, interned at New York; the *Kronprinzessin Cecilie*, 19,503 tons, interned at Boston.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask for information. Does the Senator know, and I have no doubt he does, whether those are freight or passenger ships?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that some of them are freight ships and others are passenger ships and others are combined passenger and freight ships, but the great bulk of tonnage and the cost of the boats are in the fast ships carrying the German mail and passengers from this country to Germany. We certainly would not buy them.

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I supposed, without having looked it up, but I thought the Senator would know just what ships might be passenger vessels and what might be freight vessels.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that out of the gross tonnage of the North German Lloyd and the Deutsch-Amerikan Petroleum Co., which is entirely a tank line, the D. Tripovitch Steamship Co. and the Atlantic Sea Navigation Co. (Ltd.), the greater part of the tonnage, I may say two-thirds nearly, belongs to the North German Lloyd Co. The amount of gross tonnage belonging to that company, as I stated before, is 147,887 tons, of which one boat, and that is a passenger boat, the *George Washington*, is 25,570 tons. Then the very next three boats named, if I remember correctly, are fast boats, and the gross tons are 19,503, 19,361, and 13,102. So when you take the first four boats named as belonging to the North German Lloyd Co. we find the great bulk of the tonnage is in boats that are used for the transportation of passengers from this country to Germany. So when we look at the list of the German boats interned in this country and see the size of the vessels and see the condition of the vessels and the age——

Mr. CLAPP. I was going to ask the Senator if he could throw any light on the question as to how modern these boats are?

Mr. SMOOT. I had a list with me, but I can not lay my hand on it, giving the age of every ship. I will say to the Senator that if the company followed the rule of business to write off each year a certain percentage for depreciation the books of the company would not show very much value for many of these vessels.

I did not refer, however, to the Hamburg-American Line. I find that they have 248,301 tons interned. They are at New York, Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Seattle, and New Orleans. Of that 248,000 tons the *Vaterland* has a gross tonnage of 54,282. She is interned at New York. The *Vaterland*, of course, as we all know, is a boat we would not want. It is a passenger boat of the very highest type. The cost of the operation of a boat of that kind is so much that it is hardly believable. Every trip to and from America that is made by the *Amerika*, and that is not one of the largest boats, is $110,000. Every round trip of the *Cincinnati* costs $100,000.

There is no lack of transportation facilities over the ocean to-day. Those great boats are running at a loss. Instead of having hundreds—yes, thousands—of American citizens over in Europe spending their money and their time, the war has driven them home, and many of them came over here in any kind of a vessel they could get into. So the transportation of passengers from Europe to America is almost nothing, and as far as the transportation from America to Europe is concerned you might call it nil. The passenger boats to-day are running at a loss, and will continue to run that way until there is a change in the war situation in Europe. We certainly do not want to buy from Germany or any other country a lot of boats which will be of no use to the American people.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD without reading a list of the ships I have referred to rather than to take the time of the Senate in reading them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

German steamships.

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE.

Name of vessel.	Gross tons	Now at—
Vaterland	54,282	New York.
Amerika	22,622	Boston.
President Lincoln	18,168	New York.
President Grant	18,072	New York.
Cincinnati	16,339	Boston.
Pennsylvania	13,333	New York.
Bulgaria	11,440	Baltimore.
Konig Wilhelm II	9,410	New York.
Hamburg	10,531	New York.
Bohemia	8,414	New York.
Rhactia	6,600	Philadelphia.
Prinz Oskar	6,026	Philadelphia.
Armenia	5,464	New York.
Arcadia	5,454	Norfolk.
Pisa	4,967	New York.
Prinz Joachim	4,760	New York.
Prinz August Wilhelm	4,733	New York.
Prinz Eitel Fricdrich	4,650	New York.
Allemannia	4,630	New York.
Saxonia	4,424	Seattle.
Nassovia	3,902	New York.
Siberia	3,535	Baltimore.
Sarnia	3,402	New York.
Georgia	3,143	New Orleans.
Total	248,301	

HANSA.

Ockenfels	5,621	Boston.
Adamsturm	5,000	New York.

JOLIET COMPANY.

Neptun	197	San Francisco.

DAMPSCHIFFS REED HORN AKTIEN-GESELLSCHAFT.

Portonia	2,778	New York.

OTTO ZELCH.

Clara Mennig	1,685	New York.

DEUTSCH-AUSTRALISCHE DAMPSCHIFFS GESELL.

Harburg	4,472	New York.

HOLM AND MOLZEN.

Maia	2,555	New York.

D. FUHRMANN NISSLE AND GUNTHER NFLG.

Hohenfelds	2,974	Savannah.

KOSMOS.

Scrapis	4,756	San Francisco.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD.

George Washington	25,570	New York.
Kronprinzessin Cecilie	19,503	Boston.
Kaiser Wilhelm II	19,361	New York.
Grosser Kurfurst	13,102	New York.
Barbarossa	10,984	New York.
Prinzess Irene	10,893	New York.
Friedrich der Grosse	10,771	New York.
Rhein	10,058	Baltimore.
Neckar	9,835	Baltimore.
Koln	7,409	Boston.
Wittekind	5,640	Boston.
Willehad	4,761	Boston.
Total	147,887	

DEUTSCH-AMERIKAN PETROLEUM CO. (TANK).

Jupiter	10,073	Norfolk.
Delphin	7,129	Norfolk.
Buffalo	6,631	San Francisco.
Phoebus	6,268	San Francisco.
Kiowa	5,076	New York.
Hagen	5,460	New York.
Ems	4,046	Philadelphia.
Meppen	4,045	New York.
Total	48,728	

Austrian steamships.

UNIONE AUSTRIACA.

Name of vessel.		
Martha Washington	8,312	New York.
Dora	7,037	New York.
Erny	6,515	Boston.
Ida	4,730	New York.
Clara	3,932	New Orleans.
Teresa	3,769	New Orleans.
Anna	1,575	New Orleans.
Total	35,870	

D. TRIPOVICH STEAMSHIP CO.

Himalaia	4,948	New York.
Campania	3,551	Galveston.
Franconia	4,637	Philadelphia.

ATLANTICA SEA NAVIGATION CO. (LTD.).

Morowitz	4,795	Galveston.
Budapest	3,651	Norfolk.

Mr. SMOOT. As I stated, Mr. President, it would take at least 18 months to build a first-class ship. So this bill is not intended to add to our merchant marine new vessels of that kind, and there are no first-class ships to be had except German ships interned in our ports. The British Government requires the assent of the board of trade, which is a Government department, to the transfer of a British vessel to a foreign country. Is it reasonable to suppose that that Government would allow any first-class vessel to pass out of its control while this war lasted? I care not what the head of any of the departments or bureaus of this Government says, unless the requirements of the British Government are changed from what they have been in the past no British ship can be transferred to a foreign country without the consent of the board of trade. So when we talk about buying British ships, when we think we are going to secure them, we have got to take more than the wishes of the seller into consideration. We have got to take into consideration the wishes and desires of the board of trade, which is an English institution.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a clipping from the Washington Post of January 30, 1915, this morning, in which I find a statement by Sir Edward Grey warning the United States that the purchase of German ships would be construed by his Government as an unneutral act.

NEW YORK, *January 29.*

A Washington dispatch to the Sun states that Great Britain has given official notice that it would regard as an unneutral act the purchase and operation by this Government of the interned German and Austrian vessels as proposed under the pending special purchase bill.

England has heard of this measure, England knows what its provisions are, or, I should say, were, and England is not slow in notifying our Government of the position she takes in the purchase of interned German vessels.

NEW YORK, *January 29.*

A Washington dispatch to the Sun states that Great Britain has given official notice that it would regard as an unneutral act the purchase and operation by this Government of the interned German and Austrian vessels as proposed under the pending special purchase bill.

A written statement to this effect is now in the possession of Secretary of State Bryan and has been in his hands for 10 days.

I can not see, Mr. President, why the Senate of the United States does not pass a resolution asking the Secretary of State, if not incompatible with the interests of our Government, to send all the information that is in the State Department to Congress touching the question of the purchase of interned German vessels. I think it is due to Senators to know just what has passed between our Government and the British Government upon this subject. But we have not a word unless it is given to the public in driblets as the department sees fit.

Now, that is not the way to legislate. I thought myself that it would be a good idea for some Senator to offer a resolution, but I do not know that it could pass. I know that under the present parliamentary situation I believe this is the legislative day of January 26.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. It is after 2 o'clock on the day of January 26, and I know, of course, it would require unanimous consent. I would not want to undertake to secure that information unless I knew it was perfectly satisfactory to the Secretary of State and to all the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. But I would like to know just what has passed between our Government and the British Government, the communication of which would not be to the disadvantage in any way of either our Government or the British Government.

This article proceeds as follows:

Furthermore, similar views in regard to the reported intention of the administration to purchase interned vessels are held by France and Russia.

All the three great powers forming the allies agree that for us to purchase under this bill any or all the interned German vessels would be construed by them as an unneutral act on the part of the United States. Is not this warning sufficient, Senators? Just the other day, Thursday, I listened to a speech from the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in which the whole burden of it was that we have a perfect right to buy the interned vessels; that it was none of England's business; that it was none of Russia's business; none of France's business; that we under the fifty-sixth article of the London convention had a right to purchase the vessels. Evidently England does not agree with the Senator, nor does Russia, nor France.

The article proceeds as follows:

Among those who are aware of these facts there is great surprise at the repeated impressions conveyed by officials that the State Department has had no particular reason to believe that Great Britain or any of her allies would refuse to recognize the validity of the taking over of the interned ships and their operation in trade.

I have heard that stated time and time again, not officially, but by Senators who I thought were in close touch with the State Department, and I had almost come to believe that there had been some secret understanding between our country and England and Russia and France that they would not object to the purchase of the German ships if our Government so decided to do.

But evidently they were mistaken or else this article does not state the truth. It continues:

Great Britain, as the nation with which the United States has had occasion most frequently to discuss maritime questions during the war, has taken the lead in conveying to the United States a warning as to the view which the allies will take of the contemplated action under the pending legislation.

Sir Edward Grey has gone out of his way to inform Secretary Bryan that the British Government would not look with complaisance on the purchase of the interned ships by this Government.

I do not know whether it is proper to designate the action of Sir Edward Grey as going out of his way. I think he has a friendship for our country, and I rather think it is his duty to at least warn our State Department that Great Britain would not look upon the purchase of interned German ships with favor, especially after a bill has been introduced in Congress, especially since in the discussion upon this bill one who I believe all Senators felt was speaking for the State Department had so positively said that we had a right under the London conference to purchase interned German ships, and that England or Russia or France or any other of the belligerent powers had no right to object.

I apprehend, Mr. President, that the longer this question remains before the Senate for consideration the more the testimony will pile mountain high to show that the measure is fraught with great danger.

Mr. Welding Ring, in addressing the National Foreign Trade Convention at St. Louis, said:

I venture the assertion, and I think it will be supported by every practical man in the shipping business, that every steamer suitable for carrying cargo is employed to its utmost capacity at the present time.

This is from a man who is in that business. He knows it from A to Z; he is as thoroughly familiar with the details of the business as a man could possibly be. What he says I believe to be true. He further states:

There are no idle steamers except those that are interned and can not be employed. It is not boards in Washington we want, but an opportunity for individual effort to do in this country, not only in regard to shipping, but in many other lines.

If the Government of the United States enters the shipping business by reason of the importunities of people from one section of the country, why should it not enter into other businesses? I think this administration intends to do so, particularly if a southern industry is involved. We have upon the calendar a bill which has been reported from the Public Lands Committee, which, if passed, will mean that the people of the Western States shall pay for what rightfully belongs to them a tax to the Government of the United States forever. No consideration is taken as to what our enabling act provides; no attention is paid to what the Supreme Court of the United States has decided, not once, but many times; no attention is paid to the long list of decisions in the United States district courts in many of the Western States, wherein the proposition has been laid down so plainly that the State owns the water within the borders of the State that there is no question about the facts.

Here, however, we find a bill undertaking to do indirectly what the Constitution says can not be done directly. Mr. President, I have thought many times that if each Senator would spend a day with some western Senator, taking a map of our Western States to show him how the public lands of each State containing the chief resources of the State are locked up, it would convince the Senator of the injustice that is being done to the people of those States. There are in my own State withdrawals of land in some of the counties amounting to 93 per cent of all the land within the county.

What kind of government can be maintained with the power to tax only 7 per cent of the land. How can the counties maintain schools, churches, and a form of government that will insure to their people the protection so absolutely necessary in outlying counties so common in all of the Western States. I expect, Mr. President, that if this program proves a success and we can be forced, aye, by brute force, to the passage of this bill, the same program will be undertaken to place upon the State of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], who sits before me, a condition that I know his people will resent; but such are the conditions.

In connection with the quotation just made by me from the statement of Mr. Welding Ring in addressing the National

Foreign Trade Convention, in St. Louis, I wish to say that his statement as to individual effort is the truth. I also wish to say that individual effort has been discouraged and suppressed as a result of the legislation, including the tariff bill, of the party in power.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] in a recent statement on this subject, printed in the Washington Post, is reported to have said:

The objections to the pending ship-purchase bill continue to multiply and grow in strength day by day. In the first place, where and how will we get the ships if the bill should pass? By purchase? If so, from whom? Certainly not to any considerable amount or at anything like a reasonable figure from Great Britain, whose merchant marine must serve her own great commerce, and is, besides, now subject to demands made upon it for aid to the military and naval operations, as well as an increased demand from the world's carrying trade growing out of the elimination of German competition.

SHOWS BRITAIN'S PROBABLE ATTITUDE.

From Germany? If this be the purpose, or one of the purposes of the bill, it seems certain that it will involve us in serious complications with Great Britain. It is not probable that the Government of that country will permit us to purchase and transfer to our registry the interned ships of Germany that could probably be bought at a most reasonable figure, and then operate them on the high seas.

It seems certain that Great Britain will insist that if the transfer of the ship under the registry of one of her enemies is made to a neutral registry after the declaration of war, that Great Britain is neither bound to recognize nor respect such transfer and does not propose to do so.

SAYS NEUTRALITY MAY VANISH.

Besides, the transfer of these German vessels to a corporation of which the United States is the principal, if not the sole, stockholder will greatly add to the gravity of the situation by making this Government a direct party with an immediate interest of its own in the controversy, and will seriously endanger our continued peace.

Therefore this step ought not to be taken lightly, and not at all unless we are prepared for any eventuality. If we can not safely buy these German vessels, then what ships are we to purchase under this bill, and from whom?

A very pertinent question.

From other neutral nations or their citizens? We can certainly hope to secure no considerable supply from that source.

PROSPECT OF PURCHASE IN UNITED STATES.

Nor can we hope to purchase these ships either from our own citizens of from the citizens of other countries, if it be true, as asserted and urged by the proponents of this measure, that the rates have risen so enormously and the profits of these ships increased so largely since this war began. If that be true, what inducement would be held out to private capital invested in this business to sell its ships just when they are reaping the richest harvest?

Where, then, are we to get the necessary ships? Obviously by construction. And yet this measure is urged as a temporary one—a war measure, as it were, to be promptly abandoned when the war is over and the present emergency past—certainly as soon as it becomes a "profitable" enterprise again and therefore becomes attractive to capital.

POINTS TO TARIFF REMEDY.

The Congress of the United States in the recent tariff bill adopted a plan that in the past has proved most efficacious and practicable in building up and maintaining an American merchant marine, namely, a discriminating duty in favor of goods carried in American bottoms. The discriminatory rate may not be large enough to accomplish the purpose sought. If not, let us raise it. Certain treaties with foreign powers forbid its enforcement, the Attorney General held. If so, let us give the necessary notice to the powers in question to modify these treaties in this respect and then proceed to enforce the law we have enacted and so restore our merchant marine.

Long have we Democrats insisted that business and government should be divorced; that the Government should keep out of business and business should keep out of the Government. Were our protestations insincere? Were our principles unsound? I believe not.

Mr. President, if I have been rightly informed, and if I have heard correctly the many appeals on the part of the Democratic orators in past campaigns, they have always taken a ground against the Government of the United States going into business. They have always condemned paternalism. I say that this bill is paternalism run mad. The Government is going into the shipping business. We are going into the power business. We are going into the land-leasing business. We are going into the mining business. We are already in the railroad business. We are already in the lumber business. We are already in the sheep business and the cattle business, and where on earth is it going to end?

Are we prepared, as citizens of the United States, to acknowledge that the old Populist Party was correct? Are we ready to acknowledge that all of the preachings of socialism are what is required for the betterment of the citizens of our country?

I warn my friends upon the other side of this Chamber that the passage of this bill is not worth to them what it will cost them in the future. I am thankful that I am not a member of the Democratic Party, and particularly one of the many who do not believe in this bill but are forced to vote for it. It must be most humiliating; but that is not the question involved. I would not care how much humiliation came to Senators; I would go far toward bearing it myself, or my part of it, if we could save our country from the effects that this bill is bound to bring.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that all that I say or all that anyone will say against this bill will change the result. We can only hope that it will. We can only trust that it will be brought home to the majority in such a way that they will hesitate to take the step. I believe myself that the discussion that has taken place is going to prove of inestimable value to the American people, and the longer the measure is discussed the more the people of this country will be convinced that it is a wrong step to take. I wish I had the power to convince one or two more Democrats that this bill should not pass. It would not take any more than that to defeat it. You are passing, or undertaking to do so, a measure which, if statements that have been made to me are correct, a very large majority of the Senators in this body feel is unwise. The situation is as it is, however. I shall do what I think is my duty. If the bill becomes a law I shall go home to my people, and if asked in relation to this legislation I shall simply state that if it had been in my power it never would have been enacted into law.

Mr. President, the lengths to which our friends on the other side are willing to go to pass this bill are almost beyond belief. If I had been asked a week ago—aye, if I had been asked but yesterday—whether Rule XVIII would be slaughtered, whether the precedents established in this body for years and years, some of them rendered by some of the greatest Democrats that ever sat upon that side of the Chamber, would be lightly set aside, I would have said no, no—a thousand times, no, not for any piece of legislation. I wish, after this fight is over, it might be possible to make a motion that every ruling that has violated the rules of this body should be expunged from the official RECORD.

When I came to the Senate of the United States I thought it my first duty to learn the rules by heart, and know what they were. I do not care much about the rules any more, any further than that every time I see them violated it hurts me. I say that there is not a piece of legislation that has ever been before this body, or that ever will be before it, that justifies the willful violation of the rules of the Senate.

I referred some time ago to a conference report. That report was brought before the Senate last August, with an amendment to admit foreign ships to our coastwise trade. It was not accepted by the Senate. Some of the Democrats objected to it as not a legitimate proposition to be submitted on a conference report. Yet that report, agreed to by Democratic committees of both Houses, would have practically destroyed our coastwise shipping so far as American-built ships and American sailors are concerned. Conference reports! Yes, Mr. President, we have passed in this body, concurred in by the House, some of the most vicious legislation on conference reports that has reached our statute books. I hope the time has arrived when a majority in the Senate of the United States will rise and put a stop to that practice.

An American vessel with an American crew could not compete with a Japanese vessel and a Japanese crew, and we would have had the painful opportunity of witnessing foreign vessels doing our coasting and lake trade. The coasting trade has been protected from foreign invasion for a century. It has grown to an extent employing over 50,000 men, with $125,000,000 capital and with an output of nearly $100,000,000 annually, paying in such wages some $40,000,000, purchasing some $35,000,000 worth of American products in addition. This industry has hundreds of millions of dollars invested in this country. Yet the committee propose to open that trade to foreign competition. Is it possible that my friends would like to see that army of men thrown into the already overcrowded avenues of business and manufacturing? Is it possible that with their votes they will at once make next to worthless hundreds of millions of dollars of American products?

I expect there will be an amendment offered to this bill, unless the Democratic caucus has already decided that it shall not be proposed, similar to the one that was offered for the purpose of opening our coastwise trade to foreign vessels. I now express the opinion that if such be the case and it should happen to become the law, it would be the last nail in the coffin of those who perpetrated the act.

Our dependence on foreign nations for anything that can be produced at home is a tremendous mistake. Our country is not any different, only in size and numbers, from the family at home. How long will the head of the house keep out of financial difficulties if he spends more every month than his income? How long would it take to bring financial disaster to a family who said that every member of the family should be waited upon by others, that all help in the home should be hired help, and in the hiring of that help it took more than the income of the head of the family? Not very long, Mr. President, and it does not take a nation very long to find itself in debt if it fol-

lows the policy of allowing other nations to make the goods that should be made at home. It is true that her credits are greater, but not more so when you take into consideration the wants of the Government and the wants of a family.

As far as the principle is concerned, it is the same. But the thrifty housewife, the thrifty husband, the industrious children, made so by the example of a father and mother, would do what a thrifty nation does. To see that each member of the household does their part of the work and share the burdens of the home. It is not only a question of dollars and cents that is involved in this; it is a question which affects the children morally. It is a question which affects each member of the household physically. It is a question which affects the well-being of every member of the family.

I have been taught all my life that the proper thing to do for every head of a family is to secure a home of his own and keep it free from debts of all kinds. Let it be a home and shelter for the wife and the children that God gives him. A home-owning people are generally a God-fearing people. A home-owning people are always the truest and safest citizens that a Government or a country can have. Whenever the people become landowners and home owners, I care not how small the farm or humble the home, they are not going to be men and women who organize to destroy property and trample under foot the laws of the Government under which they live.

So, Mr. President, when you undertake to drive out the individual initiative, when you undertake to say that the Government of the United States shall enter into competition with its own citizens in all classes of business, you might just as well say that the father and the mother of a home shall draw the line, that the head of the family shall do the work and the children none. Mr. President, it will never work. If this is undertaken and this Government branches out into business enterprises, I dislike to contemplate what the future of my country will be. I know, Mr. President, that there are people who look at the question of Government ownership in altogether another light. They look at it from another angle. They may be just as earnest in it as I am in the position I take, but God knows I can not see anything ahead but trouble and danger to my country if such a course is undertaken.

Mr. President, I do not care how small the industry may be; I do not care where located. I have been just as proud of that busy little hive of industry of New Jersey as of any other State in the Union. I have often pointed to her in my remarks at home as a State that manufactures everything from a ship to a needle. I have told the people by way of encouragement of the industries of that thriving State. I have told them of the interest that they have shown in legislation before Congress many times, and I have felt in my heart if the same energy that is displayed in New Jersey in establishing every sort of business was manifested in other States in this Union it would be better for the country as a whole. I once heard a Jerseyman say that they were interested in making everything from catgut to thrashing machines, and I went him one better; I thought it was from catgut to ship. But here we are. We are depending upon foreign countries for things that should be made at home, and we ought not to be doing so.

God has placed in and upon mother earth all the products required for the happiness of the human family. Our own country has been blessed, and is just as rich in all those things as any country in the world. In America is found the raw materials for making dyes of all kinds equal in every respect to Germany. But we do very little in manufacturing dyes for our own consumption. It can not be done unless protection is granted. We can manufacture dyestuffs as well as Germany, and yet we have been dependent for years upon that country for dyestuffs used in the textile industry, and to-day every textile mill in the United States and every shoe factory in the United States and every glove manufactory in the United States would be closed if England and France and Russia had not given their consent that dyestuffs should be shipped out of Germany direct to the United States. It would not take very much money to establish the industry. Yet we find ourselves dependent upon foreign countries for a product that we could make just as well as not. The policy, to me, is almost wicked, almost a crime on the part of the lawmakers of this country.

In the same way the steel industry is largely dependent upon imports of ferromanganese. Do you remember, Senators, when we had the Underwood tariff bill before us, and do you know that the Steel Trust is about the only concern in the United States that is making ferromanganese, and every independent manufacturer of this country is compelled to import it? The independents are not large enough to take from their capital sufficient means to establish a plant for the manufacture of ferromanganese. The only concern in the country that has it is the Steel Trust.

The item of ferromanganese is just a small one, but let me call your attention to what has happened to the little fellow, to the man who is struggling to build up a steel business. It is the small man who generally gets hurt by a reduction of the tariff. The ordinary price of ferromanganese is somewhere from $30 to $40 a ton, but it has been selling at an excess of $125 a ton since the European war began, and sufficient quantities were almost impossible to obtain even at that price. We had to go and beg of England and France and Russia to allow us to ship what little we have secured for the small American manufacturer. It is not right, Senators, and no country ought to be placed in that position. I predict now that the time will come when it will not be allowed.

Take the question of sugar. If we had not been dependent upon a foreign country for our sugar, do you think, Senators, that we would have paid during the last year $240,000,000 because of that fact? Our losses are not completed yet, and shall not be for at least another year, because, if the war should cease this very night, it would be impossible to plant a beet crop for the present year. So the American people, because of a mistaken policy, are paying dearly for it—$480,000,000—and no one benefited.

Senators, that amount of money would build a thousand factories; they could have been given to the people of the beet-sugar States, and half of them could make all the sugar required by the people of the United States. Competition at home would have been such that the regular price would have been paid and no more, whether there was war or whether there was peace.

A British bluebook issued not long ago, referring to our coastwise shipping, said that it surpassed in tonnage the combined coastwise fleet of the leading nations of the world, and added that it was chiefly due to that enormous volume of domestic tonnage that the United States ranks to-day as the second largest maritime nation in the world.

If our shipping in the foreign trade had been given similar encouragement, we would not now be talking about a bill to enable the Government to purchase vessels to be operated at a loss in competition with private owners. That question, Mr. President, would have been solved years ago. The war, if it had broken out with twice the fury that it did, if it covered twice the amount of the territory of the globe that it does, would have had no effect upon our industries. We are now paying for our mistaken policies. Our unpreparedness is costing us most dearly. If the war should continue another year, it will cost this Government of ours more money than it would take to build a thousand ships to carry our commerce to the world.

Some people think that we are only unprepared so far as our defense in case of war is concerned. I admit, Mr. President, that we are unprepared in that respect. I believe that if we are going to be extravagant with expenditures of the Government money it ought to be in preparation for the national defense. I want to live, but I would prefer to die rather than be compelled to have my country humiliated by a foreign power by reason of our lack of preparation, or destroyed by a greater naval or military power. It is never going to come. God established America. He gave us our Constitution; he planted liberty here; and it is going to spread from our shores until it covers the whole earth, and then mankind will be prepared for universal peace and the teachings of the Master will be adhered to.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], in speaking on the subject of our merchant marine some time ago—I forget just what year it was, but I believe it was in the year 1907—made this statement:

> I believe that there will be an uprising of the people of this country when they come to know the fact, as in due time they will come to know it, that the United States leads all the nations of the world in wealth, agriculture, mining, manufactures, and in all the great industrial pursuits of life; and yet in this matter of our merchant marine in the foreign trade we are lagging behind every maritime nation in the world. This will not always last, and I am profoundly grateful that in the debate which has occupied the last few days the American people have had an opportunity to understand that there are some men in public life who feel that this great question should be seriously considered and that an effort should be made now and hereafter to accomplish the desired result.

It takes years sometimes to get public opinion molded and aroused, and the very fact that this bill has been introduced shows that the American people have been thinking. How much better it would have been to have established a merchant marine and paid an individual or individuals a mere pittance, called, if you please, a subsidy, than to have forced the Gov-

ernment of the United States into business in competition with her own people.

Although these words were uttered a few years ago—I think they were spoken in 1907—we have not made any progress, but, on the contrary, have been going backward, especially since the present administration came into power.

The discussion of the subject on the pending bill will be of some advantage in the way of informing the public. If I did not think so, I certainly should not occupy the position that I am occupying at this time.

We have been told, as a result of investigations, how foreign steamship lines combined to deprive our farmers and others of their markets in Brazil and elsewhere and substituted for American products those of other nations. I know that Senators do not understand the workings of those foreign combines. If they did, they would put a force at work in this Government that would forever stop them. This is known by the heads of our Government. It is not altogether a new thing, and if it had not been for the filibusters that have taken place on this subject in the past we would have had a merchant marine to-day. I remember when this same question was talked to death by a few Senators on the other side of the Chamber; but, of course, the rules of this body were adhered to and their rights as Senators were respected.

Mr. President, the high and discriminating rates which the foreign combines have imposed to the detriment of our foreign trade can only be remedied by competition from American vessels. It is impossible to regulate it in any other way. Do Senators know that not only are combines in Germany and in England and in Russia allowed, but that they are encouraged, and in some instances the government itself takes a hand and combines are formed with the power of the government back of them? The manufacturers are told how much to manufacture; they are told what the price shall be, and whatever the loss may be at the end of the quarter or the half-year period is assessed against the manufacturer, or if gain it is paid to him.

Why, under that form, Mr. President, they can drive competition from almost any part of the world, and it has been very successfully accomplished in the past.

I speak more of Germany on this point than any other nation, because her combinations, I believe, are most highly organized and most efficient in their operation. There is no effort on their part to conceal the matter. They publish statements showing the transactions. When an American institution undertakes to compete with them, and, in order that their men may be employed, they make a price for export lower than they do for home consumption, they are most bitterly criticized.

If the Senators of the United States had been in a manufacturing business, they would know that in order to make a success of any concern it must run all the time. If a manufacturing concern closes down for a month or two months, its employees are scattered. It never gets them back in working force as they were before. Not only that, but the stamp of disapproval of the Almighty is placed upon idleness, and an idle man always wears out quicker than an active one. An idle brain is the devil's workshop. Idle machinery goes to wreck and ruin much quicker than if the wheels were humming and they were running to their full capacity. That is the way it ought to be. That is the way it ought to be with men and women. That is the way it ought to be with children. That is the way it ought to be with machinery. That is the way it is under the design of the Almighty.

A man and a woman can live in a house and the wear and tear of it is nothing compared to what the elements do to a vacant house. No business is run without there being a certain overhead charge. The taxes upon a plant are the same whether it runs 6 months in the year or 12 months. The superintendents, the secretaries, the office expenses, all these are standing expenses, and if a business gets off with an overhead charge of 15 per cent per year it is doing very well. So I say to the Senators it is better for a manufacturer to run all the year and keep his men working all the time, not only for their good but for the good of the machinery, if he has to sell a two months' production, or whatever time the plant would have had to lie idle, at 10 per cent below cost. Even under a condition of that kind he would be 5 per cent better off than to have let the mill lie idle. That is why, in some instances, you find goods sold for exportation for a little less than they are sold for home consumption.

American vessels will not increase in the foreign trade to any extent until they can engage in it on an equality with those of other nations. Senators, it will never come until that happens. We can whet the wits of our business men, we can preach to them about better facilities for manufacture, but that never can take the place of the difference of cost between running a business in the United States and running the same class of business in a foreign country. All other nations have found it to their advantage to encourage their shipping by Government aid at home and abroad, while we have desisted from that service in this country, where the need of it is so much greater because of higher wages and laws requiring better treatment for our sailors. Rather than to lower the standard I would prefer to see it raised. Rather than to lower the wages of our American seamen I would prefer to see them advanced. I do not believe the time is coming when they are going to be lowered; but I do believe that as we advance in civilization and as we advance in the thought of protection to this great enterprise, not only will the conditions surrounding the seamen aboard ship be improved, but an increase of compensation will be granted to them.

If the Government in going into the shipping business would help to solve that problem in the least degree the opposition to the pending bill would largely disappear. Mr. President, if I had the least idea that by the Government entering into the shipping business as provided for in this bill it would help to solve the problem, instead of opposing it I would be for its provisions; but I feel so positive that nothing but mischief can come from its passage that I have concluded it is my duty to do all I can to defeat it.

If this bill is ever put into operation it will not be for long. In fact, I doubt whether there will ever anything come from it, for I have not lost all confidence in the judgment of American business men, and I think I would conclude that this measure would not be acceptable to any such. In my opinion, instead of helping it would make the matter much worse. I do not say that in a wicked spirit, I do not say that in a feeling of fault-finding. I say it because I believe it with all my heart. I say it because every time I read the bill there is a new avenue of danger to our country appears. I have not taken up the bill yet to discuss it paragraph by paragraph. That I can do later and when I have more time at my disposal, but there is no question that the whole theory of the bill is wrong. It is based upon false premises. It is based upon false ideas of business. It is against the fundamental principles of our form of government.

Suppose we had adopted this policy 50 years ago, where do you think our country would be to-day? I will tell you, I think we would not be to-day a free people. I can tell you another thing, that individual initiative has made the American people so great; through it cities have been built as if by magic; it is the basis of American inventive genius which has been proverbial all over the world; it has increased our love for liberty and country, and has been a commanding force in making our country what it is to-day.

If Government ownership had been put in operation as provided in this bill, if this had been the policy of the American Government 50 years ago, we would not have been the leading Nation of the world to-day.

We would have built up through this form of legislation a political organization so great the time would have come when a man holding the office of the President of the United States would have had sufficient power so that he could have made himself a king. Deprive a man of the knowledge that he is just as good as any other man, and has equal rights with any other citizen, and you drive out of him all there is that makes the difference between a true American citizen and a serf under the Czar of Russia.

It will be a sorrowful day for America if the spirit of ambition and individual initiative are crushed out of the lives of her citizens.

Do you remember that at the time of the Boer War in Africa the British withdrew their best steamships from our ports to carry troops and supplies to South Africa? That is not very long ago. Every Senator here remembers that far back. But do you remember what happened? I am afraid you do not. Certainly it did not make an impression on you the same as it did on me. It certainly has not made an impression on Congress sufficient for them to act. At that time shipping rates advanced greatly, just as they have advanced now as the result of the present war in Europe.

Evidently we did not learn a lesson from the history of that war. It seems that there has to be something more forcible than the calamities to another country to impress us greatly. We shall always be subject to such a disastrous situation in connection with our foreign commerce, as long as we remain in dependence on foreign nations to supply ships to carry on that commerce. There is no more doubt of it than that we are in this Chamber.

The American consul general at Rio de Janeiro some years ago reported, as follows:

Since last August the freights have been raised and lowered and lowered and raised again, to suit the purpose of the trust, until they have reached the present level.

I wish that some of the Senators who had so much to say about the American trusts would study a little as to the situation and condition of foreign trusts. I would like to see legislation that would reach them indirectly, as well as regulation to control our own. It can be accomplished and will be accomplished.

The trust—

So the American consul general at Rio de Janeiro says—

has an agreement with coffee shippers here to pay them a rebate of 5 per cent at the end of every six months from the date of the agreements on all freights collected.

Let us see what the other conditions are, and you will see that they are just along the same lines as the requirements made by Germany of ships to carry her mail and receive a subsidy from her. Germany requires, first, that the ships shall be built in Germany, and that they shall be manned with German officers, and they must be at the service of the Kaiser whenever he sees fit to call them.

Five per cent at the end of every six months from the date of agreement on all freights collected: *Provided, however*, That this rebate is forfeited in case the shippers give freight to any vessels not belonging to the trust during the period stipulated. Through this arrangement the trust controls the shippers, and American vessels go home in ballast.

That is not from a biased source. That statement comes from the consul general at Rio de Janeiro. That is only one of thousands of cases similar in character. There is no difference, Senators, in this case from thousands of others. But it goes to show how American vessels are discriminated against, secret understandings made, rebates of all sorts paid; but if an American shipper was placed upon the same footing and had the same privileges that the foreign shippers have, he would take his chances and, I believe, would win out.

Another writer, commenting at that time on the same subject, said:

Our commerce in Brazil and the River Plata countries is at the mercy of a shipping combine. Ostensibly four lines are competing in serving a route between New York and Pernambuco southward, but in reality the management of these services is centralized in Liverpool, the freights are pooled, and the spoils divided. At the head of this syndicate stands Lamport & Holt, of Liverpool, a powerful firm, owning and managing over 100 vessels.

He goes on to tell how higher rates are charged to New York than to Europe and other means of discriminating against the United States. Freight rates between the United States and Brazil at that time were about twice what the rate was from Hongkong to New York. That is the situation that has not been remedied, because we have not provided American ships. It can not be remedied under the pending bill unless the Government is going to go extensively into the shipping business, practically, as Mr. James J. Hill asserts, covering the entire field.

I can not understand, Senators, why you can not see that point. I can not understand how anyone can figure otherwise. This bill is a makeshift, a temporary measure, so-called; a Government leasing proposition to the Senator who believes in the Government owning and leasing ships; a Government operation proposition to the Senator who believes that the Government should operate them; a proposition of the Government building the ships and operating them to the Senator who believes in that plan. All these conditions found in the bill by its defenders must appeal to you as a very unwise measure and impossible of understanding.

It may be, Mr. President, that I can not read the English language, and it may be that I do not understand it; but if I do the provisions of this bill are anything but wise, and the enforcement of its provisions can not be anything other than dangerous and mischievous.

The Senate passed a bill about a year ago authorizing the use for commercial purposes of vessels belonging to the Navy Department when not required for active use by that department. Under it the department could construct auxiliaries for the Navy which might be used for commercial purposes when required, with comparatively little extra expense.

That was about a year ago; yet the House has never considered that bill. It sleeps in the burial ground of a House committee. The only way that it can get out is for the Committee on Rules of that body to meet and order it to be brought out. Will they do that? I do not think they will. When that bill went to the House about a year ago many of the Democratic Representatives said "no; we can not consider the bill for a minute. The idea of the Government of the United States going into the shipping business." A year ago they were frightened at the violation of Democratic doctrine contained in that bill; to-day some of the same men, if I am informed correctly, will swallow this bill whole. Some of them take the same position as Senators have in the debate upon this floor—that the bill is intended in its operations for the Government to build ships, to purchase ships, to lease ships. Some go so far as to say that the leasing provision is the one provision in the bill that would make them vote for it.

Is there any limit in a lease as to time? Is there any limit as to the amount to be charged? There is none. Nobody has ever undertaken to inform the Senate for what length of time or on what basis a lease is to be made.

The need of auxiliary vessels in time of war for military service is felt by both the Army and the Navy. The need of vessels by the Army being for transportation of men and supplies, would largely depend on the location of the field of operation of the Army forces. In case of operations of a large nature in the Philippines or Hawaii or any other distant land, there would be need of a large fleet of American-owned vessels available at once for conversion as transports or supply ships. England, at the time of the Boer War, and Japan, in its war with Russia, greatly benefited by the existence of many vessels available for such purposes. The Navy Department requires vessels to act as scouts, colliers, ammunition ships, supply and refrigerating ships, distilling ships or tank steamers, hospital ships, repair and torpedo-depot ships, transports, dispatch vessels, and tugs. Vessels which might be useful for such purposes could be used, when not in need by the Navy, for commercial uses. But such wise legislation is not entertained by either House.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. President, that we find ourselves to-day without very many of the class of vessels named by me. We not only need battleships, but we need auxiliaries of the kind named. I think, in the appropriations which are made in the future, if we are going to increase our Navy, among the first things toward a proper increase would be the building of such auxiliary vessels.

Notwithstanding the humiliating lesson we had when the American fleet made its trip around the world, employing foreign ships as colliers, the Navy is still comparatively helpless in that respect. Scout ships are extremely important and should be of the most rapid kind that can be built. Foreign navies have vessels of even 25 knots and higher sustained speed to be used as scouts. Speed is essential in supply ships, hospital ships, repair and other such vessels. In accompanying a fleet they must be able to keep up with it. There are not enough vessels in the American merchant marine to-day available for the use of the Army and Navy in case of a conflict at a distance, that would require the use of such vessels.

Why, Mr. President, in our recent conflict with Mexico, in our recent occupation of Vera Cruz, that most unhappy and unfortunate event, the Government of the United States had to charter some 12 transports. I do not know why they were held as long as they were, but I know that some of them were tied to the wharves for months, with the Government of the United States paying a thousand dollars a day.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. For each boat?

Mr. SMOOT. Not all the boats cost a thousand dollars a day, but the one I have in mind did. I know, Mr. President, that the boats chartered will cost the Government of the United States over $1,450,000. I know also that the Government of the United States refitted them at a cost of over $400,000. If it will take that much to occupy Vera Cruz, what will it take to enter a port of any other country that has not been torn with dissension and its resources wasted until nothing is left the people with which to defend their sovereignty. We would be up against a similar proposition if we should get into trouble with any other second or even third class power.

Our humiliating experience at the time of the War with Spain might be repeated at any time in case of another war with a distant nation. It is generally true that the worst way is the dearest and the best is the cheapest, the worst being a procrastinating, unready policy of penury during peace and prodigality during impending or actual hostilities, the net result of which is equal or greatly increased ultimate expenditure and much less value received. In a report made to the General Staff of the Army by one of its officers, it is stated that:

To strike the quick blow of a force corresponding to our permanent military establishment would require practically all the American shipping of suitable character in Atlantic waters and more than the entire tonnage in Pacific waters; it is doubtful whether such transport tonnage could be procured at all except by impressment and in a period of six months or more.

That report goes on to state that now—

The quick, first blow, so very and increasingly important, can not be struck at all, nor can an expedition of large size be embarked without delay, except by the use of foreign vessels. This condition can not improve until the American steam seagoing merchant marine has in-

creased in tonnage to approximately two and one-half times its present volume by the addition of ships adapted in size and design to quick conversion into suitable transports and built under conditions which make their voluntary surrender to the United States on demand a foregone conclusion.

In that connection, Mr. President, I certainly hope the Senate will have a chance to vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. If the Government of the United States is going into the shipping business, let us do it openly, directly, and not in the fashion provided for in this bill. Let us buy the ships outright; but, still better, let the Government of the United States construct the ships, and let them be constructed in such a way that they will not only answer for the transportation of our commerce to the markets of the world but they will answer as transports, as an auxiliary to our Navy, and that in case of war with any country on earth we can immediately call into service all of that class of boats.

This bill, if enacted into law, will not only be a failure as a leasing proposition but it will be a failure as a Government operation or purchase plan. So it seems to me that every Senator who believes in the Government of the United States going into the shipping business ought to support a measure directly approving and providing for that course.

The London Financial Times, in referring to the effect of the Boer War in South Africa, said that it caused Britain to withdraw 250 steamships of an aggregate of 1,000,000 tons from peaceful commerce for transports and supply service. The United States suffered the most from that withdrawal, and the Financial Times remarks:

The war in South Africa has had a more serious effect on the trans-Atlantic than upon any other class of ocean tonnage, for the simple reason that the majority of the vessels employed for the purpose of transports have been taken from this route, the North Atlantic steamers, as a rule, being large, powerful, and reasonably swift craft, admirably adapted for this species of Government service. The natural effect of their withdrawal has been to cripple opportunities afforded to exports to and imports from America and to raise freight rates. It has also brought to the minds of Americans the dependence of their country upon Europe, and especially upon England, for the development of their export trade.

The farmers suffered the most from that withdrawal of foreign ships, as it interfered with their exports of farm products. The actual decrease in cereal shipments from Boston alone, as a result of that withdrawal of foreign ships, was nearly 2,000,000 bushels in six weeks. The farmers have been led to believe that they had no interest in building up our merchant marine in the foreign trade, but that was absolute proof to the contrary. Our total exports of breadstuffs declined $47,000,000 in one year, notwithstanding the war, which was supposed to lead to an increased demand. What the country needs is a permanent policy to increase our merchant marine in the foreign trade, and not such an emergency measure as that now before the Senate, which would drive American ships out of the business as a result of Government competition carried on at a loss. The British Government since 1840 has paid in mail and admiralty subsidies about $275,000,000 to its shipping. A parliamentary committee defined the object of these subsidies to be—

To afford us rapid, frequent, and punctual communication with distant ports which feed the main arteries of British commerce, and with the most important of our foreign possessions, to foster maritime enterprise, and to encourage the production of a superior class of vessels, which would promote the convenience of the country in time of peace and assist in defending its shores against hostile aggressions.

These subsidized British lines, over 30 in number at one time, have built up the British shipping to the enormous scale which now exists. She has developed shipyards and engine works, subsequently used to build tramp or cargo steamers. So, though the British tramp fleet is not directly subsidized, it is indirectly the product of the subsidy system. Most of the subsidized companies own cargo ships as well as mail liners. Besides the mail subsidies there are admiralty subsidies to fast steamers, and retaining bounties to 33,500 merchant seamen of the Royal Naval Reserve. One single British line receives $200,000 more than is paid by the United States under the postal aid law of 1891 to all the steamships beneath the American flag. In 1885 Germany granted a mail subvention of $1,047,000 a year for 15 years to the North German Lloyd Line for a mail service to the Orient, and requiring that the subsidized ships should be built in German yards. That subsidy created the German shipyards that have built the great German vessels of this time. Aid by the German railways, owned by the Government, also helped vastly in building up German lines. France, Italy, and other countries have gone to even greater lengths; but here in the United States little or nothing has been done, with the consequent decay of our shipping in the foreign trade. Materials for constructing ships for that trade are admitted free to the United States, so that the difference in cost is the difference in wages; and certainly no patriot wants to reduce wages in this country. That must be done, however, or else aid given to the ships in the foreign trade, the same as other countries do, if we are to have a merchant marine in that trade worthy of the name. The free ship policy offers no solution for the question, as has been demonstrated under the acts passed by the party now in power. All the maritime nations in the world have tried free ships in the past, and, disappointed with the results of this expedient alone, have all turned to some form or degree of subsidy, bounty, or subvention.

It makes no difference what you call it, Mr. President—a bounty, a subsidy, or a subvention. The result is the same. It costs the nation granting it the same amount. If the word "subsidy" grates upon the ears of my Democratic friends, why not use the word "subvention" or "bounty" instead?

Even Great Britain, in its subsidy to the Cunard Line, requires that the ships shall be built in the United Kingdom. The London Engineer some time ago said:

Free ships would be a good thing for our English shipbuilders, for, whether at first or at second hand, the vessels purchased would be of English build for the most part. The development of a native American shipbuilding industry can be of advantage to neither builders nor owners in the United Kingdom.

We are told of the great advance in ocean rates to foreign countries. R. G. Dun & Co., I suppose, are good authority on that subject, as they have no personal interest in the matter, and for a long period of time have had facilities for learning and reporting the rates. In their report of December 29 they say:

The ocean rates to Asia, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand are, as a rule, no higher, or somewhat less, than they were last October. To the west coast of South America the rates are very nearly what they were prior to the outbreak of the war. Rates of war-risk insurance have on the whole declined in the last two months.

That is the report made by R. G. Dun & Co., dated December 29 last. Dun said that the rates to Europe October 19 did not exceed 25 per cent on the average of nominal rates, and were less to other countries. The reports of the commercial agencies do not sustain the assertions of Secretary McAdoo and Secretary Redfield as transmitted to the Senate.

One thing is significant and that is that no other great nation has undertaken to enter into this business as now conducted by private shipowners, but the party in power wants to force this country to waste a large sum in that way. Government ownership will destroy individual initiative and produce maximum cost and increase the number of Government officials and employees, with their salaries and wages, just as has taken place in England in the telegraph and telephone business; that increase in salaries has been made notwithstanding the business is not profitable, showing an average deficit of over $5,000,000 a year, to be made up by taxation. Government operation affords increased opportunities for corruption, labor problems, and executive inefficiency. There is less interest to invent and improve facilities of service, and many other disadvantages. Public ownership of certain public utilities where competition does not exist is advocated with plausibility. But that is not the condition under this bill. If the business were conducted with a view of profit to the minority stockholders, it would not change the existing situation. If there were no profit, then it would drive off private competitors and stop the increase of private capital in the shipping trade. Moreover, if it affected foreign lines, foreign Governments would retaliate. Arguments used by the Republicans for years to increase the merchant marine, such as the need of going to Europe to reach Argentina and other South American ports in any reasonable time, and the necessity of sending goods that way, are now used in support of this pending bill by its friends. It is asserted that coastwise trade will not be affected. There is a large trade to Hawaii, which is part of the coastwise trade, but Hawaii is included in the countries to be reached under this bill. It is admitted that the cheapest water transportation of bulk freight is by steamers in the protected coastwise trade.

An argument is made that farmers are not affected by the importation of corn and other farm products free of duty, but it is admitted that Americans not only produce corn and meat to supply the home demand but also to supply a considerable part of the demand of foreign countries. Under such circumstances that party back of this bill must think that the farmers are weak minded if they can be made to believe that they are not hurt by the importation of such products from countries with low labor cost and lower transportation rates. The president of the Corn Products Co. stated over his own signature last year that that company bought Argentine corn because they could get it cheaper than American corn. Barley affords a splendid illustration of this situation. At one time we imported eleven or twelve million bushels of barley from Canada. That was excluded by the McKinley tariff law. But barley has not

been any dearer, and we have exported large quantities, while practically none has come from Canada. The importation of farm products from Argentina, Canada, and other countries is necessarily a great loss to American farmers, though there has been no reduction in cost to consumers as a result of that baneful legislation in the Underwood tariff law.

Our foreign shipping has not increased because the business has not been profitable in competition with foreign vessels manned by cheap crews and officers. How can the Government make it profitable and at the same time lower rates as it is said they will do if this measure becomes a law? Government work is always more costly than that conducted by private enterprise. The Government can run ships and make low freight rates, but it can do so only by taxing the people to make up the difference. Hence the talk about withdrawing from the business when it becomes profitable is pure nonsense. That is an admission that it will be conducted at a loss, which is a practical certainty. The Democratic Party has stated:

> We are in accord with those who feel that it is better whenever practicable for the Government to avoid engaging in any business that can be conducted by private enterprise.

They have changed that position. Are they embarking on a new one, one of public ownership or one of socialism?

There can be no question of the ability of private enterprise to carry on our merchant marine in the foreign trade. If the Government gives the necessary aid such as other Governments afford, there would be no trouble on that score. Thomas Jefferson, for whom I suppose the Democrats profess such great admiration, said:

> To force shipbuilding is to establish shipyards; is to form magazines; to multiply useful hands; to produce artists and workmen of every kind, who may be found at once for the peaceful speculations of commerce and for the terrible wants of war. * * * For a navigating people to purchase its marine afloat would be a strange speculation, as the ships would always be dependent on the merchants furnishing them. Placing as a reserve with a foreign nation, or in a foreign shipyard, the carpenters, blacksmiths, calkers, sailmakers, and the vessels of a nation would be a singular commercial combination. We must, therefore, build them for ourselves. * * * If we have no seamen our ships will be useless, consequently our ship timber, iron, and hemp; our shipbuilding will be at an end; ship carpenters will go over to other nations; our young men will have no call to the sea; our products carried in foreign bottoms will be saddled with war freights and insurance in time of war.

That is precisely what the Democrats are providing for in the pending measure. The wisdom of Jefferson does not affect the leaders of the party to-day. Jefferson favored protection to American industries, but the Democratic Party of to-day favors the purchase of products from foreign countries, even those of the farm.

It is a curious fact that the ships which the Government may purchase under this bill may sail under a foreign flag—Japanese, for instance—with a crew of that nation. The shipping board provided for by this bill could do almost anything. No restrictions are imposed and no supervision is provided. The board will determine what ships shall be bought, where they shall go, and what they shall carry. Our southern friends may be certain that their interests will be well cared for so far as the shipping board can do so with the money provided. There will be minority stockholders, as has been pointed out, not because of any profit to be obtained, but because of the advantages to such stockholders not apparent to others. It has been held here that this law, if this bill goes on the statute books, will be unconstitutional. There seems to be good reason for such contention. It may result in tying up the measure should it ever become a law, which would be an advantage to the public. The shipping board will have opportunity to give employment to a large number of Democrats. Even in selecting officers and men for the ships there will be no restriction on the choice of the board. It will be in the nature of another commission, so many of which have been created since the Democratic Party came into power. The Commission on Industrial Relations is an illustration of what may be expected from these boards. That commission expended $350,000 in 27 months, and about the only result seems to be found in a recent statement of its chairman that they want a minimum wage of $2, an eight-hours-a-day limitation, and a minimum of $10 a week for telephone girls. The commission is now conducting a hearing in New York City at which various persons are allowed to express their views. Of course, such a proceeding is of momentous importance to the Government and will result in giving the Government Printing Office a large amount of additional work.

This large sum to be expended by the shipping board, from a Democratic point of view ought to be of great benefit to that party in the way of distribution of patronage. The spirit of partisanship, the old spoils system, has been revived, and the cause of civil-service reform has already suffered more severely during this administration than in any period since it was first introduced.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat earnest in what remarks I have made this evening, at times perhaps more than necessary; but, Senators, I am in earnest in trying to call the attention of the country to what I believe in my soul will be the result if this bill becomes a law and is put in operation. It ought to be defeated. It should not be allowed to pass, and I hope and trust it may not pass.

I feel that it would be unwise for me at this time, Mr. President, to take up the consideration of the bill by sections and call the attention of the Senate to some of the glaring inconsistencies of the measure, and call the attention of the country to the basis upon which it is framed and show to the Senators themselves the unbusinesslike principles of the bill. But I can do that at some other time, and I shall take an opportunity at a very early day to do so.

I have not even called attention to the public opinion of this measure. I claim now that a large part of the public press of this country is opposed to the enactment into law of this bill. I believe that if it were submitted to the people they would speak in unmistakable terms and it would be in condemnation. We were told two years ago that no legislation should pass, no confirmations should be made of presidential appointments, as they should be left to the incoming administration and the new Congress. I say now, if your advice was accepted by the Senators giving it, this bill never could pass the House of Representatives at the next session. A year ago it was offered in the House. Why is it not first considered there now?

The friends of the measure well know if it can be forced through the Senate it can be forced through the House in a very few hours, if necessary; but before this debate is closed, I predict now that Congress will hear from the people. Protests will come, and I think they will be in such form that those receiving them will understand what they mean. The protests will come after the information that has been given to the public through the press of the country reaches the man who lives upon his farm; the man who works in his shop; but I believe, Mr. President, that protests will make no difference in the result, as far as our Democratic friends are concerned, for they have received their instructions from another source, the die has been cast, the result predicted. We can afford to wait and see if the program can be forced through.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before yielding to my colleague I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that no business has been transacted since the call was last made for a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the call of a quorum is denied.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate that if this bill is put through, it will be put through with such rulings as the one which has just been made by the Chair. There has been vote after vote taken upon amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]; there has been vote after vote on roll calls. There has not been a suggestion made of the absence of a quorum in this body for hours; but I do not care for that, Mr. President; it is all right with me, and I am perfectly willing to yield to the request of my colleague.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought my colleague was about to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Utah——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was desirous of proceeding on the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: If the Senator from Utah will suspend a moment, the Chair wishes to announce that when he took the chair he was informed that no business had intervened since the last call for a quorum. Since the point has been raised, the Chair has investigated, and finds that he was in error. He therefore will recognize any Senator

for the purpose of calling for a quorum without the Senator from Utah losing the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not desire to suggest the absence of a quorum unless it is clearly understood that I am to resume the floor after the call has been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so understood, without objection.

Mr. JONES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	James	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Brady	Johnson	Overman	Smoot
Bristow	Jones	Owen	Sutherland
Burton	Kern	Perkins	Swanson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Pittman	Thomas
Chilton	Lane	Ransdell	Thompson
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Robinson	Vardaman
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	White
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Williams
Gronna	Myers	Shields	Works
Hollis	Nelson	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is recognized.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. OWEN. There are a number of Senators whose absence has not been permitted by the Senate who have not responded to the roll call. I demand that they appear before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Sergeant at Arms will enforce the writs that are in his hands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 20415. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916; and

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 20415. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make some observations upon the pending measure. Primarily I take the floor for the purpose of discussing some legal and constitutional features of the proposed legislation, but before I come to those I desire to discuss some of the practical features of the bill.

Mr. President, this measure, in my judgment, to say the least, is a most unfortunate one; but the methods by which it is sought to be put upon the statute books are worse than the measure itself.

Before the Government of the United States was organized the rule which was recognized was that the king commanded and the people obeyed. This Government of ours was founded upon the proposition that the people command and the Government obeys. This is a Government of the people. In order that the liberties of the people might be secure, the powers of government were delegated to three separate and distinct agencies: First, all legislative power was devolved upon the Congress—the House and the Senate; all executive power was devolved upon the President; and all judicial power was devolved upon the Supreme Court of the United States and such inferior courts as the Congress might from time to time ordain and establish.

Mr. President, there is no provision of the Federal Constitution that is wiser or more sacred than are those provisions which divide among these several agencies these separate powers of sovereignty. Let me call attention to what was said by Prof. Pomeroy in his work on Constitutional Law. I do not need to say to the Senate—at any rate, I do not need to say to the lawyers of the Senate—that Prof. Pomeroy was not only a great lawyer and a great law writer, but in his work upon Constitutional Law he has shown himself to be a great statesman as well. After speaking of the tripartite division of powers among these departments of the Government and discussing its origin and history, in section 170 he says:

> A proposition which is thus historically true must have some firm foundation in the nature of things. The possession of power is one of the most dangerous gifts which can fall to the lot of humanity. The tendency is always to its abuse. Power grows upon itself. In a perfect state it is not enough that the rulers at any given time should be perfect men. There must be checks so contrived as to resist the encroachments of authority which are to be apprehended, even from the purest and most patriotic rulers.

Now, mark this:

> No other check has proved so effectual as the division of functions into executive, legislative, and judicial and their assignment to classes of officials physically separate. If the legislature were also judges, their decisions would not be based upon the law as it is; but as it would be impossible for the same men to keep their two characters entirely distinct their judgments would rather be arbitrary enactments, special measures of legislation for each particular case. Thus all certainty as to law would be lost. If the same person or class of persons were to make and execute the laws—

That has direct application to the situation in which we find ourselves now—

> If the same person or class of persons were to make and execute the laws, the results would be still more disastrous, for in applying any particular statute whatever deficiency in its provisions had been left by the rulers in their legislative capacity could be easily supplied by them while acting in their executive capacity. Thus the laws instead of being general commands enjoining the observance of general rules would become special commands addressed to individual members of society. This uncertainty and special nature of the law is the very essence of an arbitrary and tyrannical government.

Mr. President, I believe that the Government of the United States has thus far in its history fulfilled its high mission, because under its Constitution these powers were vested in three independent and coordinate departments; and whenever the time arrives that one of these departments becomes the creature of another one of the departments, or whenever one of them shall exercise not only its own functions under the Constitution but the functions of either of the other departments, the end of popular liberty will be in sight and the end of the Government itself near at hand.

Our fathers understood the necessity of this, and they understood it far better than we do, because they were closer to the dangers which made this tripartite division of powers a necessary thing. The constitution of the State of Massachusetts declares what is implied in nearly every State constitution and which, although not declared in specific words, is clearly implied by the Constitution of the United States. That language, Mr. President, can not be too often repeated. Let me read it:

> In the government of this Commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end it may be a government of laws, and not of men.

That is to say, the citizen shall be bound by preestablished rules and not by the edicts of any person or of any persons, however numerous or however powerful they may be.

It is of the very essence of these several powers that they shall be exercised independently by the departments upon which they have been conferred. It is of the very essence of the division of powers among the several departments that these departments, which constitute the agencies of the people, shall be wholly independent of each other; so that when any one of these departments surrenders its power or its independence to either of the other departments it has not only violated the Constitution, but it has broken faith with the people who made the Constitution. Yet, Mr. President, that is precisely what has happened under this administration. The present administration came into power on March 4, 1913, nearly two years ago. Congress has been in session almost continuously from some time in April two years ago; and yet during that entire time I will defy any man to point to a single act of important legislation, outside of the appropriation bills, which has been originated in Congress, the lawmaking power charged with the duty and responsibility of originating legislation.

Thousands of bills have been introduced; thousands of bills have been originated in Congress; but, outside of those of trifling importance or of local application, none of them has been passed. The President has had a legislative program, and Congress, laying aside its power under the Constitution to originate legislation and put it upon the statute books, has permitted that power to be usurped by the President; so that the important legislation which we have passed has been framed at the White House or by a Cabinet officer and has been ratified by Congress.

Am I mistaken about that? The first important measure that we had to deal with was the tariff bill. Senators came from States vitally interested in preserving a duty upon sugar. Some of them, if I am credibly informed, had substantially promised their constituents that they would stand for a duty upon sugar; but whether they did or not, the sentiment of those communities was in favor of a duty upon sugar. The necessities of the State demanded that the duty should be preserved; but, one by one, they yielded their convictions and set aside the needs of their constituents in order to follow the command of the President. So the duty upon sugar was first reduced, and then, to take effect at a date in the future, it was put upon the free list.

The same thing may be said of wool. I undertake to say, without doubt in my own mind as to the truth of the assertion, that a clear majority of both Houses of Congress believed that there should be some duty retained both upon sugar and upon wool. Why, Mr. President, it is good Democratic doctrine and good Republican doctrine to maintain duties upon those two articles. True, the reasons for the maintenance of the duty are different with the two parties. The Republican Party believes in maintaining them in order to protect and foster those industries. The Democratic Party believes in maintaining the duties as a means of raising revenue. The Treasury of the United States is in a depleted condition. We have been compelled to resort to extraordinary taxation. We have provided for the collection of an emergency revenue, miscalled a war-revenue measure, because we are not at war; but we have been compelled to pass an emergency measure to collect by extraordinary taxation $100,000,000 a year. Why, Mr. President, we are losing half that sum upon these two articles alone. We were collecting, until the free-wool clause of the Underwood bill went into operation, $35,000,000 a year from the duties upon wool; we were collecting between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000 a year from the duties upon sugar. So, by one stroke of the pen we have kept out of the Treasury of the United States $35,000,000 in the case of wool, and already, by the reduction of 25 per cent of the duty upon sugar, $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 upon sugar; and when the free-sugar clause goes into final operation we shall have diverted from the Treasury of the United States an additional $45,000,000 from those causes alone. If the Payne-Aldrich bill had been in operation, it is perfectly plain that there would have been no lack of revenue; there would have been no occasion for resorting to emergency taxation. The President, in his message, as I recall it, asking for the passage of the emergency-tax law, said that we had been losing an enormous amount of revenue on account of the war in Europe.

He called attention to the fact that in August, 1913, the revenue of the Government from impost duties amounted to something over $30,000,000 for that month, and he said for the month of August, which was the first month of the war in Europe, the revenues amounted to $19,000,000. Hence there had been a loss to the Treasury of the United States of $11,000,000 a month on account of the war in Europe.

Mr. President, the statement, while, of course, not so intended, is entirely disingenuous. The President fails to distinguish between post hoc and propter hoc. A moment's investigation of the fact will show that this difference of $11,000,000 between the revenue of August, 1913, and the revenue of August, 1914, was not due to the war, but was due to the change in the tariff. Why do I say that? Because in August of 1913 the Payne-Aldrich Act, a protective law, was in operation; in August, 1914, the Underwood law, a free-trade measure, was in operation.

But that is not all. If you are going to ascertain how much of the loss of revenue was due to the war in Europe you must institute a comparison of the amounts received during different months when the same law was in operation. It proves nothing, so far as the effect of the war is concerned, to contrast one month when the Payne-Aldrich Act was in operation and another month when the Underwood Act was in operation, because to do so is to ignore the effect of the change in the two laws. Now, let us institute a comparison of that kind.

In August, 1913, the revenue was over $30,000,000. In August, 1914, it was approximately $19,000,000, a difference of $11,000,000. But the Underwood Act went into operation in October, 1913, and if you will take the figures for the months following October, 1913, you will see that the average amount of revenue received under the Underwood Act up to August 1, 1914, the date of the breaking out of the war, was about $21,000,000 per month. So it is perfectly apparent that $9,000,000 of the $11,000,000 was clearly due to a change in the tariff policy of the United States, and not to exceed $2,000,000 of it by any stretch of imagination can be ascribed to the hostilities in Europe.

But I have departed somewhat from the line of the argument which I had outlined. I was calling attention to the fact that all these important measures originated, were practically framed, in the White House. We passed the banking and currency law. Does anyone doubt that that was an administration measure pure and simple, a part of the executive program? We passed the so-called antitrust law and the trade-commission act, administration measures. We have pending before us bills of the most momentous importance to the country, and yet they can not be considered because the President's program at all hazards must be first carried into operation.

Mr. President, I deny that in any true sense the President is any part of the lawmaking power. He has the right, under the Constitution, to submit his views to Congress, and so far as the inception and passage of laws in Congress are concerned there his constitutional right ends. When the law has been considered and passed under the Constitution it must be submitted to the President, who then may exercise what is called the veto power. I know that has sometimes been described as a part of the legislative power, and yet, as I have said, it is not so in any real sense. It is simply a power in the President to say, "I think this law has not been properly considered; I think it is an unwise law; and therefore I will send it back to you without my approval, and before it can be passed there shall be a larger majority than merely one more than half; before it can go into operation it must have the approval of two-thirds of the membership of each body." But whether we can properly describe these powers of the President as a part of the lawmaking power or not, certain it is that by vesting the President with those powers we have in no way detracted from the fundamental principle upon which this division of powers is made, namely, that they shall be exercised by the several departments wholly independently of the others.

If the President has certain legislative functions to perform that does not make him a part of the legislative department; and it is just as improper, it is just as dangerous, it is just as much a perversion of his power to undertake to dictate to or control the action of Congress in passing a law as it would be for the House of Representatives to attempt to control or dictate what action should be taken by the Senate, and vice versa. These two Houses have always been jealous to maintain this prerogative, this high right of independence. The Senate would not tolerate even for one moment advice from the House of Representatives, let alone dictation, and the House, of course, would not tolerate advice or dictation as to its action from the Senate; yet both of them do supinely accept not only advice but dictation from a wholly separate and distinct department.

Let me read from Prof. Pomeroy a single sentence upon that subject. Speaking of the power of the President he says:

> He may communicate information, and recommend measures to the consideration of Congress. (Art. II, sec. 3.) But he can not directly set in motion any scheme of legislation; he must await the definitive action of the two Houses and add or refuse his consent to their perfected work.

That is the statement of Prof. Pomeroy, a man as deeply learned not only in the letter but in the philosophy and the underlying principles of the Constitution as any man who has ever studied or written upon the subject.

"He," the President, "can not directly set in motion any scheme of legislation." He has no such power. And yet the President has not only set in motion a scheme of legislation but he has practically set in motion, outside the appropriation bills, every important scheme of legislation which has had the consideration of Congress since this administration has been in power.

Mr. President, this is not a mere theory. It is a matter of profound and practical import. If the people of the United States intended that these departments should be independent of one another, they have a right to demand that they shall be kept independent of one another. Let me read one or two paragraphs, the appropriateness of which, I think, or at least I hope, will be apparent, from a book written by Mr. Franklin Pierce, of the New York bar, entitled "Federal Usurpations." He says:

> The President of the United States may approach the execution of his powerful office in the spirit of being a simple instrument of Providence, but if he is not endowed with the clearest head and most eminent common sense he will become so intoxicated by power as to imagine that he has become Providence itself.

Edward Livingston said:

The gloss of zeal for the public service is always spread over acts of oppression, and the people are sometimes made to consider that as a brilliant exertion of energy in their favor which, when viewed in its true light, would be found a fatal blow to their rights. In no government is this effect so easily produced as in a free republic; party spirit, inseparable from its existence, aids the illusion, and a popular leader is allowed in many instances immunity, and sometimes rewarded with applause, for acts which would make a tyrant tremble on his throne.

Mr. Pierce adds to that statement:

The people who elect the President can make and unmake constitutions, and it is natural for a strenuous, ambitious President, when sustained by the people, to feel that he is endowed with powers beyond the Constitution.

In other words, if I understand the author, the President, knowing that the people have the power to make the Constitution and also the power to put him into office, concludes from that that he has some power superior to the Constitution itself.

I wish a few of the old-line Democrats who in past debates have graced this body by their presence were here to listen to this. I wish my very delightful friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], might listen to the quotation I am about to read. It is a quotation from Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party. It was written in a letter to William C. Jarvis. He said:

If the three powers of our Government maintained their mutual independence of each other it may last long, but not so if either can assume the authority of the other.

And Madison said:

If it be a fundamental principle of free government that the legislative, executive, and judiciary powers should be *separately* exercised—

The word "separately" there is emphasized by being put in italics—

should be *separately* exercised, it is equally so that they be *independently* exercised.

Here is a quotation from Chief Justice Chase—an opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States:

It is the intention of the Constitution that each of the great coordinate departments of the Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—shall be in its sphere independent of the others.

How can a department be said to be independent of another department when it takes orders from that department as to what it shall do?

And, again, here is a quotation from James Wilson, one of the framers of the Constitution, a profound constitutional lawyer, as everybody knows:

The independence of each power—or department of government—consists in this—

I invite special attention to this language—

consists in this, that its proceedings, and the motives, views, and purposes which produce these proceedings, should be free from the remotest influence, direct or indirect, of either of the other two powers.

We have gone a long way during the last two years from that doctrine, that this independent coordinate branch of the Government should be free not only from influences which are direct, but influences which are indirect or which produce their proceedings by the remotest influence.

Mr. President, it is high time that there was a return on the part of this body to fundamental principles. Here is an incident in history which I commend to my friends upon the other side of the Chamber or, rather, my friend on the other side of the Chamber, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who honors me with his presence. There was pending in Parliament in the year 1783 a bill which had for its object the organization of the Government of India. There was very great objection to this bill on the part of a large number of people. Those people claimed that the bill would result in, and that indeed was the object of the bill, the centralization of patronage in the hands of a few Whigs. George III was then King of England, and George III requested Lord Temple to inform the members of the House of Lords that any peer who should vote in favor of that bill would be regarded as an enemy of the King.

If the King had any patronage that a lord of the realm wanted—such things existed in those days as they do in these days—it was tantamount to informing him that he should expect no favors of that character.

Mr. President, the House of Commons, representing the people of England, and speaking upon this matter, although the bill itself was not a popular bill, although the sentiment of the people generally was with the desire of the King that it should not pass—the House of Commons of England, which is and has been for many years the real governing body of England, the body in which in reality the sovereignty of Great Britain is vested, made this reply to George III of England. Four days after that word had been sent by the King the House of Commons passed this resolution:

To report any opinion or pretended opinion of His Majesty upon any bill or other proceeding pending in either House of Parliament with a view to influencing the votes of the members is a high crime and misdemeanor, derogatory to the honor of the Crown, a breach of the fundamental principles of Parliament, and subversive to the constitution of this country.

Mr. President, that was the reply which the House of Commons of England more than a hundred years ago, before our Constitution was framed, made to the attempt of the monarch to impose his will, directly or indirectly, upon one of the houses of Parliament.

Sir, we have fallen upon evil times when this great body, representing the majesty and power and strength of a hundred millions of the most intelligent and freest people that the world has ever seen, will not resent the attempt of the President of the United States to tell them what they should and what they should not do.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah tell us from what book he has read?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have been reading from Pierce on Federal Usurpation.

Not only, Mr. President, does the President of the United States tell Congress what it shall and shall not do, but a few of the Members of the majority side who might be inclined to be recalcitrant are whipped into line by means of the secret caucus whip—not all of them, but some of those who are thus inclined. That has been the case as to practically every one of these important measures which have been considered. It is the case here.

The place for debate is upon the floor of this forum in the presence, and to all practical intents and purposes within the hearing, of all our constituents; but that is denied. Effective debate in the Senate of the United States has ceased. Debate which brings about any result is confined to the caucus room, from which the constituents of all those who attend the caucus are excluded. Notwithstanding that, complaint is made at the prolongation of this debate by the minority Members of the body.

Mr. President, I do not believe in filibustering; I would not do it except where I believed it to be necessary to avert a very great danger to the Republic. There has been thus far perfectly legitimate debate upon this bill; but if the minority Members of this body by any legitimate parliamentary means could succeed in defeating this bill, in my deliberate judgment they would be performing a very great and a very valuable service to the country.

Mr. President, what does this bill propose to do? It proposes, for the first time in our history, undisguisedly to put the Government of the United States into private business. It proposes the Government ownership and operation of ships engaged in the carrying trade between this country and foreign lands.

I am not going to stop to discuss what I conceive to be the evils of Government ownership; I think they are many. Not the least among them is that it has a tendency to break down, and ultimately must break down, the fundamental principle upon which this Government was established, namely, that it is a civil government and not a business organization.

In my deliberate judgment, whatever may be the case with reference to a State or a municipality, the Federal Government has no more power under the Constitution to engage in private business than private business, under the Constitution, has the right to engage in government. Not only does the Government propose to engage in this private business, but it proposes to engage in it in competition with its own citizens, whose rights and privileges the Government which engages in competition with them is bound, under the Constitution, to regulate, preserve, and protect.

It is bad enough for the Government to engage in a business of this kind if it takes possession of the entire field, but it does not propose to do that. It takes possession of part of the field. It may run at a loss, recouping its losses by general taxation, in competition with the private citizen who can not sustain losses without failure. So that, in addition to being a departure from fundamental principles and unwise in itself, it is vicious, because its effect will be to drive the private competitor from a field which the Government has made no preparation to fill.

I do not know, Mr. President, where the scheme of Government ownership will lead us. The Postmaster General has been pressing upon us for some time a scheme for taking over the telegraph and telephone lines. Other gentlemen are in favor of taking possession of the railways of the country. If we persist along that line, taking over those activities which

have always been considered heretofore as activities of the private citizen, we must end inevitably in so loading down the General Government with duties and responsibilities wholly apart from its governmental functions as will result in breaking the Government down entirely.

The legitimate increase of the exercise of power is fast loading down the Government almost to the breaking point. Is it wise to add to that these other responsibilities, which will still more add to that tendency? Why, sir, if we take over the shipping interests, the telegraph and telephone interests, the railroad interests of the country, together with the employees now under the Government of the United States, we shall have a pay roll of more than 3,000,000 people. If we keep on in that direction, after a while the Government will be supporting so many that nobody will be left to support the Government. Think of the power that could be exercised by 3,000,000 voting citizens of the United States! They could control, by organized effort, the politics of the United States until there is an uprising and a revolution among the people. The whole tendency, in my judgment, is dangerous and vicious.

I said a moment ago that it was proposed that this business should be run at a loss. Mr. President, that is the intention. Let me call attention to a statement made by Mr. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, upon that subject:

The CHAIRMAN. Would not the Government, in that event, also obtain some control over the rates?

Secretary MCADOO. Precisely. I was coming to that. It is not only a question of establishing these routes, many of which will undoubtedly have to be operated at a loss for a time in order to establish the necessary trade relationships, but the Government will also have the power to establish rates that will be advantageous to American commerce.

Establish rates upon which the Government ships will be run at a loss! That may be advantageous for a limited period of time to the man whose goods are carried, but how about the man who is engaged in the carrying trade in competition with the Government?

On page 18 he says, further:

What we need is prompt and effective action. Then, again, as I said before, private corporations might operate these ships upon routes only which were profitable from the outset. Some of these lines undoubtedly will have to be operated at a loss for a time, until trade relations can be built up and established. One of the great objects here is to open up to this country some of these new markets.

Again, he says:

Of course, as I said before, it is not the expectation that every line that may be established if this bill is passed is going to be unprofitable, but some of them undoubtedly will be. I think the tendency will be to deter private capital, of course, from joining the Government in an enterprise of this kind. I think, however, the opportunity should be afforded private capital to take stock.

Mr. President, that is the most remarkable statement that I have ever heard as emanating from the lips of a great officer of a government, or that I have ever heard from anybody's lips. Let me repeat it:

I think the tendency will be to deter private capital, of course—

There is no doubt about that—

from joining the Government in an enterprise of this kind. I think, however, the opportunity should be afforded private capital to take stock.

They are not going to take it. It is perfectly apparent that they will not. Again, he says, just before that, in answer to a question:

Mr. HARDY. Is not the consideration you are discussing now one that would prevent private capital from taking any part of this stock?

Secretary MCADOO. Yes. I do not believe you can get private capital to take stock in any company that is going to be obliged for some time to operate the ships at a loss in order to build up trade.

What a farce it is to pass a bill to allow private capital to join in a Government enterprise and then say that the considerations are such as will prevent private capital from taking any part in it at all.

I do not believe you can get private capital to take stock in any company that is going to be obliged for some time to operate the ships at a loss in order to build up trade.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question only.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will permit me, Mr. HARDY pursued the matter a little further, and he said——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I shall have to ask the Senator to put his interruption in the form of an interrogatory, because I am afraid, under the intimations that have been made, that I may lose some rights.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I call attention, then, if the Senator will permit me, to the balance of Mr. HARDY's examination of Secretary McAdoo a little farther down on page 19.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (reading)—

Mr. HARDY. So that really you do not much expect private capital to come in?

Secretary MCADOO. To take part of this stock?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Secretary MCADOO. No; I do not.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is not too much to say that the very ideas behind the launching of this thing would exclude the likelihood of private capital being invested in a corporation of this kind?

Secretary MCADOO. As I say, the tendency, of course, will be to not encourage private capital to join with the Government in this particular enterprise.

So it is conceded by the chief sponsor for this bill, first of all, that the business is to be run at a loss, and second, that the tender in the bill to private capital to come in and invest is an idle ceremony, and that it is not expected the invitation will be accepted. How could it be otherwise?

There is another provision in the bill which says that this corporation shall pay no public taxes of any kind. I shall have occasion to discuss that feature of the bill a little later along as to its legality; but if it be legal, then we have put into private business, in competition with the private citizen, forty millions, perhaps in the end $50,000,000, an enormous sum of money, which is to be free from all taxation whatever, while the competitor of the Government is to continue his business bearing the burden of public taxation, including contributions to the Federal Government, which is his own competitor and which proposes practically to ruin him.

Mr. President, during the last Congress we passed a bill, called the Trade Commission bill, by which we created a Trade Commission, and among the duties of that commission we provided that they should deal with the subject of unfair methods of competition. That means something more than unfair competition. "Unfair competition" is a term perfectly understood, well known to the law. It means simply the attempt on the part of a person or a corporation to impose upon the public his goods or business as the goods or the business of another; but obviously that was too narrow a provision, so we inserted in that bill a provision making unlawful, not unfair competition, but unfair methods of competition. What are they? Things that are legally unfair methods of competition? Things that are economically unfair methods of competition? Things that are ethically unfair methods of competition? If we are to accept the statement of the Senator who had charge of the bill, and who ought to know, it includes all of them.

The Trade Commission is given the widest kind of latitude. I wonder what they would say in response to the question as to whether or not an enterprise set on foot by the Government of the United States, which proposes to pay no taxes upon it and to exact taxes from its competitors, which proposes in the beginning to run at a loss, recouping its losses by general taxation to which its competitors have no power to resort, and thus inevitably drive its competitors out of business, constitutes an unfair method of competition on the part of the Government of the United States?

Not only that, but a few months ago we passed a law through Congress, the terms of which are familiar to us all, and the object of which was to encourage investments of private capital in the shipping industry. While there were some features of that law that I did not like, I think that would be the tendency of it. I think it was helpful. I think it was passed some time in August. We passed this law, the effect of which was to invite private capital into this field, to say to them: "We have removed certain obstructions. We have passed a law which will make it profitable to you." What terms of condemnation can be imagined sufficiently strong to apply to a Congress which will first, by its legislation, invite private capital into a field by a promise of profits, and immediately follow it up by a law which makes it impossible for them to derive profits from the enterprise? If that is not playing fast and loose with the decencies which ordinarily would obtain among private citizens, then I do not understand what decencies are.

Mr. President, I predict that if this bill is passed and goes into operation it will drive more American ships from the sea than it will ever add Government ships to the sea. This bill was introduced in the latter part of August, months ago. Its effect has been already to discourage private citizens from going into this enterprise. It has hung as a menace over their heads for all these months. I believe that if this measure had not been introduced, if we had been content to rest upon the legislation which we passed in August of last year, even the proponents of this measure would now admit that there was no necessity for passing it. It is the threat of this legislation which has kept American capital from this field. Meddlesomeness of the Government of the United States in a private business in which it has no power to engage has kept this situation as it is, until to-day it affords a specious reason for the Government going into it.

Why, Mr. President, I do not believe there is any scarcity of ships for the trade. If I understand the statistics upon the

question, during the war there has been retired a tonnage equal to about 5,000,000 tons out of the total world tonnage of about 47,000,000 tons. That has been retired in a variety of ways—first, by the ships of some of the belligerent powers voluntarily seeking asylum in our ports and voluntarily submitting practically to imprisonment because they feared if they continued in business they would be captured. That will account for a very large proportion of the 5,000,000 tonnage. Then, a part of the ships heretofore engaged in the mercantile trade have been taken over to meet the military exigencies; and in a variety of ways, due to the war, about 5,000,000 of tonnage capacity have been withdrawn from the carrying trade of the world.

In the first place, I think it is reasonably clear that that 5,000,000 tonnage is largely offset by the loss of trade consequent upon the war. The German trade, of course, has fallen off tremendously. The Austrian trade has fallen off tremendously—first, because they can no longer export with the same facility, and second, because they can no longer import goods with the same facility. Other causes due to the war have brought about the retirement of additional tonnage, until I think it is not open to reasonable question that perhaps the equivalent of this loss of 5,000,000 tonnage has been offset by a like loss in the trade of the world. If that be so, where is the gap that is to be filled by this bill?

There are other troubles—not the scarcity of ships. There are plenty of ships, but there is a variety of other troubles. One of them is the trouble of unloading facilities. We know that ships have been held up for weeks in foreign ports because of the lack of unloading facilities, lack of labor, and so on.

I read, upon this subject, an editorial from the New York Times of January 18, 1915, very recent:

There is an odd contrast between the Washington theory that there is a deficiency of ships and the actual conditions on both sides of the ocean. On this side there is a supply of grain ships so large that there is a demand for an embargo to prevent our foodstuffs being bought away from us too fast and at prices higher than we like to pay. On the other side the ships are arriving faster than they can unload. At London there are 56 ships anchored awaiting their turn to be unloaded. At Genoa 54 are awaiting pier facilities. In the words of Mr. Franklin, of the International Mercantile Marine:

"One of the most serious things the shipping trade has to contend with during the present acute situation is the great congestion in the ports abroad. As a result, steamers are doing only half the work they could do under normal conditions. It is impossible to get them unloaded. Hence there is no use trying to charter additional ships to go to these congested ports, because we could not get them returned. It takes under current conditions 11 steamers to do the work of 5."

There is the explanation, Mr. President, or one of the explanations.

Mr. Franklin's own company has 20,000 tons of undischarged cargo at Tilbury Dock, London, and there are similar conditions at the Albert Dock. There is a scarcity of longshoremen, and the lighters have been commandeered to make a boat bridge. Upon this scarcity supervenes an unusual number of arrivals due to the clearing of the German commerce raiders from the seas. Conditions in France are similar, although German prisoners are being used to handle the cargoes.

There is a double application of these facts to the Government's shipping proposals. The intention is to reduce unreasonable freight rates. But under such conditions as these the rates do not appear unreasonable. Delays are costly, and incidental expenses can not be calculated on any ordinary scale. No Government could do anything to alleviate such local conditions across the ocean, and the increased costs, which are so serious to private management, would multiply still faster under public and inexperienced and disinterested control. In the second place, these are obvious and well-known conditions to all in the trade, but have been quite overlooked by those who thought that ships alone were necessary to carry cargoes. Terminals are as necessary to ships as to railways and to canals, but the terminals were as much an afterthought to the projectors of the New York State Canal as to the proposed Federal ships, with a consequent revision of the bill of costs. It is wholesome to be under the necessity of earning profits, and that is why it is dangerous to intrust public officials with unlimited power of spending tax money in commercial undertakings.

Again, in the course of another editorial, it is said:

The argument against Government shipping is as strong on theory as on facts, and has been formally draughted by the Boston Maritime Association. It recalls that freights are always dear during a war, and always collapse. The reason is that the war creates an artificial scarcity which disappears with its cause. Five million tons of shipping are now lying in harbors idle. To build more tonnage is only to waste money by creating superabundance, at a time when there is an equal scarcity of cargo through depression of trade due to the war. There are now tied up at Boston four steel steamships for which cargo can not be found, and the association has a list of 200,000 tons available if the rates would compensate for a round trip. The African and Australian tonnage can not extemporize trade hither, and they are importing much that they have been accustomed to export. Government ships are not the remedy for conditions so obscure, abnormal, and contradictory as these. It is better to endure brief abnormal conditions than to sink capital in committing Government to ungovernmental functions, opening the way to further objectionable innovations of the same sort. Tonnage is scarce to some places. Rates are high to some ports. But the burden falls upon the trade which bears it, while the loss of capital and taxes due to the Government line would fall upon those in no traceable relation to the speculation. Government could not possibly apply the remedy so well as the operations of those directly in the trade. They are concerned solely with economic considerations. Those assisting the Government to make a case have no responsibility and have many reasons for their action apart from the public interest.

And so I could go on almost indefinitely quoting matters of that character, which show that the difficulty is not due to a lack of ships, but due to other causes, such as I have indicated already, and such as are indicated by these editorials.

This bill is confessedly an emergency measure. The President himself makes that clear in his address on the subject, where he says:

It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw. I very earnestly hope that the Congress will be of this opinion, and that both Houses will adopt this exceedingly important bill.

So it is manifest that this bill is not intended as a permanent policy on the part of the Government but to meet an emergency. The question then arises, What is this emergency? It is not a lack of ships. The only emergency which anyone has been able to state is that rates are unusually high. Is that an emergency which justifies the Government in going into the business of carrying goods from this country to foreign countries? If so, whenever the price of wheat is raised to an excessive amount, the price of cattle to an excessive amount, or any other commodity, then that constitutes an emergency which justifies the Government in taking hold of the business.

But how about these high rates? They have been brought about in the main by obvious conditions. I grant you that the people who are engaged in the shipping trade have the ordinary amount of selfishness which attaches to humanity. Undoubtedly they desire to make as much out of their business as they can, and it may be that they have taken advantage of this situation to some extent and unduly lifted their rates, but that is one of the ordinary things which happen at a time like this.

Now, what are the conditions which should be expected to increase rates? These ships which ply between this country and foreign countries are in danger of being blown to pieces from mines with which the sea over there has been sown. They go in fear of capture and the expense incident to capture. There is the delay in the handling of ships. There is the increased cost of unloading. There is the increased cost of insurance and a variety of causes that it is impossible to enumerate, but which we can all realize exist, which have had a natural and to be expected tendency to raise rates.

But grant that there is a condition of existing high rates; is this measure calculated to reduce them? Let us look at it a moment.

I have already said that the entire tonnage of the world was 47,000,000 tons and that the loss of tonnage due to the war was something over 5,000,000 tons. The number of ships represented by this tonnage is more than 30,000—nearly 31,000 ships. A very large proportion—I do not know how many—are engaged in trade between this country and other countries.

Now, due to the condition I have described, these rates have become excessive, we will say. What does the Government of the United States propose to do? It proposes to put into the shipping business the sum of $40,000,000. How many ships will that purchase? Nobody has said that it will purchase more than a hundred. The best information I can obtain upon the cost of construction and the cost of purchase of ships at this time indicates that it will procure a tonnage capacity of about half a million tons—half a million against 47,000,000.

Mr. President, I do not see how that comparatively small addition can materially affect rates. Suppose the Government of the United States were to provide for running a freight train from New York to San Francisco once a month, through the year, at losing rates, in competition with the vast railroad business of the country; does anyone think that that would affect rates? There would be a scramble of people to get their goods aboard that train, but, with the vast business, the quantity that could be carried in that way would be so trifling that it would not affect rates at all.

So it does not appear to me that this addition to the tonnage capacity will materially affect rates. Indeed, it may have the effect of increasing rates. In all probability it has had the effect. In all probability the threat of the legislation has had the effect to increase rates, because the effect of it has been and will continue to be to discourage the investment of American capital which would have gone into this enterprise to a very large amount if it had not been for this threatened legislation. So the effect of it is to discourage American investment, and to that extent discourage shippers engaged in the trade, and in the end instead of adding to the tonnage capacity it is very likely to subtract from it.

Now, I call attention to the testimony upon that subject in the House hearings, pages 49 and 50. Mr. Edmonds testified. He was asked how large a merchant fleet this amount of money would afford.

Mr. EDMONDS. You mean how many ships would it buy?
Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, in tonnage, we will say. Of course the number of ships would depend on the size of the ships.
Mr. EDMONDS. I could not give you the tonnage. An ordinary eight to ten thousand ton passenger ship, according to the conditions, would cost from a million to a million and a half dollars, according to the way you build it.
Mr. SAUNDERS. From a million to a million and a half dollars?
Mr. EDMONDS. Yes. Now, if it is a freight boat it would cost to build in this country $600,000, of the same size. You might be able to build it, according to conditions, down to as low as $450,000.
Mr. SAUNDERS. With reference to the carrying trade, then, this $10,000,000——
Mr. EDMONDS. $40,000,000.
Mr. SAUNDERS. No, not $40,000,000; $10,000,000—would not get a very large fleet.
Mr. EDMONDS. No; the $10,000,000 would not. I have given it as $40,000,000. I have set it at the outside.

That is the only testimony I am able to find. Of course, the Senate declined to grant any hearings upon this vital subject at all, and the House contented itself with hearings which did not invite experts upon the subject at all to testify, but which confined the testimony to that of the Secretary of the Treasury, the proponent of the bill, and a statement of one or two Members of Congress. So, that is the only information of an authentic character I have been able to obtain upon that subject.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. NELSON. Has the Senator observed what the Treasury Department states in its report sent in here, part 2, Executive Document 673? It was sent into the Senate on the 27th of this month. There are the names of 22 ships there offered for sale, and it gives the price of each and the net tonnage of each. Has the Senator observed that? Has the Senator noticed the fact that the prices given for those vessels amount to over $12,000,000 and that the net tonnage of the whole is only 87,972, less than 100,000 tonnage, costing over $12,000,000? Has the Senator noticed that document?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I had not observed that; but I am obliged to the Senator from Minnesota for calling my attention to it. It indicates that the estimates I have given upon the subject are too large.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator will find it on page 102, Exhibit 76. There is the list. I commend it to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to it.

Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss the practical features of this bill to the extent I have done. As I said, I rose primarily to discuss some legal and constitutional phases, and to those questions I desire now to address myself.

Let us see what this bill proposes to do. By section 1 it proposes—

That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation.

Which is to be organized in the District of Columbia. Now, note what this corporation is to do:

Said corporation shall have for its object the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes.

Those are the purposes for which this corporation is to be formed. What is the relation of this corporation to the General Government? It is a mere agency. Because it is a corporation it is not any less nor any more an agency than if the same things were to be done by a Government board, or, indeed, by a single individual. So we may consider this bill stripped of the corporation feature, so far as the constitutional question is concerned.

It is manifest that the Government of the United States can not exercise the power through a corporation which it could not exercise through any agent or which it could not exercise through a Cabinet officer. The corporation, I repeat, is a mere agency through which the Government carries into operation this power.

Therefore the Government of the United States by this proposed legislation goes into the carrying business. The Government of the United States becomes a common carrier of goods, which is essentially a private business. To carry goods by railroad or by ship is no different in principle than to carry the same goods upon a cart. To carry a trunk from the Willard Hotel to the Union Depot has never hitherto been supposed to be a governmental function. It is private business. We are confronted at the very threshold of this legislation with the question, Has the Government of the United States any authority to engage in private business? If so, I want some proponent of this measure to point me to the language in the Constitution which confers any such power.

Now, the powers of this corporation are to be limited to these purposes by another provision of the bill. They are to be limited to the purposes that I have read and such as are necessarily incident thereto. Indeed, the corporation is not in substance a self-governing body, as an ordinary corporation would be. It is nominally so, but in effect it is not. It is under the dominating control of the shipping board, which, everybody will concede, is purely a governmental agency. Let me call attention to some of the provisions of the bill which show that—

The members of said shipping board, as incorporators, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act form a corporation of the District of Columbia by making and filing a certificate of incorporation—

And so on.

The members of the shipping board, therefore, set the machinery in motion. They incorporate the company. Then it provides that—

The stock owned by the United States shall be voted by the shipping board or its duly selected representative.

That is, the shipping board has control of the stock, and that stock constitutes a control of the corporation, because it must be 51 per cent; not less.

Trustees and officers are provided for for this corporation. They are merely figureheads, because another provision of the bill is that—

Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by vote of a majority of the stockholders at any meeting thereof.

Not a regular or a called meeting. Whenever this shipping board, holding control of this stock, get together and hold a meeting, which it may do without notice, it may, without cause, remove every trustee, every governing officer of this corporation, and put others in their places. These officers are the mere creatures of this shipping board. While nominally they are given certain powers, in reality they may be shorn of every power at a word from this shipping board.

And again:

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purposes of such corporation.

Then it provides that they shall be transferred. This board of trustees is not even given the power to purchase the property of the corporation. The vessels which constitute the stock in trade of this corporation are not to be purchased by them. They have nothing to say about it. The shipping board, this governmental agency, is to purchase all the ships or construct the ships. The corporation has no power in that regard at all. The shipping board is the whole thing. Not only is this shipping board given the power to purchase ships, but they are given the power to go into the manufacturing business and put in any scheme they please within the limits of $40,000,000; to set up a shipyard if they please. There is no limitation upon it; they may construct vessels suitable in the judgment of the shipping board, but not in the judgment of the trustees of the corporation.

And again:

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to any such corporation in which the United States has become a stockholder as hereinbefore provided, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds.

The trustees have nothing to say about it. The shipping board may purchase vessels or may construct a vessel and may impose those vessels upon this corporation, whether the trustees think it is a wise investment or not. They have nothing to say about it.

And again:

Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges—

How?

under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board.

And again, the shipping board is given the power—

to do all things necessary, whether specifically enumerated or not, to carry out the purposes of this act and protect the interests of the United States.

And again:

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer such naval auxiliaries—

And so on—

suitable for commercial use * * * to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe.

Mr. President, why was this corporation organized at all? It has no powers. It can exercise no control over the ordinary

functions of the corporation. The shipping board is the controlling body.

Not only is the shipping board the controlling body with reference to the business of this corporation, but by another extraordinary provision they are given power to make all rules and regulations not only to control this corporation, but all the sea traffic that comes into and departs from the ports of the United States; in other words, the shipping board is given the power to make rules and regulations which will control to a very great extent, within the limits of the general law, the activities of their competitors in the business.

Why, sir, since civil government was established upon the earth no such extraordinary provision has ever found its way into a law. What would be thought of the proposition to invest the Postmaster General of the United States, who is engaged in the parcel-post business, and to the extent that he is engaged in it is a competitor of the express companies of the United States—what would be thought of a proposition to invest that officer with the power of regulating and controlling the express companies of the United States, fixing their rates, regulating them to the extent that the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates them—to put in the hands of an officer of the Government engaged in competition the power to regulate and control a competitor? This is to be done really by three private citizens; that is, three citizens who are private except for their activities upon this board, because the three private citizens constitute the majority of the board.

Mr. President, this corporation is therefore, if it is anything, a mere device, an agency of the Government, by and through which the Government has entered the business of transportation. It constitutes an agency of the Government for this purpose in the same way as would an individual, a public officer, or a board with similar powers, as I have already stated substantially; in other words, suppose, instead of creating this corporation, which is a circumstance of no consequence in this consideration, Congress had passed a law proposing to put into the hands of an individual named $40,000,000 with which to buy ships to go into the carrying trade as an agent of the United States; the principle would be the same. At the very threshhold, therefore, of this discussion we are confronted with the pertinent and vital inquiry, Under what provision of the Constitution is this proposed enterprise to be justified?

Mr. President, this is a Government of enumerated powers. Congress can exercise no power that is not granted by the Constitution in express terms or implied as necessary and proper to carry the expressed powers into operation. Under the Constitution what are the powers? They are of two classes: First, there are the substantive powers, or what are called the expressed powers; and, second, there are the ancillary powers, or what have been generally designated as the implied powers. What are these ancillary powers as plainly shown by the language of the Constitution? They are simply powers which the Government may exert not as ends in and of themselves, but as the means of carrying the substantive or enumerated powers into operation. This is made clear by the language of the Constitution, whose very first provision is—now mark this language—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Congress by that is not vested with all legislative power, but it is vested with such legislative power as is granted by the Constitution, which implies clearly a limitation upon its legislative power. In the case of the States, generally speaking, the Constitution confers all legislative power upon the legislature except such as is expressly withdrawn from it by prohibitory provisions. So before an ordinary legislative power can be denied to a State legislature we must find in the State constitution a prohibition against it. Exactly the converse of that is the rule with reference to the Constitution of the United States. Before the Congress of the United States can exert legislative power, it must not only not be forbidden by the Constitution, but it must be found expressly conferred in the Constitution. These powers the Constitution itself, with great care, proceeds to enumerate, and it concludes with this general power:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By the tenth amendment to the Constitution it is provided:

> ARTICLE X.
>
> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Congress, therefore, in the exercise of its substantive powers, must confine itself strictly to the grants enumerated in the Constitution. It has a wide range of choice, it is true, as to the means which it shall adopt to this end. That has been declared over and over again by the Supreme Court of the United States, and never more clearly than by Mr. Justice Brewer, speaking for the court in the Kansas-Colorado case (206 U. S., 89). He says:

> But the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a Government of enumerated powers. That this is such a Government clearly appears from the Constitution independently of the amendments, for otherwise there would be an instrument granting certain specified things made operative to grant other and distinct things. This natural construction of the original body of the Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment—

To which I have just called attention—

> This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such a contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure—

Now listen. Language could not have been more apposite if the learned judge had had this very bill in mind—

> This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted. With equal determination the framers intended that no such assumption should ever find justification in the organic act, and that if in the future further powers seemed necessary they should be granted by the people in the manner they had provided for amending that act. It reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." The argument of counsel ignores the principal factor in this article, to wit, the people.

Not the States alone. The powers which are reserved, which are not granted to the United States, not delegated to the United States, are reserved not only to the States, but, in the alternative, to the people, because there may be powers that are denied the States. There may be powers that conceivably are not to be exercised by either Government, and in that case they are reserved to the people.

> Its principal purpose was not the distribution of power between the United States and the States, but a reservation to the people of all powers not granted.

Now, mark that—

> But a reservation to the people of all powers not granted. The preamble of the Constitution declares who framed it, "We, the people of the United States," not the people of one State but the people of all the States, and Article X reserves to the people of all the States the powers not delegated to the United States.

Mr. President, that throws a flood of light upon this question. The bill under consideration has nothing to do with any of the enumerated powers, unless it be with that power which authorizes Congress to regulate commerce. Nobody has pretended that there is any other grant of power to which it might by the remotest possibility be attached. Is this bill, therefore, a regulation of commerce? If it is, it is valid; if it is not, it is utterly void. There is no half-way ground. Either this bill is valid or it is void. If it is a regulation of interstate or foreign commerce, it is valid; if it is not a regulation of commerce, whatever else it may be, it is absolutely null and void.

Now let us read the commerce clause of the Constitution:

> To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

What is the power that is conferred? It is the power to regulate, not the power to do something else. When a power is sought to be exercised under that clause, that power must be regulation. The thing to be regulated is commerce and not something else. Therefore Congress can not regulate something which is not commerce. It can not regulate manufacturing; it can not regulate anything else except commerce; and it can not do with commerce anything that does not fall within the term "regulation." Congress is just as powerless to pass a law, under this provision of the Constitution, which undertakes to deal with commerce in some other way than by regulation, as it is to regulate an activity or a thing which does not fall within the term "commerce."

The pending bill undoubtedly deals with commerce, but does it regulate commerce? What is a regulation of commerce? Fortunately we have a multitude of authoritative definitions, all to the same effect, the most comprehensive of which, I think, was that stated by Mr. Justice Barbour, a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, but at the time of making this statement a Member of Congress. His statement was as follows, and I call the attention of the lawyers of the Senate to his definition:

> To regulate commerce among the several States means the right to prescribe the manner, terms, and conditions on which that commerce should be carried on.

To engage in commerce is not to regulate it. The act and the regulation of the act are two wholly separate and distinct things. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly defined the power, as in Gibbons *v.* Ogden (9 Wheat., 196, 197).

It is there defined as the power "to prescribe the rule according to which commerce should be carried on." There is in the case of Welton *v.* Missouri (91 U. S., 275–279) a rather more elaborate definition than that. That definition is as follows:

The term "regulate commerce" as it is used in the clause of the Federal Constitution authorizing Congress to regulate commerce means to prescribe rules by which it shall be governed; that is, the conditions upon which it shall be conducted.

How can the conducting of the business be regarded as a prescription of the conditions upon which it shall be conducted? The opinion continues:

To determine how far it shall be free and untrammeled, how far it shall be burdened by duties and imposts, and how far it shall be prohibited.

I read from Words and Phrases, volume 7, beginning at page 6041, some definitions which all bear out this definition which I have read. I read them because they carry the force of the definition by illustrations. Here is one:

To regulate means to adjust by rule, method, or established mode, to direct by rule or restriction, to subject to governing principles or laws—

Citing a number of authorities.

Again:

"Regulation" as used in the title of the ordinance for the regulation of street parades, etc., means the control and government thereof, the word necessarily implying that street parades are lawful, but that certain restrictions may be necessary to preserve the public from harm.

Now, let me pause at that point. Here is the power given to regulate street parades. If the government of that city should pass an ordinance providing for a street parade, instituting a street parade as a substantive thing, would that be a regulation of a street parade?

Again:

"Regulate" means to subject to governing principles; to rule; to govern.

"Regulate" as used in constitution, article 4, section 25—

That is, I suppose, the constitution of California—

declaring that the legislature shall not pass any special or local law regulating county and township business, or in a case where a general law is applicable, means to prescribe a rule for acting, to direct a mode in which a transaction shall be conducted, the word being derived from the Latin word "rego," signifying to guide or direct, through the noun "regula," a rule.

So that, according to that definition, to regulate means to guide or direct the activity or the thing by means of a rule.

Hence an act directing a board of supervisors of a city and county to pay a certain claim is invalid.

Why? Because it does not direct the way in which they shall do it by rule, but it directs the doing of it.

A right to regulate the running of cars means, according to the ordinary acceptance of the term "regulate," to prescribe rules or laws by which the running of cars within a city is to be governed; and the power may, without any strained construction, well apply to the means or force by which the cars are propelled. A right to "regulate the running" seems ex vi termini to imply the authority to regulate the power by which they are driven.

It may be conceded that the creation of a corporation to engage in or the regulation of a corporation already engaged in commerce may constitute a regulation of commerce. That need not be disputed. That is, it may be conceded that Congress may provide that corporations, in order to engage in interstate or foreign commerce, must be of a certain character, or even that they must be brought into existence under a law of the United States. I concede that for the sake of the argument, although I think there is some doubt about the power; but it may be conceded, so far as this bill is concerned, that Congress has that power—the power to say that only a certain character of corporation shall engage in interstate commerce; the power to say that only a corporation organized under the laws of the United States shall engage in interstate commerce. I think there is very grave doubt about that, because I think the purpose of the Constitution was simply to regulate a thing which had a rightful existence independently of the Federal Government, and I am very much disposed to think that the right to engage in trade on the part of the citizens of the State or an artificial creation of the State is a right which can not be taken away by Federal legislation. But if we may go that far and concede the power of Congress to that extent, that is not the effect nor the purpose of this bill. The bill does not provide for the organization of a corporation or corporations as a means by which the Government of the United States regulates commerce, but it provides for a corporation as a means or a device by which the Government itself undertakes to engage in commerce.

Mr. President, nothing like it has ever before been attempted in all our history. There is not only no constitutional warrant for any such step, but it is a socialistic experiment entirely outside of the purposes of the Federal Government, dangerous as a precedent and far-reaching in its consequences.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia so far as I can yield without losing any rights which I have to the floor.

Mr. CHILTON. I will keep within the rule. I simply want to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator favor a subsidy to aid in building up a merchant marine?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, that is a subject about which I have not fully made up my mind.

Mr. CHILTON. The Senator admits that we must justify that upon the same clause or clauses in the Constitution upon which we would justify what is being done by this bill, does he not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. It might be justified under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. CHILTON. Is not that the one the Senator is talking about?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the granting of money to an individual to conduct his own trade, to stimulate his own trade, to facilitate his trade, or stimulate trade generally, is a very different thing from the Government of the United States carrying on that trade.

Mr. CHILTON. If the Senator will answer just one other question while I am on my feet: Does the Senator distinguish between a bonus to railroads, like the Government granted to the transcontinental railroads years ago, and a subsidy, and what is being done here now? Are they not all of the same character?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, not at all, Mr. President.

Mr. CHILTON. Was that regulating commerce when the Government granted a bonus to a railroad company for the purpose of building a railroad? Was that regulating? Was it not aiding in it and taking a part in it and an interest in it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the grant of lands to the Pacific railroads is to be justified under a wholly different provision of the Constitution—the one which provides that the Congress of the United States may dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations for the territory and other property of the United States. It is under that clause. This was property of the United States, its public lands, and Congress was given the power to dispose of those lands; and, being given the power without limitations, Congress could dispose of them in any way it saw fit. It is no more a regulation of commerce to do that than the passage of the irrigation law is a regulation of commerce. The passage of the irrigation law was to be justified upon the same clause, because if the Government of the United States has the power to dispose of its lands, and those lands are arid, and they can not be disposed of without putting them into some other condition, it has the implied power to put them in a condition to be disposed of. The irrigation law simply provided for a method of furnishing water for those lands, and thereby putting them in a condition to be disposed of. It was under that clause of the Constitution that the Pacific lands were granted. It was under that clause of the Constitution that we passed the irrigation law.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him one other question at this point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHILTON. I can understand how the Senator can possibly make a distinction—whether it is sound or not, the Senate will determine later—as to disposing of land or giving away the property of the United States. If the Senator wants to make that distinction between the property of the United States and the money which may be derived from that property, that is for him and not for me to criticize; but I do want to ask the Senator what he says as to that part of the transaction other than giving the property away, to wit, wherein the Government had an interest in the property and a certain right to the control of that property? The Senator recollects what that was. How does he reconcile that with the position he now takes?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Government, in effect, had a lien, just as it might have a lien upon any piece of property.

Mr. CHILTON. And appointed directors for the railroad.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now, wait. The Government had a lien, just as it might have a lien upon the Senator's property. If the Government of the United States were to obtain a judgment against the Senator, it would have a lien upon his property, which could be enforced by seizing the property and selling it, and then it would become the property of the United States to do with it as it pleased. It had a lien upon the Pacific Railway

property in the same way, not by a judgment but in a different way, but a lien, nevertheless, which it could enforce, and it could use all means that were necessary and proper to that end. The question of the Pacific Railroads is complicated by a variety of things. The Congress was evidently doubtful as to just what provision of the Constitution it could justify its action under. When the Pacific Railroad law was passed and the grants made we were undertaking to open up that country out there, and the Congress were driven to find some authority for it. They put it upon the war power, in the legislation. They provided that it was to be utilized to transport troops. They said it was to be utilized as a post road. They put it upon a variety of clauses.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. What trouble does the Senator find in justifying this bill under the Constitution with reference to the provision for naval auxiliaries and military transports?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the provision for turning over the naval auxiliaries to this corporation is a mere incident of it. It may or may not be done. It is not the primary thing sought to be done. I concede that if we were to pass a law such as is proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] in his substitute, providing for the expenditure of $40,000,000 to purchase ships as auxiliaries of the Navy, those ships when not in use by the Navy to be leased to private citizens, we would be within our power. We would be within the war power. We would not be within the provision of the Constitution authorizing us to regulate commerce; but that is not what this bill seeks to do. This corporation is organized and its purposes are declared. It is expressly provided that it is to be limited to those purposes. Those purposes are, in short, to purchase or construct merchant vessels and to engage in the mercantile carrying trade between this country and foreign countries. By what stretch of the imagination can that be tied to the war power—the authority to provide a navy? It has not the remotest connection with it. That being the object of the bill, there is a fugitive provision in it, merely incident to it, that when we have no need for a particular naval vessel we may turn it over to this corporation; but it is incidental.

It has been held to be within the constitutional power of Congress to provide for the incorporation of a bank as an instrumentality to enable the Government to conduct and carry on its fiscal operations; but in that case the power of the Government conferred by the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is to carry on the fiscal operations themselves. It is not to regulate such operations carried on by others.

Suppose the law had been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the power of the United States was to *regulate* the fiscal operations of banks. Under that power the Government of the United States could not have established a bank because that would not have been regulation; but the power is different. It is not that of regulation. The power is to do the substantive thing—to carry on fiscal operations. If the provision in the Constitution had been not to regulate commerce but to carry on commerce, then of course the Government could do it.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. SHIELDS. I understand the Senator to concede that any act of the Government which aids or facilitates commerce comes within the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President; I do not concede that.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then perhaps I stated it too broadly. I understand the Senator does not controvert that the building of a lock or other improvement in a navigable stream to aid transportation comes within it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; I do concede that—the building of a road, for example.

Mr. SHIELDS. Now, I understand that the Senator's view of the buying of these ships is that it is going into the transportation business, and that that is not regulation of commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My position is precisely that—that it is not a regulation of commerce.

Mr. SHIELDS. Is not the primary object of this bill not to go into the transportation business, but to aid the people of the United States in the transportation of their productions which they have for export and in the importation of things which they need from other countries; and is not the purchase and operation of ships a mere incident to that business; and in that sense is it not within the commerce clause an aid to commerce—a regulation of commerce by furnishing cheaper facilities of transportation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President. The Senator apparently thinks that anything the Government of the United States may do whose effect may be to facilitate or aid commerce is a regulation of commerce.

If that were so, then the building of a manufactory would be a regulation of commerce because it facilitates commerce. Indeed, commerce could not take place at all in many instances unless there was manufacturing. The effect of the law must be something more than merely to aid or facilitate commerce. The building of a road, as the Senator illustrates, the building of a lock, the clearing of a harbor, is a regulation of commerce because it is either providing an instrumentality or putting an instrumentality in a position to be used. But the difference between those cases and this is that the Government is not providing an instrumentality for foreign commerce. It is undertaking to become that instrumentality itself.

Mr. SHIELDS. Does it not do both?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It incidentally may facilitate trade; but the primary object of it, the effect of it, the purpose of it, is to put the Government into that business. In other words, it puts the Government into the business of engaging in trade, and that is the object of it, although its incidental effect may be to facilitate, to make somebody's business more profitable, by giving cheaper rates. But that is not sufficient.

Mr. SHIELDS. That is a difference in construction. In my idea the primary object is to furnish transportation facilities for the commerce of this country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not making these propositions without having provided some sort of fortification of my position, and I hope the Senator will do me the honor to remain here until I come to those cases which deal with that.

Mr. SHIELDS. I certainly will. I do not think the Senator is not fortified, because it is not his habit to assert a proposition without being able to give authorities and reasons to support it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is very kind of the Senator. I have said that in the case of the bank the power which the Government had was to carry on these operations and not merely to regulate them. A bank was therefore held to be a proper instrumentality to carry on these Government fiscal operations. The private business which it did was merely incidental to this governmental function.

If the Federal Government had been authorized to carry on trade, if this were the substantive power, then, undoubtedly, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the cases of McCullough against Maryland and Osborne against United States Bank, the Government might properly organize a corporation as a means of carrying on the trade, just as it properly organized a bank for the purpose of carrying on its fiscal operations; but I repeat, because this is the crux of the whole question, the power is to regulate commerce, not to carry it on.

A trade can not be carried on substantively under the guise of being a regulation when, in fact, the substantive thing is carrying on the trade.

It is the power to regulate the commercial transaction itself and regulate the agencies which are engaged therein. Regulation of an activity and the activity itself are two wholly separate and distinct matters. Congress is given the power to coin money, but suppose the right to coin money had been left to the States, as it might have been, and the Constitution had simply empowered Congress to regulate the coinage of money, would it be claimed under this language that the General Government could itself coin money? And, if it could not, could it create a corporation through the agency of which the Government would coin money? Congress is empowered to establish post roads. Suppose the provision had been simply to regulate post roads; would it be claimed under such language that Congress could build and establish these roads? The language of the Constitution was selected with extreme care. The framers found no difficulty, when it was desired to confer upon the Federal Government the power to do a thing, in saying so in precise terms.

We must look beyond the form of this bill to its substance. The Supreme Court said, in the case of Henderson *v.* Mayor (92 U. S., 268):

> In whatever language a statute may be framed, its purpose must be determined by its natural and reasonable effect, and if it is apparent that the object of this statute as judged by that criterion is to compel the owners of vessels to pay a sum of money for every passenger brought by them from a foreign shore and landed at the port of New York, it is as much a tax on passengers if collected from them or a tax on the vessels or owners for the exercise of the right of landing their passengers in that city, as was the statute held void in the passenger cases.

The Supreme Court has repeated over and over again that in determining whether a law is constitutional we are to determine what it is in substance and what it is in effect, no matter what its form may be. Congress can not take refuge in mere forms to usurp a power which it does not possess under the Constitution.

Tested by this same rule, this bill, it is true, creates a corporation, but its effect is to adopt the corporate device not as one of the means of regulating commerce but as an agency by which the Government engages in commerce. Of course, the Government can do nothing except through its agents. Under its authority to regulate commerce it may designate the character of the instrumentalities which may be used to carry on commerce.

But I repeat, as I said to the Senator a moment ago, this does not give the Government authority to become such an instrumentality itself. Congress has no authority to create corporations as a primary power, because that power has not been conferred by the Constitution. It may only create a corporation as a mean to a constitutional end, namely, as a means of carrying into operation some substantive power which has been devolved upon Congress. It can not create a corporation to carry into operation a power which the Government of the United States does not possess, and through that corporation carry into operation such power, any more than it can do the same thing through an official or a board.

To say that the actual transportation of commodities is a regulation of their transportation is to confuse all logical distinctions. To regulate commerce is a governmental function; and, therefore, if the carrying on of commerce is the regulation of commerce, then that also becomes a governmental function, and the same argument which gives the power to Congress must deny it to the citizen, since the citizen can not perform governmental functions.

Now, that may sound like a reductio ad absurdum, but I believe it to be logical and sound. If the carrying on of trade is a regulation of trade, then it is no less a regulation if the citizen is engaged in it; and if the carrying on of trade is a regulation of trade, and therefore a governmental function, upon what authority can the citizen do it? The citizen can not regulate trade, because that is a governmental function which belongs to Congress. He may do things that have the effect of facilitating trade, of aiding trade, but that is not a regulation within the constitutional meaning.

It has been held that transportation is commerce, and therefore Congress has the power to regulate transportation; but if the act of transportation constitutes a regulation of transportation, then we are driven to the reductio ad absurdum that every captain who sails a ship is regulating commerce and exercising a power which belongs alone to Congress.

The power to regulate a thing does not mean the power to establish or do the thing, but it means the power to govern the thing which the grant of authority to regulate presupposes to be already in existence. The existence of commerce is necessary to regulation, but it is not regulation itself.

Neither does the power to carry on commerce arise by implication from the power to regulate. They are separate and distinct powers. The right to do a particular thing implies the right to adopt any means to do that thing. It does not imply the right to do something entirely different or to adopt means for the doing of something entirely different. The carrying of goods from one port to another, therefore, may be regulated, but the act of carrying is not regulation. Whatever means are adopted by Congress, in the final analysis these means must result in regulation of commerce and not in commerce itself. In McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316) the Supreme Court said:

> The power of creating a corporation, though pertaining to sovereignty, is not like the power of making war or levying taxes or regulating commerce, a great, substantive, and independent power which can not be implied as incidental to other powers and used as a means of executing them.

But the power to carry on commerce, unlike the power to create corporations, is plainly in and of itself a great, substantive, and independent power equal in importance to any power conferred by the Constitution; and to say that Congress has been denied the substantive power of carrying on commerce but has the implied power to create a corporation through which the Government itself may carry on commerce is to juggle with all logical rules.

Mr. Prentice, a very excellent writer upon the subject of Federal power over carriers and corporations, in his work, page 138, quotes from Alexander Hamilton:

> A strange fallacy seems to have crept into the manner of thinking and reasoning upon the subject. Imagination seems to have been unusually busy concerning it. An incorporation seems to have been regarded as some great, independent, substantive thing; as a political engine, and of peculiar magnitude and moment; whereas it is truly to be considered as a quality, capacity, or means to an end. Thus a mercantile company is formed, with a certain capital, for the purpose of carrying on a particular branch of business. Here the business to be prosecuted is the end.

It is the business, I may interpolate, not the formation of the corporation, which is the end. The corporation is only the means to the end.

> The association, in order to form the requisite capital, is the primary means. Suppose that an incorporation were added to this, it would only be to add a new quality to that association; to give it an artificial capacity, by which it would be enabled to prosecute the business with more safety and convenience.

Then, further on, still quoting from Hamilton:

> "Thus," he said—

That is, Hamilton—

> "Thus," he said, "a corporation may not be erected by Congress for superintending the police of the city of Philadelphia, because they are not authorized to regulate the police of that city. But one may be erected in relation to the collection of taxes, or to the trade with foreign countries, or to the trade between the States, or with the Indian tribes—

But the corporation so erected must not merely be the agency through which the Government does business, for it has no power to do business.

It may be done, as in the case of the Luxton Bridge case, where a corporate form was authorized to enable citizens to do through the corporation that which Congress might have authorized them to do as individuals—

> "because it is the province of the Federal Government to regulate those objects, and because it is incident to a general sovereign or legislative power to regulate a thing, to employ all the means which relate to its regulation to the best and greatest advantage."

So I say, as Mr. Hamilton said with reference to the police of Philadelphia, we can not erect a corporation through which to regulate the police of Philadelphia, because we have no right to accomplish the end that this means is adapted to. So we can not organize a corporation to carry on trade, because we have no power under the Constitution to reach the end which is finally sought through the corporate form.

On page 149 he says:

> In this regard the power of Congress is limited, while the power of the State is unlimited. Whenever, under the Constitution, Congress can exercise a power, Congress can create a corporation to carry that power into execution, and, to the exclusion of the States, create corporations in the District of Columbia and all territory of the United States and in all countries subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

It is unimaginable that the framers of the Constitution could have ever intended that a great power like that of engaging in trade should be exercised without a plain provision to that effect. It is an absurdity to say that the power to carry on business has been conferred by a provision which simply gives authority to regulate business.

Hitherto in this country the business of transportation is one which has been exclusively in private hands. If it is a function which could be performed by any government, that government is not the United States, because it has not been delegated, and is therefore, under the provisions of the tenth amendment, either reserved to the States or to the people.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of South Carolina *v.* The United States (199 U. S., p. 450), said:

> To determine the extent of the grants of power we must therefore place ourselves in the position of the men who framed and adopted the Constitution and inquire what they must have understood to be the meaning and scope of those grants.

I want to read a paragraph or two further from that decision. The court says:

> Certain is it that modern notions as to the extent to which the functions of a State may be carried had then no hold—

That was at the time of the formation of the Constitution. Now we are to put ourselves in the place of the framers of the Constitution and inquire what they must have understood to be the meaning and scope of the grant. That is not my language. It is the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court proceeds to do that.

> Certain is it that modern notions as to the extent to which the functions of a State may be carried had then no hold. Whatever Utopian theories may have been presented by any writers were regarded as mere creations of fancy, and had no practical recognition. It is true that monopolies in respect to certain commodities were known to have been granted by absolute monarchs, but they were not regarded as consistent with Anglo-Saxon ideas of government. The opposition to the Constitution came not from any apprehension of danger from the extent of power reserved to the States, but, on the other hand, entirely through fear of what might result from the exercise of the powers granted to the Central Government. While many believed that the liberty of the people depended on the preservation of the rights of the States, they had no thought that those States would extend their functions beyond their then recognized scope, or so as to imperil the life of the Nation. As well said by Chief Justice Nott, delivering the opinion of the Court of Claims in this case (39 C. Cl., 284)—

The quotation is from Judge Nott, but is approved and adopted by the Supreme Court itself—

"Moreover, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution there probably was not one person in the country who seriously contemplated the possibility of government, whether State or National, ever descending from its primitive plant of a body politic to take up the work of the individual or body corporate. The public suspicion associated government with patents of nobility, with an established church, with standing armies, and distrusted all governments. Even in the high intelligence of the convention there were men who trembled at the power given to the President, who trembled at the power which the Senate might usurp, who feared that the life tenure of the judiciary might imperil the liberties of the people. Certain it is, that if the possibility of a government usurping the ordinary business of individuals, driving them out of the market and maintaining place and power by means of what would have been called, in the heated invective of the time, 'a legion of mercenaries,' had been in the public mind, the Constitution would not have been adopted, or an inhibition of such power would have been placed among Madison's amendments."

Can anybody conceive, looking back to the history of that time, to the political views which prevailed at that time, that the framers of the Constitution would have inserted a provision in the Constitution giving the Government of the United States the power to engage in the transportation business as a function of government? It is preposterous.

If, as Justice Nott says, they had suspected that any such power as that was wrapped up in anything in the granted powers, the Constitution would have been made plain by a prohibition against that interpretation or the Constitution never would have been ratified by the people. As was well said by the Supreme Court of Kansas in State against Kelly, Eighty-first Pacific Reporter, page 459:

It has been the policy of our Government to exalt the individual rather than the State, and this has contributed more largely to our rapid national development than any other single cause. Our Constitution was framed and our laws enacted with the idea to protecting, encouraging, and developing individual enterprise, and if we now intend to reverse this policy and to enter the State as a competitor against the individual in all lines of trade and commerce we must amend our Constitution and adopt an entirely different system of government.

The precise question was before the Supreme Court of Minnesota in the case of Rippe against Becker, Fifty-sixth Minnesota, page 100. That case involved the constitutionality of an act passed by the Legislature of Minnesota which provided for procuring of a site and the erection of a State elevator or warehouse for the public storage of grain, and so on. Let me read the syllabus:

Laws of 1893, chapter 30, entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a State elevator or warehouse at Duluth for public storage of grain," etc., is not an exercise of the police power of the State to regulate the business of receiving, weighing, and inspecting grain in elevators. It has no relation to the regulation of the business, but provides for the State itself engaging in carrying it on.

That is the precise point which I have been urging all the way through. That answers the question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. Incidentally, of course, the procuring of the site and the building of an elevator was an aid to that character of business. Conceivably, it facilitated it; it was provided for the purpose of cutting down rates; but the bill provided that the State should do that thing. The Supreme Court of Minnesota said that, under the power to regulate, the doing of the thing was not justified. Now, let me read that:

The right of the State, in the exercise of its police power, to regulate the business—

Now, mind you, the police power of the State to regulate is the same as the delegated power in the Federal Constitution to regulate. The commerce clause of the Constitution in essence and effect is a police power or analogous to the police power, and in essence it is the same as the police power of the State to regulate.

The right of the State, in the exercise of its police power, to regulate the business of receiving, weighing, inspecting, and storing grain for others in elevators or warehouses, as being a business affected with a public interest, is now settled beyond all controversy. This power extends even to fixing the charges for such services. (Munn *v.* Illinois, 94 U. S., 113; Budd *v.* New York, 143 U. S., 517; 12 Sup. Ct., 468.)

And where a business is a proper subject of police regulation doubtless the legislature may, in the exercise of that power, adopt any measures they see fit, provided only they adopt such as have some relation to and have some tendency to accomplish the desired end; and if the measures adopted have such relation or tendency the courts will never assume to determine whether they are wise or the best that might have been adopted. (State *v.* Donaldson, 41 Minn., 74; 42 N. W., 781.)

Further along it is said:

It seems to us as plain as words can make it—too plain to admit of argument—that the provisions of this act have no relation or reference whatever to the exercise of the police power to regulate the "grain elevator" business. We can not discover, and counsel have failed to point out, a single provision of the act that has any relation to or any tendency to accomplish any such purpose. Aside from the provisions of sections 3 and 4 for what we may term a bureau of information as to the state of the markets and rates of transportation (which has no relation to the exercise of any police power, and the connection between which and an elevator of a capacity of 1,500,000 bushels, with "all necessary spur tracks, terminal yards, and other facilities to receive and ship grain" is not apparent), the evident sole purpose of the act is to provide for the State erecting an elevator and itself going into the "grain elevator" business. All the provisions of the act as to receiving, handling, storing, and delivering grain clearly have reference only to the management of the business conducted by the State in its own elevator. The keynote to the object of the law is, we apprehend, to be found in the last clause of section 4, above quoted, as to the intention of the act, and so far as relates to the right of the State under the police power to regulate this business, the position of defendants' counsel really amounts to this: That whenever those who are engaged in any business which is affected with a public interest—

I commend that language particularly to those who fancy that this legislation is valid. The courts are stating the position of counsel, who urged the validity of the law, and therefore they state the position of the proponents of this bill.

That whenever those who are engaged in any business which is affected with a public interest, and hence the subject of governmental regulation, do not furnish the public proper and reasonable service, the State may, as a means of regulating the business, itself engage in it and furnish the public better service at reasonable rates, or, by means of such State competition, compel others to do so.

The very statement of the proposition is sufficient to show to what startling results it necessarily leads. It needs no argument to prove that if, in the exercise of the police power to regulate this business, the State itself has a right to erect and operate one elevator at Duluth, it has the power to erect and operate 20, if necessary, at the same point, and also to erect and operate elevators at every point in the State where there is grain to be handled and stored.

Railways are also, under this same police power, the subjects of State regulation; and if it should be deemed that they were not furnishing the public with proper service, or charging unreasonable rates, it could with equal propriety be claimed that it would be a proper means of exercising the police power of regulating the business for the State itself to construct and operate competing railways. The hack business, the pawnbrokers' business, the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and numerous other kinds of business that might be named are also the subjects of State regulation; and, if counsel's contention is correct, we do not see why, as a means of "regulating" these kinds of business, the State itself might not engage in running hacks, pawnbrokers' shops, building and operating distilleries and breweries, or even running saloons.

That is what South Carolina has done, and I shall have occasion to comment upon that situation in a moment.

But further illustration can not be necessary. The police power of the State to regulate a business does not include the power to engage in carrying it on.

There is the crux of it.

Police regulation is to be affected by restraints upon a business and the adoption of rules and regulations as to the manner in which it shall be conducted.

While the jurists of continental Europe sometimes include under the term "police power" all governmental institutions which are established with public funds for the promotion of the public good, yet, as understood in American constitutional law, the term means simply the power of the State to impose those restraints upon private rights which are necessary for the general welfare of all and is but the power to enforce the maxim, "Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas."

The provisions of this act have no reference to the regulation, in any such sense, of the "grain-elevator business," and the right of the State to embark in the construction and operation of these works can not be predicated on the police power.

* * * * * * *

The time was when the policy was to confine the functions of government to the limits strictly necessary to secure the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property. The old Jeffersonian maxim was that the country is governed the best that is governed the least.

Our friends have departed from that. The maxim of the Democratic Party now is "that government is best which governs most."

At present the tendency is all the other way, and toward socialism and paternalism in government. This tendency is, perhaps, to some extent, natural as well as inevitable, as population becomes more dense and society older and more complex in its relations. The wisdom of such a policy is not for the courts. The people are supreme, and, if they wish to adopt such a change in the theory of government, it is their right to do so. But in order to do it they must amend the constitution of the State. The present constitution was not framed on any such lines.

Therefore, that act was held unconstitutional. It is true that another point was decided in the case, which had not any effect upon this principle. There was also a specific provision in the constitution which forbade the State engaging in the work of internal improvements, and it was argued that this was not a work of internal improvement. The court, however, held that it was, and held that it would be void under that provision of the constitution as well; but it was claimed upon both grounds that it was a regulation of the business and, therefore, within the police power, and also that it was not an internal improvement and, therefore, subject to the other provision. The court answered both against the contention of those who sought to sustain the law.

The State of South Carolina had a rather remarkable experience with reference to Government ownership. That State concluded some years ago to go into the saloon business, and proceeded to pass a law which gave the State control of the sale and disposition of liquor through what were called "State dispensaries." The effect of the law was practically to exclude private parties from that business. The question arose in

South Carolina as to whether or not that law was constitutional. The history of the decision of the court of South Carolina is a very interesting and somewhat remarkable one. The case first came before the supreme court, which consisted of three members, and is reported in Forty-first South Carolina, and also in Twenty-third Lawyers' Reports Annotated, at page 410, and is entitled "The case of McCullough against Brown, and some other cases," four cases altogether.

That case was elaborately argued and was decided by the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina. Two of the judges joined in holding that the law was unconstitutional, because it undertook to put the State of South Carolina into trade, which they said was not a function of civil government. One judge dissented. The term of one of the judges who had joined in the majority opinion soon afterwards expired, and I think, under the laws of South Carolina, the legislature elects the judge. The Legislature of South Carolina, which was responsible for this law and which was desirous that it should be upheld, of course did not reelect the judge who had decided that their legislation was unconstitutional, but they proceeded to elect another judge who went upon the bench and joined with the dissenting judge in reversing the former opinion and holding the law to be constitutional.

I need say no more than that to indicate that the last decision is not entitled to quite as much weight as otherwise might have been the case. It appears also from going over these cases—and I have no other information except what I find in the cases themselves—that this matter was brought up at a special session of the court at which only this question was presented. The judge who had joined in the majority opinion having departed from the bench the new judge came in, and the new court proceeded to hold the law to be constitutional; but the remarkable thing about the last decision is that, notwithstanding the judges overruled the former decision, they agreed with all the reasoning of the former decision, to the effect that the State had no power to go into trade, but they based their decision upon other grounds. They said that if the State had undertaken to go into any other business than the saloon business the majority opinion in the former case would have been right, and they expressly approved the Minnesota case. Their whole decision is bottomed upon the proposition that the liquor business is one dangerous to society, which may be entirely prohibited, and, being within the power of the State to entirely prohibit, it may do anything short of that.

With that preliminary statement let me call the attention of the Senate to the language of the decision. I first read from the original decision, where the law was held to be unconstitutional.

Finally, the constitutionality of the dispensary act is assailed upon the ground that the legislature have undertaken thereby to embark the State in a trading enterprise, which they have no constitutional authority to do, not because there is any express prohibition to that effect in the constitution, but because it is utterly at variance with the very idea of civil government, the establishment of which was the expressly declared purpose for which the people adopted their constitution; and therefore all the powers conferred by that instrument upon the various departments of the government must necessarily be regarded as limited by that declared purpose. Hence when, by the first section of the second article of the constitution, the legislative power was conferred upon the general assembly the language there used can not be construed as conferring upon the general assembly the unlimited power of legislating upon any subject or for any purpose according to its unrestricted will, but must be construed as limited to such legislation as may be necessary or appropriate to the real and only purpose for which the constitution was adopted, to wit, the formation of a civil government. In this connection it is noticeable that the world "all" is not used in the section above referred to, but the language used is "the legislative power," meaning such legislative power as may be necessary or appropriate to the declared purpose of the people in framing their constitution and conferring their powers upon the various departments constituted for the sole purpose of carrying into effect their declared purpose. It is manifest from the numerous express restrictions upon the legislative will found in the constitution that the people were not willing to intrust even their own representatives with unlimited legislative power, but, as if not satisfied with these numerous express restrictions and perhaps fearing that some important right might have been overlooked, a general clause, not usually found in State constitutions, was inserted—

I invite particular attention to that, because it is an unusual provision in a State constitution, but a provision which exists in the Federal Constitution—

apparently designed to cover any such omissions, for in section 41 of article 1 it is expressly declared that "the enumeration of rights in this constitution shall not be construed to impair or deny others retained by the people, and all powers not herein delegated remain with the people."

I do not know that that provision exists in any other constitution except the Federal Constitution.

Now, upon well-settled principles of constitutional construction we are not at liberty to disregard this clause, but must give it some meaning and effect. It seems to us that the true construction of this clause is that, while there are many rights which are expressly reserved to the people with which the legislature are forbidden to interfere, there are other rights reserved to the people, not expressly but by necessary implication, which are beyond the reach of the legislative power unless such power has been expressly delegated to the legislative department of the Government. These views have not only the support of the highest authority in this country, as may be seen by reference to the cases of Citizens Savings & Loan Association of Cleveland *v.* Topeka (87 U. S.; 20 Wall., 655; 22 L. Ed., 455) and Parkersburg *v.* Brown (106 U. S., 487; 27 L. Ed., 238), but have been distinctly adopted by the supreme court of the State in Feldman *v.* Charleston (23 S. C., 57; 55 Am. Rep., 6), as well as by the courts of Massachusetts and Maine, as may be seen by reference to Allen *v.* Jay (60 Me., 124; 11 Am. Rep., 185) and Lowell *v.* Boston (111 Mass., 454; 15 Am. Rep., 39), and, what is more, they were applied to the vital power of taxation, a power absolutely essential to the very existence of every government. These cases substantially hold that, although there may be no express restrictions contained in a State constitution forbidding the imposition of taxes for any other purpose than a public purpose, yet such a restriction must necessarily be implied from the very nature of civil government; and hence the legislative department, under the general power of taxation conferred upon it, can not impose any tax except for some public purpose. Upon the same principle it seems to us clear that any act of the legislature which is designed to or has the effect of embarking the State in any trade which involves the purchase and sale of any article of commerce for profit is outside and altogether beyond the legislative power conferred upon the general assembly by the constitution, even though there may be no express provision in the constitution forbidding such an exercise of legislative power. Trade is not and can not properly be regarded as one of the functions of government. On the contrary, its function is to protect the citizen in the exercise of any lawful employment, the right to which is guaranteed to the citizen by the terms of the constitution, and certainly has never been delegated to any department of the government.

Now, note that—

Trade is not, and can not properly be, regarded as one of the functions of government.

That was the original case where the law was plainly held to be unconstitutional. Now I come to the case which overrules it. That is reported in Forty-second South Carolina, at page 22, and is entitled State against Aiken. After discussing the question of stare decisis, and reaching the conclusion that they were not bound to adhere to the former decision of their own court in a similar case, they say:

In the light of these cases we proceed to a consideration of the act of 1893. Before proceeding to a consideration of the specific objections urged against the constitutionality of the act, we desire to state at the outset that, in our opinion, the following propositions embody the principles governing this case—

Now, note—

(1) That liquor in its nature is dangerous to the morals, good order, health, and safety of the people, and is not to be placed on the same footing with the ordinary commodities of life, such as corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, potatoes, etc. (2) That the State under its police power can itself assume entire control and management of those subjects, such as liquor, that are dangerous to the peace, good order, health, morals, and welfare of the people, even when trade is one of the incidents of such entire control and management on the part of the State. (3) That the act of 1893 is a police measure. We are frank to say that if we are wrong as to either of these propositions, the act should be declared unconstitutional. We will now cite authorities to sustain these propositions.

So you see the Supreme Court in this opinion held that the constitutionality of the act could be justified only upon the theory that the liquor business was one dangerous to society; that if it had not been there undoubtedly would be no power in the State to engage in it. Does anyone pretend that the carriage of goods is a business which is dangerous to morals or society? It is as legitimate a business as buying or selling merchandise or any other legitimate business.

Farther along in the case it is said:

It is contended that the foregoing section—

That is, the section which reserves the right not delegated to the people—

It is contended that the foregoing section prevents the legislature from embarking the State in a commercial enterprise. We have no doubt that if such was the object of the act, and it was not intended as a police measure, it would be unconstitutional, even in the absence of section 41, Article I. As we have said, if the act is not a police measure it is unconstitutional. It is quite a different thing, however, when trade is simply an incident to a police regulation. Buying and selling on the part of the Federal, State, and municipal Governments take place every day, and as long as the buying and selling are in pursuance of police regulations they are entirely free from legal objection. The Federal Government sells liquor and other articles that have been seized as contraband. Articles are purchased by the State to keep up the penitentiary and asylum and other public institutions and enterprises. We see it buying a farm to utilize the convict labor of the State, and selling the produce made on the farm. Municipal governments have the right to buy and dispose of property in administering their governmental affairs. The very distinction for which we contend is pointed out in the case of Mauldin *v.* City Council (33 S. C., 1). In that case the court showed it was not wrong for the city to buy and sell for a public purpose, but that the act only became illegal when it was for a private purpose.

That is what this is for, a private purpose.

We think the case was properly decided, and that the decision rested upon this distinction.

The case of Beebe *v.* State (6 Ind., 501) was upon the construction of a statute of Indiana somewhat similar to the act in question, and is relied upon as an authority to sustain the proposition that the State can not take direct control and management of the liquor traffic. In that case the court uses the following language: "The business—the manufacture and sale of liquor—was, at and before the organization of the government, and is properly at all times, a private pursuit of the people, as much so as the manufacture and sale of brooms, tobacco,

clothes, and the dealing in tea, coffee, and rice, and the raising of potatoes." This case is in conflict with the distinction made between liquor and the ordinary commodities of life, as enunciated in the case of Crowley *v.* Christensen, supra; Black *v.* Intoxicating Liquor, supra; State *v.* Turner (18 S. C., 106); and other authorities hereinbefore mentioned. If liquor is to be placed on the same footing with the articles mentioned in the Indiana case, then that decision was right; but if there is that distinction for which we contend, then the case is valueless as an authority, being decided on erroneous principles. The principles upon which that case was decided would have forced the court that rendered it to have declared null and void a statute entirely prohibiting the traffic in liquor, although there is no longer any doubt as to the constitutionality of such statutes.

The case of Rippe *v.* Becker (Minn., 57 N. W., 331)—

That is the case from which I have just read—

is also relied upon to sustain the constitutional objection to the act of 1893. The title of the act construed in Rippe *v.* Becker was, "An act to provide for the purchase of a site, and for the erection of a State elevator or warehouse at Duluth for public storage of grain." The syllabus of the case prepared by the court states: "The police power of the State to regulate a business is to be exercised by the adoption of rules and regulations as to the manner in which it shall be conducted by others, and not by itself engaging in it." The language of the court, as applying to that case, was proper, and we think—

Now, mark—

"the case was properly decided in the light of the distinction between liquor and the ordinary commodities of life which we have pointed out. There was nothing in the business dangerous to the health, morals, and safety of the people, and the act should have been declared null and void."

That is, they expressly approve the decision of the Supreme Court of Minnesota to the effect that under the power to regulate a business the State has no authority to go into the business, unless it happens to be one like the liquor business, which is dangerous to the morals of the community.

In the dissenting opinion it is said:

As a justification for the State entering into the business of buying and selling liquors, reference is made to the fact that the Federal, State, and municipal governments buy and sell articles without question as to their authority so to do; and reference is made to the practice of the penitentiary and lunatic asylum, both of which institutions buy articles for the support thereof, and sell the products of the labor of the inmates thereof—

I am reading from the dissenting opinion—

But this, as it strikes me, is a very different thing from the State's engaging in the liquor traffic. In the one case, the articles are bought for the purpose of carrying on the Government or the institutions above alluded to, and when no longer needed for such purposes, sold again, while under the dispensary legislation, liquor is bought, not for any governmental purpose, but for the express purpose of being sold again at a profit. It also seems to have escaped attention that the two institutions specifically referred to—the lunatic asylum and penitentiary—are both contemplated and provided for in the Constitution—the former expressly and the other by necessary implication, as may be seen by reference to sections 1, 2, Article XI, of the Constitution—and, therefore, any appropriate means for carrying them on may lawfully be provided for by statute.

So, taking these two cases together, it is perfectly plain that—and I have been unable, in my search, to find any to the contrary—under the power to regulate a thing the State can not do that thing. It would seem not to require any authority to sustain a proposition so plain.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. The Senator has gone very exhaustively into the State cases on kindred subjects. I desire to ask him whether he has examined certain decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the commerce clause?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have examined them. The Senator refers to the case in One hundred and ninety-ninth United States Reports and the cases which preceded it?

Mr. SHIELDS. Those which I wish to call the Senator's attention to are the cases of California *v.* The Central Pacific Railway Co. (127 U. S., p. 1)——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; that case held that it was an exercise of the power to regulate commerce to provide the corporate form through which private citizens could do business.

Mr. SHIELDS. And also the case of Monongahela Navigation Co. *v.* United States (148 U. S.).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. And the case of Luxton *v.* The North Bridge Co.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. They held the same thing in those cases.

Mr. SHIELDS. The cases I have called the Senator's attention to are cited in the latest—and a very accurate and valuable—work on Constitutional Law, by Mr. Willoughby, as supporting this proposition:

The Federal Government has the undoubted power itself to own and operate, or to incorporate companies for the construction and operation of, roads, bridges, and other instrumentalities of interstate commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the author say there that it has the power to own and operate?

Mr. SHIELDS. Yes, sir. I will read it again.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the author means by that to assert the power of the Government to become a carrier of goods, I must take the liberty of disagreeing with him. He will search in vain for any authority which has ever held that. The authorities which I have read just now are plainly to the contrary. It is not a function of Government to engage in trade. Does the Senator think that for the United States to set up a mercantile establishment of its own in the District of Columbia would be a governmental function—to buy and sell groceries?

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I do not think so, nor does Mr. Willoughby say so, but, as held by these cases, that he practically digests it undoubtedly has the power to own and operate directly or to incorporate companies for the construction and operation of roads and bridges and other instrumentalities of interstate commerce, just as we contend it has the right to own and operate ships to facilitate the exportation of the products of the United States and the importation of such articles of commerce as we need. The primary object of this legislation is to aid and facilitate commerce in the sense of traffic and exchange of commodities, and not transportation, as a business. The latter is only an incident to the first.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have been standing on my feet for about an hour and a half attempting to establish exactly the contrary of that. Of course I can not assent to what the Senator has said. I assert that there is no case in the Supreme Court of the United States which holds that under the power to regulate commerce the Government of the United States may go into the business of carrying goods. It is obviously not a regulation of commerce. It is the doing of the thing which the Constitution by express terms limited the Government to regulating.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator as far as I may—for a question.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the Senator is not now arguing as to the policy of this measure, but as to the power of Congress to do that which we are proposing to do; and the Senator takes the position that, whether wise or unwise, we have not the power to purchase these ships under the commerce clause or any other clause of the Constitution, as I understand him?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, I would not say that we have not the power to purchase ships under some other power. We would have the power to purchase ships as auxiliaries to the Navy and incident to that.

Mr. BORAH. I mean to engage in commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; not as a primary object.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose the United States had concluded, instead of having a corporation build the Pacific Railroad, the transcontinental railroad, to do it itself—does not the Senator think the Government could have done it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not sure that the Government could have built the Pacific Railroad. I am inclined to think the Government has the authority to build the railroad in Aalska, but that is under a totally different power. What I am arguing is that the Government can not engage in the business of carrying goods under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Now, we provided for building the railroad in Alaska. I doubt the wisdom of that. I voted against it. But we have the power to dispose of and make all rules and regulations for that property of ours. It is our property. We are not only in there as sovereign, but we are in there as proprietor; and we may do many things in Alaska that we can not do among the States of the Union. I may say to the Senator that the Pacific Railroad when it was authorized, with the exception of a very short part of it, ran through the Territories. Possibly that might have justified it in some particulars. It might have been justified as a military necessity.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Or as the establishment of a post road.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But that is not what this bill is.

Mr. BORAH. No; but suppose the Government conceived it to be its duty to provide for the emergency that existed by reason of the war, and that that emergency could be taken care of in part by building a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific as a military necessity, we will say, to begin with. Could not the Government have proceeded to operate that road and carry

on commerce and the ordinary duties of transportation companies?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I will answer that by saying that if it could it would be in precisely the same way that a State government could sell goods which it had purchased for its institutions. Having the undoubted power to purchase goods, and having no longer any use for them in that governmental connection, it, of course, as an incident of that, could part with them. It is possible that if the Government had established a post road or a railroad under some power that would be appropriate, thereafter if it ceased to be useful under that power it could operate it. I am not prepared to say that that would not follow, but what I do say is that this bill proposes to embark the Government of the United States in the shipping business for the purpose of regulating commerce. It is not tied to any other power in the remotest way. It says so. The opening sentence of the bill says that the purpose of it is to enable them to go into the mercantile business of carrying goods from this country to foreign lands.

Mr. BORAH. I only wanted to have it appear that while I might entirely agree with the Senator, and I think I do, as to the question of policy, I want to reserve my judgment as to the question of power.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have the highest sort of regard for the opinion of the Senator from Idaho; but I have done some thinking and some investigation about this subject, and, if the Senator will permit me to say so, even his opinion to the contrary has not dismayed me.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the reason I reserved my judgment instead of expressing it was because of my high regard for the opinion of the Senator from Utah. Otherwise I should have been very clear in my own mind that we had the power.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have one final authority that I desire to quote from and then I am through, so far as this branch of the discussion is concerned. It is One hundred and fifty-fifth Massachusetts, page 598. Of course I am driven to quote State authorities on this question because hitherto the question has never arisen in the Federal Government. At page 598 the legislature wanted to know of the justices of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts whether or not it would be constitutional to pass a law authorizing a certain town or towns to go into the business of buying and selling coal and wood. The majority of the court held to the contrary. One justice qualified it to some extent and one of the justices thought they had the power. This is the majority opinion, and it seems to have been concurred in, as I recall, by all but one of the justices. I observe that there were seven of them, and five of them concurred:

> Constitutional questions concerning the power of taxation necessarily are largely historical questions. The constitution must be interpreted as any other instrument with reference to the circumstances under which it was framed and adopted. It is not necessary to show that the men who framed it or who adopted it had in mind everything which by construction may be found in it, but some regard must be had to the modes of thought and action on political subjects then prevailing, to the discussions upon the nature of the government to be established, to the meaning of the language used as then understood, and to the grounds on which the adoption or rejection of the constitution was advocated before the people. We know of nothing in the history of the adoption of the constitution that gives any countenance to the theory that the buying and selling of such articles as coal and wood for the use of the inhabitants was regarded at that time as one of the ordinary functions of the government which was to be established. There are nowhere in the constitution any provisions which tend to show that the government was established for the purpose of carrying on the buying and selling of such merchandise as at the time when the constitution was adopted was usually bought and sold by individuals and with which individuals were able to supply the community, no matter how essential the business might be to the welfare of the inhabitants. The object of the constitution was to protect individuals in their rights to carry on the customary business of life rather than to authorize the Commonwealth or the "towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic" to undertake what had usually been left to the private enterprise of individuals.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> If there be any advantage to the inhabitants in buying and selling coal and wood for fuel at the risk of the community on a large scale, and on what has been called the cooperative plan, we are of the opinion that the Constitution does not contemplate this as one of the ends for which the Government was established or as a public service for which cities and towns may be authorized to tax their inhabitants.

Mr. President, there is one further thing I desire to say a word or two about.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Before the Senator passes from that, will he give us his idea about the right of the Government of the United States to purchase stock in the Panama Railway Co. and become a stockholder in that corporation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Supreme Court itself—I have forgotten the case now—has held that that was upon a wholly different ground.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Senator did not understand me. I am not speaking about the power to build the canal, but of the right of the Government of the United States——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand the Senator.

Mr. WALSH (continuing). To purchase stock in the Panama Railway Co.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When was the Panama Railroad purchased from the French Government?

Mr. WALSH. It was purchased at the time the work was commenced, in 1901 and 1902.

Mr. ROOT. The stock of the Panama Railroad Co. was owned by the French company which was engaged in the attempt to construct the canal, and when the Government of the United States bought the rights of the French company on the Isthmus the stock of the Panama Railroad came with it, the railroad being an indispensable adjunct and agency in the construction of the canal, just as much as a steam shovel.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not want to consent to this colloquy if it affects my right in any way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless some Senator objects, as far as the Chair is concerned, the colloquy may proceed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know what Senator may object. Therefore I had better pursue my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is clearly within his right.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator spoke, however, if he will pardon me, about the conclusion reached by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Panama Canal case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator has not given to the Senate the views of the Supreme Court of the United States in this connection, it may be that it would be helpful in his discussion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The building of the Panama Canal was like the clearing out of a harbor, or like the building of a post road; it was an instrumentality of commerce; it was not commerce itself.

Mr. WALSH. No doubt. But the Supreme Court of the United States——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The difference I have already stated. The Senator from Montana was not in, but in reply to a similar question I stated that the difference is between the United States Government furnishing an instrumentality of commerce and becoming itself an instrumentality of commerce.

Mr. WALSH. But the Supreme Court of the United States did in that case put their decision upon the broad ground, did they not, that Congress had a right to construct a canal, and therefore had a right to construct a railroad for the purpose of facilitating interstate commerce?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They held that they had a right to construct this canal. The railroad was another matter.

Mr. WALSH. Might I in this connection refer to a few lines——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, Mr. President, I must not yield for that purpose. The Senator will have ample time, of course, to do that.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to one of the provisions of this bill, which is that—

> Said corporation and its capital stock shall, so long as the United States owns a majority of said stock, be free from all public taxes.

In the first place, I think that provision, if it is valid, is unwise; but I think it is both unwise and invalid, and being in the bill, of course, will lead to litigation and difficulty. The corporation is to be freed from all public taxes, which means, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] very frankly conceded, that no property of this corporation can be taxed. In other words, he conceded, in answer to the question which I put to him, if this corporation, although 49 per cent of its stock may be owned by private individuals and although it is engaged in a private business in competition with private citizens, buys terminal facilities in New York or in Baltimore, under this provision of the bill those terminal facilities can not be taxed by the State, although the terminal facilities of a private company lying alongside can be taxed. He also conceded, which is obviously true, that if a citizen in Montana owns a block of stock in this corporation and is living in Montana and the laws of Montana provide that the shares of stock of corporations owned by its citizens may be taxed, no tax could be levied upon the shares of stock in this corporation so held.

In the first place, the provision is utterly unfair. Why should a corporation engaged in a private business enterprise

in competition with private citizens be relieved of the ordinary burdens which are borne by its competitors? Of course, the effect of it is to make competition more onerous. The conditions are bad enough as they are. The Government is going into this enterprise backed by the whole taxing power of the United States. It may run at a loss and recoup its losses by general taxation, an opportunity which no private citizen has. Confessedly, it is going to run at a loss, as stated by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is a venture of so much doubt that he does not expect private citizens to contribute to the stock, yet after those onerous conditions, those oppressive circumstances against the private competitor are written into the bill, it must go further and exempt his property from taxation.

Here are Kuhn, Loeb, & Co.—I use their name because the name comes to me—who for some reason or other desire to purchase $4,900,000 worth of this stock. They thereby take money which otherwise might go into enterprises in the State and be subject to taxation and put it into this enterprise. They may not invest for the purpose of making profits. There may be some other object. They or somebody else who makes the investment may think it is a desirable connection to be interested with the Government in an enterprise of this kind. At any rate, they make the investment. Upon what theory of justice should that $4,900,000 of money belonging to this firm be taken from the power of the State to tax? Upon what theory should the terminal facilities in New York be exempted from taxation when everybody else's property of a similar character engaged in the same business is subject to the tax? Upon what theory should the ships be exempt from taxation in their home ports when the ships of all private citizens engaged in the same business are subject to taxation?

The provision is utterly indefensible from a practical point of view. If that may be done and this principle is extended and the Government acquires all the railroads of the country, taking over property worth eighteen to twenty billion dollars, it may exempt that property from taxation and strip the States in many instances of one of the greatest sources of their taxation, and thereby add greatly to the burdens of the ordinary taxpayers whose rate of taxation must be increased to fill the gap that has been made by these exemptions.

Mr. President, that is the practical objection to it; but if the Government of the United States has the power to go into this business, as I have been trying to argue it has not, it has not the power to exempt such property as this from taxation. It may exempt the franchise of the corporation, the franchise to be a corporation organized in the District of Columbia from taxation in another State. Indeed, it need not write that into the law. It would be exempt under general principles. But I deny the power of the United States Government to go into a private business and thereby lay aside its sovereignty, as far as that business is concerned, and withdraw the property which it utilizes in that enterprise from State taxation, withdraw it from the power of the State to tax when the property is in the State.

The authority which is likely to be cited for that clause is the case of McCulloch against Maryland, Fourth Wheaton, page 316. The court there held that the States could not tax the bank, but it was careful to sum up in this language:

> The opinion does not deprive the States of any resources which they originally possessed. It does not extend to a tax paid by the real property of the bank in common with the other real property within the State, nor to a tax imposed on the interest which the citizens of Maryland may hold in this institution in common with other property of the same description throughout the State. But this is a tax on the operations of the bank, and is consequently a tax on the operation of an instrument employed by the Government of the Union to carry its powers into execution. Such a tax must be unconstitutional.

But they held that the tax could be imposed upon the property, and that it was not deprived of the right to tax the interest which the shareholders held in the institution.

In First Dillon, page 320, the case of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. against Lincoln County, Mr. Justice Dillon said what I shall read. The claim was made there that the State could not enforce taxes upon this railroad company's property, which had been incorporated under a law of the United States:

> The argument in support of this proposition is that the corporation was created by Congress and not by the State; that it was created because deemed by Congress a fit instrumentality or means of exercising the constitutional powers of carrying on, promoting, or facilitating the operations or executing the duties of the General Government, and that if it be such instrumentality or means it is settled that it is beyond the taxing power of the State.
>
> Reliance is placed upon the cases of McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316) and Osborn *v.* The Bank of the United States (9 Wheat., 738), in which it was held by the Supreme Court that this bank, "as the great instrument by which the fiscal operations of the Government were effected," and "as a public corporation, created for public and national purposes," was not, on its capital or in its operations, taxable by the States. In a word, it is claimed by the company that as respects immunity from taxation it stands precisely in the situation of the bank, and that taxation of it by the States is unconstitutional for the same reasons that in those cases the laws of Maryland and Ohio taxing the bank were adjudged to be invalid.
>
> The defendant controverts these propositions, and contends that the Union Pacific Railroad Co., though chartered by Congress, is essentially a "private corporation, whose principal object is individual trade and individual profit, and not a public corporation created for public and national purposes," and denies that it is an instrument, agency, or means of the General Government in such a sense as, on this ground, to exempt it by necessary implication from taxation by the States.
>
> The cases referred to undoubtedly establish the doctrine that no State has the right to tax the means, agencies, or instrumentalities rightfully employed within the States by the General Government for the execution of its powers; and this doctrine is adhered to and, when understood with the necessary qualifications, declared to be sound by the Supreme Court in its latest adjudications on the subject. (Thompson *v.* Pacific Railroad, 9 Wall., 579, 591; National Bank *v.* Commonwealth, ib., 353, 361.)
>
> The doctrine of the implied exemption of Federal instrumentalities from State taxation, its rationale, and its limitations, are so clearly stated by the learned justice assigned to this circuit, in the case last cited, that his observations may be advantageously extracted to aid our present inquiries. The case related to the right of the States to tax shares of the national banks, and "it is argued," says Mr. Justice Miller, "that the banks, being instrumentalities of the Federal Government, by which some of its important operations are conducted, can not be subjected to such State legislation. It is certainly true that the Bank of the United States and its capital were held to be exempt from State taxation on the ground here stated, and this principle, laid down in the case of McCulloch against the State of Maryland, has been repeatedly affirmed by this court. But the doctrine has its foundation in the proposition that the right of taxation may be so used in such cases as to destroy the instrumentalities by which the Government proposes to effect its lawful purposes in the States, and it certainly can not be maintained that banks or other corporations or instrumentalities of the Government are to be wholly withdrawn from the operation of State legislation. * * * The principle we are discussing has its limitation—a limitation growing out of the necessity on which the principle itself is founded. That limitation is that the agencies of the Federal Government are only exempted from State legislation so far as that legislation may interfere with or impair their efficiency in performing the functions by which they are designed to serve that Government. Any other rule would convert a principle founded alone in the necessity of securing to the Government of the United States the means of exercising its legitimate powers into an unauthorized and unjustifiable invasion of the rights of the States. It is only when the State law incapacitates the banks from discharging their duties to the Government that it becomes unconstitutional." (9 Wall., 361, 362.) The State legislation, then, to come within the operation of the principle must relate not simply to an agent, but to an agency of the General Government, and must be of a character which incapacitates the agency to perform or interferes with its efficiency in performing its duties to the Government, or it must (as in the case of a tax, which, if valid at all, is valid to any extent the State may see fit to press it) assert a principle in its nature antagonistic to the Federal instrumentality and which may be exercised to destroy it.

Further on the court says:

> The Government created the corporation and both authorized and aided the building of the road. It was to be constructed within the Territories of the United States; and if Congress was not the only power which could erect said corporation and authorize it to build the road therein, it is certain that no road could have been constructed through the national domain against the will of Congress.
>
> The purpose of Congress is manifest, not only from the nature of the legislative provisions but from the plain expression of it, both in the title and in the body of the incorporating act. It is declared in the eighteenth section that "the object of this act is to promote the public interest and welfare by the construction of said railroad and telegraph line, and keeping the same in working order, and to secure to the Government at all times—but particularly in time of war—the use and benefits of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," and to this end "Congress may at any time, having due regard for the rights of said companies named herein, add to, alter, amend, or repeal this act." And to the same effect is the title, which is, "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad, etc., and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. We can not hear the Senator at all on this side.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr. OWEN. No Senator has a right to occupy the floor mumbling to himself words which can not be heard on this side. We have a right to know what he is saying.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator's language may be parliamentary, but it is offensive. The Senator from Utah is not mumbling to himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows of no way by which the Chair can compel a Senator to raise his voice.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma knows of some way by which he could compel the Senator from Utah to raise his voice.

Mr. OWEN. I think the Senate ought to compel it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, let the Senator from Oklahoma try. Shall I proceed, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah will proceed. The Chair has no power to decide in what tone of voice a Senator shall discuss a question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The court concludes:

> 1. That the Union Pacific Railroad Co. is not an instrument of the Government in such a sense as exempts it, by implication, from the taxing power of the State through which its road may be located.
>
> 2. If it be in any sense a Federal instrumentality, the rights of the Government, under the incorporating act, are fully protected and reserved, and any rights derived from a sale for taxes, under State authority, are entirely subordinate to the original, paramount, and indefeasible rights of the General Government; can not destroy the cor-

poration nor incapacitate it from discharging any of its inalienable, fundamental, and organic duties to the Government. If so, then the case falls without the principle on which the corporation relies to sustain its application for an injunction.

I think I can discover in the more recent judgment of the Supreme Court evidences of a conviction on the part of the judges that the doctrine of implied exemption of Federal agencies from State taxation has been carried quite to its limit, and that it will not be pressed to embrace a case of the character of the one now under consideration.

The only other case to which I desire to refer is that of the Railway Co. *v.* Peniston (18 Wall.), and, with the permission of the Senate, I will not stop to read the extracts, but will insert them as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

That the Union Pacific Railroad Co. was created to subserve, in part at least, the lawful purposes of the National Government; that it was authorized to construct and maintain a railroad and telegraph line along the prescribed route; and that grants were made to it and privileges conferred upon it under condition that it should at all times transmit dispatches over its telegraph line and transport mails, troops, and munitions of war, supplies and public stores, upon the railroad for the Government whenever required to do so by any department thereof, and that the Government should at all times have the preference in the use of the same for all the purposes aforesaid must be conceded. Such are the plain provisions of its charter.

* * * * * * *

Admitting then, fully, as we do, that the company is an agent of the General Government, designed to be employed and actually employed in the legitimate service of the Government, both military and postal, does it necessarily follow that its property is exempt from State taxation?

* * * * * * *

Nothing, we think, in the past decisions of this court is inconsistent with the opinions we now hold. McCullough *v.* The State of Maryland and Osborn *v.* Bank of the United States are much relied upon by the appellants, but an examination of what was decided in those cases will reveal that they are in full harmony with the doctrine that the property of an agent of the General Government may be subjected to State taxation. In the former of those cases the tax held unconstitutional was laid upon the notes of the bank. The institution was prohibited from issuing notes at all except upon stamped paper furnished by the State and to be paid for on delivery, the stamp upon each note being proportioned to its denomination. The tax, therefore, was not upon any property of the bank, but upon one of its operations—in fact, upon its right to exist as created. It was a direct impediment in the way of a governmental operation performed through the bank as an agent. It was a very different thing, both in its nature and effect, from a tax upon the property of the bank. No wonder, then, that it was held illegal. But even in that case the court carefully limited the effect of the decision. It does not extend, said the Chief Justice, to a tax paid by the real property of the bank in common with the other real property in the State, nor to a tax imposed on the interest which the citizens of Maryland may hold in the institution. * * * But this is a tax upon the operations of the bank, and is, consequently, a tax upon the operations of an instrument employed by the Government of the Union to carry its powers into execution. Such a tax must be unconstitutional. Here is a clear distinction made between a tax upon the property of a Government agent and a tax upon the operations of the agent acting for the Government.

In Osborn *v.* The Bank the tax held unconstitutional was a tax upon the existence of the bank—upon its right to transact business within the State of Ohio. It was, as it was intended to be, a direct impediment in the way of those acts which Congress, for national purposes, had authorized the bank to perform. For this reason the power of the State to direct it was denied; but at the same time it was declared by the court that the local property of the bank might be taxed, and, as in McCulloch *v.* Maryland, a difference was pointed out between a tax upon its property and one upon its action. In noticing an alleged resemblance between the bank and a Goverment contractor, Chief Justice Marshall said: "Can a contractor for supplying a military post with provisions be restrained from making purchases within a State or from transporting the provisions to the place at which the troops were stationed? Or could he be fined or taxed for doing so? We have not heard these questions answered in the affirmative. It is true the property of the contractor may be taxed, and so may the local property of the bank; but we do not admit that the act of purchasing or of conveying the articles purchased can be under State control." This distinction, so clearly drawn in the earlier decisions, between a tax on the property of a governmental agent and a tax upon the action of such agent, or upon his right to be, has ever since been recognized. All State taxation which does not impair the agent's efficiency in the discharge of his duties to the Government has been sustained when challenged, and a tax upon his property generally has not been regarded as beyond the power of a State to impose. In National Bank *v.* The Commonwealth of Kentucky, when the right to tax national banks was under consideration, it was asserted by us that the doctrine can not be maintained that banks or other corporations or instrumentalities of the Government are to be wholly withdrawn from the operation of State legislation. Yet it was conceded that the agencies of the Federal Government are uncontrollable by State legislation, so far as it may interfere with or impair their efficiency in performing the functions by which they are designed to serve that Government.

It is therefore manifest that exemption of Federal agencies from State taxation is dependent not upon the nature of the agents, or upon the mode of their constitution, or upon the fact that they are agents, but upon the effect of the tax; that is, upon the question whether the tax does in truth deprive them of power to serve the Government as they were intended to serve it, or does hinder the efficient exercise of their power. A tax upon their property has no such necessary effect. It leaves them free to discharge the duties they have undertaken to perform. A tax upon their operations is a direct obstruction to the exercise of Federal powers.

In this case the tax is laid upon the property of the railroad company precisely as was the tax complained of in Thompson *v.* Union Pacific. It is not imposed upon the franchises or the right of the company to exist and perform the functions for which it was brought into being, nor is it laid upon any act which the company has been authorized to do. It is not the transmission of dispatches, nor the transportation of United States mails, or troops, or munitions of war that is taxed, but it is exclusively the real and personal property of the agent, taxed in common with all other property in the State of a similar character. It is impossible to maintain that this is an interference with the exercise of any power belonging to the General Government, and if it is not, it is prohibited by no constitutional implication.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now, I want to call attention also and to insert an extract or two from the case of South Carolina against United States in One hundred and ninety-ninth United States, and particularly pages 454, 461, and 463. In that case, while the Supreme Court respected the decision of South Carolina that the business was one in which the State could engage, it held that the property, although the property of the State, was subject to taxation by the United States. There is some language in that case which I will insert in the RECORD, which I think conclusively establishes that neither the Federal Government, which undertakes to deal with property in a quasi private capacity, can withdraw that property from the taxation of the State, nor, conversely, can the State withdraw such property from the taxing power of the United States.

The extracts are as follows:

Mingling the thought of profit with the necessity of regulation may induce the State to take possession, in like manner, of tobacco, oleomargarine, and all other objects of internal-revenue tax. If one State finds it thus profitable, other States may follow, and the whole body of internal-revenue tax be thus stricken down.

More than this. There is a large and growing movement in the country in favor of the acquisition and management by the public of what are termed public utilities, including not merely therein the supply of gas and water but also the entire railroad system. Would the State by taking into possession these public utilities lose its republican form of government?

We may go even a step further. There are some insisting that the State shall become the owner of all property and the manager of all business. Of course this is an extreme view, but its advocates are earnestly conteading that thereby the best interests of all citizens will be subserved. If this change should be made in any State, how much would that State contribute to the revenue of the Nation? If this extreme action is not to be counted among the probabilities, consider the result of one much less so. Suppose a State assumes under its police power the control of all those matters subject to the internal-revenue tax and also engages in the business of importing all foreign goods. The same argument which would exempt the sale by a State of liquor, tobacco, etc., from a license tax would exempt the importation of merchandise by a State from import duty. While the State might not prohibit importations, as it can the sale of liquor, by private individuals, yet paying no import duty it could undersell all individuals and so monopolize the importation and sale of foreign goods.

These decisions, while not controlling the question before us, indicate that the thought has been that the exemption of State agencies and instrumentalities from National taxation is limited to those which are of a strictly governmental character, and does not extend to those which are used by the State in the carrying on of an ordinary private business.

It is reasonable to hold that while the former may do nothing by taxation in any form to prevent the full discharge by the latter of its governmental functions, yet whenever a State engages in a business which is of a private nature that business is not withdrawn from the taxing power of the Nation.

Mr. President, just a final word or two in conclusion. If this bill passes, the question naturally arises, what ships can be bought? Either they must be the ships which are now in use or those which have been interned and are idle. If we buy the ships which are in use, we shall have added nothing to the sea-carrying capacity; we shall not probably have relieved the situation at all; we shall not have put more ships upon the ocean; we shall not have added to the tonnage capacity. It is not to be expected that the neutral countries, whose vessels are engaged in trade at a profit, will sell them to the United States, unless we are compelled to pay extravagant prices. Certainly it is not to be expected that England or France will sell, or that their citizens will sell their vessels with the consent of their Governments. They may be greatly needed in the carrying trade of those countries. If we do not buy those ships, if we can not buy them, or if it is thought unwise to buy them, then the only ships that we can turn our attention to are those so-called interned ships, which belong to the citizens of one or the other of the belligerent countries. It is made apparent by the testimony of Mr. McAdoo in House hearings, at page 26, that it was the intention of the Government, in proposing this bill, to purchase these interned vessels. If we undertake to do that, as has already been shown so clearly by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], we will have bought a quarrel which may result in very serious consequences to the United States.

I want, in that connection, to call attention to the language of Mr. Lansing in his testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee. On page 205 he said:

Mr. LANSING. I think that the transportation of contraband to a belligerent port in a public ship of the United States would go much further than the mere matter of liability, and that it would be regarded an unneutral act.

And further:

Mr. TALBOTT. Would you include the South American ports?

Mr. LANSING. No, sir; I do not think there would be much difficulty about the South American countries. The only trouble is that a public ship that has on board private cargoes and private individuals is likely

to do some unneutral act on account of its cargo and on account of the people aboard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is, if destined to a hostile port or to a port of a belligerent?

Mr. LANSING. No; that is to a neutral port. For instance, the ultimate destination of the cargo might be a belligerent port, we do not know, and it might be taken to a neutral port for transshipment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is to say, if the Government or the shipper knew that was the intention, then it would be a violation of neutrality?

Mr. LANSING. Yes; if it was absolute contraband.

And further on:

Mr. TALBOTT. If German merchant ships were purchased by us and the purchase money went into the German treasury, how would that be considered by the English Government or the French Government or the Russian Government?

Mr. LANSING. The question of the transfer of vessels, I think, really rests on two conditions. If we can show in the purchase that it is a bona fide purchase and, in the second place, that it is not done to avoid capture, I believe the transfer can be made.

Again, on page 211:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Lansing, a while ago you said that the consequences of Government ownership of these vessels which might be acquired might or could be avoided by leasing. I will ask you to give us your opinion as to the liability that we would incur in a breach of neutrality by so conducting or operating these ships.

Mr. LANSING. We would not be operating them; the operation would be by private parties. Yet even in that case I can see that, if the private parties that operated them carried on a trade to a great extent in munitions of war to a belligerent country, there might be objection on the part of the other Government that the United States was actually giving aid to a belligerent.

Mr. TALBOTT. Could not that be easily obviated by not allowing munitions of war to be shipped on vessels of that character?

Mr. LANSING. Yes; but where are you going to stop in the matter of contraband?

Again, Mr. Lansing said:

Mr. LANSING. Of course, so far as that is concerned, you could limit your cargoes by providing that a Government-managed ship should not carry any contraband at all.

Mr. STEPHENS. But suppose it did?

Mr. LANSING. But a Government-managed ship could not do it and do any business.

Mark that statement.

Mr STEPHENS. Suppose the Government loaded a ship in New York with articles not contraband when loaded and started for a foreign port, and the cargo was declared contraband before it was landed?

Mr. TALBOTT. The Government would receive that information before the cargo was landed, and it would not be subject to seizure on the high seas.

Mr. LANSING. But if you do that it would practically eliminate any mercantile transaction with belligerents, because if you carry on your trade with European countries——

And that is the proposition of this bill—

It would include conditional contraband, and conditional contraband covers nearly everything. You would not have very much trade. For instance, foodstuffs are conditional contraband; also forage and grain; even clothing. All are conditional contraband.

It is plainly apparent from the statement of Mr. Lansing that he considers that if the United States should buy and operate these interned ships it would quite likely result in serious difficulty for the United States. Mr. President, it can not be otherwise. The countries in Europe engaged in war are as much in earnest about it as we were during our Civil War. They are striving to the utmost to achieve victory for their arms. The English Government is not going, if she can help it, to permit Germany to be assisted in such way as to make her a more formidable opponent in this war. She is not going to permit contraband articles to go into Germany if she can help it. If we buy these interned ships, we buy a quarrel with these countries that are not acting in as cool blood as we ought to be acting.

The declaration of London, which was quoted here, makes it perfectly clear that the rule which was accepted and which will be put into operation in England, France, and Germany, for that matter, is—I will quote the exact language—that—

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.

To what consequences are these vessels that are imprisoned in our ports exposed? They are exposed to the consequences of remaining idle in our ports or of going out upon the high seas and risking the hazard of capture. So that obviously, if one of these vessels is sold, the effect of the sale is to avoid those consequences to which it would otherwise be exposed. Undoubtedly it would be held in the prize courts of these countries that that was the purpose of the sale. We are to judge the purpose of people by the normal effect of what they do, of what they accomplish; and what they do by transferring vessels that are interned is to avoid the consequences as enemy vessels by lying idle in these harbors or of going out and being captured. Mr. President, it is a dangerous thing—I might go further and say it is a wicked thing—for this Government under such circumstances to contemplate the purchase of one of these vessels. And so, sir, viewed from whatsoever angle we may, this bill, if enacted into law, will set the Government adrift upon an ocean of difficulty and danger, the character and extent of which the wisest among us can not foresee. Not only is the bill bad but the methods by which its enactment is sought are worse. In vetoing the immigration bill a day or two ago the President used the following words, which I commend to the consideration of the Members constituting the majority of this body:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

Mr. President, I inquire, in the language of the President, has any political party ever avowed a policy such as is set forth in this bill? Has any political party gone to the country upon it? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? Oh, no, Mr. President; the American people have not spoken, they have not been consulted upon this subject. No party has advocated it; no platform has declared in its favor. It is a hastily conceived and defectively constructed expedient which is sought to be put through a subservient Congress, because the pride of party solidarity has become superior to the wisdom of party statesmanship. It is a measure whose constitutionality is, to say the least, in the gravest doubt; whose effect will be to discourage the investment of American capital in the shipping business, drive more privately owned ships from the sea than it will put Government-owned ships upon the sea, and which is filled with the gravest menace to the peace of the country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OWEN. I make the point of order of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma makes the point of order of no quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hollis	Owen	Sterling
Borah	James	Perkins	Stone
Bryan	Jones	Ransdell	Sutherland
Catron	Kern	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Root	Thornton
Chilton	Lane	Saulsbury	Tillman
Clapp	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Townsend
Colt	Lippitt	Sheppard	Vardaman
Crawford	Lodge	Shields	Walsh
Culberson	McLean	Shively	Weeks
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Simmons	White
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Works
Hitchcock	Overman	Smith, Md.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is my intent to make a few observations in regard to this bill, comparatively speaking, brief observations, and I had hoped that possibly some Senators on both sides would do me the honor to listen to me. But, Mr. President, I should not myself have made the point of order of no quorum. I should have been content to go on with the Senate comparatively empty, as it was a few minutes ago, because I realize that under this system of permanent sessions some must watch and some must sleep, and I should not have had the heart to disturb anybody's well-earned repose merely to hear a measure of great importance discussed.

I really regret, however, that I should not have the pleasure of seeing here at this moment the President's secretary, who was with us all last evening while I was present, and again this morning. I think it is of interest, while Congress is in process of conversion into a registry office, that we should have the visible symbol of this change attendant upon our debates. Of course it is too much to expect that the President should do it himself, and therefore, while the watchful waiter keeps his eyes fixed on the red panorama of Mexico, it is well

that he should have his secretary here to see that none of the lambs stray beyond the fold.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Florida, [Mr. FLETCHER], in the long and very thorough speech which he made the other night, dwelt at the close upon the evil influence of "the interests." Whenever there is opposition to any Democratic legislation here, some combination or association of "interests" is always paraded. They come on like the stage soldiers in the old days who used to march on at one wing and across the stage and around behind the drop scene and march in again. I notice, however, that they are almost invariably American interests which serve in that capacity. In my time I have seen foreign steamship companies ably represented in Washington when immigration bills were pending. Nobody seemed particularly to object. In fact, the appearance of foreign interests, whether on the tariff or any other subject, never seems to trouble our friends on the other side; but it is always some American who is engaged in business, and perhaps is engaged also in committing the crime of being in successful business and making a little money at it, who is invariably trotted out as the sinister influence behind the opposition to some meritorious and benevolent Democratic measure.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the shipping interests in this country are against this bill or for it. None of them have been to me, and I should hesitate to deny that they had the right to come if they saw fit. It would not occur to me to suggest that this bill was being promoted because the agent of the Hamburg-American Line, as I was told by people who knew him, was about Washington this week. It would not occur to me to suggest that there were any moneyed interests behind this legislation because Mr. Max Warburg is a director of the Hamburg-American Line, I believe also one of the three directors of the German War Bank formed to finance those lines, and that he happens to be a brother, as I am told, of the distinguished head of our Federal Reserve Board. It would not occur to me to use that as an argument to show that there were sinister pecuniary interests behind this bill. Nor because the Senator from Florida saw fit to say that some great journals were controlled by Wall Street and the shipping combination, that the very few newspapers which have a good word for this are controlled by financial interests which would profit by its passage. I think, however, that although we are so considerate of foreign interests we may at least admit that there may be some honest Americans engaged in the shipping business who are honestly opposed to this bill and who have a right to be so, but who have the wisdom, knowing that they are looked on as a suspected class, to say nothing about it, which, so far as I am aware, has been the case in this instance.

Mr. President, I discussed—I was about to say the other day, but it was prior to the last adjournment; on the legislative yesterday, we will say—the value of these imprisoned German ships which it is apparently the intent of the administration to buy. I desire to-day to say a few words on another matter, and that is, first, the question of rates as presented to us, and subsequently something about the economic side of the proposition now before us.

In order to find out about rates I took the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce—one eminent in finance, both in the Treasury and out of it, and the other distinguished as a manufacturer. I felt that in their report I was certain to get the figures which I required for an intelligent study of the rates. So I took this document—the second part of document 673—and I turned to the first exhibit, "Increased Ocean Transportation Rates." The letter, addressed to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, says:

SIR: The following tables show the *sea trade* of the United States—

In my simplicity I thought that meant sea trade. I thought it meant all the sea trade. I went a little further and I noticed, at the head of the first column, the words "Exports to Europe." Then I ran down the list to get the figures that I wanted, and I found "Total exports by sea." It seemed to me that to classify exports to Europe as "total exports by sea" was rather strange, because I have not any very clear idea of how we can get exports from the United States to Europe except by sea. There is no all-land route yet that I am aware of. Therefore, I thought, when they said "total exports by sea," they meant all our exports by sea. I think the language tends that way. Then I observed that the figures given in this table did not agree with the Treasury reports, so I examined to see where the difference came, and I found these official figures were arrived at by deducting all exports to Mexico, Canada, Japan, and all other countries, which surprised me, because I had supposed that trade with Japan, at least, was "sea trade."

Mr. President, that loose language of classification, I confess, aroused my suspicion as to the accuracy of this report; so I went on to consider their comparison of freight rates, which occurs on page 23. The comparison of freight rates as made in this report between June and December, 1914, is, on the face of it, not a fair one. In making comparisons of any business we do not compare different months in the same year to reach a conclusion as to what the trade or business is over a certain period, but we compare the same months of different years, because there are different conditions affecting all trades, and especially export trade, in the different months. Of course, to make here an intelligent comparison which would be of any value, it would be necessary to make the comparison between December, 1913, and December, 1914.

The lowest freight rates on the trans-Atlantic always prevail between April and October, and June is probably the worst month in the world in the trans-Atlantic freight business. Owing to the fact that the year 1913 was one of the worst years in the freight business experienced for many years, the comparison for December of that year is not a fair one, and would not be an aevrage rate for that month. We should also take the rate for December, 1912. Therefore, I have made the following comparisons:

Taking the freight rates on various commodities for the month of December, 1912, 1913, and 1914, which can be verified, as I verified them, by reference to any newspaper publishing freight rates, for instance, the Journal of Commerce of New York, we will begin with grain rates as given in this table.

For December, 1914, it is given in the table of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce at 22.1 cents per bushel. Those are the figures given us by the Secretaries. In 1912, according to the published freight rates in the newspapers that print them, the freight rate on grain was 6½ to 10½ cents. In 1913, which was an exceptional freight year, 4 to 6 cents. In 1914, 9 to 10½ cents per bushel of 60 pounds. They compare that 22 cents with the July rate of 5 and 6. It will be seen that if you take December, 1912, for comparison, it is 10½.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Did I understand the comparisons the Senator is giving were a part of the month of December of each of the several years?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but there is another point. These figures, taken from the published freight rates, the Journal of Commerce and other similar business papers, show 9 to 10½ cents per bushel of 60 pounds for December, 1914. The official publication says it is 22.1 cents. That could only be arrived at by taking the highest rate probably paid during the month, not taking an average, such as the shippers quote, but taking the highest rate and putting it in here as an average in the United States.

I take flour; 18 cents per 100 pounds in 1912 and 15 cents per 100 pounds in 1913; 25 cents according to the Secretary's table.

In December, 1914, 14 to 26 cents per 100 pounds, according to the figures of these newspapers.

Cotton, $1.20 to $1.90 per bale in 1912; $2.06 to $2.40 per bale in 1913. These are the limits; $1.87 to $2.88 in 1914. According to these figures here, it was $4.57 last December.

Mr. ROOT. The Secretary's figures?

Mr. LODGE. According to the Secretary's figures it is $4.57.

Provisions, which includes meat, 22½ in 1913.

Mr. ROOT. From what?

Mr. LODGE. From the freight rates for that year, from the Journal of Commerce. The freight figures were 22½, and they were 37 according to the Secretary's figures; 33 in 1914 according to the figures given in the papers publishing freight rates. It is perfectly obvious if anyone will take the trouble to make these comparisons that the averages given here in this publication can not in the least be depended upon. Of course, you can only guess at how they are obtained, but they appear to have been reached by taking some exceptional cargo or some exceptional rate and introducing that as the average. But, Mr. President, it makes it a little difficult to deal with a question of this sort when we find even the official figures apparently so misleading and so juggled. I shall return to that in a moment.

Before comparing these figures with the figures taken from the actual manifests of ships I wish to point out that the high

rates are due largely to extra expenses incurred, such as for coal, wages, and provisions; the higher cost of insurance owing to the war risk, and very heavy delays through congestion at the ports of discharge, arising partly from a shortage of labor through so many of the men having gone to the war, and also owing to the large quantities of provisions and material for the army, which of course receives preference in discharge at the principal ports.

Grain rates to-day to the principal ports in Europe are approximately from 16 to 18 cents per bushel of 60 pounds. The price of grain itself has advanced since the war began from under $1 per bushel to $1.46¾ for the May quotation.

Mr. POMERENE. To what point is the freight rate given? To England?

Mr. LODGE. Some to England. I am coming to that. I have them to England and to the Mediterranean ports. I have not the power of the Government at my command, and I could only get manifests to certain countries. I have the Mediterranean ports and the British ports. I have not been able to get rates to Bremen, which are extravagantly high, of course, because the risk is so much greater, and it is very hard to get those. I mean that the Bremen rates fluctuate very much, but of course the bulk of our exports have been going to Great Britain and to neutral ports, like those of Holland and the Mediterranean.

It should also be borne in mind that while the freight rates at the present time are very high, the regular lines crossing the Atlantic are not getting the benefit which it is generally understood they are getting by those not acquainted with the business. All these lines have passenger boats, combination passenger and freight steamers, and purely freight steamers. The only part of the line which is getting full benefit of the high rates, therefore, is the steamer carrying only freight. The large passenger steamers carrying passengers only are largely laid up on account of lack of business, except when employed by the various Governments in the transport of troops. Where they are running in order to provide accommodations for such passengers as desire to cross the ocean at the present time and also to take care of the mail, they are running at a loss. The combination passenger and cargo steamers, while making money on their freight are losing money on their passengers, so that the loss practically offsets the profit from the advanced freight rates. To get at a fair comparison, taking all these things into consideration, it would be only fair to divide the present freight rates in half in comparing the same with the rates existing prior to the war.

That is, the war conditions have doubled rates.

Mr. President, I was told the other day by a gentleman from Boston that one of the Great White Star boats, the Cedric or the Cymric, a passenger boat, went out, I think, last month with a full cargo at the very highest rates, such rates as had never before been earned. Yet she did not make as much profit on the voyage as she made on the voyage of the same period last year, carrying freight at comparatively low rates. Her passenger business was gone, and that is a ship of the precise type which constitutes the great bulk of the Hamburg-American fleet and the whole of the North German Lloyd fleet. They are ships that lose money no matter what the freight rates are unless they can carry passengers, for whose accommodation they were primarily built.

The highest rates that have been and are being paid since the war are paid to tonnage sailing under the American flag and particularly to Bremen and Gothenburg, neither of which ports is congested and where delays are not nearly so serious as those experienced by the regular lines at their ports of discharge, even allowing for delays on account of inspection by the allies' warships.

It is obvious, Mr. President, at once why ships under the American flag get higher rates than the others. They are covered by the neutral flag. They start with an assurance of safety or comparative safety which the others can not have. Therefore they are more sought after, of course, than any others.

I should like to state in this connection why it is that they get these high rates going to ports like Bremen or Gothenburg, where there is no congestion. It arises from the extreme danger of mines or capture in a North Sea voyage.

Now, let me give just two or three instances of what this congestion at the other end of the line means when they talk about extortionate rates. These are specific instances.

Heavy delays were incurred by the *Maryland* (A. T. Line) and the *Lancastrian* (Leyland Line) and in fact by all the steamers of the Leyland, Atlantic Transport, and other lines trading to London. In Liverpool delays are equally serious. The *Etonian* arrived loaded on the 23d of December and sailed January 14, having been in port 22 days. The *Dunsley* arrived at Liverpool on January 4 and had not sailed up to January 26; in port to that date 23 days. The *Saxon Monarch* arrived on January 14 and had not sailed up to January 26; delayed 13 days. In her case the owner states that the delay will probably be about 23 days, as she will not sail for a few days after the sailing of the *Dunsley*, which steamer preceded her. It will be noticed, therefore, that 23 days seems to be the average time that steamers are held in Liverpool. Under ordinary conditions they would be turned in 7 days.

You will notice therefore that 23 days seems to be the average time that steamers are held in Liverpool. Under ordinary conditions they would be turned in 7 days. Fourteen days' demurrage, 14 days of delay in Liverpool or any other of these congested ports is an enormous bill of expense, and the rates conform to that.

Sixteen days' delay, at the price paid for American tonnage for smaller steamers, say $45,000 per month, will easily show that no matter how high the freight rate to the various European ports may be there is a very large element of risk of loss in the business. Serious delays are also arising in the case of the *Samland*, *Missouri*, *Manitou*, and *Marquette*.

The delays are so costly, I may add, that I am informed that the London lines are seriously considering diverting the steamers from their regular trade on account of the heavy loss which these delays would cause.

I now wish to take up this matter of freight rates, which I have been discussing, a little more in detail, and in connection with the report of the Secretary of Commerce upon foreign freight rates. With the utmost respect for the Secretary of Commerce, it would seem on analysis that his report is based upon information supplied by brokers and shippers, who may perhaps wish to make it appear that the tonnage available for foreign business is so scant as to have forced rates to an utterly unreasonable point, to a point which makes business practicably impossible. This has been done in this way, rather than upon figures showing accurately at just what rates the export business has been handled since the outbreak of the European war. But, however this may be, I wish to present some statements that I have obtained, which give the number of steamers dispatched by the International Mercantile Marine Co.'s Lines—that is, the White Star Lines to Liverpool and the Mediterranean, Leyland Line to Liverpool, Leyland Line to Manchester, and Leyland Line to London, and their cargo capacity measured in tons of 40 cubic feet, together with the minimum and maximum rates on certain commodities, grain, flour, tobacco, wool, cotton, and provisions included.

The comparison which the Secretary of Commerce makes between the rates which prevailed from the 1st of August and those now prevailing is of no value whatsoever for this reason, that during the summer months, when the movement of cargo is light and ships are sailing with much of their cargo space empty, rates are generally lower than at any other time of the year, whereas in October, November, and December, when the movement of grain, cotton, and other bulk cargo starts in, ships are fully loaded and rates on such bulk cargo automatically advance. A proper comparison, as I have already pointed out, should be between the rates for a given month in 1913 and those for the same month in 1914. Rates on manufactured products are, generally speaking, much more stable than those on grain, cotton, and agricultural products for this reason, that all manufacturers sell for delivery over a long period and adjust their output so as to meet the demands of our local as well as foreign requirements. The manufacturer of sewing machines, for instance, finds he will be able to sell a certain percentage of his output in England or Australia, and he makes contract with the steamship lines under which they agree to handle for a period of, say, one year from the 1st of January all the sewing machines he has to ship. With the exporter of cotton, grain, tobacco, provisions, and other agricultural or bulk cargo the situation is quite different. The demand for such cargo is based not only upon the size of the crops here and our consequent ability to meet a demand from abroad, but also upon the size of the crops in Argentina, India, Australia, and elsewhere. If these crops happen to be good and American crops poor, our export of bulk cargo necessarily falls off and freight rates decline accordingly. In other words, the point I wish to make is this, that the ordinary cargo ships is built to take care of a certain amount of regular business composed of manufactured goods at fairly stable rates, which are always the same to all shippers, with a large amount of surplus space to take care of bulk cargo, grain, tobacco, lumber, and so forth.

When our crops are large, and the crop situation in other countries is such as to create a foreign demand for our surplus raw products, the ships carry full cargoes at good rates. When the contrary is true, they sail with much of their cargo space empty and carry raw products at low rates, frequently making unprofitable voyages.

I think I can show from the tables I shall ask to print just what cargo space these liners to which I have referred had available in 1913 and 1914. The space on most of the Leyland Line steamers has been considerably reduced on account of the fact that the *Bohemian, Devonian, Canadian, Cambrian, Iberian, and Etonian* have been fitted for the conveyance of horses for account of the British Government, and after loading cargo at Boston they proceeded to Halifax to load these horses.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Do I understand the Senator to claim that the present freight rates are not unreasonably high?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean unreasonably high in view of all the circumstances?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. My impression is that the rates are very natural under the circumstances.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks would account for this situation, which relates to one instance which I neglected to mention in my remarks the other evening: A shipper of phosphates—and I believe Florida produces about 78 per cent of all the phosphate mined in the United States and over 50 per cent of all that is mined in the world, and therefore that is an industry which is quite important to us and to the country—writes me and asks me to endeavor to get ships so that he can move phosphate, which is not contraband. I referred that matter to the Secretary of Commerce, and I find the best quotation we can get for him is 45 shillings per ton from Fernandina to Hamburg or Rotterdam.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Florida will permit me, there is a vast difference between Rotterdam and Hamburg.

Mr. FLETCHER. I mean now Rotterdam; but I am going to say that the same rate obtained before the war to Hamburg as to Rotterdam.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is what confused me at the time; but the rate now offered is 45 shillings a ton from Fernandina, Fla., to Rotterdam. I wrote to the shipper of phosphate in Florida to learn what his rate was before the war. This was on January 18, and he wrote me a letter, which I received a few days ago, saying:

> Before the war we were paying from 12 to 13 shillings from Fernandina to Hamburg and Rotterdam.

Now the rate is $10.80 a ton on phosphates and before the war it was $2.88 a ton. The rate, of course, prohibits the shipment, because the phosphate is scarcely worth the freight. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts what brings that condition about?

Mr. LODGE. The freight rate will not prohibit the shipment if the people want to pay, for the freight is almost invariably paid by the consumer; but I am not surprised at the rate being doubled. I am far from denying that there has been a reduction in the world's tonnage, with a consequent increase in rates resting on the law of supply and demand. Of course, that is perfectly obvious. I will give an illustration of the manner in which it works in the price of ships. Take those German ships which you are trying to buy; private parties tried to buy two of them early in the war. They were given a price, but the ships were subsequently withdrawn from sale by orders from Germany. These were two of the 15 to 20 year old small freighters, the very ships we are after now. Those ships were offered them for $125,000 apiece. The would-be purchasers were told, so I am informed, that the price would be higher to the German Government, and still higher to the United States Government. Then the whole business went off on the orders from Germany of withdrawal from sale of which I have just spoken. I inquired what those ships would bring to-day, and was told that they would easily bring $250,000 apiece. The price to the United States would be still higher, and yet it is proposed to saddle the people of the United States with those old, worn-out, obsolete boats at fancy war prices. Those ships have doubled in value, and they are an example of what is happening with all cargo carriers. There is, no doubt, I repeat, that there is a shortage in tonnage. I am only trying to demonstrate that the rise in freight rates is largely natural; that it is what is to be expected under war conditions; and that it is not going to be affected by a few ships put into service by the Government to carry freight at a loss, to be reimbursed by the taxpayers, for a few favored individuals who are able to get their products on board.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield, Mr. President, if I do not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is there anything in the bill, or does the Senator from Massachusetts have any assurance that one of these boats, should it be purchased, will be used for carrying the phosphates of Florida to Rotterdam?

Mr. LODGE. I have no idea, Mr. President, who the favored shippers are to be. Being a Yankee, I suppose I could make a guess, but I have, of course, no certain knowledge as to who the favored shippers are to be.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. Apropos of the question put by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and the subject which the Senator from Massachusetts has been discussing, I ask whether a very important element in producing a necessary increase of freight rates upon the eastbound freight is not the lack of return cargoes resulting from the enormous decrease of production in Europe by reason of the war and the withdrawal of so large a proportion of the people from production?

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly, the falling off in the imports is very marked.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator, but——

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to being interrupted if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is no point being made as to that.

Regarding this question of favoritism, however—because I happen to give facts from my own State which are within my own knowledge—does not seem to me to warrant the suggestion that Florida is to be favored in this sort of an enterprise. If the Senator who proposes that will examine the report of the Secretary of Commerce and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, he will find that such complaints come from all over the country. All he has to do is to read the letter, and I would ask, if the Senator will permit me, whether he is giving figures within his own knowledge or, if he does not mind, would he inform us as to how he arrived at those conclusions?

Mr. LODGE. I have figures here, taken from ships' manifests. What I asked for were the actual amounts paid, and I got them from as many lines in Boston as I had time to do. These are the actual payments as shown on the ships' manifests.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wanted to bring that fact out.

Mr. LODGE. I will come to that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course it will be conceded that we can scarcely depend on the statements of interested parties.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, Mr. President, I did not mean to say that the Senator from Florida would be favored in phosphate exports. My point was that the amount of freight that these Government-owned ships would carry is a trifle compared even with your $50,000,000 spent; it is but a small part of the great volume of freight exports. You may drive American ships off certain lines, and thereby contribute still further to the deficiency of tonnage, but you are not going to affect the general price. The people who are fortunate enough to get their freight on Government ships, of course, will benefit by having the Government pay their freight; but, as a matter of fact, that is a benefit to the foreign consumer in nine cases out of ten. Those who do not get the Government boats, however, of course will be left just where they are now.

In regard to the matter of complaints, of which the Senator reminds me, I have not been able to go through them all thoroughly, but I have taken a few where the complainants mentioned the ports to which they wanted accommodations. These are the complaints which are embodied in the reports of the twin secretaries. I take some of these complaints, just a few—there are many more, some perfectly vague—to show what is required to fill the wishes of these complainants. They are as follows:

Number of ships necessary to remedy some of the complaints cited in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce.

Routes.	Sailings.	Number of ships required.
New York to Scandinavian ports	Bimonthly	5
New York to Holland	do	4
Texas ports to South America	3 weeks	6
Baltimore to Argentina	do	6
Philadelphia to Uruguay	do	6
New York to Barcelona	do	6
New Orleans to Havre	Bimonthly	4
New York to Denmark	do	5
Savannah to Rotterdam	10 days	6
Savannah to Bremen	do	6
Wilmington to Bremen	Bimonthly	4
New York to Havre and continental	10 days	6
New Orleans to British ports	Bimonthly	8
Pensacola to Christiania	3 weeks	4
Baltimore to British continental ports	Bimonthly	8
New York to London	10 days	5
New York to Hamburg	do	5
New York to Liverpool	do	4
New York to Rotterdam	do	5
Southern ports to Bristol	Bimonthly	4
Baltimore to Rotterdam	do	4
Boston and New York to Buenos Aires		8
Boston to Liverpool	10 days	4
Galveston to continental ports	Monthly	3
New York to Wales	Bimonthly	6
Baltimore to Amsterdam (6), Italy (6), Norway (4), Belgium (4)	do	20
Boston to continental and British ports	do	12
Galveston to Bremen	do	4
New York to Aberdeen	do	4
		172

In all 172 steamers are asked for by these complainants, and probably most of them have not freight enough to fill half a ship. They want lines and sailings to the extent indicated, and these are only a part of the complaining letters.

Now, taking the steamers—and, of course, each man who writes such a letter thinks he is going to have one, and those happy few who get them will no doubt profit—172 ships are required to run those lines, based on some of these complaints. You can not get them even for the $50,000,000 proposed to be provided by this bill. You can not begin to supply those ships for that amount. Taking the cost at $50 a ton, which I believe is the usual estimate——

Mr. ROOT. For freighters alone.

Mr. LODGE. For freighters alone, and with all the money which the bill carries you would not get more than 50 or 60 ships out of 172. So that some of the complainants are going to be disappointed—I will not say which ones; I will not say from what States they come; but I have a strong suspicion that among the disappointed ones some will live in Boston and New York.

The rates which I am about to give are those at which the cargo actually moved. They are not guesswork or the arrangement of any expert or actuary; they are the figures at which the cargo actually moved, and are taken from the ships' manifests. Where two rates are given—for instance, 6½ cents to 6¾ cents—it will be understood that the lowest rate at which grain was carried in June, 1913, was 6½ cents, and the highest 6¾ cents, per bushel of 60 pounds. Similarly, in June, 1914, 2 cents to 3 cents—the lowest rate at which grain was carried was 2 cents and the highest 3 cents. Where there is but one rate, there was no variation during the month.

The Secretary of Commerce speaks of contracts having been repudiated by at least one of the steamship companies. This is not impossible, but so far as the companies of which I am now speaking are concerned and so far as I have been able to learn with reference to the business of the other companies, all contract obligations in existence when the European war broke out have been scrupulously observed. The fact that one company may have repudiated its contracts would seem scarcely a sufficient justification for resorting to Government ownership of steamers. I believe there is an old saying about hard cases making bad law.

It may be true that shippers of grain, cotton, and bulk cargo have found it impossible to secure room from certain ports before March and April, but this is not surprising, nor is it unusual. When there is an active demand from abroad for grain and cotton, exporters sell several months in advance, and engage their freight room accordingly, and it is not at all unusual during such times for shippers who at the last minute seek room for prompt shipment from the seaboard to find that there is no room available.

The highest charter rates so far paid have been those paid for American flag steamers, and the highest freight rates appear to have been those paid to American flag steamers for cotton to Bremen. A comparison of the rates ruling to Hamburg and Bremen before the outbreak of the war and those ruling at present is, however, manifestly absurd, for insurance on a steamer navigating the mine fields facing a German port, if procurable, would be practically confiscatory. So that to take the German rate, as has been done in some of the figures in this report, in order to show what freight rates are from the United States is absolutely unfair and misleading. The bulk of the exports have gone to England, to France, and to the Mediterranean ports.

These lines which I have named have had no serious complaints from any of their shippers about their inability to take care of their export business. On the contrary, they have managed to satisfy them all, and whilst it is true that there have been times when they have not been able to take all the cargo offered at the given moment, they have been able sooner or later to handle it.

The situation has been more or less confused on account of the large offerings of material meant for use in the field, which during normal times the steamship lines do not have. This army material, on account of the fact that its prompt movement is urgently required, carries a very high rate of freight, and it would be very unnatural for any lines not to give it preference on occasions to cargo paying a very much lower rate.

However unwise and dangerous the projects of this bill may be and however loosely its provisions may be drawn, I can not conceive it possible—and I have lately learned that many things are possible that I thought were impossible—I can not conceive it possible that we should put contraband and munitions of war on board a Government-owned ship. Contraband, of course, makes any neutral, no matter what the question is about its character—it may never have been anything but an American vessel—liable to seizure; but there is no provision in this bill against using Government-owned vessels for carrying contraband of war.

There are immense masses of munitions of war of all sorts passing out of this country, as we all know. They are going to the countries which happen to have command of the sea, and very valuable freight they make.

What would be the view of Germany if she found American Government-owned ships carrying munitions of war to the Allies? She would regard it, and would rightly regard it, as an unneutral and a hostile act. Because she does not happen to have command of the seas—and those opposed to her do—we are proposing, without a word to prevent it, to make Government-owned ships go into this trade. I do not mean merely cartridges and shells, but to take horses, to take blankets, to take shoes for the soldiers, which are being made in this country in large quantities. Take such articles on board of a Government-owned ship, and that would make it like any neutral ship a good prize, and would be, according to Germany's point of view—and rightly so, in my opinion—an unneutral if not a hostile act. Yet I was told no later than this morning that we never would be permitted to put into the bill a provision that the vessels operated under it should not carry contraband or conditional contraband of war, and that in the face of the statement of the counsellor of the State Department before the House committee, that it would be an unneutral act.

The present high rates, as I repeat in this connection, are not wholly due to the shortage of steamers; and I admit the great effect of that. They are to be accounted for in large measure by the fact that the steamers now being operated, as I have already pointed out with detail examples, are being delayed at the ports of discharge in England, France, Italy, and elsewhere. Some of the steamers of the lines that I have referred to, and from whose manifests I take these figures, have been held up in London from three to five weeks; and the latest information is that there is a large number anchored in the stream waiting for discharging berths. The advices from Genoa, Italy, are to the effect that there are about 60 steamers there now awaiting their turn to discharge at the piers, and that at Bordeaux a similar situation exists.

Those delays pile up the expenses to the ship faster than anything else, and they go with that uncertainty of loss staring them in the face. The Senator from North Dakota asked me what that exact loss was. I thought I had some estimates on it, but I remember now that I found it impossible to get exact figures, because it depends so much upon the character of the cargo and the need of delivery and the time, of course, and it is very hard to say just what it would be. The loss is very great, however, and it is, I think, evident to anyone who is at all familiar with the operation of ships that when they are held up for five or six weeks at their discharging ports, where under normal conditions they remain but a week, it will

take two ships to do the work that one ordinarily does; and that, of course, adds to the shortage of tonnage.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would it not be a loss for each day at least equivalent to the sum that is paid by the Government for its leased ships, now idle in our waters here, which were used to transport our sailors to Mexico? I understand that amounts to about $1,000 per day, just doing nothing, for each one of the ships. Therefore, for 30 days, in the case of a ship of the same size, requiring the same amount of care, etc., would it not amount to about $30,000 loss?

Mr. LODGE. Why, certainly. That is a very happy illustration of it, because those ships were tied up; and of course in the case of the people whose ships are held up at Genoa, for instance, because they can not discharge cargoes, it is running against them every day just as it ran against us here on ships chartered to take our troops and supplies to Mexico.

Mr. President, these are the tables to which I have referred, and which I ask leave to have printed with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The tables referred to will be found at a later point in Mr. LODGE's speech.]

Mr. LODGE. I am going to put them in the RECORD and then explain them. They are in too great detail to read to the Senate, but I will read the following comparisons of the articles.

This is a pretty good test of how far we can depend on that report. I take July, August, September, October, November, and December for 1914, and I compare the rate as given in the Secretary's report with the actual rate as given by the manifest, the amount actually paid for moving the cargo. These ships go to London, as I have said—and I wish to repeat it—to London, to Liverpool, to Manchester, and to the Mediterranean ports. The Mediterranean rates are very high, for they are much higher even in time of peace.

Now, we take grain in July, 1914. The rate as given in the Secretary's report is 5.6 cents. The actual rate on this line of ships running from Boston was 3.5 cents. Even in July, before the war had begun, the Secretary's figures are far above those rates that were actually paid in Boston.

In August on grain the Secretary's rate is 5.7, and the actual rate as per manifest is 4.1.

In September the rate as given in the Secretary's report is 7.7; the actual rate, as given by the manifest, 4 cents.

In October the Secretary's report was 7 cents per bushel of grain; 6 cents is the actual rate.

In November, 16.1 cents, according to the Secretary's report; 7.2 cents for grain, according to the manifests.

In December, 22.1 cents, according to the Secretary's report; 11.4 cents according to the manifests.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does the Senator know where the Secretary got his information?

Mr. LODGE. That, of course, is mere conjecture. I think they got some information in New York. They asked for information from Boston. I can not find that they used it in making their so-called averages, but they certainly got information from New York, and it seems to me that what they did was to take the highest price of the highest cargo to the most dangerous port, where the greatest rate was charged, and gave that as the average rate per month. Now, none of these are ships going to Bremen, and if they had been ships going to Bremen the rate would have been very much higher. I quite understand that. I do not mean to say that the total rates would not show somewhat higher figures when averaged; but the trouble with the Secretary's figures, as I analyze them, is that the lower rates have been left out of the calculation.

[At this point a message was received from the President of the United States, which appears under its appropriate heading.]

Mr. LODGE. I now take flour per hundred pounds. The rate as given in the Secretary's report for July is 11.5 cents. The actual rate, as per manifest, is 12 cents. There they got the July rate lower than the actual rate, and July is their month for comparisons.

August, 13.6 cents in the Secretary's report; 13.1 cents in the manifest.

September, 22.3 cents in the Secretary's report; 17.8 cents in the manifests.

October, 26 cents in the Secretary's report; 18.5 cents in the manifests.

November, 26 cents in the Secretary's report; 19.3 cents in the manifests.

December, 35 cents in the Secretary's report; 19 cents in the manifests.

There is no explanation of those different discrepancies.

The figures of the manifests, which are the actual amounts paid, can not be disputed on those lines where there is a cargo capacity ranging from 100,000 to 50,000 tons, on which it is based. There can not be any mistake about those figures. Of course, there were variations. I have only taken a few lines, taking them entirely at haphazard; but such discrepancies as exist here show that you can not rely on the figures of the report, and yet they are what are furnished us officially.

Cotton, per bale, July, $1.15 according to the Secretary's report; 88 cents according to the manifests.

August, $1.15 according to the Secretary's report; $1.20 according to the manifests.

September, $1.26 by the Secretary's report; $1.44 according to the manifests.

There you see, these manifests show a higher rate than the Secretary gives.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts is reading altogether from the manifests of the ships sailing from Boston Harbor; is he not?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not see, in the Secretary's statement, the rates from Boston.

Mr. LODGE. No; they were suppressed, apparently. Perhaps they did not conform to the official view of what the average freight rate ought to be.

Mr. SIMMONS. He gives the rates; but the Senator is reading the Boston rates, and then comparing them with the rates given by the Secretary.

Mr. LODGE. Ah, but the Secretary says these are the average rates from the United States to Europe. He does not say they are the average rates from New York.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Secretary gives the rates from New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New Orleans, and Galveston upon grain and cotton and meat and lard and probably some other products; but if the Senator will examine the rates from these different ports they vary very much.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; they vary. I have said that.

Mr. SIMMONS. And I did not understand that the Senator was giving the average rate.

Mr. LODGE. I am giving the average rate from Boston; yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is comparing the Boston manifests with the average rates given by the Secretary for the——

Mr. LODGE. In the table on page 23.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was reading from pages 13 and 14 of the Secretary's statement.

Mr. LODGE. I am taking what he says is the average increase in freight rates from the United States to Europe; and although he does not seem to have paid much attention to Boston, it is in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. I notice in the secretary's table on grain from New York to Liverpool, the rate on July 1st is 5 cents, and on the 19th 20 cents. The rate from Baltimore on grain is very different from that. It is 30 cents in January, and likewise the difference runs through the whole table. If the Senator is giving the average, of course the point I am making does not apply.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have taken the table which is the one the country would look at first, the average from the United States to Europe, and I am comparing it with the average from the second port of the United States as they appear in the absolute manifests; and I merely say that there are discrepancies which seem to me to indicate that these figures were not made up on the best information.

In October, for cotton, the secretary's figure is $2.10, and the actual rate from Boston was $1.44.

In November the rate given in the secretary's report is $3.39, and the rate from Boston was $1.74.

In December the rate as given by the secretary is $4.57, and the rate from Boston was $2.34.

Meats—I will ask to have that printed. The discrepancies exist there also, but they are not so very large, and I will not take the time of the Senate by reading them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is, in full, as follows:

	Grain (per bushel of 60 lbs.).		Flour (per 100 lbs.).		Cotton (per bale 480 lbs.).		Meats (per 100 lbs.).	
	Rate as given in Secretary's report.	Actual rate as per manifests.	Rate as given in Secretary's report.	Actual rate as per manifests.	Rate as given in Secretary's report.	Actual rate as per manifests.	Rate as given in Secretary's report.	Actual rate as per manifests.
1914.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
July	5.6	3.5	11.5	12	1.15	0.888	25	28.1
August	5.7	4.1	13.6	13.1	1.15	1.20	24.2	30
September	7.7	4	22.3	17.8	1.26	1.44	36	33.7
October	7	6	26	18.5	2.10	1.44	36.7	33.7
November	16.1	7.2	26	19.3	3.39	1.74	37	33.7
December	22.1	11.4	35	19	4.57	2.34	37	33.7

Mr. LODGE. Now, to show one or two other little variations from facts in the report. I have not had time to go into the details of this report; I merely wish to suggest the necessity of caution in dealing with it and its untrustworthiness as a basis for argument. On page 18 it says:

It has been stated that if the shipping bill is passed additional tonnage for our foreign trade can not be quickly obtained. This is incorrect. While we have made no effort to test the market for ship offerings, we have been assured by no less an authority than Mr. Bernard N. Baker, of Baltimore, a man of the best character and standing, who developed to a high degree of prosperity the American Transport Line, of which he was for many years president, and who is thoroughly familiar with the shipping trade, that many suitable and admirable ships for the purpose can be promptly secured.

That is dated January 27.

On January 27 I clipped this from a Baltimore dispatch:

BALTIMORE, *January 27, 1915.*

That the proposed shipping bill now being fought in the United States Senate was intended to create a permanent fleet and that not 10 really fit and suitable ships are now on the market, is the summing up to-day of this important legislation by Bernard N. Baker, who has been in frequent consultation with the administration leaders, both in the Cabinet and in Congress.

"It is not my idea," said Mr. Baker, "that safety and fitness in the character of the vessels should be sacrificed to any speed or hurry"—

Mr. Baker understands the shipping bill—

"I do not believe there are more than 10 vessels now for sale which are worthy of being included in any purchase to be made by the Government under the proposed act. I am in favor of building them here or having some built abroad."

That is what Mr. Bernard N. Baker said in a published report in the newspapers, but he appears in the Secretary's report as saying that many suitable and admirable ships for the purpose can be promptly secured.

Again, at the end there is attached to this report as Exhibit 76 a list of ships offered by the Merchant Marine Agency, J. V. McCarthy, manager, Boston, Mass., from which it will be seen there are 15 ships of English registry and 7 of German registry which he proposes to sell. I made some inquiries about Mr. McCarthy, who had 22 ships to sell, and I find that he has nothing substantially different from what he sent to Mr. McAdoo, but that when offers have been made for these ships from men interested in getting the ships Mr. McCarthy has been informed from abroad by the people whom he represents that the steamers have been withdrawn from sale. Those 22 ships which figure so handsomely in the report vanish when you try to buy them.

Mr. President, there are ships to be had; not ships that will add to the total tonnage of the world—that you can bring about only by building—but ships which will add to the tonnage between this country and the Atlantic, the North Sea, and Mediterranean ports, just where it is wanted. There are ships which can be taken from lines where they are not now profitable and added to the congested routes where there is a shortage of tonnage—between the United States, the North Sea, and the Mediterranean.

In the first place, we are doing something in the way of exports. Everything is not tied up here. I take from the Chicago Tribune of January 15 this extract from a news article:

Last week, for instance, there were exported from the seaports on both coasts of the United States a total of 8,000,000 bushels of wheat. During the same week one year ago the total exports were only 2,000,000 bushels. The demand from abroad has multiplied by four. Why should not the price be expected to jump?

These are initial prices in the Chicago market. But last week—this extract is dated January 15—we actually exported from the ports of the United States four times as much wheat as we did in the same week of last year. Somebody is carrying that wheat abroad. It is not going over by itself in sacks across the ocean. Somebody is carrying it, and they carry four times as much as they did last January one year ago.

Illustrating what I have said about getting ships from one route where business is light to routes where it is greatly needed, I quote from a letter from the secretary of the Boston Maritime Association, who says:

Since writing Senator WEEKS last we learned that the ships *Vincent* and *Pass de Balmaha*, both steel ships, which have been lying here for some time unchartered, have been sold to southern merchants for the cotton trade. They have in the last few days also come into the market for sailing tonnage, and there is some inquiry in that direction.

There were two ships in Boston lying idle. Somebody bought them, and the Government could have bought them if they wanted to buy ships like those that have been used in other trades. Those are ships of our coastwise trade, and they would not buy a quarrel with each of them.

I take from an article in the Boston Herald of January 16 on that point the following:

America's great coastwise tonnage steadily continues to furnish ships for the relief of our overseas commerce, left in the lurch by so many foreign carriers because of the European war. It is proving, just as the Herald predicted, that this coastwise fleet is worth far more than any wild scheme of Government ownership.

I am trying to demonstrate now that it is not necessary to go to these imprisoned German ships if the Government is to go into the shipping business; that there are other places she can buy. The Government can not buy quickly for an emergency and at the same time add to the world's tonnage. That can be done only by building ships, but the Government can get ships out of our coastwise trade, and if the Government did that then the people who had sold would build new ships, replace those which they had sold, and thus give much-needed employment in our shipyards.

The Boston Herald also says:

Within a few days after the Bremen cotton trade was opened, 12 American steamers were chartered from southern ports to Germany. Now an American sail ship, the *Vincent*, of Boston, has been secured for the same trade. The Boston-owned steamers, *Pacific* and *George E. Warren*, are leaving the coast for Transatlantic service. So is the steamer *Pleiades*, formerly of Boston, and a considerable fleet of New England schooners has been engaged within two or three weeks for the export of lumber to the United Kingdom, the Mediterranean, and South America. The Boston steamer, *Peter H. Crowell*, has taken a charter for West Indian trade, and the firm which owns this ship has ordered another of a like type from the Newport News shipyard.

Just what I said would happen. They take them out of the coastwise trade and put them into another route, as they can easily do by getting a foreign-trade license, and then they build new ships at home.

I ask that the rest of the article be printed without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The rest of the article is as follows:

Moreover, the Coastwise Transportation Co., it was stated yesterday, had closed an order for two modern freight steamers with a capacity of 8,000 tons, one to be delivered in 10 months and the other in a year from date.

If the ill-starred Government-ownership bill were not impending, there is no doubt that many more new American ships would be under construction. But the idea of the Government as a competitor is not encouraging to private capital and enterprise. Nevertheless the American people are finding that they are not wholly helpless, and that they have a maritime reserve of the utmost value in their coastwise fleet, incomparably the largest and most efficient in the world. American cargo steamers designed within the past two or three years have all been built with reference to the Panama Canal and the 5,000-mile voyage between our Atlantic and Pacific seaboards. This means that these ships are fit for any service in any ocean.

The pity of it is that when this European war broke out last August our Government did not take some decisive step to assure the immediate construction of a large fleet of American steamers. American yards were half empty then; they would have been glad to undertake the work, and a month or two hence many new cargo craft could have been in readiness.

But instead of such a straightforward, practical policy the mischievous Government-ownership bill was launched. Instead of building American ships with American labor and manning them with American officers and crews, foreign ships are to be bought and foreign labor utilized—if the scheme is not vetoed by Great Britain and France.

Mr. LODGE. Here is a statement from the American United Fruit Company. It is the statement of Mr. Andrew W. Preston, the president.

I was surprised to note that, in attempting to justify this bill after an ex parte hearing, Senator FLETCHER undertook to reflect upon the character of the ships recently given American registry by stating that the cargo space of most of those ships was employed by their owners exclusively for the transportation of their own goods and added nothing to the facilities of the American merchant marine for the transportation of general cargoes. While it is true that the United Fruit Company, to a large extent, furnishes its own northbound cargo, a tremendous advantage in competition with other lines, Government or otherwise, yet our company furnishes no part of the return cargo to ports of Central America.

AVAILABLE FOR EXPORTS.

The company's banana business requires frequent and regular trips to the United States, and the American merchants have the entire ships available for the goods which they export to Central America. Therefore, Senator FLETCHER's statement, like practically every argument that I have seen advanced in favor of this bill, is misleading and will not stand the test of a careful examination.

There has been a great deal of talk respecting the difficulty in procuring transportation to various ports. If anybody in any part of the country has any goods which they wish transported to any part of Central America, I wish they would communicate with our traffic department. We have had, still have, and expect to have, ample space for all cargo offered to us for transportation.

That is illustrative of the fact that there is unoccupied tonnage now on the Central and South American lines, and the Government could transfer from those routes where there is but little to do to the congested routes where there is more trade than there is cargo space.

Mr. President, to go from these questions of detail to a somewhat larger question, I want to say a few words on the general economic question of the merchant marine.

The existing conflict between the great European Nations, involving as opponents the two principal international maritime carriers, Great Britain and Germany, has served as an impressive object lesson to the American people of the troubles resulting from a policy of easy-going dependence upon the ships of foreign Nations to transport overseas the constantly expanding volume of their international commerce. We have had several such lessons within recent times, though none of them has been so vividly brought home to the whole people as this. At the time of the Boer War the commandeering of her merchant ships for Government service by Great Britain led to a dearth of cargo carriers, and freight rates went up all over the world. When the American fleet of war ships went around the world, we had the mortifying spectacle of an armada belonging to one Nation accompanied throughout its entire journey by a host of the merchant ships of other Nations converted into auxiliaries, colliers, and supply vessels.

The editorial and other articles appearing continuously in all our newspapers, and the legislation recently enacted by Congress, as well as that now pending, all bear evidence that the attention of the whole Nation is at present aroused on the question of the restoration of the American merchant marine, so that we may be relieved from the apprehension of preventable crippling of our agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests by reason of international disputes over which we have no control. As this comes just as the United States has gradually developed its agricultural and industrial organization to the point where it is economically self-sufficient internally, it only remains for us to address ourselves to that which is the complement of this development by determining how to make ourselves completely self-sufficient externally through the organization of our transportation facilities on the high seas, so that hereafter we shall be able to minimize the effect upon us of international disturbances in which we are not participants. It needs no demonstration to show that it is as essential for us to be self-sufficient in shipping as in manufacturing and agriculture. Just how best to accomplish this is the problem which confronts us.

The numberless propositions which from time to time are submitted through the columns of the press, and the multitude of bills constantly being introduced into Congress, suggest a bewildering confusion of ideas upon the subject. Nor is this surprising when we consider its magnitude and complexity, and the possibilities and limitations of the construction, management, and operation of modern vessels. Even our system of government, admirable as it is in most respects, does not conduce to a solution of the problem. The reference of proposed legislation to congressional committees, whose membership, with few exceptions, changes every two years, as is the case in the House, does not provide us with a body of men trained to understand even the rudiments of the factors controlling the problem of the world's competition for the international carrying trade. This difficulty is aggravated by the fact that a large preponderance of our legislators come from communities far removed from the sea, who, in the nature of things, have had no opportunity either to understand or actually to realize the situation.

During the period from about 1860 to the present time the tonnage under our flag engaged in international trade has been relatively decreasing. It is a peculiar coincidence, however, that it is almost precisely during the same period, at least from 1870 to the opening of hostilities in the war now raging in Europe, that another nation, Germany, which previously had almost no merchant marine, has gradually become the second greatest international carrier, even threatening the supremacy of Great Britain, the leading maritime nation. This result has been attained by Germany through the efficient work of her legislative machinery, combined with the enterprise of her citizens. Her permanent national boards on marine, industrial, and commercial affairs include a number of the leading men in these fields of endeavor working in conjunction with representatives of the legislature, with a staff whose world-wide researches are made the basis of constructive legislation. Somewhat analogous is the policy of the British Government with its world-renowned board of trade. These permanent organs of government are cruelly practical, look facts squarely in the face, realize that the world is dynamic, not static, a process, not a structure, and recognize that the country looks to them to formulate policies which shall keep pace with the evolution of commerce and of transportation and communication, which has been going on with ever-accelerating speed within the past 40 years. The results which have accrued from the settled policy of these two nations should commend the attention of the American people to their methods of procedure. Our past experience shows that the greatest obstacle to a large increase in our international tonnage is a lack of the proper agencies to secure accurate information on a problem surrounded with forces in a state of ceaseless ferment.

While it is true that the total tonnage of the ships flying the American flag engaged in trade between the nations is scanty in comparison with that of vessels of Great Britain and Germany engaged in the same occupation, yet, contrary to public belief, the aggregate tonnage of the United States employed in all trades, including that between the ports of our enormous extent of seaboard on the oceans (including Porto Rico and Hawaii) and on the Great Lakes is great, so great, indeed, that this country takes rank as easily the second maritime nation of the world, surpassed alone by Great Britain. The figures compiled by the United States Government show the total tonnage of all craft over 100 gross tons now carrying our flag to be in round numbers over 8,000,000, of which about 3,500,000 trade between Atlantic and Gulf ports; about 3,000,000 on the Great Lakes; about 1,000,000 between Pacific ports, the remainder being engaged in trade between this and other countries. This is about one and one-half times as great as the combined foreign-going and coastwise tonnage of Germany, more than three times the total tonnage of Norway, and twice the total tonnage of France and Italy combined. While it is likewise true that Germany's tonnage is almost exclusively engaged in international trade—her coastwise tonnage being practically negligible—and that the coastwise tonnage of Great Britain is small relatively to the tonnage of that country engaged in international trade, yet the assumption is fallacious that because over six-sevenths of the gross tonnage of the United States is engaged in our coastwise trade the coastwise routes and shipping of this country are comparable to the coastwise routes and shipping of other countries. As a matter of fact, almost all the trades in which our coastwise tonnage operates bear a close analogy in length of routes and size of ships operated thereon to many of the international routes and to the size of ships operated thereon of foreign nations, and bear no resemblance to the coastwise shipping of Great Britain even, which has the greatest coastwise tonnage in the world outside of our own. The steamers engaged in the coastwise trade of Great Britain are almost all under 1,000 gross tons, the large majority being much under this, and but few of the routes approximate 300 miles in length.

A tabulation of some of the distances between American ports to and from which our steamers operate direct, and the size of the ships employed on these routes, will illustrate this:

	Miles.	Gross tonnage of ship.
New York to Honolulu	6,700	12,000
New York to San Francisco	5,217	12,000
San Francisco to Honolulu	2,091	12,000
San Francisco to Alaskan ports	2,000	5,300
New York to Galveston	1,742	6,400
New York to Porto Rico	1,407	10,000
New York to New Orleans	1,344	10,000
New York to Jacksonville	979	4,500
New York to Savannah	708	6,200
New York to Charleston	736	4,500
New York to Norfolk	320	3,800
Baltimore to Jacksonville	772	3,600
Boston to Savannah	844	6,200
Boston to Baltimore	705	3,600
Boston to Norfolk	533	3,600
San Francisco to Portland, Oreg	400	5,000

Many of our coastwise routes exceed the distance of the routes traversed by British ships plying between ports in Great Britain and the ports of Norway, Sweden, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, and even the Mediterranean ports, as well as the Baltic ports of Russia, the steamers covering these routes being classed, of course, by Great Britain as in the foreign trade.

The ships under the American flag in the international trades, excluding small craft, comprise less than 1,000,000 gross tons,

almost exclusively steamers engaged in line traffic running regularly between the same ports. In the trans-Atlantic trade there are six and in the trans-Pacific trade the same number, all very large ships. There are lines on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts trading between American and Cuban, Mexican, South American, and Canadian ports.

International carrying trade is a bargain in which no one can assume successfully to dictate all the terms. It is open to all nations, and it is impossible to compete there except on an equal basis. It behooves us, therefore, first of all to ascertain if our citizens are on a footing of equality with those of other countries, and if not, we must, perforce, so adjust ourselves as to overcome our disabilities if we may hope to fulfill the expectations of the country at large, and cease our search for a nostrum that will by magic produce a state of health. This should be done with sober consideration, and whatever legislation is enacted should be based on information accurately ascertained by men capable of grappling with the complexities of the problem without regard to the frantic and feverish clamors of amateurs charged with ardent emotionalism, and with less regard to the traditional dogmas of political parties adapted to economic conditions which belong to a dead era, otherwise no permanent headway will be made.

It is unfortunate that most of our people whose ideas form what is commonly designated as public opinion think in terms of the large Atlantic liners whenever they give consideration to merchant-marine affairs. Such steamers are most in evidence to the traveling public who pass through our large eastern seaports, and the size and magnificence of these craft make an emotional appeal to the eye and mind. Most of the large liners to-day in the international trades all over the world are under the British or German flags; in fact, Germany has a greater number of these large liners in proportion to her total tonnage than her rival.

Great Britain stands unrivaled, however, as the world's cargo carrier, and it is the tremendous number of her large and first-class tramp steamers, with their enormous cargo-carrying capacity, which gives her such a preponderance over every other country as a maritime nation. In all the seaports of this country, on both the Atlantic and Pacific, away from the usual berths of the large passenger steamers, the red ensign of Great Britain is everywhere in evidence, though hardly ever noticed by our traveling public. It would indeed be gratifying to every American to behold the United States flag at the stern of more of the large passenger liners than is now the case, but the most immediate need of this country is for cargo carriers, such as Great Britain possesses in abundance, so that our cotton, wheat, corn, and other products shall be carried in our own ships and the United States cease to be entirely dependent on the ships of other countries for this service. It is merely to scratch the surface of the problem to attempt to solve it by the acquisition of a few steamers running on regular routes with fixed schedule. The ship of the type of the tramp is the prime necessity in the international carrying trade, and the ownership and operation of this type of ship require a commercial machinery extremely complex. The tramp has no schedule. If a bad harvest in the United States cuts off the grain export, the tramp that has done the work in the North Atlantic may seek freight at the mouth of the Danube or South Russia, or in the Indian Ocean or the East Indies. Wherever freight is offering there she may go; for rice to Rangoon, for jute to Calcutta, or for sugar to Java. Much of the work of these vessels is of a seasonal character, a certain region shipping its products at a particular time only; California wheat is ready to ship at a different season from that of the Argentine Republic or India; the corn of the Mississippi Valley is ready to ship later than the wheat from the same region; there is a different sugar season for Hawaii, Peru, Java, Germany; there is a cotton season and a nitrate season, the latter being decided by the great demand for nitrate in the spring planting time of the Northern Hemisphere. It would be absurd, of course, to contemplate engaging in the international trade with this type of ship and to confine its operations to the carriage of our own exports and imports, for then the greater part of her time she would be proceeding in ballast, while her competitor of other nations roaming all over the world, with full cargoes most of the time and consequent greater earning power, would be able to underbid her in rate quotations on American cargoes.

Disregarding the numerous and spectacular theories submitted with complete assurance for public consideration by well-meaning but uninformed persons, a consideration of some of the plausible remedies advanced by reputable newspapers, prominent men, important chambers of commerce, and maritime associations, as well as practical steamship operators, amply demonstrate the difficulties encountered in any attempt to arrive at a diagnosis and obtain an infallible prescription for a cure of our present humiliating shipping status. These may be summarized as follows: (a) A revision of our antiquated navigation laws and the removal of all Government restrictions which handicap American shipping; (b) preferential duties on goods imported in American bottoms; (c) payment of subsidies, bounties, subventions, or mail contracts to American ships; (d) Government ownership and operation of ships.

In the present crisis in international relations the people of this coutry are in no mood to view complacently the familiar arguments which urge that it would be an economic loss to attempt to undertake to do for ourselves what the foreigner is able to do for us cheaper than we can. Even Great Britain, the great protagonist of free trade, has seen fit to abandon that cardinal principle of her economic policy when her interests were vitally in jeopardy, and has never adopted it where her shipping was concerned. The object lesson taught her by our Civil War, when her supply of raw cotton was cut off from the only source from which it could be procured, and the operatives of her cotton mills were starving from enforced idleness owing to a quarrel in which she had not interest and over which she had no control, has not been lost on her, judging by the strenuous efforts she has ever since been putting forth through grants of money by the National Government and by local commercial associations to stimulate the cultivation of this staple in her possessions in India, Egypt, and Africa. The opponents of this free-trade argument contend that while apparently sound it is based on too narrow a view of the problem, claiming that the ships of a nation are like the delivery wagons of a storekeeper, and no department store in the country would dream of intrusting to a rival the delivery of its own goods to its own customers. They furthermore point out that during the Napoleonic wars in Europe, when, between the Milan decrees of 1806 and the Berlin decree of 1807 of Napoleon, and the orders in council of the British Government of the same years, the United States, a neutral nation, suffered immensely in its trade at the hands of both contestants, although in no way involved in the issues at stake, demonstrated to the people of the United States that it was not advantageous to them to continue dependent upon European nations for most of their manufactured articles of consumption, contenting themselves with the production of raw materials, even though the foreigner could produce manufactured articles cheaper than they could themselves, in consequence of which they speedily readjusted their economic policy to overcome this.

Our navigation laws are contained in the national statutes pertaining to shipping and the rules of the supervising inspectors of steamboats made pursuant thereto, which have the force of law when approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Since the enactment of the statute of June 6, 1872, and subsequent amendments thereto, all materials of foreign production necessary for the construction of vessels built in the United States for the purpose of being employed in the foreign trade, or in the trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, or generally in the coastwise trade of the United States for not more than six months of each year, and all such articles necessary for the building of their machinery and all articles necessary for their outfit and equipment, may be imported free of duty. Until the passage of the act of August 24, 1912, all ships flying the American flag had to be built in American shipyards. By this act foreign-built ships were permitted to fly our flag if not more than five years old at the time of application for registry, but such ships had to confine their operations to trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands. By the act of August 18, 1914, the restriction as to the limitation of five years has been removed, so that to-day foreign-built ships, regardless of age, are eligible to American registry to be engaged in the foreign trade. In the complete construction of but one large steel ship, the *Dirigo*, built by Arthur Sewall & Co., at Bath, Me., has the privilege of free foreign materials been availed of, and the results in this instance have not proven satisfactory. During the interval between the enactment of the statute of 1912 and the passage of the act of 1914 not a single foreign-built vessel made application for American registry, and thus far, January, 1915, during the operation of the latter act almost all of the 111 foreign-built ships, with an aggregate measurement of 396,990 gross tons, admitted to American registry are and have been owned by Americans. All of these ships have been operating from American ports, and notwithstanding that they have been officered by foreigners, these foreign officers have, perforce, been largely domiciled with their families in the United States, and as a necessary consequence the owners have been obliged to pay and feed them on a scale commensurate with that of the officers of similar ships under the American flag. In other words, the only reason for these American-owned foreign-going vessels being under foreign flags is due to the lower cost of foreign construction, from 30 to 40

per cent less than if built in American shipyards, with all that that involves in the way of earning dividends, providing for depreciation, and covering by insurance on the excess cost, and this having now been removed, there was nothing to interfere with the natural preference of the owners for their own national flag. To this limited extent the recent legislation has increased our tonnage without injury to our shipbuilding industry; but to claim this as even an approach to a solution of the problem is, of course, ridiculous, in view of the fact that more than 92 per cent of our exports and imports is carried in foreign bottoms. Furthermore, these foreign-built ships admitted to American registry by no means represent even the total number of vessels owned wholly or partially by Americans, a census privately taken a short time ago revealing 1,213,965 gross tons of shipping engaged in international trade owned and operated by Americans.

There are other legal restrictions which still remain as a handicap on American shipping, and though each is of minor importance yet it is contended that in the aggregate they interpose a formidable barrier against our capturing the share of the world's carrying trade to which we may legitimately aspire. By the statute enacted June 26, 1884, all the officers of vessels of the United States who have charge of a watch (which embraces all the licensed deck and engineer officers) must be United States citizens. British law has no such restriction, and aliens who have acquired certificates as officers can be employed on British ships, except those receiving allowances from the British Government by virtue of their being available in case of war as auxiliary cruisers, which are exceedingly few in proportion to the number of ships under the British flag. The effect of this statute is to restrict the number of licensed officers for American ships, and this inevitably tends to increase wages, so that the cost of operating an American ship owing to this legal restriction is increased. American ship officers, while admitting the greater liberality of British laws, insist that notwithstanding this practically all British licensed officers are citizens of Great Britain, few foreigners being able to avail themselves of the liberality of the law, owing to a lack of technical proficiency in the English language and the poor chance of securing a position even where able to qualify, or to retain a position when secured except under intolerable conditions. We should not be willing to change the law and lower thereby the pay of American officers, so that this provision of our statutes must be accepted as one of our conditions.

Under United States regulations there are 16 grades of marine engineer licenses for merchant steamers, varying according to routes and the type of engine. In Great Britain there are but two grades of certificates for licensed engineers required by law, with no variation as to routes and type of engine. It is significant that in the United States Navy, before the abolition of the Engineer Corps, but four grades of engineer certificates were provided for. To comply with legal requirements it takes at least six years to qualify for the position of chief engineer in the merchant marine of the United States, whereas in Great Britain this can be accomplished in a minimum of five years. As a matter of fact, it actually requires a longer period to qualify for this position on an American steamer than it would take the same man to become a physician or a lawyer even in those States where the requirements for admission to these professions are the most drastic. This, of course, likewise tends to restrict the market.

By the act of March 2, 1895, the admeasurement laws of the United States were brought into substantial accord with the laws of Great Britain and other maritime nations. They are not, however, precisely alike. The difficulty seems to arise not from lack of uniformity of the laws themselves, but from the varying constructions put by administrative officials in all countries upon certain phrases of marine architecture, such as "upper deck," "permanent closed-in space," "shelter space," "open to the weather," "under cover," etc., for which allowances have to be made in deducting from the ship's gross tonnage to arrive at her net tonnage. Mr. Robert Dollar, operating steamships on the Pacific coast and between Pacific ports and the Orient, some of which are under the American flag and others under the British, testified before a congressional committee that under the British rating one of his ships was classed as being 2,797 net tons, whereas if it were under the American flag it would be placed at 3,679, and that such a difference as this sometimes meant as much as $5,500 a year in wharfage, light, and other harbor dues, according to the foreign ports visited. In rebuttal the administrative officials of the United States Department of Navigation submit that according to American standards of measurement many ships are classed lower than they would be under foreign flags, dependent upon the build of the ship, and that British marine architects design ships to meet the requirements of the British administrative officials' methods so as to minimize the ship's tonnage.

American requirements as to the annual and other inspection of vessels are more or less mandatory, whereas the merchant shipping act of Great Britain is considerate, surveyors of ships in the performance of this duty being enjoined not unnecessarily to delay or detain a ship from proceeding on her voyage. This may mean a matter of considerable expense to an owner, for a ship when delayed for inspection is earning nothing to meet interest on investment or insurance and is under heavy expense for wages and subsistence of crew.

A ruling of the United States Steamboat Inspection Service of July 30, 1909, made it compulsory to have an auxiliary feed line enter all boilers of steam vessels through an opening and fitting entirely independent of the fitting and opening of the main feed. This requirement cost one steamship line $18,000. This is not required on foreign ships.

A ruling of the same bureau of June 30, 1914, requires fusible plugs fitted in all boilers of steam vessels except water-tube boilers. On one of our steamship lines it will be necessary to fit 1,160 plugs during the ensuing year at an initial cost of $5,120 and $2,500 annually for renewal, as they must be renewed every four months, not to mention the expense incident to the delay in carrying out these periodic requirements. No foreign country requires these fusible plugs.

American steamship operators complain that they are constantly being menaced with such governmental interference; that no sooner is one sweeping change precipitated, involving an expenditure of thousands of dollars per ship, than another order is promulgated, or a statute enacted by Congress, which necessitates the replacement of equipment just installed by other and different equipment, which, in turn, may as soon be ordered to be thrown aside and some other substituted; that it is impossible to expect to be able to compete with the ships of other nations under such conditions; and that the dread of these heavy expenditures makes American shipowners timid in their ventures. The Steamboat-Inspection Service retorts that these requirements develop as the result of actual experience in accidents aboard ship and that they are judged necessary for the safety of life at sea. The response to this is that Great Britain, Germany, France, Norway, and other nations are as much interested in the safety of life aboard their ships as we are aboard ours, and that if such requirements are absolutely necessary they should be made a matter of international agreement, so that all nations would be on a parity; otherwise, when we can not compete, the freight and passengers will be carried by the ships of other nations, and thus in an effort to regulate business ethics our purpose of building up our merchant marine will have been defeated.

By the act of March 3, 1913, American ships capable of engaging in international trade are required to carry one more licensed deck officer and one more licensed engineer than are required on British vessels. Repeated testimony was given before the Merchant Marine Commission that when vessels were transferred from the British to the American flag, or vice versa, the number of the unlicensed members of the crew were increased in the former case and decreased in the latter, showing that the local inspectors of steamboats at American ports invariably prescribe larger crews for American vessels than the Board of Trade Supervisors of Great Britain prescribe for similar ships when under their flag. It is contended, however, that while British law does not require these extra officers, British ships, as a matter of fact, carry them though they are not necessarily certificated officers. The license requirement, however, tends to limit the number of available men and thereby to enhance their wages. Where Chinese or coolie crews are carried an intelligent man of these races can be employed for such work, whereas if a licensed man is required such men would not be available. I point out this difficulty simply to show the obstacles and competition we must meet, not to suggest that we should lower our seamen's wages or employ Chinese or lascars, to which I am inherently opposed. An American marine manned by Chinese or lascars or by underpaid seamen would be of little worth. But we must find other ways of meeting such competition as that which I have described.

In addition to these legal impediments, there are other natural and artificial handicaps which weigh heavily on the American shipowner. Wages throughout the United States are higher than in any other country. This needs no demonstration. That the purchasing power of the American wage scale in the United States may or may not be greater than the purchasing power of the foreign wage scale in foreign countries does not help the American shipowner, who must pay higher wages to American ship officers and crews and at the same time compete with the ships of countries whose officers and crews

receive lower wages. The higher rates of wages prevailing in this country are doubtless in a measure due to our protective system, while the shipowner seeking to engage in the overseas trade has no protection in his favor. It is true that the American manufacturer has finally obtained a foothold in foreign markets in competition with foreign manufacturers, notwithstanding the higher wages paid the American operative, but this would not be possible were the Government to enact laws requiring a standard of employee with a certificate from the Government and regulating the number of employees in excess of that required by the foreign manufacturer. The American manufacturer's employees, if high-priced, are more efficient than the foreign lower-priced employees, and fewer of them are therefore required, and it is by this means and by improved standardization, by domestic competition, and by superior organization, that the difference in wages is counteracted. The fact remains, however, that Great Britain pays the highest wages in the world outside the new countries, such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and South Africa, and yet none of the other European nations with which she competes, all of which pay lower wages than herself, and some of which are almost as well developed commercially, has so far been able to wrest from her her supremacy.

The statutory standard scale of provisions on American ships is higher than those of other nations and must be and ought to be maintained. On American ships the food furnished generally has been much in excess of that prescribed by law, and is much better than the average workman ashore can afford to indulge in for himself and family, this being found necessary to attract and hold competent crews. Food is a matter of national taste, and doubtless the German, Italian, Japanese, or Chinaman is as well satisfied with the diet furnished him as he would be with the American bill of fare, but the higher standard of living obtaining throughout the United States, due to climatic conditions and the abundance and variety of our food supplies, imposes an expenditure upon the American shipowner that his competitor for the world's trade is not compelled to meet. This is another fixed condition which can not and ought not to be changed, but must be met by help in other ways.

It is even contended that a free trade or protective policy has no bearing on this problem, for while Great Britain is on a practically free-trade basis, her greatest rival on the high sea, Germany, is on a highly protective basis.

The statement and the tables which I have presented cover the points in the navigation laws which I wish to put into the RECORD, so that what our difficulties were may be seen. Some are of a character growing out of our condition, which we would not change if we could and which we could not if we would. As to others, there could be valuable modifications made in the law.

I now come to the second alternative proposed for the upbuilding of our merchant marine.

To overcome these disabilities of the American merchant marine the policy of exacting lower tariff rates of duty on goods imported in American vessels is extensively advocated, the leader of the Democratic Party in the lower house of Congress, Mr. UNDERWOOD, being particularly enamored of this remedy. This has the disadvantage that it might lead to retaliation on the part of foreign nations discriminated against, though a greater objection is that most of the commodities imported by us from South American countries, particularly, whose trade we seem to be most eager of all to capture, are on the free list; and, of course, there can be no such discrimination in our exports for the reason that the United States Constitution prohibits a tariff of any kind on these. It is even claimed by statisticians that, despite our high protective tariff, about 45 per cent in value and about 65 per cent in bulk of all our imports are nondutiable. If these figures are correct it is difficult to understand the potentialities of this scheme. The discriminating duties, as the report of the Mercantile Commission shows, are practically out of the question and would be wholly fruitless. They would be enormously expensive, by loss of revenue, which they would occasion, and they would bring no result, because they would be, as I have said, met at once by retaliatory duties in other countries.

The next alternative, providing for the payment of subsidies of large mail allowances, has been for a long time in issue between our political parties, and upon this they seem to have arrived at a deadlock. I wish to dwell here for a moment on the general question of subsidy.

I have heard it stated here and there that it was the duty of the Republicans not only to oppose this Government ship ownership bill, but to propose a measure in its stead. Memories are short. Why, Mr. President, the Republican Party for the last 20 years has been doing nothing in this direction, except presenting measures for the encouragement of the merchant marine, and the method and policy they have adopted has been the method and policy of subsidy. Such American ships of consequence in the foreign trade as to-day fly our flag are there solely because they receive very modest mail subsidies. That is all that ever put them there or ever kept them there. That is the policy of the Republican Party; it always has been; and it is to-day. We offer that as a policy in contradistinction to the one proposed of Government ownership.

The United States to-day pays no direct subsidies to steamship lines, but does indirectly subsidize, as I have just said, some of her steamship companies by liberal mail allowances. Under the general statute for the sea conveyance of United States mails, steamers flying the American flag are paid 80 cents a pound for letters and postcards and 8 cents a pound for other articles, as against 35 cents a pound for letters and postcards and 4½ cents a pound for other articles when carried by ships under foreign flags. Under the ocean-mail act of March 3, 1891, contracts are made for the carriage of mails on American steamers, the remuneration being on the basis of mileage and the speed of the steamers, regardless of the quantity of mail carried. There are at present six of these contracts—two being from New York to Venezuela, one from New York to Southampton, England, one from New York to Mexico and Havana, Cuba, one from Boston to Jamaica, and one from San Francisco to Australia. The total payments for these six contracts for last year amounted to $1,144,630, an excess of $157,818 over the sum that would have been allowable to the beneficiary companies even at the 80 cents and 8 cents rates under the general statute if they had not been under contract arrangement and had conveyed the same amount of mail matter, and, of course, a much larger excess if these mails had been carried at the rates paid to foreign steamship lines. Certain burdensome conditions, considered to be of advantage to the Nation, have to be fulfilled by the steamers participating in these mail contracts, which it is claimed offset the excess amount paid for the service.

Let us now consider what is done by foreign countries in this direction. Great Britain pays $1,500,000 annually to merchant seamen enrolled in her naval reserve, $350,000 as annual retainers for the seamen who drill seven days a year with the fleet, and $95,000 a year to merchant seamen as Royal Naval Volunteers. These appropriations, while intended primarily to provide a supply of seamen upon which the navy may draw to obtain the crews to man the war vessels during hostilities, are of much assistance to the merchant marine. Great Britain also pays admiralty subventions amounting to about $400,000 annually to about 20 fast steamers, built according to Government plans and specifications, so that they can be readily converted into auxiliary naval cruisers. In addition to this, the Cunard Line receives an annual subvention of $729,999, in return for which the Government requires the right to purchase or lease any vessel owned by that company; and when the fast ships of the German lines had eclipsed the Cunard steamers in speed and the supremacy of British shipping on the north Atlantic was challenged, the British Government lent to the Cunard Co. $12,660,000 at 2¾ per cent for the construction of the steamers *Lusitania* and *Mauretania*. All of these allowances by the British Government are exclusive of payments made for the carriage of mails, which are on a liberal scale. In Germany the North German Lloyd Co. receives about $860,000 annually for maintaining a service between Germany and East Asia, and over $500,000 annually for a service between Germany and Australia; the German East Africa Co. receives $321,300 annually for a service between Hamburg and Cape Town; in return for these payments these companies carry mails, though there is no pretense that the cost of doing so is commensurate with the sums paid. France disburses over $6,000,000 annually in payment of bounties to shipowners and shipbuilders; Italy pays navigation bounties of over $60,000 annually; and Spain, $1,300,000 annually; Austria and Russia refund all Suez Canal dues disbursed by their steamers, amounting to $375,000 and $334,750 annually, respectively; and France makes a special allowance to her ships for canal tolls. Not a single British or German tramp ship receives monetary assistance from the Government. These vessels, however, share in the general policy of national encouragement of shipping, as they have been constructed in shipyards and their engines built in machine shops developed by the grants to the large steamship lines.

Whether the payments made by Great Britain and other foreign countries to their shipowners and seamen can be termed subsidies has been a subject of much debate in this country. It is doubtless true that the British contract mail system, in operation in some of its features for about 80 years, is theoretically political and military, but it has none the less helped to develop British shipping, shipbuilding, and commerce, as it was intended that it should do. Bounties, subsidies, or sub-

ventions are all terms used for payments made for some kind of value received, irrespective of the policy which may be involved—in one case the carriage of mails, in another the maintenance of national defense, or yet another the encouragement of trade—and it sometimes occurs that where a given sum is granted as a subsidy it is very difficult to analyze it into its component parts and say that so much of it is paid as a postal subsidy, so much for admiralty purposes, or so much for the encouragement of trade. British policy has usually been to subsidize ships for postal or admiralty purposes only and to exclude all consideration of trade interests, but even in the British case rapid postal communication has mainly, and in fact necessarily, followed the lines of great commercial traffic. There seems to be little doubt that a general result of these mail subsidies has been that the fast mail ships have developed a trade for the company which warranted the employment later on of intermediate passenger and cargo steamers.

It is odd that the greatest opponents of subsidies to American ships, the residents of the interior of the country, are unanimously in favor of the maintenance and extension of our rural post delivery, although the Post Office Department reports that this service now costs $53,000,000 annually and returns but $10,000,000; and with similar inconsistency these same people are demonstratively enthusiastic for the construction at national expense of mammoth reclamation projects for the benefit of the farmers of the arid West.

Some writers contend that as a nation's merchant marine increases so her commerce expands; that trade follows the flag, and that every ship is a missionary of trade. Belgium, however, has imports and exports which reach about $1,750,000,000 a year, yet she has no navy and her merchant marine comprises but 97 steamers, with a total gross tonnage of 176,000; Holland has a small navy, and its merchant marine consists of but 376 steamers of 576,000 gross tons, yet she has a foreign trade of about $2,500,000,000 annually. Even our own experience would seem to contradict the aphorism, in that with an export and import trade of about $4,250,000,000 annually, we have less than 1,000,000 gross tons of shipping engaged in overseas trade.

The remedy proposed in the Government ownership and operation of ships put forward by the present administration, with the naïve announcement that the project is submitted as a substitute for the alternative methods of subsidy, bounty, subvention, etc., which the Democratic Party is and always has been uncompromisingly opposed to, may seem exceedingly specious on the surface, but is simply a pretext and a disguise. That such a scheme is not akin to a subsidy is, of course, pure subterfuge, not entitled to serious refutation. Only the most unsophisticated could fail to perceive this. Practical men are under no delusions as to ventures of this kind. However, it is unnecessary to speculate upon this point. The Government is already in the steamship business in its ownership and operation of the steamship line of the Panama Railroad Co. This line operates six large steamers between New York and Colon, the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal, and does not confine its operations to the carriage of canal supplies, but carries on a general steamship business, connecting with other steamship lines for the through carriage of freight and passengers.

The vice president of this line testified last August, before the Committee of the House of Representatives on Naval Affairs, that four of the steamers operated by the line, two of which cost $650,000 each and the other two $750,000 each, had been lent to the steamship company for a period of years by other Government departments without charge for charter, or without any obligation on the part of the steamship line to provide for depreciation, insurance, or interest on the value of the ships, in consideration that the rates on cement carried by the line for the construction of the canal would be at a figure lower than could be secured from outside foreign lines. He also stated that on the two steamers owned by the line no provision had ever been made for insurance or interest on investment. In explanation of the terms under which the four Government ships had been lent to his line, he stated that it had been considered that the difference between the normal and the reduced rate of freight charged on Government supplies equaled the charges of interest and depreciation (of course, the Government never insures any of its property; losses being made up by appropriations where there is no accrued surplus), and there was therefore no necessity for taking money out of one pocket of the Government and putting it into another. An analysis of the relations of this steamship line with the Government in this transaction demonstrates that, in its most successful year, with a preference in the carriage of supplies for the construction of the canal assuring constantly full cargoes, and even allowing to the steamship line on the large quantities carried by it the highest rates charged by outside lines on smaller quantities, with large mail payments at more than double the rates payable to foreign lines for the same service, and a complete control of a large passenger traffic embracing canal employees on recurring furloughs, the Panama steamship line, if it had to provide for depreciation, interest, and insurance on all its floating equipment, can not make a better showing than other American steamship lines with few, if any, of these advantages. This is all the Government ownership and operation of steamship property has to offer in return for its destruction of individual initiative, a Nation's greatest asset. Furthermore, the most extreme advocates of the necessity of governmental assistance to American steamship lines to enable them to compete successfully with foreign lines, need theorize no longer; the Government has furnished in the operation of this Panama steamship line the most complete and conclusive demonstration that without such assistance it is impossible to earn a living wage. This doubtless explains the absence of shipowners at the recent hearings of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives on the Government ownership bill now pending before Congress, when not a single one appeared in response to the invitation sent out by the committee; apparently, shipping men are waiting for the activities of the Government in the domain of commerce to be diminished, rather than increased. The maintenance of a merchant marine and the exploitation of the markets of the world, correlated activities, attract the minds of men versed in the intricacies of business enterprise, but with the threat of Government competition private capital will inevitably retire from an unequal contest. The most sincere votaries of Government ownership and operation of public utilities shrink from the proposition that the Government embark in this world-competitive enterprise, realizing that either the public would have to face an enormous deficit to sustain it, or that the wages of crews would have to be reduced.

The many bills before Congress in relation to our shipping attest the lack of proper coordination. It is one thing to set forth a policy for the stimulation of the American merchant marine—I believe in the subsidy policy, which every other civilized maritime nation except ours has adopted—but there is a great deal more to do in order to build up that marine, and it is for that reason that I say that we need better coordination of the authorities called upon to deal with the marine. It is for that reason I am going to point out what the two great maritime nations, Great Britain and Germany, have done in this direction.

In Germany the quays and wharves, sidings, railway connections, warehouses, arrangements for loading and unloading, with special areas set aside for industrial plants adjacent to the wharves, are treated as a comprehensive whole. The German method of having a proportion of its governmental boards appointed from the membership of chambers of commerce or kindred bodies is not adapted to our system of administration; there are historical and traditional reasons which would prevent the people of this country from accepting this idea, even though the functions of such appointees were merely consultative. It savors too much of the relation of guardian to ward or counsellor to client. The British system, which is a compromise between our own and the German method, would be more acceptable to the people of this country. The Board of Trade of Great Britain is practically the censor of the lawmaking power of that nation in connection with its merchant marine, and we never hear of any friction between that body and Parliament, for the reason that the latter has confidence in the experts of the former, who are selected for their experience and special fitness. The work now being performed by our Department of Labor, since its dissociation from the Department of Commerce, in its investigations already completed and those now being undertaken, are evidence of what might be expected by a similar policy in favor of our merchant marine. That all the marine affairs of our Nation might be properly correlated there should be a bureau or a department which should have jurisdiction not only of the work now being performed by the Bureau of Navigation, Steamboat-Inspection Service, and shipping commissioners, but also that of the Bureau of Life Saving, Lighthouses, Marine Hospitals, Anchorage Grounds, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, hydrographic work, and even over our rivers and harbors.

I have advocated no particular method in what I have said as to how to overcome the difficulties which for the past 50 years have proved an insurmountable obstacle to this country regaining its former ascendancy on the ocean.

I have stated the Republican policy in general terms. I have no time to go into the details in support of it, but I wish to

make this one further suggestion, that complex as the conditions are—and I am now going beyond the remedy of subsidies—they are not beyond the possibility of comprehension or remedy; Great Britain and Germany have not found them so. The one suggestion, apart from the Republican policy which I have mentioned, is that this country should have a permanent bureau or department of marine. Should the investigations of such a department as is here outlined demonstrate that it would be impossible to realize our national aspiration for the restoration of our merchant marine to a point commensurate with our importance as a world power except under conditions which we would not be willing to incur, it would thereafter be incumbent upon us to cease bewailing our maritime impotence and to resign ourselves to an acceptance of all that the consequences imply. The country would then, however, at least understand the problem, which there is abundant contemporary evidence is not now the case. It is certain, at least, that such difficult conditions and such complex problems can not be met by a crude bill hastily prepared by men who have never investigated the subject. Whatever else this bill may do, it will not build up the American merchant marine.

There will never be any private competition where Government-owned ships run. On those routes American private vessels would be excluded. It is impossible to compete with a competitor who is willing to incur indefinite losses, because the taxpayers of the country pay the losses.

Mr. President, I had intended to ask leave to put in some extracts from the report of the Merchant Marine Commission as showing the difference in costs with which we had to contend; but I have spoken more than two hours, and I do not mean to burden the Senate or myself this afternoon by going further into statistics of that kind. I shall reserve them for another opportunity. I wish, however, in conclusion, to make one or two observations of a general character.

In the first place, I wish to emphasize the absolute futility of this bill as a means to give any real relief whatever to the present situation except to the favored few who succeed in getting their products on board Government-owned ships. Unless the real purpose of this bill is simply to buy the German ships in order to give to the German lines, the German war bank, which has taken them over, and the bankers interested in them on both sides of the Atlantic, thirty or forty millions of the money of the American people—which I am slow to believe, because it would be an unneutral act of a flagrant kind, and due to the worst possible motives—if this is not the case, then the only ships in the German collection in any degree or under any possible pretense fit for the alleged purposes of this bill would be the freight boats of the Hamburg-American Line.

The total tonnage of those boats, 10 in number—I gave the list the other day—is 56,504 tons. If we add the two Hanser boats, 10,621 tons, we have 67,125 tons as the total tonnage of the German ships, for the most part too old, too small, and too obsolete for the trans-Atlantic trade, as all that are available among the German ships for the alleged purposes of this bill. As a mere business proposition it would be monstrous to load the taxpayers of the United States with such boats as these, unfit for the service desired and bought at war prices, twice or three times their real value.

Mr. President, in what I have said to-day I have tried to discuss the question of freight rates. I have also tried to show very inadequately, because it is an immense subject, something in regard to the economic features of this proposition. I have sought to point out that it would have no effect in building up American shipping; that on the contrary it would contract it; that it would be run at a loss to the Government, and the losses would be paid by the taxpayers. But, Mr. President, all these objections, the deep objections which I have to Government ownership, the grave objections which every consideration of this bill from the economic point of view presents, all these are as nothing, as dust in the balance, compared to the dangers involved in this bill by the plan of buying those German ships or any of them, or English ships or any of them, or any belligerent ships at all. Whatever relief you could give to a small number of shippers would be nothing in comparison with the ills which you will bring upon the country by this attempt.

Mr. President, I am no alarmist by nature, but I am alarmed, deeply alarmed, by the possibilities contained in this bill. Here we are in the last days of a dead Congress, whose successors have been elected, trying to crush through, with all the force of a majority reckless of consequences, a bill which uncontradictedly proposes to buy ships which have escaped to our ports for the purpose of avoiding capture. The President can find no popular mandate for a literacy test in the immigration bill, and stated, out of the abundance of his knowledge, that it had never been proposed by a political party. It was proposed in precise terms, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has shown, by the Republican Party in 1896. We went to the country on that and the other issues of the day and were not defeated. The test has received the support of overwhelming majorities in two Congresses of both Houses and Senate, but apparently in the President's mind the Members of the House and Senate are men who get together here and vote their own fanciful opinions without any regard to the constituencies behind them.

It has been my observation, Mr. President, extending over a number of years now, that the Members of the House and Members of the Senate generally try to represent what they believe to be the opinions of their constituencies. Perhaps an occasional thought of reelection drifts across their minds and leads them to seek to fulfill the wishes of their constituency. The view of the President, however, seems to be that we represent nothing, and that is a very natural view for him to take in the process of converting us into a machine of record.

There certainly is no popular demand that I know of behind this bill, and no party ever suggested it, for this condition of a world war and no American merchant marine never existed in conjunction before. That is the measure and those are the circumstances under which we are asked to pass a bill which, if carried out by the purchase of belligerent ships, imprisoned German ships escaping from capture, will bring us into international complications of the gravest kind. Great Britain has protested against the sale of the *Dacia* and the transfer of her flag; and her view of the transfer of belligerent flags to neutrals in time of war has been a liberal view, like our own. Her view and ours upon this question have always been much the same.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he knows why the *Dacia* does not sail?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is not fair for the Senator from New Hampshire to ask me, ignorant as I am of the purposes of this administration, to rend the veil of mystery and secrecy which overhangs the conduct of our foreign relations covering them with a darkness which is not equaled, I think, in any European Government to-day. I do not know why they do not let the *Dacia* go; but I know that Great Britain has taken a position, as stated in the newspapers this morning, against the *Dacia's* being allowed to go. England holds that it is not at all a question of whether the sale of the *Dacia* is a bona fide sale for commercial purposes. She is an imprisoned ship. By taking our flag she escapes from the danger of capture under which she now rests; and that, to the extent to which it goes, is a change in the balance of conditions created by the war, and on those sound grounds England would not recognize it.

Russia and France have made a protest—I think they made it more than once—a formal protest, going much further, adhering to the old doctrine of France, Russia, and Germany that after the outbreak of hostilities the transfer of a belligerent flag to a neutral can not be recognized. Those protests are here in the State Department. It means that if those ships go out of our ports after the Government has bought them, flying the American flag, France and England and Russia will decline to recognize that they are American ships, but will regard them as German ships, good prize, liable to be captured, or to be sunk if they resist.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], in his very able speech—and he always speaks with great clearness and force and cogency in dealing with a large question of international law—after demonstrating what I think we all admit, that the English doctrine and our doctrine have been much more liberal in this respect than the continental doctrine, the French, German, and Russian doctrine, then said—I do not pretend to quote him exactly, but substantially—that it was unbelievable that England, at a moment's notice, would change her attitude. All these powers are now operating, be it remembered, under the terms of the declaration of London—that is, as between themselves; and under the specific terms of the declaration of London, as the Senator from Utah showed only a little while ago, every one of these ships that were avoiding capture in our ports is liable to be treated as a ship whose flag has not been transferred after we as a Government or some of our citizens have purchased her. But more than that, Mr. President, how can anyone say that England would not change her long-maintained doctrine? Have we so utterly forgotten our own history?

Why, Mr. President, there are plenty of men in this Chamber who can recall, as boys at least, the *Trent* affair, which brought

this country to the very verge of war with England. Lord Palmerston began by saying—supposing at the moment that a vessel with the envoys was likely to be stopped in the Channel—that he did not see how England could make any objection, because that was English doctrine for which they had gone to war with us in 1812. Then came news of the *Trent* affair. Under the stress of that incident they first shifted to the extraordinary proposition that it would have been no breach of international comity, no hostile act, if Commodore Wilkes had captured the ship and taken it into port; but even English Crown lawyers could not stand on that theory very long, and they came in a few days straight to the ground for which we had gone to war in 1812, that the flag covered the ship, and that we could not permit a belligerent to take men out of her. The ministry adopted our doctrine, and we were on the verge of war with England during those bitter 40 days when Lincoln was trying to extricate us, as he did extricate us by his wisdom and courage. England had shifted in a moment the doctrine for which she had fought and which she had maintained ever since 1812.

When nations are fighting for their lives, when they think their most vital interests are endangered, they are not likely to permit an enemy to receive the most powerful aid which a neutral is capable of giving. They will take a great risk before they will accept it.

I have heard it said that it is the belief of this administration that if we should buy those ships and send them abroad, when it came to the point England and France and Russia would not do what they say they will do, because they will be afraid of offending us. Why, Mr. President, that is the same idea that took us down to Vera Cruz—the idea that nobody in Vera Cruz would fight. Any man who did not think the facts ought to be made to suit his will would have known that the people of Vera Cruz would fight, and they did fight, and we floundered into bloodshed there, with the loss of 19 American lives and about a hundred Americans wounded, and two or three hundred Mexicans killed and wounded. If you are going to depend upon the theory that people will not resist when all that is dear to them is at stake, you are making a most fearful mistake. If we go on under this bill and buy those ships, I say in all soberness—for it is this which makes me so intense in my opposition to this bill—if we go on and buy those German ships and try to sail them under the American flag when they are ships escaping capture in an American port, you have started this country on the highway to war, not with one nation, but with four.

Tables referred to in speech giving rates taken from actual manifests of ships sailing from the port of Boston.

LIVERPOOL.

		Number of sailings.	Cargo capacity (tons of 40 cu. ft.).	Grain (cents per 60 lbs.).	Flour (cents per 100 lbs.).	Knit goods (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Wearing apparel (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Boots and shoes (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Leather (cents per 100 lbs.).	Meats (cents per 100 lbs.).	Hog products (cents per 100 lbs.).	Butter (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cheese (cents per 100 lbs.).	Eggs (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Fish, canned (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton (cents per 100 lbs.).	Wool (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton waste (cents per 100 lbs).	Tobacco (cents per 100 lbs.).	Machinery (cents per 40 cu. ft.).
June	1913	7	70,500	6½–6½	16	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	25	28.13	33–40	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	7	97,000	2½–3	10	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	12–15	42.19	43–50	None.	4.10–6.30
July	1913	7	96,000	3½–6½	14	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	25	28.13	33–50	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	4	54,000	3½–4	10–12	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	12	42.19	43–50	None.	4.10–6.30
August	1913	6	85,000	4–5½	14–16	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	None.	28.13	33–40	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	4	54,000	4–8	12–14	4.10	5.68	4.42	45–50.63	33½	33½	50.63	45	None.	33½	None.	42.19	33–40	None.	4.10–6.30
September	1913	5	69,000	2½–6	14–16	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	25–30	28.13	33–40	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	3	32,600	3–3	12–23	4.10	5.68	4.42	45–50.63	33½	33½	50.63	45	None.	33½	None.	42.19	43	None.	4.72–6.30
October	1913	5	69,000	3–5½	15	3.46–5.78	4.42	3.78–4.42	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	25	33½	33–40	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	4	59,500	4–6½	12–21	3.46–4.42	5.68	4.42	45–50.63	33½	33½	50.63	45	6.30	33½	30	59–67	42–43	31	4.72–6.30
November	1913	5	70,000	4½–6	15	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	24–30	33½	33–40	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	4	41,800	6½	18–20	4.10–4.72	5.68	4.10–5.04	45–56¼	33½	33½	50.63	45	6.30	33½	30–35	59–67	43–53	31–40	5.06–7.56
December	1913	4	53,000	4–6	15	3.46	4.42	3.78	33⅓	22½	22½	33½	28.13	None.	22½	20–30	33½	43–56	37	4.10–6.30
	1914	4	44,900	10–10½	14–18	5.04	5.68	5.04	56¼–67½	33½	33½	50.63	45	6.30	33½	33–55	65–75	53–60	40	5.98–11.03

LONDON.

		Number of sailings.	Cargo capacity (tons of 40 cu. ft.)	Grain (cents per 60 lbs.).	Flour (cents per 100 lbs.).	Knit goods (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Wearing apparel (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Boots (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Shoes (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Leather (cents per 100 lbs.).	Meats (cents per 100 lbs.).	Hog products (cents per 100 lbs.).	Butter (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cheese (cents per 100 lbs.).	Eggs (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Fish, canned (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton.	Wool (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton waste.	Tobacco (cents per 100 lbs.).	Machinery (cents per 40 cu. ft.).
June	1913	2	27,000	6½–7	14	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.52	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	33⅓	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	2	20,000	3	10	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	33⅓	(1)	35	4.10
July	1913	2	20,000	3½–3½	14	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	33⅓	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	2	22,000	3 –4½	13	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	28.13	28.13	36.56	30.94	4.42	28.13	(1)	39.38	(1)	35	4.10
August	1913	2	22,000	4 – 5	16	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	39.38	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	1	10,000	3	13–16	3.46	5.68	4.42	4.42	28.13–33⅓	28.13	28.13	53.44	47.81	4.42	28.13	(1)	45	(1)	45	4.10
September	1913	2	22,000	4	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	39.38	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	1	10,000	5	16–18	4.10	5.68	4.42	4.42	45	33⅓	33⅓	53.44	47.81	6.30	33½	(1)	45	(1)	45	4.42
October	1913	3	22,000	4 – 5½	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	45	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	1	10,000	7	18–20	4.10	5.68	4.42	4.42	45	33⅓	33⅓	53.44	47.81	6.30	33½	(1)	56½	(1)	62	5.04
November	1913	2	22,000	4½–6½	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30.94	4.42	22½	(1)	45	(1)	35	4.10
	1914	3	29,000	7 –10	18–20	4.72	5.68	5.68	5.68	45–56¼	33⅓	33⅓	53.44	47.31	6.30	33½	(1)	56½–67½	(1)	62	5.04–6.30
December	1913	2	20,000	5 – 6	20	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	28.13–33⅓	22½	22½	36.56	30 94	4.42	22½	(1)	45	(1)	55	4.10
	1914	2	22,000	10 –14	18–22	5.68	5.68	5.68	5.68	67½–78¾	33⅓	33⅓	53.44	47.31	6.30	33½	(1)	90	(1)	62	6.30–7.56

[1] Not shipped to London.

MANCHESTER.

		Number of sailings.	Cargo capacity (tons of 40 cu. ft.).	Grain (cents per 60 lbs.).	Flour (cents per 100 lbs.).	Knit goods (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Wearing apparel (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Boots (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Shoes (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Leather (cents per 100 lbs.).	Meats (cents per 100 lbs.).	Hog products (cents per 100 lbs.).	Butter (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cheese (cents per 100 lbs.).	Eggs (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Fish, canned (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton (cents per 100 lbs.).	Wool (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton waste (cents per 100 lbs.).	Tobacco (cents per 100 lbs.).	Machinery (cents per 40 cu. ft.).
June	1913	2	15,000	3	14	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	25	33⅓	50	37	4.10
	1914	2½	15,000	2½	10	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	25	33⅓	40	31	4.10
July	1913	1	10,000	3	14	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	25	33⅓	50	37	4.10
	1914	2	15,000	3 – 3½	12	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	28.13	28.13	50. 63	45	3.76	22½	25	33⅓	40	31	4.10
August	1913	3	22,000	3½–4½	16	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	25	39. 38	50	37	4.10
	1914	1	7,800	3	12	3.46	5.68	4.42	4.42	22½	28.13	28½	54. 63	45	3.76	28.13	25	39. 38	40	31	4.10
September	1913	2	15,000	3	16	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	26	45	50	37	4.10
	1914	1	3,400	4	19	3.46	5.68	4.42	4.42	45	33⅓	33⅓	50. 63	45	6.30	33½	30	45	40	31	4.42
October	1913	1	8,000	5 – 6	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	26–30	45	50	37	4.10
	1914	1	7,800	6	20	4.10	5.68	4.42	4.42	45	33⅓	33⅓	53. 44	47. 81	6.30	33½	30	56½	40–60	31	5.04
November	1913	2	15,000	6	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	25–30	45	50	37	4.10
	1914	3	27,000	6½– 7	20	4.10	5.68	5.68	5.68	45 –67½	33⅓	33⅓	53. 44	47. 81	6.30	33½	30–50	67½	40–70	40	5.04–6.30
December	1913	2	15,000	5½– 6	18	3.46	4.42	3.78	3.78	22½	22½	22½	33⅓	28.13	3.76	22½	21–30	45	50	37	4.10
	1914	3	20,000	10 –14	21	5.68	5.68	5.68	5.68	67½–78¾	33⅓	33⅓	53. 44	47. 81	6.30	33½	50–60	90	40–75	60	6.30–7.56

Tables referred to in speech giving rates taken from actual manifests of ships sailing from the port of Boston—Continued.

GIBRALTAR, NAPLES, AND GENOA.

	Number of sailings.	Cargo capacity (tons of 40 cu. ft.).	Grain (cents per 60 lbs.).	Flour (cents per 100 lbs.).	Knit goods (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Wearing apparel (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Boots and shoes (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Leather (cents per 100 lbs.).	Meats (cents per 100 lbs.).	Hog products (cents per 100 lbs.).	Butter (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cheese (cents per 100 lbs.).	Eggs (cents per 40 cu. ft.).	Fish, canned (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton (cents per 100 lbs.).	Wool (cents per 100 lbs.).	Cotton waste (cents per 100 lbs.).	Tobacco.	Machinery (cents per 40 cu. ft.).
June.....1913	2	10,000	.....	19.12–30.12	.....	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–39.38	33⅓–39.38	None.	None.	None.	28.13	None.	None.	40	.....	6.30
1914	2	10,000	None.	None.	.....	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–39.38	33⅓–39.38	None.	None.	None.	22½	27½	None.	40	.....	6.30
July.....1913	1	4,000	.....	30.94	.....	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–39.38	33⅓–39.38	None.	None.	None.	28.13	None.	None.	None.	.....	6.30
1914	1	4,000	.....	30.94	.....	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓	33⅓	None.	None.	None.	22½	None.	None.	40	.....	6.30–7.56
August.....1913	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	(1)	None.	(1)	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
1914	1	4,000	(1)	None.	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	33¼–39.38	None.	None.	None.	(1)	8.20
September..1913	2	10,000	(1)	None.	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–45	33⅓–45	None.	None.	None.	28.13	35–40	None.	40	(1)	6.30
1914	None.	None.	(1)	None.	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓	33⅓	None.	None.	None.	33⅓	None.	None.	None.	(1)	6.30–8.82
October.....1913	1	4,000	(1)	28.13	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–45	33⅓–45	None.	None.	None.	None.	40	None.	40	(1)	6.30
1914	1	4,000	(1)	28.13	(1)	(1)	8.82	(1)	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	33⅓	None.	None.	None.	(1)	6.30–8.82
November..1913	2	10,000	(1)	30.94	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–39.39	33⅓–39.38	None.	None.	None.	33⅓	30	None.	40	(1)	6.30
1914	2	10,000	(1)	30.94–36.56	(1)	(1)	11.34	(1)	56½	None.	None.	None.	None.	39.38	70–80	None.	75–90	(1)	9.45
December...1913	1	6,000	(1)	None.	(1)	(1)	7.56	(1)	33⅓–45	33⅓–45	None.	None.	None.	28.13	30	None.	40	(1)	6.30
1914	1	4,000	(1)	36.56	(1)	(1)	11.34	(1)	50.63–56½	61.88	None.	None.	None.	39.38	None.	None.	1.00–1.75	(1)	10.08

1 Not carried.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 o'clock to-night the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk two telegrams, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the telegrams.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *January 26, 1915.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Shipowners' Association of Pacific Coast, comprising vast majority of owners and managers of vessels engaged in Pacific coastwise trade, although not affected directly by so-called ship-purchase bill, protest most strongly against this bill or any bill of like character, deeming its proposals to be most dangerous and un-American—Government competition surely antagonistic to private enterprise. Urge your valuable aid and influence against such bills.

SHIPOWNERS' ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC COAST,
OLIVER J. OLSON, *President*,
W. F. SULLIVAN, *Secretary*.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *January 26, 1915.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully protest against passage ship-purchase bill in present form as being too radical departure from established customs of Government and having too strong tendency toward discouraging private interests from building and operating American ships for foreign trade, as no private company could compete with Government lines. Believe this would be fully confirmed if public hearings would be held before any further action by Government.

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, the membership of those two organizations represent nine-tenths of the shipping interests of the Pacific coast, comprising the State of California, the State of Oregon, the State of Washington, and a portion of Alaska. I have prepared an address on the bill, and if I were in good health I would deliver it, but I feel that I can not do justice to it, and I will therefore ask my friend from South Dakota [Senator CRAWFORD] to read for me the address which I have prepared. I beg leave to state that I have not received one letter or telegram favoring the passage of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that there will be no objection, and the Senator from South Dakota will read the address of the Senator from California.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to say that we are very glad on this side to accommodate the distinguished Senator from California, whom we love quite as much and as sincerely on this side as he can be loved and revered on the other side.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Senator CRAWFORD read Mr. PERKINS's speech, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, throughout the 22 years that I have been in Congress I have earnestly supported and voted for every measure which I regarded as practical for the benefit of our merchant marine. I would gladly vote for any bill, even though offered by Senators on the other side, if it appealed to me as a business proposition and as one calculated to upbuild the merchant marine of the United States. But I can not support the measure now pending because it fails to commend itself to my judgment as a business man and as one not unfamiliar with ocean trade and navigation.

I was born in a region which for nearly 300 years has been famed the world over for its ships and sailors—in the State of "hundred-harbored Maine." Nature designed Maine and all maritime New England for shipbuilding and ship owning, and there on the coast of New England year after year up to a recent period were launched annually one-half or more of all the ships constructed on the seacoast of the United States. The first American line of battleship—it bore the proud name *America*—was built for Commodore Paul Jones in Portsmouth, N. H., only a few miles from my native town. There, too, the famous *Kearsarge* was launched, and Boston, but 50 miles away, produced *Old Ironsides*, the immortal *Constitution*, and Admiral Farragut's flagship, the *Hartford*.

The sea and its ships mean much to the people of New England. The ocean is their heritage, and nowhere has there been keener regret or heavier loss because of the years of decline of American shipping in the over-seas trade. This has involved the crippling of a noble and profitable industry. It has meant the driving of brave and hardy men from their natural calling into unfamiliar and often uncongenial employment. It is a sad and significant fact that while population has grown elsewhere, it has actually decreased in many of the coast towns and counties of Maine and New England. Ports that were once active are now idle and empty. Ships and yards are gone, and young men, who with a proper opportunity would be shipwrights and sailors, as their fathers were before them, have been prevented by the loss of our ocean fleet from following the vocation which they loved, wherein they preferred to gain their livelihood.

SHIPBUILDING IN MAINE AND CALIFORNIA.

It is true that Maine and all New England long since ceased to produce ship timber in the former abundance, but there are yards in Maine and many more yards in the other States of New England where ships were built of iron and are now built of steel. When this change was made and new materials and new methods came in the master builders found that many of their best mechanics in the construction of metal ships were men who had wrought in wood before. The art of the shipbuilder, of the shipowner, and of the sailor has been handed down with pride generation after generation in New England, from father to son. In no other part of the world could one find a more thoroughly skilled maritime population inured to the sea, to its hazards and hardships.

Many of the shipbuilders and seamen of New England went years ago, as I did, to our Pacific coast, and there in the pursuit of their calling have been joined by active and enterprising men from other maritime nations. American shipping, mostly engaged in foreign commerce, now documented on the Pacific coast amounts to 1,084,640 tons, of which by far the greater part, or 580,506 tons, belongs to the State of California, which now owns more ocean shipping than any State in the Union, with the single exception of New York.

Shipyards have sprung up on the Pacific seaboard, the largest of which are on the Bay of San Francisco and on Puget Sound. It was a California yard, the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, which launched the two most famous vessels of the Span-

ish War, one Admiral Dewey's flagship, the *Olympia*, and the other the immortal *Oregon*.

Shipbuilding and navigation would have grown and flourished to a far greater extent in New England, New York, and other States of the Atlantic seaboard, and on the Pacific coast also, if the national policy of the United States toward ships employed in foreign commerce had been favorable and not hostile. We have protected nearly everything else by national laws in the last 60 years, but we have neglected our maritime industry, and we are facing to-day in the crisis of this great war the natural results of our national shortsightedness.

For years, as Senators know, the building of vessels for trade overseas has almost ceased in the United States. The building of smaller ships for coastwise commerce has continued and the coastwise navigation laws, often assailed but never repealed, have saved a remnant of shipbuilding and navigation in America. Though we have almost lost our ocean fleet, we have kept our coast fleet, and for that some building has continued in New England. It is a source of employment and prosperity in some communities, though less in Maine now than in her sister State of Massachusetts. It is still advantageous to build ships for coastwise commerce in New England, because the climate is favorable during most of the year. There are deep ports, and, above all, an abundance of skilled labor. Good wages are commanded by the workers in the shipyards of the New England States, and almost every mechanical trade is represented in the construction of a vessel. Pattern makers, machinists, boiler makers, riveters, calkers, carpenters, painters, riggers—these are some of the callings that are employed. They demand intelligence and faithfulness, and these mechanics are good citizens, an honor to any community and of great value to our country in peace or war. Equally valuable also are the services of the officers, the engineers, and the seamen who navigate and drive the ships.

I can recall the time when half a million tons of shipping were built in a year in the United States, the greater part of this for foreign commerce. In the year 1852, when, a sailor boy from Maine, I shipped before the mast for foreign voyages, no fewer than 255 sailing ships and barks of a type especially designed for over-seas commerce were launched in the United States. In the following year, 1853, 270 ships and barks were built; in 1854, 334; and in 1855, 381. The total product of our shipyards in 1855, the high-water mark of our maritime commerce was 583,450 tons.

AMERICA SUPREME IN SAIL AND STEAM.

Those were years when a young man was proud to be a sailor beneath the American flag, which floated triumphantly over the best ships in the world, in every ocean. Those were the years when American vessels carried three-fourths or more of our own country's commerce and a considerable part of that of other nations. In the four years during which I followed the sea I made several voyages out of New Orleans and Mobile to Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, and France. On two of the voyages the ship on which I was serving brought cargoes of iron rails, one from Gothenberg, in Sweden, and one from Cardiff, in Wales; both cargoes were landed at New Orleans. Another cargo was of salt, from Liverpool to New Orleans, and another of lumber, from St. John, New Brunswick, to Ireland. I only mention this to show the great difference between then and now in exports and imports. The ships I sailed on were in competition with the famous Black Ball Line from New York to Liverpool, the White Star Line, the Anchor Line, and other sail ships plying out of New York to Europe, while the celebrated Collins Line of American trans-Atlantic steamers was making its swift trips across the ocean, regularly beating the British Cunarders and carrying under the American flag the best passenger traffic and the most valuable merchandise.

In that period the United States stood supreme both in sail and in steam. American steam lines ran to the West Indies and up the Pacific coast from the Isthmus of Panama, and the British Government was sending naval officers to the United States to discover why American steamships, as American sail ships had been before, were so superior to British steamships in their speed, power, and efficiency.

During those years at sea I made a voyage around Cape Horn to the Pacific on the good ship *Galatea*, built by the McKays at Chelsea, Mass. Later I became associated with the shipping firm of Goodall, Perkins & Co. in San Francisco, with which I continued to operate steamships and sailing vessels until my election to the Senate in 1893.

I count myself fortunate to have lived and to have borne some modest part in the most glorious era in the maritime history of the United States. I was a sailor by choice and profession, a merchant trader by necessity, and a politician by accident. If I have been successful in the shipping business on the Pacific coast, it has been due entirely to my association with my partners, men of long experience as seafaring men. I recall the great losses suffered through the destruction of American ships by the Confederate cruisers *Alabama*, *Florida*, and *Shenandoah*, whose depredations frightened shipowners into transferring many noble vessels from the Stars and Stripes to the King George's red ensign of Great Britain. Our shipping suffered terribly because of the Civil War, but the loss need not have been irretrievable. Other industries suffered, but were soon restored, and it might have been the same with our merchant marine if the policy of national protection that has done so much for manufacturing and for agriculture had only been extended to it many years ago.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AN UNWISE POLICY.

Passing now to the pending bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes—the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Florida and proposed amendments by the senior Senator from Missouri—I regret that I can not believe that it is constructed on lines that will restore maritime commerce to the United States. It involves a radical innovation in the policy of the American people, who have hitherto preferred that their Government should not embark in business undertakings which could be left to private capital and individual enterprise. The proposed bill is not to be compared with the ocean-mail act of 1891, fathered and advocated by that splendid statesman and devoted patriot, the late Senator William P. Frye, of Maine, or with the proposed bills amending and strengthening the act of 1891, introduced and advocated by Mr. GALLINGER, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire. This legislation for the encouragement of American steamship service, carrying the United States mails in naval-reserve ships to the ports of other countries and other continents, is framed on lines that have proven successful in the maritime experience of our own Government. I am profoundly convinced out of a lifelong study of the question that the best interests of our country would be most surely served by the enactment of the bills long and ably urged here by Senator GALLINGER, whose devotion to the restoration of our merchant shipping and whose knowledge of the subject have never been surpassed by any of the public men of the United States.

I do not believe that private capitalists will deem it wise or expedient to invest their funds in a shipping corporation in partnership with the United States Government, for the reason that success must depend upon the economy, the knowledge, and the skillful management of those engaged in the conduct of the business. In my opinion, it would be just as unreasonable for the Government of our country to go into partnership in manufacturing with the owners of factories or into partnership with the farmers. We have not applied this principle of Government ownership and control to those other businesses which have been protected by the Government and have become great and prosperous. Why should we put our Government in competition with ocean shipowners and shipbuilders of the country, who have been denied protection and encouragement and are less able to compete with the United States Treasury than almost any other class of business men in the land?

SHIPOWNERS HAVE HAD NO FAIR CHANCE.

I have heard it said that the Government ought to go into this ocean shipping business because the shipowners and shipbuilders of the country have been given an opportunity and have not taken advantage of it. This is most untrue and unjust. The reason why, with all our factories, all our farms, we have few or no ocean ships is because the shipowners and shipbuilders of America have not been given an equal opportunity with our fellow citizens in other great industries. I believe in the Republican policy of protection alike to manufacturing and to agriculture. It has produced wonderful results in both fields of endeavor. It has been applied to our coastwise shipping, including that on the Great Lakes, and it has produced wonderful results there also. Our coastwise tonnage under the American flag to-day is $6,852,536, or, next to the fleet of Great Britain, the very largest mercantile tonnage in the world, surpassing the entire tonnage of the German Empire and amounting to about three times the tonnage of France, Norway, or Japan.

When I was a boy and a young man at sea our American shipping employed in distant voyages to foreign countries and around Cape Horn to the Pacific Ocean equaled the tonnage of our coastwise fleet on the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Great Lakes, and the rivers combined. Our deep-sea tonnage ought

naturally to be equal to-day to our coastwise tonnage, which has had the constant and active competition of the greatest railroad systems in the world. The reason, and the only reason, why American ocean shipping has not increased as American coastwise shipping has grown is that our ocean shipping has not been protected or encouraged by the Government of the United States.

It is sometimes urged on the other side of this Chamber that for this neglect the Republican Party is responsible. It is true that during most of the years since 1861 the Republican Party has controlled our National Government. But the leaders of the Republican Party have not forgotten or neglected the merchant marine. They have endeavored again and again, as did Senator Frye and as Senator GALLINGER has long been doing, to apply to ocean shipping in some way the principle of protection that has been so constantly and successfully applied to agriculture and to manufacturing. Unfortunately, in these efforts a small part of the Republican Senators and Representatives have not followed their party and have not been willing to apply to the ocean shipping industry of America the protection which they demanded and received for the agricultural industries of their constituents.

I trust that this great war in Europe has brought a wider vision to some of our Republican friends of the Middle West and the Northwest, and that they may be willing now and hereafter to recognize ocean shipbuilding and navigation as American industries of some value even to the farmers who grow wheat and corn and cotton in the interior and Southern States of the United States.

JUST WHAT WAS PREDICTED.

It is affirmed by the advocates of the proposed bill for a Government-owned merchant marine that there is a great shortage of ships for the export trade of the United States and that there has been an enormous increase in the rates of freight demanded by the ocean shipping companies, which are chiefly foreign. A report upon this subject, in which very emphatic language is employed, has recently been presented to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce. I am not going to combat the assertions of that report, though some of them may seem extreme and unwarrantable. But I do wish to remind the Senators on the other side that one argument advanced on this side year after year for some reasonable national protection and encouragement to American ocean shipping has been that in the event of a great foreign war, in which the foreign Governments that were our principal ocean carriers might be involved, their ships would be withdrawn and we should be left without the means of delivering our own goods to our own customers.

Again and again have I stated this argument and uttered this warning in this Senate Chamber. Very much to my regret and disappointment, it has appeared to fall on deaf ears. Sometimes it has even been denied that any such great war was possible. We have lived and we have learned. We are now face to face with the consequences of the greatest and most terrible conflict which the world has ever known, and every word that was said by the distinguished and lovable Senator Frye, of Maine, by Senator Hanna, of Ohio, by Senator GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, and other Senators on this side of the Chamber, has been overwhelmingly confirmed in the far-reaching results of this European struggle. The ears that were deaf are deaf no more.

When the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, who has introduced this bill, was advocating it the other day in this Chamber it was a matter of interest and gratification to observe how fully and earnestly he quoted and indorsed the reports of the Senator from New Hampshire on the importance of a merchant marine in peace and war. There is no difference, no dispute, now on this question between the two sides of this Chamber. All doubters are silenced. It is impossible for any honest and patriotic public man to deny, in the light of what has happened since August last, that the possession of merchant ships, of shipyards, of skilled mechanics, of seagoing officers and sailors, is indispensable to the security and prosperity of the United States.

On this great truth we are all at last agreed. Our difference now is only as to the means by which an all-essential result shall be accomplished. The Senator from Florida, and those Senators on his side who stand with him, contend that a merchant fleet can be created for the exigencies of this war only through Government purchase, building, ownership, and operation. I believe, on the contrary, that this would be a slow, a wasteful, and an ineffective way. I believe that the Government can not move so quickly or strongly in this matter as can experienced and competent ship-owning corporations, which, fortunately for us, do exist on both the Atlantic and the Pacific seaboards.

UNWISE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

This proposed bill has already been much amended. It originally provided that the shipping board should be made up of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce—three members of the Cabinet who would almost certainly be gentlemen without the slightest experience in ocean trade. This was so unwise and unworkable that the provision has been changed, and the shipping board is now to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and three civilians experienced in the shipping business to be appointed by the President. To this extent the bill has been improved, but it is still imperfect and unsatisfactory.

The proposed compensation of $6,000 a year for each civilian member of the board will not properly compensate ship managers of the requisite ability and experience. To undertake this work they should be the foremost men of their calling in America. Such men can not be obtained for the compensation stipulated in this bill, unless they are to be asked to make a great personal sacrifice when they enter the service of the Government.

Moreover, the proposed shipping board must create the requisite executive and technical organization from the very beginning. This would almost inevitably be a matter of months. A great steamship business demands an organization not unlike that of a great railroad system. It can not be improvised in an emergency.

Such organizations already exist in the coastwise and foreign-going steamship service in this country. There are trained and capable expert managers this very day in charge of American steam fleets in coastwise and foreign commerce on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Some of our coastwise shipping companies are among the largest, strongest, and most ably administered steamship establishments in all the world. They are organizations that, receiving their orders to-day, can act to-day and to-morrow. But week after week must elapse before a shipping board like that contemplated in this bill can organize its force, arrange its methods, and prepare to render efficient service. The only Government shipping organization that exists in ordinary trade is the Panama Railroad Steamship Co., operating a few steamers between New York and Balboa, and this fleet and its organization are very much smaller than most of the coastwise steamship organizations of the United States.

Valuable time will be lost if this bill is passed and the creation of our merchant marine is left to the inexperienced and cumbrous methods of the Government. There are men, American citizens, in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle and other Puget Sound ports, who know the steamship business in every detail and are operating day after day fine steamships that successfully ply in foreign and domestic commerce. If it is true that grain and cotton and provisions are piling up on our seaport wharves, unable to find cargo room, unable to move because foreign shipping companies will not or can not carry them, why wait upon the tardy and uncertain organization of a semipolitical shipping board? Why not give reasonable national protection and encouragement at once to informed and able American citizens who know the shipping trade, and thus make it possible for them to do what can be done in the quickest and surest way and arrange shipping services that will serve the need of the American people?

If there are any ships in existence beyond those ships now employed that can be secured in this emergency, it will be just as lawful and just as practicable for these experienced American shipowners to secure and use them as it would be for the Government itself. These men already know by heart the business which the Government would be slowly and painfully learning. The proposed shipping board would contain two gentlemen of high political rank who, however able and distinguished they may be in other things, are without experience in and knowledge of the different trade of ocean shipowning and navigation. With these gentlemen are to be joined three others who may have experience, but are supposed to give the benefit of it for a wholly inadequate compensation—only three from among the many practical and capable ship managers of the United States.

If the emergency is as serious, as appalling, as the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce represents, it would justify the immediate summoning to Washington of all the best shipowners and shipbuilders of the Nation from all alongshore, down the Atlantic, along the Gulf

of Mexico, up the Pacific. But Government ownership and control would not help and encourage such men as these. Rather would it paralyze their energies. If prompt and great results are to be achieved, give these men the encouragement of the Government, give them its good will, its help where help is needed, but leave them free to act in details as their own initiative and judgment may best determine.

UNEQUAL TO A REAL EMERGENCY.

I can but insist that not only is the plan of the proposed bill a wrong one, but that it is wholly inadequate for a real emergency. The amount which is set aside for the acquisition of vessels is $30,000,000. This sum may seem a large one, but it should be remembered that the proposed ships are to be bought outright if they can be discovered. Indeed, a sum of $30,000,000 at the present time, with ocean steamers everywhere commanding enhanced prices because of the needs of commerce and the requisition of hundreds of ships for the auxiliary service of belligerent Governments, would probably secure no more than about 60 steamers, costing $500,000 each, with a cargo capacity each of not more than 10,000 tons. A fleet of 60 steamers may seem a large fleet to those not familiar with ocean business, but, as a matter of fact, it would be a smaller fleet by far than is controlled by any one of several of the various trans-Atlantic steamship companies. It would not be a dominating factor in ocean trade; indeed, under present circumstances it would scarcely be an appreciable factor.

With 60 ships at its disposal the Government of the United States could not begin to hope to control the shipping situation at all the seaports on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, to say nothing of those on the Pacific Ocean. These 60 steamers might enable some fortunate, favored shippers to secure temporarily reduced and preferential rates, but when these Government ships had sailed on their long voyages, rates would go up again, and the net result would be utterly ineffective and disappointing.

But where, it may be asked, are 60 additional steamers to be secured? As other Senators have shown and as foreign Governments have warned us, they can not safely be taken from the interned fleets of belligerents, and all neutral ships—American and foreign—that are fit and available for the carrying of our commerce are already open to charter for that commerce, or are actually engaged in carrying it. All that the Government of the United States could do in pursuance of the policy of purchase, ownership, and operation would be to take over into the Government service 60 steamers of those that are now employed.

This would be no net gain—no real advantage. We should have embarked upon a very radical and dangerous experiment without any real gain to our country, any large relief to our commerce, any enduring power to our flag. If we took American ships of over-seas or coastwise companies, we should be taking ships already available. Not a day now passes without the announcement that some of the larger steamers of the coastwise organizations have been chartered for export commerce—for provisions or grain or lumber or cotton. Not only are these coastwise steamers being steadily employed, but large drafts are being made upon the heavier sail craft under the American flag—upon our remaining ships or barks or schooners. Scores of these vessels, regularly employed in coastwise trade, are now loading or have already cleared for the United Kingdom, the Continent, or South America. The American merchant marine which we do possess—the merchant marine that owes its existence to our prudent and beneficent coastwise laws—is responding loyally in this emergency. Why interfere with it—why force these brave and enterprising men to face the disastrous business competition of their Government.

It is asserted that the freight rates charged, particularly by foreign shipping companies, are excessive—far higher than those rates were before the war began. But in fairness it should be remembered that the cost of coal, provisions, wages, has enormously increased, that insurance has risen, and that floating mines are a deadly menace in the waters around the United Kingdom and along the coasts of northern Europe. These extraordinary costs, these hazards, must be faced by Government-owned ships no less inevitably than by the ships of private owners.

THE BILL WOULD FAIL OF ITS PURPOSE.

I am opposed to this proposed measure because the very principle of Government purchase, ownership, and operation of merchant shipping is an unsound principle, contrary to our traditions, repugnant to our business sense. I am opposed to it, moreover, because the adoption of such an expedient is absolutely unnecessary, and will not create any additional tonnage that might be secured in some other sounder and safer way. The international difficulties and dangers involved have been ably considered by distinguished students of international law, Senator ROOT, of New York, and Senator BURTON, of Ohio, and by other Senators. I speak from the standpoint of one who has been a sailor, a shipowner, a business man.

It seems to me too much emphasis can not be given to the international complications which may arise should this pending bill become a law. Should the pending bill pass the vessels thereby placed under the control of a shipping company (of which company the United States Government will own more than 50 per cent of stock) will have to be placed under one of three classes: The class of private vessels; the class of public vessels; or a class hitherto unknown or recognized, a class of vessels that are partly public and are partly private.

In case the vessels are placed in the class of private vessels, pure and simple, the vessels will have none of the immunities of public vessels, but will be subject to all the restrictions, searches, detentions, appearances in prize courts, and so forth, to which other private vessels (that is, merchant vessels) are subject, and will be liable to the same sources of pecuniary loss. Being private vessels, pure and simple, and being therefore under the command of merchant captains and manned by merchant crews, the Government will not be able to guarantee their cargoes any more than it is now able to guarantee the cargoes of ordinary merchant ships. If our Government is willing to have vessels in which it has a majority of ownership treated in this way, it may be that international conflict may be averted; but, in this case, it would seem necessary, in the interests of fair dealing, to inform the Congress and the people clearly of this fact before the bill is put to vote, in order that they may decide intelligently whether or not they wish their ships to be treated as ordinary merchant ships.

In case the vessels are classed as public vessels, they will enjoy the rights and immunities which all public vessels, such as naval vessels and Government transports, enjoy, and will be exempt from search by our law. But if they carry cargo, our Government will not be able to guarantee those cargoes any more than the Government can now guarantee the cargoes of merchant ships unless they are placed under the command of naval officers, which it will be impracticable to do, because we have not enough officers for our distinctively naval ships. Therefore, belligerents will insist on searching them as merchant ships. The United States will then be forced to go to war, as it did in 1812, or to reverse its policy and permit its public vessels to be searched.

This principle was acknowledged when Secretary Seward immediately responded to the demand of the British Government for the surrender of Mason and Sidel, who were taken from an English ship by one of our naval vessels.

In case the vessels are put in the new class, in which each vessel is partly public and partly private, they will form a class of which, as yet, international law has no cognizance. In international law vessels are classed as either public or private. If it be attempted to class these vessels as both public and private, with the intention that they should have the special privileges and exemptions of public vessels and yet have the money-making attributes of merchant vessels, the various foreign countries, especially those now engaged in war, would probably protest, and assert, with reason, that here is an attempt to take away their right of search by disingenuously claiming a public character for vessels that are essentially merchant vessels, because they are assumed to be money-making vessels. In this case the United States would be put in exactly the same quandary as they would be put in if they declared the vessels to be wholly public vessels. In other words, this attempt would result in the United States claiming for the ships a public character and in foreign Governments denying that public character. One side or the other would have to yield or the United States would be forced into war. It is inconceivable that foreign belligerent Governments would surrender their right to search vessels of this character.

No Senator in this Chamber can be more desirous than I am of the creation of a great merchant marine. I have myself seen our merchant shipping in the height of its strength and glory, and I have grieved at its long and humiliating decline. I am not disposed to insist on any particular method to restore our shipping. I should be glad to join with my fellow Senators in any honest method that gave promise of success. I am utterly opposed to considering such a great and urgent question as a mere party question. It is a subject which always—and all the more now, in the shadow of this great war—we should treat as a matter of patriotism, not of partisanship.

But this radical proposal of Government purchase, ownership, and operation is so offensive to me that I can not assent to it. I can not agree that the Government of the United States should be hastily launched into one of the most difficult and technical of all business undertakings, when there are private

citizens who are competent and willing to assume the task if our Government will give them the equivalent of the protection and encouragement which it has successfully bestowed upon other national industries.

I can not assent to this bill, because I profoundly believe that it would utterly fail to justify the hopes and expectations of its authors. It can not appreciably add to the amount of shipping available. It can not operate that shipping any more economically than—or so economically as—experienced and able private shipping managers. It will inevitably plunge us into serious difficulties with foreign Governments, and thus retard our commerce instead of increasing it, if it does not actually embroil us in the war.

WHY NOT A BETTER PLAN?

It is not even now too late for a sane and safe course to be adopted. For a great many years the Senators on the other side of this Chamber have been urging a policy of "free ships" for the upbuilding of our merchant marine. In the month of August last, in the pressure of an emergency, their policy was embodied into law in a form so liberal that foreign-built ships can now be admitted to American registry for over-seas commerce, retain their foreign officers, and be exempt, moreover, from compliance with our inspection and measurement laws. That policy has proved a disappointment in the number of ships which it has brought under our flag, but it is the law of the land; it has had and will continue to have a fair and honest trial.

Why can not the Senators on the other side of this Chamber yield some of their prejudice in this critical hour, and join with us on this side in legislaton requisite to make a fair and honest trial of the policy of national mail subsidies or subventions to regular lines of steamships or to steamships approved by the Navy Department as fit for auxiliary use in time of war?

This is the policy of other Governments. In a small, inadequate way, under the ocean mail law of 1891, it has been the policy of our own Government. It has succeeded thus far wherever it has been tried. If the Senator from Florida had brought out from the Committee on Commerce any proposal less radical than that of Government purchase, ownership, and operation of a merchant marine, I am certain that he would have been met half way by the Senators on this side of the Chamber. Why can not he and his colleagues meet us half way now? The opportunity is a great one; the need is urgent. The creation and restoration of American ocean shipping can be made to date from this year 1915. Nobody can know how long this unhappy war will last, what suffering it may involve, to what necessities it may finally drive us. But one thing must be certain, that whether the war is a short war or a long one, we shall need American ocean ships for the security of our commerce, for the strengthening of our Navy, for the perpetuation of the race of American ship mechanics and American sailors, who now, as always, are an honor to their country, the best men of their profession in the world. Give our shipyards a chance to build our ships; give our officers and sailors a chance to sail them. Give them equality of opportunity with their foreign competitors—the same equality of opportunity which our laws have long sought to give to the millions of Americans engaged in agriculture and manufacturing. Trust the enterprise, the courage, the perseverance, the skill of individual American citizens, and you will not be disappointed.

Government control, Government ownership of our merchant marine means a paralysis of individual effort, a destruction of personal ambition, and an indefinite postponement of the day we all desire, when the Stars and Stripes shall stream victoriously again on every ocean of the world.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For a question, of course.

Mr. STONE. Not for a question. I wish to ask the Senator if he desires to go on further to-night?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not desire to go on further; I am very tired.

Mr. STONE. I should like to have a short executive session, the Senator retaining the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And then a recess?

Mr. STONE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. All right; I have no objection, the understanding being that I still have the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Alameda County and of Street Car Men's Local Union of Oakland, in the State of California, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of West Rindge, N. H., and the petition of Samuel H. Drury, of St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., remonstrating against any change being made in the locomotive-boiler-inspection law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Emil Ramig, of Bedford, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called immigration bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Albert Artzt and 59 other citizens of Manchester, N. H., praying the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Danbury, Bethel, Hartford, and Clinton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lebo, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Arma, Kans., praying for the extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Newton and Cleburn, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against excluding certain publications from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Rosedale, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to exempt Catholic publications from the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bird City, Cheney, Herington, Bremen, Marysville, and Netawaka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of Torrington, Danbury, and Rockville, of Local Branch No. 84, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, of Meriden, and of Schiller No. 117, F. of A., of Meriden, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chester, Clinton, Saybrook, Deep River, Essex, Westbrook, Old Saybrook, and Madison, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate shipment of convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the German-American Alliance of Waterville, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rome and Dunkirk, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Holy Name Society of St. Patrick's Church, of Watervliet, N. Y., remonstrating against the existing conditions in Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Pomono Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rosedale, Mich., remonstrating against any change being made in the free rural delivery system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on the upper White River, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Buffalo and Niagara Falls, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of George Valar, Henry Wegner, Herman F. Weber, Gottlieb Ellinger, and sundry other citizens of Tacoma; of Henry Nickels, of Odessa; of Joe Kress, of Enumclaw; of F. Gerstmann, of Puyallup; and of R. Fechtner, of Chehalis, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of West Union Grange, No. 527, Patrons of Husbandry, of Willapa, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to place an embargo upon foodstuffs shipped to belligerent nations engaged in the present war in Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 7, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented memorials of A. Pavot, Edward Israel, George W. Gaynor, and sundry other citizens of Grant County, Ind., remonstrating against prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of the Ladies' Aid Society of the Evangelical Church, of the Young People's Christian Endeavor of the Elkhart Castle United Brethren Church, of the Ladies' Aid Society of the First Evangelical Church, and of the Castle United Brethren Church, all of Elkhart, in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Federal censorship of motion-picture films, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Federal Central Labor Union, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate shipment of convict-made goods, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 7490) granting an increase of pension to John Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7491) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Goodwin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7492) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Sloggy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7493) granting an increase of pension to Helen D. Longstreet; and

A bill (S. 7494) granting an increase of pension to Charles Woodward (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 7495) for the relief of Kate Canniff (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7496) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Propson (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7497) granting an increase of pension to Todd L. Wagoner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7498) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7499) granting an increase of pension to William H. Terwilliger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7500) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Lockhart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Lawton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7502) granting an increase of pension to John L. Epperson; to the Committee on Pensions.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce two important joint resolutions, which I shall ask to have read or not, as the Senate desires. I want to have one printed in the RECORD anyway and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ask that the other be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and referred as requested.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics.

Whereas the United States is the only Nation of the first class that does not have an advisory committee for aeronautics to advise and direct in relation to experimental work of the Government and to provide for the cooperation of governmental and private activities in relation to the unsolved problems of aeronautics; and

Whereas the United States invented and led in the early development of the heavier-than-air flying machines, but nothing being done by the Government to develop the art and to encourage and assist American inventors and manufacturers beyond the purchase of a few flying machines and the establishment of a small plant at the Washington Navy Yard, it has fallen behind owing to the policy of inaction and the lack of appreciation of the wisdom of utilizing all of the technical ability and the inventive genius of the Nation; and

Whereas under the guidance of an advisory committee for aeronautics continuity of purpose and action in the development of this science and art is practically guaranteed, unaffected by the change of individuals in administrative positions in the executive departments of the Government; and

Whereas the expenditure of money appropriated could be more wisely made, and economies secured by the prevention of duplication of investigation and experiment, and the development of aeronautics in America placed upon a strong foundation through the influence of a suitable advisory committee; and

Whereas the establishment of such committee would be in the line of the best practice of European nations, such as Great Britain, France, and Germany, all of which have made remarkable progress in aviation under the spirit of cooperation of governmental and civil agencies; and

Whereas under existing law—section 9 of the act approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., p. 1027)—it is unlawful for the President or any Government official to appoint a committee, commission, or board on aeronautics without authorization by Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That an advisory committee for aeronautics is hereby established, and the President is authorized to appoint not to exceed 14 members, to consist of 2 members from the War Department, from the bureau in charge of military aeronautics; 2 members from the Navy Department, from the bureau in charge of naval aeronautics; a representative each of the Smithsonian Institution, of the United States Weather Bureau, and of the United States Bureau of Standards, together with not more than 7 additional persons who shall be acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, either civil or military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences, 3 of whom may be residents of the District of Columbia, and the others shall be inhabitants of some State, but not more than 1 of them from the same State: *Provided*, That the members of the advisory committee for aeronautics, as such, shall serve without compensation: *Provided further*, That it will be the duty of the advisory committee for aeronautics to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of

fight with a view to their practical solution, and to determine the problems which should be experimentally attacked, and to discuss their solution and their application to practical questions. In the event of a laboratory or laboratories, either in whole or in part, being placed under the direction of the committee, the committee may direct and conduct research and experiment in aeronautics in such laboratory or laboratories: *And provided further*, That rules and regulations for the conduct of the work of the committee shall be formulated by the committee and approved by the President.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $5,000 a year, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for five years is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, for experimental work and investigations undertaken by the committee, clerical expenses and supplies, and necessary expenses of members of the committee in going to, returning from, and while attending meetings of the committee: *Provided*, That an annual report to the Congress shall be submitted through the President, including an itemized statement of expenditures.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 230) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL (H. R. 20415).

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,140 for investigations of fruit rot and spot and apple mildew, intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $3,000,000 for the examination, survey, and acquisition of lands under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION (H. R. 20189).

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (for Mr. SMITH of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the river and harbor bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. Under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday morning next at 10 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. Saturday, January 30, 1915) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 1, 1915, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 26), 1915.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Stanley H. Trezevant, of Memphis, Tenn., to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice J. Sam Johnson, whose term has expired.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF THE MINT.

Ed Ryan, of Goldfield, Nev., to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev., in place of Andrew Maute, superseded.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Walter C. Gullion, Twelfth Cavalry, to be second lieutenant of Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1914.

Second Lieut. John B. Thompson, Fourteenth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1914.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CHAPLAIN.

Rev. Clifford Lore Miller, of Vermont, to be chaplain, with the rank of first lieutenant, from January 28, 1915, vice Chaplain Frederick L. Kunnecke, Second Field Artillery, wholly retired September 28, 1914.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Acting Dental Surg. James Francis Feely, Dental Corps, to be dental surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant from January 27, 1915, to fill an original vacancy.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

William E. Stevens, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 23d day of January, 1915.

Anderson C. Dearing, a citizen of Kentucky, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of January, 1915.

Ensign Ernest J. Blankenship to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

G. Lindley Gollands to be postmaster at Chandler, Ariz. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

E. F. Thompson to be postmaster at Kingman, Ariz., in place of J. N. Coheneur. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

ARKANSAS.

Henry Clay Maples to be postmaster at Green Forest, Ark., in place of Andrew J. Tabor. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

John B. Thompson to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, Ark., in place of Laura C. Hutton. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles B. Fair to be postmaster at Lindsay, Cal., in place of Matthew W. Grace. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Ralph P. Giddings to be postmaster at Turlock, Cal., in place of John L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

Luella Mann to be postmaster at Boulder Creek, Cal., in place of Daniel R. Trout, removed.

Johnnie L. Murphy to be postmaster at Madero, Cal., in place of W. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

C. D. Radcliffe to be postmaster at Merced, Cal., in place of C. F. Neumann. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

E. W. Wilson to be postmaster at Fowler, Cal., in place of Josephine Priest. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

CONNECTICUT.

Charles F. Greene to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Conn., in place of W. H. Marigold. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

FLORIDA.

F. Bartow Swearingen to be postmaster at Fort Meade, Fla., in place of Leslie D. Roberts, removed.

GEORGIA.

Frank L. Asbury to be postmaster at Clarkesville, Ga., in place of Oscar M. Mauldin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1914.

Julien V. Frederick to be postmaster at Marshallville, Ga., in place of Julien V. Frederick. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

Josephine M. Gray to be postmaster at Adairsville, Ga., in place of Clifford H. Dyar. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

IDAHO.

Patrick T. Sweeney to be postmaster at St. Maries, Idaho, in place of Edgar T. Hawley, removed.

ILLINOIS.

William M. Cannedy to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ill., in place of Carson T. Metcalf, removed.

J. W. Clendenin to be postmaster at Monmouth, Ill., in place of Clarence F. Buck. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Albert E. Gent to be postmaster at Brighton, Ill., in place of M. Spencer Brown. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

James Lafayette Molohon to be postmaster at Divernon, Ill., in place of William W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Conrad Scheer to be postmaster at Crete, Ill., in place of George Hoffman, deceased.

George W. Spunner to be postmaster at Barrington, Ill., in place of Henry K. Brockway. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1915.

Frank P. Williams to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ill., in place of Joseph H. Pierson, resigned.

INDIANA.

Frank Billings to be postmaster at Morocco, Ind., in place of James P. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

R. William I. Boggs to be postmaster at Veedersburg, Ind., in place of Edward Patton. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

Thomas C. Dowling to be postmaster at New Haven, Ind., in place of Willard Lucas. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

Eugene Kelley to be postmaster at Waterloo, Ind., in place of Norman T. Jackman. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Charles K. Lewis to be postmaster at Russiaville, Ind., in place of Eli W. Sherwin. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

William L. McMillen to be postmaster at Brook, Ind., in place of Fred B. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Winfield S. Sanders to be postmaster at Westport, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

IOWA.

Eliza Ann Butler to be postmaster at North English, Iowa, in place of J. W. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Peter H. Goslin to be postmaster at Clarion, Iowa, in place of Robert P. Osier, resigned.

S. M. Hutzell to be postmaster at Victor, Iowa, in place of William H. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

Maurice Moroney to be postmaster at Earlville, Iowa, in place of Philip M. Cloud. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

Caroline Y. Smith to be postmaster at Leon, Iowa, in place of Millard F. Stookey. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1914.

KANSAS.

Harry M. Brodrick to be postmaster at Marysville, Kans., in place of Samuel Foster. Incument's commission expires February 8, 1915.

J. A. Carson to be postmaster at Erie, Kans., in place of J. T. Coles. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Oscar Lundy Clarke to be postmaster at Washington, Kans., in place of C. E. Ingalls. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Michael A. Frey to be postmaster at Junction City, Kans., in place of Jacob B. Callen. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

George Harman to be postmaster at Valley Falls, Kans., in place of O. F. Falls. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Harlan W. Marmon to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans., in place of Connie Collins. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

Charles A. Taschetta to be postmaster at Leavenworth, Kans., in place of W. I. Biddle. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1915.

LOUISIANA.

Burnside Capers to be postmaster at Arcadia, La., in place of Paunie Glover. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

Ulysses J. Marcotte to be postmaster at Cottonport, La., in place of Leo J. Roth. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

Joseph P. Troschair to be postmaster at Opelousas, La., in place of G. L. Lassalle. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1915.

MARYLAND.

William J. Ford to be postmaster at Lonaconing, Md., in place of John McFarland. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

David H. Hastings to be postmaster at Lutherville, Md., in place of David H. Hastings. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Anthony J. Crean to be postmaster at Turners Falls, Mass., in place of Frank E. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Josiah W. Earle to be postmaster at Cohasset, Mass., in place of Josiah W. Earle. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

George W. Jones to be postmaster at Falmouth, Mass., in place of George W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

Thomas G. O'Connell to be postmaster at Wakefield, Mass., in place of Stanley B. Dearborn. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

George L. Olivier to be postmaster at New Bedford, Mass., in place of Frank C. Barrows. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

Charles D. Smith to be postmaster at Gloucester, Mass., in place of Charles D. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Sidney M. Towle to be postmaster at Duxbury, Mass., in place of Elisha Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1913.

MAINE.

Guy H. Hunt to be postmaster at Newport, Me., in place of William M. Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

MICHIGAN.

Charles Davidson to be postmaster at Richmond, Mich., in place of Charles H. Heath. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

John C. Downing to be postmaster at Vermontville, Mich., in place of H. H. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Edward G. Scott to be postmaster at Iron River, Mich., in place of Robert H. Barnum. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

MINNESOTA.

Adolph C. Gilbertson to be postmaster at Ironton, Minn. Office become presidential July 1, 1914.

Andrew Rotegard to be postmaster at New Richland, Minn., in place of Anton O. Lea, resigned.

Thomas Zeien to be postmaster at North Branch, Minn., in place of George W. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

MONTANA.

William C. Bernard to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of Louden Minugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

Mary Bonham to be postmaster at Ismay, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Presley L. Herring to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mont., in place of Mary L. Boehnert, removed.

George C. Milburn to be postmaster at Darby, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Hans A. Nelson to be postmaster at Joplin, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Stephen J. Rigney to be postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont., in place of Bruce R. McNamer, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Joseph E. Saucier to be postmaster at Bay St. Louis, Miss., in place of Richard Mendes. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

MISSOURI.

Harry B. Adkins to be postmaster at Weston, Mo., in place of James H. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Thomas C. Bassore to be postmaster at Rogersville, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Samuel T. Breckenridge to be postmaster at Bosworth, Mo., in place of Taylor Ray. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1915.

John Gable to be postmaster at Browning, Mo., in place of Charles E. Rinehart. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

George P. Hicks to be postmaster at Callao, Mo., in place of John W. Ayers, resigned.

Samuel J. Jamison to be postmaster at Rich Hill, Mo., in place of George P. Huckeby, resigned.

Horrell Johnson to be postmaster at New Madrid, Mo., in place of George H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Nesbert W. Lemasters to be postmaster at Oak Grove, Mo., in place of Eugene E. Wyatt. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

John H. Taylor to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Mo., in place of John L. Schmitz. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

Francis M. Traughber to be postmaster at Centralia, Mo., in place of Edward J. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Robert K. Wilson to be postmaster at Jackson, Mo., in place of Henry Puls, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Anton J. Glodowski to be postmaster at Platte Center, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Frank Howard to be postmaster at Ravenna, Nebr., in place of Charles Miner. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

NEW JERSEY.

Hunn Livingston to be postmaster at Allentown, N. J., in place of Emma Cafferty. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

William T. Nash to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of William Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1914.

Marcellus Parker to be postmaster at Manasquan, N. J., in place of James P. Van Schoick. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1915.

David A. Power to be postmaster at Metuchen, N. J., in place of Howard I. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Addison Robbins, jr., to be postmaster at Hightstown, N. J., in place of Charles E. Stults. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Alexander H. Sibbald to be postmaster at Park Ridge, N. J., in place of Erving Van Houten. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Carl Shurts to be postmaster at Lebanon, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

NEW YORK.

George F. Cornell to be postmaster at Rosebank, N. Y., in place of John J. Roehrig. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

H. Blake Stratton to be postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., in place of Harrison Beecher. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

NORTH CAROLINA.

W. M. Goodson to be postmaster at Marion, N. C., in place of Clarence M. McCall. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1915.

C. F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Winton, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

N. Henry Moore to be postmaster at Washington, N. C., in place of Hugh Paul. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Thomas J. Orr to be postmaster at Matthews, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Christopher H. Peirce to be postmaster at Faison, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

William J. Roberts to be postmaster at Shelby, N. C., in place of Barnabas A. Baber. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

NORTH DAKOTA.

A. O. Dahl to be postmaster at Plaza, N. Dak., in place of Ben H. Wilkins, resigned.

OHIO.

Levi E. Bierer to be postmaster at McComb, Ohio, in place of Samuel H. Bolton. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

Joseph E. Blackford to be postmaster at Martins Ferry, Ohio, in place of George G. Sedgwick. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1915.

Edward L. Hauser to be postmaster at Girard, Ohio, in place of Edward J. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Horace E. McConnell to be postmaster at Milford Center, Ohio, in place of Louis C. Burnham. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

James W. Stoneburner to be postmaster at Roseville, Ohio, in place of Elmer Sagle. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Roscoe Vance White to be postmaster at Middlefield, Ohio, in place of Albert A. White. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

William A. Zellars to be postmaster at Freeport, Ohio, in place of Delmer M. Starkey, removed.

OKLAHOMA.

H. E. Derwin to be postmaster at Guthrie, Okla., in place of Wilburn M. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Lee B. Fitzhugh to be postmaster at Sand Springs, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Frederick McDaniel to be postmaster at Bartelsville, Okla., in place of Millard T. Kirk. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1915.

C. D. Snider to be postmaster at Waurika, Okla., in place of John L. Morgan, removed.

OREGON.

Lizzie M. Perkins to be postmaster at Gardiner, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George J. Eppley to be postmaster at Hershey, Pa., in place of Martin L. Hershey, removed.

RHODE ISLAND.

John B. Sullivan to be postmaster at Newport, R. I., in place of Robert S. Burlingame, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Micheal P. Healy to be postmaster at Navy Yard, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

TENNESSEE.

J. T. Patten to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of Albert S. Scott, removed.

TEXAS.

Andrew Barton to be postmaster at Kilgore, Tex., in place of Evans H. Angell. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

B. G. Edwards to be postmaster at Forney, Tex., in place of Walter S. Yates. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1914.

Sam H. Little to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of George S. Ziegler. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1915.

B. H. McKinnon, jr., to be postmaster at Canton, Tex., in place of Jacob J. Utts. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

C. C. Powell to be postmaster at Clarendon, Tex., in place of Charles J. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

W. A. Smith to be postmaster at Gatesville, Tex., in place of Harry Harris. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

W. B. Stradley to be postmaster at Paducah, Tex., in place of Auguste Dumont. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1914.

VERMONT.

John J. Gallagher to be postmaster at Hardwick, Vt., in place of John E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Daniel H. Gray to be postmaster at Bellows Falls, Vt., in place of Joshua H. Blakley. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1915.

VIRGINIA.

Levi B. Davis to be postmaster at Roanoke, Va., in place of Luther G. Funkhouser. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Wirt Dunlap to be postmaster at Blacksburg, Va., in place of Byrd Anderson, deceased.

WASHINGTON.

Richard H. Lee to be postmaster at Wilsoncreek, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Freeborn S. Lewis to be postmaster at Port Angeles, Wash., in place of E. E. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Elmer McBroon to be postmaster at Chehalis, Wash., in place of Dan W. Bush. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

J. H. McCourt to be postmaster at Sequim, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Fenton Smith to be postmaster at South Bend, Wash., in place of Frank R. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Margaret McGugin to be postmaster at Ravenswood, W. Va., in place of William H. Latham. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

George H. Merchant to be postmaster at Cairo, W. Va., in place of J. E. Overton. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

Hayes Sapp to be postmaster at Newburg, W. Va., in place of W. Osborne Parriott. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1915.

WISCONSIN.

E. F. Butler to be postmaster at Mosinee, Wis., in place of W. N. Daniels, resigned.

WYOMING.

Thomas W. Keenan to be postmaster at Pinebluff, Wyo., in place of Charles W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

W. M. Wolfard to be postmaster at Encampment, Wyo., in place of Henry D. Ashley, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 26), 1915.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James A. Smiser to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, division No. 1.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. Russell Lord Lucas to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Wilmer Hake Eberly to be second lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Howard Eugene Rideout to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Frank Lynn Austin to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

C. L. Cleveland, Centerville.

CALIFORNIA.

Fred M. Kelly, Needles.

COLORADO.

Robert E. Norvell, Hayden.
Sarah J. O'Connell, Georgetown.

DELAWARE.

Edwin V. Ocheltree, Greenwood.
J. Frank Starling, Dover.

FLORIDA.

Thomas E. Blackburn, Bowling Green.

GEORGIA.

Albert S. J. McRae, McRae.

IDAHO.

Emily B. Davis, Milner.

INDIANA.

Theodore Hoss, Fowler.
J. Bruce Pessell, Butler.
Lewis Phillippe, Bicknell.
Henry E. Snyder, Atlanta.
Charles Van Arsdall, Hymera.

KANSAS.

Carl E. Hallberg, Courtland.
Virginia H. Kinyon, Fall River.
W. E. Mattison, Mount Hope.
Frank E. Munger, Atwood.
Thomas Pore, Cedar Vale.
Ferdinand Scharping, Hillsboro.

IOWA.

Cary C. Beggs, Moulton.
Charles A. Britch, Ida Grove.
Peter J. Cool, Baxter.
Madge Fell, Fremont.
Carl L. Little, Ames.
William F. Oehmke, Larchwood.
Max Mayer, Iowa City.
Frank B. Wilson, Greenfield.

KENTUCKY.

C. E. Beeler, Calhoun.
L. T. Doty, Owenton.
B. M. Powell, Corydon.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Bernard Campbell, Millville.
Marianna J. Cooke, Milford.
John T. Dolan, Avon.
Nathaniel A. Eldridge, Chatham.
Thomas F. Hederman, Webster.
James T. Hennessy, Wareham.
William B. Mahoney, Westfield.

NEW JERSEY.

Richard J. Fox, Grantwood.
Isaac Klein, Salem.
Charles C. Stewart, Mays Landing.

OREGON.

W. R. Cook, Madras.
Gaphart D. Ebner, Mount Angel.
Mary E. Fitzpatrick, Beaverton.
J. J. Gaither, Toledo.
Charles O. Henry, Athena.
Mary T. Mangold, Gervais.
George C. Mason, Jefferson.
Lovie R. Watt, Amity.
W. C. Wilson, Joseph.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Joseph P. McMahon, Susquehanna.
Joseph A. Shoff, Madera.
William W. Van Eman, Grove City.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Dana T. Crosland, Bennettsville.
G. B. Stackhouse, Mullins.

TEXAS.

Horace C. Blalock, Marshall.
Robert G. Bransom, Burleson.
Joe H. Campbell, Matador.
Hugo J. Letzerich, Harlingen.
Joseph W. Singleton, Waxahachie.

UTAH.

T. L. Sullivan, Eureka.

VERMONT.

David P. MacKenzie, Island Pond.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Byerly, Bridgewater.
Crandal Mackey, jr., Rosslyn.

WASHINGTON.

Calvin W. Stewart, Tacoma.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Fred S. Hathaway, Grantsville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 29, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for the degree of civilization which, under Thy providence, as a people we are permitted to enjoy, but we realize that with every advance toward a higher order come new and complicated problems which must be solved; but, as our fathers met the problems of their day and solved them, help us, we beseech Thee, with patriotic fervor and a high conception of statesmanship to meet the questions of our day and adjust ourselves to the new conditions in accordance with Thy will. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the amendment that I offered on yesterday to the appropriation bill, on page 72, line 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the amendment which he offered to the bill yesterday, as designated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the Army. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short speech delivered night before last by Congressman SLOAN, of Nebraska, on William McKinley. I think it is appropriate on the anniversary of his birth to publish it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a short speech by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] on William McKinley. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in reference to the navigation of the Connecticut River.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the navigation of the Connecticut River. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill; and, pending that, I wish to make a statement and to ask if an agreement can be reached relative to the time. In discussing the matter with my colleagues on the committee it was the idea that we should conclude general debate with the adjournment of the House to-day. I wanted to ask unanimous consent that the House sit until 6 o'clock this evening and then recess until 8, and then sit until 11 o'clock to-night for general debate only upon the bill, and that on the adjournment to-night the general debate be closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider House bill 20975, the Naval appropriation bill, and, pending that, he asks that at 6 o'clock the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock and have a session running not past 11 o'clock, and that when the House adjourns to-day the general debate on the Naval appropriation bill shall be considered as finished.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he has determined that this general debate shall be finished to-day?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the idea; to close it with adjournment to-night.

Mr. BUTLER. Since I had my conversation with the chairman several members of the committee, some upon that side of the House and some upon this side, have requested me, if possible, to secure them some time. Now, they can not all be heard if we adjourn to-night at 11 o'clock. I have no disposition at all to delay this debate, for I have nothing myself to say, but I would like very much if these gentlemen having views to express could have the opportunity to express them. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], for example, one of the long-time Members, desires to say something on this bill. I think the opportunity should be given him. But if it is proposed to limit the general debate, I do not see how I can find time for him, much to my regret. I concede that the chairman of the committee has much to do with the fixing of the time. I only tell him what I have learned to be the wish of some of the Members of the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state to the gentleman that several Members spoke to me with reference to the time, and among them the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who spoke some days ago. I said to all of them that I would be glad to do the best I could, but that I could not make any promise as to a definite time with anyone else. The requests that have been made upon me, so far as the time I would control, is more than consumed by requests from the members of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman tell me what his ideas are as to the division of time?

Mr. PADGETT. If we carry out the program until 11 o'clock, that would give 10 hours for debate.

Mr. MANN. About nine.

Mr. BUTLER. About nine hours.

Mr. PADGETT. Between 9 and 10 hours.

Mr. MANN. Why not run right along; what is the object of taking a recess from 6 until 8?

Mr. PADGETT. I am perfectly willing to eliminate the recess.

Mr. MANN. We did that the other day, and had a satisfactory audience all the time.

Mr. PADGETT. I will modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and eliminate the recess from 6 to 8.

Mr. BUTLER. That will give us 11 hours' debate.

Mr. MANN. We always lose some of the time.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, will the chairman give me his idea as to the division of time?

Mr. PADGETT. There has been nothing said about that as yet, because I wanted to see if we could agree on the general time. In discussing the matter with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] on that side of the House, and with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY], representing certain members on the committee in sympathy with his views, it was suggested that Mr. HENSLEY should control four hours of the time and that the remainder of the time be divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, each of us to yield one-half hour to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS], a member of the committee, and, as I understood it, we would yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. BUTLER. Is the gentleman from Tennessee willing to yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and the remainder would be divided equally among us for distribution.

Mr. MANN. I would like to make this suggestion: That the gentleman ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed at the adjournment of the session to-day, without fixing the time, with the understanding that we shall run along and that the bill shall not be read under the five-minute rule to-day.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a suggestion in connection with this debate. There is not a bill, in all probability, which will come before this House which provokes greater interest or about which gentlemen more earnestly desire to express themselves in real pertinent debate than this naval bill. I can see no impropriety whatever in confining general debate to the bill itself. In the present state of business in the Congress—the advanced situation in the House and the absolutely unadvanced situation in another body—I can see no reason why there should not be a reasonable extension of time in this House for debate. I can not see why, if there is to be a limit, debate should not run until 11 o'clock to-night and the House begin at 10 o'clock to-morrow and close general debate, unless some reason should develop here why it should not be done at 10 o'clock to-morrow. That would be an extension of an hour suggested by the gentleman, and I submit a request for unanimous consent that that shall be done and that I shall be allowed one hour. I hope that no gentleman will think that I am indulging in vanity in submitting this request. I rarely trespass on the House for prolonged discussion on any question. I do not think in the whole course of my career when an appropriation bill was up that I have asked that I should be given an hour's time, but this time, because I really want to say something about the bill and some features of it, I am going to submit the request that the time be extended beyond that suggested by the committee by two hours.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. SLAYDEN. That debate run until 11 o'clock to-night, and then begin at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning and general debate run until 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee accept that as an amendment to his request?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to suggest another matter. If the House runs continuously until 11 o'clock with the recess eliminated, I will agree to yield to the gentleman from Texas half an hour, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] will yield him half an hour, and thus take care of the gentleman from Texas out of the additional two hours that we get by eliminating the recess.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate run until 11 o'clock to-night; that he control one half of the time and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] control one-half, minus four hours that is controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY]; that the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree to yield one-half hour to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS]; that the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree to yield one-half hour each to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Tennessee, and the gentleman from Missouri agree to yield 30 minutes each to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I submitted a request for unanimous consent to let debate go on until noon to-morrow and begin one hour earlier. I think that request is reasonable.

The SPEAKER. The trouble is that the gentleman from Tennessee submitted a unanimous consent first.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will wait, then, until his request is objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I object.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman will have the hour that he requested, and I hope he will not object.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say in reply, Mr. Speaker, that I spoke to the gentleman from Tennessee six weeks ago for time, and he advised me a few minutes ago that I could not get any.

Mr. PADGETT. I told the gentleman that I would do the best I could, but the members of the committee had called for all the time that I had.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we have extended the time for the gentleman from Texas, and I hope the gentleman will not object. It is rather inconvenient to meet at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, let me understand, please, whether the gentleman from Tennessee has made any modification whatever of his request, and what it is?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again state the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. Gentlemen will have to give close heed or they will not understand it, it is so long.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I beg the Speaker's pardon. My attention was distracted for the moment by a Member who spoke to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this naval appropriation bill run until 11 o'clock to-night——

Mr. MANN. Until the House adjourns to-night.

The SPEAKER. Until the House adjourns to-night, and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] control half the time and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] the other half, minus 4 hours to be assigned to the gentleman from Misssouri [Mr. HENSLEY], and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] each agree to give 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] yields 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] yields 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], and that the general debate close when the House adjourns to-night.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. I desire to inquire whether or not at any time—say, for instance, when three or four hours have been consumed—if those gathered here should conclude that they wanted to adjourn, that would cut off the general debate entirely?

Mr. MANN. It undoubtedly would; but I take it that the House will not be so discourteous.

Mr. BUTLER. We will endeavor to see that it does not adjourn.

Mr. HENSLEY. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his objection.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand that the request submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee confined the general debate to this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. It did not.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think it ought to be so confined.

Mr. MANN. I think it probably will be, because you can not get time in any other way.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think it ought to be confined, and I think the unanimous-consent agreement ought to include that.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee include that in his request?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I do not care to complicate the request in that way.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to know if it is distinctly understood that there is to be no reading of the bill under the five-minute rule to-day?

Mr. MANN. That is not a part of the request, but that was the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand it; but the Chair did not put it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's statement is sufficient. It does not need to be a part of the request.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Reserving the right to object, I do not like that part of the agreement at all which confines the time controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] to four hours, and I want to submit to the gentleman from Tennessee that that is not a fair division of time. This method of taking six hours of the time and dividing it up between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], who favors the bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who favors the bill, and the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS], who also favors the bill, giving those who favor the bill six hours and those who oppose it four hours, is an unfair division of the time.

Mr. MANN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that we do not consider that that side of the House is entitled to control time both in favor of and opposed to the bill. We do not figure on the time granted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] as all in favor of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think that all the gentlemen who have spoken to me are in favor of the bill.

Mr. MANN. We do not intend to be compelled to go over to that side of the House to ask anybody for time.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that I imagine some of the gentlemen who have asked me for time are opposed to this bill. I have not asked them whether they favor or oppose the bill. They want to speak on it, and I shall apportion the time as gentlemen have applied to me, without asking them whether they are for the bill or against it.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Let me get through. I am not through yet. I desire to make a few further remarks. In addition to that the Naval Affairs Committee have gone into a very exhaustive examination of the questions which this House is to consider, and I think there are about 1,200 or 1,300 pages of printed testimony taken. A great many new, and in my opinion very important, facts have been developed, and it is absolutely necessary that this House should be put in possession of those facts if they are to vote according to the facts of the case, and it is an utter impossibility for the testimony, which I think shows that this bill ought to be materially amended, to be presented in four hours. Now, it is not going to hurry things along very much to cut down the debate an hour or two. We will not lose much in furthering the business of the session to extend the debate an hour or two. That does not make any material difference, and I think it is perfectly reasonable for those of us who oppose this bill to ask that we be given five hours instead of four, and I appeal to the gentleman from Tennessee to agree that Mr. HENSLEY may control five hours of the time.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state to the gentleman that the universal practice up until last year has been that the time has been divided between the two parties of the House. Out of courtesy to the gentleman, last year I departed from that practice and asked that the gentleman should control a certain portion of the time, and this year I have done the same thing; and, discussing the matter with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY], the four-hour agreement we reached was satisfactory. I can not modify my agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. FOWLER. To reserve the right to object, in order that I may get some information. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if any portion of the time for general debate has been awarded to anyone who is in favor of making some provision in this bill for high-explosive shells?

Mr. PADGETT. There is a provision in the bill for armor and armament, and it embraces all kinds of shells and is not limited to any kind.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to delay the House a moment, but I desire to have an opportunity to present the question of high-explosive shells when we reach that part of the bill. I ask that there might be embodied in this request 20 minutes, and that I may have the right to devote that time to this question.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman can be cared for under the ordinary rules of the House under the five-minutes' debate. I do not wish to embarrass the general debate in any way with an agreement in reference to the five-minute rule.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume it is the intention of the committee to be rather liberal under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman will bear me witness we have always been.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not desire to delay the consideration of this bill, but I have been attempting for several days to get at least 15 minutes in which to discuss this measure. The chairman of the committee has informed me that the committee has taken up all of its time practically which has been promised to others, so the chances are I can not get that 15 minutes from him. Of course, I realize that whatever I may say upon this bill may not be very important to this House, but there are some opinions on naval matters which I would like to have an opportunity of expressing, and if I can not obtain the 15 minutes during the general debate I shall ask unanimous consent during the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule to speak at some proper place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Kentucky is opposed to the bill. I am willing to yield the gentleman a quarter of an hour of my time. An hour is more than I shall probably consume.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAKER. Before the House goes into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union I want to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. Not now.

Mr. RAKER. It is only to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee is pending. Unless he would agree to withhold it——

Mr. RAKER. It is to correct the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the House are well aware, my voice is in very bad shape owing to a continued attack of laryngitis, and I regret that it encumbers very much my ability to speak. I shall not devote a great deal of time to a discussion of this matter, but will be pleased to answer as best I can any questions that any Members may desire to ask. I wish to say, however, Mr. Chairman, that during the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule I hope to be able to give to the committee information upon any item in the bill as we may have it under consideration at the time, and for that reason I shall not at attempt at this time to make any extended remarks. I have filed with the bill a very extensive report, going into great detail of explanation of the various items in the bill. Last year the bill as it became a law carried $144,492,453.53. The bill this year as reported and now pending before the committee carries $148,589,786.88, an increase of $3,721,070.27, and I may add, as the committee is well aware, last year we sold the two old battleships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, for $12,535,275.96, and in lieu of the two which were sold we authorized the construction of a third dreadnaught, and in this bill the sum of $5,727,410 is included for the construction of this additional ship, and it is embraced in the total of the $148,000,000 that I mentioned. In other words, if you credit the Navy with the sale of the ships in the amount of $12,535,000, which went into the Treasury last year, and deduct $4,635,000 that was taken out of that sum for the construction of the additional ship last year, and the $5,727,410 embraced in the bill this year for the construction upon that additional ship, it leaves an amount in this bill of $142,833,376.88. The bill recommends the construction of 2 battleships, 6 torpedo-boat destroyers, 1 large seagoing submarine, 16 smaller submarines but of good radius of action, 1 transport, 1 hospital ship, and 1 fuel ship. The total cost of the new construction authorized is $53,168,828, and on the first year's construction, because these appropriations are not all made at the time of authorization, but only an amount sufficient to carry on the work during the year, there is appropriated the sum of $22,903,998.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. It might be very interesting to the committee if the chairman can give the information as to what amount of money is being expended each year, or for the last year, the present year, and the future year in actual naval construction on new projects.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I will see if I have that here, and I will try to get it for the gentleman.

The amount recommended in this bill to carry on the new construction heretofore authorized is $23,805,803, and the amount necessary to carry on the construction herein recommended is $22,903,998. You will find that in the third paragraph of the second page of the report. I do not have before me the cost of new construction that was recommended last year, but if I remember correctly it was something about $43,000,000 or $44,000,000. It will appear in the report filed with the bill last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. So, according to the statement just made, if all the money appropriated in this bill for the next fiscal year be realized there will be at least $45,700,000 that will be expended?

Mr. PADGETT. It is about that sum. The total is $46,109,801. That appears in the same paragraph of the report that I referred to, just a line or two below.

Now I call attention to the fact that of the annual appropriations made in the bill for the last fiscal year there is $1,800,000 of unobligated balances, and of these unobligated balances we have made available $800,000 on account of the construction of submarines, and we have reappropriated $1,000,000 for aeronautics, in its broadest and widest terms, embracing dirigibles and aeroplanes, and so forth.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has just stated that a million dollars for aeronautics is not only for aeroplanes but also for dirigibles.

Mr. PADGETT. Balloons, also.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was stated in the consideration of the Army appropriation bill that one of these dirigibles costs as high as a million dollars, so that there would not be any money for aeroplanes left. All would be used for dirigibles.

Mr. PADGETT. The cost of some, I understand, amounts to only $89,000.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand the small ones cost only $2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Zeppelins, it was stated during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, cost as much as $1,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 286 of the hearings you will find an itemized statement in which it appears that one dirigible, under Steam Engineering, is estimated at $60,000; under Construction and Repair, $112,000; under Ordnance, $2,000; and under the Bureau of Navigation, $600, so that it would be about $174,600.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I think perhaps the confusion arises from the fact that it was testified before the Committee on Military Affairs by Gen. Scriven that a Zeppelin would cost a million dollars. I understand that the proposed dirigible is one of the other types instead of a Zeppelin. It is one of the smaller types.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is not of the larger and more expensive type.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, it was on that very subject that I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee a question, if I understood the matter properly, as to the development of aviation for naval purposes. What is the total amount recommended in this bill of unobligated balances and new appropriations? What is the exact amount available for 1915–16?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that heretofore Congress has been appropriating for aviation under lump-sum appropriations, carried under the Bureaus of Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair, just an indefinite amount of a lump-sum appropriation, given to those bureaus for general work. The committee thought it wise to segregate areonautics and to make it separate and apart by itself, feeling that it had reached a stage of development where it was deserving of separation and emphasis; so that we put it in a clause by itself, under the office of the Secretary of the Navy, with authority for him to distribute the total appropriation to the various bureaus as might be needed. And we have, as I stated a moment ago, made available for that purpose the sum of $1,000,000. I understand that last year we expended something over $200,000 for aeronautics.

Mr. GOULDEN. The chairman realizes how important this item is?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and the present year something like $300,000 will be expended. We have made available a million dollars for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. GOULDEN. I notice that the department asked for $1,187,600.

Mr. PADGETT. That was not the department. That was Capt. Bristol, the officer in the department who has charge of that particular service, and he stated that he could use $1,187,000. I will also call your attention to the fact that Capt. Bristol stated that he had an unexpended balance at the present time of $350,000, or about that amount, and we have added a million dollars, so that from now until the close of the fiscal year 1916, which would be a year from next July, we will have $1,350,000 which would be available for that purpose.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am sure none of us anticipate a war; we all hope there will be none, anyway; but I am quite confident that this is a very important branch of both the Army and the Navy, and I think it should be developed as rapidly as possible. I have no doubt that the Naval Committee has taken the matter under full advisement, and that this embodies the wisdom of the members.

Mr. PADGETT. For certain purposes we regard it as a very valuable aid for service in the Navy, and we have taken an advanced step.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am glad to hear it. I want to ask another question, if I may. I see you have provided for 17 submarine torpedo boats, 1 of the seagoing type. Will the gentleman kindly tell us the difference in the cost between the latter—the seagoing type—and the former?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The bill stipulates the limit of cost of the seagoing type. It is a large boat, from a thousand to twelve hundred tons displacement, and the limit of cost is fixed at $1,400,000. The other boats will be about 500 or 600 tons displacement, and the limit of cost is fixed at $550,000 each, or a difference of $850,000 in limit of cost.

Mr. GOULDEN. This is quite an item, and it has developed that the best use that they can be put to is in connection with the defenses of the harbors and the coast.

Mr. PADGETT. The submarine is a boat and an implement of war that is developing very rapidly. The boat that was considered and developed last year is not the boat that is in mind to-day. Last year, as I stated, the Congress authorized the construction of a seagoing vessel, jumping at one stroke from a boat of about 600 tons displacement to about 1,200 tons displacement. That is largely experimental. And the experts of the department, from their study of the matter, from the investigations that they have made, and from the drawings, feel that they have worked out the solution of the question, but there is nothing that succeeds like success itself.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am delighted to hear the gentleman say that, and sincerely hope that the genius of our naval experts may be rewarded. Can the gentleman tell us without much trouble the exact amount appropriated for submarine torpedo boats—that is, approximately—in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The total cost would be 16 at $550,000 each, and 1 at $1,400,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. That answers my question satisfactorily.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, then, for this purpose we have recommended for the first year $3,405,000, and in addition we have reappropriated $800,000, making $4,205,000 that has been appropriated for the first year's construction. It takes about 30 months to build a submarine, but on account of the difficulties we have experienced with contractors they have taken a much longer time. This is a machine of very delicate construction, very complicated machinery and mechanism, and there are many difficulties that have to be encountered and overcome. Our experience has been with the contractors, and there are only two in this country—the Electric Boat Co. and the Lake Boat Co.—that undertake to build these submarines——

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman, I am sure, realizes how important this is to the great city and its magnificent harbor which I have the honor to represent in part here, and therefore these questions are asked. I wanted full information with the desire that it go into the RECORD, and I thank the gentleman for his courteous and instructive replies. I feel that the immense commerce of New York demands from the National Government the greatest protection possible.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to say that in this bill a million dollars is appropriated for aeronautics, and in addition $300,000 is available from unobligated balances?

Mr. PADGETT. For the last fiscal year.

Mr. GARDNER. Does that make $1,300,000 in all?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I did not understand the chairman's report in that way. If you will turn to page 287 of the hearings, the hearings of Capt. Bristol, at the bottom of the page, you will find that he says there is only about $350,000 now available for expenditure.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that. Now, then, we have made available $1,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and as I stated a moment ago, from the present time until the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1916, there will be a total available of $1,350,000.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman's report and the gentleman's bill say that the million dollars is appropriated out of the total unobligated balances.

Mr. PADGETT. Annual balances—June, 1914. These are unexpended balances of the fiscal year 1915. The unappropriated balances that we have made available are for the fiscal year that is past—1914.

Mr. GARDNER. That is satisfactory. Only I wanted to have a definite understanding, because it was not clear to me from the report. Is the gentleman ready to have me ask one or two questions which I have on my mind?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment before we leave this subject of aeronautics?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand the chairman of the committee to say that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, there will be $350,000 available for aeronautics?

Mr. PADGETT. No; he says he has at the present time $350,000 available for use during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Capt. Bristol means by that that $350,000 of the lump sum for Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair have been allotted for aeronautics. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this condition of affairs which may develop at the end of this fiscal year, as it did at the end of last fiscal year. At the end of last fiscal year—June 30, 1914—we had unobligated balances of about $2,000,000, so we were informed by the Secretary of the Navy. Those unobligated balances were largely in Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair; the two items up to the present time carrying the money for aeronautics. If the same condition holds for this year, there will be something like $2,000,000 on June 30, 1915, of those appropriations unobligated which can be used, if the Secretary so wishes, for aeronautics during this year. Now, it is wholly up to the department whether the $350,000 that has been allotted for aeronautics is the limit of the amount that shall be spent for the fiscal year.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary stated in that connection that if he had more money available he could not spend it at the present time, because he can not get machines abroad, and there is no one in this country prepared to manufacture them at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, if the chairman will pardon me just a moment, reference has been made to the item and the statement of Capt. Bristol, showing the probable expenditure of the $1,000,000 which we have appropriated, and reference to that shows that a considerable proportion, running, if my memory serves, into $100,000 or $200,000, will be needed to handle aeronautics, in the way of sheds and stations and other accessories that are needed for air craft. If the money is available and can be used out of this year's appropriation, those accessories can be provided this year; and when the $1,000,000 appropriation takes effect it is probable that that can all be spent for air craft, and none of it be needed for the accessories.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman turn to page 39 of his report?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman will find that there are 21 first-line battleships included in the table on that page.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I take it that that table comes from the new Navy Yearbook. At all events, it corresponds with the Navy Yearbook table.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is taken from that.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not true that the *Arizona*, *California*, *Idaho*, *Mississippi*, *Nevada*, *Oklahoma*, and *Pennsylvania* have never as yet been completed?

Mr. PADGETT. I think that is correct.

Mr. GARDNER. That is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. That brings the number down to 14. Now, is it not also true that the *Kansas*, *Minnesota*, *New Hampshire*, and *Vermont* belong to the second line?

Mr. PADGETT. Last year in the Navy Yearbook they were placed in the first-line battleships. It was only last year that the Navy Yearbook had a heading, "First-line battleships." Prior to that time they used the designation "First-class bat-

tleships." I have looked back a number of years, and I find that the ships the gentleman mentions have been classified all the while under "First-class battleships." In the last year's Navy Yearbook they were put down under "First-line battleships," and this year they are put down under "First-line battleships."

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a publication of the Navy Department called Ships' Data, United States Naval Vessels, bearing date January 1, 1914. I hold in the other hand Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory, dated January 1, 1915, and in both these publications I find that the *Kansas*, *Minnesota*, *New Hampshire*, and *Vermont* have all four been relegated to the second line.

Mr. PADGETT. I think you will notice on the same page of your Ships' Data a note in which they say that by virtue of an order made, I believe, in 1912——

Mr. GARDNER. I have the Secretary's letter here about it.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary made an order for classification that ships more than 10 years old should be put in the second line, and ships under 10 years old should be classed in the first line, and that publication is in accord with that order of the Secretary.

Mr. GARDNER. I have his letter.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say also, for the benefit of those who may not have investigated, that the book we referred to a moment ago as the Navy Yearbook is a publication gotten out by the clerk of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, and is not published by the Navy Department.

Mr. GARDNER. I am not blaming the department or even the committee, but I want to bring out the fact that that is a mistake in the committee's report.

Mr. PADGETT. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that it depends on which classification you adopt. Let me explain this. There is another regulation that has fixed the active fleet at 21 ships, and when they speak of the 21 in the first line they are taking the 21 that constitute the active fleet—the first line of resistance. In other words, there are 4 squadrons, with 4 ships in each squadron, and 1 extra one with each squadron, and a flagship, making 21 ships, 4 to a squadron, and allowing 1 extra one to be ready to go in its alternate time to the navy yards for docking and repairs, so as to have 4 in each squadron available.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is merely confusing the question again. I want to get it clear that the Navy Department classification leaves only 10 ships in the first line.

Mr. PADGETT. According to that classification, under 10 years of age.

Mr. GARDNER. According to the classification of the Navy Department.

Mr. PADGETT. Under 10 years of age; that is correct.

Mr. GARDNER. Now I will read what the Secretary of the Navy said in a letter to me three days ago, if I may.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. This is the Secretary's letter:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 26, 1915.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GARDNER: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 25, 1915, pointing out certain discrepancies between Senate Document No. 637, Sixty-third Congress, third session (Navy Yearbook), and the Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory, January 1, 1915.

On October 22, 1912, the department issued the following general order: "The age of vessels in the Navy shall be computed from the date of the act of Congress authorizing their construction." On November 9, 1912, the department approved the classification submitted by the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in which battleships were transferred from the first to the second line when they were 10 years old.

The list of battleships contained in the Ships' Data book and Navy and Marine Corps List and Directory are therefore correct.

Senate Document No. 637 is a Senate publication over which this department has no cognizance. The list contained on page 842 has been carried along from year to year and evidently has not been compared recently with the Ship's Data Book. The *South Carolina* and *Michigan* will be transferred to the second line on March 3, 1915.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

This statement about the *South Carolina* and the *Michigan* means that on March 3, 1915, instead of having 10 ships in the first line of battleships there will be only 8.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct as to the age of the ships. The gentleman must bear in mind also that there will be added the new ships as they are authorized to come in, and then he must make this distinction.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; and it takes about four years from the date of authorization to build a ship.

Mr. PADGETT. No; about three years.

Mr. GARDNER. I think four years from the date of authorization.

Mr. PADGETT. They are building them now in about 30 to 32 months.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to call attention to the fact that the grouping of the 21 ships is the first line of resistance. They are the ones actually in commission and in service, and go into the first line of resistance. The other is a paper tabulation.

Mr. GARDNER. The *Texas* took three years and eight months from the date of authorization to the date of completion. That is the last ship completed. The *New York*, the next most recent dreadnaught, took from the time it was authorized to the date of its first commission three years and nine months to build. It is well to remember, however, that, owing to the Mexican situation, she was put into commission before she was complete. The gentleman is giving the figures of the date of the laying of the keel to the first commission, and is not counting the time from the date of authorization.

Mr. PADGETT. Then they are usually three or four months in preparing plans; but that varies, however.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I notice in the report that the Navy Department asked for 8 submarines and you give them 17.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy asked for 8 because he thought it was sufficient. The majority of the membership of the committee thought we ought to have more, and so voted, and 17 represent the action of the committee.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Nine more than the Secretary asked for. How does the $148,000,000 appropriated by this bill compare with the amount asked for by the Secretary of the Navy and the Naval Board?

Mr. PADGETT. You must separate the Secretary and the General Board.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to call attention to the fact that the General Board recommended 17 submarines, and the committee followed the recommendation of the General Board instead of the recommendation of the Secretary?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman from Michigan is not accurate. The General Board recommended 16 coast submarines and 3 seagoing submarines. The building program of the Secretary of the Navy, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, as recommended, would have carried about $44,000,000 to construct it, and when the committee reported it it was $53,000,000.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Nine million dollars more.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The General Board recommended a program that would have carried $128,224,972.

Mr. OLDFIELD. More than twice as much.

Mr. PADGETT. Three times as much as the Secretary recommended and two and a half times as much as the committee allowed.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Who is at the head of the General Board?

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Dewey. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve the balance of my time and will yield the floor.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question or two before he yields the floor.

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. Last year's appropriation bill authorized the building of what is known as a seagoing submarine. This bill provides another seagoing submarine. These seagoing submarines cost something over a million dollars each, do they not?

Mr. PADGETT. The limit of cost is $1,400,000.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the chairman give the committee some idea with reference to the practicability of these submarines—whether or not they have been worked out?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated in the early part of my statement that the experts in the department have worked out plans by which they think it will be a success. None has yet been built, and they do not know by actual demonstration; but they have great confidence and a firm belief in the seagoing type of submarines. However, it is a jump from 600 tons to one of 1,200 tons, or an increase of 100 per cent, and the question of its actual success is yet to be worked out; but we believe that it is going to be a success.

Mr. HENSLEY. Another question: Can the chairman tell when the submarine authorized by the last bill will be completed?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the contract calls for 30 months; but I will say to the gentleman that experience in the past has been such that, on account of the delicacy of the work of the submarine, its manifold number of pieces, it may not be completed

in that time. For instance, in the engine of a submarine there are something like a thousand parts; they are reducing it to something like six hundred and some odd different parts, but, as the gentleman can see, it is a very delicate piece of mechanism, and the contractors have not been able to keep up and complete it within the time limit.

Mr. HENSLEY. Is it not a fact that the experts in the department, not knowing whether this character of a submarine would be a success, did not make any request upon the committee for an authorization for another seagoing submarine?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the Secretary asked expressly for one. The General Board recommended three.

Mr. HENSLEY. Of the seagoing type?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; estimated for it and asked for it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was much interested in the gentleman's statement about what he calls the seagoing submarine, and I received the impression that there is doubt in his mind, and perhaps reflected from the doubt in the minds of these experts, whether or not it is practical.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. I stated that the experts have worked out plans, and that they firmly believe that it will be a success.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Jumping from 600 tons to 1,200 tons.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but as none has been constructed here we will have to wait; but we wait with confidence, in the belief that it will be a success.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is the gentleman quite certain that none have been constructed?

Mr. PADGETT. Not in this country.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Did the gentleman see an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in a Washington paper last Saturday to the effect that the Germans had just launched a submarine provisioned and equipped for, if it should become necessary, a three months' voyage?

Mr. PADGETT. I saw that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That looks like it might be a seagoing submarine.

Mr. PADGETT. We have no definite information about it. They state that they have not been able to get definite information from abroad. We get these reports, but the department have worked out their plans and diagrams and specifications, and they believe that it will work to such an extent that they asked for one last year and they ask for another one this year, and the committee believed it by reporting for the one last year and reporting for the one this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee unite with me now in yielding to the gentleman from California the time we agreed to give him, I to give him one-half an hour and the gentleman one-half an hour?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will yield 30 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for one hour.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not for war; I am for peace, everlasting peace. I am for a larger Navy and a larger Army, because I believe that is one of the ways to keep this country at peace. [Applause.] I am not a jingoist in any sense of the word. I am as far from that as any man can possibly be, but I do believe that now is the time to take out more insurance against war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did our European friends, who have been building large armies and large navies for the last several years, realize anything on their insurance? Does not the gentleman think the fact that they had large standing armies helped to bring about the war rather than insure them against war?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. No; I do not. I think that each of the nations now at war has postponed war, and is now benefited because of the army and navy each has.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman think that any European nation now engaged in war is benefiting itself?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. No; I think war never benefits the people of any country engaged.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They paid the largest insurance premium of any people of whom we have any record in all history, and yet the conflagration came. Now, does the gentleman think it was a wise investment under the circumstances?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will answer the gentleman's question as I go along in my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the gentleman proceeds will he answer this question?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a large standing army and a very large navy is an insurance against war, to what size does the gentleman think Germany ought to have built her army and navy, and to what size does the gentleman think Great Britain ought to have built her army and navy in order to have had effective insurance against this great war that is now being fought?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will say to the gentleman I am not and do not pretend to be a naval or an army expert, but a business man, with what I think is ordinary business sense, and it is because I believe it is a good business proposition, as well as one that will preserve the young men of this Nation, and perhaps save our women from the awful heartbreakings and sufferings and aftermath of war, that I advocate a larger Navy and a larger Army at this time.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman think he will see a disarmament of all the nations before ever seeing an agreement among the militiarists and jingoists as to the size of army and navy which a nation ought to build?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Well, I am not acquainted with very many jingoists, and I can not answer for them, but at this time I feel that we are not assured of anything at the close of this war unless it is that human nature will still be human nature.

I would insure this Nation against war, for I want no more war-bereaved mothers, widows, and children, and no more war-maimed and suffering men in these United States. I shall dwell on two points only at this time. Is the United States justified in making adequate naval defense, and is the Pacific coast fairly or even proportionately defended?

Mr. Speaker, we insure our personal property against burglary and our windowpanes against breakage; we build cyclone cellars to which we run when storms approach; we insure our homes and our business buildings against damage or destruction by fire; we go to great expense in all our cities and towns to provide fire engines and men to run them, so that we may be ready to fight fire when it comes. No city is so foolish as to wait until fire breaks out before contracting for fire-fighting apparatus. No insurance against loss by fire could be had for Chicago, San Francisco, or Baltimore after their destructive fires had commenced. Insurance must be taken out and fire-fighting apparatus be ready before the city begins to burn if it is to do any good; and trained fire fighters are more effective than the old-time volunteers.

We gather together a police force, large or small, according to the size of the community, and thereafter, night and day, it patrols the streets to prevent crime and arrest it. We do not wait until the riot call is sounded to organize and drill our bluecoats. Neither fire companies nor insurance prevent conflagrations, but they hold them within bounds and afford first aid to the injured. Policemen do not stop all crime, but they are a constant deterrent and a ready arm of the law in an emergency.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Certainly.

Mr. HENSLEY. The statement the gentleman just made—that any community needs to organize a crew or fighting force to go out and cope with fire and that sort of thing—let me ask the gentleman whether or not now the great forces in Europe, by the tremendous effort they are putting forth, are trying to prevent the fire or are they not destroying property and life with no sort of regard to bringing about a cessation of hostilities?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Of course the war in Europe can not now be prevented. One side or the other must be conquered, just as in a great conflagration we must put out the fire or be burned up. There never was a war without loss of life, and I think that previous preparation—preparation for defense—not only postpones and may prevent war but will well serve our Nation in time of war.

Every banker keeps cash in reserve and money on call that he may withstand future financial storms. Indeed, every man of sound mind and commendable habits is strengthening himself morally, physically, and financially against the possible troubles of to-morrow.

Every careful man of family insures his life and often strains to the utmost to meet insurance premiums in order to save his wife and children from a fight for existence after he is gone. Every mother with children is saving something for the rainy day that may come by and by.

If, as communities and individuals, we are so constantly and persistently, so commendably and praiseworthily, engaged in preparing against trouble, why should we not, as a Nation, insure ourselves against war by preparing our Navy to meet those who may attack us, and our Army and our fortifications to repel all who may invade? Is it wrong for husband and father to carry insurance? Indeed, is it not desirable and advisable to burden ourselves to-day that wives and children may not go hungry to-morrow?

God knows I never want another war, either at home or abroad. I pray for peace. "Peace on earth, good will toward men," means as much to me as to any other man who was taught at his mother's knee to pray for peace everlasting. If the rest of the world is armed, if every other nation in our class is possessed of a navy and an army that she thinks superior to ours, are we not more likely to be nationally imposed upon than if we are unquestionably the stronger?

It is my guess that Great Britain will never again attack us, nor will she ever seriously participate in any war made upon us. In the interest, therefore, of world-wide peace, in the interest of peace between this Nation and every other, the United States of America should be prepared to defend herself from an attack by any other nation and be fairly prepared to repel Great Britain. To be thus prepared we must have more battleships and battle cruisers, air craft and submarines, destroyers and auxiliaries—not in numberless array, but within reason.

Shall we as a nation spend millions of dollars as a warning to the world and a defense against all comers, or shall we wait until the attack is made and then sacrifice our bravest and best, our own and our mothers' sons, in awful war? Shall we delay and pay for our tardiness in the suffering and privation of our soldiers and sailors? Shall we wait until the storm breaks, and then have our women and children miserable and hungry because we would not see? Shall we spend money now or men and money hereafter? Shall we pay out millions of money to avoid war or shall we wait and spend the life blood of hundreds of thousands of our sons and billions of our money in war?

We must do one or the other. With all my strength I favor reasonable preparation now. We should husband the Nation's resources. We should not appropriate hundreds of millions additional until we know what defenses we ought to have. But we can double the number of submarines now built, building, and authorized, and help, not hinder, any proper program. We can add a few battle cruisers to our fleet and not go contrary to the lessons taught by the war in Europe.

The United States needs a council of defense made up of men who know and are not afraid to recommend that which would render this country reasonably safe from attack. And then, my fellow Congressmen, we should vote the money to carry out that program, regardless of whether or not it helps trade in our respective communities.

Again let me say I am not for war. I am unequivocally for peace. I would go the limit to avoid war. If my shoe should be stepped on, I would be sure my toe was hurt before I would enter the international prize ring. The United States ought not and must not again engage in civil or foreign war, and one of the best ways to insure against it is to reasonably prepare our Army, Navy, and fortifications for the defense of our shores.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. If the gentleman will not take too long. I do not want to take time from my colleagues.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman from California says he is for peace, and I am confident from my relations with him that he sincerely takes that position and believes in what he is saying here now, but I desire to ask him this question, whether or not if this country had a navy even twice as large as the present Navy he does not believe that there would be the same insistence upon the part of those who are asking for further increases to-day?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. First, I want to thank the gentleman for his good opinion. I have an equal respect for him. And next, I want to say, in answer to his question, that I do not believe the demand will increase with the years. What the Navy wants, and above all what the people want, is adequate defense and nothing more.

We have two great ocean fronts and a fleet large enough to fairly protect but one. The Pacific coast has more miles of territory touching the 3-mile limit than has the Atlantic coast, but it has no dreadnaught to help protect it. There are 29 battleships on the Atlantic coast and only 1 on the Pacific. That one is the *Oregon*, almost 20 years old and ordinarily in reserve, but now in commission and on her way to meet the President at Colon.

I am not one of those who think war imminent or likely at any very early day, and yet I must ask you who read the news of the world to answer one question: If war should come to-morrow, in which direction would you look to see the flash of the guns? Do you not think the Pacific coast ought to be fairly well protected? Do you not think we ought to have a fleet there equal to the one on the Atlantic? Now, that the Panama Canal is open, do you not think the only fleet we have should be on the Pacific coast at least a part of the time?

Secretary of the Navy Daniels has said the fleet should not be divided. Well, then, why not keep it in the Pacific most of the time? It is no farther from the Pacific to the Atlantic than from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It will not take a battle fleet a day longer to go from San Francisco to New York than it will to sail from New York to San Francisco.

The following figures demonstrate clearly the difference in naval protection afforded the Atlantic and Pacific coasts:

Battleships.

ATLANTIC COAST.

ACTIVE FIRST LINE.

Name	Tons.	Guns.						Under 4-inch.
		14-inch.	13-inch.	12-inch.	8-inch.	7-inch.	6-inch.	
New York	27,000	10						4
Arkansas	26,000			12				4
Delaware	20,000			10				4
North Dakota	20,000			10				4
Texas	27,000	10						4
Wyoming	26,000			10				4
Utah	21,825			10				4
Florida	21,825			10				4
Michigan	16,000			8				26
South Carolina	16,000			8				26

PACIFIC COAST.

ACTIVE FIRST LINE.

None.

ATLANTIC COAST.

ACTIVE SECOND LINE.

Kansas	16,000			4	8	12		22
Virginia	14,948			4	8		12	26
Georgia	14,948			4	8		12	16
Nebraska	14,948			4	8		12	16
New Jersey	14,948			4	8		12	15
Connecticut	16,000			12	8	12		22
Louisiana	16,000			4	8	12		22
Minnesota	16,000			4	8	12		22
New Hampshire	16,000			4	8	12		22
Vermont	16,000			4	8	12		22
Rhode Island	14,948			4			16	16

PACIFIC COAST.

ACTIVE SECOND LINE.

	Tons.	Guns.
Oregon	10,288	4 13-inch. 8 8-inch. 16 under 4-inch.

IN RESERVE.

SECOND LINE.

Name.	Tons.	Guns.						Under 4-inch.
		14-inch.	13-inch.	12-inch.	8-inch.	7-inch	6-inch.	
Alabama	11,552		4				14	8
Illinois	11,552		4				14	8
Kearsarge	11,520		4		4			4
Kentucky	11,520		4		4			4
Missouri	12,500			4			16	10
Ohio	12,500			4			16	10
Wisconsin	11,552		4				14	8
Maine	12,500			4			16	10

PACIFIC COAST.

IN RESERVE—SECOND LINE.

None.

Monitors.

ATLANTIC COAST.

	Tons.	Over 4-inch.	Under 4-inch.
Amphitrite	3,990	6	2
Tallahassee	3,225	6	2

PACIFIC COAST.

None.

Cruisers.

ATLANTIC COAST.

	Tons.	Over 4-inch.	Under 4-inch.
Washington	14,500	20	26
North Carolina	14,500	20	26
Tennessee	14,500	20	26
Brooklyn	9,215	20	12
Des Moines (3)	3,200	10	8
Tacoma (3)	3,200	10	8
Birmingham (3)	3,750	2	8
Salem (3)	3,750	2	8
Olympia (2)	5,865	14	4
Montgomery (3)	2,072	7	2
Chester (3)	3,750	2	8

PACIFIC COAST.

San Diego	13,680	18	22
Maryland	13,680	18	22
South Dakota	13,680	18	22
Chattanooga (3)	3,200	10	8
Cleveland (3)	3,200	10	8
New Orleans (3)		10	8
Denver (3)	3,200	10	8
Raleigh (3)		11	6
St. Louis (3)	9,700	14	22
Marblehead (3)	2,072	8	4

ATLANTIC COAST.

IN RESERVE.

Chicago (2)	4,500	14	

PACIFIC COAST.

Colorado	13,680	18	22
Pittsburgh	13,680	18	22
West Virginia	13,680	18	22
Albany (3)		10	8
Milwaukee (1)	9,700	14	22
Charleston (1)	9,700	14	22

Gunboats.

ATLANTIC COAST.

	Tons.	Over 4-inch.	Under 4-inch.
Nashville	1,371	8	6
Machias	1,177	8	4
Marietta	990	6	6
Petrel	890	4	4
Sacramento	1,425	3	2
Wheeling	990	6	6
Castine	1,177		2
Paducah	1,085	6	6
Mayflower			6
Dubuque	1,085	6	6
Dolphin	1,486		6

PACIFIC COAST.

Annapolis	1,010		10
Yorktown	1,710	6	8
Vicksburg	1,010	6	6

Destroyers.

ATLANTIC COAST.

In commission	21
In reserve	13
Total	34
Tender Dixie (guns)	12 4-inch.
Tender Panther (guns)	2 4-inch.

PACIFIC COAST.

In commission	5
In reserve	4
Total	9

Submarines.

ATLANTIC COAST.

5 Cs.
3 Ds.
2 Es.
2 Gs.
4 Ks.
1 G reserve.
Prairie (mother ship) 12 4-inch.

PACIFIC COAST.

3 Hs.
4 Ks.
4 Fs (Honolulu).
2 As reserve.

Résumé.

ATLANTIC COAST.

Battleships 29, 487,586 tons, 20 14-inch guns, 20 13-inch guns, 142 12-inch guns, 88 8-inch guns, 72 7-inch guns, 154 6-inch guns, 367 guns under 4 inches.

PACIFIC COAST.

Battleships 1, 10,288 tons, 4 13-inch guns, 8 8-inch guns, 16 guns under 4 inches.

ATLANTIC COAST.

	Number.	Tons.
Monitors	2	7,215
Cruisers	12	82,802
Gunboats	11	13,200
Destroyers	34	
Submarines	17	

PACIFIC COAST.

Monitors	None.	
Cruisers	16	130,000
Gunboats	3	3,730
Destroyers	9	
Submarines	[1]9	

[1] Four at Honolulu.

There are 29 battleships on the Atlantic and 1 on the Pacific coast. There are 34 torpedo boat destroyers on the Atlantic and 9 on the Pacific. There are 17 submarines on the Atlantic and 5 on the Pacific coast and 4 at Honolulu. There are 12 cruisers on the Atlantic and 16 on the Pacific, and not a gun of the 16 larger than 8-inch. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, do you think that a fair division of naval protection, even in time of peace? If the fleet is to remain the larger part of the year on the Atlantic coast, do you not think 50 submarines should be stationed along our Pacific shores? [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to ask the gentleman how many harbors you have that could be attacked by a foreign fleet from any point on the Pacific coast?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. We have a dozen, in round numbers.

Mr. GOULDEN. I did not think you had more than four or five.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. We have four or five large harbors; but there are many smaller harbors, with cities of three to fifteen thousand near by.

Mr. GOULDEN. But not of sufficient depth of water to enable large battleships to enter or approach near enough to do any harm.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I think they could easily reach the wharves in these smaller harbors. There is depth of water sufficient in many to admit any ordinary battleship. They now take in merchant ships that draw from 20 to 25 feet of water.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will permit, I am in sympathy with him and think the Pacific coast ought to be protected; but if the gentleman will pardon an observation, some years ago when the difficulty with the school board was had in San Francisco I heard it said by the President of the United States that war was imminent, and that we were on the very verge of it with one of the oriental powers. Happily the difficulty was amicably adjusted and war averted.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to talk for or against the naval appropriation bill as a whole, as it has been presented to the House, because I am thoroughly satisfied with it at present. I do desire, however, to call the attention of the House to a new paragraph on page 27 which has for its effect the elimination of the Board of Selection for Retirement, which I am told, though new legislation, will be provided for in a rule that will be presented to the House to-morrow, making this paragraph not subject to a point of order. The "plucking board"—as this board is commonly known—in the past has performed a valuable service toward the efficiency of the Navy. We all agree on that. We also must agree that the value of the "plucking board" to-day is nil. But it is in effect, and "pluckings" will continue until this House takes some action toward removing that board, which was created some 16 years ago.

Naval experts who have appeared before our committee time and again have insisted that the pluckings from year to year as they occur now do not tend to increase the efficiency of the Navy, but rather to decrease the efficiency, with the result that some 15 able-bodied, highly efficient officers, some of whom have survived 15 different sets of "pluckers," are put on the retired list every year when they are practically at the zenith of their ability; when they are enjoying the best part of their life and giving to the service the best that is in them. Then we pluck them—put them on the retired list; practically pension them—in order to make room for the promotion of an ensign or a lieutenant of junior grade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. At what average time of life are these men plucked? Have you any figures on that?

Mr. BRITTEN. They are plucked at all ages.

Mr. McKELLAR. But what is about the average time?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I mean this, how many years have they to serve on an average when they are plucked?

Mr. BRITTEN. That depends on the rank of the officer plucked.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that entirely; but my idea was, have any statistics been prepared showing the average time when these gentlemen who have already been plucked have the right to serve?

Mr. BRITTEN. They may not have served a year and then be plucked, and on the other hand they may have served 15 or 20 years before being selected for retirement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the gentleman that I am heartily in sympathy with his view about it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It is entirely left to the discretion of the board as to whom shall be plucked?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is left entirely to the discretion of the board. No public hearings are had; nothing is given to the public as to why an officer is plucked; there is nothing reviewable. The plucking board meets and acts, not upon the service record of the officer, not upon any merit that is shown to exist in the Navy Department applying to that particular officer, but upon the general impression that prevails in the Navy regarding the officer plucked.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the board report its findings; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRITTEN. To the Secretary of the Navy, who in turn reports to the President of the United States, and the officer is retired from the service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is a record kept of the findings of the board, an examination on which it acts, and is that record sent to the Secretary and then to the President?

Mr. BRITTEN. There is no record kept, the names of the unfortunate officers merely being submitted for immediate retirement to the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How is this board appointed?

Mr. BRITTEN. By the Secretary of the Navy. It is composed of five rear admirals.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Are they on the retired list or on the active list?

Mr. BRITTEN. They are on the active list.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This plucking board starts with the idea that somebody must be plucked, whether they deserve to be plucked or not?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The law provides that they must pluck so many captains, commanders, and lieutenants. If there is no plucking, there can be no promotion.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did the chairman of the committee say that if there was no plucking there would be no promotion?

Mr. PADGETT. Practically none.

Mr. BRITTEN. I dislike to take exception to that statement. The law provides that as soon as a sufficient number of retirements in the natural way does not occur during a year to provide for the proper flow of promotions, then the plucking board must retire the required number, not to exceed 15.

Mr. McKENZIE. At what age are the officers of the Navy retired by law, 62 or 64?

Mr. BRITTEN. Sixty-four years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the opinion of the gentleman, is it requisite in order to get an efficient Navy to arrange such a system as to get a proper flow of promotions or to get service?

Mr. BRITTEN. A proper flow of promotions and retirements will be established through a new personnel bill now in the hands of our committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield? Does the gentlemen know that the Secretary of the Navy approves of the findings of this so-called plucking board?

Mr. BRITTEN. Always; he must.

Mr. BUTLER. The Secretary and the President both.

Mr. BRITTEN. According to law, he can not do otherwise. We must change the law.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, that part of it; yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. It was a good law in its effect when passed, but it has now outlived its usefulness.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit this suggestion?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is not the operation of the law to-day based upon just as substantial a philosophy as that delineated in the comic opera of "The Mikado," in the words of Koko:

> As some day it may happen that a victim must be found,
> I've got a little list; I've got a little list?

[Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. "I'll prepare a little list" is more apropos.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Is it not true that the plucking board is not accountable to anybody for its verdicts, and does not have to give an account to anybody for the reasons of them?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. It has been said by one of the members of the plucking board this year that it tended rather to decrease the efficiency of the Navy than to increase it; but he added, "The law provided that we must meet and select a number of officers for retirement, and we did it." Their efficiency or value to the service was not considered.

Mr. COOPER. Would it not be better if a discretion were lodged in the plucking board, so that they would not be required to pluck an arbitrary number, but if they saw officers who ought to be plucked, they could retire them?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. That is being considered in the preparation of a new personnel act now pending before our committee. The bill will provide for reasonable promotion, and such officers as may be selected for retirement will be placed in a reserve list and used in some other branch of the department—in the Life-Saving Service or in the Revenue-Cutter Service or in the departmental service—where their activities through life have disqualified them to still serve the Government in a most satisfactory manner.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand the gentleman to say that the law was a good one at the time it was passed?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. That was 16 years ago.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman explain why it is not a good one at the present time?

Mr. BRITTEN. It is because in those days our Navy did not compare with our Navy of to-day. During the first few years after the passage of this law anybody could pick out 5 or 10 or 15 captains whose service did not do the Navy any good. But to-day they pluck men who a year ago may have included the chief of staff of the Atlantic Fleet. One officer plucked last year was the naval representative at the Army War College, whose duty in effect was to tell the Army officers what the Navy would do under certain conditions in time of war, to decide on strategical developments and tactical movements and all sorts of complicated questions which might arise during the war; and the officer who was designated by the Secretary of the Navy less than two years ago to act in that important position at the Army War College was last year plucked, notwithstanding the fact that Admiral Dewey had just sent a request to the department asking that that particular officer should be assigned to the Navy General Board for the year 1914, and he would have been in that service when retired had not the difficulty with Mexico intervened.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is it not also true that a former superintendent of the Naval Academy, a comparatively young man, was plucked last year?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; that is true; a man in the height of his ability, practically a young man in the service, was plucked, as was said, because of his social position, not because of his service record. I refer to Capt. Gibbons, one of the greatest captains in the American Navy up to the time he was plucked.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Was it not plainly stated that he was plucked because he had not gone to sea enough?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; that was one of the attributed causes.

Mr. BUTLER. Capt. Gibbons was eliminated from the service because he had not spent his time at sea, but had been too long on the land. That was the reason assigned.

Mr. BRITTEN. That was the reason assigned for his plucking, and directly thereafter another officer who had been on the high seas a greater length of time than the admirals who plucked him was retired from the service because he had an untidy ship that was 16 or 18 years old, and his great sea service and material additions to the development of the Navy entirely ignored.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. HENSLEY. I ask the gentleman if it is not true that notwithstanding the gentlemen who compose the plucking board decided that Capt. Gibbons had not had sufficient sea service, the fact that he did not have sufficient service was because he was detained as Superintendent of the Naval Academy over his own protest, when he was insisting all the time on more sea service, and those in authority would not give it to him?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. The records all indicate that fact.

Mr. HENSLEY. His record was marked "excellent" throughout?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think we ought to have some method of getting rid of the least efficient officers of our Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; and we are going to accomplish that in a personnel act that is now pending before our committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why not wait, then, for the introduction of that act instead of doing it now?

Mr. BRITTEN. Delay at this time will cause the assembling of another plucking board on June 1, and 15 officers who are to-day looked upon as valued protectors of our great country will be relegated to the scrap heap as the result of this unnecessary and now infamous law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman controlling the time on our side [Mr. BUTLER] give me some more time.

Mr. BUTLER. I greatly regret, Mr. Chairman, that I have no time at my disposal.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will be glad, Mr. Chairman, to yield to the gentleman five minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] yields to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] five minutes. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman five minutes which would otherwise have gone to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand I got five minutes from my colleague [Mr. BUTLER], five minutes from the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS], and five minutes from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], making 15 minutes in all.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; Mr. KELLEY gives the gentleman five minutes. I was offering the gentleman Mr. KELLEY's time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Then I am recognized for but 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. When Admiral Knight appeared before our committee as a member of the plucking board for 1914, he said in substance that the officers were not plucked on account of their service records, which appeared in the files of the Navy Department, but rather were plucked on the general impression respecting them that prevailed throughout the Navy.

Now, if an officer is a good fellow and a sociable character naturally he will not be plucked, if Admiral Knight's statement is true, but if he is inclined to be a little gruff, if he insists on strict discipline on board ship, he is the man who will be plucked. And in this instance, the case of Capt. Hill, he was plucked last year. I maintain that without exception he was one of the greatest, if not the greatest, captain of the United States Navy up to the time he was plucked, and I am going to tell you gentlemen just a few of the material developments he has added to our great Navy, which is going ahead in leaps and bounds.

In 1912 Capt. Hill was the Chief of Staff under the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Squadron, Admiral Osterhaus. The rank of Chief of Staff is looked upon generally as the greatest compliment that can be paid a naval officer, except to make him Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, which assignment, of course, comes through the Secretary of the Navy. The duties of the Chief of Staff are voluminous, and in substance comprise the entire management of the fleet, as well as being the principal adviser of the Commander in Chief, in all tactical and strategical movements, both in mimic and actual warfare. He does practically everything under the Commander in Chief, the latter being a sort of managerial officer. Capt. Hill was a naval adviser at the Army War College, as I explained a few moments ago, at the time he was retired. He was a member of the Navy General Board for 1907–8, and had been requested for 1914, by Admiral Dewey. Among all the captains in the Navy Admiral Dewey had requested Capt. Hill. He was a staff officer and a director of the Naval War College in 1910–1911, and the hearings before our committee developed the fact that while there he and two other officers changed the entire system of instruction, followed along the line of some of the German and English systems, and that system is to-day in effect at the Navy War College.

During the War with Spain he served on the battleship *Iowa* under Fighting Bob Evans, and Admiral Evans, in a special report to the department, highly commended this young officer for his coolness while in action at one of the rapid-fire guns.

In 1903—and here is where the shoe pinches—this young officer stepped on the toes of the Board of Construction, who had decided to eliminate from battleships the great torpedo of to-day. Hill made a single-handed fight, as admitted by Admiral Knight before our committee, and was entirely responsible in preventing the taking of torpedoes from the battleships, as had then been ordered by the Board of Construction; and, after a fight of six months and treading on the toes of his superiors all that time, the torpedo tubes and torpedoes were ordered replaced on battleships, and they are there to-day, and you and I know their great value.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have very little time left.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I should just like to ask the age of Capt. Hill when he was retired?

Mr. BRITTEN. About 52, I believe.

Mr. BUTLER. He is older than that—56 or 58.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am informed that he is 56 or 58. My impression was that he was 52 or 54.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman know of an instance where a torpedo that struck anything has ever been fired by a battleship?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; many instances.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When and where?

Mr. BRITTEN. The war between Russia and Japan was decided by a torpedo attack.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not fired by a battleship, but by a torpedo-boat destroyer.

Mr. BRITTEN. It was a torpedo, nevertheless, was it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but the torpedo tubes on battleships are simply useless.

Mr. BRITTEN. I must decline to yield further, and certainly do not regard the gentleman from Iowa as a torpedo expert.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. BRITTEN. Some years ago, when Capt. Hill was assigned to a battleship as assistant in command, he incorporated what is now known as the Ship's Organization Book, which is now a part of the equipment of every battleship. This ship's organization book will tell a new man on a ship just where to find any location and any article he desires on board that ship, the location of the lifeboats, the fire appliances, and other mechanisms that go toward the making of a battleship. This book is Capt. Hill's own idea.

Then, later on, Capt. Hill suggested to the Board of Construction and had revised practically the entire system of construction of battleship turrets and the raising of the armor belt on battleships, which at that time was too low and appeared to be erroneous. He was the originator in this country of the Council of National Defense. Now, I ask you, gentlemen, in God's name, whom is the plucking board going to pluck this year, who last year was superior to Capt. Hill and Capt. Gibbons? Still, the law provides that they must pluck five captains, and these five captains who are to be plucked this year were 12 short months ago superior to Capt. Hill and Capt. Gibbons, two of the greatest captains we had in the Navy. Unless a special rule is brought in here to-morrow to make this paragraph not subject to a point of order, some gentleman on the floor of the House, who probably is not in the room at the present time will make a point of order and it will be stricken from the bill, and the plucking board will meet again on June 1, and five captains who 12 months ago were apparently superior in efficiency and in every way, according to this last plucking board, to Capts. Hill and Gibbons, will be plucked in order to provide a sufficient flow of promotion for some ensign or some youth who now is a lieutenant, junior grade.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HENSLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether or not there is anything pointed out by Admiral Knight, appearing against Capt. Hill in his service record?

Mr. BRITTEN. Capt. Hills' record was perfect in every detail with the exception of an untidy ship, the *Marietta*, which was given him by his superior officers as a sort of unsatisfactory assignment because he had stepped on their toes. Instead of giving him the ship to which he was entitled at that time they put him on this old tub, the *Marietta*, 15 years old.

Mr. HENSLEY. Has the gentleman in mind any officer whose service was such that he anticipated the action of the plucking board and packed his things to get out of the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. It is said that one officer—and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion—thought that he would be retired by the plucking board, and he was so convinced of it that he had his trunk packed and ready to catch a certain steamer in the Orient as soon as he got the wireless telling him that he was plucked. He was dumbfounded to think that men like Hill and Gibbons should be plucked and he left in the service.

Mr. BUTLER. They had overlooked him.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; they had overlooked him. I will say that Capt. Hill had more sea service than the most of the admirals who plucked him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes more?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is it?

Mr. McKELLAR. We educate these boys at the Naval Academy at an average cost of $20,000, and then this board plucks them out. Is that correct?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Without regard to efficiency, but simply to afford easy promotion?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is correct. Now, gentlemen, at the proper time, on reaching page 34, it is my intention to offer an amendment applying to aviation, which you all realize is probably the most important branch of our naval service. Aviation and submarines are at least the most important new branch. The bill provides that the ranking officer in aviation can not be above the rank of lieutenant commander. Now, it develops that we have in the great aviation corps one lieutenant commander. Previous to the war England had 37 commanders and a great number of lieutenant commanders, and this number has been greatly augmented since the war. This one lieutenant commander, who is supposed to be attached to the Pensacola aviation base, will be promoted to the rank of commander in a few months, and then our great Aviation Corps, combining with it the great technicalities that go with that branch of the service, with its great dangers that go with the service, for which we are appropriating a hundred million dollars, will be under the direction and supervision of what is called, in the parlance of the street, a "kid," a young lieutenant. I think the bill is entirely in error, and my amendment will endeavor to cure it.

The officer who commands a dirigible or a squadron of aeroplanes will perform duties that in responsibility, cost of the material under his charge, and importance in naval operations are certainly commensurate with command rank.

It is most important from the standpoint of harmonious coordination of the air fleet and the main body to employ a reasonable number of officers in air duty that have the wide general service experience and mature judgment that can be gained only after sufficient experience in all the grades below commander.

The recommendation from the Navy Department, as prepared by Capt. Bristol, the director of aeronautics, included commanders. Unless commanders are included, it is not reasonable to expect them to volunteer for a duty which precludes them from taking out life insurance and which is most hazardous.

There are now 6 naval officers and 1 marine officer who hold the Navy Department's air pilot's certificate. They are 1 lieutenant commander, 2 lieutenants, 2 lieutenants (junior grade), 1 ensign, 1 first lieutenant, Marine Corps.

The first of these is due for promotion to commander about July 1 next, graduated from the Naval Academy 1896. The next senior graduated from the Naval Academy 1905, 9 years later, and will not be a commander in the ordinary course of events for about 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I had supposed until I listened to the speech of my friend from California [Mr. STEPHENS] that we had made at least one step in the progress toward truth in this naval business. I was astounded when I heard him say that he still believes in the old doctrine that preparedness for war preserves peace. That is not true in any department of life.

Men always do the things that they prepare themselves to do. If you want to practice law, you go to a law school and get a legal education. You get some law books and rent an office and make preparations; but, according to my friend from California, if you do not want to practice law the way to do it is to make all these preparations. If you want to be a doctor, you get a thorough knowledge of the science of medicine and make all your preparations to practice medicine, and then you will not do it.

In regard to war, if you do not want to indulge in all the barbarities and savagery of the war, the way to keep from doing it is to prepare yourself well to do it.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; but I have not much time.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. China was unprepared for war, and suffered severe devastation in consequence.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Since China has had no preparation at all she has been at absolute peace, and the same is true of all other nations in the world that are not prepared.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Is it not true——

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The gentleman has asked me a question, and I am answering it. The gentleman should not ask a question of me unless he wants it answered.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; I am answering the question of the gentleman from California. How can I yield when I am answering his question?

Every nation in the world except one or two that has prepared itself to go to war is now at war. They have done the very thing they prepared themselves to do.

Are you opposed to sneaking under the water to some innocent battleship while the sailors are all asleep, like those on the battleship *Maine*, and blow the bottom out of it and murder these innocent men? Are you opposed to doing that? Then, the way to keep from doing it is to prepare yourselves with mines and submarines. Are you opposed to going through the heavens in the midnight air with a lot of bombs around you and flying over some house where an innocent mother and little babe are asleep and dropping the bomb down on them and murdering them in their sleep? Are you opposed to that? Then, if you do not want to do it, the way to keep from doing it is to prepare yourselves with a thousand flying machines and bombs in them and then you will not do it. [Laughter.] That will keep you from doing it, according to the idiotic argument that preparedness for war preserves peace. The fact is that when men are in favor of a wrong there is absolutely no suggestion, no proposition, too idiotic for them to believe.

The question in this bill is whether or not we need to build any more ships in order to adequately prepare ourselves for defense; whether or not we are already prepared, without building any more ships, to defend ourselves against any attacks that may be made upon us. That is the question. No intelli-

gent conception of that question can be made without considering the relative power of our preparation with those of foreign Governments. Now, it is not necessary to compare our Navy with the navies of all foreign Governments, because when we compare them with the greatest and that comparison shows we need no more ships, it follows inevitably that we do not need them as to the others. Take, for instance, the German Navy. They have 10 more battleships than France; they have 21 more battleships than Japan; they have 22 more battleships than Italy; they have 26 more battleships, I believe, than Russia; and, consequently, if we do not need any more battleships to enable us to resist the naval power of Germany, we do not need any at all.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to some facts developed in the hearings before the committee in preparing this bill, which to my mind are absolutely overwhelming in the establishment of the proposition that we have all the warships that we need. In order to appreciate the force of these facts, I want to remind you of how the matter stood a year ago, and first I call attention to the number of ships. Germany a year ago had 39 battleships, and we had the same number. Now we have 40 battleships, and Germany, according to the Navy Yearbook just published, also has 40; but that Navy Yearbook, which always credits Germany with more than she has and puts us with less than we have, is not corroborated in that respect by the British Navy Annual, which all naval officers say is the highest authority on naval matters. That book, just published for the year 1914, gives a full list of German ships built, building, and authorized, and it puts down the number at 39. The last battleship on the list in the Navy Yearbook of 1914 is not found in the list as put down in the British Navy Annual. In regard to the number of ships we should have, the General Board has been recommending for years that we ought to have 48 battleships, or, in other words, 8 more than we have now. They say that they base that recommendation upon the building programs of other nations. Their argument is, we ought to have 48 battleships because Germany and other nations have a program of building so many. That basis of recommending has no foundation in fact. A year ago the last dreadnaught completed by Germany was the *Koenig Albert*, and you can take the Navy Yearbook for 1914, just published, which I have here before me, and look at the list and you will find that the last completed battleship of Germany is the same one, the *Koenig Albert*, and within the last year Germany has not added a single ship to her navy, and according to the British Annual she has not authorized any other battleships than those that were building a year ago. Not only that, but Germany has never expressed any intention or purpose of having anything like 48 battleships. The number of battleships in Germany is determined just like they are determined in this country—by law—and the laws of Germany tell us how many they propose to have.

In 1900 Germany passed her first law for the construction of battleships, and she at that time fixed the number of battleships that should constitute her navy at 38. Six years afterwards, in 1906, that law was amended, by which Germany determined that her fleet should be composed of 40 battleships, and that stood as the expressed intention of the German Government for six years longer, until 1912, when her law was amended the last time, and when she provided that 41 battleships should be the full number of her fleet. That is the German law, and the German Government has no more power to increase her battleships beyond that limit fixed by German law than the executive department of our Government has to increase them without the authority of Congress. So that, as Germany does not propose at any time to have but 41 battleships, and we have 40 already, I say that the recommendation for 48 battleships, based on what other nations propose to do, falls to the ground. Not only that, not only has there never been any German proposition to increase the number of battleships in a way as to justify the increases which we are proposing, but at this time Germany's kindly neighbors are very rapidly decreasing her fleet. She has lost in the last five months 45 of her war vessels. In that loss is 1 battle cruiser, 5 armored cruisers, about 23 scout cruisers or protected cruisers, as they are called, 9 destroyers, 3 submarines, and a number of auxiliary vessels. So if a justification for a large increase in our Navy that is proposed is to rest for a basis upon the proposition that Germany has increased her navy, then I say that the argument falls to the ground, in the face of the fact that within five months she has been decreased 45 vessels. I want to call attention also to the fact that a year ago I demonstrated to the House that according to every test known to naval experts our Navy was already far superior to the German Navy. One of the tests, and the one which Admiral Vreeland told us was the most accurate test, was a comparison of the muzzle energy of the guns in the armored vessels of the two Navies. I showed you by data taken from the authorities that at that time the muzzle energy of all the guns on our armored vessels was 444,110 foot-tons greater than the muzzle energy of all the guns in the armored vessels of the German Navy.

Now I want to call attention to a change that has occurred in the last year in that regard. Instead of our Navy having a superiority of 444,110 foot-tons in muzzle energy you will find this to be the fact, that within the last year we have added three great dreadnaughts to our Navy, each being armed with twelve 14-inch guns. The muzzle energy of these 36 guns is 2,374,732 foot-tons, and during the last year we have sold two of our battleships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, and the muzzle energy of the guns of those two ships was 351,590 foot-tons. Deducting that from the increase of the three last authorized ships, we have an increase in the muzzle energy of the guns on our armored vessels of 2,023,142 foot-tons.

Adding that to the 444,110 foot-tons that we were superior to Germany a year ago it makes our armored vessels now superior to those of the German Navy by 2,264,252 foot-tons. But that is not all. The muzzle energy of the battle cruiser and the four armored cruisers that Germany has lost in this war amounts to 1,037,170 foot-tons, while ours has increased nearly two and one-half million foot-tons. Germany's Navy has decreased over 1,000,000 foot-tons. So that now the muzzle energy of the guns on our armored vessels instead of exceeding that of the German Navy, as it did a year ago by 444,110 foot-tons, now exceeds them 3,504,422 foot-tons. There is the statement of the condition between the two navies, which, according to test, Navy experts tell us is the most accurate criterion to make a comparison and determine the superiority.

Another test of great value, though not as certain as this one, is the weight of the metal in a broadside from all the guns in the Navy. Now, I showed you a year ago that a broadside from all the guns on the armored vessels of the American Navy was 45,954 pounds greater than the weight of the metal in a broadside from guns on the armored vessels of the German Navy. I want to call your attention to the change that has occurred according to that test. The three dreadnaughts that we have added to our Navy within the last year, having thirty-six 14-inch guns, with shells actually weighing 1,400 pounds apiece, increases the broadside in our Navy 50,400 pounds, and deducting from that the weight of the metal in the broadside in the *Idaho* and *Mississippi*, which we have sold, leaves an increase in our Navy of 36,740 pounds. Adding that to the superiority that existed a year ago, we have this result, that the weight of the metal in a broadside from all the guns in the armored vessels of the American Navy now exceeds the weight of the metal in a broadside from the armored vessels of the German Navy instead of 45,954 pounds, as it did a year ago, 82,694 pounds. If figures, argument, and reason can satisfy any human mind, I submit that this ought to be satisfactory to you.

But there is one particular in which the evidence is now much stronger than it was a year ago. At that time we had to rely solely upon arguments and reason. We had very little support in the testimony of experts. It is true that we had the testimony of Admiral Vreeland, who, with a great deal of reluctance, contrary to his own wishes, finally was constrained to admit that the facts show that the American Navy is superior to the German Navy. And that is all we had at that time. Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that three members of the General Board and the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet have been before the Naval Affairs Committee in the hearing just closed, and every one of them testified that the American Navy is superior to that of Germany. In other words, I claim that the admissions of experts now unite with facts and arguments and reason to establish the proposition that we already have a Navy so big that it is not necessary to increase it in order to be able to resist the German Navy, and, of course, to resist those which are much smaller.

The General Board, in its report to the Secretary of the Navy, makes an assertion like this: It says the want of any definite naval policy has resulted in an inferiority of the American Navy, and that that inferiority, unless it is removed, will involve us in war. That is substantially the statement of the General Board. That is the statement, however, that was made in an office, was a statement made by men who could not be cross-examined, but when three of those men who made that report came before the committee and were confronted with the facts of the case, they united in testifying that our Navy is not only not inferior but is superior to every navy in the world except England's.

Admiral Badger, the ex-commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, now a member of the General Board, was the first men-

ber who testified on this subject. He was asked to take the last two of the American battleships and German battleships and compare them. He was asked this question:

It is a fact that the last two battleships in the German Navy are armed each with eight 15-inch guns and the last two in the American Navy are armed with twelve 14-inch guns; now state which are the superior ships.

He did not hesitate a minute to testify that the American ships are superior to the German ships. He was also asked to compare the next three ships of the American Navy, also armed with twelve 14-inch guns, with the corresponding three ships in the German Navy, armed with ten 12-inch guns, and, of course, he could not hesitate and did not hesitate to say that ours are superior. In that way he was taken from one end of the list to the other, and with ship after ship he was asked to compare it with those of the German Navy, and he testified that ship for ship we had the superior Navy. That is the testimony of Admiral Badger.

Then Admiral Fletcher came before us, and he was asked these same questions substantially, and he was then asked particularly about every nation in the world. He was asked the question if he thought our Navy was superior to the German Navy, and said that in tonnage and armament it had better ships and was superior. Then he was asked the question, "Do you think in a war between Germany and the United States we could successfully resist the German Navy?" He said, "Yes." "Do you think we could successfully resist the French Navy?" He said, "Yes." "Do you think we could successfully resist the Japanese Navy?" He replied, "Yes." "Do you think there is a navy on earth we could not successfully resist with the ships we already have?" And he said, "None but England." "But, Admiral," he was asked, "we have been told by one of the experts of the Navy that if we had war with England that, on account of her relations with her neighbors, she could not possibly send more than 50 per cent of her fleet against us. Now, if that be true, if she could not send half of them against us, do you think we would be able to resist her?" "Well," he said, "that would be a close question;" and he declined to answer it. That was the testimony of Admiral Fletcher, the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet. A year ago Secretary Daniels spent two days and a half before the Committee on Naval Affairs trying to uphold the contention that the German Navy was superior to ours, and every suggestion and argument that he could make was put in that hearing to show that our Navy was inferior to the German Navy. While he was testifying his aid for operations, Capt. Winterhalter, sat beside him and aided him and made suggestions to him about how to answer questions, and I thought that Capt. Winterhalter was clearly on the other side, and I think all the members of the Naval Affairs Committee thought the same thing. I believe still that he was on the other side a year ago. But in the present hearings just closed this great mistake was made. One of them, who wanted to prove, I think, that we ought to have about 40 more battleships, put Capt. Winterhalter on the stand by whom to prove it, and he told him about our immense coast line and how many ships it would take to defend that. He told about the $64,000,000,000 of property that he said was lying right on the water's edge close enough for hostile ships to destroy. "Now," he said, "Capt. Winterhalter, in view of these facts do you think it good policy to let the Navy sink to a third or fourth grade naval power?" Capt. Winterhalter, to the astonishment of the whole committee, made this reply. He said, "Well, I want just as many battleships as you will give me." He said, "I would like to have the biggest Navy in the world, but there is Judge Witherspoon, he has already proved that our Navy is superior to the German Navy, and I agree with him on it." [Applause.] That is what the third member of the General Board says. Nobody asked him whether I had proved anything or not. Nobody said anything to him about that. But evidently since we went into the facts and discussed them, the fact that our Navy is superior to the German Navy had been weighing on his mind and heart, so that he wanted to give expression to it, and he just did. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman also recall the statement of Admiral Fletcher when I asked him in the committee as to the relative strength of our Navy and the German Navy, and he also said that our Navy was the equal or the superior of the German Navy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, I recall that Admiral Fletcher said at first that our Navy is as good as any in the world except England's, and then later on he qualified that a little and said that our Navy is as good, if not better. He amended his statement, just as we sometimes amend our statements in the House, by putting in the words "if not better." But when he got through testifying the facts he did not say that ours was as good; he did not say that ours was as good, if not better, but he admitted that we have a Navy that is superior to Germany's. [Applause.]

That is the way with every naval officer that has ever come before that committee when you confronted him with the facts. His very self-respect will force him to admit it.

But the remarkable thing that I have to submit to you is the statement of the Secretary of the Navy himself. A year ago the Secretary of the Navy sat in that committee for two days and a half defending the proposition that the German Navy is superior to ours. This year he came before the committee and he used this expression: "We have a powerful Navy." He said: "It is the most powerful Navy in the world except England's, and possibly Germany's." In the estimation of the Secretary of the Navy that German naval superiority which was clear and certain and fixed, that superiority of the German Navy over ours has now dwindled down to a bare possibility. [Applause.] The fact is the Secretary has always told us that he has to rely upon his experts for these matters in the Navy. That is what he has said a dozen times in the committee. Now, all his experts, including Capt. Winterhalter, have deserted him, and he is coming to the truth. [Applause.]

So much for that. There is one old fallacy that I want to call to your attention. For years and years and years in these debates we have seen Members who advocate the building of more battleships parading here a big map of pasteboard, with the figures of the American Navy on it—that is, the figures with reference to tonnage. The thing does not show that there is a single gun in any navy in the world. It leaves out everything that is important, and tries to show the superiority of other navies to ours by the matter of tonnage, as if battleships shoot tons instead of projectiles.

Now I want to call your attention to that. Of course you can make a paper map like that and prove that any navy is the smallest navy in the world or that any navy is the largest navy in the world, if you will just confine yourself to the tonnage and leave out enough ships to accomplish the result you aim at, and that is the way this is done.

I want to call your attention to that. Take, for instance, this statement of the German Navy. They say that the battleships of the dreadnaught type already built have a tonnage of 285,770 tons, and those building have a tonnage of 187,164 tons. Then they give the same for ours. They say that we have 8 dreadnaughts built, with a tonnage of 189,650, and 4 building, making 12 in all. The figures are given of 12 of our dreadnaughts. Now, the truth is that we have 17. They have just simply left out 5 of them, and in that way they make the tonnage of the German Navy superior to ours.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if it would not interrupt the gentleman, will he yield to me?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I may be misinformed, but so far as I remember we have never yet attempted in the provisions we have made to equal the English Navy.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. In tonnage or in vessels, do you mean?

Mr. MANN. In tonnage, or in any other way, so far as a comparison is concerned; but we have in a way attempted to keep up with the German fleet.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I recall, there has been a dispute as to whether last year we were ahead or a little behind the German fleet. Is there any dispute now, in view of what has taken place during the war and the destruction of some of the German fleet? Is there any dispute now as to whether our Navy exceeds in strength the German Navy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think there is. I think that some of these fellows would dispute it if every battleship in the German Navy were sunk in the ocean. Yes; they will dispute anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I was not referring to those. I think possibly the gentleman exaggerates a little bit what he would state. I want to get at the facts.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember how many of the German vessels have been destroyed, but there have been some.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes. They are in the hearings, and they numbered 44 in the hearings; and since the hearings were published the *Bleucher*, the largest armored cruiser Germany had, has been sunk to the bottom of the sea, making 45.

Mr. MANN. Does not that clearly leave at present the American fleet superior to the German fleet?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Of course it does.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the war lasts a little while longer, with the natural results of the war; can anybody then dispute it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, I think they will. I think they will dispute it. [Laughter.] But I want to say this to the gentleman from Illinois on that proposition: When Admiral Badger, a member of the General Board, was before us, I said, "Admiral, you base your recommendation on 48 battleships, and you put that on the basis of what these other nations are doing." I said, "Now, if this war continues and Germany loses half of her battleships, will not the basis of your argument be gone?" And he said, "Yes." "Well," I said, "then would you say that we should stop?" And he said, "I should."

That is what Admiral Badger said. But, talking about this tonnage, there are the *Oregon*, the *Massachusetts*, the *Indiana*, three of our old battleships, left out of this table, and there are the three, the *California*, the *Mississippi*, and the *Idaho*, that we authorized a year ago. They are left out, and those make six of our battleships that are left out in making this table showing that the German tonnage is superior to ours.

Well, of course, you can do that. You can leave out enough battleships to show that the tonnage of our fleet is inferior to any fleet in the world, and it does not take any brains to do it, either. [Laughter.] All it requires is a little disregard for the truth. That is all that it requires. [Laughter.]

Not only that, but this table here includes in the tonnage of the German Navy all these vessels of Germany that are now lying at the bottom of the sea. Let me show you. This tonnage table has among the German battle cruisers two completed. One of them is the *Goben*. The *Goben* is the largest and last completed battle cruiser in the German Navy, and it was the one that was caught down there in the Mediterranean at the beginning of the war, and she nearly ran herself to death getting out of the way of the other ships to avoid a fight, and finally got into the Dardanelles with all her boilers burned out, half ruined, and was sold to Turkey. The tonnage of the *Goben* is still included in this table just issued in the Navy Yearbook. Take the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, that were sold to Greece long before Germany sold the *Goben* and the *Breslau*, and the tonnage of the *Mississippi* and the *Idaho* is excluded from our Navy, but they put into it the *Goben* and the *Breslau*, two cruisers that Germany had sold to Turkey. That is the kind of juggling with figures that these fellows resort to in order to fool you into voting for more battleships.

Then here are the armored cruisers. They have got down 9 of them. Well, 4 of those are lying at the bottom of the sea—4 of them are destroyed. Yet their tonnage is set out in this table against the tonnage of the American Navy.

Here are 41 cruisers. My recollection is that in the list of 45 ships lost by Germany 23 of them are those cruisers. The tonnage of 23 cruisers lying at the bottom of the sea is put down here in this table, in order to show that in tonnage the German Navy is superior to ours. Then here are all the German torpedo-boat destroyers—130 of them—of which 9 are destroyed; and 27 submarines, of which 3 are destroyed.

I want to show you how that will figure out. This table gives the total tonnage of the German Navy as 1,306,577 tons, and gives ours at 894,889 tons. Of the German cruisers that are destroyed there were about 12 of which I could not get the tonnage. Leaving them out of the deduction, the tonnage of the vessels that Germany has lost amounts to 112,540 tons, which would reduce the tonnage in the German Navy to 1,094,037 tons.

On the other hand, take the tonnage of the 3 dreadnaughts that we have ordered, that are not included here, and the 3 battleships that are left out, and they amount to 126,864 tons, which gives the total tonnage of our vessels as 1,021,753, instead of 894,000. That makes the German tonnage about 17,000 tons ahead of us still, but you must remember that in that total there are 12 cruisers that ought to be deducted, and if they were deducted it would show that the tonnage of our vessels is superior to those of the German Navy.

But I want to call your attention especially to one thing, and that is that the tonnage of the German Navy includes 20 battleships of the predreadnaught type. So far as our defense is concerned, they ought to be excluded. You will remember that last year I compared the *Oregon* with every one of those 20 battleships, and showed that in the armor plate, in the armament, in the muzzle energy of the guns, in the weight of the metal of a broadside of those vessels, the *Oregon* was superior to every one of them. Yet the *Oregon* is left out and they are all included. If it is fair to leave out the *Oregon*, *Indiana*, and *Massachusetts*, then in order to determine the greater tonnage you ought to leave out every vessel in the German Navy that is inferior to them. That would be fair.

But what I want to call your attention to especially about these ships is that they ought not to be considered by us at all, for the reason that it is an impossibility for them ever to cross the ocean. They can not carry coal enough to bring them across the ocean, not one of them. The maximum coal capacity of the first five of those German battleships is 1,050 tons. The maximum coal capacity of the next five is 1,400 tons. The maximum coal capacity of the next five is 1,600 tons, and of the other five is 1,800 tons of coal. You can not get those ships across the ocean with that much coal. They can not carry enough coal to bring them, the largest of them, closer than within 500 miles of our shores, and I do not believe the smallest of them could get halfway across the ocean. How can it be justified that we should build battleships to defend ourselves against such battleships as these, from which there is no possibility of any attack? The truth of the business is that the German Navy was never constructed with any idea of fighting the United States. If it had been the vessels would have been built differently. Take the ships of our Navy, the first five old ships that we have carry 1,475 tons, or 425 tons more than the corresponding ships of the Germans. The others carry 1,450, 3,000, 1,900, 2,300. That is the kind of ships we have, and if Germany had ever built her Navy with any idea of prosecuting a war against the United States she would have built different kinds of ships. She would at least have supplied her ships with enough coal to bring them across the ocean.

And there is another thing that bears out the very same idea. You will recall that I pointed out with great detail a year ago how much superior in size the guns on our ships are to those on the German ships. When we were building 13-inch guns they were building 9.4-inch guns. When we were building 12-inch guns they were building 11. When they built 12-inch guns we were building 14-inch guns. Their guns have always been very much smaller than ours. I asked a very brilliant naval officer to explain why that was, and his explanation was that the German Navy was constructed with a view to having war with its neighbors. He said in that country they nearly always have fogs on the sea and the weather is rarely clear, and necessarily a naval engagement over there would be at very close range, and at very close range those smaller guns are as good as the big ones, but nobody would build a ship to fight in such a country as this and equip that ship with those small guns.

So from this we learn two lessons. The first is that we are in no sort of danger from at least half of the German battleships, and the other is the blessed assurance that in the German mind there has never been any idea of a war with the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman has said nothing whatever about the relative speed capacity of the German vessels and ours. Does the gentleman attach no importance to that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. They are just about the same.

Mr. GOULDEN. I wanted to know that, because I imagined we had greater speed capacity in our vessels than they had in the German naval vessels.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is very little difference, and I do not think it makes a particle of difference, anyway. If you are going out to fight an enemy, it does not make much difference how soon you get there or how late you get there.

Mr. GOULDEN. Speed is useful to get away sometimes, when you find yourself being beaten.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. So far as getting away is concerned, we do not want to get away. When we get into a fight we are going to whip them before we go.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi have 10 minutes more.

Mr. MANN. That is not within the power of the committee.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes additional time to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. For information, I want to ask the gentleman a question. I understood the gentleman to say that a large number of the German battleships would not have sufficient steaming radius to come across the ocean.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I so stated.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not understand how many in number the gentleman stated.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Twenty. I heard a naval officer say that on one occasion he saw some German battleships in one of our ports, and when they got ready to go home they had to fill the bunkers full of coal and pile it up on the deck in order to have enough to get back.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Germany has already installed some oil-burning machinery on her battleships the same as we have. Could she not install it on the 21 battleships?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will say that I do not know whether she could or not. It is very uncertain whether you can change the construction so as to make it suitable for oil. I do not know; I doubt it. According to all authorities she has not done it yet, and that ought to be enough for us.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman has based his argument on the proposition that our Navy is superior to that of Germany, and that therefore we are in no danger from Germany. It develops that England is a good deal more powerful on the sea, more powerful than we are, and I would like to have the gentleman deal with that.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The reason I do not want to discuss that is because all the battleship crowd that has been before the committee admit that it is unnecessary to build more ships as far as England is concerned. That never has been a question before the committee, and the gentleman will have to excuse me from going into it because I have not now the time.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. It has been stated, and the gentleman knows, that during the war Germany, as well as England, has been building new battleships to replace those that have been destroyed during the war. Can the gentleman give us information as to what extent they are building to repair their losses?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will give you this information, that your information is newspaper talk and does not amount to a bill of beans. [Laughter.] The newspapers are publishing this kind of information to influence Congress to squander the public funds, and that is what they are for. We have examined into that; we have asked the Navy Department about it, and they say they have no information at all.

Mr. TOWNER. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is no such information, and it is nothing but idle newspaper talk. It is very much like the newspaper report a year ago that Japan had just decided to build 12 more dreadnaughts, and it turned out that she did not want to build but one, and a mob congregated, and they had to escort the members of Parliament home who voted for one in order to keep them out of the hands of the mob. That is the kind of stuff that some newspapers are trying to stuff the public with.

Mr. TOWNER. With the present resources of the German shipyards, would they be able to replace such as have been destroyed?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know, because I have never seen them, but I imagine that Germany and England and all those other countries have all they can do right now without attempting to build new ships that will not be completed until after the war is over. It takes three years to build a battleship.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman speaks of the newspapers as a source of information, and that argument is as good on one side as it is on the other. Did not the gentleman see an Associated Press dispatch the other day that England would hasten to complete such dreadnaughts as she had under construction but would lay down no more?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I did not see it. I think it is reasonable that she would hasten to complete those, but it would be folly to build new ships that they could not possibly complete until the war is over. That is the way it looks to me.

I want to suggest this to you: Suppose that Germany had the same number of battleships that we have—40; concede that. What is the relative strength of the American Navy and the German Navy, supposing that every ship in both navies is equal in power? That is a false supposition, because we have proved by every expert that, ship for ship, our ships are superior to the German; but I am supposing that they are just equal, ship for ship, the same number. Then could we defend ourselves against Germany?

A naval officer told me that the Naval War College had worked out the problem as to what disadvantage it is to any country to wage a war against another one 3,000 or 4,000 miles away. Everybody admits that it would be a great disadvantage, and they have worked it out as a naval problem. My information from him is that their decision was that, for instance, if Germany should come over here to attack us it would take 11 of her battleships to equal 10 of ours of the same power and character.

Now there is a reason for that. Where a nation sends its fleet 4,000 miles away to fight that fleet has got to be supplied; and, according to one of the experts before us, if we were carrying on war 4,000 miles distant it would take 200 ships to supply our Navy, and it would require the same to supply the German Navy if they were fighting us.

Then you would have to have a part of your fleet to protect those merchant ships bringing your supplies to you, and every one you take away to defend and protect your transports would weaken you just that much. And, so they say, putting it in figures, that 10 of our battleships of the same power would be equal to 11 of the German battleships. In other words, if we had 40, as we have, Germany would have to have 44 in order to be equal to our 40. That is what they worked out in the board of naval experts, according to my information. If that is true, then with 40 battleships in our Navy and the same number in the German Navy, according to the Navy Yearbook, would not we be able to resist her? Have not we got plenty already?

But what is the value of battleships anyway? What are they worth? Do they fight? Do battleships shoot guns? Do they shoot shells? Do they waste any powder? Why, we have had the greatest war of the world going on now for five months. Most of the battleships of the world are owned by the belligerents, and not one single battleship has fired a gun. What are they worth; what are they made for? Sir Percy Scott and other experts told you long before this war came that the day of the battleship was ended; that the invention of the submarine had destroyed its usefulness and it was no longer of any service. He said that before this war began. The war has continued now for five months and not a battleship has fired a gun. I ask you what are they worth?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Is is not true that no battleship has fired a gun because the German battleships are all bottled up?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is the gentleman's reason.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. What is the gentleman's reason?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will show you that is not the reason of the experts. I will show you that is not the reason given in the testimony. The gentleman says the reason the German battleships have not fired a gun is because they are all bottled up in the Baltic Sea. That is the contention of my friend. Where is the Russian fleet? It is also bottled up in the Baltic Sea. The two fleets are right there side by side. The German fleet is five times as powerful as the Russian fleet. Why does not the German fleet destroy the Russian fleet? Why does not it attack the Russian fleet? Why did not they fire a gun from the battleships at the Russian fleet? Do you know why it is? The experts before the Naval Committee tell us that the reason why the Germans have not attacked and destroyed the Russian fleet in the Baltic Sea is because they know that the mines and the submarines of Russia would destroy them before they got in reach of the battleships.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is that the case with England?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am going to get to England; I will get to all of them. Now, they say that the reason the German battleships did not fire their guns at the English ships is because England has got her bottled up. If that were a good reason, then Germany would have fired her guns at the Russians. The reason why England and France do not fire their guns at the German fleet is this: Those two nations together have two and a half times as many battleships as the Germans. They are two and a half times as strong as the German Navy. Why do not England and France send their battleships into the Baltic and destroy the German fleet, as they could do if they could ever get in there? Why do not they do it? I will tell you what the experts say. Admiral Badger and Admiral Fletcher, who we have asked to explain that, both agree that the reason why the French and English do not send their battle fleets into the Baltic in order to destroy the German fleet is because England and France know that the German mines and submarines would sink them all to the bottom of the sea before they could get to the German fleet. [Applause.] That is the testimony before our committee. That is what the nations of the earth believe to-day, and everybody believes it except those who want an excuse for building more battleships here—everybody. I will show that England and Germany both believe it. Just take that fight they had the other day. The Germans sent three of their battle cruisers and one of their armored cruisers out on the North Sea. Did they go alone? No. What did they have with them? Why, the German admiral took with him a whole lot of submarines.

Mr. FORDNEY. How did they get back?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will tell you——

Mr. FORDNEY. I am asking for information.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I am going to tell the whole story. The German admiral carried his fleet of submarines out and strung them out in a line behind him, fixing a place behind which he could run. When he was attacked he made for those submarines and got behind them. Now, what did he have the submarines out there for? What did he want something to get behind for except that he knew the English Navy were afraid of submarines and would not follow him when he got behind them as breastworks? That shows the estimate of the German admiral of how submarines are dreaded by the English. The English admiral had the same estimate, because with a great deal more powerful navy, with five battle cruisers all armored with much larger guns than the Germans had, it was perfectly certain that he could have destroyed all of them, but when he got within shooting distance of these submarines he stopped and went back, and that shows what England thinks about submarines.

Mr. HENSLEY. And that was 70 miles from the coast.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Seventy miles from Helgoland. [Laughter.] I do not know how far from the coast, but I think Helgoland is 30 or 40 miles the way I saw it. They would not approach within 70 miles of that fortified island of the Germans, because Admiral Beatty says himself that he was scared of submarines.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is reported one of the German cruisers went down. Did it go down from the effect of a submarine or from the effect of the fire of an English gun?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know; but I know if the submarines got close enough they would have blown their bottoms out.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is so wise in all other directions I thought he might know about that.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact that the *Blucher* did go down from the effect of big-gun fire and not from a torpedo?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I suspect it did, although I do not know. The truth about the submarine is that the submarine is described as a weapon of opportunity. That is the expression of the experts. It can not do anything unless you give it the opportunity; but if you do give it the opportunity, you are going to the bottom of the sea. Great ado is made by my friend from Illinois and all these other advocates of so many battleships, and a great point is made of the fact that so few vessels in this war have been destroyed by submarines. Well, that is true. Submarines do not go way out on the oceans. They are defensive weapons, and the very fact that they have destroyed but few vessels in this war shows what is the consensus of opinion in the minds of all the belligerents. They do not let their vessels get close to them. That is the reason they do not destroy any more. [Applause.]

Now, here is the argument I want to impress upon you. If the submarines and mines that have got the Russian fleet hemmed in are sufficient to deter the German fleet, four or five times as big, from attacking it; if the submarines and mines that lie between the German fleet and the English and French fleets, which are two and one-half times as great, are sufficient to deter the fleets of those nations from attacking the Germans; if the submarines were sufficient to stop the English the other day in their pursuit of the German cruisers when it was perfectly apparent they could have destroyed all of them if they had just pursued them; if they would give up that pursuit on account of their fear of submarines; if the submarines have had that effect in Europe, then I appeal to you as men who have some logic in your minds if it is not also a fact that with our 59 submarines to protect us, it would deter any of them coming 4,000 miles to attack us? [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do you recommend that our Navy have submarines and mines and no battleships or cruisers?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; I could not recommend that, because we have already 40 battleships.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do you mean to say that if we have no battleships or cruisers——

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is no question of whether we need 40 battleships or not, because we already have them.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do you recommend that the Navy have the necessary submarines and mines and nothing else competent to protect our Navy?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, no. If we did not have any battleships at all, then your question would arise. But we have 40, and what is the use of discussing the question whether we will have any or not?

Mr. FORDNEY. The argument has been presented here recently that why we do not want a battleship or a cruiser is that in some eight or ten years it becomes obsolete, and therefore unless we continue replacing ships our Navy will be obsolete in a few years.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There are some people who, wishing to squander the public funds, assert that ships become obsolete in a few years. But anybody knowing anything about battleships will not say that, because it is not true.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did not my colleague, for whom I have the very highest regard——

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I thank you.

Mr. BRITTEN (continuing). Vote against the increase in the number of submarines?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir; I voted against them.

Mr. BRITTEN. I wanted the House to know of the fact.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will tell you why I voted against them. There is just this difference between me and my friend from Illinois. I voted against them because the testimony showed that we did not need any more. He votes for the construction of battleships whether we need them or not. That is the difference. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Applause.]

Mr. HENSLEY. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Mississippi. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Excuse me. I was asked one question about submarines, and I want to answer it. I voted against increasing our submarines for several reasons. We have 59 already. There is great difficulty in constructing them. I think the amount of money that it will take to complete the submarines already authorized will be about $15,000,000; but there are a great many difficulties about it which I can not take time now to explain. It takes a long time, and they hardly ever get them right, and there is the greatest difficulty about ever getting them constructed. They are working to solve these difficulties, and I say, as reasonable men, we ought not to waste any more money on them until they have solved the difficulties and given us some assurance that the money will result in the construction of good ships. That is one reason. Another reason is that the experts tell us that the submarine is a weapon of opportunity, and that 50 will do just as much good as 500. That is the testimony before our committee. You can not find in the hearing a single man that advocates a great number of submarines. Admiral Fletcher says, "I do not advise it; I would have a small increase," but he said a small number is just as good as a big number. Admiral Badger says——

Mr. BRITTEN. Right at that point.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. When I get through with the point. I have started to tell what was said. Do not interrupt me until I get through. He says that 50 will do just as well as 500. He says also that it is a weapon of opportunity. All it depends on is whether they can get close enough to a battleship, and he says that if 50 can not do it 500 can not do it; their value is not increased in proportion to the number like other ships. Admiral Badger was also questioned about that. He said, "Well, we think we ought to have a hundred instead of 64." I asked him if there was any reason by which he could tell why we ought to have 64 or 100, and he said, "No; I just said a hundred, but there is no more reason for having 100 than having 64."

Now, there is another thing about that that I want to call your attention to, a reason why we do not want to have any more. If we should have a war with Germany or with England or with any of these other nations, they could not bring their submarines over here to fight us; and we have already 59. I submit that 59 are enough to fight a nation that could not have any on its side.

Mr. BRITTEN. Right there, on that point, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman refers to our having 59 submarines. Is it not a fact that we have only 6 modern submarines in commission to-day?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, no.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; it is a fact.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You asked me a question.

Mr. BRITTEN. How many have we, then?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, sit down, and I will tell you. [Laughter.] You asked a question, and you ought to allow me to answer it.

Mr. BRITTEN. If you answer the question I will sit down.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir. We have 59 submarines. That is the number we have, and the testimony shows that we have that many.

Now I will tell you about these submarines. The commander of the submarine flotilla tells all about them, and he said this, that they could go under their own power from 400 miles to 1,350 miles. That is to say, the smaller ones could go out 200 miles and come back; the others could go out 675 miles and come back again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have 20 minutes reserved for myself, and I yield 10 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman from Ohio to control time under the agreement that was made. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BATHRICK. Then I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri, to give to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has no time to yield.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I may state that I reserved 15 minutes for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK], and if he desires I will yield 10 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Mississippi. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I thank the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has any method been discovered whereby the submarine may be destroyed?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, there was a test made the other day down here of a shell invented by Mr. Isham. I was not present; I was not able to go. But I understand that that test showed that he had invented a shell that would not ricochet and would go under the water when it struck the water, and would explode after it had gone under the water for a certain length of time. Now, if such a shell as that could be fired out of a battleship or a cruiser and should strike near the submarine, it would probably destroy it. But the trouble about that is this: Submarines are things that you can not see. They are the assassins of the sea. They go under the water, and they go up under a battleship and blow the bottom out of it before the battleship knows that it is anywhere near about. Here is the fact about it: The submarine can go under the water with its periscope just out, so that it can see everything itself, and in very smooth water the men on the battleship, if they happen to be looking right toward where it sticks the periscope up, may see it at a distance of 2, 3, or 4 miles. But if the weather is anyways rough and the sea foam is there, they can not see it more than a mile or two, and the submarine therefore has the power to get up close enough to the battleship to destroy it before it can be seen, and therefore the invention of that shell, in my judgment, would have very little effect upon the submarine.

Mr. BARKLEY. How close does the submarine have to get to the battleship before it sends its projectile forth to destroy it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That depends on the submarine. The oldest submarine can only shoot its torpedoes a thousand yards, if I remember, but the latest and best improved submarines are supposed to have a range of 4 or 5 miles. It depends on the power of the submarine.

Mr. BRITTEN. How many of those have we in commission, please?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know how many.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact that we have only six of those in commission? I have the Navy Register right here before me.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Excuse me now. I am going to answer you. You can not ask me a question and when I start to answer it, interrupt me.

Mr. BRITTEN. Pardon me.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do pardon you. It does not make any difference whether a thing is in commission or out of commission. If we have the ship we can put it in commission very quickly.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it just as effective out of commission as it would be in commission?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. It is not out of commission and consequently it does not need to be put into commission.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] has no right to interrupt a gentleman on this floor and interject remarks without his consent. It is a gross breach of the rules. The gentleman should address the Chair if he wants to take the floor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman just a word about the statement that the enemy could not bring his submarines to this country.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As I remember, we have some 9 or 10 submarines in the Philippines, and my recollection is that those were carried there. What is the gentleman's recollection as to that? If they were carried there, why could not an enemy carry its submarines over here?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, this is the fact about that: I do not think it makes any difference whether those submarines were carried to the Philippines by their own steam or whether they were carried on a battleship. They can go long distances, provided they can stop every 1,300 miles and get new supplies. That is the reason why they can not go any farther. Those submarines, I expect, went to Hawaii and stopped along the route wherever they could get supplies and supplied themselves. That is the way, as I understand that. But all the testimony before us is that neither Germany nor any other nation in the world could bring submarines over here to fight us except England, and she could only do it because she has a base of supplies at Halifax and at Bermuda. You remember that testimony. The others could not do it. That being true, I want to submit this argument: If we were to have a war with Germany, there would be on the German side her 40 battleships, her destroyers, and her cruisers, without any submarines. We would have on our side all of our battleships and cruisers and destroyers and monitors, plus our submarines. And the number of German ships that 59 submarines would destroy in that war would be no unimportant part. So, I think that ought to be considered in determining whether it is necessary to build any more ships in order to defend ourselves against foreign countries.

The whole question seems to me to reduce itself down to this, that we have now in our possession so many ships of all kinds that no nation on earth would dare to attack us, especially when we see that they have no disposition to do it, and it is not to their interest to do it.

A great deal is said against Germany because of her militarism. A great many people criticize that country on that ground. Have we more militarism in us than Germany has? Are we less peaceful than Germany is? If we are not, then we ought to be as good as Germany. Let us adopt the same policy that Germany adopts. Germany states her policy in her laws, and she says in that policy that it is not necessary to build a navy as big as that of any other nation in order to defend herself. She has never tried to build a navy as big as that of England, and she puts it on this ground: She says, "All we propose to do is to build a navy big enough so that any nation that might attack us would know that we would destroy so many of her ships that it would imperil her standing among the other nations as a naval power." That is the policy of Germany, expressed in her statutes. Why can we not be as good as she is? Why must we want the greatest Navy on earth? What is it? Is it barbarism? Is it the savage that is in us, or is it the profits that there are in building battleships? Tell me! [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this debate on the naval bill has been going on now for about four hours, and while I believe in the doctrine of concentration I think, perhaps, there is such a thing as carrying it a little too far; and so, on the general theory that any change is a rest, during the short time that I shall occupy I am going to discuss a matter entirely foreign to the question of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, in a little more than 30 days the work of the Sixty-third Congress will be a matter of history and one-half of the administration of Woodrow Wilson will be over. Within 18 months from this time, and before the end of the first regular session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, the battle lines of the

next presidential election will be drawn and the people of the country will be getting ready to choose again between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

The work of this Congress will necessarily play an important part in the next election. It has been in session almost continuously for two years and has acted upon scores of propositions. The great mass of this legislation, however, will have but little bearing upon the fortunes of either party, because party issues were not raised by its enactment. The fact is, that upon many propositions there is substantial agreement between Republicans and Democrats. Upon many other questions there is disagreement among Republicans and a corresponding disagreement among Democrats, while only upon a very few questions is there drawn a clear-cut line of demarcation between the two parties. But in order for parties to exist there must be at least one well-defined, fundamental, outstanding difference between them. But what fundamental difference is there between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party? I do not desire to discuss psychological differences or differences in habits of thought between Republicans and Democrats. I simply wish to call attention to such practical differences as have been shown by the attitude of the two parties upon public questions in this Congress.

Running down through the middle of the House of Representatives is an aisle separating the Democrats from the Republicans and Progressives. Over on one side of the House, sitting together, are the 127 Republicans and 18 Progressives so thoroughly in accord on most propositions that it has never occurred to anyone that these two parties should be assigned different sections of the House. Over on the other side of the House are the 290 Democrats. (Too many altogether.) Why are these men on one side of the aisle Republicans and these on the other side of the aisle Democrats? Is it a difference in character? No. Is it a difference in patriotism? No. Is it a difference in love or sympathy for mankind? No. Is it a difference in faith in Republican institutions? No. What, then, is the meaning of this middle aisle? What economic, social, or moral question is responsible for its existence?

Let us briefly examine the attitude of Members of this House toward important questions which have been considered here during the past two years with a view of discovering, if we can, at least one sure, unfailing, reliable test of party fealty.

A short time ago the question of woman suffrage was before the House. It aroused Nation-wide interest and was ably debated by Representatives of all parties. It very soon developed, however, that there was a diversity of opinion in both parties upon the subject of woman suffrage. The roll call showed 88 Republicans and 86 Democrats in favor of it, and 34 Republicans and 170 Democrats against it. The question of woman suffrage, therefore, is not a party issue, and is not responsible for the existence of this middle aisle. A person might sit on either side of the aisle and be on either side of the question.

On another occasion recently the question of national prohibition was before the House. The debate very soon disclosed the fact that party lines would not be observed in the consideration of this great moral and economic question. The roll call showed 81 Republicans and 116 Democrats in favor of it, and 46 Republicans and 143 Democrats against it. And so the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic does not explain the existence of this middle aisle.

One of the great questions considered by this Congress is the matter of immigration. During the past few years a million aliens a year have been coming to our shores. Many thoughtful persons of all parties have come to the belief that we should restrict immigration. The Sixty-second Congress passed a bill with this object in view without regard to party lines. That bill was vetoed by a Republican President. This Congress passed a similar bill with a similar object in view. Again party lines were disregarded, and this bill has been vetoed by a Democratic President. And so the question of immigration is explain the existence of this middle aisle.

The doctrine of State rights was at one time regarded as a peculiarly Democratic doctrine. To-day, however, it is just as common to hear this doctrine invoked by Republicans as by Democrats against encroachment by the Federal Government on the rights of the State. And so the doctrine of State rights is in no sense a test of party fealty and is not responsible for this middle aisle.

The principle of Government ownership has had the attention of this Congress. We passed a bill here providing for the Government ownership and operation of a railroad in Alaska. This project had the indorsement of two administrations—one Republican and one Democratic—and party lines were disregarded in the passage of the bill. The President of the United States is now urging Congress to put the Government into the business of transportation on the high seas, an experiment which would test to the uttermost the principle of Government ownership, even though other serious questions were not involved. When this proposition comes up it is certain that the Democratic Party at least will be divided upon it. And so the principle of Government ownership is not responsible for this middle aisle.

The most spectacular debate which has taken place in the House during the past two years was the debate on the question of free tolls for American ships passing through the Panama Canal. On this proposition the leaders of the Democratic Party were in open disagreement. The Speaker of the House and the leader of the majority held views opposite from those entertained by the President. The roll call showed 26 Republicans and 221 Democrats in favor of the repeal of free tolls, and 110 Republicans and 52 Democrats against it. If this question had been a test of party fealty, 26 Republicans would have had to cross over to the Democratic side and 52 Democrats, including the Speaker and the majority leader, would have had to come over on our side.

On the subject of national defense there is a diversity of opinion in each party. You will find Democrats and Republicans who believe we should have a larger Army and a more powerful Navy. You will find Democrats and Republicans who believe our Army and our Navy are entirely sufficient for our needs. You will find peace-at-any-price Democrats, and I dare say that you will also find peace-at-any-price Republicans. And so the question of national defense is not responsible for this middle aisle.

Mr. POWERS. I suggest to the gentleman that if he is not careful about what he says he is going to get all of us together directly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There will be enough there. [Laughter.] And so with a single exception I might review the attitude of Members of both parties toward the whole field of legislation, including legislation affecting the currency, conservation, and the trusts, without discovering any one safe or reliable test of party fealty.

What policy or principle of government, then, have we had under consideration here during the past two years big enough, vital enough, and fundamental enough to divide Congress and the country into two great political parties? I will tell you what it is. It is the old familiar doctrine of protection to American industry, a doctrine which in its 50 years of continuous application has lifted our country up out of the industrial lowlands to a commanding position among the nations of the earth.

Go over on the Democratic side and ask any Democrat, no matter what his views may be on other questions, "Are you in favor of the principle of protection?" and his answer will be "No." He will tell you that the Democratic Party is the traditional opponent of protection. He will tell you that Congress has no power to levy a tariff except for revenue. He will tell you that Congress has no power to levy a tariff to equalize wages and conditions here and abroad, or to encourage production or manufacture in the United States.

Go over on the Republican side and ask any Republican, no matter what his views may be on other subject, "Are you in favor of the principle of protection?" and his answer will be "Yes." He will tell you that he is for protection because it is a matter of civilization and standards of living. He will tell you that we ought to build up here under the American flag a civilization higher than that of any other country in the world, and then we should protect that civilization against all cheaper and inferior civilizations elsewhere throughout the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But how can it be said that protection is a matter of civilization? Because, in the last analysis, it is largely a question of wages and conditions of employment. Wages and civilization are bound up together. Tell me the wages and conditions of employment of labor and I can paint in the balance of the picture of a nation's life. If you strike at wages, you strike at the home, and the home is the headwaters of the world's civilization. A reduction in income is always a serious matter for labor. It means less nutritious food and poorer clothing for the family. It means fewer books and less schooling for the children. It means a sacrifice of leisure and recreation. It means more of the grind and drudgery of life. It means smaller savings laid aside for a rainy day against sickness and adversity, which sooner or later are apt to cross the pathway of every human life.

And so any policy which protects the wages and the employment of the people against cheap competition, tending to drag men down to a lower plane of living, becomes vital to our civ-

ilization and is of sufficient importance to the Nation's life to become the chief article of faith in the creed of any political party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The present leaders of the Democratic Party recognize that protection is the one great policy which divides Republicans from Democrats. Coming into power two years ago, for the first time in 16 years, the tariff was the first thing to claim their attention. The first blow struck by this administration was against protection. The first message of President Wilson to Congress was a plea to uproot the doctrine of protection from our social, industrial, and economic life, and in a few weeks thereafter the views of the President were enacted into law.

Conditions in the country two years ago were most favorable for trying out the theories of the President. The business of the country was never more forehanded than then. Industry was standing firmly and confidently on its feet. Even the prospects of a Democratic administration had lost some of its terrors because the promise had been made that no legitimate industry would be injured. Factories were all running full time. Labor was well employed at wages higher than had ever been paid before in the history of the country. The farmer had a ready market for everything he had to sell at prices higher than he had ever received before in times of peace. The savings banks of the country were full of money laid aside by the people for a rainy day. Our merchants and manufacturers and farmers had gone out beyond the seas in quest of a market for their surplus until our export trade had reached the enormous sum of $2,500,000,000 per annum, or an increase of $1,000,000,000 per annum over our exports of only 10 years before. [Applause on the Republican side.] And then, like sensible folks, we did not buy back from the world as much as we sold the world. Our imports during the last year under protection amounted to only $1,800,000,000, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of approximately $700,000,000 per annum, or an average of nearly $60,000,000 per month. And our domestic commerce—the trade among ourselves, grown in volume beyond the power of the human mind to comprehend it—reached the staggering total of $35,000,000,000 per annum. That was the condition in which the Democratic Party found the country only two years ago.

How have we been getting along since that time? The new tariff law went into effect in October, 1913, and continued in uninterrupted operation until the beginning of the war in Europe, August 1, 1914. During those 10 months of its operation there was an increase in imports of more than $100,000,000 over the corresponding months of the previous year under protection. The American people had to send into foreign countries to pay for goods formerly made at home $100,000,000 more than during the corresponding 10 months of the year before. Not only did the American people lose this $100,000,000 on account of increased imports, but they suffered a further loss of approximately $160,000,000 during the same 10 months on account of a falling off in our exports. By buying more from the outside world and selling less we lost in trade the enormous sum of $260,000,000 during the first 10 months of the operation of the Underwood tariff law. This readily explains why business began to halt and stagger almost everywhere throughout the country even before the commercial uncertainties incident to the war in Europe were introduced into the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Since August 1, 1914, the Underwood tariff law has in effect been suspended by stress of war as to certain lines of trade. During the last five months imports have fallen off approximately $125,000,000 as compared with the corresponding five months of last year. The heaviest falling off was for the month of December last, and amounted to approximately $70,000,000. During the same five months there was also a falling off of exports, as compared with a year ago, of approximately $243,000,000. Our exports, however, for the month of December last were practically normal in volume, being slightly in excess of the exports for December of last year and only about $5,000,000 less than for December, 1912.

This heavy falling off of imports in December, coupled with the return of a normal volume of exports, has undoubtedly benefited many lines of trade in this country during the last few weeks. In a sense war has operated as a tariff to shut out imports, while at the same time war's demands for food and supplies have stimulated our exports. War, however, is a poor substitute for the tariff. Trade contingent upon the duration of a war is most hazardous and uncertain. Business, to be successful, must plan for the future. The manufacturer must be able to make contracts with the jobber for future delivery. The wholesale house must be able to send out its traveling salesmen to make contracts for delivery many months later. Conditions in trade to-day are uncertain. Business men realize that the falling off of imports during the month of December to the extent of $70,000,000 was due to the exigencies of war, and that when the war is over the stream of imports is again likely to flow to our shores. Under such circumstances it is but natural that business should go forward, feeling its way with hesitation and doubt. Under such circumstances merchants will contract only for immediate or early delivery and the business world will pursue a hand-to-mouth policy. Business men can not take advantage of present trade opportunities at home or abroad or go forward with confidence planning for the future, because no one can say how long the war in Europe will continue or how soon American business must meet destructive competition again from abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan all the time he wishes, and take my chances on it, and the time may be charged up to me. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the industries of the United States were to-day protected by a tariff reasonable in its terms and certain in its operation, instead of being forced to rely upon the uncertain, temporary protection of a European war, how quickly would American business men seize upon present opportunities to retake our domestic markets and open up new lines of foreign trade. If business men could be assured at this time that they would not be subjected to ruinous competition from abroad when peace comes again, in my judgment, every wheel of industry in this country would begin to turn, and a new era of prosperity for the American people would be at hand.

I believe that the American people have fully determined to restore the policy of protection. In 1912, for the second time in more than half a century, the party of protection was retired from power. It was not because the American people preferred Democratic policies to Republican policies. It was not because there were more Democrats than Republicans in the country. The trouble in 1912 was that we Republicans tried to elect two Presidents at once. [Laughter.] Some of us voted for President Roosevelt and some of us voted for President Taft, and because we voted for both we elected neither. By dividing our forces in 1912 the policy of protection was temporarily supplanted by a Democratic tariff. Whenever our forces are united the policy of protection can be restored. The result of the last election, in which our party gained 60 seats in this House and nearly won a score of others, is a prophecy that the Republican Party, reunited and carrying the banner of protection as of old, will be speedily returned to power. Fifty years of achievement without a parallel in the history of mankind is our party's guaranty for the future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In view of all that there is at stake for us and for our children, and for all mankind, to be charged as a party with the destinies of this mighty Republic is a sublime trust. Fully alive to the responsibilities which go with the leadership of a great people, let us upon return to power dedicate anew our party to all the high and holy purposes symbolized by the flag of the Republic itself. But what does our flag stand for? It stands for liberty under the law. There can be no such thing as liberty except through the orderly processes of the law. It stands for the rights of persons and the rights of property; it stands for popular rule, and in this it is our destiny to lead the way. It stands for universal education, because every wise person knows that free schools and free government go up and down in the scale together, and that you can not long continue to have one without the other. It stands for a Christian civilization, the best and the cleanest on the globe. It stands for the home and for all the virtues which thrive and cluster around the hearthstone. Standing for all these things, may the God of our fathers protect it and defend it, and may it ever continue to be the emblem of liberty and the banner of promise for all mankind. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Michigan consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used 31 minutes.

Mr. HENSLEY. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the comprehensive, learned, and well-reasoned address of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], who is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and evidently a student of the operations of the Navy, and of the construction of the appropriation bills pertaining to it, has left little to be said by one who in the main stands with him as regards this question. I do differ from him—and I do it with a great deal of reluctance, because I have

such a high respect for him as a man and for his learning as a legislator—I do differ from him, however, in some minor details which I will undertake to express to the House. Before he closed his address he was interrupted by some one, I think by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND], with a discussion of the late naval fight in the North Sea.

This gentleman asked some questions about how the German battleships which had been defeated got back to port. Since that question was asked I have had put in my hand a brief editorial which appeared in a New York paper yesterday afternoon, which so clearly and fully answers the gentleman's question and sheds such a light on other phases of this bill that I am going to read it:

Score one more for the submarine. The most interesting passage in Admiral Beatty's report reads thus—

Bear in mind that this is a report of a British admiral who commanded the fleet—

"The presence of the enemy's submarine subsequently necessitated the action being broken off."

The victorious fleet, in a moment of triumph, abandoned the field of battle and discontinued the fight where there was every prospect that it might go on and clinch its victory by absolutely destroying the fleet of the enemy. But what happened?

Thus the English commander records something undreamed of hitherto—that the mere presence of underwater boats compelled the sudden ending of a victorious fleet action by the most powerful battle cruisers yet produced. At the very moment when the complete destruction of his quarry was in sight, Admiral Beatty had to haul off and start for home—not because of the appearance of a great fleet of costly battleships, but because the enemy's submarines were at hand. This is the more remarkable because the British ships had their own destroyers and torpedo boats with them, which are reported to have given perfect protection to the fleet operating off the Belgian coast. More than that, the *Tiger*, like the *Lion*, was going at a terrific speed, making 28 or 29 knots; yet, as in the case of the *Hermes*, which was sunk by a German submarine when running at full speed, ability to go fast was not, in Admiral Beatty's mind, sufficient defense, despite the fact that he had once successfully dodged submarines. All of this must send the submarine's stock 'way up above par, if it has become so formidable as to be a deciding factor in a fleet action, without having even scored a hit. Plainly the surviving German cruisers owe their safety to-day to their underwater comrades.

Mr. Chairman, my text for the speech which by the courtesy of the committee I am allowed to make will be chiefly on the unparalleled conservatism of the United States Navy. In these days of radicalism and what masquerades as reform, and which, when you strip the mask from it, is socialism pure and simple, we ought, I suppose, to welcome conservatism when we can find it in an important body of men like the naval bureaus. But, Mr. Chairman, there is such a thing as an excess of virtue in some cases. And it is to that particular phase of the United States Navy that I shall address myself.

Mr. Chairman, the citizen of the United States or the mere Member of either House of Congress who has the temerity to hold and express an opinion contrary to that of their masters, the bureaus, on the question of national defense invites and unfailingly receives contumely. Although he may believe himself to be a patriotic citizen, although he may be endeavoring to the best of his ability to serve his country and the constituency which sent him here, he becomes immediately the target for what are meant to be offensive epithets when he has the audacity to do his own thinking.

I know of no American in public or private life who wants to see his country inadequately defended. I know of none who is willing to take a chance of having his country invaded or overrun by any enemy, even the strongest and most aggressive. But is it not a pity, sir, that in the discussion of this question of the national defense epithets can not be dispensed with and real arguments, dictated by calm judgment and supported by sound reasons, substituted?

To call the man who does not believe that an excessive share of the people's contributions to the Government shall be wasted in the support of a needlessly large army and a huge navy a "little American" is not an argument. It is sound and fury from the foolish or insincere pleading by the representatives of those who grow rich in war traffic. I even refuse to feel insulted when such epithets are hurled at me, as they have been. I merely feel sorry for infatuated jingoes, drunk with the war spirit, who resort to such methods and who really seem to believe that they are reasoning.

In voicing my opposition to some features of the naval bill as reported by the committee I shall try in a courteous way and in perfect sincerity to give reasons for my position.

Let me state that position in a sentence. I believe that the committee has advised the appropriation of too much money for obsolete weapons and too little for the greatest ever devised by the wit of man. Recent and current events sustain that view. Battleships are helpless in the presence of submarines and in terror if their presence is suspected. They are secure only when locked up in well-protected harbors. That is not merely my opinion; it is the logic of events. The committee and the bureaus seem not to have been impressed by facts of recent occurrence. Why are these two bodies so conservative, so ultra-conservative, one may say?

Lately I have been looking into the history of the United States Navy. My investigation has been altogether too casual and superficial for the importance and interest of the subject. But, casual and superficial as it has been, I have learned, for instance, that the American Navy is probably the most conservative body on our continent. Men of my age are usually conservative, but the Navy excels in that particular virtue, as is clearly shown by some of its own historians. History overflows with evidence that the disinclination to employ newer and improved methods of defense has characterized it for a hundred years. It was daring and brilliant in its achievements during the War of 1812, but immediately thereafter it appears to have become the victim of paralysis, mental and physical, and has not yet entirely recovered.

What can be the reason for this peculiar conduct on the part of a body which contains so many men of daring and talent? The only reason I can think of is bureaucracy, always and everywhere dangerous alike to liberty and progress.

The classic example of a purely bureaucratic government is—or, at least, was until the recent revolution which established a Republic—China. For thousands of years the Government of China was in all of its departments and branches thoroughly bureaucratized. Its civilization was stereotyped, its institutions petrified, and every improvement proposed was stoutly resisted and usually defeated. All the activities of government flowed in bureaucratic channels hoary with age, and to propose an improvement was to incur the penalties of treason.

Prior to her great revolution the institutions of France had broken down. There was no outlet for the aspirations, the energy, and the activities of a highly intellectual people. To propose and advocate any improvement or any change, however slight, in the administration of affairs met as its reception the galley, the Bastile, or the block. In intellectual despair, in wide-wasting economic ruin, the French people rose in revolt against this desperate tyranny, and through seas of blood they struggled to emancipate themselves from the dead past, and in the new world of thought, of action, and government became a great, free, progressive nation and the instructor of the world. The bureaus and special privilege were drowned in an ocean of blood.

It was reasonable to suppose that the United States, a new Nation in a New World, untrammeled by foolish traditions, would in the conduct of its Government have lent an eager ear to the suggestion of needed improvements and would have reformed its processes of administration as exigencies and occasions demanded. Not so, however. They also fell under the spell and influence of the bureaus.

Even Congress, acting presumably on the advice of military bureaus, has not been altogether free from excessive conservatism, for until recently every able-bodied citizen of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 was enrolled in the militia. After his enrollment, until 1903, it was, if I may go to the statutes for an illustration, expressly required by law that every militiaman should be constantly provided with a good musket or firelock of a bore sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound, two spare flints, a pouch, and a powder horn. See Federal Statutes, volume 4 page 891, section 1628. These muskets, powder horn, pouches, and so forth, were required by the act of Congress of May 8, 1792, and this act was unchanged until after the Spanish War, and not then until 1903.

However, the most bureaucratic department of our Government is the Navy. During both terms of President Washington's administration there was no Navy Department and no Secretary of the Navy; but during its whole existence since the Navy Department seems to have been controlled and dominated, effectively and absolutely, by bureau and naval officers. During the whole of its existence the bureaucrats in charge have steadily, and generally successfully, resisted all improvements until they were forced to adopt them by an aroused public opinion.

The first great revolution in water transportation was the discovery and invention of steam navigation, and how slow and how reluctant the Navy was to adopt this very evident improvement I will try to show you.

STEAM POWER RELUCTANTLY ACCEPTED.

In 1787 John Fitch launched the first steamboat in the United States and made regular trips on it from Philadelphia

to Trenton, N. J., Wilmington, Del., and other points in neighboring States. In the Library of Congress there are newspaper files that carry advertisements of his boat with a fixed steaming schedule.

Robert Fulton launched the *Clermont* on the Hudson River in 1807. His venture was brilliantly successful, and in our commercial navy steam rapidly superseded oar and sail. Steamboats made regular trips on many of our lakes and rivers immediately after Fulton's successful cruise with the *Clermont*. It was surely to have been expected that as steam was successfully used as a means of navigation in the commercial marine of the Nation our Navy experts would eagerly avail themselves of such an epoch-making invention for the Navy. Five years after Fulton had propelled vessels by steam and steamboats were in constant use on our lakes and rivers, the War of 1812 was declared. But during that entire war until late in 1813 no effort was made by the Navy to use steam as a means of navigation.

In that year Fulton designed the first vessel of war which was to be propelled by steam alone. He laid his plans before President Madison, who eagerly and enthusiastically indorsed them. Subsequently, in March, 1814, they were accepted by Congress. This steam war vessel was immediately built by the direction of Congress. The vessel was given the curious classic name, *Demos-Logos*. It was popularly known, however, by the name of the inventor as the *Fulton*. When the *Fulton* was completed in May, 1815, she was assigned to the command of Capt. David Porter, who had just returned from his unfortunate cruise with the *Essex*. The original plan of the *Fulton* was to rely upon steam alone for propulsion. Its commander, Capt. Porter, however, could not forget his previous training and experience on sailing vessels. True to the traditions of his profession, he had no confidence in steam as a motive power. As soon as he assumed charge he caused two large masts to be erected, and he had the sides of the vessel, ordinarily stop flush at the spar deck, carried up to form protecting bulwarks for the sailors who might be on deck attending to the sails and rigging that had been added by order of Capt. Porter.

On her trial trip the *Fulton* steamed out from New York Harbor 50 miles and back. No use whatever was made of either oar or sail on the trial trip.

Then and there it was demonstrated to everybody save the Navy experts that steam was a successful means of navigation of boats of any size then known and that it had every advantage over the oar and sail.

Before the *Fulton* was finished her inventor died, and peace was declared between Great Britain and the United States. The head of the Navy at that time, on the advice of his cabinet of bureau officers, did not attempt to utilize this great invention of Fulton's, but ordered her to be laid up as a receiving ship at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, where she remained as such from June, 1815, to March, 1829. She was afterwards blown up and destroyed in an explosion. Thus ended the first steam vessel in the American Navy.

The next steamer to appear in our Navy was the *Seagull*. This vessel was used as a dispatch boat in Porter's mosquito fleet. She was laid up in 1825 at Philadelphia, where she remained until 1840, when she was sold for $4,750.

Bennett says in his Steam Navy of the United States that after the *Seagull* was laid up there was no mention of steam in the literature of the Navy for 10 years.

From 1825 to 1835 no effort was made to use steam in propelling vessels in the United States Navy. During all these years there were about 700 steam vessels in use in the commercial navy of the United States, owned and conducted by citizens, on the rivers and lakes of the United States, and several coastwise steamers and steamship lines had been established and were running successfully and prosperously.

It is not desirable to pursue further this sickening history of hidebound inefficiency, blind conservatism, and disastrous incompetency at that period of our naval history. The bureaus were in absolute control. Mr. Bennett, in discussing the failure of the naval officers to avail themselves of Fulton's invention of steam navigation, after lamenting their refusal to utilize it, says that had it been employed it would have changed the naval architecture of the world, and would not only have changed the naval architecture, but would also have changed the methods of naval warfare. He further says:

> Steam, instead of being afterwards obliged to fight its way inch by inch and foot by foot, compelled to struggle against every obstacle and every objection which jealousy, conservatism, and ignorance could bar against its progress, slowly and painfully forcing an unwilling and qualified recognition from the very element that should have championed its cause, would have appeared in the arena fully armed and equipped from the brain of its master and would have been hailed not only as an auxiliary but as an all-important arm in naval warfare.

This blind obstinacy and conservatism of the naval officers generally has been graphically summed up and described by Prof. James Russell Soley in an article called "The Union and Confederate Navies, battles, and leaders of the Civil War," pages 611 to 631. He says:

> The consciousness of ignorance in some men begets modesty, but it seldom has this effect upon the older members of a military hierarchy. Obedience to the orders of a superior is, of course, the essence of military discipline, without which it could not exist, and rank is the primary source of authority. But a system which combines reliance upon rank as the sole source of authority and reliance upon age as the sole qualification for rank contains essential elements of weakness. Its tendency is to make the seniors grow less capable and more despotic, while the juniors gradually lose all sense of responsibility and all power of initiative, and when they at last reach a position of command their faculties have become paralyzed from long disuse. Especially is this the case in a long period of peace, such as followed the War of 1812, and lasted, with only a brief intermission, until 1861. During this time the Navy was always grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. * * * The fatal defects of the system were not noticed until 1861, when the crisis came and the service was unprepared to meet it; and to this cause was largely due the feebleness of naval operations during the first year of the war.

The next great revolution in naval warfare was the invention of ironclad warships of the *Monitor* and *Merrimac* types. Of course, this invention was frowned upon by the bureau chiefs of the Navy Department. It was a new invention, and the old and venerable cry of "experiment" was urged against their construction, and yet the present dreadnaught is but a modification of the *Monitor*. Long after France and England had constructed and had in commission warships incased in iron armor not a step had been taken by our Navy. As Prof. Soley states:

> The advantages of a light armor plating for vessels of war had been demonstrated by the experience of the French floating batteries *Devastation*, *Lave*, and *Tonnante* in the attack on Kinburn in 1855 during the Crimean War. These vessels were protected by 4½-inch plates, and the experiment had been deemed so conclusive that both France and England had already constructed new warships incased in armor. It was to be expected that a navy with a war on its hands would have directed its attention from the first moment when it was convinced of the probability of hostilities to securing some of these formidable vessels; and if a hesitation due to the want of statutory authority had led the department to defer building until after Congress met it would at least by that time have digested its plans so thoroughly that the work could begin at once. Nevertheless, for four months after Mr. Welles entered upon his office no steps were taken, even of the most elementary character, toward procuring ironclads.

When the *Merrimac* steamed out of Norfolk Harbor and destroyed the *Cumberland* and *Congress* and disabled the *Roanoke* wooden navies were made obsolete. Would it be believed that after this conclusive demonstration of the worthlessness of wooden vessels in naval warfare that they were built all during the Civil War under the advice of our naval experts, and that they continued to be built even after the Civil War was ended? Prof. Soley says, on page 615, as cited above:

> The vessels purchased by the department during the war amounted to 418, and included every variety of merchantman and river steamboat roughly adapted in the navy yard for war service. Three types of wooden vessels were built—14 screw sloops of the *Kearsarge*, *Shenandoah*, and *Ossipee* classes; 23 screw gunboats; and 47 side-wheel steamers, known as "double-enders," for service in narrow channels where they could move ahead or astern without turning.

It seems that the board which was appointed on the 6th of August, 1861, to pass upon the advisability of the United States constructing ironclads in effect damned the project. In their report they said:

> Opinions differ amongst naval and scientific men as to the policy of adopting the iron armature for ships of war. For coast and harbor defense they are undoubtedly formidable adjuncts to fortifications on land. As cruising vessels, however, we are skeptical as to their advantages and ultimate adoption. But whilst other nations are endeavoring to perfect them we must not remain idle. * * * We, however, do not hesitate to express the opinion, notwithstanding all we have heard or seen written on the subject, that no ship or floating battery, however heavily she may be plated, can cope successfully with a properly constructed fortification of masonry. The officers on this board were Commodores Smith and Paulding and Commander Davis.

It can almost be said that, without exception, every new and effective invention of a war vessel in the history of the Navy of the United States has been the result of an act of Congress demanding that the "experiment" be tried. Three iron-plated floating batteries had been used by the French in the Crimean War in 1855. A joint resolution of Congress, June 24, 1861, directed the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to examine the Stevens ironclad floating battery, ascertain the cost and time necessary for its completion and the expediency thereof. This board was composed of the elite of the old wooden navy. It examined the Stevens battery and did not make a report until the end of the year 1861. This report was, of course, adverse to the completion, and, so far as the Government was concerned, the project was dropped.

Ericsson was reluctantly granted a contract. This contract was very rigid in its terms. It provided that the *Monitor* should be built, and when completed should be tested under the direc-

tion of the Navy authorities, and that 25 per cent was to be withheld from each payment until after the completion and satisfactory trial of the vessel. A clause of the contract provided that in case the vessel did not develop the stipulated speed or failed in other stated requirements the contractors should refund to the United States the full amount of the money paid them. This contract contained another clause which illustrates very strikingly the ingrained habit of naval experts to cling to the dead past. The contract made with Ericsson required him to furnish on the ironclad, as a part of its construction, masts, spars, sails, and rigging of sufficient dimensions to drive the vessel at the rate of 6 knots per hour in a fair breeze or wind.

It may not be generally known that when Mr. Bushnell, a friend of Ericsson's, presented the model of the *Monitor*, which had been prepared by Ericsson, to the board composed of Commodores Smith and Paulding and Commander Davis, they grew merry over it and told him that they would vote for a trial of the design if he could get Commander Davis to vote for it. Commander Davis, when appealed to by Mr. Bushnell, told him to take the little thing home and worship it, as it would not be idolatry, because it was in the image of nothing in the heaven above or the earth beneath or in the waters under the earth. Long after the *Monitor* was under way Ericsson examined the contract and stated that if he had known of its terms he would never have completed it. Had he not done so, the *Merrimac* would have pursued its career unchecked, would have destroyed the blockade of the southern ports, and by the destruction of the wooden navy it is safe to say the Confederate States would have established their independence.

The *Monitor* was built very rapidly after the contract had been signed, but, says Prof. Soley:

> It must be remembered that the Navy Department had possessed from the beginning five frigates, sister ships of the *Merrimac*, any one of which could have been armored more efficiently than she was in half the time and with half the money, and without waiting for congressional action. Evidently the department little imagined while it was dallying for six months with the question of ironclads that the first 24 hours of the *Monitor's* career would be so big with fate.

While Ericsson was constructing the *Monitor* he was constantly annoyed by Commodore Joseph Smith, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with angry criticisms of details. On September 25, 1861, he wrote Ericsson as follows:

> I am in great trouble from what I have recently learned, that the concussion in the turret will be so great that men can not remain in it and work the guns after a few fires with shot. I presume you understand the subject better than I do.

He certainly did.

Again, on October 11:

> I understand that computations have been made by expert naval architects of the displacement of your vessel, and the result arrived at is that she will not float with the load you propose to put upon her, and if she would she could not stand upright for want of stability, nor attain a speed of 4 knots.

All the world knows now that she did float.

He wrote on October 15:

> I have been urging the Ordnance Department to furnish the guns for your vessel, but the knowing ones say that the guns will never be used on her.
>
> In a heavy sea—

He wrote again, October 17—

> one side of the battery will rise out of the water or the sea recede from it, and the wooden vessel underneath will strike the water with such force when it comes down or rolls back as to knock the people on board off their feet.

Admiral Farragut, if I read history correctly, never commanded an ironclad vessel during the Civil War or after it. Like all the old officers of the Navy, he damned ironclads as well as torpedoes. When he captured New Orleans in 1862 he commanded a wooden vessel, which was nearly destroyed by a fire raft. At the battle in Mobile Bay in 1864 his flagship was also a wooden vessel.

Admiral Dupont, after the failure of the attack on Charleston, S. C., in 1863, in his report of his operation expressed a decided opinion that monitors and ironclads as vessels of war were failures. See Bennett, pages 403 to 404. In December, 1863, the admirals of our Navy were called upon officially by Secretary Wells to report their opinions as to the efficiency of ironclads.

In the light of subsequent developments, indeed, it was curious, in view of what had already happened, that high officers of the Navy could have been found to report against the efficiency of ironclad vessels. Let it be remembered that an historic engagement at Hampton Roads in March, 1862, had already been fought. The epochal contest between the *Merrimac* and *Monitor* had been in history nearly 21 months when an official opinion as to the value of ironclads was asked and given, and the report of Rear Admiral Goldsborough, made in 1864, was anything but favorable.

In Bennett's Steam Navy of the United States, from which I have derived much information and from which I have freely quoted, is also found the statement that the naval bureaus were not in sympathy with the efforts to get vessels of great speed. In view of the now generally recognized value of speed in vessels of war the statement of the author taxes one's credulity. But let me quote him again:

> The importance of speed as a factor in naval warfare, although demonstrated by many events of the Civil War, was disputed, or at least not admitted, as soon as that war was over, and the element that disparaged the *Wampanoag* type of war vessel by referring to them as "engine carriers" and "runaways" succeeded so well in checking naval development in this direction that it was more than 21 years after the triumph of the *Wampanoag* before her speed was again reached in our Navy, the first vessel to equal it being the steel cruiser *Charleston* on the occasion of her four hours' trial trip in smooth water in September, 1889. The British, more progressive and less hidebound in naval matters than ourselves, arrived at the speed of the *Wampanoag* in their navy in 1879 with the large dispatch vessels *Iris* and *Mercury*.

To show how reluctant the Navy was to surrender the wind as a motive power is shown in an order made as late as June 11, 1869, which directed that "hereafter all vessels of the Navy will be fitted with full sail power. The exceptions to this will be tugs and dispatch vessels not fitted with sails. Commanders of squadrons will direct that constant exercises shall take place with sails and spars." A long list of exercises with sails was prescribed.

However, Mr. Chairman, steam did win in the contest with sails and the picturesque old wooden ship, so hallowed by the memories of Van Tromp, Drake, Nelson, Paul Jones, Decatur, and Perry, surrendered to the ironclad. A thing of beauty and grace was displaced by an ugly mass of iron propelled by steam. About these modern creations McAndrews' Hymn is the only bit of literature I recall, and that, beautiful as it is, hardly fills the void in song and romance made by the disappearance of the full-rigged ship.

To the monitor and fast cruisers that were the early development of the ironclad vessels succeeded the battleship. The battleship was succeeded by the dreadnaught, which, in turn, was followed by the superdreadnaught. This change has tremendously increased the cost of the Navy. To construct a dreadnaught of the *Pennsylvania* type costs $15,000,000—more often it costs $16,000,000.

And here I will remark that the clause in every naval act passed in recent years which provides for the construction and fitting out of a superdreadnaught is, in my opinion, purposely misleading. This clause reads: "For hull and machinery, $6,000,000 or $7,000,000." Nothing is said in it about the cost of armor and armament, which usually amounts to much more than that of the "hull and machinery." To ascertain the cost of armor and armament of a superdreadnaught one must resort to lump-sum appropriations and dig it out after painful efforts. In popular opinion, it only costs six or seven million dollars to construct and fit out a superdreadnaught, when, in fact, it costs more than twice that sum.

In passing I will say, Mr. Chairman, that this is an evil in the methods of the Committee on Naval Affairs which should be corrected, even if an act of Congress is necessary to secure the reform. That committee should deal frankly with the House and the country.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Every appropriation bill contains the language that the cost, exclusive of armor and armament, is not to exceed, as in the last bill, $7,800,000 each, as it does expressly call attention to the cost of a vessel.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; I can not; for my time is short.

Mr. HOBSON. I simply wanted to call the gentleman's attention to one thing.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What is it.

Mr. HOBSON. It is simply in the next paragraph in each bill the gentleman will see that there is an appropriation for armor and armament, and of course that completes the appropriation for the vessel.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But nowhere does the bill say what a superdreadnaught shall cost. It says so much excluding armor and armament, but it does not state it so that the man in the street may know approximately the cost of a battleship.

THE COMING OF THE SUBMARINE.

Following the battleship and, in the opinion of many people, destined to drive it off the seas is the submarine.

It has not only brought terror to the commanders of great battleships but it has also disturbed swivel-chair sailors who sit in administration buildings and see danger ahead for their pet project of majestic and expensive dreadnaughts.

Maybe they do not feel as discouraged as Decatur did when he first appreciated the fact that steam had to be accepted by the Navy, but they are not happy at the outlook.

Capt. Mahan tells a story of Decatur, when he was present at an early experiment in steam navigation.

"Crude as the appliances still were, demonstration was conclusive; and Decatur, whatever his prejudices, was open to conviction. 'Yes,' he said, gloomily, to King, 'it is the end of our business; hereafter any man who can boil a teakettle will be as good as the best of us.'"

In anticipation of this legislation and to develop hostility to the purchase of a reasonable number of submarines, certain naval experts and their journalistic fuglemen have already said that it is to be feared that uninformed Members of Congress, victims of the spectacular work of the submarine, may seek to substitute them for dreadnaughts.

If they are wise that is exactly what Members of Congress will do, and I half suspect that the greatest naval power in the world, measured in terms of dreadnaughts, would agree with them. Everybody will admit, I suppose, that if England had had three submarines in the North Sea on a certain day instead of the three cruisers, *The Hague*, *Cressy*, and *Aboukir*, she would have more live sailors to-day and less humiliation.

The submarine has literally fought its way to recognition. It has won its rank as a fighting machine on its achievements.

The idea of a subsurface boat is not new.

Admiral Melville says that—

A submarine craft was experimented with at Toledo, Spain, nearly 400 years ago, and it is possible that submarine navigation was seriously attempted even earlier.

The French are said to have had one in the last decade of the eighteenth century. It first demonstrated its destructive force during the Civil War, and was the work of the Confederates. The Confederate States had no navy worth mentioning. Its naval officers, in the absence of other employment, designed submarine torpedo boats. In February, 1864, a Confederate "David" approached the sloop-of-war *Housatonic*, lying on the outer blockade of Charleston, and exploded a torpedo under her which sank her. In fact, it may be also said that the development of the torpedo as an engine of destruction in war was the work of the Confederates.

The modern submarine is the invention of J. P. Holland, a civilian and a resident of New Jersey. The present efficiency of submarine craft appears to be the direct result of that invention of Mr. Holland. When he presented it to the Government for inspection and adoption it was sneered at and ridiculed by officers in the Navy. There were a few eminent exceptions, however, for Admiral Hichborn and others immediately saw that a revolution had been made in naval warfare.

On the other hand, Admiral O'Neil and other naval officers are reported to have commented most unfavorably on the submarine as an engine of war. Its terrible effectiveness, so recently and conclusively demonstrated, is a complete answer to such critics.

But American officers have not been the only skeptics. The present high admiral of the German Navy, in March, 1901, pronounced against them, and Carl Busley, a German naval expert, once published a monograph on the subject, in which he poured out unstinted ridicule on the submarine. High Admiral von Tirpitz has changed his mind, and so no doubt has Mr. Busley.

In 1910 Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine published a contribution from Col. A. Court Repington, a British staff officer, on "The submarine menace." It is usually very dangerous to essay the rôle of prophet, but Col. Repington did so nearly five years ago, and events have justified him. Let me quote him:

I think—

He says—

that the North Sea falls within the category of narrow waters which eventually must, by a process of evolution which is taking place under our eyes—that is to say, by the invention or development of the airship, the submarine, the torpedo, and the mine—become practically closed on the outbreak of war, and possibly throughout the war, to the operations of seagoing fleets and cruisers.

Col. Repington was right. The North Sea has been virtually closed to the operations of seagoing fleets. To save her's, Germany keeps them immured within her own harbors. To save her's, after a few disastrous ventures, England keeps them in her own waters.

But hear Col. Repington again:

I think that the great ships to which we devote so much money every year * * * will, within a limited period of time, become useless for most operations of which the North Sea or the channel will be the theater.

Col. Repington, in the same article, spoke of the possibility of a superdreadnaught which costs from two to two and a half millions sterling, or, say, $12,500,000, with its load of a thousand men, being sunk by an invisible submarine which costs only $300,000 to $400,000. That also has happened.

The author directed attention to the fact that improvements in the controlling mechanism of the torpedo has given it astonishing accuracy, and that it can compete with a gun at the medium fighting range and deliver a far more deadly blow.

But let me give you Col. Repington's own words on another point. I like to quote these military experts because the words of the "uninformed" Member of Congress may have no weight, even when supported by such tragedies as those of the North Sea and the English Channel.

He says:

Combined with the submarine the new torpedo becomes a weapon of deadly menace, while the submarine herself—worst of all for battleship and cruiser—has not yet found her naval destroyer, nor is open, except accidentally and by chance, to any known form of attack by ships in fair and normal fighting circumstances.

I express my own opinion, not Col. Repington's, when I say that sneaking up on the enemy while submerged and invisible is about as fair as any feature of war on land or sea.

Our colonel hardly knew, I fancy, how prophetically he spoke when he said:

I think that Germany realizes the value of the submarine and will soon astonish us by her productive capacity in this type.

Germany has shown marvelous productive capacity, and operative capacity as well.

Again, he says:

It is time for us to recognize that the North Sea in time of war will be, if it is not now, no place for a seagoing fleet. Swarms of submarines and destroyers * * * will infest this sea and the existence of every great ship which ventures into the area controlled by these pests, which are almost unassailable by naval means, will be most precarious.

Now, listen to what he says:

Our great and costly battleships and cruisers must be stowed away safely in some distant, safe, and secluded anchorage. Britannia may rule the waves, but who will rule above and below them?

Our author, who seems to be an unusually clear-headed man and also endowed, as events have proved, with a rare gift of prophecy, says that "battle fleets will have to keep out of harm's way and leave flotillas to carry on the war."

They have tried to keep out of harm's way, but have not been entirely able to do so. The fate of the English men-of-war in the North Sea and the Channel and of the Turkish men-of-war inside the Dardanelles, and protected by many mines, warns the commanders of vessels in a way they can not afford to ignore.

Col. Repington says frankly that nothing the English can do by naval means will prevent German submarines putting to sea when they please. Of course the submarines of other countries, if equally enterprising, can also go to sea when they please.

Mr. Chairman, the submarine has taken the place of the dreadnaught as a sea terror. When a flotilla of submarines is operating, the particular sea in which they operate has no place for great battleships. This, of course, is contested by the great firms which have huge and expensive plants for the building of dreadnaughts. Very naturally they fight the inevitable change, for it means the disappearance or lessening of dividends. But its realization and acceptance means success to the countries that employ the latest and most marvelous development in naval architecture. It has been said—and I think it has been shown that—

The submarine can observe, attack, and sink a dreadnaught while she can neither observe, attack, nor sink, except by accident, the submarine.

I have quoted this frank-speaking Englishman at length. Now, let me return to an American authority, Admiral Melville, who says:

If the boat—

He was speaking of the Holland submarine—

has military or strategic value, we should change our policy of construction. Nothing could justify the building of so many battleships if the submarine possesses even a portion of the advantages that their advocates claim.

Who will now deny that it has military and strategic value?

He further says:

In the indifference of naval officers to this question there is great danger. The boats are either valuable or they are worthless for military purposes. From the time that the Senate and House Naval Committees look with favor upon these boats there will be a decrease in the construction of battleships, and the action of Congress in striking out of the naval appropriation bill of 1901 all authorization for battleships and cruisers can certainly in part be traced to the belief that the submarine possesses many of the qualities claimed by its advocates.

If Admiral Melville had known of the present Naval Committees of the two Houses, he would not have been alarmed, because they are usually the last to get an impression aside from that which is sent to them from the department.

And it may be said in passing that Congress still seems inclined to do its own thinking—sometimes, at least.

Yet Admiral Melville did not send forth his note of warning in vain. From that time down to the present the submarine has been fought by the great majority of the officers of the Navy at every session of Congress. Twenty years ago the *Holland* was denounced as an experiment. Long after the submarine had been successfully demonstrated in our Navy, under the mandatory provisions of Congress and following the success of this American type in foreign navies, our own Navy Department in its annual recommendations gave this type of vessel only perfunctory recognition and grudging recommendation. We find, for instance, in the report of Secretary Moody in 1902 that he asked for two submarines; in his report in 1903 Paul Morton did not ask for any. Secretary Bonaparte, in the first year of his administration asked for two submarines; in the second year, none. Secretary Metcalf asked for four submarines during each year of his term. Secretary Meyer, 1909, did not recommend any; in his second year he recommended two; in his third year he did not ask for any. This will show the Navy Department's attitude toward this epoch-making invention. In other words, had the submarine depended upon departmental recognition we should probably have had at this time—instead of 51 built and building—about 10. To show that our naval officers instinctively fear and distrust the submarine and realize that it means the doom of the battleship, reference may be made to the fact that every time a battleship is torpedoed by a submarine during the present war our naval officers are quick in their endeavor to "save the face" of the dreadnaught, and they invariably put down the catastrophe to a floating mine. After the cable dispatches prove conclusively that the disaster was due to a torpedo fired by a submarine they grudgingly admit the fact, but apologize for the incident by calling it a lucky shot, and persist in their opinion that the submarine is still an "experiment."

In the Navy, now presided over by that rare old salt from Tar River, N. C., Josephus Daniels, the submarine is still denounced as an "experiment." Future historians of our Navy will discover that as late as the year 1914, and in the month of December, the Secretray of the Navy, supported by his aid for matériel, Capt. Winterhalter, and by two of his admirals, denounced submarines as an "experiment." If the horrible war which now devastates the earth has taught one naval lesson, it is that the battleship, the dreadnaught, and the superdreadnaught are the certain and legitimate prey of the submarine.

To decry the submarine as an experiment seems a bit absurd in the light of current events. Are we not justified in declaring that dreadnaughts and superdreadnaughts are experiments? Have they ever been tried out in any war? The British battleships *Bulwark*, the *Audacious*, the *Formidable*, and four large British cruisers—the *Aboukir*, *Cressy*, *Hogue*, and *Hawke*—as a result of submarine attacks now rest on the bottom of the ocean. Only a few days ago we read how a British submarine dived under the mines placed in the Dardanelles and sunk the Turkish battleship *Messudieh*. As a result so far of the experiment of dreadnaughts and superdreadnaughts all of them that have ever been encountered by submarines have been sunk. The events of the past few months demand that on humanitarian grounds, if on no other, the advisability of building great battleships each calling for not less than 1,000 officers and men to operate them should be seriously weighed. Due to the torpedoing by submarines the following is the partial death roll up to date of big ships alone:

	Officers and men.
British battleship *Bulwark*	700
British battleship *Formidable*	600
British cruisers *Aboukir, Cressy, Hogue,* and *Hawke*	1,653
Total	2,953

In December, 1913, Admiral Sir Percy Scott, one of the most famous naval experts of the world, and having specialized with great success in gunnery, wrote a remarkable letter to a friend, which for some reason never saw the light of day until June 14, 1914. In that letter, which I will not stop to read in full, but ask to have published as a part of these remarks, he stated that a battleship's occupation was gone, that the naval warfare of the future would be dominated by aeroplanes and by submarines. Every prediction he made in regard to the submarines has been more than fulfilled, and aeroplanes have proven to be of tremendous importance. Submarines have sunk every battleship that they have attacked. Admiral Scott said, among other things:

> If we ever go to war with a country that is within striking distance of submarines, I am of the opinion that that country will at once lock up its dreadnaughts in some safe harbor.

This is precisely what Great Britain has had to do and is now doing with her dreadnaughts in the present war. Sir Percy Scott predicted that in any future war there would be—

> no use for battleships, and very little chance of much employment of fast cruisers. The navy will be entirely changed; naval officers will no longer live on the sea, but either above it or under it, and the strain on their system and nerves will be so great that a very lengthy period of service will not be advisable. It will be a navy of youth, for we shall require nothing but boldness and daring.

This great English admiral says that—

> the function of a battleship is to attack an enemy's fleet; but there will be no fleet to attack, as it will not be safe for a fleet to put to sea.

This prediction of Sir Percy Scott has been conclusively demonstrated during the present war; and as he further says, referring to maneuvers which he had seen:

> This demonstration should have made us realize that, now that submarines have come in, battleships are of no use either for defensive or offensive purposes, and consequently building any more in 1914 will be a misuse of money subscribed by the citizens for the defense of the Empire.

He is a sailor who has spent his life on the sea and achieved great distinction in his profession, and is, of course, better qualified to speak than some uninformed Member of Congress who has the audacity to hold an opinion contrary to great naval experts like the gentlemen from Tennessee, North Carolina, and elsewhere. [Applause.]

Secretary Daniels differs from Sir Percy Scott. He says that—

> submarines are an experiment and that our main reliance in the future must be upon battleships and dreadnaughts.

But it should be remembered that Mr. Daniels's experience as a sailor was on Tar River in North Carolina, and his taste naturally inclines him to the larger ship.

Notwithstanding North Carolina differs from Great Britain, I humbly submit that Sir Percy Scott has earned his reputation as a prophet.

The General Board and the Navy League insist that four new battleships should be provided for. It is given out that the program of Secretary Daniels for two will be adopted. What will be thought 10 years hence of the American Congress if it yields to these insensate demands? Advanced Navy leaguists claim that an insufficient number of dreadnaughts is worse than none. I suggest, then, that we take them at their word and do the better thing. In spite of all its activities, with conclusive demonstration of the destructiveness and effectiveness of the submarine staring them in the face, the Navy League, so sensitive in regard to our defenseless condition, has never, so far as I know, once raised its voice in behalf of the construction of submarines. The advocates of battleships are some people. Members of Congress and others, who are victims of an obsession—the Navy League, which wants more money spent and more offices provided, and builders who want more orders with the resultant profits. In our naval policy heretofore, but at a safe distance, we have followed England. Let us follow her now. The British Admiralty, so it is reported, has issued orders that no new battleships are to be constructed. All the shipbuilding plants of England to-day are said to be at work on submarines, and the papers state that an effort was made to have a supplemental number built in this country. Charles M. Schwab, it is authoritatively stated, had a contract to build here 20 submarines for the use of England.

Immediately upon the publication of Sir Percy Scott's letter frugal Holland ceased to build battleships and dreadnaughts. The minister of the Navy of Japan is said to have issued orders that no more battleships shall be built, but that torpedo vessels, submarines, and destroyers are to be provided in lieu of the dreadnaughts, so far as new construction is concerned.

The lessons taught by the present European war appear to be that the torpedo carriers—to wit, the fast destroyers and the invisible submarine, together with the fast scout cruiser—will constitute the efficient naval vessels of the future. It has been stated that England is building a 5,000-ton cruiser of the *Sydney* type, the scout cruiser that sunk the German cruiser *Karlsruhe;* but we do not find our Navy Department making any estimates for valuable vessels of this type. The dreadnaught is sacred. Nothing must interfere with the department securing the maximum number of these expensive luxuries. Cruisers of the type of the *Sydney* and the submersible ships are so far the only vessels that have established great value in the hard tests of battle. Then why should we do that which Sir Percy Scott said nearly a year ago would be a criminal waste of the public funds? Why not, if we must appropriate such large sums as this bill calls for, spend it for vessels that are shown to be worth while instead of in huge and costly ships that have never been really tested in war?

"Oh, but," the supporters of the dreadnaughts will say, "the big battleship can whip anything afloat on the ocean." That

may be true of anything floating on the surface of the ocean; but the danger is from below, and from that direction a greater, and from a mysterious and an unmatched power.

Again, say the big-battleship protagonists, "the submarines are all right for defense, but they have no radius worth considering, and can not go out into the great oceans."

Capt. Otto Wedigen, commanding the *U–9*, went more than 200 miles from his base in or near the Kiel Canal to find and sink the three English cruisers in less than 60 minutes. From a position 12 feet under water and at a distance of, it is safe to say, approximately a mile he launched his first torpedo at the unfortunate English ship, the *Aboukir*. She sunk in a few minutes. The other two boats were quickly dispatched. I do not care to even repeat the story of this horror. I refer to it as proof of my contention that in modern naval warfare, as in the contest between the Philistine and Israelite champions, David is the better man.

Now, a word more as to the radius of these subsurface boats.

More than a year ago I read somewhere that they were being built with power to go nearly a thousand miles out to sea and back again. Very recently I have seen it stated that now the newest, largest, and most powerful submarines are being built with the idea of going 1,250 miles out to sea and back again.

Who is prepared to say what the radius will be in one or two or five years?

Who will be so bold as to fix a limit to the powers of the scientist and engineer?

Is it not easily conceivable that in a short time submarine boats of increased speed and power may cross the Atlantic? I read:

NEW GERMAN SUBMARINE AN INDEPENDENT CRUISER.

LONDON, *January 23.*

The Daily Mail's Copenhagen correspondent says he learns from Hamburg that one of the new German supermarines has just finished trial runs in the Bay of Helgoland and that she proved well suited for the purpose for which she was constructed.

This giant submarine, the correspondent adds, is of the type that carries supplies for three months, and is not under the necessity of putting into a port or having recourse to the parent ship.

About 12 or 14 years ago I saw my first submarine. I had the privilege of going under the water in it. After the first plunge I got over my timidity, and in subsequent submersions I studied, as well as a nontechnical man can, the boat and its possibilities. I was convinced that it is the most wonderful weapon ever invented, and that on the defensive it could withstand any force sent against it. I did not believe then that it could become the powerful offensive arm into which it has since developed and which in some ways I regret.

I would like to see the weapons of aggression lose their potency and those of a defensive nature increase theirs. It would make for peace. It would thwart the schemes of ambitious monarchs and leave the people freer to develop socially and economically. It is the ideal weapon for a Government like ours which harbors no schemes of conquest.

With an adequate supply of submarines, 30 or 40 of which can be built for the cost of one battleship, the United States could not be successfully attacked by any power or possible combination of powers, and millions a year could be saved to the taxpayers. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall print with my speech a few selected clippings from newspapers representing the sentiment of this and other countries. The first of these that I shall print is the celebrated letter of Admiral Sir Percy Scott, in which we find these striking statements:

Now that submarines have come in battleships are of no use, either for defensive or offensive purposes, and consequently building any more in 1914 will be a misuse of money subscribed by the citizens for the defense of the Empire.

Under these circumstances I can see no use for battleships and very little chance of much employment for fast cruisers.

The submarine when in water must be kept away from, not looked for.

What we require is an enormous fleet of submarines, airships, and aeroplanes, and a few fast cruisers, provided we can find a place to keep them in safety during war time.

If we go to war with a country that is in striking distance of submarines, I am of opinion that that country will at once lock up their dreadnaughts in some safe harbor. We shall do the same.

[From the Army and Navy Register.]

THE SUBMARINE MENACE.

The London Times of June 12 published a letter from Sir Percy Scott concerning the "Uselessness of great battleships." The position taken by the distinguished writer is the subject of editorial comment elsewhere in this issue. The letter to the Times is as follows:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR: Although I have retired from His Majesty's navy, many people have written and are still writing to me as to whether we should build small battleships or large. My opinion is that we should not be building either. My reasons for holding this opinion will be found in a letter I wrote some time ago, and a copy of which I inclose herewith.

I am, yours, truly,

PERCY SCOTT.

52 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, *May 31.*

52 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE W.,
December 15, 1913.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter I have seen the correspondence in the press suggesting building smaller battleships and also the arguments as to whether two or four battleships should be laid down in 1914.

If we have battleships, we must have thick armor on them to keep out the enemy's shot, and we must have speed to give a tactical advantage in bringing our fire on the enemy. These are axioms among naval officers. For battleships our nation and all other nations have very properly decided to have big ships, big guns, thick armor, and high speed.

The other question is, Are we in 1914 to build two or four battleships? The little navyites say two in order to save money; the big navyites say four to, as they think, save the country. If battleships are of use in saving the country, the little navyites are foolish and unpatriotic. If battleships are of no use, then the big navyites are wrong in putting the country to the expense of building four more; the real question to settle before even talking about building more battleships is, Are they of use or are they not? For some thousands of years armed vessels floating on the surface of the water have been used for attack and defense; these vessels to-day vary in size from a canoe containing one man armed with a spear to a 32,000-ton battleship armed with 15-inch guns, and these craft, whether large or small, all float on the water and are visible. In this island we depend upon our food supply coming from overseas; hence it has been necessary for us to have a large number of armed ships to protect our commerce and to safeguard our food supply. This protecting force or insurance of our country is called the Royal Navy and to-day consists of a large number of ships that swim on the water and can be seen and a few that swim under the water and can not be seen.

The introduction of the vessels that swim under water has, in my opinion, entirely done away with the utility of the ships that swim on the top of the water.

The functions of a vessel of war were:

Defensively:

1. To attack ships that come to bombard our ports.
2. To attack ships that come to blockade us.
3. To attack ships convoying a landing party.
4. To attack the enemy's fleet.
5. To attack ships interfering with our commerce.

Offensively:

1. To bombard an enemy's ports.
2. To blockade an enemy.
3. To convoy a landing party.
4. To attack the enemy's fleet.
5. To attack the enemy's commerce.

The submarine renders 1, 2, and 3 impossible, as no man-of-war will dare to come even within sight of a coast that is adequately protected by sumarines; therefore the functions of a battleship, as regards 1, 2, and 3, both defensively and offensively, have disappeared.

The fourth function of a battleship is to attack an enemy's fleet, but there will be no fleet to attack, as it will not be safe for a fleet to put to sea. This has been demonstrated in all recent maneuvers, both at home and abroad, where submarines have been employed, and the demonstration should have made us realize that, now that submarines have come in, battleships are of no use either for defensive or offensive purposes, and consequently building any more in 1914 will be a misuse of money subscribed by the citizens for the defense of the empire.

As regards the protection of our commerce on the high seas, we must examine who can interfere with it.

Turkey, Greece, Austria, and Italy must pass through the narrow Straits of Gibraltar to get at our commerce.

Cyprus, Malta, and Gibraltar, well equipped with aeroplanes to observe the enemy's movements, and submarines to attack him, would make egress from the Mediterranean very difficult.

Spain and Portugal have ports open to the Atlantic and could interfere with our commerce, but war with those countries seems very improbable, and they are not very far from Gibraltar.

France from Brest could harass our commerce, but if homeward-bound ships gave that port a wide berth and signaled by wireless if they were attacked, fast cruisers and submarines from Plymouth could be very soon on the spot.

Russia and Germany are very badly placed for interfering with our commerce; to get to the Atlantic they must either run the gantlet of the Channel or pass to the north of Scotland, and even if they get out they have nowhere to coal.

America could attack our commerce, but they would have a long way to come.

If by submarines we close egress from the North Sea and Mediterranean, it is difficult to see how our commerce can be much interfered with.

It has been suggested to me that submarines and aeroplanes could not stop egress from the Mediterranean; that a fleet would steam through at night. With aeroplanes that would report the approach of a fleet and 30 or 40 invisible submarines in the narrow Strait of Gibraltar, trying to pass through them at night would be a very risky operation.

Submarines and aeroplanes have entirely revolutionized naval warfare; no fleet can hide itself from the aeroplane, and the submarine can deliver a deadly attack even in broad daylight.

Under these circumstances I can see no use for battleships and very little chance of much employment for fast cruisers. The navy will be entirely changed; naval officers will no longer live on the sea, but either above it or under it, and the strain on their system and nerves will be so great that a very lengthy period of service will not be advisable; it will be a navy of youth, for we shall require nothing but boldness and daring.

In war time the scouting aeroplanes will always be high above on the lookout and the submarines in constant readiness, as are the engines at a fire station. If an enemy is sighted, the gong sounds, and the leash of a flotilla of submarines will be slipped. Whether it be night or day, fine or rough, they must go out to search for their quarry; if they find her she is doomed, and they give no quarter; they can not board her and take her as a prize, as in the olden days; they only wait till she sinks, and then return home without even knowing the number of human beings that they have sent to the bottom of the ocean.

Will any battleship expose herself to such a dead certainty of destruction? I say no.

Not only is the open sea unsafe; a battleship is not immune from attack even in a closed harbor, for the so-called protecting boom at the entrance can easily be blown up. With a flotilla of submarines commanded by dashing young officers, of whom we have plenty, I would undertake to get through any boom into any harbor and sink or materially damage all the ships in that harbor.

If a battleship is not safe either on the high seas or in harbor, what is the use of a battleship?

It has been argued to me that if a foreign power destroys our submarines we are at the mercy of his dreadnaughts. There can be no doubt about the accuracy of this statement, but submarines are difficult to destroy, because it is difficult to attack what you can not see. A power that sends out ships to look for and destroy submarines will be courting disaster; the submarine when in the water must be kept away from, not looked for.

Submarines will be hauled up on land, with arrangements for instantly launching them when required; they can only be attacked by airships dropping bombs on them.

What we require is an enormous fleet of submarines, airships, and aeroplanes, and a few fast cruisers, provided we can find a place to keep them in safety during war time.

It has been argued to me that our enemy will seize some island in the Atlantic, get some fast cruisers there, with plenty of coal, and from this island prey on our commerce. This is ridiculous; the moment we hear of it we send a flotilla of submarines towed by an Atlantic liner, she drops them just when in sight of the island, and she brings them back to England when they have sunk everything they found at the island.

If we go to war with a country that is within the striking distance of submarines, I am of opinion that that country will at once lock up their dreadnaughts in some safe harbor; we shall do the same; their aeroplanes and airships will fly over our country; they will know exactly where our ships are, and their submarines will come over and destroy anything and everything that they can get at.

We shall, of course, do the same; but an island with many harbors and much shipping is at a great disadvantage if the enemy has submarines.

I do not think that the importance of submarines has been fully recognized; neither do I think that it has been realized how completely their advent has revolutionized naval warfare. In my opinion, as the motor vehicle has driven the horse from the road so has the submarine driven the battleship from the seas.

I am, yours, truly, PERCY SCOTT.

A few weeks ago I read an Associated Press dispatch from London which said that the British Admiralty would hurry to completion such battleships as were in process of construction, but would lay down no more. This may be only a shrewd surmise. It can hardly be more, for the Admiralty certainly would not have its secrets cabled around the world, but it is so reasonable that I believe it.

Mr. Chairman, I protest against the expenditure of vast sums of the people's money for vessels of war that all men must now doubt the value of and great sailors say are obsolete. Let us make the country safe against attack by providing the best weapons, but let us avoid waste by refusing to buy any of even doubtful value. This of all times in our history is the one in which we can best afford to go slow in the matter of military equipment. [Applause.]

The great navies of the world are destroying each other. It is entirely within the range of possibility, Mr. Chairman, that before this House convenes again after it adjourns to-day the United States may be the greatest naval power in the world. If the commanders of these battleships have the courage and indiscretion to go out upon the high seas, it is entirely within the range of possibility that before the survivors would come limping back to their home port the Government of the United States will, I repeat, possess the greatest and most powerful Navy in the world. We can afford to wait. The interest of the people demands we should wait, Mr. Chairman, and I sincerely hope that this House will try to make a record for economy in its closing hours and that we will reduce the waste of public funds in the way that has been proposed by the committee. [Applause.]

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer.]

THE "FORMIDABLE."

The sinking of British warships by mines and submarines is not merely a matter of luck. It has become apparent that the numerous British disasters are the result of a systematic campaign planned by the German naval authorities.

The losses are already so great that Great Britain can not ignore them as insignificant. Ship after ship has been destroyed by unseen agencies. Slowly, but with amazing system, the Germans are reducing the size of the navy which holds their own ships bottled in Prussian havens of refuge. And while the British are losing their ships the Germans are losing almost nothing. Disregarding the battle of the Falklands, which practically wiped out the German force beyond the North Sea, the naval performances of the war have been strongly to the advantage of the Germans.

Of course, the Germans have a better field for operations. The British ships are in the open and can be easily found by the prowling submarines and mine layers. British retaliation in kind is practically impossible, as the Germans do not come out into the open sea.

The war is certain to be long. If month after month the Germans continue to pick off the British ships the vast British superiority will eventually vanish. With anything like equality of forces the Germans will surely come out for battle. The virtual blockade of the German coast is very irksome, and as soon as a fight can be risked without utter foolhardiness the Germans will attempt to open their harbors.

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, October 29, 1914.]

JAPAN FOR DEFENSIVE—NAVAL BUDGET DOES NOT CONTEMPLATE EXPANSION—RUSSIA'S FAITH IN NIPPON—SO DECLARES MINISTER OF JUSTICE OZAKI IN OUTLINING PLAN TO CONSTRUCT ONLY SUBMARINES AND TORPEDO-BOAT DESTROYERS, "TO SET AT REST ANY SUSPICION SOME NAVAL POWER MAY HAVE."

NEW YORK, *October 28.*

The East and West News Bureau to-day issued the following statement received from Tokyo:

"Yukio Ozaki, minister of justice, who has heretofore consistently advocated the disadvantage of Japan's entering into the race of armament expansion with the great powers, has made a statement with regard to the navy and army budget to be presented before the coming Diet.

WOULD ALLAY SUSPICION.

"'In the next budget,' he says, 'no proposal for construction of any new battleship will be made. It will only provide for building of submarines and torpedo-boat destroyers, with the sole purpose of placing the defense of Japan's adjacent seas on a safer basis. This will set at rest any suspicion some naval power may have harbored toward Japan.'"

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, January 8, 1915.]

THE SUBMARINES.

In deep-sea warfare the battleships and armored cruisers will continue to play an important part, but it is already dangerous for such craft to approach anywhere near the shore of an enemy's country, and it will become more so with the improvement of submarines and experience in their use.

The present war has taught that fortifications avail nothing against big siege guns, and it has also impressed the lesson that the greatest dreadnaught is helpless against the insidious attack of the hidden submarine, of whose approach it has no warning until struck by its torpedoes.

These lessons are important ones for the United States, and should be applied to the question of adequate defense, now so much discussed. With big siege guns mounted on the forts that line our coasts, guns that will carry great shells many miles to sea, and a sufficient force of submarines, the landing of an invading army in this country would be such a hazardous task as no European nation will be willing to undertake.

It has been revealed beyond doubt that the British ship *Formidable* was sunk in the English Channel by a German submarine operating probably from one of the towns held by the Germans on the Belgian coast.

A British submarine went under the water out of reach of the forts on both shores of the Dardanelles, sunk a Turkish battleship, and returned by the same route unhurt. How could a transport ship with thousands of soldiers on board, however it might be convoyed, land on the coast of the United States if this country were well supplied with submarines?

It is the German submarines that now protect Bremen, Hamburg, and other German cities in reach of ships from attack. The British and French fleets combined greatly outnumber those of Germany, and under the old conditions they would long ago have assailed the sheltered position of the German fleet beyond Helgoland, about the Elbe's mouth, and in the entrance to the Kiel Canal. To do so with the submarines in use would be to court destruction.

If there had been no submarines and no mines, the first efforts of the British in the present war would have been the destruction of the German Navy. They would have followed it into secluded places, as Nelson did the French fleets at Trafalgar and in the Battle of the Nile.

The big ships will still be needed in the navies of the world for long-distance cruises and fighting in the open seas, but submarines will otherwise revolutionize naval warfare. They are all powerful for coast defense.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, January 2, 1915.]

VICTIMS OF THE SUBMARINE.

The dispatches rouse again the old query, "What's in a name?" Here is H. M. S. *Formidable* at the bottom of the channel, sunk with all on board by an invisible adversary. The *Formidable* lived up to its name only in looks and on paper; in the pinch it was far from formidable. Down went the battleship like an iron pail with a hole punched in the bottom.

The truly formidable craft in this war are the submarines, cheap and humble creations of marine architecture. They are not imposing in line of parade or decorated with fire-breathing names. They struggle through life as colorless units designated by number and letter. The navy departments require a card index to keep track of them. Then suddenly the *E–9* or the *B–11* humbly and dutifully chucks a Whitehead torpedo at a huge and haughty battleship, and Davy Jones gets a fresh companion.

This ought to demonstrate that battleships are costly investments. No doubt they are needed to deliver hard blows, but even at that the mortality among them is bound to be frightful. The larger they are the better targets they become for the stalking submarine. Too slow for scouting blockade work, battleships seem destined to go by the board. Unless the battleship demonstrates its usefulness very shortly it can hardly avoid the scrap heap.

The prospect is encouraging. Battleships are too expensive. The burden of building and maintaining them is too heavy for mankind to bear. Their development no doubt advanced the science of marine construction; but having learned how to build such huge warships, it is now high time to quit building them.

Possibly the world will now enter upon a new era of naval expansion, in which larger and larger submarines will be constructed. But as the submarine has limited the size of surface warships, so is it likely that some future development will operate to keep submarines within reasonable size.

[From the Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post.]

DOUBTFUL INVESTMENTS.

Battleships and forts are two of the costliest objects of military expenditure. This war has demonstrated that the latter, as a means of repelling land attacks, are a poor investment, and has indicated the probability that the day of the dreadnaught is closing.

The Germans have shown that under favorable conditions a submarine can strike and sink any vessel, and it is entirely probable that invention within the next five years will increase the submarine's power of attack much more than it will increase the dreadnaught's power of defense. With better lungs and eyes a submarine would stand an excellent chance of stopping any battleship now.

It is also possible that no battleship laid down now can keep afloat under the attack of aircraft 5 years hence. Within 5 months a big question mark has been written against military objects on which hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent during the last 20 years.

[From the London Morning Post.]

THE NAVAL POSITION—A NEW BATTLESHIP.

[From our naval correspondent.]

The naval and military policy of the United States is her own affair, and criticism of it might by our American friends be considered impertinent. There are, however, certain passages in President Wilson's message to the United States Congress—quoted in these columns yesterday—which, as they strangely resemble assertions with which we used to be familiar in this country, may be usefully considered by the British public. Of that part of the message dealing with the military aspect this is not the place to speak, except to remark that President Wilson affirms that a system of voluntary military training is "right American policy" and is "the only thing we can do or will do," and that if the President thinks that such a force can be raised "for mere health's sake" he is likely to be disappointed.

But, says the President, "a powerful Navy we have always regarded as our proper and natural means of defense." Very right. British politicians have for many years been saying the same thing, and saying it so often that they sometimes induced the public to believe that the mere affirmation of a principle was equivalent to possessing a powerful navy—so potent is the influence of iteration. But the President went on to ask a very pertinent question, which is being asked by a large number of people in this country to-day, "Who shall tell us now what sort of Navy to build?" The immediate answer is that there are many naval architects, both in America and this country, who are competent to supply the information required. The United States enjoys at present the inestimable privilege of being able to benefit by the experience of a naval war in which she is not herself engaged. The conclusion drawn by the President is that no type of vessel can survive the rapid evolution of new ships of war for 10 consecutive years, and he implies that it is therefore of no use to build any ships at all. The same argument has been frequently heard in the British House of Commons.

The United States shipbuilding program for the current year suggests that America is waiting on events, although with some apparent inconsistency, she is to build two battleships; for if there is one class of vessel more than another concerning which doubts are entertained, it is the existing type of battleship. It may, of course, be that the United States Navy Department will design a new type. That a new type must be evolved is certain. A battleship or a battle cruiser which can be sunk by mine and by submarine torpedo attack is deprived of one-half its value. The other half consists in its ability to meet the enemy's ships of the same class. When the submarine is sufficiently developed to enable it to operate upon equal terms with the battleship in respect of sea endurance and speed, the value of the present battleship will disappear altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks to insert as part of his remarks some memoranda, and also to extend other parts of his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I asked to be stopped when I get to the end of three-quarters of an hour, because I have agreed to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

FLOATING HAS BEENS.

SLOWER THAN THE SLOWEST.

Mr. Chairman, the fastest battleship or armored cruiser which the United States has ever owned or owns to-day, built or building, is slower than the slowest of the nine big warships which fought last Sunday in the North Sea. The *Blücher*, which was sunk because she was 5 knots slower than her companions, was faster than any vessel in our Navy to-day, built or building, except the small fry like destroyers and scouts.

Three of the five British battle cruisers, the *Tiger*, the *Lion*, and the *Princess Royal*, carry more powerful guns than any which have ever been carried by an American ship, except the dreadnaught *Texas* and the dreadnaught *New York*. Great Britain has 26 battleships, built and building, which carry as powerful guns as the *Lion* and the *Princess Royal;* we have, built and building, just 6 ships which carry such powerful guns.

GIVE US FULL CREWS.

What we need most in the Navy to-day is men. We ought to have enough men to provide full crews for all our ships now in commission and in addition full crews for such of our ships "in reserve" as ought to be put in commission. There is not much sense in building ships and then putting them in cold storage for lack of crews to man them. Eighteen thousand men is what we need, say Admiral Badger and Assistant Secretary Roosevelt. In my worthless judgment 18,000 men added to the Navy to-day would help our defense more than 50,000 men added to the Army.

The Navy constitutes our first line of defense, and the harbor fortifications and the field Army constitute our second line of defense. If we are so anemic that we can not spare enough for both services, for heaven's sake let us spend the money on the Navy and let the Monroe doctrine go. But do not fool yourself into thinking that we can enforce the Monroe doctrine while we sit at home in our own easy chairs.

THE BUILDING PROGRAM.

I stand for the building program of the General Board of the Navy from turret to foundation stone. What has possessed the Naval Committee in times like these to cut that building program in two is one of those things nobody can find out.

Another thing nobody can find out is why Chairman PADGETT absolutely refused to summon before his committee as witnesses Admiral Knight, Admiral Winslow, Admiral Wainwright, and Admiral Brownson. Either Capt. Hobson or I asked for every one of those men.

What possesses you gentlemen to declare that two battleships this year is a long step toward building up the Navy? Do not you know that the General Board of the Navy has reported that two battleships must be begun in 1915 to take the places of the *Kearsarge* and *Kentucky*, which became antiquated this year? At the rate of speed you are running you will just manage to stay about in the same place. If you want to get ahead, you must run twice as fast as that. You must vote for four battleships this year, as the General Board of the Navy advises. By the way, I wish some one would tell me what, in heaven above or in the earth beneath, is the sense of creating a board of our very best Navy officers to give us advice if we are going to use their reports only as kindling for the furnace of our superheated and childishly self-complacent eloquence?

A NAVY CATECHISM.

I have taken the liberty of assuming that the Members of this Congress are as ignorant on the question of the Navy as I was after I had sat in this House for nearly 12 years. So I have prepared a series of questions and answers concerning certain matters which ought to be familiar to every legislator, but which were, as a matter of fact, entirely unfamiliar to me until four or five months ago:

Question. What is the General Board of the Navy?

Answer. It is an advisory board, composed of the very ablest officers of the Navy.

Question. What does the General Board advise?

Answer. Among other things, it advises us what ships to build to insure our safety, and it advises us how to man those ships.

Question. What do we do with the General Board's advice?

Answer. We chuck it in the wastebasket year after year.

Question. What does the General Board advise for a building program this year?

Answer. It advises 4 battleships, 16 destroyers, 3 fleet submarines, 16 coast submarines, 4 scout cruisers, 4 gunboats, 7 auxiliaries, and $5,000,000 for the air service.

Question. What are we going to do with the General Board's advice this year?

Answer. We are going to chuck it into the wastebasket, as usual. The committee has more than cut the program in two, except in the matter of submarines.

Question. Is the shipbuilding program which the General Board advises supposed to be sufficient to insure our safety against Great Britain?

Answer. By no means. It is supposed to be sufficient to insure our safety against any nation except Great Britain.

Question. Why is that?

Answer. I give it up.

Question. Are there any authentic figures published showing the standing of the United States Navy as compared with other navies?

Answer. The Bureau of Naval Intelligence in our Navy Department published on July 1, 1914, a table of the warship tonnage of the world's navies.

Question. What did that table show?

Answer. It showed the war tonnage of Great Britain to be 2,157,850 tons, of Germany to be 951,713 tons, of the United States to be 765,133 tons. If you count also the war vessels then building, France led the United States. In other words, in war vessels built and building we stood fourth.

Question. How many battleships of the first line have we?

Answer. We have 10 battleships of the first line, according to the official Navy Directory of January 1, 1915; but 2 of those battleships are slated for retirement to the second line on March 3, 1915.

Question. How many battleships does the Committee on Naval Affairs claim for the first line?

Answer. Twenty-one is the number given on page 39 of its report.

Question. How does this difference arise?

Answer. It is the same old story of counting your chickens before they are hatched. The committee's list includes four ships that are building and three more whose keels have never yet been laid. If we are lucky, they may be ready in 1918. Meanwhile others will be becoming obsolete. Furthermore, the committee has performed the feat of resurrecting the semi-obsolete *Kansas*, *Minnesota*, *Vermont*, and *New Hampshire* from the limbo of the second line and has restored them to the company of the dreadnaughts of the first line; which, by the way, is a sin, whoever did it.

Question. Is our Navy, man for man, as good as foreign navies?

Answer. No one knows. The Secretary of the Navy refuses to publish the figures for target practice.

Question. Is our Navy, ship for ship, as good as foreign navies?

Answer. No one knows. The Secretary of the Navy says so; but recently when an attempt was made to mobilize the 12 submarines which constitute the flotilla for the Atlantic coast it was found that only 1 of them could dive.

Question. Is our fleet prepared for war?

Answer. Against the Mexican fleet; yes. Against a formidable enemy; no. Secretary Daniels in his annual report has a subdivision, which he entitles "Proof of the preparedness of the fleet."

Question. Do other authorities agree with Secretary Daniels?

Answer. They do not. Assistant Secretary Roosevelt has testified that a dozen of our battleships and some 70 or 80 smaller craft are in "cold storage," and that they only can be got out in from 3 to 12 months' time.

Question. What do you mean by "cold storage"?

Answer. Either "in reserve" or "in ordinary" or "out of commission."

Question. What is the difference between a vessel "in reserve" and a vessel "in ordinary"?

Answer. "In ordinary" is scrap-heap common, and "in reserve" is scrap-heap preferred. In reserve a ship has from a quarter to one-half a crew aboard; in ordinary a ship has enough men on board to scare off the rats.

Question. Does anyone else disagree with Secretary Daniels?

Answer. Well, Admiral Fiske, the chief for operations of the fleet, testified that it would take five years to get the Navy in shape to meet a first-class power. Admiral Fletcher, commander of the North Atlantic Fleet, has just written a letter in which he says that there is "an alarming shortage" of 5,219 men and 339 officers aboard the 21 battleships in full commission under his command. Admiral Strauss says that every battleship in commission is "equipped with a short-range torpedo which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet." Admiral Knight testifies that there is no unity of effort in the fleet. The General Board of the Navy testified last year that the absence of a definite naval policy has placed us in a position of inferiority which is getting more and more marked. Commander Stirling was rebuked by Secretary Daniels for calling attention to the shocking condition of the submarine fleet. Admiral Badger testified that we are 18,000 men short of what we ought to have to man our ships. Capt. Bristol testifies that we have only 12 Navy aeroplanes where we ought to have 200, and so it goes; and yet gentlemen talk of our "preparedness."

Well, what are we going to do about it? The immediate question before us is the building program for the next fiscal year. I favor the program recommended by the General Board of the Navy. The board's building program for the fiscal year, which begins on July 1, 1915, without a break from one end to the other is what I stand for.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman kindly tell us what that program would cost?

Mr. GARDNER. I have no idea, and I do not care, so long as I believe it is a necessary expense.

WE NEED A COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

I regard it as of very great importance to provide for a commission to examine into this whole question, to bring fresh minds to bear upon the problem—not men who are defending the work of their own departments, not legislators who are examining the results of their own committee decisions of the past. I hope to see a commission appointed, partly by the President, partly by the Speaker, and partly by the President of the Senate—a commission which will get together and consider the problem of our defense as a whole, not by piecemeal. At present we have eight different committees of the House and Senate which possess jurisdiction over the problem. Can anyone reasonably expect an intelligent solution under the circumstances? I want new blood; I want a commission which will send for the junior officers and get their real opinions. I want a commission which will send for enlisted men and say, "What is your view as to the length of time required to make an able seaman out of a green recruit? Do you believe that merchant-marine training is a step in the journey toward the making of a man-of-war's man?" I want to see Congress get out of this rut of sending, year after year, only for the bureau chiefs.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think that the recommendations of the commission he proposes would have any greater influence with Members of Congress than the board that we now have?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I do, because that commission would be watched by the American people from the start. The moment the American people know where to turn for accurate information our fight for an adequate Navy is won.

PEACE! PEACE!

Andrew Carnegie has given $10,000,000 as a fund with which to persuade the world that a flexible spine is a better defense than a mighty biceps, but he will never be able to persuade us Americans. Our people will never say "Amen" to such a doctrine as that. The doctrine is not new, by the way. Cobden, the great British apostle of free trade, preached on that text in England in the middle of the last century. I am going to read you from one of his letters written in 1842. Here is what he wrote:

It has struck me that it would be well to try to engraft our free-trade agitation upon the peace movement. They are one and the same cause.

Twenty-two years later Cobden and his school forced Lord Palmerston, the British premier, to abstain from helping out Denmark when Germany and Austria together combined to take away from her Schleswig-Holstein. Great Britain was prevented from interfering by the peace advocates, and what has happened? The Kiel Canal, which connects the North Sea with the Baltic, was cut across Schleswig-Holstein. That intersea canal could never have been so advantageously cut if Schleswig-Holstein had not been taken from Denmark, and the German fleet to-day would be still more seriously restricted in its operations. So you see that the mistakes of the British pacificists of the nineteenth century were but a prelude to the mistakes of the British pacificists of the twentieth century. Ever since the war, "which could not possibly occur," broke out Great Britain has been paying the bill for her lack of preparation against war.

How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

INTERNATIONAL ARMIES.

Mr. GARDNER. I am going to say a word about international courts and international armies, because as fast as one dream is shattered the income of Mr. Carnegie's $10,000,000 is paying men to invent new dreams and believe them. When, last August, the dream that the bankers would not allow the European countries to have any war was shattered, and the dream that workingmen would not fight each other merely because they wore different uniforms was shattered also—the moment those dreams were dissipated a new vision was promptly dreamed. If I had $10,000,000 to spend in the business I could get people to dream dreams just as fast as Mr. Carnegie or anybody else can get them.

What is the new dream? An international court and an international army to enforce its decrees—no less.

Supposing that that international court were to decide that the Chinese and the Japanese ought to have equal rights with men of other nationalities to be admitted into this country—which, by the way, is by no means an unlikely decision for an international court to render—do you think that our workingmen would allow us to lie down and permit it? Supposing the international army and the international navy were obliged to attack us in order to force the admission of those Chinese and Japanese, would the American division of the international army fight with the rest of the international army or against it? And if it mutinied, what would be the future of that international army?

Supposing the international court decided that if we would not secure debts owed to foreign countries by Mexico and would not protect foreign investments or persons in Mexico the international army would have the right to do it in our stead—and that is also a very possible verdict—what would happen then? Would we stand by and see that international army invade Mexico? And if the international court decrees that it shall

do so, shall we have no need for an army and navy to resist the international army and the international navy?

My friends, the theory is growing up in the world that the various people of Europe have an inherent right to migrate to the United States or elsewhere if they so desire. You meet that theory in every sort of foreign publication. Our right to exclude immigration seeking to come to these shores has been challenged more than once. Do you suppose our people would bow to an international decision which denied our right to control immigration?

Supposing the doctrine of the single tax becomes an international doctrine, and that also is quite possible. Supposing the international court decides that no man, no nation, no body of men has the right to own the unearned increment of real estate, that no body of men has the right to an unqualified title to the land, for the land is not the product of man's work but the gift of God. Supposing the international court decides that way, are we to give the Ethiopian or the Hindu an equal share in the land for which our fathers toiled and fought? Supposing the international court should say, "You must not be selfish. You must admit immigrants from the overcrowded countries of Europe, and give them some of the wonderful prairie land in the Dakotas. The Lord never meant that land to be parceled out to pioneers in quarter sections. He meant it for the whole world." How about our quota of the international army, when the international court starts to enforce that decree?

Suppose that by some strange mischance two nations at the same time are dissatisfied with the international court. Suppose, for example, that a question arises which involves the right of passage through the Dardanelles or through the Suez Canal, where several nations' interests are vitally concerned. Suppose two powerful nations simultaneously refuse to submit to a decree by an international court on some question involving the commerce of the Mediterranean. The international army will have its hands full. It must ask for more troops, and the United States will be called on for additional men and more money. Do you believe that public opinion in this country would support any administration which involved the United States in a Mediterranean dispute in which we were not concerned? Ask yourselves whether you would vote the additional troops and the additional money for the international army.

WHY NATIONS FIGHT.

In arguing this question do not forget that besides the great question of trade there is another prolific cause of warfare between nations and between men, and that is insolence. A little international insolence will do more to bring on a war than any kind of a trade dispute which you can conceive of. I have not much question that in my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the epoch which preceded the Revolution the anger of the people of the town of Boston was aroused more by international insolence than by any question of taxation.

NAVAL DISARMAMENT.

After this war is over, assuming that the allies are successful, many people think that there will be a general disarmament, and that Great Britain will consent to forego her navy. Let us not forget that Great Britain is the only populous country which can not practically feed itself. Therefore it is essential to Great Britain's security that she take no risk of being shut off from her ocean trade. Will she be willing to trust the safety of her ocean trade to the good will of other nations? Such a notion seems to me to be fantastic; yet, of course, it is conceivable that Great Britain might consent to forego her navy if other nations did the same. That would be no true disarmament, however, for in case of war her ocean-going merchant marine is so enormous and so much more powerful than that of other nations that she could easily convert a part of her fleet into warships and still have plenty left for commerce.

GREAT BRITAIN'S TWO-POWER STANDARD.

Great Britain undertakes to have as big a navy as any two European nations put together. Are we forever to go ahead and ignore what that means? Why, recently I received a petition asking me to vote for a reduction in the estimates for our Navy. Why? Because, as my petitioner declared, everybody will be exhausted and unable to fight after this European war is over, except, perhaps, Great Britain, and she is friendly. Well, she is friendly to-day, but in international affairs it is just as it is in politics. Your friend of to-day is the man you may be fighting to-morrow. If we are going into a match against Great Britain in the business of whittling down navies, I should like to start to whittle on a good deal longer stick than we have at present. I do not relish whittling on a short stick while we let Great Britain whittle a little off her long stick.

As to successful nations being so exhausted that they can not fight, I do not believe it. We were never stronger in a military sense than we were in 1865 after four exhausting years of war. Moreover, the victor nations in this European war will, if they think best, provide themselves with funds by the exaction of war indemnities from the vanquished. I want this country to remain on friendly relations with the whole world; but I do not want this country to be at the mercy of any nation's friendliness. My sympathies are entirely with the allies; but, more than anything, I want this country to be in the position to feel toward Great Britain the way one strong man ought to feel toward another strong man. I do not relish the idea that our safety depends on the friendliness of our relations with Great Britain. I hate to feel that Great Britain could wipe our Navy off the seas, and yet I believe such is the case. I want a Navy so strong that our intercourse with that great power may be like the intercourse of two giants who respect each other's strong right arms. I do not any longer wish to see this country subscribe to the doctrine that we must look at Great Britain from the point of view of a man who says, "Well, I know if you choose to hit me over the head, there is nothing I can do about it."

ARE WE GOING TO WAR?

Now, do I expect war? Of course I do not expect war. No sensible man ever expects war, but sometimes war comes. If I go into a neighborhood where there is smallpox, I do not expect to catch smallpox, but I get vaccinated just the same. I hope I shall not run into anybody with my automobile this year, and I do not expect to do so, but I propose to carry some automobile insurance. I am mighty sorry, by the way, that I carried any insurance for the last few years, because I have not run into anybody, and I might as well have saved the money. You see, I am giving you the same line of reasoning as that of the gentleman who yesterday felicitated us on all the money we have saved by inadequate armament.

If we are going to have a Navy at all, let us have a real Navy, such as the General Board of the Navy recommends, and not make a halfway surrender to the torpor of anemia reenforced by the economies of the cheeseparers. If we propose to save our money and surrender to those dreams, let us openly admit it and stop humbugging the people by pretending that the Navy is ready for war.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

It is all very well to say that we shall never have any trouble if we go ahead and mind our own business. We can not go ahead in this country minding our own business. We never have done so, and probably we never shall do so, because our business is interwoven with the business of other nations. So long as that is true we are bound to have international troubles from time to time. It is pretty nearly certain that we should not be willing to arbitrate those troubles if they were to become too acute. For instance, would this country have consented to arbitrate the question of the annexation of Texas, which brought on the Mexican War? If so, we should have lost our case in any international court.

Would the North have consented to arbitrate the question of slavery? The Missouri compromise and the compromise of 1850 were nothing else but arbitrations of that question, with the usual result of arbitrations, to wit, compromises.

Possibly we might have consented to arbitrate the questions in dispute with Great Britain in 1812; but what international court would have been satisfactory to both parties? All Europe was in arms for Napoleon or against him while our troubles with Great Britain were brewing. Would we have consented to arbitrate the question as to whether the Maine was blown up from the inside or the outside, or would we have consented to arbitrate the question of whether or not Spain must get out of Cuba?

Why, we would not have arbitrated any of those questions, except, possibly, our grievances during the five years preceding the War of 1812. If we had arbitrated the disputed issues of our various wars, we should in all probability have lost nearly every one of our contentions. That is to say, we should have lost them before judges whose verdicts reflected the educated world's opinion of their day. It seems strange to intimate that the educated world would have decided against the North in 1861, and yet that conclusion is almost irresistible to the student of history.

EXHIBIT A.

LETTERS FROM GENERAL BOARD OF NAVY, 1913, ON PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND NAVAL POLICY.

From: President General Board.
To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Proposed construction, 1915.

The General Board, in compliance with the duties imposed upon it by article 167, paragraph 3, section 7, of the United States Naval Regula-

tions, 1913, submits to the department the following advice and recommendation upon matters coming within the purview of that paragraph:

Under corresponding paragraphs in preceding regulations the General Board has previously considered the needs of the fleet in relation to adequate requirements for the national defense, and presented in its memorandum G. B. No. 420–422, of September 25, 1912, and again in its letter G. B. No. 445, of March 28, 1913 (copies of which are attached), statements, giving reasons therefor, showing the minimum yearly construction for the years 1913–1917, inclusive, necessary to insure a fleet in 1920 of measurable equality with the fleets of the principal foreign powers.

The General Board as the responsible naval advisers of the Secretary under the regulations referred to above again expresses the conviction that the number and types of vessels recommended in these papers is a concrete expression of what must be considered at this time an adequate Navy for defensive purposes only.

The General Board, adhering to these convictions and recommendations previously made, proposes as the building program to be recommended by the department to Congress at the second session of the Sixty-third Congress: Four battleships, 16 destroyers and 1 destroyer tender, 8 submarines and 1 submarine tender, 2 oilers, 2 gunboats, 1 transport, 1 supply ship, and 1 hospital ship.

The above construction of vessels is submitted in their order of importance.

The General Board further invites particular attention to the fact that the four battleships recommended will not constitute a numerical increase in the battleship strength of the fleet, since these vessels would simply replace the *Indiana*, *Massachusetts*, and *Oregon*, authorized in 1890, and the *Iowa*, authorized in 1892, all of which vessels should be withdrawn, even from the reserve battle line, before the four battleships recommended can be completed.

The military necessity for the lesser units, auxiliaries and gunboats, is set forth fully in the attached memorandum; and to this may be added the statement that frequently in times past and at the present time it has been necessary to detail battleships for duty ordinarily performed by gunboats, at the expense of the military efficiency of the fleet.

While not coming directly under the duties imposed by paragraph 3, section 7, of the regulations, the General Board feels it its duty to also invite the attention of the department to the present, and increasing, inadequacy of docking facilities for the fleet. This inadequacy will increase and become more accentuated on the completion of the ships now building and projected. The board is of the opinion that in the event of war the country would be in a most serious situation, especially in the Pacific, from its lack of docking facilities, and urgently recommends that at least two docks of a capacity to take the largest ships projected be authorized at the coming session of Congress.

GEORGE DEWEY.

From: President General Board.
To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Naval policy.

1. The General Board invites the attention of the department to the fact that in the creation and maintenance of the fleet as an arm of the national defense there is not now and has never been in any true sense a governmental or departmental naval policy. The fleet as it exists is the growth of an inadequately expressed public opinion; and that growth has followed the laws of expediency to meet temporary emergencies and has had little or no relation to the true meaning of naval power, or to the Nation's need therefor for the preservation of peace, and for the support and advancement of our national policies. The Navy, like our foreign policy and diplomacy, of which it is the arm and measure of strength, is broadly national, and has no relation to party or parties; and hence, should not be affected by changes of administration; but should develop and grow with the national growth on a fixed policy that should keep it equal to the demands that will be made upon it to support our just policies on challenge, and to preserve peace.

2. The General Board has from the time of its organization in March, 1900, studied the question of naval policy from the point of view of the Nation's need, free from other influences, and having in mind solely the preservation of peace and the maintenance of the Nation's prosperity as it develops along the lines destiny has marked out, and according to the policies that have become national. In 1903 the General Board formulated its opinion as to what the naval development of the Nation should be, and established a policy for itself which it has consistently followed since, making recommendations to the department in accordance therewith from year to year. This policy—as a policy—has remained a General Board policy only, without adoption by the Government or even by the Navy Department, and without being understood by the people or Congress.

In the opinion of the General Board, any rational and natural development of the Navy looking to the continuance of peace and the maintenance of our national policies demands the adoption of and the consistent adherence to a governmental naval policy founded on our national needs and aims. To give life to such a policy requires the support of the people and of Congress; and this support can only be obtained by giving the widest publicity to the policy itself and to the reasons and arguments in its support, and taking the people and the Congress into the full confidence of the Government, inviting intelligent criticism as well as support.

3. The General Board does not believe the Nation stands ready to abandon or modify any of its well-established national policies, and repeats its position that the naval policy of the country should be to possess a fleet powerful enough to prevent or answer any challenge to these policies. The absolute strength necessary to accomplish this is a question that depends upon the national policies of prospective challengers and the force they can bring against us, and, hence, is relative and varies with their naval policies and building program.

4. The General Board believes that only a lack of understanding of these views by the people at large prevents the adoption of a consistent naval policy; and recommends to the department a system of extended publicity in all matters relating to naval policy, acting through patriotic organizations, the press, or by whatever means a knowledge of the naval needs of the Nation may be brought home to the people of the country, with the meaning and reasons for them. The General Board believes that an understanding by the Nation of the Navy's rôle as a guarantor of peace and an upholder of those doctrines and policies which have become a part and parcel of our national existence will fix a naval policy that will meet those needs.

5. What that policy should be is stated broadly in paragraph 3—the building and maintenance of a fleet powerful enough to prevent or answer any challenge to our national policies. To arrive at any concrete formulation of a naval policy, for recommending to the department for presentation to Congress and the country, the General Board invites attention to the following fundamental facts:

(a) The "power" of the fleet consists of two elements, its personnel and its matériel.

(b) Of these two elements the personnel is of the greater importance.

(c) The measure of the matériel portion of a fleet's power is expressed in the number of its first-line battleships.

(d) The life and continued power to act of these first-line battleships are dependent on the assistance of a number of smaller fighting units of the fleet proper and of a number of auxiliaries in recognized proportion to the battleships.

6. From these fundamental facts two principles follow:

(1) That, in any consideration of naval policy to arrive at a fleet of a power suited to the Nation's needs, questions of personnel and matériel must go hand in hand, and the two must expand and grow together until the needed power is attained.

(2) That the basis of the matériel side of the fleet is the battleship of the first line, and that this basis, for life and action, requires to be supplemented by its military assistants—destroyers, scouts, submarines, aeroplanes—and by its auxiliaries—fuel ships, supply ships, repair ships, etc.—in proper proportionate numbers.

7. The General Board in its letter No. 420–422, of October 17, 1903, expressed an opinion of what the strength of the Navy should be in 1920, based on the second of the principles above stated, and placed the number of ships of the line which should form the basis of the fleet at 48. In paragraph 9 of the same letter it formulated the first principle in these words:

"These recommendations would be incomplete unless the General Board invited your attention to the futility of building vessels for the defense of the country without providing the personnel to man them. Whenever appropriations are made for new vessels the number of officers and enlisted men should be increased in due proportion."

From year to year, since the formulation of those opinions in 1903, the General Board has consistently recommended a building program based on the policy of a 48-battleship strength in 1920, with necessary lesser units and auxiliaries, and these recommendations have varied only in the lesser units of the fleet, as developments and improvements have varied the relative value of those lesser units and the auxiliaries.

8. These recommendations of the board have been made in the pursuance of a fixed and definite "policy" adopted by the board for its guidance after mature and deliberate consideration of all the elements involved and after a careful estimate and forecast of the future as to what would be the naval development of those foreign countries with which conflict might be probable, and what should be our own development to insure peace if possible, or superiority of force if war should be forced upon us. Expressed in concrete words, the "policy" of the board has been to provide the Nation with a fleet equal or superior to that of any probable enemy as a guarantor of peace, and its forecast was that a fleet of 48 battleships, with the attendant lesser units and auxiliaries, ready for action by 1920 would accomplish this result.

9. The forecast of the board with regard to naval development in other countries has proved remarkably accurate. The absence of any definite naval policy on our part, except in the General Board, and the failure of the people, the Congress, and the Executive Government to recognize the necessity for such a policy has already placed us in a position of inferiority which may lead to war, and this inferiority is progressive and will continue to increase until the necessity for a definite policy is recognized and that policy put into operation.

10. The General Board, while adhering to the policy it has consistently followed for the past 10 years, and believing that the naval needs of the Nation call for a fleet of 48 ships of the first line in 1920, with the attendant smaller units and auxiliaries in proper proportion, all with trained personnel, officers and enlisted men, active or reserve, recognizes conditions as they exist and as clearly set forth in its memorandum of September 25, 1912, and the futility of hoping or expecting that the ships and men its policy calls for will be provided by 1920. The board does believe, however, that this result may be eventually attained by the adoption by the Government of a definite naval policy and the putting of it before Congress and the people clearly and succinctly. By this method responsibility for any rupture of our peaceful relations with other nations due to our naval weakness, or any national disaster in war due to the same cause, will be definitely fixed. The General Board believes that the people, with full understanding of the meaning of and the reasons for naval power, will instruct the legislative branch of the Government, and that that branch, with the same understanding, will provide the means. By the adoption and advocacy of a clearly defined, definite policy the department, with whom the responsibility first rests, will have done its part and placed the responsibility with the people and the legislative branch of the Government. If the people, having been given the meaning of and the reasons for naval power, fail to instruct the Congress, the responsibility and the resulting material loss and national humiliation rests upon them; and if the Congress, having been instructed by the people, fails to provide the means, then the responsibility is theirs.

11. In this connection, and for the furtherance of the establishment and carrying out of a definite naval policy, the General Board invites especial attention to the proposed formation of a council of national defense. The formation of such a body would, in the opinion of the board, compel the adoption of a definite naval policy and assure the department of the aid of all other branches of the Government in carrying it out. Further, all other branches of the Government, more especially the legislative, would become instruments for disseminating knowledge of the naval needs of the Nation among the people in justifying the policy, thus giving the people that understanding which is needed for earnest support.

12. The General Board recognizes that full understanding and complete support from the people and from Congress can not be obtained immediately, nor in a few weeks or months, or possibly years. It believes, however, that it can eventually be obtained, and that the best and surest method of doing this is for the department—which has knowledge and understanding of the questions involved—to adopt and maintain consistently from year to year a fixed governmental policy, taking the Congress and the people fully into its confidence, and disseminating generally through the press, through patriotic societies and organizations, and through any other available agencies its reasons and arguments in support of its policy.

13. As a basis for this governmental policy the General Board recommends:

(a) That the fleet shall consist of 48 battleships of the line, with the appropriate number of lesser units and auxiliaries to complete and maintain a fighting whole.

(b) That the personnel of the Navy, officers and enlisted men, shall grow and keep pace with the matériel fleet; and there shall at all times

be on the lists, active and reserve, a sufficient number of officers and men to fully man the existing fleet for war.

(c) That the full strength of the fleet given in (a) shall be attained at the earliest date practicable—by 1920 if possible. That, pending the full cooperation of the people and the Congress in carrying out this program, and as long as the full yearly increase the program calls for can not be obtained, the new construction each year shall be recommended in the proportions based on battleships to keep the fleet a complete fighting whole.

14. As a basis for departmental recommendation to Congress to carry out subhead (c) of the preceding paragraph, the General Board submits, as the results of its studies pursued since 1900, the following proportions of the various units needed for a complete fighting fleet: To 8 battleships there should be 32 destroyers, 16 submarines, 1 ammunition ship, 2 destroyer tenders, 4 fuel ships, 1 hospital ship, 1 repair ship, 2 submarine tenders, 1 supply ship, 1 transport. To these, with the present state of development, should be added at least 16 aeroplanes. With these proportions, to carry out the policy in full, there would be required to be laid down each year until the full fleet of 48 battleships was completed, 4 battleships, 16 destroyers, 8 submarines, 8 aeroplanes, and 6 auxiliaries, the particular kind of auxiliaries to be laid down each year to be of the character to keep the auxiliary fleet in the proportions given above.

(NOTE.—Until a sufficient number of aeroplanes for the existing fleet are obtained, the board recommends that no limitation be placed on the number to be built each year, since the aid for material states that the funds are available.)

15. The General Board recommends that the department place this program before Congress yearly until 1920, in pursuance of its definite policy.

PERSONNEL.

16. The immediate preceding paragraphs have treated of a naval policy in relation to material only. In the opinion of the board a naval policy in relation to personnel is of even greater importance, as all history teaches us that the greatest element of success in all enterprises, and more especially in the enterprises of war, lies in the personnel conducting the enterprise and its morale.

17. The General Board has from its incipiency given careful consideration to this question and made recommendations to the department from time to time. These recommendations have varied in details at times to meet conditions existing at the time, but have all been founded on the same fundamental ideas, which are expressed in the citation made in paragraph 11 of this letter from General Board letter No. 420–422, of October 17, 1903. The same idea is expressed in paragraph 4 of General Board letter No. 58, of February 9, 1903, which reads:

"4. The General Board further strongly recommends, as an essential part of any intelligent continued naval policy, that whenever an appropriation is made for an increase in the material of the fleet, the corresponding indispensable increase in personnel of officers and men be simultaneously provided for."

18. In the opinion of the General Board the question of personnel is more urgent now than at any time in the history of the Navy; and the board believes that the adoption and continued advocacy from year to year of a regular policy by the department of expansion and regulation of the personnel coequal with the expansion of the fleet will result in eventual success.

19. The General Board recommends as a basis for such a policy:

(a) That the personnel of the Navy, officers and enlisted men, including the active list and an established and trained naval reserve, shall at all times be sufficient to fully man the entire fleet for war.

(b) That the officers and enlisted men of the Navy on the active list shall bear a definite fixed ratio to the total displacement of the fighting units of the fleet.

(c) That the officers of the active list of the Navy shall be distributed in the various grades in a ratio that will insure the best efficiency of the fleet, by having in all grades the proper proportion of numbers for the duties of the grade, and so regulated as to bring each officer to the grade with sufficient experience and at the age when best equipped to perform the duties of the grade.

20. The General Board in this letter has taken up the question of naval policy in relation to the fighting fleet and its creation only and has not considered lesser adjuncts, as gunboats, tugs, etc.; nor has it considered the question of policy from the point of view of naval bases, stations, docks, and maintenance. The General Board does not consider that such lesser adjuncts as gunboats, tugs, and naval police duties enter into the broad question of a national naval policy and, hence, need not be discussed in a letter on policy. The broad question of the maintenance and uses of the fleet, however, which includes bases, stations, and docks, is coextensive with the creation of the fleet, and a national naval policy in relation to them will be discussed in another letter.

GEORGE DEWEY.

EXHIBIT B.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL BOARD OF THE NAVY, 1914.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
GENERAL BOARD,
Washington, November 17, 1914.

To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Increase of the Navy; building program and personnel, 1916.
Reference: Department's indorsement 8557–146: 11, September 22, 1914.

Article 167, paragraph 3, United States Navy Regulations, 1913, reads as follows:

"It (the General Board) shall consider the number and types of ships proper to constitute the fleet, the number and rank of officers, and the number and rating of enlisted men required to man them, and shall advise the Secretary of the Navy respecting the estimates therefor (including such increase as may be requisite) to be submitted annually to Congress."

The General Board, in compliance with duties thus imposed upon it by this and similar paragraphs in preceding regulations, has from year to year recommended to the department a building program and personnel legislation that would, in its opinion, produce a fleet that would be adequate to the needs of the Nation.

2. In view of conditions now existing, the General Board has given particularly careful thought to its recommendations for the coming fiscal year. To make its position clear and place before the department the full meaning of its recommendations, the General Board considers it necessary to review at length all that has preceded these recommendations and led up to them.

CONSISTENT POLICY OF GENERAL BOARD SINCE 1903.

3. In its letter No. 420–2, of October 17, 1903, the general board, after mature consideration of our national policies and interests, and of those of the other leading naval nations of the world, expressed its opinion of what the ultimate strength of the United States Navy should be, and recommended a program for the completion of the Navy to the strength then believed adequate by 1919.

4. The basis of the fleet recommended was 48 battleships; and lesser units and auxiliaries were recommended in the proportions believed to be best to complete a fighting fleet, in the light of the best information obtainable at that time. The influence of the progress made by new inventions and the discovery of new ideas in the development of the lesser units have changed the proportions and character of some of these lesser units; and have, to that extent, modified the original recommendations of the General Board. But the fundamental fact that the power of a fleet is to be measured by the number and efficiency of its heavy fighting units, or battleships, has remained unchanged. The recommendations of the General Board heretofore submitted have consistently followed a policy looking to the creation of a fleet founded on a battleship strength of 48, in accordance with its recommendation made in 1903, of what it considered an adequate fleet to meet the naval needs of the Nation and be an adequate insurance against aggression.

5. The General Board believes that these recommendations made from year to year have been both misunderstood and misconstrued in some quarters. An impression prevails that the General Board has always recommended an annual continuing building program of four battleships, with accompanying lesser units and auxiliaries. A brief analysis of the recommendations made by the General Board, beginning with the original formulation of its policy in 1903, to the present time, will demonstrate the error of this impression, and show that the recommendations made were consistent and contemplated the creation of a battleship fleet of 48 vessels by 1919, but did not involve a constant and fixed program of building 4 battleships a year.

BATTLESHIPS.

6. In October, 1903, the Navy had 10 battleships completed and 14 more either under construction or authorized. The last of these 14 was to be completed by 1907. In view of this condition, and to complete a fleet of 48 battleships by 1919, the General Board, in paragraph 8 of its letter of October 17, 1903, recommended:

"8. To sum up, the General Board recommends that Congress be requested to authorize for the present a yearly building program, not limited by the amount appropriated last year, composed of the following ships: Two battleships, etc."

To this letter was appended a table, quoted below, showing what the condition of the Navy would be in battleships, year by year, to 1919, starting with the 10 completed and 14 already building or authorized, if the recommendation of the General Board for a two battleship per year program from 1904 were followed:

Year.	Battleships.		Year.	Battleships.	
	Completed.	Authorized.		Completed.	Authorized.
1903	10	14	1912	34	2
1904	12	2	1913	36	2
1905	17	2	1914	38	2
1906	19	2	1915	40	2
1907	24	2	1916	42	.....
1908	26	2	1917	44	.....
1909	28	2	1918	46	.....
1910	30	2	1919	48	.....
1911	32	2			

7. It will be seen from the foregoing table that the General Board's recommendation provided for a two-battleship program consistently pursued from 1904 to 1915 to provide a fleet of 48 battleships by 1919. In these recommendations replacements were not considered, nor had limits of age been placed on battleships. The fundamental idea, however, was a 2-battleship program to provide a fleet of 48 battleships by 1919. A larger program to hasten the completion of the fleet had been considered, but had been rejected because it was believed a fleet of 48 battleships by 1919 would answer all needs, in view of the known building programs of other countries.

8. In pursuance of this policy the General Board, as stated above, began its yearly recommendations by asking that two battleships be authorized in 1904. The following table shows the yearly programs recommended. The reasons for an increase over two battleships annually are given in succeeding paragraphs:

Year.	Battleships.		Year.	Battleships.	
	Recommended by General Board.	Authorized by Congress.		Recommended by General Board.	Authorized by Congress.
1904	2	1	1909	4	2
1905	3	2	1910	4	2
1906	3	1	1911	4	2
1907	2	1	1912	4	1
1908	4	2	1913	4	1

9. The recommendation for the laying down of two ships in 1904 failed of enactment, and only one was provided for, leaving the program for the creation of a 48-battleship fleet by 1919 one ship in arrears. To make this deficiency good, and maintain the general program, one additional ship, or three in all, were recommended for the 1905 program. Two were authorized, still leaving a deficiency of one for the two years 1904 and 1905. To provide for this, three were again recommended for the 1906 program. In 1906 and again in 1907

one ship only was authorized, leaving by 1908 the general program three ships in arrears. To begin making this deficiency good the General Board for the 1908 program recommended the authorization of four ships. From 1908 to 1911, inclusive, Congress followed the original program and provided for two battleships yearly. The accumulated shortage of three ships still remained, however, during these four years, and the General Board recommended year by year the laying down of four ships to begin making this good, since each succeeding year found the shortage still there.

10. In 1910 a new element entered, not considered in the original program. The fleet of 48 battleships contemplated in the program put forward in 1903, on a two-battleship per year building program, to be ready by 1919, contained all battleships then borne on the list, beginning with the *Indiana*. Experience had not yet in 1903 demonstrated the effective life of battleships, nor had any exhaustive study been made of it. Beginning with the program recommended for 1911 in General Board's letter No. 420–2, of May 24, 1910, this matter was seriously taken into consideration, since experience had shown that the three older battleships, the *Indiana, Massachusetts,* and *Oregon,* then 20 years old from date of authorization, were approaching the limit of their effective life. Further studies from our own experience and from that of other navies and from practice abroad convinced the General Board that the effective life of battleships is about 20 years from time of completion; and that hence, to maintain a fleet at a given strength, it is necessary to lay down a replacement ship 20 years from the time of the laying down of the original ship. Hence, replacement ships for the *Indiana, Oregon,* and *Massachusetts* should have been laid down in 1910, for the *Iowa* in 1912, and new replacement ships should be begun for the *Kentucky* and *Kearsarge* in 1915. These matters, together with the shortage of three battleships already existing in 1911, were taken into consideration by the General Board in making its recommendations for a four-battleship program in both 1912 and 1913. One battleship only was authorized in each of these two years, increasing the shortage in the original program to five, without considering replacement ships for the *Indiana, Oregon, Massachusetts,* and *Iowa,* already overdue for authorization.

11. The preceding analysis shows clearly the error in the prevailing impression that the General Board has heretofore advocated a navy based on a continuous building program of four battleships a year, and proves that up to the present it has advocated continuously and consistently a program to produce a fleet of 48 battleships by 1919. This would have called for, considering replacements, a general two-battleship program with a third added every three years. The number of battleships called for by this policy—48—and the date set for their completion—by 1919—were fixed by a calm and logical review of the policies and aims of the Nation and the known laws and prospective developments and aims of other countries, and the policy was to provide and maintain at all times a fleet equal to or superior to that of any nation likely to challenge our policies.

12. The 1903 program given in paragraph 6 of this letter, as modified by the replacement policy in 1910, called for at this date, November, 1914:

(a) Effective battleships completed and ready for service less than 20 years old from completion	38
(b) Battleships under construction	7
(c) Battleships authorized in 1914	2
Total	47

13. The actual situation of the fleet as relates to battleships at this date, November, 1914, is as follows:

(a) Effective battleships completed and ready for service less than 20 years old from completion (since the sale of the *Mississippi* and *Idaho*)	30
(b) Battleships under construction	4
(c) Battleships authorized in 1914	2
(d) To replace *Mississippi* and *Idaho*	1
Total	37

14. This shows that we are now deficient 10 battleships, built, building, and authorized, from that contemplated in the 1903 program.

15. The General Board has made the foregoing brief analysis to set forth clearly the reasons for and meaning of all the recommendations it has made for battleship construction up to this time; and to show the conception under which the General Board has acted in the performance of its duty, under the regulations, as the responsible advisers of the Secretary in all matters relating to the strength of the fleet and the number and character of the units composing it. In the matter of battleships, the final result of all recommendations, and of all action taken thereon up to this date, has been to produce a completed battle line of eight units less than the General Board believed to be safe, and with two units less under construction and authorized than was needed to continue the expansion of the fleet to the strength laid down in the policy.

16. The General Board believes the policy it has consistently advocated for the production of an adequate Navy is to the best interests of the country, and that any Navy less than adequate is an expense to the Nation without being a protection. It can not, therefore, too strongly urge the adoption by the Government of a policy looking to the making good of the deficiencies of the past and the building up of this arm of the national defense until it becomes equal to the task that war will put upon it. That point will not be reached until the Navy is strong enough to meet on equal terms the strongest probable adversary.

17. The wisdom of such a policy is well illustrated by recent events, and is reenforced by the teachings of all history. For a review of the history of all ages will show that no nation has ever created and maintained a great over-sea commerce without the support of sea power. It will further show that trade rivalry, which is the active expression of the most universal of all human traits—desire for gain—has been a most fruitful cause of war; and, when the clash has come, the commerce of the weaker sea power has been broken up and driven from the seas. That has been true for all time, and is true to-day; and has a particular bearing on the United States at the present time, when such strenuous efforts are being made to build up a national merchant marine and extend our foreign commerce.

18. In the matter of national defense, history teaches still another great lesson particularly applicable to ourselves. That is, that a nation, insular in character or separated by bodies of water from other nations, can and must rely on its Navy—when that Navy is adequate—for protection and freedom from invasion and may keep its own soil free from all wars other than civil. The United States is one among the few nations of the world that occupy this happy position, being insular in so far as any nation capable of making serious war upon us is concerned, since any opponent that need be considered must come to us from across the seas. Our main defense and protection from invasion must, therefore, always rest with the Navy, which must ever remain our first and best line of defense. This defense, unless adequate, is impotent; and, as before stated, adequacy is not reached until the Navy is strong enough to meet on equal terms the navy of the strongest probable adversary.

19. In the matter of battleships the General Board remains of the opinion that it has always held, that command of the sea can only be gained and held by vessels that can take and keep the sea in all times and in all weathers and overcome the strongest enemy vessels that may be brought against them. Other types are valuable and have their particular uses, all of which are indispensable, but limited in character. But, what has been true throughout all naval wars of the past, and what is equally true to-day, is that the backbone of any navy that can command the sea consists of the strongest seagoing, sea-keeping ships of its day, or, of its battleships. The General Board recommends, therefore, in the light of all the information it has up to this present date, that the development of the battleship fleet be continued as the primary aim in naval development, and that four of them be authorized in the 1916 program.

DESTROYERS.

20. For the general purposes of war on the sea the General Board has placed the destroyer as the type of warship next in importance to the battleship, and has based the programs it has recommended on that idea. After very mature consideration of all the elements involved and a study of the results obtained from fleet maneuvers, the General Board came to the conclusion that a well-balanced fighting fleet, for all the purposes of offense and defense, called for a relative proportion of four destroyers to one battleship. Hence for every battleship built four destroyers should be provided. The General Board still holds this opinion and, therefore, recommends that 16 destroyers be provided in the 1916 program.

FLEET SUBMARINES.

21. For several years past all leading navies have been striving to perfect a submarine of an enlarged type with habitability, radius, and speed sufficient to enable it to accompany the fleet and act with it tactically, both in offense and defense. Our designers and builders have been devoting their efforts to the same end and are now ready to guarantee such a type and one such vessel was provided for in the appropriation act of 1914. The great difficulty in the past in the production of this type has been the lack of a reliable internal-combustion engine of the requisite power to give the necessary speed. This difficulty has been overcome, and the General Board is assured that engines have been designed and fully tested that will meet the requirements, and the builders stand ready to guarantee the results. The value of such a type in war for distant work with the fleet can hardly be overestimated, and the General Board recommends that three be provided in the 1916 program. These, with the one already authorized, will form a fleet submarine division of four for work with the fleet, and be the beginning of a powerful arm of the fleet.

COAST SUBMARINES.

22. For the submarine for coast defense and for occasional acting with the fleet in home waters, the General Board sees no necessity for boats of as great speed and size as the later designs, made before the seagoing submarine was believed to be in sight. In fact, any increase of size is detrimental, in that it increases draft and debars them from shallow waters; and any increase of speed in this class of submarines is not needed, and is gained at the expense of other desirable qualities. Between the coast-defense submarine and the submarine of sufficient size, radius, habitability, and surface speed to accompany and act with the fleet tactically, the General Board sees no necessity in naval warfare for an intermediate type. It is therefore recommended that the submarines for the coast work be of the general characteristics already prescribed in General Board letter No. 420–15, of June 10, 1914, and that 16 of these be provided for in the 1916 program.

SCOUT CRUISERS.

23. In the struggle to build up the purely distinctive fighting ships of the Navy—battleships, destroyers, and submarines—the cruising and scouting element of the fleet has been neglected in recent years, and no cruisers or scouts have been provided for since 1904, when the *Montana, North Carolina, Birmingham, Chester,* and *Salem* were authorized. This leaves the fleet peculiarly lacking in this element so necessary for information in a naval campaign, and of such great value in clearing the sea of torpedo and mining craft, in opening and protecting routes of trade for our own commerce, and in closing and prohibiting such routes to the commerce of the enemy. The General Board believes that this branch of the fleet has been too long neglected, and recommends that the construction of this important and necessary type be resumed. For the 1916 program it is recommended that four scout cruisers be provided.

AIR CRAFT.

24. The General Board in its indorsement No. 449 of August 30, 1913, and accompanying memorandum brought to the attention of the department the dangerous situation of the country in the lack of air craft and air men in both the naval and military services. A résumé was given in that indorsement with the accompanying memorandum of conditions in the leading countries abroad at that date, showing the preparations being made for air warfare and the use of air craft by both armies and navies, and contrasting their activity with our own inactivity. Certain recommendations were made in the same indorsement looking to the beginning of the establishment of a proper air service for the Navy.

25. The total result of that effort was the appointment of a board on aeronautics October 9, 1913. That board made further recommendations, among them the establishment of an aeronautic school and station at Pensacola and the purchase of 50 aeroplanes, 1 fleet dirigible, and 2 small dirigibles for training. At the present time, more than a year later, the total number of air craft of any kind owned by the Navy consists of 12 aeroplanes, not more than 2 of which are of the same type, and all reported to have too little speed and carrying capacity for service work.

26. In view of the advance that has been made in aeronautics during the past year and the demonstration now being made of the vital importance of a proper air service to both land and sea warfare, our present situation can be described as nothing less than deplorable. As now developed, air craft are the eyes of both armies and navies, and it is difficult to place any limit to their offensive possibilities.

27. In our present condition of unpreparedness, in contact with any foe possessing a proper air service, our scouting would be blind. We

would be without the means of detecting the presence of submarines or mine fields or of attempting direct attack on the enemy from the air, while our own movements would be an open book to him. The General Board can not too strongly urge that the department's most serious thought be given to this matter, and that immediate steps be taken to remedy it, and recommends that Congress be asked for an appropriation of at least $5,000,000, to be made available immediately, for the purpose of establishing an efficient air service.

GUNBOATS.

28. The Navy is very deficient in gunboats. Though the Navy list gives 50 names under "gunboats," only a very limited number of these 50 are in a condition to be available for general service. Some, like the *Villalobos*, *Callao*, *Samar*, *Sandoval*, etc., are old boats of little value taken over from Spain, of from 400 to 250 tons and less. Of the others, with the exception of the light-draft river gunboats *Monocacy* and *Palos*, and the *Sacramento*, no gunboats have been authorized since 1902. Seven are at present assigned to Naval Militia duty, and three others have been recently withdrawn from that service because of the crying need for more gunboats for general duty. Those remaining on the list serviceable and fit for general duty are so limited in number that it has been necessary in recent years to detail battleships, large cruisers, and destroyers to do gunboat duty. This has been markedly demonstrated during the past year on the Mexican coast. It would seem superfluous to point out the harmful influence this has on the efficiency and training of the fleet for war, and the General Board advises strongly against such practice whenever it can be possibly avoided. It is therefore recommended that a beginning be made to replace the old and worn-out gunboats, that there may be sufficient of them to do the police and general diplomatic duties required of such vessels in time of peace without disrupting the battle fleet. To this end it is recommended that four be authorized in the 1916 program. With the exception of the *Sacramento*, authorized in 1911, no seagoing gunboat has been authorized since 1902.

AUXILIARIES.

FUEL SHIPS.

29. In the matter of auxiliaries needed for the fleet, the General Board is of the opinion that the most serious situation exists in the matter of fuel-oil supply, and that provision for oil-fuel ships should be given first consideration. This is serious from the point of view of economy in time of peace and would be disastrous in the event of hostilities arising. We have 41 oil-burning destroyers built or building, to be followed by others, 8 ships of the dreadnaught type using oil as an auxiliary fuel, and in 1915 the two first all-oil-fuel battleships will be added to the fleet, to be followed by others. To supply this oil-burning fleet with fuel the Navy possesses the *Arethusa*, an old tank ship of 3,629 tons capacity and not more than 10 knots speed, and seven fleet colliers fitted to carry some fuel oil in addition. The total oil capacity is 23,738 tons, 3,629 tons of which—that in the *Arethusa*—could not accompany the fleet; so that the present available oil supply that could accompany the fleet is 20,109 tons. Logistic studies show that to maintain our present oil-burning fleet in active service across the ocean requires the delivery of about 23,000 tons of fuel oil per month. To maintain this supply we have the seven colliers mentioned above capable of delivering an average of about 10,000 tons per month. This situation will be very much aggravated on the addition to the fleet of the two all-oil-burning battleships, *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, and the other destroyers now under construction. Nor can commercial oil carriers be relied upon to remedy this deficiency, since ocean tankage, both at home and abroad, is not yet adequate to meet the demands of commerce and industry.

30. To partially meet this situation two oil-fuel ships of a combined cargo capacity of 15,108 tons were authorized in August, 1912. On November 1, 1914, one of these ships was only 82.4 per cent completed and the other only 57.2 per cent completed.

31. To remedy this serious defect in our preparedness for war the General Board recommended the construction of two oil-fuel ships in the 1915 program. These were not authorized, and the General Board therefore emphatically repeats this recommendation for the 1916 program, and further recommends that the construction of the two ships authorized in August, 1912, more than two years ago, be hastened with all possible speed.

DESTROYER TENDERS AND SUBMARINE TENDERS.

32. The auxiliaries of next importance to the fleet at the present time, after the oil-fuel ships, are destroyer tenders and submarine tenders. Of the three improvised vessels used as destroyer tenders the *Iris*, built in 1885, is past her period of usefulness and should be replaced. The General Board recommended one destroyer tender in the 1915 program. This was not authorized, and the recommendation is repeated for the 1916 program.

33. Of the six vessels used as submarine tenders, all are of the improvised variety, and none is well fitted for the service. Three of them are old monitors, two of them old gunboats, and one the old sailing ship *Screen*. To begin replacing these, one submarine tender was authorized in 1911, another in 1912, and one was recommended in 1913 for the 1915 program. This last was not authorized, and this recommendation is repeated for the 1916 program.

TRANSPORTS.

34. The General Board has from time to time, in numerous letters extending over a series of years, called the attention of the department to the inadequacy of preparation in the Navy for advanced base work and to the vital importance of this work to success in war. The prerequisite for any advanced base work is the necessary means for transportation of the personnel and material of the advanced base outfit; and for this reason the General Board has recommended the construction of the two transports needed for the purpose—ships of the size and speed necessary and especially designed for what they were intended to accomplish. Their primary use was to be for war, but secondarily they could be used in general transportation service at all times. Not one of the four improvised transports now in service in the Navy—the *Hancock*, *Rainbow*, *Prairie*, and *Buffalo*—is of the size or is fitted for the work required, nor of the character of construction needed for safety in ships carrying large bodies of men. All are old single-skin ships without proper water-tight subdivision. Of the two transports needed, one was authorized in 1913, and the other recommended in the 1915 program. This was not authorized, and the General Board repeats this recommendation for the 1916 program.

HOSPITAL SHIP.

35. The General Board in making the foregoing recommendations has given preference to what is needed for the fighting efficiency of the fleet over all other matters. Two other types of auxiliaries, however, are required for the successful administration of the fleet—hospital and supply ships.

36. The two hospital ships now borne on the Navy list—the *Solace* and the *Relief*—are both improvised and small, and neither adapted to the service. They have done good service in time of peace in connection with subdivisions of the fleet, but the *Relief* is now unseaworthy and the *Solace* would be of limited value in time of war. To remedy this defect, the General Board recommended the construction of one hospital ship in the 1915 program. This was not authorized, and the General Board repeats this recommendation for the 1916 program.

SUPPLY SHIPS.

37. Of the four ships borne on the Navy list as supply ships, all are improvised and were hurriedly bought and fitted in 1898 to meet the exigencies of the Spanish War. The *Supply* is already beyond her period of usefulness, and has been discarded as a supply ship. The *Culgoa* is approaching her limit of usefulness. The *Celtic* and *Glacier*, while old and inadequately fitted, are still good for some years service. One new ship was authorized in 1913. Another is needed, and to meet this situation the General Board recommended the construction of one supply ship in the 1915 program. This was not authorized, and the General Board repeats this recommendation for the 1916 program.

SUMMARY.

38. To summarize, the General Board recommends for the 1916 program—

4 battleships.
16 destroyers.
3 fleet submarines.
16 coast submarines.
4 scouts.
4 gunboats.
2 oil-fuel ships.
1 destroyer tender.
1 submarine tender.
1 Navy transport.
1 hospital ship.
1 supply ship.
Air service, $5,000,000.

PERSONNEL.

39. The General Board can not too strongly urge upon the department the necessity of using its best endeavors to carry out the repeated recommendations of the General Board, made from year to year, to provide the fleet with a personnel, active list, and trained reserve equal to the manning of the fleet of war.

40. In the opinion of the General Board this is a matter of even more serious import than that of construction, for it can not be too often repeated that ships without a trained personnel to man and fight them are useless for the purposes of war. The training needed for the purpose is long and arduous, and can not be done after the outbreak of war. This must have been provided for long previous to the beginning of hostilities; and any ship of the fleet found at the outbreak of war without provision having been made for its manning by officers and men trained for service can be counted as only a useless mass of steel whose existence leads only to a false sense of security.

41. The strength of fleets is measured too often in the public mind by the number and tonnage of its material units. The real strength of a fleet is a combination of its personnel—with their skill and training—and its material; and of these two elements the more important—the personnel—is too often forgotten and neglected in making provision for our fleet. The General Board can not impress this point too strongly on the department or recommend too earnestly that every effort be made to correct it, and that legislation be urged to provide for a personnel on the active list, supplemented by a trained reserve, sufficient to man every vessel of the fleet when the call comes.

42. No nation in time of peace keeps all the ships of its navy fully manned and in full commission. But all leading nations except ourselves provide an active list, officers and men, sufficient to keep the best of their fleet in full commission and all the serviceable ships of their fleet in a material condition for war; and in addition a trained reserve of officers and men sufficient to complete the complements and fully man every serviceable ship of their navies, and furnish a reserve for casualties. Thus, every nation with which conflict is possible is prepared to mobilize its entire navy, by order, with officers and men trained for the service. We alone of the naval powers provide no such reserves, and an active personnel too scant, and trust to the filling of the complements of our ships by untrained men recruited after war is imminent or declared. To quickly man all of the ships of the Navy serviceable for war (including ships which are now in reserve or ordinary) with trained crews is impossible owing to the absence of a trained reserve.

43. In view of all that has been herein set forth, the General Board recommends:

(a) That legislation be asked for providing an active personnel, officers and enlisted force, capable of keeping in full commission all battleships under 15 years of age from date of authorization, all destroyers and submarines under 12 years of age from authorization, half of the cruisers and all gunboats, and all the necessary auxiliaries that go with the active fleet; and of furnishing nucleus crews for all ships in the Navy that would be used in time of war, and the necessary men for the training and other shore stations.

(b) That the general policy be adopted of expanding the active personnel with the expansion of the fleet in the proportions indicated in (a).

(c) That immediate steps be taken to form a national naval reserve of trained officers and men, and that this work be pushed until this reserve, in connection with the Naval Militia, has reached the point where, combined with the active list, it will be possible to fully man the entire fleet with war complements and furnish 10 per cent additional for casualties.

(d) That the Naval Militia be expanded in number and that the department encourage the continuance and improvement of its training to the end that it may still more efficiently serve to reenforce the regular service at need.

GEORGE DEWEY.

EXHIBIT C.

ADMIRAL KNIGHT SURPRISES SECRETARY DANIELS.

UNITED STATES NAVAL WAR COLLEGE,
Newport, R. I., December 16, 1914.

To: The Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Coordination in the fleet and the Navy Department.
Reference: (a) Department telegram of December 15, 1914.

1. Receipt is hereby acknowledged of the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 15, 1914.*

Rear Admiral AUSTIN M. KNIGHT,
Naval War College, Newport, R. I.:

Desire statement by first mail from you for insertion in hearing as to whether or not there is lack of coordination in the administration of the fleet and what the War College says it should accomplish.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

2. It is not possible in the brief time before the departure of the mail to compress into a few words a satisfactory reply to these questions, nor would it be possible in any case to avoid some discussion of issues which may appear to lie outside the field—not very closely defined—of the department's inquiry.

3. It will be convenient to reply to the second of the questions before taking up the first.

4. The War College considers that every effort of the fleet and every effort of the department in connection with the fleet should have for its sole aim the war efficiency of the fleet. Every effort which does not directly contribute to this end is in itself a wasteful expenditure of energy, and, so far as it is a diversion from this end, is distinctly harmful.

5. So much for what the fleet should accomplish.

6. Coming now to the question of coordination. By coordination is understood that unity of purpose and of effort which shall insure the concentration upon battle efficiency of all parts of the fleet itself and of all agencies outside of the fleet which bear, or can be made to bear, upon battle efficiency. The coordination of preparation is not less important than that of administration.

7. Coordination of administration calls for unity of effort within the fleet, within the Navy Department, and between the fleet and the Navy Department.

8. Unity of effort within the fleet demands that all elements of the fleet should be under a single administrative head and that they should act together under the direction of this head with singleness of purpose for the development of the ideal, namely, battle efficiency. For this they must, as far as possible, remain in intimate association with each other, with constant drills carefully designed to lead by progressive stages toward war maneuvers on a large scale.

9. It is clear that for many years past no such condition as this has existed. It is idle to connect this lack of coordination with any one administration of the Navy Department. It has characterized our naval policy, or, rather, our complete lack of naval policy, since 1865. One of the harmful manifestations of this lack of coordination is the frequent diversion of battleships and torpedo craft to uses widely different from that for which they exist, with resulting interruption of preparation for battle, and the breaking down of the efficiency of both material and personnel.

10. In many cases it is apparent that this use of the fighting units of the fleet results from the lack of cruisers and gunboats and that it is an emergency measure which can not be avoided. That this is a lack of coordination is not changed by the fact, if it is a fact, that the necessity for this condition is inherent in the present constitution of the fleet and in the exigencies arising from national policies.

11. In one important respect there has been recently a notable gain in coordination. The Navy Department, the fleet, and the War College have been drawn into very much more intimate association than has ever before existed, the importance of this association having for the first time found recognition under the present administration of the Navy Department. There is every reason to believe that these relations will become constantly closer as time goes by with results which will be far-reaching in their effect upon the efficiency of our Naval Establishment as a whole.

12. It is clear that the necessities which have arisen for using battleships to do the work of cruisers and gunboats arises from the lack of coordination in the character of the fleet. A true coordination here would result in an all-around harmonious development providing for all demands upon the Navy in peace and war. In my opinion the responsibility for this lack of coordination rests with Congress and with Congress alone. It is often said that naval officers themselves do not know what they want and neither Congress or the country has any guide in this matter; that naval officers have never stated what they mean by an "adequate navy."

13. No doubt there have been wide differences of opinion upon this subject and many inconsistencies in the views of naval officers themselves. But for many years past the General Board has spoken in no uncertain terms, and its reports are available for anyone who seeks information as to expert naval opinion on the subject of an adequate Navy for peace and war.

14. In some cases the Navy Department has accepted the recommendations of the General Board and passed them on to Congress, where they have never, so far as I recall, been accepted in their entirety. But in nearly all cases the Navy Department has felt called upon, even when agreeing with the views of the General Board, to ask for very much smaller appropriations than the recommendations of the board required. This because it has been considered impossible to obtain appropriations for anything approximating the complete program.

15. Replying specifically, then, to the first of the department's questions, the War College believes that lack of coordination does exist in the fleet; between the Navy Department and the fleet, and between the Navy Department, the fleet, and Congress. The college does not regard this as a new situation, although it happens for the moment to be unusually acute, and this, unfortunately, at a time when perfect coordination is especially to be desired.

16. The remedy for this condition rests partly with the fleet, where it is believed that everything which can be done is already in preparation; partly with the department, where it is understood that plans have already been formulated for more extensive maneuvers than have ever before been attempted by our fleet; and partly—and chiefly—with Congress, which alone has power to correct the imperfections in the composition of the fleet which make coordination difficult, and where there is already pending a bill for a council of national defense, which more than all other agencies combined would make for a coordination of all the agencies of the Government, many of which lie far outside the fields of the Navy and the Navy Department.

AUSTIN M. KNIGHT.

EXHIBIT D.

A SERMON OF 1785.

"AS A LOVER OF PEACE, I WISH TO SEE MY COUNTRY PREPARED FOR WAR."

The following interesting historical citation is contributed by J. M. Wilson, of Lowell, Mass. The sermon quoted appears in Potter's Biography of Dr. Jeremy Belknap, Manchester Monthly, March, 1852.

The following is an extract from a sermon preached before the General Court of New Hampshire, June 2, 1785, by Rev. Jeremy Belknap, D. D., author of "The History of New Hampshire":

It is a melancholy consideration that one of the most effectual methods to preserve peace is to be prepared for war; but such is the present constitution of things in this unhappy world, and such it will be till the gospel of peace shall so far prevail and extend its influence as that the nations will either avoid all occasions of controversy or agree to refer their disputes to some arbitrating power, with a peaceful design to abide its determination. (The distant hint of such a proposal does honor to the benevolent heart that conceived it and will do more honor to the States or nations that will publicly recommend and adopt it.) But at present it seems as if things must go on in their old course. The lust of power has been a ruling passion since the days of Nimrod, and there is no effectual way to check it but by a forcible resistance. Convinced that a nation can not preserve itself but by rendering itself formidable, as a lover of peace, I wish to see my country prepared for war; to see every cannon which now lies carelessly about our streets and wharves and in our forts properly secured from decay; every musket and sword furbished and kept in the nicest order; our militia officered and instructed, arranged and accoutered, and ready for the field on the shortest notice; our arsenals and magazines well supplied; our fortifications repaired and strengthened and garrisoned. God only knows who our next enemies may be or how soon we may have occasion for our veteran officers and soldiers and our foreign friends and allies.

EXHIBIT E.

Memorandum for the press prepared by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt, October 21, 1914:

In answer to certain statements which have appeared in regard to the personnel and the state of preparedness of the Navy at the present time and supplementing what has already been said by the Secretary of the Navy, I wish to call attention to certain facts which have, perhaps, been misunderstood by some. The Navy has always felt glad to have the actual facts relating to the condition and the needs of the service given the widest publicity.

In regard to the numbers of the officers and men of the Navy, there has never been an attempt to hide the fact that although the numbers are recruited up to the limit allowed by Congress we have only sufficient men to man, in an adequate manner, a portion of the vessels already built. At the present time 3 second-line battleships, 2 armored cruisers, 4 first-class cruisers, 1 second-class cruiser, 2 third-class cruisers, 21 destroyers, 3 monitors, 5 submarines, 1 gunboat, 3 fuel ships, and 2 vessels of special type are in commission in reserve; that is to say, they have on board only from 25 to 50 per cent of the crews necessary to man them in case of war.

There are also 6 second-line battleships; 1 armored cruiser; 1 cruiser, second class; and 14 torpedo boats which are in the condition technically called "in ordinary." These vessels are manned by from 10 to 20 per cent of their regular complements—just enough to prevent them from rusting to pieces. Further, there are 3 second-line battleships, 3 second-class cruisers, 1 third-class cruiser, 1 destroyer, 2 monitors, 4 torpedo boats, 6 gunboats, 1 transport, 1 hospital ship, 1 fuel ship, 1 repair ship, and 11 converted yachts which are at present out of commission altogether; these vessels are in nearly every case hopelessly out of date. They are to all intents and purposes unserviceable for war purposes. Several of these gunboats, torpedo boats, and converted yachts are, in the absence of suitable vessels, being used by the Naval Militias of the various States.

To provide a proper complement for all vessels of the Navy which could still be made useful for war purposes would require an addition to the present force allowed by Congress of about 18,000 men. Meanwhile the problem is becoming more difficult as time goes on because of the vessels under construction which must shortly be provided with crews. For instance, during the coming year two battleships, the *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, will take their places with the fleet. Each of these vessels will require a complement of nearly a thousand men each. Theoretically and on paper the Navy possesses at the present time 10 battleships of the first line and 23 battleships of the second line. Actually, however, only the 10 battleships of the first line and 11 battleships of the second line can be placed in commission for service because of the shortage of men.

In regard to the material of the Navy—that is to say, ships and their equipment, including guns, engines, range finders, etc.—matters are on the whole in excellent shape. As units, the vessels in commission are well built, well designed, and well cared for, and compare in all types very favorably with the vessels of other powers. In fact, I believe that they are better. In a few particulars, such as the lack of sufficient torpedoes, there is room for great improvement. Also, in regard to the lack of certain auxiliaries and the insufficient number of scouts, much can be done to make the fleet better balanced. But the Navy has felt that while it greatly desires a well-rounded fleet in the material sense, it would be the greatest possible mistake to secure such a fleet at the expense of the main seagoing fighting craft; that is to say, our battleships and destroyers. This is because of the fact that makeshift auxiliaries can be improvised in an emergency, whereas battleships must be planned and commenced at least three years beforehand.

Mention has been made of the unreadiness of the fleet at the present time. It is true that during the past two years maneuvers and battle practice of the fleet as a whole have of necessity been greatly curtailed. International affairs have required the use of a certain number of our ships. In many of these cases the department has found it necessary, owing to the shortage of men, to use battleships for duty which could have been performed equally well by gunboats or small cruisers. This lack of fleet maneuvers is, however, a matter which can be remedied by

a few months' practice, and it is hoped that these maneuvers will take place in the near future.

The department has received numberless inquiries in regard to its attitude on the relative merits of battleships and submarines. There can be, of course, no fair or exact comparison between the two types of vessels, each of which has its own sphere of usefulness. In their present stage of development submarines and air craft can make a hostile attack only from a distance of approximately four or five hundred miles. In other words, from the purely technical point of view of national defense the use of a base within that distance of our own territory would be necessary for an attack by submarines and air craft upon our territory. The establishment and maintenance of such a base requires beyond all possibility of dispute the possession of the control of the sea or, in other words, a force of seagoing vessels superior to our own. Again, from the purely technical point of view of national defense submarines can probably be relied upon to ward off an attack by a hostile fleet upon the principal harbors of the continental coast line of the United States, provided the submarines are at the point of attack. The possession, however, of a seagoing fleet having rapidity of movement and the ability to keep the sea insures, without doubt, the transference of a hostile attack to some point at sea at a great distance from our home shores and an ability to maintain a free highway for American commerce under conditions where the submarine would be practically powerless. All of this refers, of course, to the existing stage of development of all types of vessels of war. It would be foolish to attempt to prophesy what the future will bring forth, but it is at the present time clear that submarines have an undoubted sphere of usefulness in harbor work and within short distances of the coast, and that battleships are still the controlling factor in any war in which the belligerents are separated by great distances of water.

EXHIBIT F.

WARS AND REVOLUTIONS FROM END OF NAPOLEONIC WARS DOWN TO END OF FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR.

1815. Congress of Vienna; end of Napoleonic Wars.
1821–1832. War of Greek Independence.
1830. Revolution in France; revolution in Belgium against Holland; constitutional revolutions in Brunswick, Hesse, Hanover, and Saxony; revolution in the Papal States; revolution in Poland.
1832. Belgian neutrality guaranteed by the powers.
1832–1836. Civil wars in Spain and Portugal.
1846–1848. Rebellions of constitutional revolutions in France, Prussia, Hanover, northern Italy, Naples, Galicia, Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, and Switzerland.
1849. Independence of Hungary proclaimed.
1849–50. War in Schleswig-Holstein.
1852. Napoleon III declared Emperor of the French.
1854–1856. The Crimean War.
1859–60. War of Italian Independence.
1861–1865. American Civil War.
1862. Creation of Roumania.
1862–63. Rebellion in Poland.
1864. War in Schleswig-Holstein.
1866. War between Austria and Prussia; Venice ceded to Italy.
1870–71. Franco-Prussian War; proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not take a great deal of stock in these war scares; but, just as a prudent business man would pay the cost of insurance to prevent loss by fire, I think it would be the part of prudence for this Government to provide a Navy strong enough to make it very improbable that an invading force could land on our shores. Now, just what degree of preparation that would require I am unable to tell, and for that reason I favor the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], that this matter should be remitted to a commission of experts who, by careful investigation, would be able to tell us what should be done. The United States Navy should be strictly up to date, perfect as American skill can devise, thoroughly equipped in all the auxiliaries necessary to make it a first-class fighting machine, finely coordinated with the Army and coastal defense, so that England or any other country contemplating an assault upon our shores might well hesitate. But that we should enter the race to build a great Navy is absurd at a time when in all probability it is least likely to be needed.

After this expression of my sentiments on a big or little Navy, I wish to digress to say that I was elected to Congress as a Progressive, and that I have been rather on the side line down here and have been given a greater opportunity to watch the game than to take any active part in it, and so I crave the indulgence of the House for an opportunity to say a few things that I think ought to be said.

I am somewhat in the frame of mind of the tramp printer to whom the editor when he went on a journey committed charge of the office. He collected bills for all the subscriptions and all the advertisements, and then he wrote an editorial and said, "I have always wanted to run a newspaper; I never thought it would be in a guy town like this; but the boss is gone, and I will never have another opportunity to tell you long-faced, hypocritical sneaks and booze hoisters what I think of you." He wrote a most defamatory article calling by name the prominent men of the town. Of course, it kicked up a great row, and when a posse of wrathful citizens went around to hunt up the author they learned that just as the paper had gone to press he had boarded a through train for the West. Unlike the tramp, I have nothing derogatory to say of this Congress. On the contrary, I have the greatest respect and admiration for and shall always bear testimony to the ability, the great industry, and the high character of the average Member of Congress. The unfailing courtesy which the older Members of Congress give to new Members has put me under obligations that I shall never forget, and in singing my swan song before I board the train for the West, I only regret I shall have to part from gentlemen on both sides of this House whose friendship I shall always cherish among my dearest possessions.

Now, I have said that to square myself with you as most charming gentlemen with whom I do not agree politically, because I am going to tell you some things which, as Democrats, you will not like.

The Democratic Party came into power by the divine appointment(?) of 41 per cent of the voters. The other 59 per cent were not and never will be Democrats.

The Democrats were wildly enthusiastic about things they would do which they have not done and about things they would not do which they have done.

They were especially enthusiastic about the "pie counter," and created 5,500 new offices, at an annual expense of $6,975,000.

They promised economy, and gave the country the most expensive administration the country has ever known.

They have stricken down the civil-service law in three separate assaults, approved by the President, to provide places to "reward faithful Democrats."

For 30 years the transcontinental railroads prevented the building of the Panama Canal. We gave our coastwise shipping free tolls. I think this was a mistake, and that as a mere economic policy every ship should pay a fair share of the cost; but it was done with the approval of the President and all political parties. But when Great Britain, whose shipping will get 80 per cent of the use of the canal, claimed that we had no more right in the canal than any other nation, except the exclusive right to pay the bills, the administration made a pusillanimous surrender.

They promised to take from Wall Street the control of business credits and enacted a measure which in the last analysis gives the banking interests legalized control of every great operation which requires large sums of money. The currency law, of which they so loudly boast, provides, indeed, elasticity, which was so greatly needed, but in other respects it is a complete surrender to the money power, at least so long as the Reserve Board is constituted as it now is.

They promised to reduce the cost of living, and only increased the number of those who have nothing to buy with.

But the Democratic tariff bill was to prove the divine commission of the Democratic Party to bring prosperity, "New Freedom," "markets beyond the seas," and other "phantom and psychological" blessings to the American people, with the physical, actual result of men out of employment, factories closed, and soup houses in full blast.

The bombastic threat that if anybody dared to say Democratic times were not good times the public prosecutor would jump on him has failed to suppress widespread complaint.

Everybody but a Democrat knew what would happen. Foreign goods came in, displacing American goods, but the rates were so low that there is a deficit in the revenues.

The President assured Congress that the tariff was working "admirably until the war came along and stopped imports." Nobody laughed, but most people knew four months before there was any war that the Democratic leaders were behind the door gnawing their fingers, at their wits' end to devise some way to meet the deficit.

The imports have not fallen off considerably, but so much comes in free or at reduced rates that you had to levy a "war" tax.

You threw away $50,000,000 of revenue derived from sugar imports and gave it to the sugar refineries. You fixed it up so that any foreign country can buy sugar in New York at 1 cent per pound less than our own people are obliged to pay.

You are now figuring some way out of the slough into which your misguided policy has plunged the country.

You can not do it with your shipping bill. You can not do it by stopping necessary works and improvements.

You can do it by repealing the sugar schedule, by repealing the Underwood Tariff Act, and enacting a substantial protective tariff.

The American people believe in a protective tariff. At the last election they repudiated your Democratic tariff.

There are Democrats on this floor who have seen these mistakes, but the party lash with few exceptions has whipped them into line; and there has never been an administration more

fanatically partisan nor a more subservient Congress in the history of the country.

When the Republican leaders in 1912 refused to nominate the man whom an overwhelming majority of the party wanted they trampled upon the fundamental doctrine of Republicanism. It was the culmination of an era of oligarchic tendencies and subserviency to special interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The election of 1912 was a revolt against "boss politics." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The election of 1914 was a revolt against Democratic administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The average progressive in 1912 was in comparatively prosperous circumstances. He indulged in hopes, perhaps in "dreams," of reforms and betterments. He revolted against the alliances of political bosses and big business, against privilege; but, in 1914, the same man was hungry and out of a job, and, as the quickest way to get relief from the hard times brought about by the Democratic Party, he voted the Republican ticket as the quickest means of relief, but he did not abandon his progressivism.

What the Progressive will do in 1916 will decide that election.

The same old leaders are in the Republican saddle. PENROSE is there, Cannon is there, and SMOOT and GALLINGER and all the other repudiators of the party will in 1912. Have they learned anything?

If they resume their former arrogant disregard of public sentiment and again make the Republican organization the citadel of "privilege," they will ride to a fall; but if they will make the organization responsive to the public will; if they will make it an efficient agency to meet the public demands, there will be no good reason why the Progressive who cherishes the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln should not find in a reformed and rehabilitated Republican Party the realization of his "dreams." [Applause.]

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks Mr. STEPHENS of California yielded five minutes additional to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HULINGS.]

Gentlemen, what will happen in 1916 depends entirely upon what the Republican Party does meanwhile. Here, of course, the Democrats are responsible, and it would be difficult to determine what the leaders of a minority party in Congress would do if they were returned to power; but the Republican Party is fully in control in many States, and it will be easily seen whether the leaders have learned anything or will be up to their old tricks. Up in Pennsylvania, for instance, Gov. Brumbaugh was elected as a Republican. If he will clean out the boodlers, the grafters, and the place warmers that have infested the State capitol for a generation; if he will give the people of Pennsylvania a clean administration—oh, not a perfect; but a good, substantial administration, free from the dictation of the "interests" or the control of the bosses—there is no reason why the Progressives in that State should not support him, and I believe they will. They ought to support him, for anybody who has inspected the organization of the State senate knows Gov. Brumbaugh has a rocky road before him if he means to make a fight for clean politics; and he ought to be supported by every man who is opposed to the corrupt methods that so long have disgraced the Republican machine. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, before I begin I desire to request to be notified when I have proceeded for 30 minutes and to request gentlemen to defer questions until after that time. I also ask unanimous consent, in case I shall not be able to complete my remarks, to extend them in the RECORD and print certain documentary material.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print certain additional documentary material and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, we have come again to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. Since the naval bill was considered last year events of great importance have occurred in the world. From a world at peace we have suddenly become a world at war, and the field of operations has extended over the ocean until to-day there are active war operations in Canada, to the north of us; in Europe, to the east of us; in Asia, to the west of us; and internal war in Mexico, to the south of us; and every day that our citizens awaken they see hostile men-of-war hovering over our ports in both oceans. This disturbed condition in the world's affairs certainly calls upon us to give the question of national defense at this time our most earnest and painstaking consideration.

Our national defense must be founded essentially upon our world policies, and especially upon that part of our world policies that conflict, or are supposed to conflict, with the world policies of other nations. Let us consider briefly the world policies of America. America, like all nations and like all other living things, owes its first duty to itself and to nature—the duty of self-preservation. In my judgment, it is not a necessary corollary of international relations that under the dictates of self-preservation the world policies of one nation must inherently conflict with those of other nations. I am fundamentally convinced that the test for fitness to survive is no longer might and brute force to conquer, destroy, and rule, but is essentially a capacity and willingness to cooperate with others and actually to contribute substantially to the welfare of others. In other words, to serve. This conception of the fitness to survive is not now accepted the world over. On the contrary, there are great nations whose peoples honestly believe that their duty of self-preservation involves harm and even destruction to other nations. We must, therefore, make provision to protect our vital interests against violence. By vital interest I mean, first, the lives, property, and commerce of our citizens, including the integrity of our territory. When we contemplate the great exposure of these, our vital interests, the thought is almost staggering. The vast stretch of the Atlantic coast and its bays, harbors, and tributaries, upon which are built our great centers of population; the Gulf, the Pacific, the Panama Canal; and then, beyond our shores, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, the Philippine Islands, in the Pacific; Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, in the Atlantic. In a conservative calculation we will find that we have the homes of over 30,000,000 of our citizens, with a property aggregation of more than $37,000,000,000, located within gunshot of the water, so that a foreign foe attacking us would not have to proceed inland. He could permanently occupy the outlying territory with great armies without opposition if he had control of the sea. On our mainland he could make raids and levy ransom, striking us long before we could organize any material resistance, and he could then retire with his booty, having destroyed our military resources, military stores, arsenals, factories, shipyards—all without suffering any serious loss.

As to the question of the Philippine Islands I think this is the time for me to express certain convictions that have grown upon me in the last few years. I am convinced that whatever may be our political relations to the Philippine Islands, whether we grant them partial or complete independence—and I for one am in favor of the principle of granting them a larger measure of self-government than they are even capable of successfully conducting, so that in the exercise and even in the mistakes of self-government they can make progress in the capacity for self-government—I am clearly and strongly convinced, from my knowledge of the American people, that whatever our relations with the Philippine Islands this Nation will always protect those helpless Filipinos, as we have undertaken to protect the helpless Cubans, against any intervention or oppression by any military monarchy. I know there are many of my countrymen who disagree with me, many of my countrymen who openly express the idea of our evacuating those islands in order to escape the exposure to attack that their possession brings to us. My conviction is that the policy of the present administration is to get in a position free from responsibilities in the Philippine Islands, so that if during this war or after this world war a foreign power proceeded to occupy them America might remain aloof with some show of honor.

I have just had a conversation with the Secretary of State over the phone, and I wish to state carefully what he has said to me clearly, that there has been no understanding whatsoever with Japan in this matter; that this question has not been officially discussed—that phase of it—either in Washington or in Tokyo, and I am glad to make that statement in connection with my own. And I make my statements simply as a conviction. I hope my conviction is not correct, but the natural statement or disclaimer of the Secretary of State has not changed my conviction partially founded upon a news report last summer, shortly after the world war began, apparently emanating from the White House, but whether literally given out or not, I care but little. That report intimated that the administration desired the Philippine independence bill to be hastened, so that in case the belligerent conditions in the world required our retirement from those islands we would be in a position to retire quickly. Of course I would expect the Secretary of State to deny this;

and of course I do not impugn his good faith and conscientiousness in making his disclaimer. This question of the conflict of our vital interests on the Pacific with the vital interests of another nation has been brought up on a number of occasions on the floor of this House. At the risk of continued misunderstanding and widespread criticism I have each time undertaken to give a warning to my countrymen, and I now repeat the warning. A great military nation of Asia believes that its vital interests in the Pacific Ocean run counter to ours.

Now, I have made the statement that our relations with that nation have repeatedly been strained. I wish now to repeat that statement, and I desire also to state that the Secretary of State has just assured me that he does not agree with me on that proposition; that he has not considered our relations with this power as strained at any time since he has held office. But I repeat the statement I made in the Naval Committee.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It was rumored here soon after the President spoke on the Mexican situation, in which he spoke of the Philippine situation, that what he had in mind was to have the other nations to assist in neutralizing the islands. Have you any information on that?

Mr. HOBSON. I have no positive information, Mr. Chairman; but I wish now to renew my statement, without any chance of contradiction, because it was drawn out of me by a taunt in the Naval Committee, and then and there I called on the Secretary of the Navy to deny it if it were not true. I said then, and I repeat it now, that our Government believed in May and June, and up into July of 1913, that war was imminent, and our gunners at Corregidor Island at the mouth of the Manila Bay slept on their guns for six weeks, and were on duty night and day; that the harbor was mined, and that every hour they expected the appearance of a hostile fleet. Furthermore, cipher instructions were sent to navy-yard commandants to be prepared to instantly put their station on a war basis. But that is neither here nor there. Denials or differences of opinion are of little consequence. The principles of national defense that I have laid down demand that we recognize this condition in the Pacific Ocean. In that ocean, as in the Atlantic, since we have no large standing army and are inadequately provided with coast defenses, the only basis for the security for our vital interests is control of the sea. This control of the sea by America would not be a menace to any nation in Asia or anywhere else, because there would be no great army upon it, the fleet not being able to march ashore.

Mr. Chairman, there are other considerations that are becoming more and more dear to the American people which are not wholly based on our material interests and self-preservation.

Our free institutions have always been very dear; especially the principle of the right of local self-government, the corner stone of liberty; the principle that there can be many local sovereignties exercising the functions of local sovereignty consistently with the wider sovereignty of the Nation. But that thought has never yet been accepted by the great nations of the world. In the matter of the exercise of the police power by the individual States there have been 13 cases where the life and property of aliens have been put in jeopardy and injured. In those cases the foreign Governments concerned demanded action on the part of our Federal Government looking to the punishment of the offenders; and at each time our Government replied, "We regret the occurrence, but we can not interfere."

This question has gone further than that of lynching and violence. It has touched the question of land tenure, the right of a sovereign State to control and regulate the question of land tenure. It has gone even further and touched the question of school regulation, the right of a sovereign State itself, without interference from the Federal Government, to determine its own school policy. These matters have not been conceded; they have been challenged, and are now openly challenged. Could America surrender to such a challenge? Not while our Nation lives.

Not only are our free institutions here at home dear to the American people, but we are becoming more and more committed to the principles of the rights of man everywhere—the principle of justice and right and equality of opportunity, irrespective of the force or the might or the power of the individual nation.

The Monroe doctrine was enunciated as a doctrine of self-preservation simply because in international law, so called, no other principle has ever been recognized. But the fact is imbedded down deep in the heart of the great American people that this Nation proposes to protect the weaker nations of this hemisphere against military aggression and colonization by monarchies across the sea. And yet imperial colonization goes on all over the world. It is the fixed, established policy of European monarchies.

When this Nation had her hands tied in the Civil War, Maximilian led the French and occupied Mexico. He proceeded against the strongest protests from our Government. The protest was ignored. When the war was over and America had command of the sea and not another French soldier could be sent across to Mexico, then we repeated our request and sent Gen. Sheridan to the frontier. Promptly the French retired, but when they retired they never conceded the right of America to undertake the protection of Mexico. Neither has Germany ever conceded that right. Neither has England ever conceded that right. In the midst of all the disturbance of Europe we may not see the question arise during the period of war, but if either side comes out overwhelmingly victorious the question of Mexico may become critical in our foreign relations.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOBSON. When my 30 minutes are up, I will yield to questions. I can not well maintain the continuity of my argument if I am interrupted, but, of course, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Suppose that for destruction of property, either English or German or French, in Mexico, there is an indemnity demanded and Mexico can not pay it and they demand a coaling station in lieu thereof. What will be our situation?

Mr. HOBSON. I believe it would be a plain question of whether we would abolish and abrogate the Monroe doctrine or fight.

Now, this Nation has a permanent policy of conscience and conviction; it has made up its mind to thus protect the weaker nations in this hemisphere; yet this policy has not been recognized by the great military nations of the earth. Therefore it is very clear, since our armies could not reach Central and South America, if we would maintain the Monroe doctrine in peace, we must have control of the sea.

I want to refer, incidentally, to other instances of the infringement of the Monroe doctrine besides that of Maximilian in Mexico. We recall that in the history of the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela Great Britain was proposing to proceed, because of the weakness of Venezuela, without regard to an adjudication or settlement, and President Cleveland sent a message practically announcing that the clear right of Venezuela to recourse to arbitration should be respected. His message had a sympathetic response in the heart of all America, unprepared as we were. Every man here who remembers the time knows that, without respect to party, we would have all supported the President. [Applause.]

Now, not long after that Germany hoisted her flag over the customhouses in Venezuela. Our President promptly assembled our whole fleet at Guantanamo and sent Admiral Dewey to take charge of it, and then requested Germany to haul down her flag and retire. Germany promptly did haul down her flag and retire. But when Great Britain granted arbitration to Venezuela and when Germany retired from Venezuela neither nation acknowledged the right of America to assume to protect those people.

Now let us pass from the Atlantic over to the Pacific and consider the open-door policy. Why did this find such a prompt response in America's heart? Because beneath it lies the same principle that underlies the Monroe doctrine. It is true that America did not inaugurate the open-door policy in China, yet America was one of the first nations to champion its acceptance by the nations of the world. When Russia entered Manchuria and occupied Port Arthur America made a vigourous protest. She practically demanded that Russia evacuate China, but we had no fleet, and Russia declined. War came, as the result, between Russia and Japan. When Russia retired Japan took Russia's place.

Why did we find such a response in America's heart in behalf of the open-door policy in China? It was because China, though with vast resources, had no preparations for national defense, and the great military nations were carving her up like vultures. China was helpless before the militarism and greed of the world. Of course, America had rights under her treaties to equal opportunity, under the most-favored-nation clause, in seeking markets in China. But, as I said, Japan stayed when Russia retired. The violation of the open-door policy was the same by Japan that it had been by Russia.

The effect upon our commerce was quickly seen. America's cotton-goods trade alone in Manchuria fell off $20,000,000 the first year of Japanese occupation. We have not yet made a protest to Japan against this permanent occupation of Chinese territory as we made to Russia for a similar occupation. Now

we are confronted with a situation where the Japanese have supplanted the Germans at Kiaochow, with assurances to the world that it was temporary, but later tentative statements that it would be permanent.

Disquieting reports have come from Tokio recently, one of them saying that Japan regarded China as committing an unfriendly act when she simply put an end to the war zone about Kiaochow when war ceased.

Another disquieting report has come that Japan is now taking up negotiations with China with a view to regulating the development of that empire. We got a dispatch this morning from London that Japan's ally in her spoliation of China put an O. K. on Japanese procedure. Great Britain herself is in the same category. She seized Hongkong, and then extended it with the Kowloon extension, and fought two bloody wars with China to compel her to receive the opium produced by the British companies in India.

I have referred to Germany. She occupied Kiaochow, and when she retired recently under force she never said she respected the open-door policy. The day is fast at hand when this Nation, which has championed that policy as we championed the Monroe doctrine, on the principle that the weak are entitled to consideration and respect of their rights by the strong, and the principle that over that great ocean there shall be equality of opportunity and fair chance, and no favor when commercial and industrial nations trade with China; the day is fast approaching when, in my judgment, this Nation will be compelled to surrender every vestige of the maintenance of the open-door policy in the Chinese Empire or fight. It is possible I may be mistaken in my deductions, but I am not mistaken in my facts. If we would see to it that the principles of justice and right, the rights of the weak as against the strong shall be respected wherever America has influence over the Pacific, there is only one policy of defense in that ocean. We must control the sea.

Human evolution in the world must rely upon America, the great peace Nation, a Nation which has no enemy in all the world. Our inherent altruism stands out everywhere. America returned to Japan the indemnity collected from that country in the sixties, when Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and ourselves bombarded the straits of Shimonoseki and collected an indemnity. The other nations divided the indemnity and took their share and used it up, as they always do, but the United States, by the unanimous vote of the American Congress, returned to Japan the last dollar of our share of that indemnity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed half an hour.

Mr. HOBSON. When the huge indemnities were collected from China in connection with the Boxer disturbances, against the constant protest of America at their being collected, particularly against the exorbitant amounts, there are Members who remember with what alacrity in due time this House by unanimous vote returned the last dollar of our share to the Chinese Government. It was one of the happiest votes I ever cast.

Members will remember that after the Spanish War, when Spain lay prostrate, we did not want to harm Spain. We sent peace envoys to meet her peace envoys, and we ended a victorious war by paying a conquered foe $20,000,000 and voluntarily transporting the Spanish soldiers for her back to Spain. And when Cuba was in our hands the world could not believe their own eyes when they saw America did not only not keep Cuba as a source of revenue, not even ask her to pay back the cost of the war, but saw us go back and spend more money to set Cuba on her feet, and then patted her on the shoulder and gave her her independence and told her we would protect her until the end of time. This is the only Government in the world that practices such principles of altruism in its relations with other nations, and this fact increases the importance of our possessing the power to promote the cause of such principles in the world.

Now consider the question of the rights of neutrals. It is in the interests of civilization that these rights should not be subordinated further to the alleged rights of belligerents founded solely upon the rule of might. Similarly in the question of the rights of weak nations neutral in war time. The principle of altruism ought to be projected more and more into the so-called international law, into the precedents and practices of the great nations of the world. In this America is the natural champion.

I am not asking America to go far afield, a wild champion of the weak everywhere, undertaking to dictate to the world and assuming that she alone can determine the true ethics of international conduct; but where we have such a settled policy as the Monroe doctrine, and as the open-door policy, we ought not to do as we did toward Korea. We were really under treaty obligation to protect the sovereignty of Korea, yet we would not even allow her ambassador, who was sent to Washington, to appear in the White House to ask us to observe our treaty. Orders were issued to prevent him from coming to the White House. America should not have her hands tied and be impotent in matters of humanity any more than in matters of vital interest. More and more the world policy of America should be based on altruism, and the only way to have it is to give America power on the seas.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. The gentleman has spoken of the Monroe doctrine, and knowing that the gentleman has paid as much attention to that as any person in the House, I would like to inquire whether we are not under obligations to keep the peace if other nations interfere in Mexican affairs?

Mr. HOBSON. I think I should refer my friend to the watchful-waiting policy.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Whether or not there could be any liability attached to us for the loss of property and lives of other nations by our undertaking to enforce the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. HOBSON. I doubt whether there would be financial responsibility upon us, but I can see that if there should come the threat of foreign military aggression in Mexico our responsibility of protection would be clear.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I take it that the gentleman is not in accord with the watchful-waiting policy.

Mr. HOBSON. On the contrary, I do not approve all the things we have done, but I wish to take occasion to compliment the President and the Secretary of State, and compliment this Congress and the people of the United States upon their patience and good will and long-suffering waiting. I do not wish to be put in the attitude of condemning the policy.

Having established these principles for our defense, I now desire to discuss the question of our defense policy. How can we expect to determine and maintain a sound defensive policy as long as there is no agency in the Government for that purpose? There is no agency in this Government with the responsibility of investigating and determining questions of a defense. Ours is the only Government in the world that has no such an agency.

A bill has been pending in this House for six years to establish such an agency—a bill to establish a council of national defense—upon which there would be a representative of the whole Nation, the President ex officio; then the Secretary of State, representing world policy; and the War Department and the Navy Department, represented by their heads and by their great experts, to give full knowledge on these matters, these all representing the executive branch of the Government. Then there would be the chairmen of the great committees of the House and Senate—Military and Naval, the purse strings, and Foreign Relations. Six years I have been earnestly endeavoring to have this bill favorably acted upon. All investigating measures have been taken—elaborate hearings before the Naval Committee.

Take, for instance, such testimony as that Gen. Wotherspoon, president of the War College and late Chief of the General Staff, gave. He said, in effect, that it would treble the efficiency of the Army and cut its cost in half.

Twice the bill has been reported by the naval committee. I will append the report from the committee. It has been approved by all the Secretaries of War, I think four of them, and by the Secretaries of the Navy down to the present Secretary. The measure is mentioned by name in the Democratic platform at Baltimore, giving the country to understand at that time that the Democratic Party if intrusted with power would be constructive in dealing with our national defense, by creating an agency to treat it rationally.

That bill to-day would be on the statute books but for the opposition of the President and the Secretary of State.

In order that my words may not be misquoted or misunderstood, I will read them.

THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF STATE THE GREATEST OBSTACLES OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The fact that the council of national defense bill is a plank in the Democratic platform seems to have no influence with the administration. This bill would long since have been a law but for the opposition of the President and the Secretary of State. This opposition to the most vital and fundamental measure, similar to measures that have been taken by all the other nations of the world, opposition that keeps America from making a start, constitutes the President and the Secretary of State the greatest obstacle of their country's defense.

It seems a singular irony that the movement for national prohibition likewise has found greatest opposition from the present administration. To thoughtful men these two questions are the

most vital and the most fundamental before the Nation, one affecting the integrity of the Nation within and the other the security of the Nation without. It seems passing strange that measured by these two great causes we find the highest official of the Nation is the greatest obstacle to progress.

This brings me to the question of a naval program. I wish in the remaining 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to come down to the specific question of a naval program. I submit to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues that our first duty, though not exclusive duty, is to make efficient the Navy that we actually have. It would be a singular thing, but for the fact that our people are nonmilitary, that in all the legislation relating to the Navy Department and the organization of the seven bureaus of that department there is not one word about keeping the Navy always prepared and ready for war under plans definitely worked out in advance. There is actually no agency in our Navy Department to work out detailed plans prior to war, to coordinate all agencies of the Navy, and insure efficiency when the war actually comes.

This present bill carries in it a provision to create a chief of naval operations and assigns him 15 assistants; this body, then, for the first time will give us an agency to take charge of this great question.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I will.

Mr. OLDFIELD. What is the object of that board of which Admiral Dewey is the head?

Mr. HOBSON. I am gratified the gentleman asked that question. That board is only established by regulations, not by statute; it is a general accommodation board and is used for a lot of miscellaneous duties in the Navy. There are three active members of it, and one of those has the question of general plans, but it has no provision for working out complete detail plans; most of the time that board is working on knotty problems for the Navy and the Government at large. By the way, at the present time two of those three members of the board are occupied by duty with the State Department working up precedents on international law involved in neutrality. In other navies they will have 20, 30, 40, or 50 officers and assistants trained to this work, giving themselves over to this work exclusively all the time. We need not imagine that one or even several officers' sporadic work on general plans could answer. That is one of the most important parts of the whole bill.

Next comes the question of the fleet itself. What shall we do to make efficient the fleet that we have? There is a vast extent of ocean, the Atlantic and Pacific, over which our fleet will have to operate. It will have to see farther than any other fleet.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield there for about a minute?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I have a letter from Admiral Dewey, which I received yesterday, with reference to the duties of the General Board on preparing plans.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman incorporate them or allow me to incorporate them in my remarks as an extension?

Mr. PADGETT. It is for the benefit of the House, and I would like to have read the letter the Secretary of the Navy forwarded to me.

Mr. HOBSON. I will read them. [Reading:]

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 28, 1915.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT,
Chairman House Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my hearings before the Naval Committee I stated that the Navy Department, through the General Board, carried out the naval regulations providing for plans of campaign if our country should be engaged in war.

I am inclosing herein a copy of a letter from Admiral Dewey, president of the General Board, stating that the General Board has prepared such plans; that they are constantly revised and kept up to date, and are in such condition as to be immediately available for the use of the Navy Department.

Sincerely, yours, JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 28, 1915.

To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Preparation of war plans by General Board.

In compliance with your verbal request of this date for information as to the work done by the General Board in the preparation of war plans, I submit the following:

Article 167 (2) of the Navy Regulations is as follows:

"It (the General Board) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Navy plans of campaign, including cooperation with the Army and the employment of all the elements of naval defense, such as the Naval Militia, Coast Survey, Lighthouse Service, Revenue-Cutter Service, and merchant vessels, and shall constantly revise these plans in accordance with the latest information received."

2. The General Board has prepared plans, in cooperation with the Naval War College and the Office of Naval Intelligence, for war with various nations which may be considered as being our most probable adversaries. These plans are being constantly revised and kept up to date, and are in such condition as to be immediately available for the use of the Navy Department.

GEORGE DEWEY.

When I made my statement in the beginning I was then aware of this naval regulation and the work which the naval board has done in the way of general plans, but I do not wish now to discuss the adequacy or inadequacy of that kind of a plan.

Mr. PADGETT. With the gentleman's permission I will insert in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary setting out the regulations, etc., in regard to the board in the preparation of plans.

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; I will also put those in my remarks as an extension, together with the general functions of this chief of naval operations and his assistants when they finally put that in operation.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 28, 1915.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT,
Chairman House Naval Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Referring to my testimony before your committee regarding the preparation of war plans and to your inquiry by telephone in regard to the same, I quote below for your information the Navy Regulations covering the subject in question:

"SECTION 7.

"ART. 166. (1) The General Board shall be composed of the Admiral of the Navy, the aid for operations, the aid for material, the director of naval intelligence, the president of the Naval War College, and such additional officers as the Secretary of the Navy may designate.

"(2) An officer above the grade of lieutenant shall be detailed as secretary to the General Board. He shall record its proceedings and have charge and custody of its files and correspondence.

"ART. 167. (1) The General Board shall devise measures and plans for the effective preparation and maintenance of the fleet for war and shall advise the Secretary of the Navy as to the disposition and distribution of the fleet and of the reenforcements of ships, officers, and men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

"(2) It shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Navy plans of campaign, including cooperation with the Army and the employment of all the elements of naval defense, such as the Naval Militia, Coast Survey, Lighthouse Service, Revenue-Cutter Service, and merchant vessels, and shall constantly revise these plans in accordance with the latest information received.

"(3) It shall consider the number and types of ships proper to constitute the fleet, the number and rank of officers, and the number and ratings of enlisted men required to man them, and shall advise the Secretary of the Navy respecting the estimates therefor (including such increase as may be requisite) to be submitted annually to Congress.

"(4) It shall advise the Secretary of the Navy concerning the location, capacity, and protection of fuel depots and supplies of fuel, and of navy yards and naval stations; also in regard to the establishment and maintenance of reserves of ordnance and ammunition and depots of supplies; and shall advise as to the delivery of provisions and stores of every kind required by the fleet.

"(5) It shall coordinate the work of the Naval War College and the Office of Naval Intelligence, and shall consider and report upon naval operations, maneuvers, tactics, organization, training, and such other subjects as the Secretary of the Navy may lay before it."

SECTION 8.

"ART. 126. (1) The aid for operations shall advise the Secretary as to strategic and tactical matters, in conjunction with the recommendations of the General Board, as covered by section 7 of this chapter, and shall also advise regarding all movements of naval vessels, and in general regarding the operations of the vessels of the Navy.

"(2) He shall advise the Secretary as to the submission of subjects to the General Board and Naval War College, and, in order that he may properly perform this duty, all papers which are required to be submitted to the General Board of War College shall be forwarded to the department (Division of Operations of the Fleet) for such reference.

"(13) He shall, in conjunction with the General Board, advise the Secretary as to coordinating the work of the Naval War College and the Office of Naval Intelligence. (Art. 167, par. 5.)"

SECTION 1.

"ART. 105. The Division of Operations of the Fleet shall include the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Office of Target Practice and Steaming Competitions, the Naval War College, and a Section of Movements of the Fleet."

Pursuant to the above regulations the General Board makes a study of the armaments and war resources of foreign nations as compared to our own and their probable strategic plans for defensive and offensive operations against us in case of war, and prepares war plans for our use in operations against them.

In the preparation of such plans it has advantage of the studies on strategy, tactics, and logistics made at the War College on various situations that might arise. The president of the War College is a member of the General Board, and attends its regular monthly sessions. The General Board transfers its place of work to the War College during about three months every year. The Office of Naval Intelligence, whose director is also a regular member of the General Board, is located in the same building with the General Board, and furnishes it with all information obtainable relating to armaments and war resources of foreign nations.

The General Board, through the aid for material, who is also a member, has the means of obtaining all information relating to the material condition of the Navy, including ships, navy yards, and naval stations, and ways and means of supplying the fleet in time of war and peace.

The aid for operations, who is also a member, is charged with assisting the board in the preparation of war plans and with advising the Secretary in regard to the same, and in coordinating the work of the various utilities of the Navy Department in carrying them out.

Under the system briefly outlined the General Board has prepared war plans for use in possible contingencies against various nations, and these are now on file for immediate use should the occasion arise.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

TENTATIVE DUTIES OF PROPOSED CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND HIS ASSISTANTS.

The work may be conveniently divided among nine committees, or "sections."

The historical section studies past campaigns, analyzes them, and deduces a comprehensive conception of war. From this conception it deduces broad and general "doctrines," as guides for our officer personnel in their conduct of war. By means of these "doctrines," the personnel works with a prearranged understanding, without the necessity for awaiting long and detailed orders.

The policy section makes studies of the inherent interests of all nations, and the policies which logically follow. They endeavor to forecast the possibilities of international conflict and to devise measures to carry out the policies determined by the Government. The various policies of their own Nation, as outlined by the State Department, are studied, and upon these are based the naval strategy of possible future war.

The strategic section studies the theaters of possible wars from every aspect, and the sources and means of supply to the military and naval forces. The strategic situation in each case is studied not only from our point of view but also from the enemy's point of view, and his probable course of action is deduced.

The tactical section studies tactics, particularly in relation to the strategy determined, and endeavors to insure that the tactics of the fleet are kept constantly up to date and conform to the character of the ships and weapons that will be used. They also study the enemy's forces, together with the probable tactics which he will employ.

The logistic section studies the logistic aspects of the strategic and tactical plans, and deduces the following:

(a) The requirements as to supplies at the beginning of war.
(b) The requirements for subsequent phases of the war.
(c) The sources of supply and supplies available.
(d) The organization of transportation.
(e) The organization of the auxiliaries forming the fleet train.
(f) A list of available merchant vessels, their characteristics, whereabouts, and places of assembly for alterations, and the time required to place each in readiness.
(g) Inspection of merchant vessels, and detail decision in each case as to the use to which the vessel shall be put, the alterations to be made, the yard to which assigned; and tentative arrangements with owners as to price and mode of transfer.
(h) Detailed plans for the assemblage of supplies.
(i) Orders necessary for the execution of the plans.

The organization section studies and devises plans of organization for war in order to secure the most efficient flow of authority; the best administrative and tactical grouping of the forces; the detail of personnel for command; and the orders necessary for the execution of the various plans.

The mobilization section prepares and keeps always up to date plans of mobilization for war for each of the various situations arising from conflict with possible enemies. These plans must show:

(a) The vessels to be mobilized.
(b) Detailed scheme of organization and utilization of Naval Reserves, Naval Militia, ex-Navy men, and others who would be needed on outbreak of war.
(c) The names of their chief officers.
(d) The dates when mobilization of the various types of ships must be completed.
(e) The places of assembly.
(f) The plan of recruiting organization.
(g) Orders necessary for execution of plans.

The training section studies methods for the training of the naval forces, and devises strategical problems and tactical exercises involving combined maneuvers of battleships, scouts, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, air craft, and mining vessels.

The executive section sees that the plans devised are executed.

The importance of the work may be judged from the fact that in Great Britain it is performed by a separate organization called the naval war staff, composed of about 39 line officers, a few staff officers, and about 31 civilian assistants; in Germany by the admiral staff, composed of 22 officers with 13 officer-assistants and a librarian; and in Japan by a general staff, which is immediately under the Emperor.

In the duties of each of the present bureaus of the Navy Department, as explicitly defined by law, not one word appears as to the necessity of being prepared for war, or for the steps to be taken in preparation therefor. The Navy has no such bureau.

Now, as to the fleet itself. We have a vast extent of ocean which we must cover in our fleet operations.

Mr. CURRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. The naval board has no real power. It simply makes recommendations, which are usually ignored.

Mr. HOBSON. It has no statutory power. Its power would be merely advisory.

Mr. CURRY. And the advice is not accepted.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is correct that it may not be accepted. Now, in these vast operations our fleet ought to be able to see farther than any fleet in the world. Our fleet to-day is blind. There is not in the North Atlantic Fleet nor in the naval service a single efficient scout vessel, a vessel that could scout and do its scouting out on the high seas and keep there. Every other navy in the world has them. These fleets have eyes. Most up-to-date fleets have, in addition to regular scouts, these great battle cruisers that can make their reconnoissance in force at a long distance. Our Navy has not one. That I regard as a prime necessity for making the battleships we now have effective. We should no longer turn down amendments offered here for years, and which will be offered again, to authorize two battle cruisers. My conception of the best vessel for this service is a vessel of about 40,000 tons displacement, having guns as big as any built, with at least 30 knots speed, and having armor such as would protect them at battle ranges against attack by an armor-piercing shell. In addition to that, we ought to have at least five regular scouts——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How much would the vessel cost?

Mr. HOBSON. The 40,000 tons.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. I imagine the one I recommend would cost about $22,000,000. It is the 30-knot speed that makes it so expensive; the machinery is exceedingly expensive. All the nations of the world have seen fit to go to extra expense in order to get these vessels. The prime requisites are speed and power of hitting, enabling the vessel to choose its own range as against most vessels, at least those that are met in scouting, and be able to take its distance and then by a superior attack at long range destroy the enemy without having the enemy become effective against the ship itself. That is what has been done in all the battles recently fought. The one off the Chilean coast, Members will remember, was fought at a long range, nearly 14,000 yards, although the biggest guns were only 9.2; but through superior speed the German fleet was able to totally destroy the English fleet, although one of the English ships had larger guns than the Germans. Through superior speed the Germans were able not only to choose their own range, but also to choose their location, so that when the sun set the English ships could not see the German ships, while the German ships were practically destroying the English.

Now, in the Falkland Islands the tables were exactly turned, but the results were the same. The two English battle cruisers that went there chose their range and distance and destroyed the Germans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will extend my remarks in the RECORD in more consecutive form.

Mr. Chairman, we have again reached the time when the Sixty-third Congress is to consider and to provide for the maintenance and development of the Navy. This is a momentous year in the history of the world. Amidst the clash of arms in all parts of the world our people have a general feeling of alarm and some misgivings and forebodings. The war area has extended until we find it in Canada to our north, in Europe to our east, in Asia to our west, and the echo of internal war in Mexico to our south. Daily we see the warships of belligerent nations hovering off our shores. There has never been such a disturbed condition of the world, certainly not since the Napoleonic wars.

CONDITIONS ANALOGOUS TO THOSE BEFORE THE WAR OF 1812.

Both sides in the great European struggle are taking occasion to bitterly criticize America's conduct. We have suffered already a serious interruption of our commerce and an economic dislocation requiring emergency revenue legislation for the Government and entailing hundreds of millions of dollars' loss by our people. The situation is closely analogous to the situation at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, when Great Britain was the moving spirit in directing allied nations against Napoleon. Indeed the situation now is more ominous than the situation at that time.

WAR WITH FRANCE IN 1800.

Napoleon's resentment which led to the war with France in 1800 was not as intense as the growing resentment of the Germans to-day at the great source of supply of war materials her enemy allies are finding in America.

WAR OF 1812.

The arbitrary treatment of American ships and American commerce by Great Britain to-day are closely parallel to similar treatment in the years preceding the War of 1812. The attitude of Great Britain toward America in recent years should give serious concern to all thoughtful Americans.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

It was exceedingly ungracious, to say the least, for Great Britain to press us as she did over the question of simply granting free tolls through the Panama Canal to our coastwise shipping.

SHIP PURCHASE.

Great Britain's attitude toward our purchase of ships from Germany is nothing short of menacing.

RIGHTS OF NEUTRALS.

Her continual and arbitrary abridgment of the rights of neutrals to the great disturbance of our foreign commerce, and her arbitrary extension of the list of contraband to suit her own convenience, regardless of the Declaration of London and

of other international conferences, is a serious menace to the development of our foreign commerce and infringes the just rights of all neutrals.

THE ANGLO-JAPANESE ALLIANCE.

The disturbance in China, growing out of the seizure of Kiaochow by Japan, with the occupation of islands near our possessions, are causing disturbances in the Pacific where conditions were already serious.

The most ominous and significant event of the year is the giving out to the world that the Anglo-Japanese treaty is an alliance offensive and defensive.

TIME TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

It is high time that all thoughtful Americans should pause and earnestly consider the condition of our national defense.

BEWARE OF PEACE DREAMERS.

Let us particularly beware of those who come and who have been coming crying, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace; those who fold their hands like followers of Confucius and would pray for peace, but do nothing to actually insure peace. Peace is nowhere maintained without definite and adequate provision for its maintenance. Definite organization has been evolved in every community where peace prevails, whose principal purpose is to insure peace and that administration of justice upon which alone abiding peace can rest. There is no such organization between the nations of the world. Each nation is sovereign, acknowledging no superior, subject to no restraining authority. The prosecution of the war in Europe is a constant reminder that nations are beyond the domain of law and are subject only to the impulses that sway human nature unrestrained. An idealistic enthusiasm that assumes that organization exists between nations capable of assuming the responsibility of administering justice deceives itself and endangers the real progress of peace and justice. It becomes a public menace when it advocates leaving a nation's life, independence, and vital interest to hang upon a myth. To advise our country and other peaceable nations to go disarmed simply because we would prefer an international organization for justice would be like advising the peaceable inhabitants on a wild frontier to disarm and allow the lawless to reign. Such action would prevent the development of a condition of law and order.

MUST RELY UPON OUR OWN RIGHT ARM.

America never has been an aggressive Nation. She is not now and never will be. But America lives amidst the powerful military nations of the earth. As pointed out, we can not look to an international organization for our protection. There is no international court; only the embryo, in the form of The Hague tribunal; no international parliament, only the embryo of The Hague conference, whose third convocation, due in 1915, is now being allowed to lapse. Where are the peace dreamers? Sitting idly by, without raising a finger to avert this tragedy to the little embryo. In vain have I sought to interest the Secretary of State. He also will not raise a finger, out of fear, evidently, of displeasing those belligerents who do not wish any measures to be taken to hasten the advent of peace. There is no international executive—not even an embryo.

THE QUESTION OF TREATIES.

Treaties lack the main basis of a contract—the power of enforcement; the question of arbitration. Arbitration up to the present time, as between great nations, specifically excludes from consideration questions of vital interest and questions of honor—the very questions over which nations wage war. Having no outside recourse, nations must provide their own means of defense. At this stage of the world's political and social evolution we must rely upon our own strong arm alone for our national defense.

THE RIGHTS OF PEACE VERSUS THE RIGHTS OF WAR.

A very illuminating example is now seen of the encroachments of nations at war upon the rights of nations at peace simply and solely because of their preponderance of power over the latter. America's woeful lack of preparation is the fundamental reason for the reversal of the ordinary progress of humanity, the contraction of the rights of peace before the encroachment of the so-called rights of war, based solely upon the preponderance of brute force. It is no exaggeration to say that the condition of preparation for national defense in America is now and will remain the largest determining factor in the preservation of our own peace and the establishment and extension of peace throughout the world.

AMERICA'S WORLD POLICIES.

A nation's position among the nations of the world and its own world policies are the foundation considerations for working out a policy of national defense.

SELF-PRESERVATION THE FIRST LAW OF NATURE.

For America and for all other nations, as for all living organisms, the first law is self-preservation.

DANGER OF ATTACK IN THE ATLANTIC.

We have 5,300 miles of Atlantic coast line, and bays and harbors and navigable rivers leading up to the same, upon which are located, within 15 miles of water, the homes of 15,000,000 American citizens and over seventeen billions of American property. On the Gulf coast we have the homes of nearly 2,000,000 citizens and over eight hundred millions of property; on the Great Lakes, the homes of about 8,000,000 citizens, with about seven and a half billions of property; in the great Mississippi Valley, 11,500,000 citizens and nearly nine billions of property. In addition to our mainland exposure, we must protect Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Panama Canal.

DANGER OF ATTACK IN THE PACIFIC.

In the Pacific Coast States the homes of nearly 2,000,000 citizens are exposed, with nearly three billions of property. In addition to the mainland, we have the great treasure house of Alaska, the great strategic harbor and islands of Hawaii, together with the Philippine Islands, and also the Panama Canal.

MUST ALWAYS PROTECT THE FILIPINOS.

Whatever may be our political relations with the Philippine Islands, America will always protect the Filipinos, as she protects the Cubans, against military aggression.

INADEQUACY AND IMPOSSIBILITY OF DEFENSE BY LAND FORCES.

As compared with the great nations, our regular standing Army may be considered a negligible quantity. Likewise our militia and reserve. The same may be said of coast fortifications, which are open to capture from the rear because of the lack of a mobile army for their defense. Therefore an enemy in control of the sea could occupy Cuba, Porto Rico, and Panama, in the Atlantic; Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippine Islands, in the Pacific, all with little practicable resistance in case of attack in force. In addition to definite occupation of this outlying territory, an enemy could raid our mainland coasts in force, occupy and levy upon our great cities without any chance whatever of effective resistance until long after they could retire with their booty, after destroying our navy yards, shipbuilding yards, arsenals, shipping, and public works. It is vain to imagine that our cities would be spared after the experience of cities abroad. It is likewise vain to imagine that the meager land forces available could make any serious resistance.

AMERICA MUST CONTROL THE SEA.

In order to realize the first policy, namely, that of security of our vital interests against violence in accord with the dictates of self-preservation, there is no other recourse. America must control the sea in the Atlantic, and thereby keep the European armies in Europe, and must control the sea in the Pacific, to keep the Asiatic armies in Asia; and since these oceans are so far apart and since nations that are liable to attack us in Europe and Asia are liable to establish and have already established alliances, offensive and defensive, we must control the sea in both oceans at the same time.

PROTECTION OF OUR COMMERCE AND FOREIGN MARKETS.

America is rapidly becoming a great industrial nation, competing for the markets of the word. The jealousy of industrial nations in this competition is illustrated by the attitude of Great Britain toward Germany before the war. America need not hope to have a fair chance to gain supremacy in world commerce any more than Germany if she has no more formidable naval strength than Germany had. The alacrity with which our rights as a neutral are invaded and the quickness with which every means is sought to hamper the growth of our merchant marine at the present time clearly show that neither when Europe is at war or at peace will our commercial and industrial expansion over seas be permitted normal and legitimate course unless we have control of the sea. Thus control of the sea must be the foundation for the security of our property rights on land and on sea.

MENACE TO OUR INSTITUTIONS.

Our Government was established and will have to be maintained in the face of antagonistic institutions of the Old World. Believing, as we do, in the principle of the right of self-government and of equality of opportunity, no European or Asiatic monarchy has yet acknowledged the right of sovereign local self-government as vested in our individual States. There have been 13 cases in our country's history where the subjects of foreign powers have been maltreated in individual States; in 11 cases these foreign subjects suffered violence. The foreign Governments promptly made demands upon our central Government to interfere, and our central Government informed

them with regret that it could not interfere. In most cases an indemnity was afterwards made as a matter of humanity but not as a matter of law. In one recent case a foreign Government questioned the right of a State to regulate its own school system, and in another case now pending it challenges the right of a State to determine the question of tenure of lands and property rights. It is not necessary to cite the dangers involved in this case on account of the race question. Thus, for the security of our institutions as for the security of our homes, our property rights on land and on sea demand that America should control the sea.

THE CAUSE OF JUSTICE AND OF RIGHT.

In world relations under the dictates of self-preservation the game should be played according to the rules of justice and of right, not the rules of brute force and of might.

The ascendency of right is in line with the law of evolution. The progressive development of the higher and nobler faculties of men and of nations, indeed cooperation and service, should supplant the destroying principle in the relationship of nations as in men. America has already historically become the champion of the right of the weak against encroachments of the might of the strong.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Though the Monroe doctrine may have been conceived with the idea of self-protection for the United States, and though from time to time its justification is based upon considerations of vital interest, nevertheless the spirit of the Monroe doctrine is our championship of the rights of the weak against the oppressions of the strong and our championship of the principle that among all strong and weak alike there shall be equality of opportunity, fair chance and no favor. This doctrine cuts off the Western Hemisphere from the extension of colonial policies of Europe and Asia. It is natural and inevitable that the security of this policy rests, and can permanently rest alone upon the control of the sea.

MAXIMILLIAN AND MEXICO.

When America was embroiled in a civil war the French invaded Mexico against the protest of the United States. When the war was over and America had control of the sea and her armies were ready to be turned into Mexico the French promptly retired.

GREAT BRITAIN AND VENEZUELA.

In the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela the former proceeded against the latter in defiance of the expressed wishes of America until President Cleveland sent his Venezuelan message, "Arbitrate with Venezuela or fight." The British chose the former.

GERMANY AND VENEZUELA.

Germany hoisted her flag over the customhouses of Venezuela against the expressed wishes of America. President Roosevelt assembled our whole fleet at Guantanamo, then requested Germany to haul down her flag. The request was complied with.

MEXICO AFTER THE EUROPEAN WAR.

When Europe is relieved of the absorbing activities of the great war what will likely be the attitude of the victorious nation toward Mexico, especially in the event that the allies are victorious and British financial interests are greatly disturbed and injured by Mexican disorder? No one can tell when or in what way the issue may arise, but certain it is that America will be called on to surrender the Monroe doctrine unless she is able to defend it, and since the countries involved, Mexico and Central and South America, are over the seas this defense will hinge absolutely upon our Navy, whether it is powerful enough to control the sea.

CANADA AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

A new complication of the Monroe doctrine has arisen in the participation by Canada in the European war. If Germany were victorious and gained control of the sea, she would probably send an expeditionary force against the British colonies. In the event of such a force conquering Canada, question would arise whether Germany following her natural inclination to remain should be allowed by the United States to establish a German colony on our borders. In case German and American policies should conflict, the question of peace and war—the question of the integrity of the Monroe doctrine—would hang upon the strength of our Navy. If we want peace with the Monroe doctrine, we must control the sea.

THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY IN CHINA.

America has been the champion of the open-door policy in China, beneath which lies essentially the same principle underlying the Monroe doctrine, namely, justice to the weak and equal opportunity to all; respect for the integrity of China and equal opportunity for all nations in their competition for the trade of China.

Russian encroachments through Manchuria continued until Port Arthur was occupied. America promptly protested and practically called on Russia to retire. We had no strong fleet and no military strength behind the fleet we had. Russia ignored our demand and remained, and from her remaining came the war between Russia and Japan. Great Britain has shown scarcely more consideration for the integrity of China than Russia. She seized Hongkong after imposing her opium from India upon the unwilling Chinese by war. She has since extended the territory first seized in the mainland in the Kaloon extension. She made a second war on China to further impose opium upon her people, and later seized Wei-hai-wei, though it appears that since the Japanese alliance she has dismantled this station. Germany has shown a similar attitude toward China, especially when she seized Kiaochow and fortified the harbor of Tsing Tau.

JAPAN AND THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY.

Japan has shown less regard than all the other nations for the integrity of China. She has annexed Korea, part of the Liao Tung Peninsula with Port Arthur; she has practically annexed southern Manchuria, and now has seized Kiaochow. She went to war against Russia ostensibly to get Russia out of Port Arthur and out of Chinese territory, but when Russia withdrew Japan remained and never made any pretense of returning the Chinese territory to China. The probabilities amount to almost a certainty that having gone to war with Germany ostensibly to remove Germany from its encroachment upon China Japan now in Germany's place will never dream of retiring herself.

JAPAN'S MENACE TO CHINA.

Count Okuma, prime minister of Japan, in an article in the Shin Nippon, used these words, referring to the struggle for existence:

> We must be careful to keep this point in mind and prepare ourselves with power to meet the struggle for existence. The people who can not meet the struggle will be crushed * * *.
> Thus, those who are superior will govern those who are inferior. I believe within two or three centuries the world will have a few great governing countries and others will be governed by them—will pay homage to the mighty * * *.
> Woe to the nations which are governed. We should from now on prepare ourselves to become a governing nation.

These statements are significant in light of the recent dispatches from Japan stating in effect that Japan had practically sent an ultimatum to China, because China had, naturally, ordered the discontinuation of the war zone around Kiao Chao, since war there had ceased, and a later dispatch stating that Japan had taken up negotiations with Pekin for the purpose of "determining the development policies of China."

JAPAN AND AMERICA.

In the same article referred to above Count Okuma stated:

> Although we hold Germany as our enemy, yet we do not forget the part played by Germany * * *. In future as in the past we will continue to pay our respect to German knowledge and scientific genius, but we must at all costs fight against the Kaiser's spirit of conquest until we shall have crushed it * * *. Our attitude toward the American people will be the same; we shall attack any mistaken ideas or policies without mercy. We do not, of course, hate the individuals. The time has now come when humanity should awaken. The present war has brought about the opportunity. We should free ourselves from the mistaken racial competition arising from prejudice.

ANTI-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA IN JAPAN.

The cosmopolitan press and the dispatches to the foreign press from Japan continue more or less the same kind of smooth generalities regarding the Japanese and American relations, but in the vernacular press all kinds of disquieting and misleading rumors are being energetically circulated, all tending to arouse enmity and hatred of Americans among the Japanese populace, ending in the conviction that war with the United States is inevitable. A similar propaganda against Russia preceded the Russo-Japanese War. Among the rumors and misrepresentations may be mentioned the following: That the United States had territorial ambitions in the Far East and proposed to seize a naval station on the continent of Asia; that the United States is seeking to undermine Japanese commerce and the like. It is authentically reported that when the Japanese troops were mobilized for the expedition against Kiao Chao the soldiers for a long time thought they were starting for war against America.

ANOTHER WARNING.

My warnings to my countrymen as to the dangers in the Pacific Ocean arising from our lack of defensive preparations have been little heeded, and in some quarters have even been ridiculed.

Officers high in the councils of our Government have joined in the scoffing when they themselves knew that code messages

had been sent to commandants of our navy yards to be prepared to put their stations on a war basis upon short notice and that our troops in the Philippines protecting the harbor of Manila had slept at their guns for weeks with the harbor mined, hourly expecting an attack by the Japanese fleet. I renew my warning. The only security for permanent peace in the Pacific Ocean is our unquestioned control of the sea in that ocean.

THE PACIFIC OCEAN CLEARED OF AMERICAN BATTLESHIPS.

When our battleship fleet started around the world I endeavored to have it stopped and remain in the Pacific Ocean. The impression I received led me to the firm conviction which I have not since changed, that our fleet was allowed to go to the Pacific Ocean by Japan only upon our assurance that it would be out of that ocean by a fixed date. I have felt for some time that our battleship fleet will never go to the Pacific Ocean under the present administration. My conviction is firm that, protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, peace with Japan has thus far been secured by the present administration and war was averted at the critical juncture to which I have referred by assurances that America would speedily retire from the Philippine Islands. I am further convinced that our first inquiry as to the intentions of Japan in seizing Kiao Chao and the islands in the Pacific Ocean will not be followed up, at least by this administration, and that Japan, as a price of peace, will be given a free hand in China with the prospect of the complete overthrow of the open-door policy, leaving China to its fate to become a "governed" nation, while the commerce of America, which in cotton goods alone fell off over twenty millions in Manchuria after Japanese occupation, will be at the mercy of a competitor, while the complete overthrow of the balance of power in the Pacific Ocean would lead to one inevitable result, war.

THE GRAVITY OF THE ANGLO-JAPANESE ALLIANCE.

In determining the movements of our battleship fleet we can not escape leaving one ocean undefended. We may rest assured that in our negotiations with England that country has in mind her alliance, offensive and defensive, with Japan, knowing that both the Japanese Navy and the Japanese Army would be available for cooperation should war result, while in our negotiations with Japan that country will bear in mind that the British fleet, or part of it, and possibly the forces of other allies will be available in the Atlantic to prevent our battle fleet from going to the Pacific, insuring Japanese control of the sea and the availability of her overpowering army already on a war footing.

This brief scan of America's policies, the Monroe doctrine, and the open-door policy, based upon the principle of right and justice like America's policies based upon the necessity of self-preservation, both meet in the same inevitable conclusion. We must control the sea in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, both at the same time.

COOPERATION AND SERVICE.

In the relations of nations to each other as in the relations of individuals with each other there should not only be justice and right but also cooperation and service, generosity, mercy, charity, good will, brotherhood.

MILITARISM VERSUS INDUSTRIALISM.

Two forms of civilization are passing through a test of survival—militarism, with its concurrent institutions, based on monarchy and a privileged hierarchy of royalty and nobility and bureaucracy, and the system of industrialism, based upon productiveness with institutions free from privilege. America is the Nation that embodies industrialism; Japan and Asia and the great military nations in Europe embody the system of militarism. In a fair competition in times of peace militarism must go down, but industrialism unprepared would as inevitably fall in war. In the interest of humanity, that lies upon the survival of industrialism, America should with her vast resources make adequate preparations, taking care always to safeguard her own people against the spirit of militarism.

AMERICA THE MERCIFUL AND THE GENEROUS.

When Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and the United States jointly bombarded Shiminosiki and exacted $3,000,000 indemnity from the Japanese Government for having closed the straits at that point, the other nations took their equal shares and expended them. America's share was duly received, but ere long, by a unanimous vote of the American Congress, every dollar was returned to the Japanese Government.

In the Boxer disturbances, when the allied nations invading China levied huge indemnities against America's pleading and allotted America $12,000,000, by a unanimous vote of our Congress we returned the last dollar to the Chinese Government.

When our blood and treasure had been freely poured out in Cuba and the world expected us to remain and hold Cuba as a fruit of conquest and a source of revenue, America astonished the whole world by voluntarily giving Cuba her independence. What nation on earth would have been so patient, so long suffering in Mexico as have been the American people?

AMERICA THE PEACEMAKER.

America is the one great Nation that covets no territory of any other nation. America is the one great Nation that has no enemies. America is the one great Nation that would recoil at the very thought of becoming a "governing" nation. In America Jews and Gentiles have become reconciled, Protestants and Catholics. America is a blood kinsman of the Anglo-Saxons, of the Germans, of the Frenchmen, of the Austro-Hungarian, of the Italian, of the Russian, the common friend of Celt, Slav, Teuton, Latin. America opened up Japan with the blessing of an elder brother. America to-day is the one disinterested friend of China in all the world. Shall this great Nation of destiny be impotent when it raises its voice for the establishment of such policies as the Monroe doctrine, the open-door policy, such principles as justice and equal opportunity and rights of the weak? Shall America be impotent when she seeks to restrain the cruel march of war and permit the operation of great organic forces of commerce and industry, of education, the moral and religious forces of the world, to work out the overthrow of war and the ultimate establishment of the era of peace on earth, good will to men?

THE RIGHTS OF NEUTRALS VERSUS THE RIGHTS OF BELLIGERENTS.

The swift events are daily bringing into contrast the so-called rights of belligerents and their restraint upon the inherent rights of neutrals. America is the only great nation in the world logically constituted the champion of the latter. The so-called rights of belligerents are founded solely upon might. For instance, Great Britain maintains that she has a right to negotiate unlimited credits and purchase unlimited amounts of war material in America and denies the right of Germany to sell ships to America from which a credit might be derived that, when derived, could not be used to supply war materials. Our Secretary of State takes the position that we ought to be parties to the proposition of giving great military aid to Great Britain and her allies and withholding even commercial aid to Germany, because the British and allied fleets are stronger in might than the Germans and have control of the sea.

A statement was made some time back, emanating evidently from the White House, that our Government in bona fide transactions and our citizens in similar transactions could purchase vessels where they pleased, but now we hear no murmur of protest when Great Britain informs us that a ship purchased in good faith from Germany by an American citizen will not be allowed to carry on peaceful commerce over the high seas. Every arbitrary action of the British Government in extending the list of contraband and the exercise of search and seizure represents an encroachment for all future time, at least as far as precedents go upon the sphere of neutral rights, simply because the combination of the allies represents so much power upon the high seas the limited progress already made in the rights of peace must be turned back. America must fold her hands while her own opportunities for commercial expansion are limited and the evolution of the rights of neutrals, the rights of peace, is set back.

NO CHRONIC BELLIGERENT SHOULD HENCEFORWARD BE ALLOWED CONTROL OF THE SEA.

Great Britain has undertaken for a long time to maintain power upon the sea greater than that of any two nations—in fact, more than double that of any other nation—so that the high seas are practically under the control of a partisan. In the interest of humanity at large and the orderly evolution of peace and right, and especially the development of the rights of neutrals, minimizing and localizing of the disruption of war demand that the scepter of the sea shall pass from the hands of Great Britain and hereafter rest in the hands of the great peaceful kinsman of all nations, the United States.

AMERICA'S DEFENSE POLICIES.

Having reviewed America's world policies, we can now proceed to establish our defense policies.

The elements of national defense may be divided into two classes—national resources and national preparations.

The trend of the times is to increase the already preponderant advantages of preparations as compared to potential resources. When Prussia struck Austria in 1866, the war was over in a few months. When Germany struck France in 1870, the same result followed. When Japan struck Russia, the same. In the great world war now raging both factors may be brought into the field, because both sides had ample preparations to insure having a time element sufficient to develop and bring to bear their resources. America's preparations are so utterly inadequate that the prospects are the blow struck would seriously

endanger our chances of being able to bring our resources to bear at all. It is estimated that at least three years would be necessary to create a model army in America, prepared to cope with modern armies abroad, which are kept ready to move on a moment's notice, with transportation facilities sufficient to cross the ocean in a few weeks. Our mobile army being so small and so widely scattered and our militia being in the same condition, with the complete absence of any reserve, America must rely upon her naval forces to insure the time element in which to bring to bear our great resources. Fortunately from our geographical position over seas from the great military nations, naval forces sufficiently powerful can insure us a security greater even than that England has enjoyed for hundreds of years, enabling her to escape the necessity of conscription and permitting her to evolve liberal institutions.

NAVAL POWER VERSUS MILITARY POWER.

Military power involves large numbers of men organized into armies; naval power consists chiefly in property made up of ships. A dreadnaught to-day, with its crew of 1,000 men, is ordinarily estimated to be more than equivalent in power to an army corps of more than 40,000 men. Take Germany's case to-day: Twenty additional dreadnaughts would give her control of the seas, and at least cut off the 2,000,000 men England is preparing to place on the Continent drawn from the British Isles and the colonies of the British Empire. Germany would have access to the resources of the whole world, while England could be starved into submission in a few months. The additional 20 dreadnaughts would be worth to Germany more than a billion of dollars, more than millions of men. It would mean sure victory; in fact, it would have prevented the participation of Great Britain in the war. It would have determined the course of history. A few more battleships in our Navy before the war with Spain would have insured control of the sea without the necessity of the test of war, and would have saved the cost of the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars entailed by the war itself. Defense by naval power, therefore, does not involve military activities of the people, and what few people there are involved are far away from the mass of the people themselves. Thus there is no tendency to militarism. On the contrary, when people can secure their defense by naval power, then industrial activities are uppermost, and their civilization follows the kines of industrialism instead of militarism. It is this great fact in history that has caused all the Republics of the world to be built upon naval power. This will account for the fact that it is such countries where defense comes through naval power that free institutions have developed most, as in the case of England. The evolution of the world has been away from militarism and toward an industrial civilization, so the history of the world has persistently hung upon the course of sea power, and the great crises, the great decisive battles, have really been naval and not military.

The perpetuation of Grecian civilization as against Persian was not settled at the Battle of Thermopylæ on the land, but at the Battle of Salamis on the water. Likewise, the advent of the Augustan era of Roman history was not settled at the Battle of Philippi, but at the Battle of Actium. Indeed, the survival of Rome as against Carthage was settled when the Roman galleys gained control of the Mediterranean. The English civilization of Elizabeth overcame the Spanish civilization of Philip II because of the destruction of the Spanish Armada. England came through the Napoleonic wars supreme as against Napoleon because Napoleon could not cross the English Channel. England at Waterloo fought for victory; England at Trafalgar fought for existence. Anglo-Saxons are associated with the most advanced civilizations in the world, with the most advanced institutions of human liberty, because the Anglo-Saxon has held naval supremacy for a thousand years and has not been subjected to military conscription. The future of the world, like the past, is going to be determined by the control of the sea. Industrial nations sufficiently farsighted to make naval preparations to insure their bringing to bear their great resources are the ones that are going to survive as against the nations that continually maintain great armies.

OUR POLICY FOR LAND FORCES.

The fact that defense through naval forces where available is more advantageous than defense through land forces does not nullify the importance of the latter nor the necessity of clearly establishing a policy for land forces.

AMERICA A NONMILITARY COUNTRY.

We are a nonmilitary country, and our very civilization demands for its perpetuation that we remain a nonmilitary country. Therefore we can not have and should not have large standing armies, maintained under conscription like the military nations of the world. Our relatively small standing army therefore must be maintained in the highest state of efficiency, and must be kept at such station as to permit of rapid concentration at our vital points of exposure.

PRESENT POLICY WASTEFUL AND INEFFICIENT.

The policy of maintaining small detachments in scores of points widely scattered is absolutely contrary to such a policy, since it prevents practice in large units and prevents efficiency and makes rapid concentration an impossibility, while the cost per soldier is increased beyond all reasonable limits. There should be two main points on the Atlantic, one on the Gulf, two on the Pacific. Most of the others should be abandoned.

Having such a small standing army increases the importance of maintaining a comparatively large militia and military reserve force.

MILITARY PAY BILL A NECESSITY.

Congress should speedily take measures to encourage the States and the citizenship to develop in numbers and efficiency the National Guard. This, of course, can not be done without the Federal Government's sharing a reasonable amount of the expense necessary. A comprehensive militia pay bill insuring not only expansion but increased regulation and efficiency of the militia is a military necessity.

A GREAT CITIZENRY RESERVE FORCE MUST BE DEVELOPED.

We should adopt national policies to encourage the average citizen to secure that minimum amount of military training necessary for a speedy development of the citizen into a good soldier after war comes. This will involve the Federal Government's cooperation in the educational policies of the Nation, and a comprehensive plan for financial aid should be established to apply to all high schools and colleges and even to the seventh and eighth grades in the graded schools. The cost in equipment would, of course, be large, since the Federal Government in all probability will find it necessary to provide the essentials, but the success of the Boy Scout movement shows that cooperation on the part of the people and the boys would greatly reduce the total cost from what would naturally be the estimate.

EX-SOLDIERS AND OFFICERS.

A definite military reserve should be maintained in such a way as to keep together the bulk of discharged soldiers, and colleges, high schools, together with the militia and reserve, should be conducted with a special view to preparing a large contingent of officers ready for taking charge of the great volunteer armies in time of war.

COORDINATION.

Our land forces and our policies controlling same should be determined in coordination with our naval forces and the policies controlling the same. The two are essentially supplemental. In proportion as the land forces are weak so the naval forces must be strong. In a few moments I will discuss the elements that should determine our naval policy. It is clear, however, that before any real permanent efficiency and economy can be realized in our national defense we must create an agency competent to investigate the whole question of national defense, whose duty it would be to work out and recommend to the Government a comprehensive policy.

THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE BILL.

For six years such a measure has been before Congress in the form of a bill to establish a council of national defense. This bill has been twice favorably reported by the Naval Committee of the House. It has been incorporated in the Democratic platform of Baltimore. In the hearings before the Naval Committee Gen. Wotherspoon, president of the Army War College, made the significant statement that under the operation of such a council the efficiency of the Army could be trebled while its expense could be cut in half. Similar testimony was given by other officers in the Army and Navy, and favorable action has been urged by the late President of the United States and by the last four Secretaries of War and by the late Secretary of the Navy.

Such a council would only have advisory power, and could not possibly interfere with the jurisdiction of the legislative or executive branches or with their independent operation. Upon the council would be found with the President the Secretary of State, the highest authority on our world policies; the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, with their highest technical experts and advisers; along with the chairmen of the committees of the Senate and the House having cognizance of naval and military affairs, foreign relations, and the purse strings.

THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF STATE THE GREATEST OBSTACLES OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The fact that the council of national defense bill is a plank in the Democratic platform seems to have no influence with the administration. This bill would long since have been a law

but for the opposition of the President and the Secretary of State. This opposition to the most vital and fundamental measure, similar to measures that have been taken by all the other nations of the world, opposition that keeps America from making a start, constitutes the President and the Secretary of State the greatest obstacle of their country's defense.

It seems a singular irony that the movement for national prohibition likewise has found greatest opposition from the present administration. To thoughtful men these two questions are the most vital and the most fundamental before the Nation, one affecting the integrity of the Nation within and the other the security of the Nation without. It seems passing strange that, measured by these two great causes, we find the highest official of the Nation is the greatest obstacle to progress.

THE COUNTRY'S GREATEST LIABILITY.

It is far from me to question the patriotism and the conscientious devotion of this eminent citizen. This only deepens the tragedy of the situation and the deadening effect of his influence in these two fields of public endeavor. I do not disparage the usefulness of his services in other lines and the beneficent educational influence his life has had upon his country. These, again, only deepen the tragedy.

Every citizen is entitled to his own appraisal of the relative importance of public questions. I expect others to differ with me. To me, however, the first question in importance before this Nation or any other nation is to make and keep the nation sober. The question of next importance before our Nation is to provide an adequate defense, so that as a people we may live in peace and security and work out our institutions at home without molestation and with the minimum disturbance when war exists in other lands, and so that we may without fear be able to effectively champion the cause of the weak and the principles of right and justice in the Western Hemisphere, and even ultimately in the Eastern Hemisphere, thus insuring the survival of industrialism, bringing about the passing of militarism, causing war to steadily recede, so that at last peace can reign throughout the earth, free institutions can be developed in all lands, leading toward the ultimate goal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Nothing is so much needed in this country as for the public to be appraised of the truth that really bears upon great public questions. If there were any chance of my being mistaken about the obstacles in the path of these two great lines of national progress, I would not raise my voice; but being in the heart of the public movements in both lines, I have felt only too heavily the power of the obstacles represented by the President. My conception of duty as a public official is to do the duty, whatever it may be, without flinching, though it be "to his own hurt." It is only when the truth is fully known to our people that the real obstacles in the path of progress can be appreciated, and a beginning made toward ultimate realization of a great objective. If national prohibition and national defense are the greatest questions in America, as I believe them to be, then the President of the United States instead of being our country's greatest asset is our country's greatest liability.

I am fully aware, Mr. Chairman, what these words of mine mean, and the effect they will have in the minds of millions, perhaps, especially the effect upon the feelings of partisans, particularly those who exalt party because party constitutes for them the ladder upon which to climb to offices of preferment and eminence. There are some who place self above party and party above country, even without being conscious of their own subconscious classification. My conception is exactly the reverse. I look upon all parties as human agencies organized fundamentally to promote the public welfare. If our country were at war in the presence of a deadly foe, whether within or without, the patriotic citizen would subordinate self, and if necessary subordinate party. Others may differ with me, but I do not believe that in our country's whole history, whether in peace or in war, we have ever been confronted with a more critical situation.

OUR NAVAL POLICY.

Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat to-day the substance of my speech of April 23 of last year, setting forth, as many previous speeches in this House have set forth, my ideas of a true naval policy for America. I wish to make a supplemental addition brought out by the great world war that has come since our last appropriation bill. My previous investigations led to the final conclusion that America should always maintain in the Atlantic Ocean a fleet the equal of the fleet of any military nation of Europe possessing a big standing army, and that we should maintain permanently in the Pacific a fleet as large as the fleet of any military nation of Asia possessing a large standing army. Formerly this standard demanded that our Navy in the Atlantic should be equal to the navy of Germany, and that our Navy in the Pacific should be equal to the navy of Japan. The war in Europe, as previously pointed out, has shown that Great Britain is not a nation whose relations with other nations permits her to be safely trusted to dominate the waters of the world. In the interest of our own peaceful commerce when warlike nations are at war, in the interest of the rights of peace of all nations as against the usurped rights of belligerents based on might, the interests of neutrals, the interests of peace throughout the world now demand that our two fleets in the Atlantic and the Pacific should always at least equal the British Navy, and during the continuation of the Anglo-Japanese alliance they should be together equal to the navy of Great Britain and the navy of Japan combined. This should be the foundation upon which to determine our naval program.

OUR NAVAL PROGRAM.

The true naval program for our country at this juncture should be to speedily take measures to render the Navy that we have efficient and to adequately increase its strength. The great lacking of the Navy as a whole to-day is that naval administration in our country has been developed almost wholly in times of peace. Not since we have had a Navy Department beyond an embryo stage has our country ever engaged a powerful naval foe. It is not surprising therefore that the organization of the Navy Department, based upon seven bureaus, has not included an agency for coordinating all the elements of the Navy and for preparing plans and directing their execution in time of war in order to insure naval victory. Every navy department and every military department of every other nation of the world has such an agency; ours alone is lacking.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.

In my judgment, the most important part of the present bill is the paragraph establishing a chief of naval operations, with 15 assistants. The enactment of this legislation would represent the real beginning of ultimate efficiency for the Navy we have, whatever its size. It is needless to remark that the efficient navy is beyond all comparison to the economical navy. Whatever the size of an organization, nothing is so wasteful in its operation as inefficiency. In my extension of remarks I will print a speech recently delivered by Rear Admiral Austin M. Knight, United States Navy, before the Efficiency Club of New York City, and I will also print a brief outline of the natural subdivisions or sections in the organization of the office of a chief of naval operations.

OUR FLEET IS BLIND.

Although the field of operations of our fleet must cover inevitably not a narrow channel nor a comparatively small sea, but the great extent of an ocean, nevertheless to-day we have no scouting ship, either weak or strong, and consequently our fleet is blind. All other navies have eyes in the form of not only scout ships properly adequate to the task of scouting on the high seas, but great battle cruisers that can make swift "reconnoisance in force" over long distances. Irrespective of the qualities to be developed on the part of the fighting ships, the imperative need of the fleet we have to-day is two great battle cruisers of about 40,000 tons displacement making more than 30 knots, carrying the heaviest guns afloat, and sufficient armor to keep out armor-piercing projectiles at usual battle ranges, with a radius of action larger than that of any vessel afloat. In addition to these we should provide at least four scout ships proper, three for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific.

INCREASE IN ENLISTED MEN.

To make our Navy efficient for the vessels that we now have and would expect to commission instantly on the outbreak of war would require at least 20,000 additional enlisted men. The report from the commander in chief of the battleship fleet, on the findings of various boards, shows an "alarming" shortage of enlisted men. The admiral refers to the findings as follows:

These boards have now completed their work and the result has developed an alarming shortage of officers and men that are required to efficiently man our ships for battle. The reports of all these boards were made independently and are singularly unanimous in their conclusions, presenting a more serious shortage than could have been anticipated by either the Navy Department or the fleet until brought to light by this searching investigation.

The reports of these boards show that in the 21 battleships in commission and now composing the Atlantic Fleet there is a shortage of 5,219 men and 339 officers required to fill all stations necessary to efficiently fight the ships in battle.

The least we can do at this session of Congress is to provide for addtional men to make up this deficiency on the battleships alone now in commission. Taking into account the fact that we have a comparatively small ocean-going merchant marine, a small Naval Militia, and as yet no naval reserve at all, we should endeavor to have our complements on our ships in commission relatively larger than on the ships of other nations. I shall

offer an amendment at the proper place to begin by the authorization of an increase of 5,000 men in the enlisted force of the Navy. This would entail an additional provision of a little over two millions of dollars and would ultimately require about three millions a year.

THE BUILDING PROGRAM.

In order to approximate a Navy equal to the Japanese Navy and the German Navy combined, and equal to and ultimately superior to the British Navy, we should adopt a consistent program of six capital ships per year, and I trust that sooner or later we may reach this basis. Knowing, however, that this Congress will not provide such a program, at the proper time I shall move to increase the number of battleships from two to four, in addition to offering an amendment of a new paragraph to provide for two battle cruisers.

I will not discuss at length the characteristics of these capital ships, but the experiences in the present war confirm the contention I have consistently made for many years before the Naval Committee and before this House that our capital ships should have superior speed along with the most powerful guns.

AUXILIARIES.

It is a corollary or an axiom that with the capital ships we must provide auxiliaries in sufficient numbers to make the capital ships most effective and to balance the fleet.

THE QUESTION OF SUBMARINES.

The submarine has rapidly demonstrated its power in the course of operations in Europe, a demonstration that shows that the defense from torpedo attacks heretofore provided is not adequate. As yet the use of destroyers and picket boats seems to have been the only available defense. There are indications, however, that other means of defense may be developed. Nevertheless the great usefulness of the submarine is fully demonstrated, and its numbers should be rapidly increased.

CAPITAL SHIPS DETERMINE THE CONTROL OF THE SEA.

It should be borne in mind that however useful auxiliaries may be, it is the preponderance of capital ships of the latest type that gives a nation control of the sea—the all-determining factor in the course of the world. No matter how many submarines Germany possessed, no matter how many auxiliaries of other types she possessed, the heavy preponderance of the allies' capital ships insures them the control of the high seas and recourse to the resources of the world.

EXPERIMENTATION.

The question of types of ships and of the qualities of each type involves evolution and change, particularly during and immediately following war. Orderly and useful developments of complicated implements of war entail laborious, patient experimentation. The organization of the Navy Department contains no agency to conduct such experimentations, and only at intervals does a bureau appoint a board for such special purposes. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House has had a subcommittee on ordnance experiments cooperating with the Navy Department for several years in the development of ordnance materials. The results of the investigations are naturally of a confidential nature, but their importance can not be overestimated. In the conduct of these investigations a member of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs has been frequently present. I trust that this special subcommittee work may be continued after my leaving Congress and may become a joint subcommittee of the two naval committees, and may have cooperating with it a corresponding board of the Navy Department, which could be provided by slight extension of the present board appointed to conduct experimentation on torpedo shells. At the proper place I shall move an amendment for a reasonable increase in the appropriations for experimentation.

AIR CRAFT.

I can not close, Mr. Chairman, without urging—what I have urged for a number of years—the systematic development of experimentation and building of air craft of all types. The utter decadence of aviation in our Army and Navy is due to lack of sympathetic legislation of Congress. I remember with painful vividness the defeat several years ago of a measure brought to the floor of the House from the naval committee to simply cooperate with private individuals to establish in Washington a laboratory and plant for experimentation in aeronautics. I hope the day will some day come when America—the great peacemaker, the great Nation championing the cause of free institutions and of humanity, championing the cause of the weak; our great peace Nation of America—will not only be mistress of the seas but mistress of the air.

Under my leave to print I will here print the speech of Rear Admiral Austin M. Knight, United States Navy, delivered at the annual banquet of the Efficiency Club of New York City, January 25, 1915. The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL AUSTIN M. KNIGHT, UNITED STATES NAVY, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE EFFICIENCY CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 25, 1915.

I appreciate very highly the privilege of addressing you this evening, not alone because of the compliment which the privilege involves, but because of the possibility of usefulness to the Navy and the country which seems to be connected with it. If I do not speak as full as you might wish me to, I shall at least speak frankly.

It is not my intention to go into questions of the efficiency of individual ships, the results of target practice, and kindred topics. I propose to deal with the efficiency of the Navy as a whole, considering it as a great and very complicated machine, upon which hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended, with one end in view, and only one—the development of a supremely efficient weapon for the defense of the country against any and every enemy which may come against us.

I was asked a few weeks ago what the War College considered that the fleet should do, and I replied:

"The War College considers that every effort of the fleet, and every effort of the department in connection with the fleet, should have for its sole aim the war efficiency of the fleet. Every effort which does not directly contribute to this end is in itself a wasteful expenditure of energy, and, so far as it is a diversion from this end, is distinctly harmful."

No doubt there are many differences of opinion among those assembled here to-night as to what constitutes an adequate Navy for the defense of the United States. There may even be some present who think that we should have no Navy at all. But on one point I am sure there will be no difference of opinion—that if we are to have a Navy it should be as efficient as it can possibly be made. And everybody who knows anything about the Navy knows that this is not its present condition. I am not one of those who hold that it is altogether inefficient. Unsatisfactory as conditions are, it would be very easy to exaggerate them. When things are wrong you can always find extremists to tell you that they are much worse than they actually are. Some people think that this is the only way to make an impression. Others are so constituted temperamentally that they can see nothing good in anything which falls short of perfection as they see it.

I am going to assume that all of you who are gathered here to-night occupy a reasonable middle ground so far as temperament is concerned, and that to make an impression upon you I need not do violence to my own temperament by painting the picture which I shall draw for you in maximum contrasts of light and shade.

There is much about the Navy which is splendidly efficient, but as a whole it is far less efficient than it can and ought to be. Our ships are fine. Our officers are capable, industrious, and ambitious. Our enlisted men are the equals of those in other navies. But efficient ships and officers and men do not alone make an efficient navy. They must be welded into an efficient whole by a unity of organization and administration and purpose which coordinates their capabilities and directs their efforts toward a common end, wisely selected, and very clearly seen. Here is the first point at which we are lacking. We are lacking also in that harmonious composition of the fleet which is needed to give to every element of it the support that it needs from other elements to make up a symmetrical and well-balanced whole. And we are lacking to a marked degree in absolutely essential facilities for the care and preservation of our ships, especially in the matter of dry docks.

Finally we are lacking in efficient organization of the personnel. Here, so far as officers are concerned, the conditions are altogether deplorable. In a service like the Navy, where spirit is everything, where enthusiasm must be the driving power back of every activity, I ask you to picture the effect of a condition where a young officer, graduating from the Naval Academy, full of spirit and enthusiasm, finds himself confronted with a prospect of promotion to the grade of lieutenant at the age of 52 years.

If you ask me who is responsible for these conditions, I can only reply that the responsibility comes home to nearly all of us. Some of it, I am sure, rests with me; much of it, I believe, with you. Certainly it can not be attributed in excessive measure to any one administration of the Navy Department, for it has existed for half a century at least. So let us not cloud the issue by assuming that it is a new condition and that all administrations up to some recent date have been models of wisdom and efficiency or that naval officers themselves have always been ready with good advice. Speaking as the representative of naval officers as a body, I frankly admit that we have not always seen clearly what was needed and have not always worked together even for ends which we did see clearly. As for the Secretaries of the Navy, it is not surprising that many of them have failed to realize that their first duty was to strive, in season and out of season, to promote the war efficiency of the Navy as a whole. Many of them have not remained in office long enough to learn this. Some, perhaps, have realized it more or less clearly, but have not found at hand an organization through which they could produce results. A few have made material contributions toward improved conditions. I shall have the pleasure a little later of calling attention to one important step in advance which was taken by the present Secretary at the very beginning of his term of office.

A large part of the responsibility, especially that connected with the small size and the unbalanced composition of the fleet and the lack of dry docks, rests with Congress, which has always approached naval legislation from the wrong side so far as efficiency is concerned—asking, not what do we need for efficiency, but what can we afford to spend for efficiency. Behind the responsibility of Congress lies the responsibility of the country—and you, gentlemen, represent the country—because it has not insisted upon having what was needed without reference to cost. It may be that this attitude of both Congress and the country is necessary and even inevitable. But I am one of those who believe that this great country of ours can afford to have anything in the way of national defense which it needs, and I assume that all present here to-night agree that we need a Navy, and if a Navy then an efficient one, and that whatever efficiency costs is the measure of what we can afford to spend.

One particularly unfortunate feature about the application of the policy of "economy first" in naval expenditures is that it has often been invoked to prevent a small appropriation which would have added many times its own cost to the value of those items for which money was cheerfully appropriated. I shall discuss this more at length hereafter.

* * * * * * *

But, after all, is it not rather futile to spend our time in trying to place responsibility for existing conditions? It seems to me that what

we ought to do is to recognize the conditions clearly—neither exaggerating nor minimizing them—and to dissociate them absolutely from personalities. We can then proceed, with a perfectly open mind, to consider how the conditions can be improved.

I ask you to accept this point of view and to banish from your mind all thought of politics and every trace of partisanship, and fix your attention upon the question before us as one of national, not of political, significance.

The conditions, then, to which I shall invite your attention are those connected with, first, the size and composition of the fleet; second, the organization of the personnel; third, the organization and administration of the Navy Department.

* * * * * * *

First, as to the size of the fleet. I shall not go into this very fully because my subject is not so much adequacy as efficiency. A small machine may be efficient within the limits fixed by its size. It is from the point of view of efficiency within the Navy as it exists that I wish chiefly to consider my subject this evening. It must be recognized, however, that the actual efficiency for war of a battleship fleet which is efficient within itself may be seriously compromised by the lack of those supporting units which are vitally essential to its operation. There is, moreover, a sense in which we may say that a machine is not efficient if it is too small for the task for which it is designed.

What constitutes an adequate navy for the United States? The answer will depend, of course, upon the purpose for which we assume that the Navy is to be used. We are all agreed, I presume, that it is not to be used for aggression. Is it, then, to be used solely for defense? If we answer "yes," we ought to do so with a full recognition of what we are to defend and also of the elementary maxim that the best defense is a vigorous offense. In other words, no matter how resolute we may be to use our Navy only for repelling aggression, it does not follow that we should plan for meeting the aggressor only at our gates. Even if we had no interests outside our borders and no responsibilities for the defense of our outlying possessions and dependencies, we should still, as reasonable beings not wholly ignorant of history, prepare to project our battle line toward the enemy's coasts and to assume a course which would throw upon him the burden of replying to our initiative. In this sense, then, we need a Navy for offense; that is to say, for offensive action with a defensive purpose. In shaping our plans along these lines we should not overlook the fact that the policy which dictates the measure of our defense must take full note of the larger national policy which it is to enforce in relation, for example, to the Monroe doctrine, the Panama Canal, the Philippines, and other matters which are at once of national and of international significance.

The statement is often made—I have heard it made on the floors of Congress—that naval officers themselves do not know what they need. There are, naturally, differences of opinion among naval officers as to what the strength of the Navy should be and as to the types of which it should be composed. But the country has in the General Board a body of mature and experienced officers, whose business it is to study this question and to speak authoritatively upon it. In the main the recommendations of this board from year to year have been consistent with each other and consistent with the best naval sentiment. It has stood since 1903 for a fleet of 48 battleships and necessary smaller units and auxiliaries. The character of the smaller units and auxiliaries recommended has varied from time to time, following the developments of naval art and science; but the basis of 48 battleships, to be kept up to date by eliminating ships more than 20 years of age and replacing them by new construction, has been steadily adhered to. Now, it may be that we need fewer than 48 battleships or that we need more. Whatever their number is to be, we should have a policy in the matter looking as far into the future as practicable, and one which, in providing for capital ships, provides also for the smaller units and auxiliaries to round out the fleet into a complete and well-balanced whole, with an appropriate number of cruisers, scouts, destroyers, submarines, colliers, tank ships, supply ships, repair ships, mine-laying ships, tenders, and gunboats.

The program advocated by the General Board would, if it had been followed, have given us 47 battleships, built and building, in 1914. This program has not been followed, and we have at present 37 battleships instead of 47. It seems to me that he would be a bold man who, recalling the history of the last days of August, 1914, when the world passed within a week from a condition of universal peace to one of almost universal war, should say that we do not need the full number of battleships proposed by the General Board—and more.

But battleships alone do not make up a fleet, much less a navy. A fleet without fuel ships is crippled and one without scouts is blind. It can neither secure information of the enemy's movements nor deny information of its own. To send a fleet thus blind and crippled into hostile waters would be to invite destruction. We have an altogether insufficient number of fuel ships and practically no scouts. Moreover, we are very weak in destroyers, of which a large number should accompany the fleet to back up the scouts, to act in part as scouts themselves, to stiffen up the screen about the battleships, and to be ready for a dash against the enemy when an opening is presented. The effect of the conditions actually existing is to almost completely nullify the power of our fighting ships. Picture to yourselves the plight of a battleship fleet operating in hostile waters against a fleet much smaller, but with all its elements complete. The smaller fleet, with scouts thrown out a hundred miles or more around its main body, every scout in touch with every other one and with the commander in chief, and with a horde of destroyers backing up the scouts and awaiting the word to attack, would gain and keep touch with the larger fleet, while itself evading discovery, and would send its destroyers in at night, unchecked and unnoted by any protecting screen, to drive home an attack which might decide the issue without the main fleets ever having seen each other. And if nothing of this sort occurred, consider the situation where the fleet, with its fuel supply exhausted, finds itself without a reserve supply on which to draw.

There is a widespread and very dangerous opinion that all the fuel ships and scouts we need can be improvised on short notice from merchant vessels. This is one of those miserable fallacies based upon experience in the Civil War and the Spanish War, in both of which we won because our opponents were even more grotesquely unprepared than we were. The Civil War was, I suppose, the most costly war ever fought and the most unpardonably wasteful in money and in human life. But its cost did not end with the end of the war. Apart from the tremendous pension list, which our pacifist friends insist upon charging up to what they are fond of calling "militarism," although it was really the direct result of the criminal folly of unpreparedness; apart from this is the indirect cost of the perpetuation of that folly. Since we were successful in that war—so the implied argument runs—our preparation for it must have been of the kind that makes for success, and we can look for success hereafter from the same policy. To these gentlemen I commend the perusal of a book called The Military Policy of the United States, by Gen. Emory H. Upton. If any of you here present to-night have failed to read this book, I urge you to read it at once. It exists in conveniently available form as Senate Document No. 494, Sixty-second Congress, second session. It would be interesting to know how many Senators have read it. It is the best antidote I know for the monstrous delusion which sees in every American citizen a soldier, trained, efficient, ready to take his place in the ranks at a moment's notice and sweep the loathed invader from our soil, and in every ship that floats a potential man-of-war complete in everything but guns.

By what seems almost a misfortune, in view of its effect upon the minds of many of our people, the delusion that we alone of all the nations of the earth can carry on a successful war without preparation was confirmed by our easy victory in the Spanish War—our opponent again being as unprepared as we were. I should be sorry to agree with those who hold that nothing short of an overwhelming defeat in some future war will ever open our eyes to the danger of existing conditions, and I wish to do my part toward opening the eyes of my countrymen before such disaster comes. We must recognize the fact that war is an art and a very highly specialized art. For every task which it involves there is a need of special tools, efficient in themselves and contributing to the efficiency of the whole organization. And these can not be improvised. Yachts, tugs, and ferry boats can perform certain duties in waters close to our own coasts when they are absolutely unopposed. And any steamer capable of carrying a thousand tons of coal can get the coal to a fleet which is lying quietly outside a quiet port with no threat of interruption to its lines of communication. But no language is strong enough to characterize the fatuity of relying upon such tools for carrying on a real naval war. It is true, no doubt, that there are many fuel-carrying ships that can be utilized by the Navy in time of war. But let us consider briefly the characteristics which they should have, and then inquire how many of them we would probably find available in our waters on the sudden outbreak of war. First of all, a goodly proportion of them must carry fuel oil instead of coal or in addition to coal. Second, they must be large. A great number of small craft, manned by untrained crews and commanded by untrained officers, might be a fatal handicap to a fleet operating at sea. Third, they must be fast, for the speed of the fleet will be the speed of the slowest craft accompanying it. Fourth, they must have facilities for handling and transferring their fuel at sea.

I do not know how many such ships there are under the United States flag at this moment. But somebody ought to know how many there are, and how and where they can be reached. This should all be provided for in advance. But when it is provided for, it is safe to say that the number will be far short of what a fleet would need. And it is clear that, at the best, such craft could not work at maximum efficiency with a fleet engaged in operations where perfect military coordination is of the first importance.

We need, then, in order to make our 37 or our 47 battleships efficient, more large, fast Navy fuel ships of the *Jupiter* type, many more destroyers, and a considerable number of scout cruisers, designed and built as such, with a speed of not less than 28 knots.

It goes without saying that in these days a scout should carry aeroplanes to be launched from her decks, and this means, of course, that we need a large number of these, and of the most efficient type obtainable. It has been suggested that we can rely upon aeroplanes alone for scouting, sending them out from battleships, and so dispense with cruisers altogether. This might work if no other function were involved than that of locating the enemy; but the screening duty of the outlying line of cruisers is even more important than the scouting duty. To discover an enemy force is helpful; to arrest its advance is far more so, especially when by arresting it we deny the enemy the information about our whereabouts and our movements which it will be his object to secure.

We are weak in submarines, and the submarine, as you are all aware, has within the last few months established its claim to very serious consideration as an element in naval warfare. It has not shown itself the master of the battleship, and I doubt if it will ever do so; but it has taken a more commanding place than most of us have heretofore assigned it. I should rejoice if we had to-day 100 submarines instead of less than half that number, built and building. Those that we have are only half efficient because they lack tenders of the proper type to accompany them and care for their needs and the needs of their personnel. Here, again, crops up the old idea that a vessel for a special purpose, demanding special characteristics, and vitally necessary to the efficiency of a vital part of our naval force, can be improvised out of any old craft which happens to be handy. And here, again, is illustrated the false economy which in providing a weapon efficient within itself denies it the support outside itself which alone can make it efficient in application.

Running parallel with the omissions in the fleet itself is a corresponding list of omissions in the provisions for its upkeep—in dry docks and other navy-yard facilities especially. A fleet without dry docks of suitable capacity and suitably located is only a little less helpless than one without fuel ships.

We have at Guantanamo a station which should be the principal base of our fleet for operations in the Caribbean, the area in which, if anywhere, our control of the Panama Canal will be challenged. But not only have we no dry dock or efficient repair shops there, we have none within a thousand miles of it. Here the expenditure of $2,000,000 might conceivably double the efficiency of the fleet in some critical emergency by making it possible for every ship to go out in perfect condition; and it requires no stretch of the imagination to picture the issue of a war as hinging upon this point alone. After a battle the importance of a dock close at hand for repairing damages is too apparent to require more than a passing mention. It might enable the fleet to take the sea again after a brief delay, with every advantage over an enemy fleet less favorably situated.

It is understood, of course, that every station which is designed to serve as a base of supply, of repair, or of refuge for the fleet should be adequately fortified. This is a phase of my subject upon which I should like to dwell at considerable length, but time and other considerations make it impracticable for me to do so.

If I have made myself clear up to the present point, you will understand by how narrow a margin we have missed efficiency in the composition of our fleet and the provision for its upkeep; and yet of what vast importance is the space that separates us from it. Two per cent, perhaps—5 per cent, certainly—added to our expenditures year after year would have added at least 50 per cent to the efficiency of the fleet as a whole.

* * * * * * *

I come now to the question of personnel. In an ideal system the development here as regards both officers and men would keep pace automatically with the development of the fleet through a law by which the authorization for a certain increase in the number of ships would carry with it the authorization for a corresponding increase in officers and men and for a reasonable flow of promotion. Failing this ideal, we should at least have a periodical readjustment such as to maintain a personnel ample in numbers, amply trained, and so organized as to insure a flow of promotion which will secure contentment, foster ambition, and bring officers to the command of ships and fleets while still in the perfection of their mental and physical powers. Unfortunately, the present conditions are as far from this ideal as could be imagined. To begin with, we have not the officers and men to man our ships efficiently. This is serious enough, but much more serious is the fact that the promotion of officers is so completely blocked that a young man graduating from the Naval Academy must look forward to spending all the best years of his life in the two lowest grades of the service; to performing, as a gray-headed man, the same duties that he has performed as a boy; and to receiving but a very small increase in salary. I need not point out to you the inevitable effect of this upon efficiency.

For this condition I could not place the responsibility if I would. Congress has long been calling upon the Navy Department for a satisfactory personnel bill. Several bills have been prepared and every one has had support. But none has had the cordial support of the Navy as a whole. A new one has been presented to Congress this month. I hope it is a good one, but I confess that I do not know.

In this matter, as in that of the fleet, the question of expense stands in the way of every easy solution that can be suggested. Here is the problem in a few words: We need in the three lower grades of the Navy—ensign, junior lieutenant, and lieutenant—a very large number of officers. We can find room in the highest grade, that of rear admiral, for very few. Let us say, simply as an illustration and without any attempt of arithmetical accuracy, that of 100 men who reach the lieutenant's list not more than 5 can ever become rear admirals. Our problem is to eliminate the other 95 between these two grades without injustice to individuals or unreasonable expense to the Government, always remembering that expense is of far less consequence than the efficiency of which it is the price. The interest of the Navy should, naturally, take precedence over the interest of individuals; yet if it appears that a given scheme in conducing to the efficiency which we all so much desire chances to conduce also to the advantage of individuals, it should not on that account be abandoned.

The enlisted personnel is inadequate for the manning of the fleet as it exists to-day, and falls far short of what would be absolutely necessary in time of war. And we have no reserve on which to call. The present shortage is variously estimated at from 5,000 to 18,000 men, the wide difference between these figures being accounted for by different views as to the manning of ships not actually present with the active fleet. The extreme view on one side is that battleships can be laid up at navy yards for long periods of time with 50 or 100 men on board and still be counted as serviceable. The extreme view on the other side is that when a ship is to be laid up approximately half of her crew should remain with her, and she should be kept ready to join the fleet not in a year or a month but in 48 hours. If ships in reserve are to be borne on the Navy list and to stand before the country as available for war, there is no doubt that the second of these views is the correct one. A battleship "in ordinary," as it is called, with less than a hundred men on board, might as well be eliminated from the list of ships available for any service within a reasonable length of time.

Added to the deterioration in the ships themselves after a certain period of the neglect that is inevitable where crews are greatly reduced, is the fact that among the plans for utilizing the ships in an emergency is one which contemplates manning them with untrained or half-trained reserves. Such reserves may doubtless be made very useful in time of war if they can be distributed throughout the fleet, to be assimilated by the regular crews of active ships. But the fate of the *Good Hope* and the *Monmouth* is an object lesson on the folly of manning ships exclusively or even chiefly with reservists.

Here, again, I want to call attention to the mistake of providing the largest and finest fighting ships in the world—for this is what our dreadnaughts are, and it is largely due to the insistence of Congress that they are so—and balking at the comparatively trifling cost of providing the officers and men to make them fully efficient.

Other factors, less concrete than those that I have named, have militated and are militating against ideal efficiency. You will all understand that a fleet can not be efficient unless it has abundant opportunity for drilling as a unit. No matter how admirable may be the training and the discipline of the individual ships they will not work together efficiently as a fleet without the teamwork which comes from constant drilling in company with each other under the direction of the commander in chief. And their exercises must be progressive, leading up to war maneuvers on a large scale. We have had too little of this training at all times, and especially within the past year, the necessity of keeping the battleships in Mexican waters having been a controlling factor in all phases of administration of the Navy. This has not made for efficiency, but both the present commander in chief of the fleet and his immediate predecessor testify that the effect upon efficiency has not been as great as might have been expected. Many of the battleships have missed opportunities for target practice; but here, too, the commander in chief reports that the effect has not been disastrous. That conditions remain so good in spite of such extremely unfavorable conditions is a gratifying evidence of the excellence of our ships and the fundamental soundness of our personnel. We must, nevertheless, recognize that the necessity for using battleships in this way is seriously detrimental to their efficiency, and this throws further emphasis upon the importance of an all-around development of our fleet with the demands of peace in mind as well as those of war. If cruisers and gunboats had been available for service in Mexican, Haitian, and Santo Dominican waters the battleships could have spent the past year together in a good climate, carrying on their maneuvers and target practice under favorable conditions.

* * * * * *

I come now to what is, perhaps, the most important part of my subject—the organization of the Navy Department, viewed from the standpoint of efficiency. There can be no question that the existing organization is inadequate and would break down under the strain of war. The administration starts from too many sources and flows through too many channels. It lacks the unity of purpose which would come from recognition of the fact that a navy has one excuse for existing, and only one—that it shall always be ready to strike on the minute and with every element of power concentrated behind its blow for the defense of the country.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not telling you that our organization is wholly bad. I am telling you that it is inadequate. In many cases it works rather surprisingly well. But if you analyze these cases you will find that in so far as the results are good, they are so in spite of the system and because of some personal factor which has compelled efficiency. Moreover, and this is the crux of the whole matter, the cases with which we can deal at the present time are illustrations of peace efficiency, whereas the efficiency upon which our attention should be fixed unwaveringly is war efficiency; not because we are going to have war, but because we may have it, and because the one supreme duty of the Navy is to be ready for it if it comes.

I suppose this relation of the Navy to war, whether possible war or actual war, has always been understood more or less clearly. But it is a singular fact that the organization of the Navy Department takes no account of it. War is the one thing for which no arrangement is made. There are seven bureaus in the department, each with clearly defined duties; but in all the elaborate legislation creating these bureaus and defining their duties there is not a word about the duty of keeping the Navy in readiness for war or preparing plans for war or conducting war after it begins. There would be a certain element of comedy in this if there were not so many elements of possible tragedy. There is a bureau in the department charged with the construction and repair of ships, one with the design of machinery, one with the preparation of ordnance, one with the direction of personnel, and so on; but nowhere is it said "this bureau shall be responsible for the readiness of the fleet for war, for the preparation of war plans, and for the conduct of war." This, then, is the last and great defect in the efficiency of the Navy. How shall it be remedied? The answer is, I think, by the creation in the Navy Department of a "Division of Strategy and Operations," preferably not coequal with the present bureaus, but superior to them and standing between them and the Secretary. This arrangement would be a recognition of the fact that all the activities of the present bureaus should lead up to the Secretary through a channel which coordinates them all and directs them toward war efficiency.

The title proposed for the new office, Division of Strategy and Operations, covers very completely the ground that I have in mind. As standing for strategy, this division would plan what to do, and as standing for operations it would direct the execution of its plans. It would correspond more or less closely with the General Staff of the Army and the First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty, whose duties are thus defined:

"1. Preparation for war: All large questions of naval policy and maritime warfare—to advise. 2. Fighting and seagoing efficiency of the fleet, its organization and mobilization, including complements of ships as affecting total numbers; system of gunnery and torpedo exercises of the fleet, and tactical employment of air craft, and all military questions connected with the foregoing; distribution and movements of all ships in commission and in reserve. 3. Superintendence of the war staff and the hydrographic department."

These duties are all performed subject to the general authority of the First Lord of the Admiralty, who corresponds to our Secretary of the Navy; and I wish to emphasize the fact that I am not advocating a reorganization which would in any way reduce the authority of the Secretary.

I have spoken of strategy as shaping plans which are later carried out by operations. This is a convenient distinction but not an exact one, for in a broad sense strategy both plans and executes. It may be defined as the art of so shaping plans and directing forces as to concentrate the maximum of pressure upon the enemy at the time and place best suited to accomplish the purpose at which we aim. This evidently presupposes a clear conception of what the purpose is at which we aim, and a careful preparation—in advance—of the forces and the plans required for attaining the purpose. The strategy of a far-sighted nation does not begin with the beginning of war. It has its origin far back in the history of international relations and runs parallel with national policies, taking account of the ends at which these national policies aim and accepting their ends as its own.

First of all, then, strategy is preparation. Secondarily, it is execution; always—if it deserves the name of strategy—through the medium of forces and of plans previously prepared.

I have explained that the defects in the organization of the Navy Department are a lack of coordination of authority, as a result of which the administration starts from too many sources and flows through too many channels, and a total lack of provision for planning and carrying forward the operations of war. It must not be supposed that these defects have escaped recognition or that no efforts have been made to correct them. The most successful of the efforts to secure coordination between the bureaus was the adoption during the last administration of a system of aids to the Secretary, who coordinated the work of the various bureaus, and who, when important questions were under consideration, formed a council upon which he could call for advice. The weak point about this system was, and is, that the aids have never been legalized by Congress, and therefore have no permanent status whatever. In spite of this, they are in a position to do much toward improving the administration of the department.

The General Board was called into existence in 1900 by an order of the Secretary of the Navy to provide a body for the consideration of war plans and allied subjects. It has performed and is performing work of the very highest importance, but it, like the Council of Aids, lacks legislative sanction, although Congress has for many years past shown great interest in its work and not a little deference to its views.

Another and a very important agency to which the Navy Department looks for a contribution to its work in strategy and other matters connected with preparation for war and the conduct of war is the Naval War College at Newport. The War College has been in existence since 1884 and has been an important factor in the education of officers from the very beginning. For some reason, however, it has failed until very recently to command the full recognition which it has deserved from the Navy Department or even from the officers of the Navy. The present Secretary of the Navy visited the college shortly after coming into office and, with an insight of which many naval officers have shown themselves incapable, recognized its possibilities for usefulness and pronounced himself its friend. Since that time he has done everything to forward its work which could be dictated by the most thorough comprehension of its mission and its needs, and as a result of this generous support, both moral and material, the college has taken its proper place as an institution for the training of officers for high command and for the development of the art of naval warfare. Thus the college is enabled to contribute something toward making good the lack of a strategic division in the Navy Department itself.

You will see, therefore, that, although no law takes cognizance of the necessity for keeping the Navy ready for war, there are many

agencies which cooperate toward that end—the Council of Aids, to which the Secretary would naturally turn in an emergency, the General Board, and the War College. These agencies are so closely in sympathy that they are able to cooperate harmoniously with each other and with the fleet, and this cooperation is having important and very valuable results. This does not change the fact that there should be—that indeed there must be—in the Navy Department itself and close to the Secretary a coordinating office to bring the efforts of these and other agencies to an administrative focus bearing directly upon the efficiency for war. Such a coordinating office I have already sketched as a division of strategy and operations immediately below the Secretary of the Navy in authority.

The creation of this office would provide a policy for the Navy, so far as the activities of the Navy itself are concerned, insuring unity of effort and shaping plans toward the end which we have recognized to-night as the proper end of all our efforts—preparedness for war.

But a policy within the Navy is not enough. I have said of strategy that it should take account of national policy as applied to international affairs. We need, then, a policy broader than our naval policy and including it. Thus must be a national policy, dealing with both Army and Navy, and bringing the broadest statesmanship as well as the highest technical knowledge to bear upon the whole question of national defense. Its enunciation must come from the highest authority in the land, executive and legislative.

This points to a council of national defense, for the creation of which a bill is already before Congress. In such a council, with the President of the United States at its head, we should have the last word in the coordination of national resources for national defense.

I will now print the report of the Naval Committee on the council of national defense bill.

[House of Representatives. Report No. 584. Sixty-second Congress, second session.]

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. HOBSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1309) to establish a council of national defense, having had the same under consideration, report the same to the House with the following amendments, and recommend that the amendments be adopted and that the bill as amended do pass:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "Secretary of War, who shall be president of the council," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"President of the United States, who shall be ex officio president of the council; the Secretary of State, who shall preside in the absence of the President; the Secretary of War."

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "the aid for operations of the fleet of the Navy," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"An officer of the Navy not below the rank of captain to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 2, after line 3, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The chairmen of the several committees of the Senate and House of Representatives herein named shall act as members of the council until their successors have been selected."

Page 2, section 2, strike out the section and add the following:

"SEC. 3. That said council shall report to the President for transmission to Congress a general policy of national defense and such recommendation of measures relating thereto as it shall deem necessary and expedient."

Page 2, section 3, at the end of line 11, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That in the time of war said council shall meet only upon the call of the President of the United States."

Page 2, line 10, strike out the words "Sec. 3" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Sec. 4."

Page 2, section 3, line 12, after the word "*Provided*," insert "*further*."

Page 2, section 3, line 13, strike out the words "except in time of war."

Page 2, section 3, line 14, strike out all after the word "that" and strike out all of lines 15, 16, and 17, and insert in lieu thereof:

"The council may summon for consultation at any of its meetings any citizen of the United States, and upon request by the council the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall order any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to appear before the council for consultation."

Page 2, line 18, strike out the words "Sec. 4" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Sec. 5."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "session," insert the following:

"And the necessary expenses of all persons summoned."

The bill as amended reads as follows:

"A bill to establish a council of national defense.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a council of national defense, consisting of the President of the United States, who shall be ex officio president of the council; the Secretary of State, who shall preside in the absence of the President; the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the General Staff of the Army, an officer of the Navy not below the rank of captain to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, the president of the Army War College, and the president of the Navy War College.

"SEC. 2. The chairmen of the several committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives herein named shall act as members of the council until their successors have been selected.

"SEC. 3. That said council shall report to the President, for transmission to Congress a general policy of national defense and such recommendations or measures relating thereto as it shall deem necessary and expedient.

"SEC. 4. That said council shall meet at least once in each calendar year, on such date or dates as it shall fix: *Provided*, That in time of war said council shall meet only upon the call of the President of the United States: *Provided further*, That special meetings may be called by the president of the council: *And provided further*, That the council may summon for consultation at any of its meetings any citizen of the United States, and upon request by the council the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall order any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to appear before the council for consultation.

"SEC. 5. That for carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, to be available until expended, and to be expended upon vouchers signed by the president of the council: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses of the chairmen of committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, when called to attend meetings of said council when Congress is not in session, and the necessary expenses of all persons summoned shall be paid from this appropriation upon approval by the president of the council."

This bill is approved by the President of the United States, by the late Secretary of War, by the present Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and without exception officers of high rank, knowledge, and experience of both the Army and Navy. The council entails practically no cost. A similar council has been established in every other great nation in the world.

The President, in a message to this Congress, says:

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

"I urge again upon Congress the desirability of establishing the council of national defense. The bill to establish this council was before Congress last winter, and it is hoped that this legislation will pass during the present session. The purpose of the council is to determine the general policy of national defense and to recommend to Congress and to the President such measures relating to it as it shall deem necessary and expedient.

"No such machinery is now provided by which the readiness of the Army and Navy may be improved, and the programs of military and naval requirements shall be coordinated and properly scrutinized with a view to the necessities of the whole Nation rather than of separate departments."

The late Secretary of War, to whom was referred H. R. 29371, an almost identical bill, states as follows:

"WAR DEPARTMENT, *December 16, 1910.*

"Respectfully returned to Hon. George Edmund Foss, Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

"I approve of the provisions of this bill and recommend its enactment into law.

"J. M. DICKINSON,
"Secretary of War."

The last Secretary of War further stated in a hearing before the committee in part as follows:

"I do desire, however, to avail myself of this opportunity to say that I have considered the question and am very heartily in favor of the bill. I think one of the main troubles that we have had is that we have not proceeded upon a comprehensive and uniform plan in the development of our schemes for military defense. What we have done in that line has been largely sporadic, brought forward from time to time upon individual suggestion and reflecting more or less the views of some particular Secretary of War, so far as the Army is concerned, or the Chief of Staff, and there has never been any system of uniform legislation well thought out, planned, thoroughly studied, and proceeded with.

"There are great advantages, I think, to be gotten from the establishment of a board of this character. It provides for men of technical information. Then, it has represented upon it both branches of the legislative assembly. If the board shall be created, I believe that they can adopt a plan which will be utilized, and that then all legislation will be correlated with that plan. It will proceed then in a systematic way and not run out at tangents as it does now. That is a general statement, Mr. Chairman, of my views of the advantages of a bill of this character.

"The legislation that would be the outcome of an investigation by such a board as this, and recommended by such a board, would command the executive support and the legislative support, and it would command the confidence of the country, and it would not be upset from time to time by legislation that would emanate merely from some individual standpoint. I think that it would result in great economy and great efficiency."

The present Secretary of War, in his annual report dated December 4, 1911, states as follows:

"The House Committee on Naval Affairs has submitted a favorable report upon a bill to establish a council of national defense. This bill is approved by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy. Its duties are to make practicable the formulation and execution of a consistent and continuing policy of national defense, to help in coordinating the plans of the Army and Navy, and furnish a means of coordiating military and financial questions before submitting to the President and to Congress recommendations for measures of national defense. It is hoped that this bill will receive favorable consideration during the present session of Congress."

The Secretary of the Navy states as follows, referring to a similar bill:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 27, 1910.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 15th instant transmitting a bill (H. R. 29371) to establish a council of national defense, and requesting the views and recommendations of this department thereon.

"The proposed bill is regarded as very desirable to the Navy in that it would make practicable the formulation and execution of a consistent and continuing policy of national defense; it would help to coordinate the plans of the Army and Navy and furnish a means of reconciling the military and financial interests before submitting to the President and the Congress recommendations for measures of national defense, and would furnish the President and the Congress a ready means of ascertaining at any time the condition of the Nation for defense.

"Favorable consideration of this bill is recommended.

"G. V. L. MEYER,
"Secretary of the Navy.

"CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
"House of Representatives, Washington, D. C."

Again, in a hearing before the committee on May 19, 1911, the Secretary of the Navy said in part:

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in war nothing fails like failure. Now, in order to have success we must have efficiency. To have efficiency we must have a definite policy; and to bring about a definite policy we have to have cooperation and coordination of

Congress, the Army, and the Navy. To bring about this cooperation we have to have an intelligent understanding.

"Now, this national council of defense bill is made up of two Cabinet officers, four Senators, four Congressmen, two Army officers, and two naval officers. It would seem that this council would tend toward and result in an intelligent understanding and assist in cooperation of Congress to a definite policy. I can not help feeling, after due consideration, that this council would result in a definite policy and would encourage cooperation, and would increase efficiency as well as economy.

"The President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy should be a member ex officio of this board. I say this without consulting with the President. I do not know whether or not that has come to the attention of the committee."

Again, the Secretary of the Navy, in a hearing before the committee on March 1, 1912, said in part:

"We feel that this council of national defense will be an additional benefit to the Navy, to the country, and to the Nation. It will in a way be a vehicle between the department and Congress. There will be representatives in this council from the Congress and from the departments of the Army and Navy, and they will be in touch with exactly what the future requirements may be in the Army and the Navy, and it will enable them to be in council with the two departments.

"In that way it will keep the departments and Congress in touch with each other and encourage continuity of policy, which is of vital importance to the best results. I will not go into the details of the bill, because it is all in the hearing which took place May 19, 1911, when Secretary of War Dickinson, the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Mahan, Gen. Wood, Admiral Wainwright, Gen. Wotherspoon, president of the Army War College, and a number of officers from both the Army and Navy were present. The departmental heads of the Army and Navy are in sympathy with it, and the President is also in sympathy with it.

"In other countries—in England, and particularly in Germany and Japan—they are working out in advance policies for the next few years. If Congress were more in touch with the aims and objects of those two departments and felt that they thoroughly understood them, they could in turn inform and keep informed, not only in an intelligent way but in a sympathetic way, the Representatives of Congress, and thus be of great benefit in furthering proper and necessary legislation. I hope the committee will give this matter further consideration."

Sections 1 and 2 of the bill establish a council of national defense, composed of six officials of the legislative branch of the Government, four officials of the executive branch, and four technical and expert officers of high rank, two in the Army and two in the Navy. The officials of the legislative branch are the four chairmen of the two service committees, Naval and Military, of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the two chairmen of the Appropriation Committees of the same.

The officials of the executive branch of the Government are the President, the Secretary of State, and the two Cabinet officers at the head of the two services, naval and military. The four technical officers of the Army and Navy are those charged with duties pertaining to high matters of national defense.

Thus in its composition the council brings together the officials charged with responsibility and most competent to pass on questions of national defense and insures unity, continuity, and cooperation heretofore impossible and the lack of which has entailed added expense and lowered efficiency in all branches of national defense.

Section 3 makes it the duty of the council to report a general policy of national defense and to recommend measures for carrying out the same. Under present conditions there is no authoritative official or body of officials to perform this important function. The lack of a definite policy at the time of and during our past wars has always entailed enormous outlay of treasure, loss of life, and at times has cost us victory on the battle field.

The necessity of having a definite policy worked out in advance of war has become of greater and greater importance in the conduct of modern war. Indeed, it is not overdrawing the facts to say that victory in modern war has invariably gone to the side of the nation with its policy the best determined.

The experience of these modern wars has caused all important nations to develop a council of national defense with duties similar to those prescribed in this section. This is noticeable in the cases of the two last wars, the Russo-Japanese War and the Boer War. Both Russia and Great Britain found the lack of a definite, carefully prepared policy chiefly responsible for their reverses.

The composition and duties of the similar councils abroad are as follows:

For Great Britain, including India, the name of the council is "The committee on imperial defense."

GREAT BRITAIN, INCLUDING INDIA.

THE COMMITTEE ON IMPERIAL DEFENSE.

"The defense committee, assisted by a small secretariat, will deal with questions of national defense and will foresee imperial requirements.

"The prime minister, who is president of the committee, and the secretarial staff are the only permanent members of the defense committee. The other officials who attend the meetings do so by invitation, and invitations are sent out for each meeting.

"The members who ordinarily attend the meetings of the defense committee are: The prime minister, the secretary of state for foreign affairs, the secretary of state for war, the secretary of state for India, the chancellor of the exchequer, the first lord of the admiralty, the first sea lord of the admiralty, the director of naval intelligence, the chief of the general staff, the director of military operations, Lord Esher, and Gen. Sir John French. Other members of the cabinet and officials who possess special knowledge on subjects under consideration are asked to attend meetings of the committee from time to time.

"The secretariat, or, as it is sometimes called, the 'permanent nucleus,' was appointed with a view to insure continuity of work and that a record of work done might be kept for the information of succeeding committees.

"The following statements, made in the house by the present and late prime ministers on August 2, 1906, will show clearly the status and functions of the committee:

"Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman said:

"'The defense committee act as the expert advisers of the Government in regard to technical questions.

"'It was for the cabinet to determine their political policy, and then it was for the expert members of the defense committee to furnish them with the information as to how they were to carry out their policy. Questions of high policy were beyond the ken of the committee of imperial defense. It was no part of the duty of the committee to pronounce an opinion on the general policy of the Government, either naval or military.'

"Mr. Balfour said:

"'The committee was summoned by the prime minister to assist him in dealing with matters outside the purview of a single department, and it was the prime minister's business to choose which heads of departments he would summon, and what experts were to be brought in * * *. There was a natural elasticity in the committee of defense depending on the problems to be dealt with, and the prime minister of the day must decide for himself whose advice he would take.'" (Organization and Equipment, Lieut. Col. Brunker.)

FRANCE.

DECREE RELATIVE TO THE ESTABISHMENT OF A SUPREME BOARD OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

PARIS, *April 3, 1906.*

"ARTICLE 1. A supreme board of national defense is instituted for the examination of all questions requiring the cooperation of two or more ministerial departments.

"ART. 5. The supreme board of national defense shall be composed of: The president of the board of ministers, presiding; the minister of foreign affairs; the minister of finance; the minister of war; the minister of marine; the minister for the colonies.

"ART. 6. The chief of staff of the army, the chief of staff of the navy, and the president of the consultative committee for colonial defense shall be present at meetings of the supreme board with deliberative voice."

GERMANY.

"In order that the whole undivided strength of the fleet may be successfully employed in the destruction of the enemy and in defending our coasts, it is necessary that the army and navy should have a common commander in chief, whom the German Empire possesses in His Majesty the Emperor. The navy, as well as the army, must receive its instructions from the great headquarters, and this will be taken into consideration in the composition of the latter.

* * * * * * *

"In view of the importance of the German fleet at the present day and of the still greater importance which it will have in the future, the chief of staff of the navy and the chief of the naval cabinet with their staffs will in future be attached to the headquarters staff in order to insure the cooperation of the navy with the army.

* * * * * * *

"To some extent the two services already work together in peace times. This is the case as regards the enlistment of sailors by the military administrative circles, the joint action of the admiralty, the war office, and the general staff of the army on mobilization, the defense of our coasts, and so forth; but these joint duties are of little assistance in making the services better acquainted with one another, since they affect but a small number of officers of each branch.

"Something has been effected in this direction by the practice, recently introduced, of appointing naval officers to the army staff, and vice versa; of detailing joint committees of naval and military officers; and of selecting officers to attend the maneuvers of the sister service; but much more than this is required to instill into all ranks of the army and of the navy the necessity for combined action and mutual support in war." (The Duties of the General Staff, 1905, Gen. Bronsart von Schellendorff.)

The great successes of Germany in the wars of 1866 and 1870 were chiefly due to the policy and preparations resulting from the cooperation of the civil and the military embodied in Bismarck, the statesman, and Von Moltke, the soldier.

RUSSIA.

BOARD OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

(This and a great general staff were created by the Emperor of Russia as a result of the experience of the Russo-Japanese War.)

"The board of national defense is charged with the study of questions which relate to the security of the Empire. It acts under the direct orders of the Emperor, and is made up of a president and six permanent members—all named by the Emperor—but has also a certain number of other members, some on account of the offices which they hold, as the ministers of war and of the navy, the chief of the general staff, the chief of the great general staff of the navy, and the inspectors of the army, and others because of their personal knowledge or because of the needs of the service as, for example, ministers, commanders of army corps, etc.

"The board of national defense has the following duties:

"(*a*) Study of general measures so that a fixed plan may be determined upon by the ministers of war and of the navy in order to assure the development of the military power of the Empire in conformity to the political ends which it is desired to accomplish.

"(*b*) To watch that these measures are carried out as soon as they have the approval of the Emperor.

"(*c*) Study of propositions emanating from the military ministers and conforming them in order that all resources may be employed in time of war and unification and direction of all preliminary measures.

"(*d*) Study of modifications which it is desirable to make in the plans of the two military ministers.

"(*e*) Study and solution of the questions of the fitness of the different branches of the administration and the differences which exist in them from the standpoint of national defense.

"The board of national defense has no executive power, but is limited to recommendations to the Emperor. The execution of measures which receive the approval of the Emperor is in charge of the minister of war. The president has direct communication with the Emperor, and speaks as his mouthpiece when he presides in the board. Said president forms a part by virtue of his office of the imperial council and of the council of ministers. He has the right to ask from the various ministers anything which can contribute to the work of the board, and receives from the minister of war, of the navy, and of foreign affairs information relating to the national defense. All the deliberations and actions of the board are considered as state secrets." (Revista Cientifico-Militar y Biblioteca Militar, 25 Septiembre, 1905.)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

"In Austria-Hungary there is no minister of the navy. The minister of war of the monarchy has in his charge questions relating to the navy. On this account the bureaus of the navy constitute a section attached to the ministry of war." (L'Etat Militaire des Principales Puissances Etrangeres en 1902, Lauth.)

ITALY.

"By a decree of the 16th of July, 1897, the supreme mixed commission for the defense of the Empire was organized. This is charged with the duty of giving advice on all important questions concerning the defense of Italy. The Duke of Genoa is president; the members are: The admiral president of the superior council of the navy, the generals designated to command the various armies in case of war, the admirals designated to command the fleets, and the chief of the general staff of the army and of the navy. The generals, the commanders of army corps, the inspectors general and admirals, when it appears that their presence will be useful, may be invited to attend the meetings of the commission for consultation only." (L'Etat Militaire des Principales Puissances Etrangeres en 1902, Lauth.)

SPAIN.

"Spain has a consultative board for war which is concerned with the large questions in reference to preparation for war, etc. The organization and the composition of this board are regulated by decisions made in the council of ministers." (L'Etat Militaire des Principales Puissances Etrangeres en 1902, Lauth.)

JAPAN.

THE SUPREME MILITARY COUNCIL.

This was created in 1898 as the highest advisory body on naval and military matters to the Emperor. It was made up of six members, three army and three navy officers of the highest rank.

THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF WAR.

"This is a special office created on the eve of the outbreak of the late war, and may be regarded as the Emperor's advisors and staff officers on all important matter pertaining to war. The members of the supreme military council, ministers of war and of the navy, chiefs of the general staff, and of the naval staff board are entitled to membership by virtue of their official positions." (Japan Year Book, 1907.)

In the hearings before the committee the last chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. Hull, made a statement in part as follows:

"A board of the kind provided for would be of great benefit to the country at large and would enable the Government to pursue a settled policy, and when that policy should be changed it would only be after very mature deliberation.

"I heard the question of my colleague from Iowa [Mr. Dawson], and I can not see any objection to creating a board of this character whose action is simply advisory. It can not have any effect until Congress acts, the same as it did with the Endicott board, the same as it does with plans for improvements at different institutions like the Military Academy and the Naval Academy. Congress must first adopt its recommendations.

"One great advantage of having a board of this character is, to my mind, to have some definite policy decided on. I do not know whether the Navy Department changes its mind very often or not, but the War Department changes its mind very often, and we are pushed into a line of legislation under one Chief of Staff, and when the head of the bureau changes or a new Chief of Staff comes in he urges sometimes a different line from that urged by his predecessor.

"Our whole system would be steadied if there was a board composed of these experts of the Army and Navy and the Members of Congress who have charge of these matters. In my judgment, the whole line of legislation would be steadied and benefited by the creation of this board. We can not conceive that there is any constitutional objection to creating it, and, as it is not a board that has absolute power to go ahead and do things, I can not conceive of any objections to both the experts and Members of Congress being joined together to get information. Personally, I think it is a splendid bill, and I should like to see it adopted. It will not cost us much; it will be of benefit to the Government; and we do need something in the way of a permanent policy of defense, and then let Congress carry it out; or, if the time comes to change it, we do need more than one man's technical ideas, no matter who he may be, before we can change it. You will never succeed in getting a continuous line of work unless you have some permanent authority, that Congress will have confidence in after it has been tested, or abolish it if you do not have confidence in it.

"I do believe in the bill, and I believe it is one of the best things you can do to get a board that can have some permanency and adopt some permanent policy and quit this makeshift we have been suffering from.

"I do want to see this act put in some shape where the vast sums we expend will be beneficial for the country as a whole, not only for this year, but growing up each year, with better results each year for our defenses, and getting results for the money we appropriate for the national defense. We are not doing it now. There has been a wonderful advance in the Army for the last four or five years. We are getting a better system all the time, and yet it has not that steadiness of purpose it ought to have and will have, in my judgment, if we adopt this bill."

Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Army, Chief of the General Staff, made a statement in part as follows:

"I believe thoroughly in the bill. I consider it to be the most important measure for military efficiency that has come up for consideration since I have had anything whatever to do with my present duties in Washington, and probably one of the most important that has ever come up. My reasons for making this statement so strong are as follows: If we succeed in having this bill enacted into law, it means that we shall have a committee consisting of the elements directly interested in the preparation and maintenance of national defense. It will insure the military proposition, and by 'military' I mean the propositions advanced by the naval and military authorities, being considered by a committee in which both Houses of Congress and the President's Cabinet are strongly represented, and it means that matters which are approved by this committee will be presented to Congress under an indorsement guaranteeing to that body that four of its own Members and two officers of the Cabinet, all civilians, have very carefully considered the measure and believe in it and recommend its enactment.

"It is well known to all of us that officers of the Army and Navy are generally looked upon as being a little overenthusiastic in military matters, and I believe that the effect of a joint committee of this sort taking up and considering questions of policy will, if it approves them, bring these matters before Congress in a much stronger way than we could possibly do it ourselves. It means, moreover, that we shall be able to establish and maintain a general military policy. The committee will change its membership gradually. We shall be able to adopt a general policy and carry it out from one administration to another without the radical changes which occur at the present time.

"A committee of this sort will insure a continuity of policy and a harmonizing, I think, of the military policy of the Government; it will provide a body in which the civilian element outnumbers the military, and whatever it approves is bound, I think, to appeal very strongly to Congress. I think it will be safe, sane, and strong for the betterment of the national defense."

Admiral Richard Wainwright, United States Navy, late aid for operations of the fleet, made a statement in part as follows:

"I am entirely in favor of the objects of the bill. I believe they will promote both efficiency and economy. With the same amount of money we should get more efficient military and naval forces, or for the same efficiency we should do it for less money. I think the object is to better bring before the Members of both Houses the requirements of the country, and then they would determine how much their resources were to be turned into preparation. I think, after the first formulation of the policy there would not be a necessity of many meetings. Of course from time to time the circumstances of the country would change its foreign relations, etc., that might require changes in the broad policy. And of course each year the question of how much should be recommended to do in that year—that is, broadly, between all the services taken together—would have to be largely determined by the Members who are representing the Senate and House.

"I can not see why there should be any emergency meetings of this council. Of course it would be better if the council could meet a little prior to the session of Congress, as Mr. PADGETT suggested, because they are very busy when Congress meets, and it would take a little time to carry it out. The English imperial council of defense was organized in 1895.

"Mr. HOBSON. Right there, will you explain why they came to organize that council in England?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. The 1895 one?

"Mr. HOBSON. Yes; and the subsequent one.

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. The object of the subsequent one was more apparent. In 1895 there were no technical men in the council, and they felt they were not spending their money to the best advantage. They saw certain deficiencies in both army and navy.

"Mr. BATES. May I ask how that council was constituted—from what personnel?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. In 1895 the president of the council, the prime minister, the secretary of state for war, and the first lord of the admiralty.

"Mr. BATES. Were there members of Parliament in that council?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. The first lord of admiralty is a member of Parliament; the prime minister is a member of Parliament; the secretary of state for war is a member of Parliament. The president of the council is probably almost always a member of the House of Lords. So they are all legislative men.

"Mr. ROBERTS. You are speaking of the first council, of 1895?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. Yes. In 1903, after the Boer War, when they saw how deficient the army was, they increased the council by putting in the commander in chief of the army, the first naval lord (the first sea lord) of the admiralty, and the two intelligence officers, the officer in charge of military intelligence and the officer in charge of naval intelligence. They really represent what our presidents of the War College do, except that our president of the War College now has not the Office of Naval Intelligence under him. It would be better if he had.

"Mr. HOBSON. I want to ask Admiral Wainwright, in connection with his account of the second and current council in England, whether the Boer War threw any light on the necessity for the council?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. The Boer War was the reason they strengthened their council with technical members. Formerly they would call in technical people to explain to them the necessities, and after their great troubles in the Boer War they found that their army was not properly organized, and they also thought they could do better with transportation, etc., which was the navy part. They thought by placing regular technical members on the board they could talk more freely with the legislative members than if they were called in for a mere hearing. I do not think that in any of these boards it can ever become a question of voting. I think if the legislative members, for instance, did not agree to a policy the recommendation would not be made, because it would be ineffective. It would be like our meetings of the joint board.

"Mr. HOBSON. Admiral, as to the necessities or needs of that general policy now, do you think that it would facilitate settlement of the broad question of naval bases?

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. As to the question of naval bases, naval stations, and fortifications, I think both the Army and Navy—a great many of us think there should be a uniform policy as to what should be fortified; that the country should not put money where it is not needed, in fortifications or in permanent naval stations, and that some places may not be neglected; but a uniform policy which would state what we are looking forward to I think would be of great value.

"Mr. HOBSON. In connection with that arises the question of joint operations of Army and Navy in time of war and preparation in time of peace for such matters as transportation.

"Admiral WAINWRIGHT. The question of preparation and how they should cooperate, not how they should operate after the war came; that should become technical."

Rear Admiral Raymond P. Rodgers, president of the Naval War College, United States Navy, made a statement in part as follows:

"I think the principle embodied in this bill is most desirable and necessary for us in determining any policy of preparation for war. It not only brings together the two executive military departments, the Army and Navy Departments, but it brings into this council several of the principal Representatives of both Houses of Congress to shape these policies. Councils similar to the one proposed are found in all the parliamentary countries of the world, and the advantage of them has been found to be very great. We have not had very much policy heretofore, for anything we got in the way of increase was of value; but now that we have developed so widely as we have it seems most important that there should be a policy for future development and expenditure in preparedness for war, and it seems that a council of this character is the best adapted for the purpose."

Brig. Gen. William W. Wotherspoon, United States Army, president of the Army War College, made a statement in part as follows:

"I consider this the most important bill in regard to the military efficiency of the country that has ever come under my observation. I say that from the standpoint purely of the Army. The great trouble we find at the War College is in ascertaining what the policy of Congress, the legislative body, is in regard to military affairs. We can only deduce that from its legislative acts. If we can crystallize that into a few brief sentences, it would be this, that Congress expects, on the breaking out of war, that the gathering together of untrained, unskilled,

and uneducated men will constitute an efficient Army for the country. That has always been the course pursued, and until we get some council like this probably it will be continued to be pursued. The result of that apparent policy has been most disastrous in the past, both financially and from the point of conservation of our human resources. In the War of 1812 Great Britain had never at any time on this continent a greater force than 16,500 soldiers. We mustered into the service 527,000 men, more than half a million. In 1878 we had a pension roll of 78,000 pensioners from the War of 1812, costing over half a million more than the entire Regular Army cost in 1811. That is simply an illustration.

"The most important feature, however, of this bill, so far as the Army is concerned, is this: The Army, drifting along from its old days in Indian campaigning, settled down here, there, and everywhere in the West and we have posts in the most out-of-the-way corners you can conceive of, the farthest possible from sources of supply and sources of recruits, so that the administration of the Army is enormously expensive. I conceive that such a board would take this up."

At another hearing Gen. Wotherspoon said:

"I consider this as decidedly the most important measure that has ever come under my observation since I have been in the Army, in forty-odd years. I should say that I have been working continuously for the last six years in order to get some such body as is proposed in this bill to pass authoritatively upon a national policy with regard to national defense. I have been compelled, as president of the War College, in preparing plans to pass from a state of peace to a state of war to search the records to see if there existed such a thing as a military policy in the United States. I found no evidence whatever of it. There is nothing that anyone can point to and say, 'This is the policy the Nation will pursue in the event of war or in the preparation for war.' In those studies I have seen that the expenditures for the Army are enormous, without results adequate to the cost. We have our Army scattered all over the country in the most expensive situations that there are, far from the sources of recruitment, far from the sources of supplies, far from railroad communication, where the cost of assembly at any definite point where their services would be required would be a great deal more than if we could have a scientific assembly. We have none of the higher organizations, such as brigades and divisions, which all other nations consider as absolutely essential for military efficiency. I have been in the service for 40 years, and I have never seen 5,000 men assembled. I have only once had control as a general officer of about 4,000 men, and then only for a few weeks in a militia camp.

"I have never seen a staff for one of these higher organizations trained. I consider that this bill will coordinate the efforts of the Army and the Navy and the legislative branch into some unified policy which will make for decided economy and still more decidedly for efficiency. I have stated to this committee before and to the Military Committee that I am perfectly convinced that an army three times as efficient and probably twice as strong as we have now can be maintained for the money we are at present spending for the Army. I should regret very much to see this bill fail, because it will throw us back to where we have always been, so that when a war comes on the first step is to evolve a policy from uncoordinated elements; the next step is to organize the higher fighting units; the third step, and that we always fail in, is the equipment of those units. I do not know that the committee knows that when the War of 1861–1865 came on it was the Secretary of the Treasury that drafted the bill for the United States Army or the Federal Army. The Secretary of War was too busy at that time to establish either a policy or to prepare for an organization. Consequently it was left to Mr. Chase."

Admiral A. T. Mahan, United States Navy (retired), made a statement in part as follows:

"The general purpose of the bill seems to me excellent. It would compel the deliberation in common of a number of men whose specialties are closely allied actually, but are not brought into formal cooperation, as the bill provides they shall hereafter be. For the information of each member of the council, and of the whole as a body, and for the subsequent formulation of measures, this method is superior to the appearance of experts before a committee, though it doubtless will not supersede that. Experts before a committee are like witnesses in a box, and confine themselves very closely to the matter in hand, whereas in discussion between equals many collateral facts and considerations transpire because of the freedom of range. Time is not thereby lost, at least to any greater extent than the half-informed questionings of those who are eliciting statements from a witness. I believe that Congress, the ultimate arbiter in matters of military provision, would be enabled to judge much better through the institution of this proposed council.

"As to questions of detail, I have very little to suggest. The proposed composition of the council, by ex officio members, seems to me very judicious.

"It has been justly remarked (Corbett's Seven Years War) that the strength of Great Britain's action in that war was that the three allied functions—diplomacy, army, and navy—were in one hand. In my judgment, they should all be represented in the proposed council."

Commander Frank Kinsey Hill, United States Navy, of the Naval War College, made a statement in part as follows:

* * * "A war will be properly carried on when the statesmen who control the steps preceding and subsequent to war work with and sustain the two military branches in harmonious plans during war, which plans are drawn to further the policies which caused the war; and, further, that it is necessary for the military commanders to study and broadly comprehend the policies of governments, so that their plans will fit the ends to be attained. * * * Now, unless the statesmen will tell us what the policies are we can not make proper strategic plans. I would like to illustrate this in one case with regard to Russia and Japan. The Russian statesmen did not coordinate with the army or navy. They did not know that a war was coming on between those two countries, as a matter of fact. The result was that they did not have the Russian forces in place to fight at the beginning of the war. The result was that Russia was defeated up to the time of the treaty. It is now considered by many that if war had been continued for a few months longer Russia would have prevailed. But lack of harmony between the Russian statesmen and the Russian army and navy commanders caused the defeat of that country. Another case, if you wish, is the Boer War, when exactly the same thing happened. * * * Having established a policy, then it is next the business of the military officers to state the necessities for their branches to carry out the policy.

"There is one other question which was asked several times by the chairman, and that is the question of economy, and the answers were wholly based on the economy due to coordination and a directive force. I consider that two economies will result, and the one named is the minor one. The largest economy which will ever come from this bill will result from our being so prepared for war that the enemy will decide not to have war with us. We would save a couple of billion dollars and several hundred thousand lives over and above the few millions which we could save by this fixing up of the stations, as mentioned by Gen. Wotherspoon. * * *

"We thus see that a definite responsibility can and ought to be fixed: first, for the decision as to what the policies of the Government will be; second, for the recommendation concerning the forces necessary to carry out the policies; third, for the appropriations necessary to provide these forces; and, fourth, for the right use of these forces by the military and naval commanders after they have been provided. The people of the United States, who delegate power to carry on the Government, should be thoroughly informed as to the various responsibilities, so that the credit for success or odium for failure should rest where it belongs. * * *

"War, being the result of policies enforced, should be based on strategic plans to gain certain definite ends. For instance, if the United States had a policy of extension of territory by absorption of Canada, the war would be directed so as to gain military control of that territory, and if the war ended successfully for the United States, the treaty would probably cede to them such territory as was held under military control at the end of the war.

"It is thus seen that the strategic objective of a war must rightly comprehend a knowledge of the policies which preceded war and contemplate the treaty which is to conclude the war.

CONCLUSIONS.

"War is not independent of political considerations, but must be outlined and carried on with due regard to these considerations. That to properly outline the war the three branches of the Government (State, War, and Navy Departments) should act in conjunction, and that peace preparation in anticipation of war should be the joint action of Congress, the War and the Navy Departments.

"Finally, both the peace preparations and war will best be carried out by a national board for war comprised of units representing both branches of Congress and the Departments of State, War, and Navy."

The three greatest authorities on the art of war are Jomini, Clonseuritz, and Von der Goltz.

Von der Goltz says:

"Upon policy the whole condition, the feeling, the constitution, and the moral and physical affairs of a State depend; and upon these depends, again, the waging of war.

"Policy, again, regulates the relations not merely of those States immediately concerned, but also those of such as are indirectly interested in the final issue. Their favor or disfavor may be of very great significance, impeding the course of events or promoting them. Politics, again, as a rule determine the moment for the outbreak of hostilities, upon the happy choice of which much depends. They, in short, create the general situation, in which the State enters into the struggle, and this will be of material influence upon the decisions and attitude of the commander in chief, and even upon the general esprit of the army. * * *

"War serves politics both before and after. War waged only for annihilation and destruction is in these days inconceivable. An end and aim that is of permanent value to the State, be it only a question of ascendancy, must be existent; and this can only arise from political considerations.

"The object of a war is of such importance and will be of such lasting effect upon the exertions which nations make to attain it that we ought, almost on this account alone, to place policy first among conditions of success. Now, as we have here pointed out, many motives are also attendant, and thus we may without hesitation lay down a maxim that without a good policy a successful war is not probable." * * *

Clouseuritz says:

"Thus, therefore, the political object, as the original motive of the war, will be the standard for determining both the aim of the military force and also the amount of effort to be made. * * *

"We see, therefore, in the first place, that under all circumstances war is to be regarded not as an independent thing, but as a political instrument; and it is only by taking this point of view that we can avoid finding ourselves in opposition to all military history. This is the only means of unlocking the great book and making it intelligible. Secondly, this view shows us how wars must differ in character according to the nature of the motives and circumstances from which they proceed.

"Now, the first, the grandest, and most decisive act of judgment which the statesman and general exercise is rightly to understand in this respect the war in which he engages, not to take it for something or to wish to make of it something which by the nature of its relations it is impossible for it to be. This is, therefore, the first, the most comprehensive, of all strategical questions."

Jomini says:

"The art of war consists of six distinct parts:

"(1) Statesmanship in its relation to war.

"(2) Strategy, or the art of properly directing masses upon the theater of war, either for defense or for invasion.

"(3) Grand tactics.

"(4) Logistics, or the art of moving armies.

"(5) Engineering the attack and defense of fortifications.

"(6) Minor tactics.

* * * * * * *

STATESMANSHIP IN ITS RELATION TO WAR.

"Under this head are included those considerations from which a statesman concludes whether a war is proper, opportune, or indispensable, and determines the various operations necessary to attain the object of the war.

"War is always to be conducted according to the great principles of the art; but great discretion must be exercised in the nature of the operations to be undertaken, which should depend upon the circumstances of the case.

"To these different combinations, which belong more or less to statesmanship, may be added others which relate solely to the management of armies. The name 'military policy' is given to them, for they belong exclusively neither to diplomacy nor to strategy, but are still of the highest importance in the plans both of a statesman and a general."

Col. Henderson, of the British Army, in his book, The Science of War, says:

"While a statesman may be competent to appreciate the general principles of the projects of operations laid before him, he should never attempt to frame a project for himself. * * *

"But political and financial considerations may not present themselves in quite the same light to the soldier as to the statesman, and the latter is bound to make certain that they have received due attention. If, however, modifications are necessary, they should be made before the plan of campaign is finally approved, and in any case the purely military considerations should be most carefully weighed. It should be remembered that an unfavorable political situation is best redeemed by a decisive victory, while a reverse will do more to shake confidence in the Government than even the temporary surrender of some portion of the national domains. 'Be sure before striking' and 'reculer pour mieux sauter' are both admirable maxims; but their practical application requires a thorough appreciation of the true principles of war and a very large degree of moral courage, both in the soldier who suggests and in the statesman who approves. If, however, the soldier and the statesman are supported by an enlightened public, sufficiently acquainted with war to realize that patience is to be preferred to precipitation, that retreat, though inglorious, is not necessarily humiliating, their task is very considerably lightened."

The question of the constitutionality of this measure was referred to the Attorney General, who gave an opinion as follows:

"I see no constitutional objection to the proposed measure. It merely empowers a number of officials—some in the executive and some in the legislative department—to meet and recommend to the President 'such measures relating to the national defense as it shall deem necessary and expedient.' I suppose that the President might without any act of Congress call together the same officials and discuss with them any measure of government in which he is interested. As a matter of fact, that is what he does with respect to important legislation of any kind. Take the various conferences that the President had with the members of the executive and the legislative branches of the Government regarding the railroad legislation two years ago and with respect to the tariff.

"I know of nothing in the Constitution to interfere with such legislation as is proposed by this bill."

A precedent for associating together members of the different branches of the Government is found in the act establishing the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Regents of that institution.

Under the act of March 12, 1894, the President, Vice President, and Chief Justice of the United States are associated together in the charter body, and under section 5580, Revised Statutes, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice, and six Members of Congress—three from the Senate and three from the House—are associated together on the Board of Regents.

Every bill signed by the President is the joint work of the two branches of the Government. The complete separation of authority lodged in the two branches of the Government will be no more affected by joint action in the council than it is by joint action upon bills. The advantages of having the wisdom of both branches invoked in determining policies of national defense are even greater than in determining the usual laws.

Indeed, it is inherently impossible to attain a high degree of effectiveness in policies of national defense without bringing together the two branches of the Government.

The chief original purpose of the separation of the two branches of the Government was to avoid combining the powers of the two in the same man or group of men. Such a combination does not in the remotest degree result from the council.

No member of the executive branch is given any legislative power, nor is any member of the legislative branch given any executive power. In fact, the authority of the council is only advisory, and before any of its reports can be effective the recommendations made must be acted on by Congress and by the Executive.

The very fact that our two branches of Government, legislative and executive, are so entirely distinct, so much so that a member of the Cabinet may not even address the Houses of Congress and a Member of Congress may not hold an executive office, makes it far more imperative in America than in any other great country to establish a council of national defense in which the divergent branches may meet. Unity, continuity, and harmony are otherwise impossible, and without these there can be neither effectiveness nor economy.

The investigations of military authorities, notably the late Gen. Upton, show conclusively that the lack of a well-developed policy and the lack of harmony in our past wars are chiefly responsible for the larger part of our sacrifices of blood and treasure and for most of our reverses, if not for the wars themselves, while the hearings before this committee on this bill show clearly the same lack to be at the bottom of the high cost and lack of efficiency in our Military Establishment in time of peace.

George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress, dated August 20, 1780, sets forth the serious and all but fatal consequences of a lack of a real definite policy of defense during the Revolutionary War. He says:

"Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning which, by the continuance of the same men in service, had been capable of discipline, we never should have had to retreat with a handful of men across the Delaware in 1776, trembling for the fate of America, which nothing but the infatuation of the enemy could have saved; we should not have remained all the succeeding winter at their mercy, with sometimes scarcely a sufficient body of men to mount the ordinary guards, liable at every moment to be dissipated, if they had only thought proper to march against us; we should not have been under the necessity of fighting Brandywine, with an unequal number of raw troops, and afterwards seeing Philadelphia fall a prey to a victorious army; we should not have been at Valley Forge with less than half the force of the enemy, destitute of everything, in a situation neither to resist nor to retire; we should not have seen New York left with a handful of men, yet an overmatch for the main army of these States, while the principal part of their force was detached for the reduction of two of them; we should not have found ourselves this spring so weak as to be insulted by 5,000 men, unable to protect our baggage and magazines, their security depending on a good countenance and a want of enterprise in the enemy; we should not have been the greatest part of the war inferior to the enemy, indebted for our safety to their inactivity, enduring frequently the mortification of seeing inviting opportunities to ruin them pass unimproved for want of a force which the country was completely able to afford, and of seeing the country ravaged, our towns burnt, the inhabitants plundered, abused, murdered, with impunity from the same cause.

"Nor have the ill effects been confined to the military line. A great part of the embarrassments in the civil departments flow from the same source. The derangement of our finances is essentially to be ascribed to it. The expenses of the war and the paper emissions have been greatly multiplied by it. We have had a great part of the time two sets of men to feed and pay—the discharged men going home and the levies coming in. This was more remarkably the case in 1775 and 1776. The difficulty and cost of engaging men have increased at every successive attempt, till among the present lines we find there are some who have received $150 in specie for five months' service, while our officers are reduced to the disagreeable necessity of performing the duties of drill sergeants to them, with this mortifying reflection annexed to the business, that by the time they have taught these men the rudiments of a soldier's duty their services will have expired and the work recommenced with a new set.

"The consumption of provisions, arms, accouterments, and stores of every kind has been doubled in spite of every precaution I could use, not only from the cause just mentioned, but from the carelessness and licentiousness incident to militia and irregular troops. Our discipline also has been much hurt, if not ruined, by such constant changes. The frequent calls upon the militia have interrupted the cultivation of the land, and of course have lessened the quantity of its produce, occasioned a scarcity, and enhanced the prices. In an army so unstable as ours order and economy have been impracticable. No person who has been a close observer of the progress of our affairs can doubt that our currency has depreciated without comparison more rapidly from the system of short enlistments than it would have done otherwise.

"There is every reason to believe that the war has been protracted on this account. Our opposition being less, the successes of the enemy have been greater. The fluctuation of the army kept alive their hopes, and at every period of the dissolution of a considerable part of it they have flattered themselves with some decisive advantages. Had we kept a permanent army on foot the enemy could have had nothing to hope for, and would in all probability have listened to terms long since."

In a subsequent letter to the President of the Congress, dated September 15, 1780, he says:

"I am happy to find that the last disaster in Carolina has not been so great as its first features indicated. This event, however, adds itself to many others to exemplify the necessity of an army and the fatal consequences of depending on militia. Regular troops alone are equal to the exigencies of modern war, as well for defense as offense, and whenever a substitute is attempted it must prove illusory and ruinous. No militia will ever acquire the habits necessary to resist a regular force. Even those nearest to the seat of war are only valuable as light troops to be scattered in the woods and harass rather than do serious injury to the enemy. The firmness requisite for the real business of fighting is only to be attained by a constant course of discipline and service. I have never yet been witness to a single instance that can justify a different opinion, and it is most earnestly to be wished that the liberties of America may no longer be trusted, in any material degree, to so precarious a dependence. I can not but remark that it gives me pain to find the measures pursuing at the southward still turn upon accumulating large bodies of militia, instead of once for all making a decided effort to have a permanent force. In my ideas of the true system of war at the southward, the object ought to be to have a good army rather than a large one."

The late Gen. Upton, perhaps the greatest military authority in America, in his book on "The Military Policy of the United States," in summing up the conclusions as to the War of 1812, says:

"The lessons of the war are so obvious that they need not be stated. Nearly all the blunders committed were repetitions in an aggravated form of the same blunders in the Revolution, and like them had their origin either in the mistakes or omissions of military legislation.

"In the war under the Confederation Congress in its own name could not raise a dollar nor arm and equip a single soldier. Under the Constitution it had the sovereign authority to call forth the entire financial and military resources of the people.

"In one war, with a debt of $200,000,000, the Nation became bankrupt at the end of five years; in the other, a debt of nearly equal magnitude was contracted in two and one-half years.

"In the first war, notwithstanding the steady decline of our military strength, two British armies of more than 6,000 men each were made captive; in the other, less than 5,000 men for the period of two years brought war and devastation into our territory and successfully withstood the misapplied power of 7,000,000 people."

These ideas were concurred in by Gen. James A. Garfield and by Gen. William T. Sherman, who penciled the following notes on Gen. Upton's original manuscript:

"I renew the suggestion that a further statement of the composition of the British forces against us ought to be made.

"J. A. G."

"A compliance with Gen. Garfield's suggestion will strengthen your argument. Many strong men will contest your conclusions by charging the lamentable failure of the War of 1812 to other causes than false legislation; to want of skill by generals and officers, such as the want of concert of action and dispersion of our strength, the want of men of action as leaders, rather than want of wisdom in council. I doubt if you will convince the powers that be, but the facts stated, the references from authority, and the military conclusions are most valuable, and should be printed and made accessible. The time may not be now, but will come, when these will be appreciated, and may bear fruit even in our day.

"W. T. SHERMAN."

Gen. Upton in the same work points out the similar consequences in the Florida War, 1836–1843, in which over 40,000 troops were engaged. The 4,000 Regulars engaged alone lost 1,500 men. He says:

"For want of a well-defined peace organization, a nation of 17,000,000 of people contended for some years with 1,200 warriors and finally closed the struggle without accomplishing the forcible emigration of the Indians, which was the original and sole cause of the war."

Gen. Upton is authority for the statement that the Mexican War, though successful, was longer than should have been required and exposed both the army of Gen. Taylor and the army of Gen. Scott to unnecessary peril. The events attending the annexation of Texas caused a degree of preparation for this war excelling anything in our previous annals. We were fortunate in the ability and experience of our officers, and their determining influence was felt as much in the preparations as in the battles. A crude approximation to a definite policy in this war, as compared with previous wars, was rewarded by an unbroken series of victories.

It remained for the Civil War to bring out the staggering price in blood and treasure a nation may pay for having no definite policy of defense.

Capt. J. M. Palmer, of the General Staff, investigating the causes that led up to this war, drew the conclusion that the utter lack of a military policy and of preparation on the part of the Union is the real responsible cause of the war. He says in Scribner's Magazine, February, 1912:

"A study of the period immediately preceding the Civil War reveals that secession was a formal and carefully preconceived act. * * * The southern people took the step that meant war simply because they thought that they could win. It must be remembered that Jefferson Davis was not only a trained soldier but an ex-Secretary of War of the United States. As a trained soldier he knew what military institutions should be, and as a Secretary of War of the United States he had learned what military institutions should not be. He knew that the United States was unprepared for war, he knew that it had no intelligent military policy, and he knew that know-nothingism in military affairs was cultivated as a positive civic virtue among northern politicians. He knew that the North had greater resources of wealth and population, but he knew that the war must be a war of subjugation, and as a trained military expert he knew that a war of subjugation can not be successfully waged by raw levies. He realized that the southern armies must also be largely untrained at first, but he was acquainted with the scientific fact that troops can be trained to defend long before they can be trained to conquer. He knew also that the military situation would impose a policy of invasion upon the North and that invasion would largely neutralize the advantage of superior numbers.

"Mr. Davis and his associates also knew the military history of the United States to be a history of legislative incapacity. They knew that Washington considered the British Army to be a much less formidable obstacle to success than the stupid military policy of the Continental Congress. * * * They knew that in the War of 1812, a war conducted on Jeffersonian principles, 16,000 British soldiers had been able to prevent 500,000 Americans from conquering Canada. They knew that during the Mexican War Gen. Taylor was left with only 5,000 men to bear the brunt of Buena Vista, and that when Gen. Scott was within three days' march of the City of Mexico, with victory behind him and final victory within his grasp, he was deprived of half of his little army on account of an oft-repeated legislative blunder. They knew that in all of our wars the American soldier has been called upon to win in spite of an unintelligent military statesmanship, and they did not believe that with such military institutions as these the North could successfully undertake the conquest of 5,000,000 Americans.

"Such was the logical estimate of the military situation. The appeal to arms was made by the southern leaders because in all human probability their cause would succeed. And they were almost right. But they failed to estimate the marvelous endurance of the northern people, who, spite of defeat, spite of unprecedented wastes of their blood and treasure, and spite of an unenlightened military policy, clung to the fearful burden of the war and bore it to the bitter end.

"The Civil War was a long and protracted struggle because it takes two years to convert armed mobs into armies, and until that conversion is complete there can be no decisive scientific military action. It was indeed fortunate for the United States that in this war its antagonist also began operations with an armed mob instead of an army.

"Our analysis of the facts of the Civil War has thus far led us to two important conclusions: First, that efforts to prevent it judicially were vain; and, second, that the undoubted proximate cause of the war was the military unpreparedness of the United States. * * * At the close of 1860 the Regular Army of the United States comprised 16,367 officers and enlisted men. This force consisted of 198 companies, and of these 183 companies were stationed on the Mexican and Indian frontier or were en route to distant posts west of the Mississippi. The 15 remaining companies were employed in guarding the Canadian frontier and the Atlantic coast from Maine to the Gulf of Mexico.

"On October 29, 1860, in view of the 'imminent danger of a disruption of the Union by the secession of one or more of the States,' Gen. Scott recommended that Forts Moultrie and Monroe and other southern forts be reenforced in order to prevent their capture by a coup de main or surprise. In a postscript added to his letter to the Secretary of War he stated that the forces of the United States available for the purpose were only five companies, stationed as follows: One company at Boston, one company at the Narrows (New York Harbor), one company at Pittsburgh, one company at Augusta, Ga., and one company at Baton Rouge. These five scattered companies, comprising about 400 men, constituted the total military force of the United States available for any sudden emergency. * * *

"The propriety of reenforcing the southern forts was carefully considered by Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet, but the project was overruled, and thereupon the Secretary of War, Gen. Cass, resigned.

"But in its decision the administration of Mr. Buchanan should not be criticized without weighing the means at his disposal. The demands of the military situation were very clear. Prompt and decisive military action must have terminated the crisis, but prompt and decisive military action is not to be expected of a nation that has no military power. A vigorous national policy could hardly be supported by five scattered companies numbering 400 men. The tone of the southern leaders at this time was one of contempt for the weakness of the Federal Government. Their contempt was justified by the facts, and out of their contempt grew war. * * * The total cost of the Civil War to date has been over $9,000,000,000. It might have been prevented by an appropriation of $5,000,000 per annum from 1850 to 1860. But though it has already cost $9,000,000,000, it is still costing over $160,000,000 per annum for pensions on account of preventable military service, death, and suffering. In view of its consequences was the military retrenchment of the "fifties" a true economy? For every dollar spared from the proper military budget of 1860 we have so far paid $1,800, and we are still paying $32 a year almost half a century after the war. And this is the traditional military policy of the United States. * * *

"Although our analysis of the causes of the Civil War has necessarily been brief, it throws a suggestive light on several phases of the profound problem of war and peace. We find that the controversies that led to the Civil War were first brought before a competent tribunal, but that judicial action even under the most favorable circumstances was unable to prevent the appeal to arms. We find, however, upon further examination that the war in all human probability was a preventable struggle and that the proper preventive measure was simply Washington's classical remedy, preparedness for war.

"We also find a remarkable illustration of the vast difference that exists between military retrenchment and military economy. Economy always demands efficiency, no matter how much efficiency may cost, and retrenchment at the expense of efficiency is never economy. Because our fathers ignored this truth, we are still paying thirtyfold for an unintelligent retrenchment of 60 years ago."

There can be no doubt that the lack of a definite policy, the lack of harmony and organization, at the outbreak of the War with Spain are the chief causes of the heavy toll of life and health paid to disease, fourteen times that paid to bullets, though the bulk of our forces never left our own shores.

In fact, this lack of a defense policy is no doubt the real cause of the war itself. Any rational policy would have dictated our holding control of the sea as the Cuban question grew more acute. Ten million dollars put into ships in the early nineties would have insured this control and would have guaranteed the settlement of the Cuban controversy by diplomacy. With control of the sea there would have been no war. As soon as we gained control of the sea the war ended. A few millions of dollars put out in pursuance of a policy would have saved hundreds of millions poured out in war.

America has 30,000,000 of her citizens and $37,000,000,000 of her property exposed to naval attack. We have an expanding foreign commerce coming more and more in competition with the commerce of the great military powers of Europe and Asia. We propose to maintain the Monroe doctrine and insist on the "open-door policy," and are pledged to maintain the neutrality of the Panama Canal. Our possessions, whether to our liking or not, are spread all over the Pacific Ocean, placing us in the vortex of the world's politics. There is no choice. We must make adequate provision for self-defense.

This can not be done with efficiency and economy without a proper agency. This bill establishes such an agency without creating any new offices, and practically without entailing any additional expense. The committee unanimously recommends its passage at an early date.

The great weakness of our Nation from the standpoint of national defense has been the want of a definite policy and the want of cooperation between the various agencies involved. This bill makes up for this weakness and will promote economy and efficiency in peace and increases the chances of victory in war.

I will also print a letter from Admiral Fletcher bearing on the question of shortage of officers and men in the Atlantic Fleet.

AMENDMENT OF TESTIMONY BY REAR ADMIRAL FLETCHER, UNITED STATES NAVY.

UNITED STATES ATLANTIC FLEET,
U. S. S. "WYOMING," FLAGSHIP,
Navy Yard, New York, January 14, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: I desire to correct my testimony as given on page 547 of the hearings before your committee. The testimony is in answer to the question as to "how many short we would be if we attempted to put all our fighting ships in commission with trained service." My reply was to the effect that I could not give exact figures, but my impression was that it would take 4,000 or 5,000 additional men to fully man the ships which I think ought to be manned upon the opening of hostilities, and 5,000 in addition to the above to man other ships that should immediately be called out of reserve.

I am now able to give more exact information. Boards, consisting of the captain and other ranking officers of experience, by order of the Navy Department, have been appointed upon every battleship of the Atlantic Fleet, with instructions to carefully consider the complements of both officers and men required on the various types of vessels and scrutinize the number allowed in each rank and rating, with a view to reducing the same to the lowest practicable number consistent with efficiency for a peace complement and the lowest number that would be desirable for a war complement.

These boards have now completed their work, and the result has developed an alarming shortage of officers and men that are required to efficiently man our ships for battle. The reports of all these boards were made independently and are singularly unanimous in their conclusions, presenting a more serious shortage than could have been anticipated by either the Navy Department or the fleet until brought to light by this searching investigation.

The reports of these boards show that in the 21 battleships in commission, and now composing the Atlantic Fleet, there is a shortage of 5,219 men and 339 officers required to fill all stations necessary to efficiently fight the ships in battle.

The above figures refer to the commissioned battle fleet alone, and this shortage does not include "4,000 or 5,000 additional to fully man the ships which I think ought to be fully manned upon the opening of hostilities," as stated in my testimony.

My complete report has been sent to the Secretary of the Navy, but I desire the above facts to be placed in your possession in order that the testimony I gave before your committee may not be misleading.

Very respectfully,

F. F. FLETCHER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy.

HON. L. P. PADGETT,
Chairman Naval Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY].

[Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this does not seem to be an opportune time to invest heavily in fighting ships. The experience of the present European war will doubtless shed much light on naval attack and defense. Up to this time what was clear before has been made clearer still, namely, that in naval engagements, as in prize-ring engagements, speed and "the punch" wins. Neither one enough. It takes both combined. It would seem to be almost criminally unwise to build fighting ships which were known to be slower than those of a possible enemy.

The ship which has speed enough to decline the combat, unless the conditions are favorable to it, has a great advantage, but if to greater speed it adds guns which are effective at longer range than its opponent's, it is complete master of the situation. Hence, every ship we build should have the greatest practicable amount of speed, should be faster than any now in service, if that is practicable, and should carry guns of the greatest range

Our Government recognized the force of this position when it sold the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi* because they were practically out of date on account of their lack of speed and lack of effective armament.

But it may be claimed that as we do not intend making war on any nation and need ships only for defense, we do not need such high speed in our ships; their principal function being to defend our coasts.

There are at least two answers to this. In the first place, one of the best methods of defense often is a vigorous attack. Hannibal taught the world that lesson, and Scipio learned it so well from him that he gave a demonstration of it. It is still true. For that reason alone we need speedy ships, if we need any.

The second answer is that we have so large a number of slow fighting ships now that we should equip them for coast-defense purposes, or such other work as slow ships can do, and put all the money we are now going to appropriate for naval purposes into fast ships only. Other nations now have great fighting monsters capable of a speed of 28 to 34 knots. Our new ones should have as great or greater speed than that.

I have heard the argument made repeatedly that speed is not important for defense; that big guns and heavy armor are what is needed. The bulldog, they say, does not need to be as fast as the greyhound; he does not have to seek safety by flight.

The illustration does not illustrate. There are many things the bulldog could do if he were capable of greater speed which he can not do now. Who would think of putting the most faithful of bulldogs to guard his flock of sheep or to run down a wolf? The greyhound or the wolf could kill every sheep in the field with the bulldog in full pursuit trying to prevent it. The bulldog's range of usefulness is quite limited because he has been developed into mere jaws, just biting capacity. But he must catch before he can bite. If his legs fail to serve his jaws they will soon grow weak from hunger.

I do not know whether it is practicable to develop a breed of dogs having the fleetness of the greyhound and the jaws and courage of the bulldog, but I do know it is practicable to develop a class of ships having both these qualities, having the speed of the fastest cruiser and gun power of the heaviest superdreadnaught. She may not carry as many heavy guns as the latter but she can carry enough to conquer with when she cares to fight, and she has speed enough to decline to fight when prudence dictates such a course.

Not long ago we sold two ships to Greece—the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*. We sold them because they were practically superannuated; that is, newer and better methods of construction as to speed and armament had rendered them ineffective. As against faster ships armed with guns of longer range they would be mere targets.

But we still have 28 ships of practically the same character both as to armament and speed. What are we to do with them? If slow ships can do coast-defense duty, surely we have enough of them now. With 28 such slow ships on hand and no fast ones, it would be more than mere folly—it would be criminal folly—to build more of the slow ones and no fast ones.

It may be of interest to have more specific information as to these ships, and for that purpose I give a list of them, with their principal armament. Their approximate speed ranges from 14 to 19 knots an hour:

Name of ship.	Large guns.	Small guns.
Alabama	4 13-inch	14 6-inch.
Connecticut	4 12-inch	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
Delaware	10 12-inch	14 5-inch.
Florida	10 12-inch	16 5-inch.
Georgia	4 12-inch	8 8-inch and 12 6-inch.
Illinois	4 13-inch	14 6 inch.
Iowa	4 12-inch	8 8-inch.
Kansas	4 12-inch	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
Kearsarge	4 13-inch	4 8-inch and 18 5-inch.
Kentucky	4 13-inch	4 8-inch and 18 5-inch.
Louisiana	4 12-inch	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
Maine	do	16 6-inch.
Michigan	8 12-inch	
Minnesota	4 13-inch	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
Missouri	4 12-inch	16 6-inch.
Nebraska	do	8 8-inch and 12 6-inch.
New Hampshire	do	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
New Jersey	do	8 8-inch and 12 6-inch.
North Dakota	10 12-inch	14 5-inch.
Ohio	4 12-inch	16 6-inch.
South Carolina	8 12-inch	
Utah	10 12-inch	16 5-inch.
Vermont	4 12-inch	8 8-inch and 12 7-inch.
Virginia	do	8 8-inch and 12 6-inch.
Wyoming	12 12-inch	4 5-inch.

The other three, the *Oregon*, *Indiana*, and *Massachusetts*, are on the retired list.

When we take into consideration that every one of these ships carries only armor-piercing shells, it is perfectly apparent that they would be entirely harmless to an enemy of greater speed, with guns of equal or greater caliber firing high explosive shells.

The range of vision from ship to ship at sea is about 12 miles; that is, a man on a ship, at an elevation of about 25 feet, can see the top works of another ship, in clear weather, about 12 miles away. Many modern guns carry farther than that, and a shell loaded with guncotton, gelatin, or some other high explosive striking a ship at that, or even at a greater distance, would in all human probability sink it. The *Empress of India*, a British ship, was used as a target for such shells and sunk at a distance of about 9 miles. At that distance our A. P., or armor-piercing, shell would be as harmless as a popgun.

But we are on the eve of better things in that regard. Even reactionary ordnance bureaus can not much longer delay a change. We must soon adopt high-explosive shells and high-power guns, and if these 28 slow-going ships were armed with such guns and such shells they would be quite effective for coast defense and for many other purposes. It is not any defect in the structure of the ships, beyond their lack of speed, that makes them antiquated; it is only the armament, and particularly the use of a shell which is destructive only when it penetrates the enemy's armor and explodes after penetration. As that is possible only at comparatively short ranges, say, 4 or 5 miles, it can be readily seen how helpless such a ship is against an enemy with high-explosive shells, which are as effective at 10 miles as at 1 mile, if hits are made at the greater distance.

This whole matter and other matters of great interest are set out so clearly in an article printed in the New York American, of November 1, 1914, that I quote it.

After referring to the speech of Congressman GARDNER of Massachusetts, the article continues:

Mr. GARDNER's speech has served to call attention to another notable address recently made to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee by Mr. Willard S. Isham, a military engineer and expert, and the inventor of a torpedo shell. Mr. Isham makes five very specific charges of inefficiency against the United States Navy. These charges were made on September 30, publicly, and in the presence of high officials of the Navy, and they have not been challenged, explained, nor denied.

The graveness of Mr. Isham's charges can scarcely be overestimated. If they are unjustified they ought to be proved untrue by the Navy experts; if they are true our Navy administration needs immediate investigation and reorganization.

Here is an official copy of Mr. Isham's address to the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate:

"Gentlemen: The main purpose of this brief presentation is to direct attention to some of the many defects in the matériel of our Navy which, neutralizing many good points, destroy the efficiency of our Navy as a means of national defense. A further purpose is to disclose some of the contributing causes that have resulted in present conditions in the expectation that when these are fully considered a searching investigation of our national defenses will result

"Since the time when our Government was established it has been recognized that an efficient Navy operating on the high sea was the most practical means for the protection of our long coast lines against hostile invasion. A Navy to accomplish this purpose must be able to intercept and overcome any convoyed force before a port suitable for a base could be secured and made defensible, and since it is obviously impossible to determine in advance the objective point of attack of an enemy it is necessary that our Navy, to be efficient, must possess eyes, as it is recognized that a blind fighter could never accomplish much in a combat with an active enemy.

"Hence an important adjunct to a fleet consists in scout ships for scouring the seas and ascertaining the strength, location, direction, and speed of an enemy's expeditionary force, so that he may be met by a suitable force at such a point and at such a time that a tactical advantage may be secured and a favorable result obtained. We possess no ships capable of cruising as scouts at a distance from our battle fleet which could not be quickly destroyed by the faster and more powerfully armed battleships and battle cruisers of other navies. Hence at the door of those responsible for the condition of our Navy is laid charge number 1.

"1. Our Navy is inefficient because of its inability to scout out an enemy on the high seas.

"Our battle fleets are made up of battleships in which speed has been sacrificed for armor plate and from a strategical or tactical standpoint are no better than floating fortresses, as they can never force a battle upon an unwilling enemy or interfere with any of his movements. Moreover, no part of a battle fleet can be safely detached as a flying base for cruisers, destroyers, or other fast ships acting as scouts, since they might be cut off and destroyed by a concentrated force of ships having superior speed and armament. Hence it is that our battle fleets must operate as an entity and must possess the force necessary to meet at any time or place the maximum force which an enemy can concentrate against them. This condition also results from the second defect in our Navy.

"2. We possess no ships capable of operating at such a distance from our battle fleets as to screen its formation and strength from the scout ships of an enemy.

"Because of this defect our fleets are compelled to be always ready and are as a consequence never ready to meet an enemy to the best advantage. This defect makes the defense of our fleets impossible at night, since it permits a hostile torpedo flotilla to hover about them at sundown like a pack of coyotes around a campfire ready to rush in when the conditions are favorable. Against this attack our battleships are powerless, as shown by Lord Charles Beresford in The Betrayal, page 62:

"'No guns, heavy or light, will protect a battle fleet from torpedo attack at night. The only effective method of protection is to employ a large number of small cruisers to clear a wide area about the battle fleet at sundown. These cruisers do not exist in the requisite number. * * * The small cruiser force must be disposed so that they form a protecting screen distant 120 or 140 miles on all sides from the battle squadron. By no other means is it possible to move a battle squadron at night without risking its destruction by the attack of torpedo craft.'

"Rear Admiral Twining, late Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, stated in the House hearings, March 12, 1912, page 907:

"'The torpedo boat continues to be held in great favor as a weapon of underwater attack, and it must be admitted that no navy has at present an adequate system of defense against such attack if efficiently delivered. Torpedoes have been designed which can cut, penetrate, or displace the nets. The searchlight is ineffective, since a torpedo may be successfully launched at a range beyond its reach. Gunfire is ineffective against an invisible target, and the torpedo boat can launch its weapon while still invisible to the gun.'

"The great naval expert, Percy Scott, who formerly championed the construction of battleships, now declares them to be worthless and defenseless against underwater attack. The European war thus far has shown that no commander dares to expose a battleship to underwater attack. Hence the charge is laid and should be investigated:

"3. Our battleships are defenseless in a fog or at night.

"Moreover, the results thus far obtained as to the naval operations in the European war seem to indicate that heavy ships are defenseless by day against underwater attack. Notwithstanding this accumulation of evidence, our technical boards still propose to construct slow battleships, and one week from to-day bids will be opened for three such ships that will cost $45,000,000 and that an investigation will show to be as worthless and as antiquated as the flintlock musket.

"These defects in our battleships result from the sacrifice of active aggression for passive resistance, a vital sacrifice in speed for an unnecessary increase in armor plate. Because of this our ships are compelled to fight fleets, which make them an easy prey for the torpedo and which fired at the line of battleships will in one case out of four hit and sink a ship. The Napoleonic maxim that "The thicker the grass, the faster it is mown," applies with especial force to naval warfare. This is one of the fruits of armor-plate domination in the construction of our Navy. Had our battleships been constructed with such speed that they could cruise as fighting units they would have nothing to fear on the high seas from torpedo attack. Let us examine the advantages which this excess armor plate has given our ships.

"Since the remotest ages the art of war and the implements of warfare have developed according to certain immutable principles. For example, the boy David slew the giant Goliath because he could select a range for his attack where his sling was destructive, but which range the slow-moving Goliath could not lessen so as to make his ponderous sword and spear effective. This principle has been expounded for centuries and employed to secure victories in all ages, and it was recently reaffirmed as the basis of an argument for the sale of the *Idaho* and *Mississippi* that they were outranged by the larger guns of foreign fast ships. Hence charge 4 is laid and should be investigated:

"4. Thirty-two of our older battleships, carrying guns of equal or lesser power than those in the *Idaho*, are inefficient for the purposes for which they were designed because they are outranged by foreign ships having guns of superior range and possessing superior speed.

"A corrollary of this principle is that the effect of a missile weapon is not dependent upon its ultimate range, but upon its destructive range. The guns of the *Idaho* and *Mississippi* and our other 32 ships having the same armament fire shell weighing 870 pounds about 22,000 yards, yet these shell can not destroy a battleship at even one-half this range, which general fact is stated not only in the last British Naval Annual and in other technical journals, but also has been proven by tests carried out by a special committee of Congress and reported to Congress by the chairman, Capt. Hobson, on April 30 of the present year. Admiral Twining, in testimony referred to, stated that hits could be made at a range of 16,000 yards. The British navy last December sunk the battleship *Empress of India* at over 16,000 yards, and the account of the test in the Naval Institute Proceedings for April of the present year states that "holes were blown in her like lock gates," showing the employment of torpedo shell, since A. P. shell never make a hole larger than their diameter. Since then torpedo shell are used abroad that are effective at 16,000 yards or up to the limit of range fixed by visual conditions, as stated by Admiral Twining.

"The question naturally arises why these 32 battleships of our Navy are not supplied with such shell so as to prevent them from being outranged, as it is stated they would be in combat with foreign ships. Several types of torpedo shell were brought out in this country nearly 20 years ago. The War Department perfected one. I presented one, but neither type has been adopted. The cry of danger was raised against one of these types. That charge would have been accepted as honest had either of the other types of torpedo shell been adopted and against which no such charge could be brought. Either of these shell could destroy any battleship without even exploding in contact with it, as was established by experiments carried out by Gen. Abbott nearly 20 years ago. It was also proven by tests made with the Army shell against a caisson representing a battleship and furnished by the Navy Department, an account of which test is contained in Ordnance and Gunnery, by Lissak, page 583, which shows that this shell would destroy a battleship at even a distance of 15 feet from it. Hence charge 5 is laid and should be investigated:

"5. Ordnance officers of this country for the past 15 or 20 years have been in possession of safe torpedo shell that could destroy any ship at any range within the limit fixed by visual and other conditions, but, notwithstanding this, such shell have not been adopted for the service and our ships have not been constructed either to employ them or meet the change that would result if other navies adopted them.

"Tests of these shell have shown that by means of them not only can ships be sunk at extreme range, but also irrespective of their armor protection, as their most favorable point of attack is below the water line. Has this recognized destructive effect of torpedo shell which discounts the use of armor plate been the cause of the vigorous opposition to their adoption? Has their use been opposed because their adoption would at once extend the destructive range of all the primary guns on all our battleships and thereby prevent such ships from ever becoming obsolete? Has their use been opposed because their adoption would destroy the basis of the permanent naval building program so dear to many? Those back of this opposition should be permitted to give the reasons therefor, and these reasons should be weighed and tested by a searching investigation.

"The immediate cause for this request for a hearing in the hope of securing an investigation has been the arrogant act of the Naval Chief of Ordnance, who has refused to carry out tests with either of two types of torpedo shell in which I am interested, and as requested by the House Subcommittee on Ordnance Tests, but who has at the same time carried out a test with one of these shell in utter disregard of the wishes of either the House committee or myself, which for high-handed disregard for the interests of the Navy and of this country stands without parallel in the history of his department; and I am informed, having thereby secured the material for an unfavorable report, the caisson employed in the test was blown up and destroyed, thereby preventing further tests to disprove the inaccuracy of the reports and conclusions obtained and uttered by the department.

"It is recognized that a saw may be proven to be worthless if tested as a means to drive nails. Likewise a hammer may be proven worthless as a means for cutting off timber; but a test to prove their efficiency should be made under such conditions as they are designed to be used, and I am informed by many Members of Congress who received invitations to be present at a test requested by the House Committee on Ordnance Tests that they expected such test to take place. I am also informed that if the subterfuge of blowing up the caisson has been resorted to in order to prevent the result of an honest test from stopping contracts for battleships or shell, the blame will be placed where it belongs.

"The issue is not the Isham shell, or anybody's shell in particular. The question is whether the ordnance officers shall prevent the use of any torpedo shell because they lessen the demand for armor plate and for new ships. This issue, it is submitted, should be decided by an investigation and by honest tests, and it is believed that it will be so decided.

"Believing that the few serious charges herein made can be established by the honest officers, composing 95 per cent of those in the service, and that a searching investigation will result in great good to our Navy, I respectfully request that such an investigation be made."

It was my privilege to go down the bay this week to witness some experiments with a shell containing a high explosive, the invention of the Mr. Isham referred to above. To my mind the experiments demonstrated the excellence of the invention, and point unmistakably to a change—almost a revolution—in naval warfare.

Up to this time it has been found impossible to devise a form of shell which would not skip along the surface of the water, or ricochet, as it is technically called.

This fact made it impossible to hit a ship below the water line with a shell, and hence it was unnecessary to put armor plate below that line. Hence the submerged portion of the ship is especially weak against attack, and a hard blow delivered under the water is usually fatal. This, together with the secrecy with which its blow can be delivered, constitute the main reasons for the submarine and the torpedo. From shells which refuse to go into the water before exploding the submarine is, of course, practically immune. But if a shell could be found to enter the water and explode under the water, the submarine would be another Othello—its occupation would be gone. That is just what Mr. Isham has accomplished. By a device which is unerring in accuracy and so simple that one wonders why it was not discovered before, every shell not fired at too short a range enters the water on contact, and equipped with a time fuse, travels under the water a distance of from 100 to 200 feet before exploding.

No ship and no submarine within a distance of 15 or 20 feet from this shell at the moment of explosion could survive. The effect is manifest. The attack is carried direct to the weakest point of the ship and irreparable damage is done. In this way every shell becomes a mine, and it is difficult to conceive of a defense against it. Such a shell takes the place of the torpedo and, in addition, possesses tremendous advantages over it. In the first place its cost is but a small fraction of the cost of the torpedo. In the next place it is far more practicable. It will travel through the air in 15 seconds a distance which it would take the torpedo at least 5 minutes to travel through the water. In 5 minutes the ship may change its course so as to miss the torpedo, but if the high explosive shell is properly aimed, the ship can not in 15 seconds gain anything by change of position, and, in addition, during the 5 minutes the torpedo is making its journey at least 15 shells could be fired from a single gun. And in the third place, the shell has for its target the whole ship, both above and below the water line, whereas the torpedo has only the part below the water line.

I do not believe we are in danger of being involved in war very soon. I have the most abundant confidence in the ability of the President and Secretary of State Bryan to avoid such a calamity. It would be almost unpardonable that not even one of the great nations remained at peace. But if we appropriate money to build additional ships for our defense they should possess every quality of excellence—of superiority that skill and intelligence can supply.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. Chairman, the present war has proven beyond question the value of the control of the sea, and has made our people realize more than ever the importance of an adequate

Navy to the United States. Oceans are the great highways over which the preponderance of commerce must travel. The nation that controls them has the world to draw upon, and its influence must be felt at all shores. In time of war the protection of one's commerce is an elementary and fundamental necessity for continuing commercial prosperity. A country that is able to carry on its foreign trade while its enemies' ships are driven to port has a great economic advantage. Sound finances are as fundamentally important to a government as they are to a business man, and the successful combatant in a great war is generally, in the long run, the one that has the deepest purse. Napoleon recognized this fact when he inaugurated his continental system and attempted to conquer England by closing the markets of Europe to her commerce, but his policy failed because he did not have command of the sea.

Apart from mere commercial considerations, there is also the advantage to military strategy that naval supremacy gives. If the enemy's navy is blockaded, advantageous points of attack can be chosen, colonies at the other end of the world can send aid to the mother country, and a concentration of troops is easily accomplished.

These are a few of the fundamental advantages that go with the command of the sea, and which experience is teaching to-day as it has in the past. In fact, I think it would be hard now to find any thinking person who would question the importance of naval supremacy. It therefore only remains to consider what is the best way to obtain it. All facts point to one sound principle, namely, to have the largest and most efficient fleet of capital ships. There are many different fighting vessels that can aid a navy, but there are none that can take the place of the first line of battleships. The mere fact that there is such a fleet capable of attacking the enemy's armada, if it comes out, is enough to keep it in port and give the command of the sea to the greater navy. England has proven this in the present war. Her superiority of superdreadnaughts has prevented the German Navy from attempting a battle, because they realize that the odds are greatly against them—too heavy to be recommended by sound policy.

Submarines have done effective work, and they are valuable adjuncts to a fleet; but, as Commander Stirling said before the committee this year, "It is a weapon of the battleship, just the same as the battleship's 12-inch turret."

In other words, the dreadnaught has not been superseded, but an additional destructive force has been added to the fleet, useful as harbor defense and helpful in conjunction with battleships. To rely solely upon a submarine attack to destroy a first line of battleships is to put much to chance, for the submarines must succeed in evading the aeroplane lookouts that in clear weather can see them although their periscopes are submerged some distance. They must be able to dive under the screen of cruisers and scouts that are extended far out to protect the dreadnaughts. Once or twice they must come to the surface if they are to determine the speed of their opponent and other questions of range, without which there can be little accuracy in discharging the torpedo. They must overcome all these difficulties and get in striking distance, although under the most favorable circumstances with new batteries they can only make 10 knots an hour submerged, and that for but one hour before their speed is cut in two by the using up of the electricity. While they are making 10 knots the dreadnaughts can make 20; therefore any change away from them in the direction of the fleet places the submarine at an irreparable disadvantage.

The reason why the submarine has proven so effective in the present European war is because of the close proximity of the belligerent nations, the waters that the skirmishes are taking place in are limited in area, home bases are never far off, and the scouts which the English have thrown out to protect their dreadnaughts and coast have given the submarine a great field for effective work, being near the enemy's bases. The only vessels that are known authentically to have been sunk by submarines were the units of this screen and not the protected vessels themselves. In other words, the outpost vessels were lost. Naturally, these scouting vessels are bound to suffer from the submarine's hands, and that is why the latter is being more and more recognized as a valuable new auxiliary; but how little naval commanders will consider them when they desire to make a raid is shown by the action of the Germans when they attacked the coast of England with their battle cruisers. The bombardment was effected and the retreat made without submarines being able to do any damage to the enemy, and this on a short coast line which was supposed to be protected by scouts that could give the alarm and create a rendezvous of forces when necessary. A similar raid was evidently attempted a few days ago, but this time they met the enemy's fleet of battle cruisers. The odds were at once recognized as too great and a retreat was made, with a loss to the attacking party. It is worth noting here that it was not until capital ships were met that the expedition had to be abandoned. Submarines alone would have been discounted as a negligible danger. I do not believe that there is a naval authority who would suggest for one instant that if England only had a fleet of submarines, she would have been able to have blockaded the North Sea.

The soundness of the United States maintaining a consistent policy of sustaining an adequate Navy can not be denied with any force of argument. Such a defense means that our shores can be kept from the ravages of war, our colonies protected, and the Panama Canal retained. As an adjunct to the Monroe doctrine it is absolutely essential, for, unless we can enforce our wishes, little respect will be paid to them. Might is still essential in international controversies. This defense of our country is maintained by a Navy at low cost, if we consider how vast would have to be our expenditure should we try to adequately fortify our great seacoast and support these fortifications with a standing army. An immense Army is not desired by the American people, and history shows that it is an unwise policy for Republics to pursue if they are to maintain the character of their Government, but by relying upon naval defense all these dangers are eliminated. Even with the Navy on a war basis, the number of men are few, in comparison with the millions in our country, and the danger of these few creating any spirit of militarism throughout the Nation, as a standing army might do, is not possible.

A glance at the table of the building program of the great nations of the world shows that their program calls for more ships than ours; and even should there be an important naval battle in the near future, history teaches and the present experiences show that the victor is not likely to lose many ships although the defeated is annihilated. In the battle off the Chilean coast the German fleet destroyed two of the English boats and escaped themselves unharmed. When, however, they were met by a superior force, all their ships but one were lost and their conquerors were practically unscathed. It would therefore seem an unwise policy for us to rely on the possibility of future loss among other powers instead of trying to continue our own strength among the sea powers of the world.

This bill reported by the Navy Committee is the best bill that has been presented to the House in years, and a vote for it is supporting policies that must appeal to us as patriotic Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, while we are considering a bill providing funds for our occupation of the seas by our Navy I desire for a few minutes to discuss a serious problem growing out of the soil.

I wish to submit a few observations with regard to the price paid for live stock in the principal live stock markets in the country. Apparently but few people realize the great loss that is being sustained every day by our farmers and stockmen. I undertake to say that if the same demoralization of earnings and actual losses sustained by our farmers and feeders during the last few months were visited upon the railroads of the country they would be given instant relief.

Unquestionably the live-stock industry has received a staggering blow. The men who to-day are engaged in furnishing the meat supply of the country are doing it at a loss that will total many millions of dollars.

I have before me a Chicago paper of yesterday, January 28, from which I quote the following:

Live-stock quotations.

CATTLE.		
Beef steers, good to choice	$8.00 @	$8.75
Beef steers, fair to good	7.00 @	8.00
Beef steers, common to fair	5.25 @	7.00
Yearlings	7.00 @	9.50
Beef cows	4.50 @	6.75
Fat heifers, fair to selected	5.00 @	8.00
Bulls	5.00 @	6.75
HOGS.		
Bulk of sales	6.40 @	6.55
Common to good, mixed	6.25 @	6.45
Fair to choice, medium weight	6.45 @	6.55
Lightweights	6.50 @	6.60
Fair to selected butcher's	6.50 @	6.60
Select, 260 to 300 pounds, packer's	6.45 @	6.50
Boars, according to weight	5.00 @	4.00
Pigs	5.75 @	6.35
Stags	6.00 @	6.25

AVERAGE PRICES OF CATTLE AND HOGS.

From these quotations it will be seen that the average price paid for fat cattle at the Chicago market on yesterday was

$6.90 per hundred and that the average price paid for hogs was $6.06 per hundred pounds.

PRICES DEPEND ON COST AND DEMAND.

Mr. Chairman, as a general rule there is a corresponding relation between the price of fat cattle and hogs and the price of corn, the principal food on which hogs and cattle are matured. To-day there is no relation whatever between the price of fat cattle and hogs and the price of corn. Fat cattle and hogs are selling to-day in the principal stockyards of the country for considerably less than the actual cost of the corn to produce them.

Obviously there should also be a corresponding relation between the price paid for cattle and hogs and the prevailing price of fresh beef and pork. When the domestic and foreign price of fresh meats advance, should not the price of fat cattle and hogs also advance? Since the outbreak of the European war all foodstuffs have rapidly advanced, both here and abroad, but, strange to say, the price at which the American farmer has been obliged to sell his hogs has declined from $8.90 per hundred on July 18, 1914, to $6.06 on January 28. The average price of cattle has declined from $9.10 on July 18 last to $6.90 on January 28.

FARMERS UNABLE TO FORCE COMPETITION.

No one at all familiar with the live-stock industry will underrate the effect which this unreasonable depression in the price of fat cattle and hogs is having on the American farmer and cattle raisers. When a feeder picks up a daily paper and reads that the price of wheat to the wheat grower has doubled in the last six months, and sees that the price of his commodity has declined by leaps and bounds while everything that goes to mature his product has greatly increased in price, he naturally begins to question the forces that makes this unnatural, unjust, and unreasonable condition possible. He realizes his helpless condition; but, try as he may, he can not improve it. He sees heavy losses staring him in the face every day, but he is unable to reduce them. Great transportation companies similarly situated would have redress by interesting the President of the United States, as they have already done, and have him appoint men on the Interstate Commerce Commission who favor the granting of increased freight rates. By newspaper advertisements to create a public sentiment, and by political pressure from the White House, the railroads will get the increase which they are seeking, but where is the Government executive official who is demanding that the farmer receive even a "square deal"?

1912 AND 1915 COMPARED.

I suppose some one will claim that inasmuch as hogs sold on January 28 for almost as much as the average price of hogs in January, 1912, that the farmers should not complain. In comparing prices we must not lose sight of the comparative cost of production. While it is true the average price of hogs on January 28 last was almost as high as the average price of hogs in January, 1912, we must also remember that it costs a great deal more to produce fat hogs to-day than it did in January, 1912. In January, 1912, corn on the Chicago market sold for 47 cents per bushel, while to-day it sells for better than 70 cents per bushel. A farmer could make money feeding cattle and hogs at the prevailing prices in 1912, whereas he can not help losing money feeding stock at the prevailing prices of to-day.

COST TO PRODUCE CATTLE AND HOGS.

The Department of Agriculture has determined the amount of corn necessary to produce 100 pounds of gain on a hog or a steer. It claims that 1 bushel of corn will make 10 pounds of gain on a hog, and that it requires 922 pounds, or 13.17 bushels of corn, to produce 100 pounds of gain on a steer. Mumford and Hall, of the Illinois Experiment Station, after a most extensive investigation, concluded that 1 bushel of corn will produce:

	Pounds of gain in winter-fed lot.	Pounds of gain in summer on pasture.
With calves	8.9	10.0
With yearlings	6.5	7.6
With 2-year-olds	5.4	6.8

That 1 bushel of corn will produce 10.5 pounds of gain on hogs.

COSTS OF PRODUCTION GREATLY INCREASED.

Applying the first rule, because it is more general, let us see whether or not the farmers have a just cause of complaint with regard to the present price paid for fat cattle and hogs at the stockyards of the country. The facts are that the price paid to-day for fat cattle and fat hogs does not begin to pay the corn cost alone of their production.

I have prepared a table showing the profit or loss in producing fat cattle and fat hogs at the prevailing prices of beef cattle and hogs, and also the price of corn on the Chicago market for 1912, 1913, 1914, and for January 28, 1915. The table is as follows:

Table showing profit or loss in producing 100 pounds of gain on cattle and hogs from standpoint of corn costs only, as of Jan. 28, 1915, and for 1912, 1913, and 1914.

Year.	Average price of cattle per 100 pounds.	Average price of hogs per 100 pounds.	December and January price of corn per per bushel.	Corn cost.		Profit or loss.	
				To produce 100 pounds gain on cattle.	To produce 100 pounds gain on hogs.	To produce 100 pounds gain on cattle.	To produce 100 pounds gain on hogs.
1912	$7.75	$7.55	$0.47	$6.17	$4.70	$1.38	$2.85
1913	8.25	8.35	.46	6.21	4.60	2.14	3.65
1914	8.65	8.30	.60	7.90	6.00	.75	2.30
1915 (Jan. 28)	6.90	6.06	.70	9.45	7.00	2.55	[1].94

[1] Loss.

NOTE.—Prices for 1912, 1913, and 1914 are from Yearbook of Figures, published by the Daily Farmers and Drovers' Journal, January, 1915; prices for January 28, 1915, taken from Chicago papers—all prices at Chicago. Labor costs and losses through disease not included.

PROFITS IN 1912; LOSSES NOW.

It will be observed that the corn cost to produce 100 pounds of beef in 1912 was $6.17; that the average price for cattle that year was $7.75, leaving a profit on the corn cost to the farmer of $1.38 for every hundred pounds of gain produced. There was a profit on the corn cost to produce 100 pounds of pork that year of $2.85. In 1913 the profit in producing 100 pounds of pork, so far as the corn is concerned, was $3.65, and $2.30 in 1914, while on January 28, 1915, there was a loss of 94 cents for every hundred pounds of pork produced. In other words, the farmer who fed hogs on 70-cent corn until they weighed 300 pounds and sold them yesterday on the Chicago market for $6.06 per hundred lost over $2.80 on every hog he matured, to say nothing of his loss for labor in raising the hog or his loss through cholera and other risks which he had assumed.

So, too, the farmer who fed cattle in 1912 made a profit of $1.38 per hundred pounds, exclusive of the cost of labor and the risks assumed. In 1913 he made a profit of $2.14 per hundred pounds; in 1914 he made a profit of 75 cents per hundred pounds; and at the prevailing prices of both fat cattle and corn on January 28, 1915, he sustained a loss of $2.55 per hundred pounds.

In other words, the farmer who sold 1,200-pound steers yesterday at the average price suffered a loss on the cost of the corn alone to produce them of $30.60 for each steer sold, while at the average price paid in 1913 he had a profit of $25.60 on each 1,200-pound steer produced. His profits were not large in 1913. But who will question the seriousness of his losses in 1915?

PRODUCER SELLS FOR LESS WHILE CONSUMER PAYS MORE.

The wholesale price of fresh beef in London advanced 2 cents per pound from July 13 to December 21, 1914, while the average price of fat cattle on the Chicago market declined from $9.10 per hundred pounds for the week ending July 18, 1914, to $6.90 per hundred pounds on January 28, 1915. No one can dispute these prices. The English price will be found in Mark Lane Express Agricultural Journal and Live Stock Record, while the prices of live stock will be found in the Chicago papers. Who can explain how such things are possible, except through the violation of law? Who can justify such practices, which, if continued, will destroy the live-stock industry in this country? But where is the executive officer of the Government who is attempting to enforce the law and put a stop to this practice?

The Chicago wholesale price of pork for the week ending July 18, according to the National Provisioner, was 13 cents per pound. The average price of hogs at the Chicago market for that week was $8.90 per hundred pounds. The Chicago wholesale price of pork for the week ending December 19, 1914, was 13 to 14 cents per pound, while the average price paid for hogs in the Chicago market was $7.10 per hundred.

The American consumer paid more for his pork in December than he paid in July, but the American farmer sold the hogs out of which that pork was made for 20 per cent less in December than the price he received in July. The wholesale price of pork in London increased 25 per cent from July 18 to December 13, 1914, while the average price at which the American farmer was compelled to sell his hogs declined during the same time $1.80 per hundred pounds, or 20 per cent. This condition is unbearable, almost unthinkable, and yet it has been going on month after month, and not a single executive officer of the Government has interceded in behalf of the American farmer to put a stop to a pernicious practice if not an unlawful conspiracy.

The executive officers of the Government, whose sworn duties are to enforce the law, may give as an excuse for their failure to prosecute these violators of the Sherman antitrust law that the farmers have received an increase in the price of their wheat and their oats and their corn and that they should not therefore complain. It is true that the price of wheat has advanced from 78 cents a bushel to $1.50 per bushel during the past six months. Oats have advanced, and likewise corn has gone up in price; but these advances aid only the farmers who have these cereals for sale. They do not help the farmer who uses his corn and his oats for the purpose of maturing his stock and who looks to the sale of his fat stock for his annual income.

SUPPLY NOT EQUAL TO DEMAND, BUT PRICES DECLINE.

Let us remember that it can not be successfully urged as an excuse of these falling prices that there has been an overproduction or that the supply exceeds that of previous years. Just the reverse is the case. The demand for fresh meats has increased, and there has been a great falling off in the number of cattle and hogs sold on the stock markets in 1914, as compared with previous years, yet prices decline. Take the Chicago market, for example, and we find the live-stock movement for several years to be as follows:

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Cattle	2,237,881	2,513,074	2,652,342	2,931,831
Hogs	6,618,166	7,570,938	7,180,961	7,103,360

The combined total of receipts of all kinds of live stock at the 14 live-stock markets of the country show a great falling off in receipts in 1914, as compared with previous years. These combined receipts are as follows:

1914	53,700,238
1913	57,339,840
1912	57,268,861
1911	57,023,951

With this great shortage in the live stock in the country, why should our farmers be compelled to sell at the present bankrupt prices? With the demand for fresh meat increasing, with rising prices therefor to the consumer, and with the supply falling off why should there be such a great reduction, a reduction of over 20 per cent in price of fat cattle and hogs to the American farmer?

HOW PRESENT PRICES AFFECT IOWA FARMERS.

Take the State of Iowa, for example, for it is a typical stock-raising State: The farmers of that State naturally desire some of the benefits flowing from the great advance that has been made in the price in all food products by reason of the war in Europe. But the fact is that the farmers of Iowa, under present conditions, obtain but little of the great increase in the price of foodstuffs.

The entire State of Iowa produces only about 15,000,000 bushels of wheat and consumes about 13,000,000 bushels. Take from our production of wheat the amount that we consume and what we use for seed, but very little remains for sale.

The farmers of Iowa for several years have been advised by such eminent men as the Hon. James Wilson, the real father and builder of the now great United States Department of Agriculture, to conserve their lands by raising live stock and feeding their cereals on their farms. They have followed this advice, and in recent years have taken to raising cattle and hogs as their principal source of profit.

While we raise wheat, we raise only a little more than our people consume. We raise more oats by far than any State in the Union, but a large portion of our oat production is fed to our live stock. We excel all of the other States in the Union in the production of corn, producing in 1914, 389,424,000 bushels, yet of that great crop we will feed more than 85 per cent to our live stock. In the production of hay Iowa excels all the other States in the Union, save only the great Empire State of New York, but this crop, too, is largely fed to our horses and cattle. Iowa produces more horses than any State in the Union. It produces more cattle than any State except Texas, and it produces more hogs by 2,500,000 head than any other State.

It can be said as a general rule that the great production of cereals in Iowa is to a large extent fed to the live stock raised or matured within the State. It is therefore to the sale of live stock, and especially to the sale of fat cattle and hogs, that our farmers must look for their annual return, and when they see the price of pork advancing in London at the rate of 25 per cent in six months, and at the same time see the price of their hogs decline on our markets 20 per cent, they realize that some strong forces, stronger than the law of competition, is at work undermining their profits and destroying their industry.

When our farmers see the foreign and domestic price of beef advance, and at the same time are forced to sell their fat cattle on the live-stock markets, their only market, at a greatly reduced price, they are forced to the conclusion that powerful interests have combined against them to unreasonably depress the price of their principal product and to ruin their prosperity. Will this Congress refuse to grant the farmers relief?

There was a time not many years ago when our farmers having cereals for sale were obliged to sell their grain to the Elevator Trust at the price fixed by that combination. The farmers solved that question by going into the elevator business. The result has been that to-day the farmer who has grain to sell receives the advantage of the natural rise in price.

The slaughter of live stock and the operation of stockyards presents a far more difficult question. The magnitude of the investment alone in such enterprise has prevented our farmers engaging in this industry. But who can say that the losses which they will sustain this year by reason of this unjustifiable depression in the price of live stock will not force them to find some more profitable way of marketing this great crop?

LOSSES TO IOWA FARMERS.

Take the losses which the farmers of Iowa will sustain this year on their hogs alone. They raised last year 6,976,000 head. If three-fourths of them were matured to a weight of 250 pounds each and marketed this year at the average price paid on the Chicago market on yesterday, the loss to the Iowa farmers alone on the corn which was consumed in maturing these hogs would total over $11,000,000. Fortunately for the farmers of Iowa they have not all sold their hogs at the prevailing price of yesterday, but they have all sold their hogs at a much lower price than they should have received for them. Instead of sustaining a loss, if they had received the same percentage of profit which they realized in 1913, of $3.65 per hundred pounds, on the corn cost to produce their hogs, they would have realized on the same sales a profit of more than $19,000,000. Considering the profit which should have gone to the farmers and stock raisers of Iowa by reason of the advanced prices in beef and pork, which the farmers did not receive, I believe that loss of the Iowa farmers on cattle and hogs this year will total over $25,000,000.

I do not know who is responsible for this unreasonable decline in the stock market. I do not know who is controlling it. I only know that the farmers are receiving far less for their fat cattle and hogs than they should receive. The law of competition, uncontrolled, would have forced the price of cattle and hogs even higher than the prevailing prices at the time of the outbreak of the European war.

ANDERSON RESOLUTION.

I believe that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] should be adopted by the House, and that the Department of Justice should, in justice to the farmers, make a thorough examination into the causes of this decline in the price of cattle and hogs. If there has been a manipulation of these markets and a violation of the antitrust laws, those guilty of such violations should be punished. If there has been no violation of such laws, and if the prices paid at the various stockyards of the country for live stock have been the natural prices established by the law of competition, then the men engaged in the packing industry and in the ownership of stockyards should not be compelled to rest under the indictment fixed in the minds of thousands of farmers throughout the land that they are responsible for this manipulation of prices and the loss of untold millions to the stock-raising industry. If there has been no violation of the law, a thorough investigation of this subject should disclose what additional legislation is necessary to insure a full return to competitive conditions. [Applause.]

Average weekly prices of cattle and hogs at Chicago from June 27, 1914, until Jan. 21, 1915.

	Beef cattle.	Hogs.
Week ending—		
June 27, 1914	$8.70	$8.30
July 18, 1914	9.10	8.90
Aug. 1, 1914	8.80	8.80
Aug. 15, 1914	9.20	9.40
Sept. 5, 1914	9.25	9.20
Sept. 19, 1914	9.30	8.80
Oct. 3, 1914	9.20	8.35
Oct. 17, 1914	9.00	8.65
Oct. 31, 1914	9.25	7.40
Nov. 7, 1914	9.10	7.50
Nov. 21, 1914	8.80	7.45
Dec. 5, 1914	8.30	7.00
Dec. 19, 1914	7.95	7.15
Jan. 2, 1915	8.50	7.20
Jan. 16, 1915	8.20	6.80
On Jan. 28, 1915	6.90	6.00

Average weekly prices per pound of wholesale fresh meats at Chicago from July 4, 1914, until Jan. 16, 1915.

Week ending—	Carcass beef—prime native steers	Fresh pork—dressed hogs.
July 4	$0.13½–$0.14	$0.13
July 18	.13½– .14	.13
Aug. 1	.14 – .15	.13
Aug. 15	.14½– .15	.13
Sept. 5	.14½– .15½	$0.13½– .14
Sept. 19	.14½– .15½	.14½
Oct. 3	.14½– .15	.14½
Oct. 17	.14½– .15	.14 – .15
Nov. 7	.14½– .15½	.13 – .14
Nov. 14	.14½– .15½	.13 – .14
Dec. 5	.14½– .15½	.13 – .14
Dec. 12	.14½– .15½	.13 – .14
Dec. 26	.14½– .16	.11½– .13

Prices of beef per pound at London from July 13, 1914, to Dec. 21, 1914.

Week ending Monday—	Beef.
July 13, 1914	$0.12½–$0.13½
July 27, 1914	.13 – .14
Aug. 10, 1914	.13 – .13½
Aug. 31, 1914	.13 – .14
Sept. 14, 1914	.13 – .14
Sept. 28, 1914	.13 – .14
Oct. 12, 1914	.13 – .14
Oct. 26, 1914	.12½– .13½
Nov. 16, 1914	.12½– .13½
Nov. 30, 1914	.12½– .13½
Dec. 14, 1914	.13 – .14½
Dec. 21, 1914	.14½– .15½

Mr. PADGETT. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ESTOPINAL].

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, I believe in a strong Navy, because the Navy is our main dependence for national defense. It is the line of the first resistance to enable us to prepare our military defense, should invasion be attempted. I am against territorial expansion, but realize that we have assumed responsibilities which must be reckoned with; and, besides, we have, not counting these outlying possessions, a large coast line of rich interests and development which must be considered. While recognizing these responsibilities and willing to prepare ourselves so that we may not be derelict in meeting them, we may take comfort from the fact that the deadlocked condition, so to term it, of the novel overhead, underground, and underwater warfare of the present war seem to point to conditions which will make warfare impossible; but I am not willing to pin my faith on that appearance to the extent of ceasing adequate preparations for a real, competent defense; for, however much the opponents of a large Navy may talk of financial burdens, bankruptcy, and so forth, we know that two, or three, or even four hundred million dollars a year spent on our Navy would be a cheap insurance on the lives of a hundred million people and property wealth of one hundred and fifty billion dollars, not reckoning our pride as a people.

To have faith in peace and brotherly love among the peoples is a fine ideal, and we should cultivate that faith. It may serve to prevent warfare, but I am not of those who believe so.

So, in my opinion, we must not be so beguiled by this idealism as to fail to make preparation to meet any eventualities. History has always repeated itself, and until the nature of man is changed and his economic ideals and environment are different we may see the philosophers and advocates of peace thrown into confusion again and again by warfare, and in which we ourselves may be involved.

As I have already inferred, we have at stake, in the lives of our people, in the wealth of our cities, and in the pride of our national spirit, too much compared to the insignificant expenditure that is necessary to keep up our building program.

There are some who contend that fast cruisers must replace battleships; but, Mr. Chairman, for national defense it is imperative that we have powerful mobile fortresses capable of keeping the seas and clearing them of hostile vessels of all kinds. In this work these fighting machines must go hundreds, and even thousands, of miles from their base, and, after traversing such a distance, must be ready for conflict with similar fighting machines of an enemy bent upon breaking down the defense of our seacoast. Our naval experts and those of foreign nations are agreed that the modern dreadnaught is the only answer to this requirement, since this type of ship combines (1) the ability to inflict the greatest injury on the enemy, (2) the maximum protection to itself, and (3) the maximum speed practicable for any fortress which must carry all the weight of the guns, ammunition, armor, fuel, provisions, and so forth, that are imperative for the very object of the ship's existence. It is a truism to state that a ship of 30,000 tons displacement can not be loaded with more than 30,000 tons of weight without going deeper into the water and sacrificing essential fighting qualities. If, therefore, we wish to increase the speed of a ship of a given size, we must add more weight for machinery; which means that we must take away weight for guns or armor, or both. While we would like to give our dreadnaughts as much speed as we can, if we put too large a proportion of the weight in machinery to increase speed the ship could not carry enough guns and armor to enable her to stand up against an enemy's corresponding ship which carries a greater preponderance of weight in artillery and protection, and our ship could only run away from the fleet that would constitute the backbone of the enemy's sea power. We must therefore be amply provided with real first-class fighting machines, and these must be extremely powerful in their offensive and defensive qualities, with as much speed as is compatible with these primary qualities. It would be a great mistake to infer from results of the present naval hostilities that the modern battleship or dreadnaught has not amply justified its existence; as a matter of fact, it appears to be doing exactly the work it was designed to do. To state that opposing vessels of this class have not come into conflict in large numbers, the one with the other, is merely to state that the weaker fleet has stayed at home, while the stronger fleet has had the freedom and control of the seas.

While dreadnaughts "form the backbone" of any efficient fighting fleet, it is absolutely essential that the vessels of this class be provided with the necessary auxiliaries, including submarines, destroyers, fuel ship, etc., in order that they may find and engage the enemy and defend our country by bringing a sea campaign to a successful termination. It is noted that the bill as reported in the House provides an addition of 17 submarines. Vessels of this class have amply proven their value in the present naval war, particularly in defending the home coast. The 17 vessels of this class covered by this bill will add greatly to the national defense.

Of course we need vastly more of these types of vessels, but we are, even with this increase, conservative.

The strategy board recommends a material addition to our fleet of air craft and states that they "are the eyes of both the armies and navies, and it is difficult to place any limit to their offensive possibilities," and further states that in this respect "our present situation can be described as nothing less than deplorable." The bill as reported calls for $1,000,000 for air craft. This million dollars is ample to encourage the spirit of enterprise in building these craft. Only a few days ago there was sent to me a copy of the Yale paper, which mentioned the organization of a company to build dirigibles of the Parseval and Zodiac type, with the following comment:

> Up to a year ago very little had been done regarding the building of dirigibles in this country, but since the formation of the Connecticut Aircraft Co., with ample funds, they have conducted a private research and to-day possess constructive genius, experienced builders, and reliable drivers. They have evolved a design that has been tested with favorable results in the wind tunnel at Boston.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of building up a merchant marine and would go to almost any lengths to attain this object. The need of this, both as regards auxiliary vessels to be used in time of warfare and for the development of a seafaring addition to our population, is so apparent and so fully recognized that it is needless to discuss it.

When the last naval appropriation bill was being considered by this body I claimed that our country could well afford to spend ample sums to build and maintain a large navy. I am stronger in this conviction than ever. The condition of Germany to-day, with her fleet bottled up in the Baltic and her commerce destroyed, and the attitude of Great Britain toward the neutral powers, emphasizes the need of a strong navy. It is a great mistake to say that the people of this country are opposed to an effective navy. I believe this question, as well as that of the merchant marine, will be made an issue in the next presidential campaign, and that the majority of the people will strongly pronounce in favor of these measures.

The bill now under consideration is not too large, and it should receive the hearty approval of every Member of the House.

Mr. Chairman, in closing my remarks on the naval bill of last session, I used the following language:

> There has probably not been a year in the last decade—no; not in the last two decades—when there were not more than three times as many idle men tramping the streets of our cities and along the railroads of this country marauding and destroying than were enlisted in the Army and Navy. Before we decry the Army and Navy for taking men out of the productive channels of life, and thus causing the high cost of living, we should try to solve the problem of voluntary and involuntary idleness of these three times as many that stagnate in cities and tramp the

country and the several times as many more that are idle at home during certain seasons of the year.

To measure up to a full and symmetrical development of national defense, as well as international influence that may serve us to make a national defense unnecessary, I wish again to emphasize the economic problems which in themselves form the basic features of a stronger national life, and a stronger national cohesive support, in case that, unfortunately, warfare should become our portion. Successful issue of any country engaged in warfare is dependent upon the fiber of its citizenship. This is fundamental and underlies all other preparation. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. On behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] I yield five minutes to his colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KETTNER].

Mr. KETTNER. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's mail I received a pamphlet from California dealing with a subject that has engrossed my attention for some time past. It deals with the report of four very prominent citizens of my State, all Free Masons, and active in that fraternal order. The report is made to Judge Paul J. McCormick, of Los Angeles, a Roman Catholic citizen of that city, who had submitted to the Masonic committee, with full authority of the supreme officer of the Knights of Columbus in the United States, a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order of the Knights of Columbus for their full examination and inspection. That Masonic committee, consisting of Motley Hewes Flint, thirty-third degree Mason and past grand master of Masons of California, formerly postmaster of the city of Los Angeles, and president of one of the largest banks in that city; Dana Reid Weller, thirty-second degree Mason and past grand master of California, and a distinguished member of the California bar; William Rhodes Hervey, thirty-third degree Mason and past master and master of Scottish Rite Lodge, and formerly a superior court judge of Los Angeles County; and Samuel E. Burke, thirty-second degree Mason and past master and inspector of Masonic district, one of the most prominent dentists of Los Angeles.

These four men, than whom none stand higher for probity and honor in the State of California, and who are known throughout the State for their adherence to the highest standards of personal integrity, have just made a report on the ceremonies and ritual of the Knights of Columbus. They find unanimously that "the ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and holds up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a knight of the order." They state further that they "can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that to our minds could be objected to by any person."

As a thirty-third degree Mason and a working member of the Masonic order, I esteem it a privilege to present this report of these distinguished and fair-minded men on a subject which has been grossly misrepresented, and has caused religious bitterness and strife. I believe in justice and fair play. In the Sixty-second Congress the Committee on Elections No. 1, in a certain contested election case, incorporated in their report (H. Rept. No. 1523) an alleged oath or obligation of the Knights of Columbus, the publication of the said alleged oath being in connection with a contest for membership in this body. This alleged oath, which can be found in the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-second Congress, third session, page 3216, was used to the detriment of the Knights of Columbus, whose critics pointed to the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the alleged oath as sort of proof of its genuineness. The alleged oath having found publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I think it but fair that this report dealing with the oath of the Knights of Columbus by this distinguished Masonic committee should likewise be given the same prominence.

LOS ANGELES INVESTIGATION.

The following letter needs no explanation:

Hon. PAUL J. MCCORMICK,
Court House, Los Angeles.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I take pleasure in handing you herewith the findings of the committee of Free Masons to whom you exhibited the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus.

I am very glad that I have been able, in a measure, to secure this refutation of a slanderous lie which has been widely circulated and which has been disseminated in many cases by well meaning, credulous, and deluded persons.

I shall see to it that this report has wide circulation among Masons, and you may use it in any way you deem best to bring about an understanding of the truth among men who, above all controversies and contentions, desire to know and to follow that which is right and true.

Yours, cordially,

W. R. HERVEY.

OCTOBER 9, 1914.

We hereby certify that by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instructions from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed, and examined the same. We found that while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization, and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great religion and every free State. Our examination of these ceremonials and obligations was made primarily for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a certain alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus, which has been printed and widely circulated, was in fact used by the order, and whether if it was not used, any oath, obligation, or pledge was used which was or would be offensive to Protestants or Masons, or those who are engaged in circulating a document of peculiar viciousness and wickedness. We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind. We find that the order of Knights of Columbus, as shown by its rituals, is dedicated to the Catholic religion, charity, and patriotism. There is no propaganda proposed or taught against Protestants or Masons or persons not of Catholic faith. Indeed, Protestants and Masons are not referred to directly or indirectly in the ceremonials and pledges. The ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and holds up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a knight of the order. We can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that to our minds could be objected to by any person.

MOTLEY HEWES FLINT,
Thirty-third Degree Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
DANA REID WELLER,
Thirty-second Degree Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
WM. RHODES HERVEY,
Thirty-third Degree Past Master and Master of Scottish Rite Lodge.
SAMUEL E. BURKE,
Thirty-second Degree Past Master and Inspector of Masonic District.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

THE REMEDY FOR UNPREPAREDNESS, IF ANY EXISTS IN THE ARMY AND NAVY, AND THE MENACE OF A MILITARISM.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, for five years I have patiently listened to discussions of naval appropriation bills to discover our true policy of construction and the reason for it. No man during that time has attempted to lay down a well-defined policy; no man has attempted to discuss the subject as related to a democratic form of government, and particularly in connection with our historic policies and physical environment. We have argued much upon our needs under the ambiguous phrase, "An adequate Navy." The man who would spend $700,000,000 a year and the one who would spend $7,000,000 a year can find shelter and political security for his theory, whatever that may be, under that declaration. Our discussions have always proceeded on relative assumptions; namely, that we should build battleships because other governments built them. We have always talked about, not what our needs are to-day, but what they might be to-morrow. The advocates of large naval construction and of large standing armies have always proceeded upon comparison. No advocate has based our policy upon what we ought to do because of our coast line and our exposed and unfortified cities.

No man has until the immediate present proposed that we should have as large a Navy as Great Britain. We have usually contented ourselves with the statement that we ought to have a Navy as large as Germany has, though no one has given a reason why we should have one just as powerful and be contented with it. The naval policy of every nation must be anchored in reasons essentially individual and always looking to the promotion and accomplishment of the nation's ultimate purposes. The nation's ideal is always the controlling force. Who has not asked himself why Great Britain has constructed a great navy; why Germany in the last quarter of a century has copied English activities not only in manufacture and commerce, but in naval construction? To illustrate what I previously stated, that the policy of every nation must be individual in her construction, there was no other recourse for England than to build and maintain a great sea-going power. Her territory covers one-fifth of the habitable globe; her victory at Trafalgar a century ago gave her the control of the sea. She did not scatter her surplus population into her islands and continental possessions, but kept it at home to build a complete mastery of the world's trade. And let it be remembered that that mastery has always been maintained, either by the sharpest possible competition or by cutting off the commercial lines of her rivals. Australia and India and South Africa and Canada, where she holds large possessions, have always contributed to the maintenance of her prestige. She scattered her warships to the strategic points in the Mediterranean, Indian Ocean, and the Yellow Sea; to the Straits of Magellan and the Cape of Good Hope, and to the most advantageous coaling stations in all the world. A new period came in vessel construction—

steel ships operated by steam. England rapidly laid the keels for great warships, to protect her colonies and keep her immense business. Continental Europe had no modern ships, no war vessels, but England looked upon the swift mobilization of petty States in the continental center of Europe under the German flag with a suspicious eye. England blocked up the channel and crowded the North and Baltic Seas with her vessels, so that she could be in complete command, knowing that every dollar of export coming from central continental Europe would have to pass that way and under her observation.

The rapidly increasing German population, immense commerce, and national spirit sought new territory into which to spill her surplus population. Her trade sought sale in the English colonies. She became a rival of England for South American business. The restless and aggressive spirit of Germany sought a wider field of activity—cemented her national unity—and she now believes that her future depends upon becoming the dominating force in all Europe. There was only one barrier for her to break down, and that was the English Navy. Germany knows she has no way to the world's market except over water that her bitter antagonists control; that the Mediterranean and the North Sea are in England's control; that her racial enemy in the east, Russia, controls the railroads leading to China and Japan. With that situation confronting her, with a virile race of 60,000,000 looking to the strongest centralized Government on the earth for employment and destiny, she saw that her future as a people lay in the complete absorption of Continental Europe and in wresting the control of the seas from the British Empire. Her idea now is that she shall be the Roman Empire of the twentieth century in Europe. She began a naval program of construction with that idea in view. To return to my original proposition, the far-reaching ideal of a nation is always its controlling motive—the unifying power of her people in her military and naval program. That idea arises out of the nation's geographical location, its form of government, and its economic necessity. If it is the ambition of Germany to become pan-German in western Europe, there is no moral force to which to appeal. The arbitrament of this proposition must be determined by the force of arms. If England shall retain her grip on her colonies, her prestige on the sea, her commerce, she must remain master of the seas and be able to maintain all her strategic positions. The concurrence of conditions both in Germany and in England—and I am speaking of naval power—gave rise to both of their successes in naval construction. The result is not artificial. It is necessarily evolved out of the acts that complete the realization of the national idea. Germany has cast into the world's crucible of powers her industrial, commercial, and race problems for settlement. England, prompted by the history of her heroism, her chivalry, and her traditions for 20 centuries, has hurled her race against a most aggressive and determined people to protect her political integrity, her territorial limitations, and her supremacy over the waters of the globe. But none of these economic positions, none of these environments, none of these necessities need shape our opinions or our activities in naval or military armament. We have no island continents to protect, no pathways over the seas to guard, no enemy sworn to absorb and destroy us. We have no need of some place to dump our surplus population, to build up and protect new markets. No power is attempting to prohibit us from entering the world's trade, or intercepting our commercial highways, or standing over us to intimidate us with great war vessels as we pass to and fro in the pathways of a water. The relationship of our mixed population is not in harmony with any propaganda to acquire additional territory, especially by conquest.

These European conditions are due in part to the forms of government with which their respective territories are invested. American democracy is not in harmony with great military power. The militarism that has invested these monarchies is in deathless antagonism with a representative government like ours. We have never had great military or naval establishments. Recently ill-considerate enthusiasts have attempted to create a sentiment for a great standing army and a great navy. I am opposed to both. I believe in efficient naval and military power. Many problems enter into the solution of what constitutes such efficiency. We have no demand or necessity for an offensive naval and military establishment. Military power thrives in a centralized monarchy, whose efficiency to command when national sentiment and submissive obedience makes the prompt realization of every resource and activity sure. Decentralization of power is destructive of military force. I want to inquire into the probability of this country aping the great military forces of Europe by raising our standing army to the strength of half a million enlisted men, with a great trained reserve force. I want to inquire whether we need a navy exceeding that of any world power, clamored for only by a yellow press and the limelight exhibitors? There are many reasons why we do not need a large standing army and a greater navy than we now have. Our entire policy from the foundation of the Government has been to maintain friendly relations without alliances with all Governments. We have a Nation of mixed nationalities, whose tender and affectionate sympathies reach back to the fatherland, wherever that may be; hence the necessity for absolute neutrality. Because of the very fact that we may keep intact a complete national sentiment that shall dominate and control all ancestral relationship we must avoid all foreign complications. The steady march of democratic impulse is manifesting itself in Europe and in the Far East. The Hindu and the Egyptian, the Persian, and the inhabitant of the Balkan States all dream of new governments, of a nation administered by themselves on their own territory, independent of and tributary to none. These demonstrations will give birth to a new democracy that shall supersede autocratic and monarchical rule. I do not stop here. The interdependence of nations in commerce and trade, that has become profitable in the proportion that they participate in it, is always contingent upon the continuance of peace. Our own suffering, commercially speaking, since this world conflagration of war was inaugurated is to us conclusive proof upon that subject. There is a world-wide drift of all these forces that tends to eliminate war, and consequently the suppression of those agencies that develop war. These tendencies form a solid basis for great organized movements in favor of international arbitration. I have for years listened to the arguments that preparation for war was the surest guaranty of peace. How quickly that fallacy has been exploded. Why should we follow the trend of Germany, England, and France, that has brought them financial and industrial ruin? I call your attention to economic reasons that are world-wide in their application why disarmament should begin and militarism should cease.

We ourselves have paid out of the Public Treasury to develop and maintain the Army and Navy from 1901 to 1914 the incredible sum of three billion five hundred and thirty-eight million, an amount staggering the imagination. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, how better to understand such expressions of amounts unless we make comparisons of them with matters we are familiar with. I know, though, that three billion five hundred and thirty-eight million is nearly 3 per cent of all the taxable wealth the country has accumulated since the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers nearly three centuries ago. In 13 years we have paid out an amount to support the Army and Navy alone equal to three-fourths of all the taxable wealth of the two greatest States in the upper Mississippi Valley, Indiana and Illinois. The homes of 8,000,000 people, with their towns, villages, and cities, one of them the second on the Western Hemisphere; their railroads, telegraphs, and telephones; their banks, stocks and bonds, credits and cash; their thousands of square miles of the richest farming lands in the world; their improvements, flocks, and herds, are only 25 per cent more than the vast sum we have contributed to the Army and Navy. The taxable value of the 11 Southern States, known as the seceding States, with 22,000,000 people developing that great region of natural resources—collect all their taxable resources, consisting of railroads, cities and towns, farming lands and improvements, their mines, great smelting furnaces and steel mills, millions of cotton spindles, their cotton that clothes the world, their bank stock, loans, credits, and money, and it all amounts to but a trifle more than twice our contribution in the last 13 years to the Army and Navy. But there are other great overshadowing reasons why governments should cease to build great armaments and organize great military systems that invite war. The credit system of international exchange, merging into vast transactions where time and distance have been eliminated, has revolutionized and greatly multiplied the business of the world. Great aggregations of capital in the hands of powerful corporations for the purpose of financing single enterprises in modern industry have become a stupendous power in the material development of nations. This is world business. It can not be fostered, encouraged, and developed when nations are at war. Capital will hide away; industrial paralysis will seize business everywhere the sword is in action. These reasons could be indefinitely multiplied. I am opposed to an increased Navy. I want to balance it up and maintain it at its present state of efficiency. That is my attitude. We are the second naval power in the world. Since this world-wide war began England has lost 200,000 tons and Germany 190,000 tons displacement. The statement of Rear Admiral Badger, in a hearing before the Naval Affairs Committee, during the construction of the present bill, on cross-

examination by Judge WITHERSPOON, declared the American Navy to be better, ship for ship, in construction, in activity, and in effectiveness, than that of the German Navy. That authority convinces me; if it did not, the comparison made by Judge WITHERSPOON of our Navy with that of the German Navy in the preceding session of this Congress that demonstrated that fact has not been answered and will not be answered. Only one gentleman has attempted it, and his efforts, although his life has been spent almost continuously in the service of the Navy, reminded one of the adage that a certain class of people "rush in" where the angels exercise more caution.

I said in the outset that no man has laid down a basis for our naval construction. No one has undertaken it but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who runs into Congress with a resolution and into the press and the limelight with the declaration that the Nation was in a state of unpreparedness. Unpreparedness for what? For an attack by one of the great powers of the world now engaged in the bloodiest war of all the ages? There is not a student of history but knows that the present war in Europe will so exhaust the combatants that another international war involving these same powers is an absolute impossibility for a half century to come. England, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary are crushed to earth with the burden of expenditures, their standing army slaughtered, industry closed, credit gone, equipment destroyed, their cities and farming land laid waste, and their industrial activities paralyzed. Neither of them has had a war of any consequence in 45 years; they give us no fear of another early contest. That condition is not sufficient to quiet the alarmist, the militarist that seeks to plant that vicious doctrine in the democracy of this Republic. No rational basis has been laid down for naval construction. Shall we build a Navy for coast defenses compared with what other nations have builded for their coast defenses? If so, then you would build more battleships, more cruisers, more torpedo boats, more submarines, more transports than the entire Continental Europe, for we have more coast line than all of them. Shall our naval construction be built equal to the fighting force of the greatest naval power? That would not answer. Suppose England should attack us. This European conflagration has welded the triple entente into a league of offensive and defensive operation that no one supposes will soon be dissolved, and instead of having England to fight, we should have with her Russia and France. So that, following the logic of a gentleman from Massachusetts, we should have a Navy equal or superior to all of them; that is the absurdity of the logical deduction that the argument of a gentleman from Massachusetts leads us to. Of what efficiency has the German Navy been to its country in this contest? England has not only Germany's battleships, but her merchant vessels, interned in the bays and harbors of the great seas, while England remains so far as commerce is concerned, an outlaw upon the world's waters, with no power on the globe to successfully dispute her control. In this whirlwind of destruction now enveloping European nations the militarist of our country has seized the psychological moment to raise the alarm of unpreparedness and fire the country to demand a standing army of 500,000 men and the Navy equal to that of the English. May I digress sufficiently to say no effort has been overlooked to intimidate and alarm the public mind and business of the country by the war enthusiast who thinks more of seizing the present opportunity for self-aggrandizement than to patriotically promote the public welfare? It was handy to have an impromptu uprising in the Philippines pulled off to illustrate the necessity of more soldiers in the Regular Army and a greater Navy. A gentleman who for a long time ably administered the second office in the civil government of the islands was called 7,000 miles to testify before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the subject of conditions in the Philippines; an influential part of the metropolitan press turned its editorial battery upon the opponents of militarism in the attempt to popularize sentiment for a large navy and military establishment. Such ponderous military personages as Assistant Secretary Breckinridge and the "brass-button" and "gold-fringed" brigade who feed and live and retire on the toil of other men, rush to banquets and public functions to tell the dear people of the awful unpreparedness of this country for war.

The *Dacia* incident—sailing with a noncontraband cargo of cotton for Rotterdam—and Great Britain's answer to our protest for interfering with our neutral commerce has been worked as a scarecrow for all its worth, and last, but most ineffective, a "back fire," systematically scheduled, on Members of Congress, to have our constituents' chambers of commerce bombard us with resolutions already drawn, letters already directed, and telegrams already paid for, the most contemptible and despicable engagement a Member of this House can resort to, has been started. These parties not only demand a standing Army of half a million men, but a military trained reserve supported largely by the Federal Government. Every man in favor of a large standing Army knows that it can not be maintained in this country except under a statute requiring compulsory service. Every country in the world maintaining an immense military establishment does so by force of law enforcing conscriptive service. Every country in Europe except Great Britain maintains this service. I note with what alacrity the militarist rises to deny that there is any idea of conscriptive or compulsory service to be enforced in the United States in the building up and maintaining great fighting forces. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the present session, page 1609, the words of the distinguished member of another legislative body, who, speaking of a reserve force auxiliary to the standing Army, used these words:

> These reserves should be created. No one would think of suggesting either conscription or compulsory service for this purpose, but the end can be attained without either.

Well, let us see whether "no one" is suggesting compulsory service to create a great reserve force for military services in the United States. I note in the Army and Navy Journal, the ready conduit through which the prominent figures of the Army and Navy and the devotees of that proposition reach the public and attempt to develop and control the sentiment of the American people, that in a recent editorial from which I quote, written October 3, 1914, discussing and commending German militarism, it uses these words:

> There is left, then, only the last supposition, namely, that "German militarism" is condemnable because of its extreme readiness. As Gen. McCoskry Butt wrote from Europe the other day, Germany was ready; the other countries were not. But this is a feature of her military system for which Germany should be praised, not blamed; for what is any army worth if it is not ready when the call comes? The more nearly ready it is the more nearly it approaches those standards of value and efficiency for which all great commanders have striven through all the ages. Instead, therefore, of "German militarism" being something that should be "wiped out," it is something that should be imitated closely by other nations, not excepting our own United States.

I note also in the Associated Press report that Col. O. S. Heistand, adjutant general of the central department of the Army, in an address at Chicago on the evening of December 24, 1914, used these words:

> For the purposes of the Army of defense I would have every male citizen of the United States in the early part of his life give a sufficient time to the United States to qualify himself in the essentials of a soldier. * * * I would have him submit his will to that of his commander.

The Army and Navy Journal, whose policy is shaped by the personnel of the Army and Navy, commending "German militarism" as a proper thing for the United States to adopt, and Col. Heistand, commanding the central division of the Army of the United States, advocating a doctrine of conscription, and then to be told that "No one would think of suggesting either conscriptive or compulsory service" is a surprising statement to come from one of the greatest of present-day American statesmen. I am opposed to a large standing Army, because one can not be maintained in this democracy without dangerous complementary burden of militarism. I challenge the preposterous proposition preached by the Army and Navy Journal, known to be at least the semiofficial publication of the commanding forces of both of these features of our national life. The Army and Navy Journal expresses the sentiment of those officers in both branches of the service who direct their activities to mold public sentiment in affairs. Since this journal gratuitously advised the people of the United States that it was our business to follow the example of European countries and practice compulsory service not a single officer connected with either branch of that service except Secretary Garrison has seen fit to publicly repudiate its attitude and its statements. No man objects to a proper standing Army; no man objects to preparedness for national defense. We object to the militarism advocated by the Army and Navy Journal and by Col. Heistand. The militarism preached and indorsed by the Journal and its followers takes the best years out of the life of every young American, withdraws him from the farm and from productive pursuits, and puts him on the back of another man to keep and feed. The tact and skill with which the idea of compulsory service is kept in the background at the present time surprises no one; every advocate of a standing Army of a half million men knows better than to advocate compulsory service before we get a law authorizing such enlistment. But the hour that such an Army is authorized by law all sorts of arguments will be resorted to to make compulsory service obligatory. There is not a militarist now but knows that a standing Army of half a million men and a naval reserve like that of Germany can not be recruited in this Republic without compulsory service. I am opposed to the standing Army and a complementary Navy of

the dimensions suggested, because it burdens not one nation alone but every nation with neutral commercial interests with great armaments that can be sustained only by crushing taxation. I am opposed to it because it begets a military oligarchy and silently issues a command that comes from an irresponsible power that the productive forces of the Government shall be diverted to the uses of destruction. These great standing armies and great navies, this militarism, must be paid for and its subjects fed by the men who work, by the citizen, the tradesman, the clerk behind the counter, and the husbandmen in the field, whose hands have fed the maw of competitive armament for a generation in the name of "armed peace."

The pretense that its purposes are to establish a guardianship of peace and progress on this continent is the most contemptible hypocrisy. A half million men, an immense standing army, an unmatched navy is sponsor for the philosophy that war and the destruction of property, paralysis of industry, and death of a multitude of men is the most exalted and glorious engagement of men and nations, and that peace is a cowardly surrender. The militarist, and he is universally and always in favor of a great standing army and a complementary or great navy, believes that the crowning glory in this generation is the supremacy of brute force. I quote from a great newspaper:

> A vast standing army overshadows pacific traditions and humanizing policies with a dazzling ideal of conquest. It holds that the strong alone have a right to exist, and that the weak must be thrust aside in the interest of evolution toward a more vigorous type of men and nation. Such abstract virtues as sympathy, generosity, and justice it derides as systems of weakness.

A mighty standing army and great navy and its accompanying militarism gives the soldier preeminence over every other type of men. It sneers at peace and lauds military power. The temper with which the brass-button brigade entertain the right of Congress that represents a hundred millions of American people to express its opinion upon the Army and Navy is admirably illustrated in the sneering and contemptuous remarks of Rear Admiral W. F. Fullam, of the Naval Academy, at a meeting of the Efficiency Club in New York on the evening of January 25, 1915, when he insolently used these words:

> In this country the only people who feel they ought to discuss the Navy are those who are not in the Navy; if you want to be a naval expert don't go into the Navy. Become a Congressman, or a lawyer, or a newspaper man; it seems that the citizens are made up of natural-born admirals and generals.

No great standing army ever existed except by compulsory service that did not create a self-sufficient aristocracy, of which Rear Admiral Fullam is a happy illustration; they constitute themselves a super caste, whose leaders sooner or later become the controlling forces in the Government. Its supporters of this propaganda exhaust the tactics of the soft-cushion boards of strategy to keep prominently before the masses the supremacy of their mission, and if criticized for their conduct whimper like a whipped cur that an ungrateful people are persecuting the apostles of peace. A vast standing army with its immense armament invest the people with a constant air of uncertainty and insecurity, and if the people complain they are rebuked by the snobbish aristocracy that we do not appreciate the respect they show us in not using the power they possess.

Great military power, so large that it can control conditions, puts international law and solemn treaties and conventions into the scrap heap. Militarism, when it is not at war, gives us apprehension all the time that we soon shall be, and when in war it becomes a livid horror and defends itself with the plea of complete justification in race and territorial aggrandizement; it respects no neutral territory, and its wicked and destructive hand lays a ruinous tribute upon conquered cities. It seizes innocent citizens and hangs the postponement of the execution up as a hostage for the surrender of their fellow citizens who revolt against the destruction of their homes and the ruin of their families. Militarism flings its bombs out of the clouds upon mothers and sleeping children and the helpless and unfortunate. Its justification is in the complete annihilation of home, of government, and all that is sacred. That is militarism; the handmaiden of a great standing army and an immense navy. Our protection lies in our system of Government, in the dissemination of power, in our democracy. I hate militarism because its influences are always political; because it seeks always to belittle and secretly subvert the civil authority; because it seeks to minimize a real patriotism and build upon it its insolent prestige. These are the logical results of great military systems. They can not exist in a true democracy because they draw their sustenance from a dominating and controlling caste. Between militarism and a self-governing, self-reliant, self-respected democracy there is an irresistible antipathy, and yet the Army and Navy Journal says that German militarism "is something that should be imitated closely by other nations, not excepting our own United States." That is the publication that assumes to speak for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, what is the present situation? We are told by the advocate of a large military and naval establishment that we ought to have a trained reserve force, ready at any time that we might be attacked. We have now a large reserve of enlisted men amounting to 120,000 in the National Guard. We will next year, and each year thereafter, under the 4-year terms of enlistment, discharge from the Regular Army at least 15,000 men. We will likewise discharge from the National Guard at least 20,000 more. There will graduate from military schools and colleges and schools that teach military tactics at least 25,000 more, making a well-trained force of 60,000 men that we turn back into civil life every year, fully equipped in all the lines of military tactics to mobilize a great reserve civil enlistment. A little calculation will show that in 5 years we could have a well-seasoned, well-trained reserve force of 300,000 men. We have still another greater reserve force; we have 16,000,000 of patriotic American citizens who are ready at all times when the occasion demands to volunteer their services to defend the flag and American institutions. That great moral force in American democracy is more effective than the standing armies of Europe. What we ought to do is to supply the Naval arm of the service with sufficient officers and enlisted men to properly man the vessels we now have, and build those accompanying auxiliaries—submarines, torpedo boats—that shall properly equip them and maintain the Navy in statu quo by new construction when it is necessary to supply worn-out equipment. We should do another thing; every vessel, whether great or small, should be built in the United States navy yards; our armor plate, powder, small arms, field guns, munitions of war, clothing, boots and shoes, and all equipment necessary to supply the Army and Navy, should be made by the Government itself and thereby eliminate a long line of grafters who stand for a large standing army and a big navy, because they think there is something in it for them. Let it be remembered, however, that any settlement growing out of the present war that does not look toward a gradual disarmament and an international arbitration of all differences is not a peaceful settlement. That if unnecessary armament shall continue to be made under strong competition war will simply be postponed. Such a settlement would be only a truce. On no other terms than those looking to a final arbitrament of international difficulties through arbitration can a peaceful civilization again reestablish itself. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will define my position with reference to our naval program at the outset of my remarks, that what I say may be the better understood. I am for a conservative naval program. Heretofore the question has been presented from two viewpoints, represented by those who are opposed to any increase of the Navy and those who have stood for a conservative constructive program. This year the issue presents three angles, and in addition to the arguments heretofore advanced we find a third element entering into consideration represented by gentlemen on the floor who favor a distinctively large navy and who are much concerned lest we are inadequately prepared for immediate war. The arguments of those who are opposed to any navy are familiar to us and have been replied to so often that I will not take time to discuss the issues raised by these gentlemen. I do not mean thereby to underestimate or disparage the very able arguments made by distinguished gentlemen who have from year to year ridiculed the importance of a good and adequate navy. I have time only to present the case from the standpoint of one who favors an adequate navy as against the arguments advanced by those gentlemen who urge the necessity of a navy equal to or superior to any afloat.

I must confess that the hallucinations which seem to disturb the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] have not occasioned any nightmares for me, and that I do not feel any urgent, immediate necessity for great military preparation. I am sure that no Member of this House would go further to protect and defend the honor and the integrity of the flag if assailed or threatened than would I, but I can not agree with the gentlemen that the country is assailed or that the integrity of the flag is threatened. I know that complications arise from day to day, growing out of the unfortunate conditions which exist abroad, and that these complications will require diplomacy and statesmanship to solve, but I do not apprehend that questions of such great moment will arise as to precipitate war or to even threaten the peace of our country or disturb the quietude of our people. I have implicit faith and absolute confidence in the President and know his intention to avoid war

and to maintain peace. In this I am hopeful that he will succeed. If there was ever a time in the history of the world when a peace-loving people, bent on the pursuit of material gain, should stop and consider the prodigious cost and the enormous and fearful consequences of war, it is now, when conflagration rages around the globe and when we of all the great nations of the earth are at peace.

The only argument that can be advanced by the most zealous advocate of a great army and navy is the possibility of war arising out of world-wide conditions as we face them to-day. There are but few nations which maintain a great naval establishment, and but two at most which have a navy superior to our own, and these nations—all of them—are engaged in a death struggle to maintain national existence. These powers consist of Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Austria, Turkey, and Japan, with other and lesser powers involved. The struggle is stupendous, and the resources of each and every one of these powers are taxed to the utmost. Which one of these countries, think you, could or would be willing under any ordinary cause of war to engage the United States on sea or on land? There is not the remotest possibility of war with Russia. There is no occasion for strained relations and no disposition on the part of either country to encourage or provoke hostilities. And Russia's hands are full. Her task is herculean, and Russia has all that she can accomplish if she maintains her territory intact. France is friendly, but if she were disposed otherwise she could not spare a man nor a ship in a conflict with the United States. Germany is encompassed in a struggle for her very existence, beset upon every hand, approached from every quarter, and defending almost single handed and alone against four of the greatest powers of earth. Do you anticipate trouble with Germany now or in the near future? Even though she emerges from this struggle without territorial impairment, without the exaction of enormous indemnity, her trade will be paralyzed, her population decimated, her people impoverished. Do gentlemen who start in their sleep and imagine they descry upon the horizon myriad ships and phantom fleets approaching our shores fear England? Why should England and the United States go to war? What has either country to gain? What devilish spirit or malevolent influence could impel war between the two great English-speaking peoples, whose traditions and customs and laws are one, whose hopes and aspirations are in common, and whose combined power and influence must dominate the world for centuries to come? These two nations have been foremost in advocating peace and promoting arbitration by means of which disputes between nations may be peaceably adjusted. But if England were disposed to be unfriendly, if our commercial and political relations were strained, how could England contend upon land or sea with the United States now, at this time, when she stands in armed conflict, face to face, locked in mortal combat with the greatest people, the best armed, the best trained, the best equipped armies which ever went to battle in all the history of Europe?

If England, together with her allies, succeeds in driving Germany within her own borders and dictating terms of peace she will have accomplished more than her most sanguine friends can hope for or expect within many months to come. This war is a drain upon her mighty resources, on men and means, and common sense teaches me and convinces the mind of the reasoning and thinking everywhere that England can not if she would deliberately provoke or cause war with this mighty Nation. It is true that England controls the seas in this war; but why? Because her enemy is at bay and her whole resources and extensive navy are concentrated in a limited area. Let her divide her fleet and engage in naval war across the seas with so dominant a power as the United States, and it would be but a day until Germany's fleet would emerge en masse from its shelter, challenge Britain's supremacy in the North Sea, and imperil her commerce in the four quarters of the globe. Are the English so foolhardy, are her statesmen so puerile as to invite a condition that would hamper, menace, and, perhaps, destroy the one thing upon which she must rely if she hopes to win in this war?

Does anyone fear Turkey? She has no navy and is not a menace to us at home nor abroad. And what of Japan? Japan is a thrifty, progressive, and ambitious nation. She acquitted herself well in a 200 days' war with Russia, at her own doors, within a short radius of her own base. But suppose she had been called upon to attack Russia thousands of miles away from home. Would anyone entertain the belief that she would either have undertaken the task or would have stood any chance of victory? We have no cause of quarrel and are not seeking war with Japan. Will she attack us? Just now, with limited resources and an exhausted treasury as a result of the war with Russia, she has plenty to do in safeguarding and protecting the interests of England and her own in the Far East. She could not bring to her assistance the active aid of any other nation. She could not involve us in war with Europe, because the countries of Europe would not involve. She would have to fight her battle alone. It is the most ridiculous and nonsensical notion advanced by some that Japan could land an army on the Pacific coast and invade the domain of the United States. It would require a thousand transports each conveying a thousand men, with provisions, munitions of war, and equipment, convoyed by a hundred battleships to effect a landing and to secure a foothold on our shores. These could not come en masse, nor in a day, but would have to come detached, in installments, under convoy, and would be dispatched in succession as they arrived, if not waylaid at sea by our Navy and sent to the bottom. Japan knows this as well as we know it. Let no man nurse a thought nor harbor a dream that this will ever happen. War with Japan is only a remote possibility, now or hereafter, and if it ever comes it will be when we are involved in war with some nation which is foot-loose and free-handed to engage with us in the Atlantic. That time is not near. It will be many years before any other respectable military power will sufficiently recuperate to go to war with the United States. Hence I see no spectacle, feel no alarm, and fear no war in the immediate future from any source nor with any country.

Then why a great navy? We have a magnificent navy now. I favor such a constructive program as will maintain our relative place among the navies of the world. If Europe were at peace to-day and their navies not impaired in battle I would favor a continuation of the program which Congress has authorized in recent years, and I see no reason why that program should be altered or changed by reason of anything now occurring across the Atlantic. To my mind the lessons and the consequences of this war would argue for a reduction rather than an increase in naval construction. This because of the reasons which I have already stated, that Europe can not disengage herself at home and engage in war with us now nor in the immediate future and because of the impairment of their navies which must inevitably occur as a result of naval engagements from day to day, and for the further reason I hope and confidently expect world-wide disarmament as the one beneficent result of this awful conflict. I am not for the whole of this bill. I am not for any increase greater than that recommended by the department. I opposed in committee the increase of submarines and will vote here to limit the number to that recommended by the Secretary. I voted in committee against the hospital ship and the transport provided for in the bill and will vote to eliminate them here. I stand substantially for the rest of this bill, including two battleships. There is but one thing which I would add to this bill, and that would be a battle cruiser. I believe that the efficiency of our Navy would be materially enhanced by battle cruisers of maximum speed, and I hope that some day, if naval construction throughout the world continues, we will authorize the construction of cruisers and strengthen this arm of our Navy. I favor battleships because we can maintain the present efficiency of our Navy only by a systematic, uniform building program and offset deterioration by new construction. I have no patience with men who decry the battleship and disparage its usefulness. It is no argument to my mind to say that they have not actively participated in the present war. These constitute the main reliance which must determine the eventual outcome of the struggle. Lesser craft, including destroyers and submarines and scouting ships, may maneuver and harass the enemy in the front and in the rear, but in this war, as in every naval war, the time will come when the monsters of the sea, the dreadnaughts, will, like two great armies after preliminary maneuvers, strategy, and skirmish, come together and decide the conflict. In that awful clash, when the fatal test comes, when the fleets of contending nations grapple in a final struggle for supremacy, the side that can bring into action the best-equipped and the greatest number of modern battleships will win the victory and determine the fate of nations and the future of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART].

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I have no written remarks on this bill. It is my purpose only to make some comment on what seems to me an unnecessary degree of interest at this time in national defense. I shall discuss for a few minutes the European war as it seems to me it should affect our policy of national armament.

This war has demonstrated that a battleship is not an instrument of national defense and that it is not a weapon of offense in conducting a war under present conditions. The two greatest navies on earth are employed in this war as far as

possible. The greatest navy in the world has not knocked one brick off another on the soil of Germany after the war has been in progress nearly six months. The great dreadnaughts of the British Navy have not appeared anywhere near the coast of the enemy. For the first time in the history of Great Britain the British Navy has England between the navy and the enemy instead of having the navy between England and the enemy. It has been demonstrated that a battleship is the most helpless thing in the world when attacked from under water; on account of its ponderous weight it immediately sinks, and so far it has been more dangerous to the crew than it has been to the enemy. [Laughter and applause.]

This war has farther demonstrated that a navy can serve only one great purpose, and that is to protect the commerce of a nation that may be at war. The logical conclusion from this war is that the nation that can not be starved into submission does not need a single battleship in order to maintain a complete national defense. If the navy of England was at the bottom of the sea to-morrow, it would not be six months until that Empire would have to sue for peace, for the people would be face to face with famine. Britain must maintain her supremacy on the sea in time of war or starve, and so far she has been able to maintain that supremacy on account of her superior navy. The German Empire, fighting for its life, finds it unnecessary to expose its navy. It has food for its army and can maintain the struggle, while the British Empire must maintain its supremacy on the sea because it has not the food for its people or army without the ports of England remain open to the commerce of the world.

I would like to ask gentlemen who seem to be nervous at this time about our national defense which of the cripples are they afraid of. Every great nation but this one, as the gentleman preceding me stated, is at war. Great wars are always followed by periods of profound peace. The Napoleonic wars ended 100 years ago this year, in 1815. Then for a period of 29 years there was no war of any consequence in Europe until 1854, when the Crimean War occurred, and that was not a war of great consequence. The Crimean War and the disastrous invasion of Russia by Napoleon absolutely proved that a great continental nation can not be successfully invaded. Russia never was successfully invaded, and in this great war there is absolutely no attempt, and will be no attempt, to invade Russia. After the Crimean War there was a short war between France and Italy, and then in 1866 there was a six weeks' war between Germany and Austria, and four years later came the Franco-Prussian War.

Then for 43 years the two nations that represent one side of this struggle, Austria and Germany, were the only two great nations in Europe that did not fire hostile shots. Every other great nation that is at war at this time had war in that period with some other country, but those two maintained absolute peace for a period of 43 years. Now, who will say that after this European struggle is over that there will not be a long period of peace? If we are ever to have such a thing as international disarmament, it is going to come after this war is over. If it is possible to teach humanity that it is wiser and better to maintain peace, I believe this sacrifice will bring that lesson home to the nations of the world. It is again demonstrated that the little streak of silver sea that has protected Britain through all the centuries is just as effective now, if not more effective, than it was ever before.

If less than 100 miles at the widest and 23 miles at the narrowest place will protect England against the power of Germany what will you say to the 3,000 miles that separates us from Europe? Why, is it not plain that it would be impossible to conduct a successful war against the United States even if all the powers of Europe with all the navies of Europe were combined for the purpose? But we went into the expansion business some 20 years ago. We went out looking for nations to conquer. We took possession of the Philippine Islands. We have spent more than a billion of dollars holding those islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. I yield five minutes additional time to the gentleman.

Mr. TAGGART. In case of war between us and an Asiatic nation we would be obliged to hold those islands or surrender them. Then perhaps the question of the supremacy on sea will come to us, and then, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, the superiority of the battleships in mid-ocean may be tested. If those islands are protected by submarines their cities can not be attacked by any navy. If it is necessary in the protection of those and other islands to maintain our supremacy in the Pacific Ocean it is the only condition under which we can say that we would ever employ a battleship. But who would reason if he had charge over the Japanese Government that it would result in any profit to Japan to have a war with the United States?

Now, in these war colleges where young officers are studying they give to one group of young men the problem of invading the United States from Asia, and they give to another group of officers the problem of defending the United States, and the conclusion is always reached that the final result of such an attempt would prove that it would be impossible for an Asiatic nation to effect a permanent lodgment or to maintain an army on the soil of continental United States. If a foreign army invaded Alaska, it would be almost impossible to maintain it there. The only danger we could encounter would be the loss of the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, and we are trying to get rid of all responsibility in the Philippine Islands. If we do, we will have no place subject to attack in the Pacific Ocean except the Hawaiian Islands. It seems to me that if we should have a war with any nation and the enemy took possession of the Hawaiian Islands we could do as Germany is doing now with the little possession it held in China—just overlook the matter until the final settlement of the war. We would not need to speed our strength in defense of those little islands, but in the final adjustment of any war we might have they would be restored to us if we were successful.

Of all the times that we could ever feel safe it is now. Whenever great nations are preparing navies and armies, and those navies and armies have not been employed and militarism is at its highest pitch and military enthusiasm and navy enthusiasm pervades the great nations of the world, then is the time that peaceful and peace-loving nations are in danger. But now, when these fighting nations are exhausting each other's strength, until they are leaving each other prostrate and helpless, this is a time when we can afford to look forward to a period of profound and uninterrupted peace. [Applause.] I have here a list which I presume is correct, and it has been referred to in other speeches here, of 13 British vessels aggregating a tonnage of 133,000 tons, carrying crews in the aggregate of more than 8,000 men, all of which have been sunk to the bottom of the sea without a single shot having been fired at any of them, without the intervention of a single battleship—all of them sunk by submarine boats.

Vessels.	Class.	Tonnage.	Crew.	Date.
Amphion	Third-class cruiser	3,440	320	Aug. 6
Pathfinder	Patrol scout	2,940	268	Sept. 17
Hogue	Armored cruiser	12,000	755	Sept. 22
Cressy	do	12,000	755	Do.
Aboukir	do	12,000	755	Do.
Hawke	Protected cruiser	7,350	544	Oct. 15
Audacious	Battleship	23,000	900	Oct. 27
Hermes	Protected cruiser	5,600	456	Oct. 31
Good Hope	Armored cruiser	14,100	900	Nov. 1
Monmouth	do	9,800	754	Do.
Niger	Gunboat	810	85	Nov. 11
Bulwark	Battleship	15,000	781	Nov. 26
Formidable	do	15,000	750	Jan. 1
		133,040	8,023	

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. TAGGART. I should like about three minutes.

Mr. HENSLEY. I will yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. TAGGART. The tonnage of these ships is greater than the whole tonnage of the navy of Great Britain 110 years ago, when it was under the command of Nelson. Of what use is a battleship near a coast? If it is near the coast of its own nation, it is not as effective as a submarine boat.

If it dares approach the coast of the enemy, it is in immediate danger of being sent to the bottom of the sea. By the inexorable logic of war its place is in mid-ocean. Its function is to protect the commerce of a nation. Its purpose now is to allow a nation to be fed while it conducts a war; and, as far as our Nation is concerned, we could not be starved in any war. We have talked about the high cost of living; we have argued it from every angle; but I can not imagine anything that would so effectively lower the cost of living as to have all the navies of the world combined together to shut up the ports of the United States and forbid anything to leave this country. It would solve the problem. And I do not know of anything that ought to suit one of our great parties, which is so ably represented here this evening, as to have all the ports of the Nation shut up, so that we could not import anything. In their opinion, American business would flourish then as it never did before. That would be protection without revenue. I am afraid that

if such a thing ever happened that great political party, with its usual luck, would be restored to power.

We do not need to defend the highway of the ocean if any nation attacks us. Great Britain is not going to attack us. The centerpiece of the British Empire lying next to us has an unprotected frontier of 4,000 miles. Any trouble between us and Great Britain would mean the dismembership of the Empire. We have nothing that the Germans want except our trade and our good will. They do not want our territory. They want a market for their manufactures. We want their patronage; and I say here and now, while I digress from the subject, that of all the short-sighted policies that was ever pursued by the American press and some American people, the most unfortunate thing for us is for them to continue to heap insult on the most thrifty——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes of additional time to the gentleman.

Mr. TAGGART (continuing). On the most skillful, the most industrious, and the ablest people in the world—the people of Germany. [Applause.] We will have to look to them as customers when this war is over. Now, imagine a business man in the case where two of his customers were fighting, and he would go and hand a weapon to one of them. After the fight was over he would have one customer, the one he helped, and he would lose the customer that he had helped to injure. That great nation, that wants nothing but peaceful commerce with all the world, which maintains its army for its own defense and is now demonstrating to the world the supreme necessity of that army, does not want our territory, and has not, and never had, any purpose to attack the United States. The Germans have no cause of quarrel with us. We have nothing belonging to them, unless it is that we have with us their best blood, their most enterprising children, inheriting all of the great qualities of their ancestors, as true to our flag as their cousins are to the Fatherland.

I will oppose any more than one battleship in this bill. I will vote for all the submarine craft that is provided for in the bill. I will vote for everything in this bill that looks like national defense and against everything that looks like national offense. We should not prepare to carry war to any nation, but we should prepare to defend our coast against all the nations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes. The gentleman also asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND]. [Applause.]

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman and Members, I favor the pending bill. While it does not carry such character of increases as I personally favor, nevertheless I believe it is a decided improvement over any naval appropriation bill reported to this House since the Democratic Party came into control of this branch of the Government.

I listened to-day with a great deal of interest to the chief small-Navy advocate, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]. I knew that he was opposed to battleships, but during the discussion I became somewhat hopeful that he was at least in favor of submarines, because he spoke very highly of this character of defense, but in answer to a question I ascertained, much to my amazement, that he had not voted in committee for even the submarine increase, and as an excuse declared that he believed we had a sufficient number of submarines at the present time. I recall, however, in looking over the testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the commander of the submarine fleet, Commander Yates Stirling, jr., stated that when he was asked to appear for maneuvers on the 1st day of November last he was compelled to report that there was only one submarine on the Atlantic coast in condition to be submerged. So I do not feel that our submarine flotilla, according to that testimony, is sufficiently formidable at the present time to offer him a valid excuse for refusing to vote for the submarine increase carried in this bill. My own idea is that the gentleman is opposed to any Navy at all, and for that reason voted against both battleships and submarines.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I will.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you not think he was telling the truth when he named the number of submarines that we had?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. We may have obsolete submarines, but what good are they if they can not be submerged?

Mr. CALLAWAY. They might be out of commission.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. If they are out of commission, what use are they in case of a sudden war?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you know anything about the different submarines we have?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I know from the testimony, and I take it that is all you know about it. I have read it just as carefully as has the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You heard a gentleman speak here this evening and tell how many submarines there are. I assume he was telling the truth; in fact, I know it as well as anything I can hear.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I assume that the gentleman in command of the submarine flotilla was also telling the truth.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Who said that we did not have but one?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Commander Stirling said that on November 1 last there was only one submarine capable of being submerged.

Mr. HENSLEY. He never stated anything of the kind.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I have the testimony showing that he did. When he was called upon to report for maneuvers with the fleet he reported there was only one submarine fit to be submerged.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I will, if the gentleman will yield to me the time he takes up.

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman whatever time I take up.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman's statement was misleading. He made the statement that we had seven submarines on the Atlantic coast; five of them were in Panama and in good shape.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. But he said they were not equipped with the proper kind of torpedoes.

Mr. PADGETT. That is not the fault of the submarines. He said they simply had a short-radius torpedo. But in that connection I want to state that the range of the torpedo in our submarines has recently been cut down on the recommendation of the General Board, and even with its reduced radius it is superior to that of England or France, so there is nothing in that.

The fact is that there were five submarines at Panama in good condition. There were four at Norfolk, on their annual overhaul. There were some at New York undergoing their annual overhaul. He carried four with him to the maneuvers, but on the way one of them broke down—broke a crank shaft. The other two had batteries that were 4 years old, and they would not submerge well.

You will find all that recorded on pages 864, 865, and 866 of the hearings of Commander Stirling, so that at the time the gentleman refers to about there being only one, it was simply a date that had been selected when the others were taking their annual overhaul, as we do with our battleships and all other ships.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. In other words, you do not challenge my statement that when called upon to mobilize the submarine flotilla he made the report to the department that there was only 1 of the 17 submarines on the Atlantic coast that could be submerged?

Mr. PADGETT. No; he did not say that.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. He states that he made that report.

Mr. PADGETT. No. If you will look at pages 865 and 866 of the hearings you will see that he says this:

> I think I can explain where they got that impression. The commander in chief ordered a mobilization of the Atlantic submarine flotilla at Hampton Roads on the 1st of November of all available vessels. He left it to me to say what vessels I would bring down there. He did not consider the five at Colon.

He had already stated that the ones at Colon were in good condition. Then he added:

> That reduced the submarine flotilla to 12.
>
> Two of the 12 had but recently been turned over by the contractors. Their officers and men were new, and the boats had not been given their torpedoes; they had not left the navy yard. So I excluded them. That left 10, and 2 of them had been ordered by the Navy Department to have necessary alterations made on them at the contractor's yard at Groton.
>
> If the contractors had been ready to do the work, and if the department had held those boats up and sent them to Hampton Roads, they were perfectly able to go there and would have been efficient, but it would have cost the Government a good deal of money by holding up the contractors.

So that it was a matter of adapting the time so as to let the contractors fulfill their contracts.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. How many does that cut it down to?

Mr. PADGETT. Eight. Then he says:

Of the eight, one of them had, after a submerged run, developed salt water in the battery. It was sent to the navy yard, and they were reconstructing the battery tank, and at the time of the mobilization the alterations had not been completed; and that left seven.

[Laughter.]

The *G*–¼ had only been in operation a few weeks, and had only joined the flotilla a couple of weeks before that—about 10 days before the order came—and I considered that her best duty would be to train herself in submerged running, and that the best locality to do that was where she could base on some vessel that could look out for her crews more or less, and so I gave her the *McDonough*, an old destroyer, and based her on New London, and she went out two or three times a day and got in good shape.

Not that she was not able to submerge, but that it was better for her to do her work at another place. He says that left six. [Laughter.] Then the colloquy continues:

Mr. ROBERTS. The *G*–¼ was the Lorenti boat?
Commander STIRLING. The *G*–¼ was the Lorenti boat.
Mr. ROBERTS. You say her batteries are too weak for underwater running?
Commander STIRLING. No; but batteries are defective. That left six. Two of those were the *G* boats, under alterations and in reserve. So that left only four.

[Laughter.]

So I took the four submarines from Newport to the mobilization, and one tender, the *Tonopah*. When we left Newport the condition of the submarines was this: There were two boats in good shape in every way. There were two other boats with negligible battery capacity. They could submerge for 10 or 15 minutes only. Their batteries were dead. They were 4 years old.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. That left two. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. And the other, as I stated, broke a crankshaft. So that, as I said, there were a number in there that could submerge. All the others that could be submerged had been sent on their annual overhaul.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Well, the chairman of the committee having proven my case better than I could myself, I would like to yield him more time if he desires. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. You are perfectly welcome to my statement.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. According to the chairman's own statement he finally got down to my figures, showing that the small Navy Member, Mr. WITHERSPOON, when he said that we had an ample number of submarines did not make a statement that was entirely in accordance with the facts. Although we have submarines, we do not have the number claimed, at least in condition for service. The committee evidently felt as I do, because they gave an increased appropriation for submarines, and I commend the committee for its action.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee did vote it. The chairman did not. But permit me to say that every year we send our battleships to the navy yard for their annual overhaul. Because we send them there for their overhaul and to be docked that does not mean that the battleships are inefficient or that they are incapable. It was a routine matter that at that time they were there for their annual overhaul.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. All I can say in answer is that it is mighty fortunate for this Government that a sudden war did not break out with our submarine fleet in the condition in which it was found on the 1st day of November of last year.

Mr. PADGETT. On that very question Commander Stirling stated that if an emergency had arisen he could have had them all ready in 10 days or two weeks.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. A delay of 10 days or two weeks at the breaking out of a war might prove serious.

Mr. PADGETT. That does not amount to anything. Now, in order to clarify the subject further, I will read again. The question was as to whether there was anything the matter. He said:

No; nothing seriously or fundamentally.

Then, on page 906 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. These batteries that you spoke of in the other boats are simply exhausted by use, are they?
Commander STIRLING. By constant use; by charging and recharging.
The CHAIRMAN. That is just simply putting in new batteries, as you would have to do with any boat that you used that had batteries?
Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir; absolutely.
The CHAIRMAN. And that is the condition of those?
Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. And the other two that you mention, the Lake boats, they did not come up to contract?
Commander STIRLING. They never have.

Those were some that the Government has not yet accepted, and they have not yet been accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. And the department has not accepted them?
Commander STIRLING. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. And is requiring the contractors to put them up to contract?
Commander STIRLING. The Government is completing them at the navy yard, New York
The CHAIRMAN. And that they are doing?
Commander STIRLING. That they are doing; yes, sir.

And I may add that the Government is doing this at the cost of the contractors, they having requested the Government to do it. So that is the situation that was presented. These boats were simply undergoing their annual overhaul, as we do with our torpedo boats, as we do with our cruisers, as we do with our battleships; but it does not mean or argue that they were incapable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman five minutes out of my time, to make up for the time that I have used.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. The gentleman will have to yield me more than that, because the understanding was that I was to be yielded the time he used out of my allotted time.

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes, though I only took 5.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and he is now recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWNING. Have the 20 minutes expired which I yielded to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair is controlling the time. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON RECORD AGAINST AN ADEQUATE NAVY.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] this afternoon stated that upon the question of an adequate Navy the parties in this House had not divided, or, at least, that they were about evenly divided. Lest we forget, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that the first year the Democratic Party came into control of this branch of the Government they met in caucus and voted against a single battleship. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS], a Republican, moved, on May 28, to recommit the bill when reported from the Committee of the Whole to the House, with instructions to report back a provision for one first-class battleship. The amendment failed by a vote of—yeas 106, nays 140. Ninety-seven Republicans voted for the motion and but 9 Democrats. Going on record as against a single battleship were 137 Democrats and but 3 Republicans. A Republican Senate amended the bill by providing for two battleships, and the conferees were forced to finally agree to one.

In 1913 the naval bill as reported made provision for two battleships. An amendment was offered in the House to reduce the number to one. On this vote there were 174 ayes and 156 noes. Of those voting against two battleships, as recommended by a Democratic committee, were 146 Democrats and but 27 Republicans, while those who supported the two-battleship program and the Democratic committee were 102 Republicans and but 54 Democrats.

DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION TO BATTLESHIPS CONTINUES.

The Senate provided for two ships by a vote of 55 to 16, and of the 16 small-Navy votes 12 were Democrats and but 4 Republicans. When the conference report came before the House the Senate amendment for two ships was defeated by a vote of 144 to 168. Of the 144 voting in favor of two battleships there were 94 Republicans and but 54 Democrats, while those opposing the modest program of two ships were 147 Democrats and but 20 Republicans.

Having felt the pulse of the American people, the naval bill of 1914 came from the Democratic Naval Committee with an authorization for two ships, but even in the committee there were some recalcitrant small-Navy Democrats, and on May 7 1914, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], a member of the committee, moved to recommit the bill with instructions to report back a provision for one battleship only, which motion was lost by a vote of 106 in favor to 202 against, and of those voting for the small-Navy program were 96 Democrats and but 10 Republicans. This record is illuminating and conclusive in showing the attitude of a majority of the Democratic Party toward the American Navy.

PENDING BILL MORE IN HARMONY WITH PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

The bill now before the House authorizes 2 first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of their class and with the highest practicable speed. In addition, 6 torpedo-boat destroyers, 17 submarines, 1 oil-fuel ship, 1 transport, and 1 hospital ship are provided.

I want to say that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], the chairman of the committee, has, I believe, always, from the time he assumed the chairmanship of this committee and when he was the ranking minority member of that committee, been a firm advocate of an adequate American Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not want the gentleman to mislead. He uses the word "adequate." Sometimes I have supported one, and sometimes I have supported two, and in the last Congress

I favored three, so that I have accommodated myself to the wisdom of the occasion.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. The gentleman's wisdom has made his judgment sound. The program in this bill is in response to a well-defined public sentiment, which our Democratic friends are beginning to sense. The American people favor an adequate Navy. The advocates of a Navy capable at all times of upholding the dignity, honor, and prestige of this great Republic can not be classed as opponents of peace. Those who would neglect and weaken our Navy are the individuals who would jeopardize the peace of the Nation. I contend that one of the strongest influences for peace is a Navy strong enough to meet any international emergency.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT FAVORED.

I favor international disarmament, and would gladly vote in favor of this Nation joining in such a movement, but in the meantime let our Navy be equal to the world responsibilities that we have assumed. I am inclined to agree with the Secretary of the Navy, who honors us with his presence this evening, that this country would have a greater voice in urging disarmament while in a condition of preparedness than by allowing the impression to go abroad that we were weak, urging a peace program because we lacked an adequate Navy to protect our interests.

RESPONSIBILITY OF UNPREPAREDNESS WOULD REST UPON CONGRESS.

During the 11 years that I have been a Member of the House I have never failed to cast my vote in accordance with the views I now express. I have realized, as every sensible man must, that upon the shoulders of the Members of Congress would fall responsibility rest and the wrath of the people be visited should a sudden war find this Nation unprepared. Year after year I have heard the statement made on the floor of the House that the possibility of a war between this Nation and a foreign power was preposterous. Yes; and I have heard it just as positively asserted that a European war was almost beyond the realm of possibility. In this debate such statements will not be heard. Our small-Navy men have taken to the cyclone cellar.

VERA CRUZ INCIDENT.

With what suddenness we found ourselves in Vera Cruz. In this connection I may be pardoned for adverting to the fact that while there were some American citizens who wondered why we entered that Mexican port, there are many more who are in a quandary as to why we slunk away. It was an abandonment more than an evacuation. The only excuse for taking Vera Cruz was to obtain reparation from Huerta for indignities to the flag. It was a sudden and rather unexpected exhibition of backbone on the part of the administration which many Americans, irrespective of party, applauded. The demand for a salute of the flag was abandoned. We lowered the Stars and Stripes, yet unsaluted, and steamed out of the harbor; but scarcely had we weighed anchor when shots rang out from the shore signalizing the return of chaos then existing throughout the balance of Mexico.

HUERTA ELIMINATED BUT THE FLAG NOT SALUTED.

Oh, yes; it is true that while the flag was not saluted the demand for which salute brought us into Vera Cruz, resulting in the sacrifice of 19 American lives, we eliminated Huerta. Eliminated Huerta! For whom and for what purpose? What leader there to-day is one whit more desirable than the man we forced out to vindicate a policy? Has murder ceased? Do American citizens command any greater respect? Is American property any more secure?

LANGUAGE OF PRESIDENT INCONSISTENT WITH ACTIONS.

Does the language of the President concerning Mexico, uttered at Indianapolis on January 8, square with our performance at Vera Cruz? Here is what he said:

> It is none of my business, and it is none of your business, how long they—
>
> The people of Mexico—
>
> take in determining it. As far as my influence goes while I am President nobody shall interfere with them. Have not European nations split as much blood as they pleased in settling their affairs, and shall we deny that to Mexico?

Was it our business, then, to take Vera Cruz and shed blood to eliminate Huerta, although we may have disliked him? Have we not as much right to eliminate the bandit Villa or the bloodthirsty Carranza? Conditions in Mexico but emphasize the necessity for preparedness. Foreign nations hold us responsible, and will continue to look to this Nation while we see "that nobody interferes" during the continuance of the reign of terror.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNITED STATES INCREASING.

It should be borne in mind that up to 1898 the United States was almost isolated and was much less concerned with the affairs of the world, but the War with Spain brought in its wake the acquisition of the Philippines and Porto Rico and the independence of Cuba, the latter island coming under our protection.

MONROE DOCTRINE BROADENING.

As the years pass the Monroe doctrine seems to broaden and assume new significance, entailing greater responsibilities. We do not allow foreign nations to acquire territory nor secure a foothold in Central or South America. We practically guarantee them against invasion. Recently we have announced that no harbor or other property must be acquired on the American continent so situated that its occupation for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or safety of the United States. This broadening of the Monroe doctrine was set forth in the Lodge resolution which passed the United States Senate on August 2, 1912, by a vote of 57 to 4, the resolution reading as follows:

> *Resolved*, That when any harbor or other place in the American Continent is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other places by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another Government, not American, as to give that Government practical power of control for military or naval purposes.

The threatened acquisition by a foreign power of a base on Magdalena Bay no doubt prompted this resolution.

PACIFIC ISLAND POSSESSIONS INCREASE RESPONSIBILITY.

Hawaii and Alaska have both increased the demands upon the Navy. Tutuila and Guam and other Pacific islands of naval importance add to our responsibilities. The Panama Canal is now open and naval experts regard the Canal Zone as the most vulnerable part of our entire possessions, and yet we hear it argued that we have no use for a large Navy.

SANTO DOMINGO AND HAITI.

The Monroe doctrine is responsible for our present interest in the affairs of Santo Domingo, which Republic has proven so useful to the present Secretary of State in finding places for deserving politicians, a rather new and unique argument, advanced for the first time by a Democratic Secretary of State, in favor of upholding the Monroe doctrine.

The black Republic of Haiti, now presided over by two opposing Presidents, at this very moment calls for the presence of an American naval vessel. Are we to meet these responsibilities? If so, is not an adequate Navy essential?

EXPERTS DECLARE NAVY NOT ADEQUATE.

Is our Navy adequate? Naval experts tell us it is not. Admiral Fiske, in the recent hearings before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, declared we were behind other nations in mines and air craft. (See p. 1007, Naval Hearings, Dec., 1914.)

Interrogated as to how long it would take our Navy to get ready to fight, he declared it would take five years. (P. 1023, Hearings.) Asked if we were doing the essential things to make ready, declared we were not. (Pp. 1047–1050, Hearings.) Assistant Secretary Roosevelt declared that in case of war there would be a shortage in the Navy of between 23,000 and 43,000 men. (P. 932, Hearings.) He also made the statement that it would take the ships in reserve three months to get ready for actual battle. (P. 939, Hearings.)

Admiral Fletcher, when asked how many unharbored places there were on the Atlantic coast where a landing could be made in case our fleet was unable to prevent the approach of a hostile force, stated that in smooth water and fine weather they could land almost any place (p. 536).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWNING. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Commander Yates Stirling, jr., in charge of the Atlantic submarine flotilla, to whose testimony I have already made reference, told some rather unpleasant truths concerning our submarine strength, or rather lack of strength, for which action he was reduced.

When the vessels now building are completed by the various nations, according to the Navy Yearbook just issued by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the United States will be fourth in naval strength. Our ships lack speed, a fatal defect in the light of last Sunday's naval battle in the North Sea.

Had we followed the recommendations of the General Board since 1904 for a building program we would have authorized 38 battleships instead of 17. And this holds good for practically all of their other recommendations.

PACIFIC COAST LACKS PROTECTION.

It is admitted that the Pacific coast is not as well protected as the Atlantic. Naval strategists hold that it is unsafe to divide a fleet no less formidable than the one we now possess, and it has therefore been the policy to keep the fleet in the Atlantic. With the opening of the canal it is, of course, recognized that the Atlantic Fleet would be available in case of dan-

ger, provided, of course, that the canal was not rendered inoperative. With our Pacific possessions, and with the knowledge of the tremendous importance of that great ocean, and the problems it presents, it would seem important that we have a navy adequate to protect both oceans. We should have two effective units of the Navy. On April 10, 1908, on the floor of this House, I used these words:

> The people of the Pacific ask and insist—and their request is but reasonable—that there be permanently assigned to the far western seaboard of this great Nation a fleet of battleships commensurate with the growing importance of the Pacific.

The opening of the Panama Canal has, of course, resulted in a greater feeling of security on the part of the people of the Pacific coast, yet the necessity for a formidable Pacific fleet still exists. We also lack proper naval stations on the Pacific. The Atlantic coast is far better equipped.

FORTIFICATIONS USELESS WITHOUT A NAVY.

Fortifications are important on our great coasts, but these guns can do no damage to a blockading fleet if it keeps out of range. The Navy must drive off the enemy's ships. We were recently informed by Secretary of War Garrison, in response to a congressional resolution of inquiry, that there is no gun mounted on the fortifications of the United States proper more than 12 inches in diameter; that these 12-inch guns as mounted have a range of 13,000 yards, and that the larger dreadnaughts of the *Queen Elizabeth* type are equipped with 15-inch, 45-caliber guns with a range of 21,000 yards. In other words, one of these dreadnaughts of an enemy could exceed the range of our coast guns by 4 miles—but another argument showing the necessity of a formidable fleet.

WHAT THE NAVY MEANS TO GREAT BRITAIN.

In the present war Great Britain rules the seas, as she has since the days of Queen Elizabeth. Her navy has, to a very large extent, made of England what it is commercially and politically. In the present great European contest we are assuming a position of neutrality, but vexatious questions are continually arising. Americans are growing restive under the attitude of Great Britain toward our shipping. She laid down the terms upon which we can use the canal commercially, and we acquiesced in her terms.

It does not follow, however, that we will as meekly submit to a continuation of outrages to American commerce on the high seas.

It would seem to be the irony of fate that England was reported to be the first nation to violate the neutrality of the canal.

IS WAR POSSIBLE?

There never may be another war in which the United States may be involved, but is it safe to act upon that assumption? I sincerely hope that there will not be another conflict. It has never been denied, and can not be, that in May, 1913, and for several weeks thereafter, our gunners at Corregidor Island stayed at their guns night and day.

NECESSITY OF AN ADEQUATE NAVY.

The Spanish-American War was decided by the Navy at Manila Bay and Santiago Harbor. As has been stated so well, right backed by might is irresistible. We have a striking example of unpreparedness in the case of China, which nation, lacking an adequate army and navy, has suffered the greatest humiliation and been involved in costly and disastrous wars.

The United States can not assume its present position among the nations of the world without a navy commensurate with our needs. It is essential for the protection of our coasts, to guard the Panama Canal, to safeguard our insular possessions and dependencies, to uphold the Monroe doctrine, to protect our shipping, and to command the proper respect for our flag in every section of the world. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, believing that I have six minutes remaining to my credit, I yield that much to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to discuss the Navy in its relation to our foreign affairs, the Mexican policy, or anything of that kind during the few minutes that are allotted to me; but I want to call attention to one or two features of naval accomplishment, which I think are very commendable and reflect credit upon the present administration of the Navy. In the first place, it has always been my delight to look upon our Navy with a great deal of pride. I believe the American Navy has a record of unusual accomplishment, and every American is justly proud of its achievement. We on the Pacific coast do not know very much about the modern Navy, because we seldom see the big units of the Navy referred to as the line battleships, which constitute the real Navy. We do not see any of the real battleships out there. Since, by order of that President of whom a great and much-loved historian, now in the White House, said his administration was one that reflected great credit and was one of ideas, 16 battleships turned their prows toward Puget Sound as they skirted the Horn, we have not seen a battleship. They came; and they went; and they never came back any more.

We have a few little boats, a few cruisers, but if the canal is kept open, I understand, we will see some real battleships once in a while, and that some of those big vessels will guard our interests out there occasionally.

The Secretary of the Navy has done some things in connection with the internal management of the Navy that I think he ought to be given due credit for. He has instituted certain rules and regulations for the control of the men in the Navy. For one thing he has issued an order that shuts liquor out of the Navy. [Applause.] I believe the Secretary should receive hearty commendation and the backing of every governmental officer and every element in the national administration in that particular movement, and in the enforcing of that order.

I know something about the influence of liquor on men in the Navy.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman realize that the Navy League criticized the Secretary of the Navy for that order?

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, yes; but that does not make any difference. The Navy League probably had some champagne on the banquet board at the time they criticized the Secretary. [Laughter.] I do not care to enter into any crusade against the Navy League, for the league may be doing some good along some other lines.

It was impossible to keep the men free from liquor if the officers of the Navy indulged in that way and had their mess rooms filled with liquor and every vessel ladened with it. So I think the Secretary of the Navy is entitled to great credit for that.

He is entitled to great credit for the movement to open the door to men in the Navy along certain lines of instruction so they can spend some of their time acquiring a little learning that we are all craving. He has revised the laws and rules of the Navy as to the punishment of deserters, and removed from men the infamy and criminality of penitentiary service for desertion in many cases. For these things he ought to be characterized as a real progressive Secretary of the Navy.

Now, I want to mention just one other matter. We have heard a good deal said about the trusts and about men using various opportunities to supply the Navy for graft and all of that. There is more or less truth in that, no doubt. But I want to call attention to the fact that there is over in New York a commission on industrial relations asking questions of representatives of the great interests of this country that is doing more to revise and modify the conditions as between the great interests and the average citizen of this country—the working classes and others—than any other man or any other agency has been able to do in a generation.

I heard them ask Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., the other day a series of questions, and I tell you that that commission, with Mr. Walsh as chairman, is accomplishing a wonderful task. He led Mr. Rockefeller through a series of questions and demonstrated before this commission and those that were listening there and those who read the proceedings that Mr. Rockefeller was entirely incompetent to serve as a director.

It has been demonstrated in these hearings that Mr. Rockefeller has certain high-sounding principles which are very good. Mr. Rockefeller really believes in a certain high standard of idealism, as I am convinced; but when he was compelled to analyze those views in the light of certain facts, which he has set forth before the commission in response to the queries of Mr. Walsh, his ideals seemed to vanish for want of support by his acts. He was searched as to his views on all features of the labor problem, as to unions, and the rights of the workers. He soon demonstrated a weakness in execution and an ignorance as to the problems concerning the workers in the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. that made plain his incompetence and the rank injustice associated with absentee landlordism over such areas as were involved in this Colorado case.

It was admitted by Mr. Rockefeller that one Mr. Ivy was receiving $1,000 a month to produce publicity to send out to the public on the Colorado situation. One of the things Mr. Ivy was doing was to send to the Members of this House a bulletin at regular intervals on the strike out there. One of his bulletins told of how much salary the labor leaders were getting. In cases of political corruption on the part of Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. operators Mr. Rockefeller did not know that he would vote to discharge such operators. In cases of compensation to injured workmen Mr. Rockefeller was ignorant as to what

amount should be paid. Every phase was considered in the questions. No legal objections were offered or could be offered. The interrelation existing between Rockefeller profits and Rockefeller philanthropy was demonstrated. I heartily commend the work of Mr. Walsh and his associates. They are accomplishing more than anyone has the slightest idea of at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRYAN had leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

[Mr. SAUNDERS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, war is a horrible thing to contemplate; it never comes as a rule by choice or option of the participants, and the results are not what the people who go into it expect. People can be very certain and positive in their insistence that there is no symptom of war anywhere, and yet, like a clap of thunder out of a cloudless sky, it breaks, and you are in war when you do not expect it. The history of most wars is but a comment upon this fact. Even in Congress, in 1814, could have been heard assurances that we were out of danger at the very time the Capitol was soon to be burned.

I appreciate the position that the distinguished Member from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] has taken. I never have heard him speak that he did not edify the House; he speaks from a full mind and from conviction. I do think, however, that his conclusions are not altogether warranted to-night. I am not sure that unpreparedness, as he would have us believe, prevented the war in 1895 with England, and that preparedness had nothing to do with preventing it in 1867 with France in connection with Mexico. It seems to me the answer would be true of both cases if it was true in one.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to speak on that line. Remembering this day, January 29, I wish the membership of the House would think with me a few minutes upon the life of an Ohioan of whom we all are proud and whose memory is celebrated to-day throughout all the country. I refer to Ohio's great son, William McKinley. [Applause.]

Before entering upon that, however, let me remind the House, since war possibilities and defense have occupied the House, that we have had a few wars in our history, always had in the cost of life and treasure, but usually with results that were commendable. The first great war of vast importance to us was the French and Indian War, known as the Seven Years' War in Europe. The results to our Nation we do not yet appreciate, for that was the war that made it possible for this country to be the virgin soil of Anglo-Saxon democracy, rather than a Latin ecclesiasticism. It was not a conflict between two nations, but between two systems. It was settled at that time that here was to be planted the experiment of self-government based upon a free state, free church, and free school. But nobody could have believed in 1763, when the treaty of peace was signed and our country had but two and a half million people, that by 1915 we would be a Nation of English-speaking people double in population of that of any other nation speaking the language. No wonder that Lord Salisbury, in substance, said 16 months before he died, had it not been for the unwisdom of the mother country the capital of the British Empire might to-day be on the American Continent. Of course we are glad the mistake was made, for I do not think that this young Republic ever could have reached the plane under any other form of government that it has under its own. While it is true that in 1763 the treaty of peace finally decided that this was to be the birthplace of Anglo-Saxon democracy, the foundation had attached to it certain elements under which we could not progress. There was a modified system of feudalism; also the system of hereditary government with life tenure in office; also the system of primogeniture; also the system of entailed estate. While we say that the cause of the Revolutionary War was taxation without representation, that does not cover all of it.

The real cause of that war was these effete systems which obtained in the mother country and which she wanted to fasten upon this country, while the immediate cause was as stated. We went to war to free ourselves from these customs which could not be consistent with our ideas, and from 1775 until 1781 we fought the battles of independence in the Revolutionary War, with the result that the Republic, which had been born in 1763 by the first treaty of Paris, was given a new lease of life, when we started the real Republic in 1783 under the second treaty of Paris, 20 years after the first treaty of Paris. From that on until 1812 we had a period of wondrous growth, but in that year, after 5,000 American citizens had been impressed into the British Navy—I do not speak in the spirit of anger or criticism of Great Britain—but after those 5,000 had been impressed in the English Navy we went to war, covering years of dispute over England's contention on the right of search, the second war for independence, and ended it in 1815 a really great Nation before the eyes of the world. We should here remember that our Nation, differentiated by climate, soil, and occupation, and by what follows these differences, started two civilizations in this Republic, the one beginning with the cavalier on the James in Virginia and the other with the Puritan in Massachusetts, which ran in parallel columns in the western course of empire until finally the wave of southern civilization struck the rock of northern civilization, when our country went into the most dreadful vortex that is known to man—in the Civil War. One side was fighting for a principle of constitutional supremacy, born in the North out of natural conditions, while the other side was fighting for the rights of the States, born in the South out of conditions of nature. The one seemed to be embodied in the Hamiltonian theory of government, while the other in the Jeffersonian theory, and I hope that there is not a man on this or the other side of the aisle who can not see that without the Hamiltonian theory the Jeffersonian policy would not have been of value, and without the Jeffersonian theory the Hamiltonian policy would not have been profitable to the Nation. You can not have a nation builded as is ours with power or authority as one of the pillars and liberty as the other; you can not have a modern democracy built of a safe foundation without both of these fundamentals are recognized and represented.

The arch of the American Government is builded upon these two fundamental policies. One is power, authority, order in government embodied in national prerogative. That is Hamiltonian. The other is liberty, rights of the individual under government, and the rights of the State. That is Jeffersonian. Weaken one of these pillars that support the arch and you weaken the arch. We must preserve the Jeffersonian and we must have the Hamiltonian. We must preserve authority in the Nation and we must have the rights in the States. We must make a sharp distinction between the principle of State rights and State sovereignty. Dangerous would it be for this Nation if we ever forget the rights of the States. Dangerous would it be for this Nation if we should ever forget the prerogatives of the Nation. State rights must be maintained, State sovereignty must be surrendered. The State must maintain its rights in all matters pertaining to it that do not interfere with the Nation. The Nation must maintain its prerogatives in matters pertaining to all the States. We had a difference. That difference was fought out ultimately and settled, not that the Nation was to be wholly Hamiltonian, and not that it was to be wholly Jeffersonian, but it was to be a combination of the two. The contest between the two theories will continue. Our system keeps it alive, but never to be carried beyond debate. We see the Federal authority extended over the States to-day in wonderful fashion, but, strange to me, it is more on the Democratic side of the House than on the Republican side of the House. I think that I can say this without being offensive to the Democrats here, that I might say it is due to the fact that the party in power is always aggressive, always loose constructionists, always extending national authority, for no administration will willingly suffer embarrassment by refusing to do what seems to be the duty of the hour simply to maintain a position of consistency, even though it might seem a little stretch of the authority of the Nation. The party that is out of power is likely to become strict instead of loose in its construction, although loose constructionists when it is in power. The war closed in 1865. The results were world-wide in significance. The Nation was one in law, but there was a sore left, as might have been suspected. Four years of bloody strife would leave some sores hard to heal, even on both sides. One should not be surprised over such results. In 1898, on the 15th day of February, an incident occurred down here in Habana Harbor when 266 of our boys went down in the muddy waters of that bay. The morning after I walked the streets of a university town as a professor and noted in the countenances of citizens the promise of the tragedy of war to come. I spoke to the students as they gathered in front of one of the college buildings. They were wild. The sense of a national wrong was dominant, as the Nation's honor was at stake. They wanted to form companies; they wanted to call upon the governor of my State. In a word, they wanted to go to war. The most majestic figure—at least, one of the most majestic figures—our country has produced was the man at that time in the White House. He stood from February 15 until April 19,

from the day the *Maine* was blown up to the day when the declaration of war was made, like a majestic oak upon which the storm was beating. How he pleaded with the people of the country to suspend judgment, not to go into war; and yet, in spite of all influences against it, we went into war.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think the country would have insisted on war had it known as much as the President of the United States knew at that time, that Spain had yielded every point in all the demands made?

Mr. FESS. It only demonstrates the heroic passion, which may be fickle, of our public life as expressed in public opinion.

Mr. BAILEY. The people knew nothing of that.

Mr. FESS. You do not mean the public was not pressing the President upon this occasion?

Mr. BAILEY. The public was pressing him. The public did not know of the facts.

Mr. FESS. I thought you meant that it was not. I happen to know that the President of the United States did not want war—was doing all he could to prevent it; but it came, and it came like other wars will come, when we do not expect it.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. This insistence upon the part of the people for war was after the blowing up of the *Maine*, was it not?

Mr. FESS. Most of it.

Mr. HENSLEY. Have you ever contemplated what the future of this country would have been if the *Maine* had not been in the harbor of Habana at that time?

Mr. FESS. Do you mean if we had taken all our vessels off the sea?

Mr. HENSLEY. That was not the question. The gentleman understands that the *Maine* was lying right there in the harbor of Habana.

Mr. FESS. Yes; and the *Viscaya* was up in New York Harbor.

Mr. HENSLEY. And if the *Maine* had not been there, but had been at Hampton Roads at that particular time, have you contemplated what the history of the country would have been?

Mr. FESS. I do not want to enter upon that, but I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that he has suggested a thing that he ought not to have suggested. Probably I ought not to say what is in my mind, suggested by the interruption, but if in times of war we purchase ships of governments that are belligerent and put our flag upon them and send them across the sea and one of them is sunk, what will follow? In such a contingency it will be a bluecoat that is being attacked, and how long can you maintain the people of this country in a peaceful attitude if a thing of that kind would occur?

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FESS. I did not mean to inject that question, but it is worthy the consideration of those who see no possibility of war, especially at this moment.

Mr. DECKER. Well, you got it in.

Mr. FESS. It is in. Brother HENSLEY brought it in.

Mr. DECKER. I want to ask if the gentleman does not know that when we buy a ship either from a neutral nation or a belligerent nation, with the flag of this country on that ship, and that ship sails just the same as any other ship owned by a private individual, and along with that ship does not go the sovereignty of this country, that the people of this country are no more apt to take an interest in that private ship, because we do own only a small part of it, than if it was a ship of some powerful Ship Trust that would afterwards try to stir up a war and protect their own property if the ship was sunk?

Mr. FESS. My friend from Missouri may make the American people believe that what he has said here he believes will prevent trouble, but he will have a task on his hands to prove to the people that if the Government of the United States owns the vessel foreign powers do not fire upon the majesty of the Government if they fire upon that vessel. [Applause.]

Mr. DECKER. You mean to be understood that you are not willing to trust the intelligence of the American people in a war?

Mr. FESS. I mean to say that my friend from Missouri would be one of the first citizens to fire up quickly when the honor of the Nation was attacked, and you do not differ in that from the mass of our citizens.

Mr. DECKER. I do not want to take up your time, but I want to say that "the gentleman from Missouri" would not be any quicker to rise in defense of a ship owned by all the people than he would be to rise up against the defense of a ship owned by one American citizen.

Mr. FESS. When an attack is made upon all the people by not only attacking property belonging to them but their honor symbolized by the flag of their Nation, it is a little more serious than when made on one person or upon the property of a person or corporation.

Mr. DECKER. Why?

Mr. FESS. I do not wish to be discourteous——

Mr. DECKER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FESS. I have pretty nearly forgotten where you took me.

Mr. HENSLEY. We had you down at Habana, Cuba.

Mr. FESS. You will allow me to resume the consideration of the question before us.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to suggest an answer to the query of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FESS. I am afraid you will embarrass me.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no. I was going to say that when our flag is fired upon it is a very different proposition than when an American is killed by some Canadian fishermen, which happened a few days ago.

Mr. FESS. Your observation is most timely and true. Now, Mr. Chairman, why I rose was to call attention at this time of stress and storm to the attitude of McKinley, whose birth is celebrated to-day, upon war and his part in that of 1898. You say it was not so terrible. War is always terrible. It is nothing if it is not horrible. The President was not in favor of it. He had his reasons. He had in his life tasted war. He knew its probable consequences. He feared it might apply the match that would involve the world. He did what he could to prevent it at the cost of many friends and expense of virulent criticism from both Democrat and Republican, and it is the finest example that I know of the danger of this Nation going into war before it knows what it is doing, and I do not believe that my good friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is altogether right when he says that there is no possibility of our being involved at the time when all Europe is in war itself. I am afraid that that might be used as an occasion for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman think——

Mr. FESS. I regret I can not yield further. I am sorry.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yielded to my friend.

Mr. FESS. Well, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Do you not think that the nations that are now embroiled would hardly care to take on an additional adversary?

Mr. FESS. Well, I am of the opinion that some of them who are very seriously embroiled would like to have us on their side. [Applause.] There are two sides, you know. Each combatant would be glad to see us involved; if they could get us to take sides, it would be to their advantage.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman does not think that going to war with us will get us on their side, does he?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Democratic side of this House to think with me just a moment as to whether the war of 1898, bad as it was, did not have a result that paid for all that it cost? I do not extol war. Far from me to do so. But this war had one great result. Senator Dolliver related to President McKinley the desire of Gen. Wheeler to go to Cuba. The President at first declined on the ground that the general was old. "He is a good citizen. He can do more for the United States at home here in Congress than he can by going down there and being shot at and killed." And when Senator Dolliver, then a Member of this House, carried that message to Gen. Joe Wheeler, the general seemed not pleased with the statement that he ought to stay here and represent his section of country in this trouble. "For," he said, "I do not need to be here. No man needs to be here to represent my section of the country in this trouble," making it clear that there was no hesitancy whatever, when the trouble was coming, from any section of the country. The President was touched by the story of the general's wish to fight under the flag against which he had fought in 1861 and commissioned him. When Gov. Gen. Weyler said that the first thing he would do would be to land troops in Florida, where he would be met by people of the Southland, who would join him in a march upon the Capital, you remember that the mayor of New York City laconically announced that "when you are ready to do it let me know, and I will send the policemen of New York City down there to arrest all who come over for trespassing on American soil."

The statement was an insult that the governor general offered to our great Nation, and when the crucial point came, and

war was declared, what happened? More troops in proportion to the population came from the section that the governor general referred to than came from the northern section; and we saw how the grandson of Robert E. Lee marched with the grandson of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant against a foreign enemy. And if there was not any other single result of the war with Spain, here is one that I think all will agree was the great reward. The sore that was kept somewhat open by unkind utterances in the press and on the rostrum was healed, it seems to me, entirely, because we were fighting a common enemy.

If that was not enough, the incident that occurred in Buffalo soon after was. After the President had finished one of his greatest speeches, in which he said "Our greatness is not in war, our greatness is in peace; it is not in discord, it is in accord," and then was receiving the men and women who wanted to shake his hand. In the group there appeared one with his hand bandaged, as if it were injured; and we are told that the President, looking upon him, had upon his face an expression of pity. But while he took the President's hand in one hand, he pressed the trigger with the other, and fired two shots in quick succession, and the President fell into the arms of those who were about him. Do you remember what he said as he saw the men clamoring for the life of the poor wretch who had committed the deed? "Let nobody hurt him; let nobody hurt him." And as they took him down the street to Mr. Milburn's home he said, "Be careful how you break the news to Mrs. McKinley."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. FESS. When Dr. Mann, the surgeon, said, "Mr. President, we are going to operate upon you; the delay cost the life of one of our Presidents; we will not let it cost you your life." He replied, "You know best." And you all remember how from that fatal day until the end hope rose and fell with the passing hours. How well we all remember the story how, as they were about to apply the instruments, when they noticed the lips of the injured man moving, Dr. Mann, thinking it might be a dying message, pressed his ear to the lips of the President and heard his words, "Nearer, my God, to Thee; nearer to Thee." The hand of the doctor was almost palsied. He waited a moment and noticed the patient's lips again moving; he pressed his ear again and heard the words, "Angels to beckon me nearer to Thee." After days of suffering, and when at last the fatal moment had come, and when it appeared he had gone into his last sleep, his wife was taken away into an adjoining room. By the administration of oxygen he was revived. When he looked about, as if for her, she was brought back to him. To her he said: "Do not worry. It is better for us both. Good-by, all. God's will be done."

And President McKinley, who was born 72 years ago to-day, died, as he lived, one of the most beautiful and representative spirits America ever knew; and in these hours of war I think it is well for us to think of the man who tried to prevent war. [Applause.]

Among the lessons of his life we should consider, his policies for the Nation at this moment are of greatest importance. It is fitting to contrast his policies with those now in vogue.

As one nation is distinguished from another by various movements which distinctly mark each, so one generation in each nation is distinguished from another by the leadership it develops. The present day and leadership stands in sharp contrast from the last generation, with Ohio's most beloved son at the helm. In that day the dominant impulse was achievement. It had become a national passion. McKinley embodied in the best sense this national passion. He had devoted his time and had dedicated his talents to the Nation's largest possibilities in accomplishment. In this he best represented the inspiration not only of America's youth but of youthful America. What Emerson predicted for the individual, McKinley planned for the Nation. His passion was to see the United States absolutely independent of all the rest of the world in its productive ability. He religiously believed that duty demanded America first, just as life demands safety first. He contended that wise policy would develop all the Nation's natural resources, investing American capital, and the employment of American labor rather than going to Europe for goods. His slogan was, "Open our mills to American workingmen, not our markets to European-labor-made goods." His philosophy plants tin mills in America, not in Wales; it invests American capital, not European; it employs American labor, not foreign; it maintains a standard of living wage, not Europe's pauper hire.

McKinley's policy would manufacture in this country not only all the sugar we consume but much used by other countries, and at a price less than that paid to foreign producers. Under the fostering care of the McKinley theory our Nation has grown until it is now one and three-quarters times wealthier than the next wealthiest country on the globe. It has now double the railroad mileage of any two European countries. It has two-fifths of all the banking resources of the globe, including our own resources. We produce 40 per cent of all the pig iron in the world, 25 per cent of wheat, 60 per cent of coal, 70 per cent of corn, 65 per cent of cotton. It has the largest per capita circulation of all other countries. Its citizens, great and small, have larger deposits in savings banks than any other country. It has the happiest people on earth; better fed, better clothed, better housed, better educated; most public spirited of all the peoples of earth.

Only now and then do this people suffer an epidemic, caused by a spirit of unrest, due to an independence born of Republican prosperity. Twice since the advent of the party of Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, and McKinley has the Democratic Party afflicted the Nation by its free-trade propaganda—once in 1893-1897 and again in 1913-1916, 20 years later. Note the deadly parallel. In 1890, with the country enjoying great prosperity, capital fully invested, labor fully employed, the law bearing McKinley's name was placed upon the statute books. The cheap demagogue took the front of the stage and held sway until at the very height of the Nation's trade relations Cleveland was elected. The Wilson bill followed as an attack upon the employer of labor and in the pretended interest of the wage earner. The cheap propagandist attempted to assault the business integrity of the Nation's producers and at the same time promised to benefit the wage earner. He proposed to buy Europe's product at Europe's price without either displacing the American laborer whom he placed in competition with Europe's labor or even reducing his wage to the level of his competing wage earner in Europe. While few were so oblivious to the laws of production as to have faith in such promise, enough gave it credence to permit the experiment. What followed? Read the record. It is brief but complete. Democratic success at the polls. Tariff for revenue only, the Wilson bill. American markets open to Europeans. Cheap goods—American mills closed. Capital in hiding—labor out of employment—business generally paralyzed. Imports increasing, exports decreasing, buying more, selling less—balance of trade against us—gold going out of the country, deficiency in the Treasury—issue of bonds, suffering among the poor, soup houses installed by municipal authority, bread lines maintained by charity. Within three years loss to the country billions of treasure. In the face of such calamity quickly following upon the heels of universal progress under protection, the people called for a leader. Out of the masses came our hero. The honor belonged to the city of Canton to produce him.

Notwithstanding the hue and cry of the populistic nostrum vendor under the leadership of the present Secretary of State, who promised a cure-all in the famous 16-to-1 prescription, the people had been under the spell of the theorists long enough. They turned to the party of protection under the leadership of America's greatest protectionist, buried free coinage of silver together with the fatuous 16-to-1 pretense, and followed McKinley in the inauguration of the country's greatest era of prosperity.

For nearly 20 years the Nation has swept on in its marvels of growth to the point where it had reached the acme of greatness, where every man could find a market for what he had to sell, whether it was the product of the farm, the mine, the manufactory, or whether it was his capital or his labor—all found a ready market. Such states of prosperity produce more or less of independence. Hence the demagogic appeals find a hearing. The party of free trade, seeking an issue, admits a general prosperity but demands a "new freedom," whatever that means. I need not remind of how they succeeded. It is enough to say that the minority party slipped into power in both legislative and executive branches of the Government. When you read the record since 1913 you will think you are reading from a history of Cleveland's days. Democratic success at the polls; the Underwood bill; imports increasing, exports decreasing, American mills closing, American industries paralyzed, American labor out of employment, balance of trade against us until war-ridden Europe had to be fed; gold going out of the country; deficiency in the Treasury in spite of war tax; suffering universal in the cities; soup houses again in-

stalled; bread lines the longest in our history. And all this in the fact of the promise that no legitimate business will be hurt. When these assaults were being made threats were heard from Mr. UNDERWOOD and Secretary Redfield that any firm that reduced its output or slowed down would be investigated. Instead we now hear of the Socialist proposition that a Federal employment bureau must be created to find work for the unemployed. There is one employment bureau that we can afford to employ—American industry. President Wilson's psychological remedies will deceive no one.

As the people 20 years ago refused to be misled by political propagandists and returned to a protective tariff as a permanent remedy, so this year they refused to be caught up by high-sounding phrasing of "new freedom," "emancipation of business," "constitution of peace," and "watchful waiting," and again turned to the party committed to the principle of protection.

It is difficult to understand the credulity that could see in the European war distress to American industry. It is the one only item to save us from the blighting effects of a bill that not only paralyzed our home industries but suggested the iniquitous stamp tax as a remedy, which at best can be but temporary. The war, in the extent that it disturbs European production, annuls foreign competition with our labor, the very purpose of a protective tariff. In that degree it leaves the American market to be supplied by our own producers and loudly calls us to the foreign market, now unsupplied by the European producer, whose ability is arrested if not destroyed.

The recent election proved that the people of this country could not be deluded by such appeals, and they registered their protest in no uncertain tone. It is not the mere cutting down of a Democratic majority in the House from 145 to 30, but the nearness with which that majority came to being turned into a minority. The elements which prevented it will not be present in 1916. The work begun in 1914 will be completed by 1916. The policies of Wilson will give way to those of McKinley.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to have the allotment of time which I expected to use in the discussion of this bill taken by my eloquent colleague from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. It seems to me that after hearing such a clear and philosophic discussion as he has given us it would be a discord to enter into a detailed comment upon this bill. I would not feel justified in doing it, even if time permitted.

However, let me say here that I am opposed to war and the spirit of war. Great armies and great navies create a warlike spirit in a people, and therefore I oppose great Army and great Navy appropriations. The taxpayers' money can be spent for better purposes. It is foolish to say that preparation for war averts war. It rather invites it. Look at Europe. What is the cause of the war hell now raging in Europe? The fault does not lie with the masses of the people of any country. The greed for property and lust for power of the great leaders of all the nations built the great armies and navies with which they first frightened and now destroy each other. Jealousy and hate are born of greed for wealth and lust for the land of other men. Shall we, as a Nation, yield to that same base avarice that has wrecked the civilization of Europe and brought hopeless woe upon her helpless millions? Shall we foster the spirit of war? If so, let us build great battleships and organize great armies.

Is there no danger in the spirit we foster? This talk of trade and profits, these schemes of capturing commerce lost by warring nations, this marketing while half the world lies bleeding and broken, may be business and may be legal, but it does not look good to me. It is more cold-blooded than stealing from the dead, for it takes food and drink from the wounded while they suffer. To what bottomless depravity does greed drive men and women? Some of us are so low and base that we rejoice in this cruel war, because it makes our profits larger, God help us.

But what shall be said of us as a nation, if for the profit and gain of greedy men we add to war's horrors and increase its roll of dead? What shall be said of our honesty as a Government if we take sides while pretending to be fair and neutral? Dare we pray for peace, like hypocrites, while we trade for profits in the hellish weapons of war?

ARE WE OUR BROTHERS' KEEPERS?

To hand weapons to angry, quarreling men is to invite the brand of Cain. To sell guns for gain to warring nations is adding avarice to the crimes of lust and murder, and men who will do it are akin to demons without any of the decent instincts of the brute creation. But what shall we say of our Government, representing us all, if it permits great, brutal corporations to sell shot and shell and hellish guns without limit to England and Russia and their allies when they know that Germany and Austria can not even buy our life-giving bread and meat? If that be neutral, neutrality has two faces, and both are false. If that be international law, international law books should be burned for the benefit of cold-blooded, international lawyers who quibble while trades thrive on widows' hearts and tears. But selling arms and munitions of war to the allies under present conditions is anything but neutral. It is unfair. It is un-Christian. It is greedy. It is base and un-Christian, greedy and unfair; it is murdering for money.

We are told that it would be an unfriendly act to refuse to sell war material to England. Therefore we must permit England to violate the plainest principles of international law by stopping our ships and taking our cargoes of food sent to starving women and children in Germany, and we must at the same time keep on manufacturing and selling to England guns and powder with which to shoot us later, if, forsooth, she should conclude to take our ships as well as our cargoes, and in case we resist. Is our Government afraid of the English Navy or is it because too many of us now in office are deep in our secret hearts in favor of England and against Germany, while we profess to stand on neutral ground?

At the beginning of this war my sympathies for France and Belgium were profoundly stirred by the published reports of the desolation wrought upon the people of those countries, but it was not long before I learned the deeper meaning of the awful tragedy and that fundamentally both sides were at fault and equally at fault in permitting the spirit of greed and imperialism to shape their courses. All deserved sympathy in equal degree, for all were reaping the bitter fruit of avarice and selfishness. They were, as nations, equally sick and equally mistaken, because they had permitted blind leaders to guide them and had forgotten the justice, fraternity, and statesmanship that Christ had taught in Judea.

We have in this country many men and women who came from Germany and Austria, whose hearts beat in sympathy with their struggling countrymen and who naturally grieve to see the Government of this land of their adoption and which they love with brave devotion lending itself to the service by indirection of the enemies of their fatherland. Our fellow citizens of German and Austrian blood are among our very best. They are loyal and devoted to the Stars and Stripes and to all that our flag stands for in nationhood and in honor. They are peace-loving, justice-loving, home-loving men and women. They are Americans with all their might and all their hopes, and as Americans they have the right, for the sake of America herself and for the sake of humanity, to join with all the rest of us who think more of human beings, of broken hearts, and tears, than we do of trade and profits, in demanding that our Government should stop the sale of munitions of war to any of the nations at war. To demand it in the name of God.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that I may revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, the naval bill under consideration carries $148,589,786.88, $4,000,000 more than the bill carried in 1914. In 1913 the bill carried $140,800,000, which was $4,100,000 less than the bill carried last year, and in 1912 the bill reported from this committee carried $123,000,000, which was over $17,000,000 less than the bill in 1913. The naval appropriation bill has been increased from year to year since 1897, when it carried only $33,003,224.03, over $100,000,000 less than the bill now carries. Since 1899 up to the present time, a period of 16 years, we have spent on our Navy $1,645,000,186, which represents about 50 per cent of the total volume of money in circulation in this country on the 1st of January last. It is stated that we are now spending each year on account of past wars and in preparation for wars which we all trust may never come about 70 per cent of our total revenues from every source, leaving only about 30 per cent of our revenues to be expended on the account of all the other multitude of purposes for which government is organized—for courts, for education, for public improvements, for the advancement of commerce, for agriculture, and for numerous other purposes. During the last 16 years—since 1899—Germany has spent on her navy $1,237,915,960. For this same period of time we have spent over $400,000,000 on our Navy more than has Germany. It is, therefore, plain that Congress has not starved the Navy. Is it fair that more than 50

per cent of the total revenues derived from all productive efforts throughout the country should be converted or perverted for destructive purposes?

If our Navy is no stronger than some gentlemen on the floor of this House would have you believe it is, then I insist that there should be an inquiry to ascertain the responsibility for the reckless expenditure of these enormous sums of money; and following the ascertainment of that fact, if it is a fact, as charged, that our Navy is inadequate, those who are responsible for this criminal waste in the disbursement of these vast sums should be held personally responsible. These same gentlemen who insist that we are wholly unprepared and that we would be entirely helpless to defend our country against an invading enemy attempt by comparison to show that our Navy is inferior to the navy of Germany. Some of the gentlemen in the Navy Department, under whose direction and supervision these vast sums are expended, profess to believe the same thing. If this is true, then these gentlemen in the Navy Department owe the American people an explanation. It certainly is an unfavorable admission on their part; and if our Navy is really inadequate, to authorize additional battleships will not promote the efficiency, as has been demonstrated by the present European conflict. It is not the battleships of Germany that has kept back the great combined fleet of England and France.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I have heretofore stated, these vast sums are appropriated from year to year without any regard to the real needs of our Navy, sacrificing the very thing in which these gentlemen appear to have such a deep interest—the adequacy of the Navy. The theory has been urged that preparedness in a military way on the part of a nation was a guaranty against war. This theory has been exploded by the European war, and if this Congress authorizes additional battleships another reason must be assigned therefor.

Many people heretofore believed the argument that preparedness prevented war, but since the naval bill was before Congress last year we have had some lessons taught us, one of which is that the doctrine of preparedness in a military way on the part of a nation as an insurance against war and a guaranty of peace is fallacious and silly. I did not believe this doctrine heretofore any more than I believe it to-day. I believed then, as I believe to-day, that preparedness on the part of a nation, like preparedness on the part of an individual, is not only calculated, but is most certain, to incite trouble and bring it about. History does not record an instance where a nation has been better prepared for war than was Germany at the outbreak of hostilities in the present European conflict. Did preparedness on the part of Germany insure peace? Not by any means. Preparedness on the part of each and all the nations involved in this titanic struggle produced, naturally enough, a feeling of apprehension, a feeling of nervousness. Each nation was alarmed over the prepared state of all the other nations, and when the first overt act was committed by one of the nations the other nations were seized with fear, and, all nations being prepared, the campaign of slaughter was precipitated throughout continental Europe. We all recall very clearly how Germany called out to Russia to quit mobilizing. The tension at that time throughout Europe was high, but Russia did not reply to the demand of Germany excepting to keep her hand on her weapon. Germany, figuratively speaking, said: "I have an automatic in my pocket; I am prepared"; and in that way, just as individuals frequently do, the weapons were drawn, the fatal shot was fired, and now all Europe is staggering from the effect of a campaign of carnage and murder, the greatest war since the dawn of creation.

Dr. David Starr Jordan a few Sundays ago, in a lecture here in Washington, declared that he was so certain that this conflagration would break out in Europe that 18 months prior to actual hostilities he went to Europe and, going from country to country, he studied conditions which, as he saw them, rendered escape from war impossible. He unhesitatingly checks the responsibility of this war up to the military people, and says that preparedness on the part of nations will as certainly eventuate in war, as certain as will two trains collide when running on parallel tracks at the same rate of speed, the tracks converging at a given point; in other words, that there is no means of escape. There was a time when individuals carried upon their person concealed weapons. It was an approved practice, and frequently men, because of trivial differences, were called upon the field of honor, and their lives went out, where nothing was involved. It was regarded as most honorable and courageous on the part of those who acted in this fashion. We know to-day that it requires more courage not to fight than it does to fight. We know to-day that it is cowardice on the part of an individual that prompts him to carry concealed weapons. The people of the Nation, when public sentiment was properly aroused, succeeded in stamping out the last vestige of this criminal practice, and I hope and pray that at the conclusion of the present conflict in Europe mankind will be wise enough and courageous enough to turn away from this barbaric practice that prevails in Europe to-day, and that reason may be enthroned and the criminal slaughter of men, women, and children may be averted forever thereafter. But I was asked a few days ago, "Would you have this Nation recede and go backward from the place she now holds in the catalogue of nations and become a China?" I answer the question, "No"; but the difference between our state of civilization and the civilization of China is not the difference based upon gunpowder and deadly instruments of warfare, and to me it seems so silly for anyone to so construe it.

It has been said that the future and the destiny of Europe in the last week of July was in the hands of a group of men numbering not over 50, and that what they did was never known to their respective nations in any detail until after the fell Rubicon had been crossed and a world war had been precipitated. Do you suppose that those nations engaged in this present war, if they could be restored to their former state before this war broke out, would be as ready to take the fatal step now, seeing and appreciating just what their experiences would be, as they were at the beginning last summer? Do you not believe that these 50 men would desire that others should share some of the responsibility of this world's tragedy? Do you suppose, even if those responsible for this war were ready to take this grave step, that you could marshal the millions of men upon the field of slaughter to-day? In other words, do you not suppose that if one should have gone to Europe before this war broke out, and had called out in trumpet tones to those countries that you wanted so many millions of men of Germany, so many millions of men of Russia, so many millions of men of France and of England; that you wanted the very flower of the country, the kind of men by whom the race should be perpetuated—that they would have asked you for what purpose? And do you suppose, if you had advised them that you wanted these people, together with billions of property to be destroyed, simply to entail upon the children yet unborn an indebtedness the burden of which will bow their forms to the grave, that those countries would have responded? And what more is involved in this struggle? Who brought it about? What good purpose will it serve when those countries are devastated? Mr. Chairman, as I see it, it is all the result of this mad, nonsensical, idiotic rivalry that has existed for many years between the nations of the world to excel each other in armament. On a former occasion I declared that the militarists of a nation feed upon their own appetites.

I described the appetites of the militarists as a great chasm, as a great opening into which we pour millions of money annually, and that the larger the amount we pour into it the larger becomes the cavity and the more insolent it becomes when it returns for increased appropriations. Mr. Chairman, if we authorize the building of one, two, or three battleships per year the other nations would authorize a like number, and at the end of the year our positions would, relatively speaking, remain the same. It is a beautiful system of rivalry which inures to the benefit of the great supply concerns and shipbuilding concerns. At all times there is an interchange of ideas with reference to improvements in the navies. Our Navy will steam out from Hampton Roads with an admiral and the very flower of the Navy officering the fleet and it will visit the different ports of the world. No sooner does the fleet reach a foreign port and has cast anchor until the boats are lowered and other boats come to meet the steamers and the representatives of the foreign nations are brought aboard these great dreadnaughts. These representatives are taken on board and every courtesy is extended to them. They are assured by the treatment they receive that they are among their friends, and only incidentally are the great engines of death pointed out to them and they are told, not in so many words, but practically, that while our relations with you and your country are friendly, we desire to call your attention to our state of preparedness, so that you will know exactly what we can do to you in case of hostilities. Nor does that end the perniciousness of this practice. When the fleet has made its rounds and returns to this country it all results in what? Ere long those countries visited respond to the spirit that is disseminated and to suggestions which have been made, and those countries authorize additional increases, and then at once the representatives of this great establishment here rush to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House and of the Senate and they point with apparent apprehension to the actions of these other nations in making increases, and then, with all the eloquence of which they are capable, they appeal to the committee to respond with increases. Nor does this tell it all.

The same class of profit-sharing individuals who are present here at every session of Congress and who are disseminating this sort of spirit throughout the nations by means of the press, these men who are urging by every means within their power that we increase the armament of this country, are present in those other nations urging them to make additional increases; and let me say here and now, Mr. Chairman, that if we had a Navy to-day twice the size of the one that we have, if no nation on the face of the earth could float a navy comparable with ours, even then, without regard to the tax burden on the masses of the people, or even the adequacy of the Navy, they would urge increases with the same vehemence and earnestness that they are to-day. Can you hope to satiate their appetites? Never, so long as the world stands. I favor an adequate Navy for defensive purposes, and for defensive purposes only, but I refuse to let those who get a profit out of the increases be the judges of what constitutes an adequate Navy.

I have maintained all the time that the state of preparedness on the part of a nation determined its degree of aggression. In other words, that if a nation was thoroughly prepared her rights would not be predicated upon equity and justice, but would be based entirely upon the country's ability to enforce those rights because of her state of preparedness. In this connection I desire to quote from the testimony of an admiral in the Navy at the hearings before our committee at the last session:

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Do nations fight to maintain their rights without any reference to whether they are as powerful or less powerful?

Admiral VREELAND. I think the aggressor is generally the more powerful nation, because he thinks there is something to gain by warring, and the other party to the contest is forced into it.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The aggressor, according to your idea, would go into war because he thought that he could win in the war; is that your idea?

Admiral VREELAND. He would not become the aggressor if he were sure of defeat.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. I intend to take only a few minutes to make a little statement.

Mr. FARR. The gentleman quoted Admiral Vreeland a little while ago.

Mr. HENSLEY. Very well, I will yield.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman state what Admiral Vreeland said in regard to the number of wars that we have had because of unpreparedness?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That was a mere opinion.

Mr. HENSLEY. That was a mere opinion and I shall not enter into that. I have not the time nor the disposition.

And further in this connection in support of the position I took I inquired of the admiral if the Navy that this country had during the Cleveland administration would in any sense compare with the navy that Great Britain had at that time, and he answered me that it would not. I then asked him how he accounted for the fact that Great Britain acceded to our position concerning the Venezuelan dispute. He answered me that the concession of Great Britain to this country was not contingent upon the size of our Navy; that Great Britain took her time and that when she saw that our position was a just one she acceded to it, but that if we had had a stronger Navy we could have been more aggressive and insistent, but, gentlemen, a part of that statement did not remain in the hearings after his testimony was audited. Statesmanship, based upon common sense and not militarism based upon a tax-burdened people, is what we need. Secretary Bryan when delivering the conclusion of this Government upon the California alien-land proposition, was asked, "Mr. Secretary, is this your last word?" The Secretary replied, "Baron Chinda, there is no last word between friends." If Secretary Bryan does nothing more to distinguish himself during his administration as Secretary of State, that alone is sufficient to add luster to his administration.

But, Mr. Chairman, if all these considerations should be dismissed at this time, if it is our purpose to ignore the great blood-bought opportunity that is being presented to us now to bring about an agreement between all the nations for disarmament at the conclusion of this war, if we fail to recognize the opportunity that is presented to this great Nation and refuse to appropriate a dollar toward the attainment of that capsheaf of all statesmanship, but stand upon the inhuman, uncivilized, and barbaric premise that a nation is only considered valuable and potential according to her state of preparedness and her ability to enforce her demands, even then it is a criminal waste at this time to appropriate the people's money for additional battleships without knowing what the conclusion of this great war in Europe shall bring forth.

The war in Europe has demonstrated that it is not the dreadnaughts which constitute the fighting efficiency of the Navy. The great combined fleets of England and France are impotent because Germany will not come out from behind her mines and forts and wage an unequal battle against superior numbers. The submarine has so thoroughly demonstrated its superiority over the battleship that it is reported that England has instructed her officers "to steam away from the vicinity of submarines at full speed, even if it is necessary to abandon a torpedoed sister ship and its drowning crew to their own fate." Is there anyone in this body who has not discovered that it is not the dreadnaughts of Germany that prevented the battleships of Great Britain from approaching their ports, but that it is the submarines, it is the mines, it is the air craft of Germany that has prevented the allies from approaching her ports. But suppose that this war had demonstrated that battleships are the best engines of defense, which is contrary to the facts, even then we would not need additional battleships now, for the reason that at the conclusion of the present foreign war all European countries will not only be indisposed, for at least years to come, to become embroiled in another war, but it will be a physical impossibility for any of such nations to carry on another war. And further, it was admitted before our committee, that no European nation would, under any circumstances, think of sending as much as 50 per cent of her naval strength against us; and that, as a matter of fact, the aggressive nation should have a naval force 50 per cent stronger than the defensive navy, which means that one of our battleships would be equal to four battleships of a foreign navy sent against us. The situation that is presented to any thinking individual by this war in Europe makes him apprehensive as to whether this shall be a war of extermination. Yes; one side or the other will be victorious, but I am afraid there will be few left to celebrate, and certainly they will not hunger and thirst for more wars right soon. Everyone appreciates the fact, as these European nations weaken each other, that from a military standpoint, relatively, we become stronger. Our Navy is much stronger to-day, for instance, on that account; and by the time this war is ended who can tell but what we may have the strongest Navy in the world? Up to the present time, so far as reported, the loss of the various nations has been as follows:

List of men-of-war lost by belligerents from July 1, 1914, to Jan. 1, 1915.

[NOTE.—Does not include "interned" vessels.]

Type.	Number.	Name.	Tons.
ENGLAND.			
Battleships	3	Audacious	24,000
		Bulwark	15,000
		Formidable	15,000
Armored cruisers	3	Aboukir	12,000
		Cressy	12,000
		Hogue	12,000
Cruisers	3	Hawke	7,350
		Good Hope	14,100
		Monmouth	9,800
Light cruisers	4	Amphion	3,360
		Pathfinder	2,940
		Pegasus	2,135
		Hermes	5,600
Auxiliary cruisers	2	Oceanic	17,274
		Rohilla	7,400
Torpedo gunboats	2	Niger	810
		Speedy	810
Destroyers	2	Bulfinch	370
		Name not given [1]	
Submarines	3		2,000
Mine sweepers and trawlers	11		(?)
Training ship	1	Fishguard II	
GERMANY.			
Armored cruisers	3	Yorck	9,750
		Scharnhorst	11,420
		Gneisenau	11,420
Protected cruisers	8	Ariadne	2,618
		Koeln	4,280
		Mainz	4,280
		Hela	2,003
		Konigsberg	3,348
		Emden	3,592
		Leipzig	3,200
		Nurnberg	3,396
Small cruiser	1	Madgeburg	4,478
Auxiliary cruisers	11	Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse [2]	12,952
		Cap Trafalgar [3]	18,710
		Comet	977
		Itolo [4]	299
		Rhios [4]	150
		Bethania [4]	7,518
		Markomannia [4]	4,595
		Spreewald [2]	8,899
		Graecia [2]	2,753
		Ophelia [4]	1,153
		Soden [4]	150
Gunboats	8	Cormoran	1,604
		Iltis	885
		Jaguar	880

[1] Ran ashore off Scottish coast.
[2] 5, tonnage unknown; 6, tonnage, 1,301 tons.
[3] Sunk
[4] Captured.

List of war ships lost—Continued.

Type.	Number.	Name.	Tons.
GERMANY—continued.			
Gunboats—Continued.		Tiger	886
		Luchs	886
		Möwe	640
		Hedwig von Wissman	300
		Planet	640
Destroyers	9		3,953
Submarines	2		900
Mine layers	3	Konigen Louise	2,163
		Rufin	
		Name unknown[1]	
Battle cruiser		Goeben[2]	22,635
Light cruiser		Breslau[2]	4,478
RUSSIA.			
Armored cruiser	1	Pallada	7,775
Cruiser	1	Zhemtchug	3,130
Auxiliary cruiser	1	Prut	5,440
Gunboat	1	Donnetz	1,224
FRANCE.			
Gunboat	1	Zelée	636
Destroyers	3	Mousquet	298
		347	97
		348	97
Submarine	1	Curtie	392
JAPAN.			
Cruiser	1	Takachiho	3,700
Destroyer	1		380
Torpedo boat	1		82
Special service	2		424
TURKEY.			
Battleship	1	Mussudyeh	10,000
Gunboat	1	Burak Reis	502
AUSTRIA.			
Cruiser	2	Kaiserin Elizabeth	3,937
		Zenta	2,264
Monitor	1	Temes	433
Torpedo boat	1		78
Training ship	1	Beethoven	

[1] Captured off Havre disguised as French collier. [2] Sold to Turkey.

And, furthermore, we should wait until after the close of this war before building additional battleships in order that we may in the construction of battleships if, indeed, it is then desirable or imperative, avail ourselves of all the lessons taught by this war.

We have just passed the centennial anniversary of the treaty of Ghent, a period of 100 years of peace with Great Britain, and we are living along by the side of the citizens of that country in perfect peace and harmony. We have never had a serious quarrel with Germany in our whole history. People from every country on earth have been pouring in here since this Nation was born, going into that great crucible out of which has come a type of manhood and womanhood the peer of any in the world. It seems to me that there is not only no excuse for authorizing additional battleships now, but that we should not place the stamp of approval upon this great carnage in Europe by going forward at this time.

I would be glad to see at least a million of dollars carried in this bill to promote peace, to bring about international disarmament at the conclusion of this horrible slaughter of men—one million for peace and one hundred and forty-eight million dollars for war! We should let the word go forth from this great Nation that we have the courage and manhood to do right in the midst of difficulties.

I shall ask leave to print the following letter from Lord Bryce, of England, addressed to Dr. Eliot, as follows:

Most persons in this country, speaking of England, including all those who work for peace, agree with you in deploring the vast armaments which European States have been piling up, and will hope with you that after this war they may be reduced, and safely reduced, to slender dimensions. Their existence is a constant menace to peace. They foster that spirit of militarism which has brought these horrors on the world, for they create in the great countries of the Continent a large and powerful military and naval caste which lives for war, talks and writes incessantly of war, and glorifies war as a thing good in itself.

Splendid letter, stating the situation clearly and nobly. Why can we not see it in this light and act accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 17 minutes.

[Mr. BARKLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the House this evening, the hour being so late, and so I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of the civil service.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have some time left, and I promised the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY] that I would yield him 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have neither the ability nor the disposition to discuss this measure from the technical or professional standpoint. If we are to accept the theory upon which it is drawn, there is really an end of the discussion, for it can not be doubted that the great committee which is responsible for it, and which stands behind it with what it evidently regards as an unassailable array of facts, has done its duty in accordance with those facts in fullest measure.

But I refuse to accept the theory.

I refuse to believe that any such preparation for war as it implies is necessary or even excusable.

I refuse to believe that we are promoting peace and national safety by spending almost $150,000,000 on the Naval Establishment.

And I refuse to believe that anything in recent history has afforded justification for the notion that nations insure themselves against bloodshed and red ruin by what has come to be known as "preparedness."

In my judgment the committee has made an inglorious surrender to jingoism. It has knuckled to that noisy propaganda to which the President so recently paid his respects while addressing the Congress of the United States in this historic hall.

It is said in some quarters—

Remarked President Wilson in his annual message read before both Houses—

that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready on brief notice to put a nation in the field; a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that; and we shall never be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions. And what is it that it is suggested we should be prepared to do? To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found means to do that, and we shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in times of peace. * * * We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel, based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities, can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. * * * We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce, or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will; but we mean to let live. We are indeed a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is offered in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness.

But not in the estimation of the framers of the bill before us. Our greatness, as viewed by the proponents of this measure, lies in the floating fortresses which we have or design to build. It lies in the great guns which we have mounted upon these steel monsters of the deep. It lies in the caliber and the range of those guns. It lies in the fleetness of the great fighting machines which constitute our Naval Establishment.

It lies in battleships and destroyers, in submarines and floating mines, in all the paraphernalia of aggression which modern science, perverted to devilish purposes, has invented or developed. "We are champions of peace and of concord," says our great President. But who will believe us, in view of the concrete evidence supplied by this monstrous diversion of the people's substance into the enginry of destruction? Who will believe that we are indeed the champions of peace and of concord when we are straining the credit of the Nation in a mad competition for naval supremacy? Who will accept the views of President Wilson and his reassuring words when the Congress of the United States goes deliberately about belying them in a fashion so cynical and so unashamed?

Mr. Chairman, the country, owing to the unparalleled conflict across the seas, is facing what it has not before faced in many years. It is facing a huge and menacing deficit in the public revenues. According to estimates made by the highest authorities in the Government, this shortage in revenue will approximate $80,000,000. It may run beyond that great figure. Our customs receipts have enormously declined as a direct and inevitable consequence of the war. This decline would have been realized even had the tariff remained in force which the Democrats found in operation when they succeeded to the control of government. There never was before such complete exclusion of foreign competition with home industries as we have to-day. It is all but absolute. Protectionists in their wildest dreams never had in contemplation any such interference with com-

merce as war has effected. They never sought by any audacity of legislation so utter an embargo on foreign goods as we have had during the last six months. Yet, are they happy? Far from it. Never before were they more critical, more captious, more uncandid in dealing with the facts or less amenable to reason and common sense in considering cause and effect.

With a tenacity worthy of a better cause they stick to it that the Underwood tariff and not the war has depleted our revenues at the ports of entry. With calm disdain of the facts they ignore the circumstance that imports of dutiable goods have practically ceased, not on account of anything a Democratic Congress has done, but by reason of the disjointed condition of commerce resulting from the great struggle among nations.

This bill disregards the state of the Public Treasury as it disregards the state of the world at this moment as a result of the very "preparedness" which it is designed to afford the United States. It is drawn, not according to our means, but to fit the excitement of gentlemen who have wrought themselves up to a wonderful pitch of apprehension over imaginary foes. It is not a bill for national defense, because no one is threatening us. It is a bill for national aggression, because it can mean nothing else in the absence of danger from without. It is not a protective measure or a preventive measure, since we have seen that warships do not protect nor do dreadnaughts ward off trouble. On the contrary, we have seen in the light of battle flames covering half of Europe that they are a provocative of war, a certain incentive to strife, a constant and irresistible temptation to the exercise of force.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this floor last year on this general subject of preparedness I ventured to urge that we should learn to think in terms of peace rather than in those of war. It seems to me that we dwell altogether too much on the idea that some day we are going to run into trouble. Was not that the besetting weakness of the old-time bad man of the border? Was it not his practice to go loaded? And was it not his invariable fate either to kill some one or to be killed himself? Did the knife in his belt or the gun in his hip pocket ever really avert the trouble of which he was apprehensive? Did they not, in fact, stand as a guaranty that sooner or later he would come up with it and either die with his boots on or see to it that the other fellow did?

It is one of the melancholy results of the jingoistic agitation in which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has borne so conspicuous a part that it has inflamed the school children of the land with his own mistaken zeal for military expansion. All over the country boys and girls who ought to be thinking the thoughts of peace and dreaming of a future unvexed by war's alarms are engrossed in the literature of "preparedness" and steeped in the idea that patriotism means sword thrust and shrieking shell. Yet the highest patriotism is that which keeps the peace. The highest patriotism is that which appeals to reason and brotherly love and Christian forbearance rather than to the arbitrament of arms. He is no patriot who stirs racial prejudice, national jealousy, or commercial rivalry into flames of hatred. He is no patriot who teaches the youth of the land that it is more glorious to die for one's country than to live for it. The patriotism of a Franklin or of a Jefferson shines with a finer radiance than that of the fire eater who conjures with the sword and makes a fetish of the flag. We need patriotism, but not that sort which expresses itself in drum beats and bugle blasts. The patriotism we need is the patriotism which in the still small voice speaks to us of the golden rule and of the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Chairman, I am sincerely and unaffectedly sorry that a Democratic Congress is to become responsible for this monstrous appeal to force, for it is such an appeal and nothing else. We may gloss the fact over as we will, yet it remains a fact. It emphasizes an abandonment on our part of a traditional policy. It gives fresh notice to the world that we are of it in its suspicions and its turmoils and that what concerns it concerns us. This preparation of ours serves notice on it that it must watch its steps lest it trespass on forbidden ground. The pretense that this is not so is too flimsy to deceive anyone. All the peoples of the earth read in our busy augmentation of physical force a definite change of policy, a policy Democrats most justly denounced, only to adopt it themselves when the big stick dropped from the hand which had so long and so vigorously brandished it in the face of civilization.

When I became a Member of this body it was with the hope that I might have some small part in changing this policy for a better. I had hoped that my party and its leaders would set their faces against the doctrine of force. I had hoped and believed that they would set a new high mark of economy in public expenditures and in the encouragement of international disarmament. But here we find them outdoing even the Republicans in jingoistic enterprise and in profligate preparations for anticipated trouble which we infallibly invite by the preparation. And we may well pause to ask ourselves what the judgment of our countrymen and of posterity will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the naval service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. SAUNDERS having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GILL for one week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. Saturday, January 30, 1915.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the service of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1529); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting list of papers in the Department of Labor of no use in the transaction of current business and having no permanent or historical value (H. Doc. No. 1530); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department during the calendar year ended December 31, 1914, together with the number remaining on hand January 1, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1531); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TEN EYCK, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) accepting the statue of George Washington Glick, presented by the State of Kansas, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1337), which said concurrent resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5734) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909, to the State of Kansas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1338), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21237) to incorporate the Seventh-Day Baptist General Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 21238) to suspend the requirements of law as to annual assessments and final proof under

certain conditions; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 21239) to increase the limit of cost of the site of a Federal building at Oakland, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANAHAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate the fluctuations and control of the price of wheat and flour and the methods and practices of doing business on grain and cotton exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 715) requiring the Attorney General to make an investigation of the prices of cattle and hogs and other farm products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 21240) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Hart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 21241) granting an increase of pension to George D. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 21242) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peckham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 21243) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Nickerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21244) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 21245) granting an increase of pension to John Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21246) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 21247) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Bender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 21248) for the relief of Cyrus F. Goddard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 21249) granting a pension to Matilda Myer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21250) for the relief of Henry Borman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 21251) granting an increase of pension to John F. Hatley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21252) granting an increase of pension to William C. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 21253) for the relief of Mary H. Marshall; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 21254) granting an increase of pension to Viola R. Brackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 21255) granting a pension to Agatha Litchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 21256) granting an increase of pension to William H. Terwilliger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Polish Alliance, Branch No. 19, Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Ohio Canners' Association, approving adoption of the "most-favored nation" clause in tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Pattern Makers' League of North America, favoring the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of F. H. Smalley and 15 other citizens of Jeromesville, Ohio, protesting against legislation prohibiting the Government from printing stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Penton Publishing Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Government shipping bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of John Sobuskee Society, Croyl Township, Pa., protesting against passage of the immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of S. A. Nelson, Patton; Will Dunmire, Johnstown; and C. P. Campbell, Duncansville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill, relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of Men's Society of Central Verein and Young Men's Society of Central Verein, of Florissant; Catholic Knights of America, branch 400, of Kirkwood; branch 240, of Manchester; branch 309, branch 407, branch 552, branch 556, branch 847, branch 950, branch 1025, branch 1042, branch 1048, and branch 1052, of St. Louis; Thomas F. Golden, George G. Ernst, E. L. Ryan, L. L. Ryan, C. A. Watson, G. Fiebeger, also of St. Louis, all in the State of Missouri, praying to give the President authority to take steps to protect the sisters and Catholic priests in Mexico and protesting against the publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Stadtverband German-American Alliance, of Watertown, Wis.; William H. Tatge, Arnold H. Ehle, and Louis Brahmstadt, of Chicago, Ill.; Gottlieb Traut, of Rosebud, Mo.; Anton Streicher, Louis Streicher, and William Streicher, of Wellston, Mo.; Joe Diem, of Webster Groves, Mo.; and A. A. Weber, Glencoe, Mo., favoring a bill providing for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war for the belligerent nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 51 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring a bill providing for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war for the belligerent nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Mankato and vicinity, of Minnesota; Catholic Union State League of Missouri, of St. Louis, Mo.; citizens of Quincy, Cal.; mass meeting of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Young Men's Sodality of Florissant, Mo.; Western Catholic Union State League, of St. Louis County, Mo.; and German Theater Society, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of a bill providing for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war for the belligerent nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of the German Landweher Verein, Jackson; the Vestry of St. Emanuel's Lutheran Church, Ypsilanti; Leonard Hasley and 22 citizens of Maybee, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the shipment of arms to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Chancy W. Rickerd and 96 citizens of Manitou Beach, Mich., urging Congress to invite all nations to join the United States in a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Ladies of Luther, Castle No. 1, Auxiliary to Knights of Luther; Oliver Cromwell Castle, No. 3, Jackson, Mich., in opposition to House bill 20644, relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Ed Marx, Gust Marx, George Laumer, George Balzer, Henry Schwarting, Henry Boll, Frank Kaemph, Frank Weber, and 60 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, Wis., urging and indorsing the passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of McCook County and other citizens of South Dakota, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Brule County, S. Dak., protesting against amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill by Mr. FITZGERALD, of New York, relating to exclusion of certain matters from the mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Connecticut, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana German-American Alliance, of Los Angeles, Cal., and citizens of Mankato and vicinity, protesting against export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of German-American Alliance, La Crosse, Wis., protesting against export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Bay State Automobile Association, favoring Adamson bill to eliminate discrimination against motorists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. S. Louis & Son, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petitions of S. N. Evans and Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Roberts, of Little Rock, Ark., protesting against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 42 persons of Butler, Pa., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the shipment of arms and ammunition to warring nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 20919, for the relief of Edward H. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 21048, for the relief of Anna Harleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Herbert L. Rickard, pastor Presbyterian Church, Hudson, N. Y.; Mrs. O. S. Griffin, county superintendent Mercy Woman's Christian Temperance Union; M. Catherine Allen, Mount Lebanon; Frederick Du Bois, of Highland, N. Y.; urging support and passage at this session of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Augustus Kohler and 123 others, of Kingston; Howard Moshier and Frederick Letzner, of Ellenville, N. Y.; favoring prohibition of export of arms, etc., by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Walter W. Reid and 52 others, of Monticello, N. Y., urging passage of Palmer-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of interdenominational meeting held at Friends' Meeting House, West Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any increase in the armed strength of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of St. Michael's Polish Society, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of meeting of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa., against increased appropriations for the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of priests of Scranton (Pa.) diocese and J. J. Curran, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., against passage through the mails of certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of Local Union No. 119, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, urging a satisfactory solution of the matter of employing American citizens in the various departments of the work on the Panama Canal in preference to aliens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of Henry Borman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of F. L. Rector, E. A. Stewart, and H. Montgomery, of Summit, Cal., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Solano County, Cal., and Women's Civic Club of Eureka, Cal., favoring civil-service retirement; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of J. Shillinger, D. S. McCarthy, C. F. Merkle, H. E. Sountag, and E. B. Powers, of Chicago Park; Franz Fritsche, of Sonora; John A. Schroeder and others, of Mariposa, all in the State of California, and citizens of New Orleans, La., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Hardware Manufacturing Corporation and the S. S. Thompson Co., of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of 5,000 persons of the Order of the D. O. H. of Connecticut; Court Schiller, No. 117, F. of A., of Meriden, Conn.; and Windhorst Benevolent Society, of Meriden, protesting against export of arms, etc., by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petitions of sundry Polish societies of the State of Illinois, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of citizens of Perth Amboy, N. J., favoring House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Mercer County (N. J.) Branch of American Federation of Catholic Societies, against use of the mails by publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of 150 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Senate bill 6865, prohibiting sale of liquors in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Memorial of the Memphis (Tex.) Commercial Club, favoring Federal aid in building a national highway from the Gulf of Mexico to Denver, Colo., via Memphis, Tex.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of board of trustees of the German Baptist Church of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 880 American citizens for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of German-American Alliance of Gladstone, N. Dak., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 30, 1915.*

The House was called to order at 11 o'clock a. m. by Mr. UNDERWOOD, as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, who hast set Thy glory above the heavens.

Help us, we pray Thee, to set our glory above the material, that we may rise out of the eating, drinking, counting man into the realms of the higher values; that truth may be stronger than wealth, nobility of soul than the plaudits of men, righteousness than temporal power; that our souls may touch the Eternal Soul and bring us into perfect harmony with the eternal fitness of things, after the manner of the Christ. And Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SEGREGATION OF RACES IN STREET CARS.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have three legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill (H. R. 1718) to require all transportation companies, firms, and persons within the District of Columbia to provide separate accommodations for the white and negro races and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions (H. Rept. 1340, pt. 2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS] asks unanimous consent that he may have three legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 1718. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WILBER H. ESTEY.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] presents a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 686 (H. Rept. 1339).

Whereas Wilber H. Estey was the clerk of the Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, jr., late a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the thirty-first district of the State of New York, and is not entitled to compensation under the law as such clerk after the death of the said Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, jr.: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Wilber H. Estey, out of the contingent fund of the House, the sum of $125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House.

Mr. LLOYD. It is just following a precedent that has been established.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE ON THE IMMIGRATION BILL (H. DOC. NO. 1527).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, when the President's message vetoing the immigration bill was read on the floor of the House, the usual request followed for the publication of that message, and it was objected to. Since that time several resolutions have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Printing asking for the publication of this message. As a House document there have been printed 420 copies of the President's message in a pamphlet, which also carries the full text of the Burnett immigration bill. As a House document we are entitled under the present arrangement to 420 copies of it—not enough to supply one copy to each Member—but the Joint Committee on Printing under the law has the privilege of ordering a reprint of any public document to a number costing not more than $200. Under this law I have signed an order, as chairman of the Committee on Printing, for the publication of $200 worth of copies of this message and the bill combined, which will furnish 23,250 copies for the document room. I want to announce, so that the announcement may appear in the RECORD, that those copies will probably be available for Members to-morrow morning, and if that number does not prove sufficient and the demand is really pressing for more, the resolutions that have been introduced will then be considered by the Committee on Printing.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON EDUCATION.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to present a request for unanimous consent. On July 8, 1914, Senate joint resolution 157 was passed, and request was made by unanimous consent to lay on the table the House resolution—House joint resolution 291. The Clerk made a mistake and laid on the table House joint resolution 273, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which is a somewhat similar resolution to the Senate resolution 186.

I ask that the RECORD be corrected, and also the Journal, and that the House joint resolution 273 take its place on the calendar, as it would have done if this mistake had not been made. It is Calendar No. 246.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is too late to correct the RECORD and the Journal of this Congress. As I understand, under the order of the House, which was intended to apply to one resolution, the clerks were a little confused by resolutions covering somewhat the same subject and laid the wrong resolution on the table. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent to have that resolution taken from the table and restored to the calendar and that the proper resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask, then, that the House joint resolution 273 be taken from the table and restored to the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is that House resolution 273 be taken from the table and restored to the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 20975, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have for many years voted against large armaments. I have thought that the rule of force, the doctrine that might makes right, was steadily yielding to the enlightened love of justice, that a respect for the opinion of the civilized world was supplanting respect for the sword, and that in international life, as in private life, an appeal to law and to courts was displacing the appeal to battle.

I confess that recent events have caused me to revise my opinions. Among those nations which we have considered most progressive and civilized has suddenly burst forth a worship of force, a reversion to the primitive savage type, a lawless selfishness, a disregard of sacred obligations, of pity, of mercy, and of humanity, which is depressing and confounding. There is only one encouraging symptom. Amidst all this wreck of civilization there has issued from every nation involved an appeal to the judgment of the neutral world and an attempt to absolve itself from responsibility, which indicates a consciousness that after all there is another arbitrament than the sword and that the tribunal of public opinion is still recognized, respected, and feared. But there is no escape from the discouraging fact that in this enlightened age innocence will not insure against attack and that a nation which leads in the race of civilization may with cold-blooded deliberation plunge into a war of selfish aggression. What is our duty under these new conditions?

Although the shock may well disturb our complacent sense of security, we must not allow it to frighten us into hysterical apprehension or excite us into belligerent emulation. It is, above all, a time when we should keep calm and try to determine our necessities with cool and even-tempered judgment, without panic and without bellicose ambition. A navy and an army are not playthings to be indulged in from a jealous vanity that will not be content while our neighbor's toys are better than ours; they are simply a method of insuring possessions, and as in all forms of insurance the difficult problem is to ascertain truly the risk. That will be rated differently according to one's temperament, environment, and interest. Allowing that everyone was equally impartial, the results would differ greatly. By weighing as carefully as I can the various elements I have made up my mind what premium of insurance I think it wise to pay, and with diffidence and a profound recognition that only a real prophet could be certain that his conclusions were right I submit my opinion.

The first point to determine is the danger to be insured against. While the present European condition safeguards us against immediate attack, yet at the same time it vividly impresses us with the terrible effects of war and how science and invention have so changed conditions that a mighty but unequipped nation is helpless before a relatively small army furnished with modern engines of destruction, which can prevent the most heroic valor and endless numbers ever approaching near enough to inflict injury, and which can mow their irresistible way to certain victory. When the present European war ends is there danger that the victorious weapons will be turned against us? If there is, we can not too quickly begin to train our soldiers by the hundreds of thousands and manufacture artillery and ammunition on a corresponding scale, for if either side shall completely triumph it will possess the fleets of all and could easily sweep us from the sea and land here an army against which our enormous but untrained population would be helpless. Against such an attack the preparations urged by the most extreme and apprehensive advocates of increased defenses would be impotent; we need not to increase, but to revolutionize our whole system. The end of a war does not, as is sometimes suggested, leave the victor weak, but he is generally at the maximum of his fighting power and ready for new conquests, and we must recognize that it is easier to-day than ever before for one nation to be permanent masters of the world. A hundred years ago, when France had subjugated Europe, the means of transporting troops and intelligence were so slow and armaments so simple that the subject nations could organize and equip armies before their conqueror could prevent them. To-day if one power were mistress of Europe it could disarm other nations and forbid their organizing new armies, and so omnipotent is artillery and so slow its manufacture and so rapid transmission of news and troops that the conqueror, perfectly armed, could suppress any outbreak before it became formidable and keep all nations in permanent subjection. It is not difficult to conceive that if a military power should once establish its supremacy—by a complete victory, for instance, in the present war—it might disarm the rest of Europe, compel the other nations by annual tribute to support its armies permanently with perfect equipment, and thus establish a complete and inviolable despotism until perhaps after long years the demoralizing disintegration of such a military aristocracy worked its own downfall.

But I think that danger is slight. It does not look as if either side was likely to win a complete triumph, and in that case their mutual jealousies and fears will protect us in the future as in the past. And yet it is possible to conceive that if Germany should win and emerge completely master of Europe she might look across the ocean and see this commercial, helpless people, gorged with the wealth which had accumulated here while European capital was wasted and destroyed; and she might, without even a pretext except lust of power and dominion, send across and tie us to her chariot wheels with the rest of Europe. But, while conceivable, I do not think that danger is probable enough to warrant any expenditure to forestall it. Any ordinary preparation would be wasted; it must be either thorough or none at all. I have too high an opinion of the German character to insure against such an unprovoked aggression.

If, on the other hand, the allies should completely triumph whom have we to fear? Certainly not France. Certainly not Russia. England is the only possible menace. And an unprovoked attack from England is quite as inconceivable as from Germany. England is governed by public opinion. Its great English colonies are dependent only in name. They can separate when they will. She can have no ambition or hope to again annex us to the Crown. She can never become a great military despotism. I do not believe that, if she should be a victor in this war, she would wish to direct her newly developed military prowess against us. At any rate, I would risk waiting till the end of this war before insuring against that danger.

There is, indeed, one prolific source of conflict—the Monroe doctrine. That has never been acknowledged by Europe; it has no basis in law or convention or natural justice; it is a threat which we publish against a whole hemisphere, and whose only sanction can be in the physical force behind it. Its original purpose, of course, long ago passed away. For generations there has been no danger that any European nation would interfere in South America in order to perpetuate monarchical institutions. The motives which inspired the Holy Alliance would no longer actuate any European nation. But the doctrine which developed as a defense and protest against that alliance is still worshiped as a fetish, although its original motive is lost and it is perverted to quite different ends. I see no justification for it now in law or reason except self-interest, and that, when given as an excuse for breach of law, has not of late met much favor. No nation has ever cared to raise the issue with us, but if the prize was great enough or if our weakness was manifest, I can easily imagine that a nation might challenge the Monroe doctrine and assert that we had no international right to decide what should become of South America. I see but one reason why we should be unwilling to have lands south of us colonized by Europe, and that is fear of a fortified base of operations against us. But England and France and Spain already have such harbors. Against them, therefore, the argument does not apply. And if Venezuela for the past 20 years had been under English control it would have been vastly better for Venezuela, for the United States, and for the world.

If France had succeeded in establishing its power in Mexico in the sixties and we had acquiesced, I do not think we or Mexico would have suffered from the change. It is not at all improbable that but for the present war European nations might recently have said to us, "The lives and property of our subjects are being sacrificed in Mexico by a government which you were instrumental in establishing. We demand that you secure safety for our subjects or we shall interfere ourselves." Or it is possible that they might have interfered without even the preliminary appeal to us. Some of the nations to the south of us seem to enjoy indulging in breaches of obligations and violations of the rights of others, and then hope to go unpunished because the Monroe doctrine makes us their sponsors and defenders. Such a one-sided doctrine needs revision or abandonment. To me it seems a most probable and prolific source of war.

There is one other possible antagonist—Japan. And I would like to say here that I appreciate how impolitic and unwise it is to thus discuss publicly our relations with other nations and to treat them as problematical enemies. The mere suggestion of such relations tends to weaken friendship. As a maiden has taken the first long step toward surrender when she contemplates with herself its possibility, so a nation makes more easy and probable a conflict when she openly discusses its possible causes and chances. I deprecate such debate. But it has been precipitated by others, has become general and absorbing, and the question of our preparedness for war can not be answered without its free consideration. But if the situation demands discussion and frankness, we can at least be considerate, friendly, and respectful; and I feel like admitting that the danger of collision with Japan lies not with her but with ourselves. The attitude of some of our States has been so contemptuous, has so singled the Japanese out for unfriendly legislation, that you can not blame a high-spirited and powerful people, which has of late given so many proofs of its equality both as a nation and as individuals, if it resents bitterly being treated as an inferior and an outcast. Nor does it seem improbable that if this discourteous and irritating conduct continues it may cause a wave of outraged resentment to sweep the Japanese people into a hostile outbreak. We can not leave those who give just cause for such an attack to suffer alone, and must come to their defense. But in such a war, while I recognize that Japan could put in the field an army which would readily overwhelm ours, yet I believe our Navy is superior and that she would never dare attempt a landing on our shores. The Philippines, of course, we would lose. We would not even pretend to defend them outside of our forts. Any warships we had there would steam for home, and it would not take Japan long to overrun the country.

I have never been able to see why we should fortify those islands, for we could never defend them against any strong oriental power. But I should not mourn over their loss, because I have always considered them a burden rather than an advantage. I would gladly sell them now for what they cost us, and the natives would doubtless gladly be sold except for the hope that from us they will some day receive independence. But after the Philippines were lost I can not see that a war with Japan alone would have any serious effect on either combatant. Neither side would dare to send its navy to the distant home of its enemy, and we could but hurl epithets at each other across the Pacific, only varied by an occasional daring raid. Our Navy is certainly not so weak that it should fear attack in our own waters, and I can not conceive it so strong that public opinion would allow it to go 4,000 miles from home. Against war with Japan I do not think we are unprepared, and I am ashamed to admit that if such a war should come, it would probably be due to the unreasonable and unfeeling conduct of our own people. If we will but be patient and reasonable, and not follow demagogues, the problem of Japanese immigration can be satisfactorily solved through diplomatic channels. Japan does not wish her people to emigrate here, but she does not wish our laws to discriminate against her alone.

There is one other danger against which we must insure, and that is our emotional, self-satisfied, undisciplined spirit, which is constantly inflamed by the flatteries of Fourth of July orators claiming that we can whip a world in arms, and which might blaze up on any slight provocation and drive even a reluctant administration into war. Or we may have Presidents who will attack another nation because of the punctilio of a salute and who may not have the prudence to select an opponent of inferior size. A nation always ready to fight at the drop of the hat ought indeed to be fully armed, and one great benefit from this agitation about our preparedness for war is that it may convince us that it is wise to be less aggressive and belligerent and overbearing and more just and reasonable and pacific in our relations with other nations. It may make us realize that for war we are not a first-class power, and that instead of being able to "lick all creation" there is not a nation with a modern army which, if once landed on our shores, could not march resistlessly all over our continent. The army of Germany, Austria, Russia, France, England, Italy, Japan—any one of them could easily overthrow any force we could muster and take possession of our richest cities. If we wish to indulge our tendency to be self-willed and arbitrary and unyielding and dictatorial, then this war teaches us that we ought to begin to spend hundreds of millions a year in military preparations to defend that tendency. Unless we will be considerate and pacific and reasonable, we certainly are unprepared. But I should be glad to have our condition force upon us those commendable qualities.

One branch of our defense is thorough and adequate—our coast protections—and the criticism of it seems to me either blind to its real purposes or misinformed. Coast defenses are meant for a temporary check, not a permanent defense. They are not designed to protect us against an adversary whose army and navy are both superior to ours. Such an opponent, after demolishing our Navy, has but to land on an unfortified part of the coast and take our cities from the rear. We are protected against a sudden naval raid and nothing more. But against any adversary who does not dare land an army our coast defenses are impregnable. I do not believe a hostile navy would dare to attack them. Here and there may be a weak spot easily remedied, and while our guns must keep pace with the increasing power of the guns on battleships, we need not fear that our protected cities are in any danger of assault

by sea. An insufficient quota of trained artillerists for a full war basis is their greatest weakness.

I have thus discussed our dangers and our weakness. There is nothing hidden about them. Anyone can see them. They are not novel, though the present war has taught some new lessons. Their imminence and seriousness is a matter on which men will necessarily differ. How much risk you are willing to take will depend on temperament. To insure against all risk, we ought first to have a trained and equipped army of at least 500,000 men, with a reserve of as many more. That involves an annual additional expense just about equal to the present cost of the National Government. It involves conscription and compulsory service and a vast pension list, for the attempt to provide an adequate reserve by the militia has pitifully failed.

I think few persons would think the insurance worth the cost under present conditions. They would take the risk of waiting till the end of the present war. Between that establishment and our present Army, which is small but efficient, and capable of meeting any emergencies which may arise on this continent alone, I see no rational stopping place, unless it is to provide an ample garrison for Hawaii.

With the Navy the question to me is more difficult. With the recent changes in construction and ordnance, and the lessons taught by recent naval battles, the efficient force of our Navy is hard to estimate. I think here we can not afford to deteriorate, and, though I have misgivings about the distribution of the present appropriation, yet I have decided to support the program of the committee.

I am not without strong hope that the end of this war will solve some of our questionings. For a generation Europe has been an armed camp, with cost steadily mounting. We became so accustomed to it that we began to talk about it as an assurance of peace, and to persuade ourselves that handling the weapons of war did not beget war. But at last the crash came, and we see now how inevitable it was, and that these stupendous preparations could not be wasted forever. But their permanent expense is unbearable, and we must hope that in the treaties of peace some provision for general disarmament and the release into private activities of these enormous masses of men and of expenditure will be provided. When that glad day comes we can judge better of our duty. It may come before the appropriations in this bill are even allotted and change all our planning.

Meanwhile, the sensational agitation for an increase of our military establishment may have one unintended good result, if it brings home to us the fact that though perhaps the richest we are by no means the strongest nation of the world; that our wealth and commercial absorption is a temptation to a poorer but more martial nation to pick a quarrel with us, and so is a liability as well as an asset; and that arrogance and swagger are as unsafe as they are unbecoming. It may teach us that forbearance and courtesy are as prudent as they are admirable.

We have tried to lead in the movement for peace among nations, not, I believe, simply because it was for our interest, but because we thought it would benefit the whole world. This war has cruelly demolished that ideal. It has postponed indefinitely the realization of our hopes. But it ought not to discourage our purpose. It certainly shows in more lurid light than ever before the hideousness and destructiveness of war, the fallacy of the doctrine that the consciousness of great military power promotes peace.

If we wish to rank as an equal among the great military powers of the world, and to be absolutely secure against aggression or insult, and to be able ourselves to be domineering and self-willed, then I agree our only safe course is to double our Navy and increase our Army fivefold. But if we are willing to tread the more honorable path of justice and moderation and forbearance, relying upon the delicate balance of power in Europe to protect us in the future as it has in the past, and hoping that the treaty of peace will effectually curtail and limit future dangers and expenditures, then the appropriations we are this year making for our Army and our Navy are, in my opinion, a sufficient insurance against the risks which we can reasonably apprehend.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, MISCELLANEOUS.

The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list showing the amount of money of all pay and for all allowances for each grade of officers in the Navy, including retired officers, and for all officers included in this act and for all enlisted men so included.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. If I recall correctly, this same paragraph is in the current law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the object of repeating it? How many times do you want the Secretary of the Navy to send a report to Congress giving precisely the same information?

Mr. PADGETT. It shows the officers who have been changed each year, and it shows the expenditures during each fiscal year. It gives to Congress the benefit of the information.

Mr. MANN. I may not know what this means, and probably do not. I supposed when it was in the bill last year that it was intended to furnish the Congress information as to how much pay and allowances were granted to each grade of the Navy—not the total sum that had been paid for the preceding fiscal year. That is information that comes in the estimates, anyhow. The pay and allowances of each grade of the Navy do not vary from year to year.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. What is the use of publishing it every year in an annual report?

Mr. PADGETT. The amount changes from year to year.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that is the total. I supposed the purpose of this was so that we could find out how much the pay and allowances of a lieutenant or a lieutenant commander and other officers after so many years' service amounted to.

Mr. PADGETT. It was that, and also to give a report of the expenditure in the different grades.

Mr. MANN. That is not what it says. What was the report made by the Secretary in December?

Mr. PADGETT. He reported what is paid to the different grades.

Mr. MANN. In a separate report?

Mr. PADGETT. No; in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. He gives that every year, and always has done it. That is not a compliance with this section of the law. I do not know; it may be necessary to enact it every year to get the Secretary to act on it. I do not think he has made any report this year.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recollect of any except in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. But that is not a compliance with this provision. We have had a provision in the law requiring him to make a report so that Members of Congress may know something which they never yet have been able to find out—how much the pay and allowances of naval officers amount to. I dare say that no member of the committee can tell offhand.

Mr. PADGETT. No; not offhand; but I think you will find it set out in the Yearbook.

Mr. MANN. You can find there that they have allowances for light and heat, and so forth, and you may make a computation yourself; but when you have done that you will find that they have medical attention, or something else of that sort which you did not know anything about and which you have not included. I suppose it was to give that information, which I think would be very valuable, but I see no objection in putting it into the bill every year. If we get it once, we will have it until there is a change in the law. The fact is the Secretary of the Navy has not complied with the law that we put in the last bill. I will not make a point of order now; but if he does not comply with the law this year I will make it in the next. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I did not understand the chairman to say that a report had actually been made in accordance with this provision last year.

Mr. PADGETT. I said it was contained in the estimates, and then there is information given in the yearbook and also in the statistics issued by the department showing the allowances to each grade.

Mr. MOORE. If my recollection is correct, there was a desire to ascertain the amount paid to retired officers as distinguished from those in the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will turn to page 1077 of the estimates, he will find the detailed expenses of the pay of the Navy. He will see that it takes up the grade of admiral and the different grades and gives it in detail.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for the reference; but was it not the intent to obtain a separate report from the Secretary of the Navy which should be sent to Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Beginning on page 1077 of the estimates, in appendix F, the gentleman will find a detailed estimate "for pay of the Navy, an estimate of the amount required to pay

officers of the United States Navy on the active list for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," and it is continued for several pages.

Mr. MOORE. Is there anything in that statement which indicates how much money is paid to the retired officers and the officers on the active list?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it shows the pay for active officers, and also at the various navy yards. I have not gone through it in detail.

Mr. MOORE. I do not wish to put the gentleman to any inconvenience, or to take up his time. The point is, is there any method by which Congress receives information as to the amount of money provided for in this bill that goes to the retired officers of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; on page 25 of the bill the gentleman will find pay and allowances of the officers on the retired list.

Mr. MOORE. What is the total amount?

Mr. PADGETT. Three million seventy thousand two hundred and thirty dollars.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. How many of these Books of Estimates are sent to Congress, and are they for general distribution?

Mr. PADGETT. They are for general distribution, and are distributed through the document room.

Mr. SLOAN. How many are provided?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know; there is an ample number. The gentleman can get them by applying to the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. I understood the gentleman to say, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], that the total annual expense for the officers on the retired list was over $3,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Three million seventy thousand two hundred and thirty dollars is the amount carried in the present bill.

Mr. BORLAND. That is the annual expense?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How does that compare with the amount that other nations expend for officers on the retired list?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I could not say exactly as to other nations, but it is much higher. The pay on the active list and the pay on the retired list is higher in the United States than in any foreign country. In all foreign countries except England they have conscription both in the army and in the navy.

Mr. BORLAND. England is the only country that relies on volunteer enlistment, as we do?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. England carries a retired pay of considerable size?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but her active and retired pay are both lower than in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. England's Navy is much larger than ours—practically double, is it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And the gentleman says our expense for officers on the retired list is larger than England's?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the totals. I am talking relatively. In other words, the allowance we make to officers on the retired list is greater than the allowance England makes. What the total is I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has not the total. Is that to be found in any figures in the report?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not got it in my report. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement for the benefit of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked as to what would be the course of procedure to-day—about how long we would continue in session. I will say that it is my desire to run until about 6 o'clock, but not to hold a night session. There were some Members who wanted to know whether there would be a night session. It is not my purpose to ask for a night session, but I would be glad to continue until 6 o'clock.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, we have been holding pretty long hours this week, and 6 o'clock is pretty late. Would it not depend upon the progress that we make with the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. If we can make first-class progress, we may get some time off that, but I would be very glad to run until 6 o'clock, if we can, but I shall not ask for a night session.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede to all men on this floor equal love of country and equal patriotism, but I also note on this question, as on most all other big questions, a diversity of opinion.

But, may I make this suggestion? I believe that the duties of a Member of Congress can be summed up in this one statement: That while serving in this capacity we are the guardians of the people's liberties, prosperity, and peace, and that the greatest of these is peace.

I believe that if President Wilson has done nothing else or shall do nothing else than to successfully steer the ship of state off the rocks of war, and thereby preserve the peace of our people, he will be entitled to have erected to his memory a monument towering toward the skies, bearing this inscription: "First in peace, always in peace, and forever in the hearts of his countrymen."

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that we all earnestly desire peace, but differ only in the mode of preserving it. I am quite willing to concede to the "big Navy" advocates absolute sincerity of purpose; that they honestly believe that the best way—in fact, the only way—to successfully maintain peace with the other nations of the earth is to have a Navy big enough to blow them off the face of the earth if they do not remain steadfastly our friends. To this barbarous doctrine every fiber of my being dissents. I believe that such an idea is not only immoral, but fraught with great danger to the peace of the world.

You can not long keep a man your friend through fear, but you can make him your friend throughout time and eternity by kindness, which will ripen into love.

Mr. Chairman, I have walked up and down Pennsylvania Avenue, this city, with impunity and in absolute security for 10 years. Why? Not because all the savage instincts of man have disappeared—for if so, we would not now have any advocates of a big navy with us—but because I went about my business showing no disposition to interfere with the rights and liberties of any other man. But I apprehend that if I were to have donned a sombrero with a rattlesnake band on it, my trousers tucked in my boot tops, a red bandana handkerchief tied around my neck and a six-shooter buckled around me and a cigar in my mouth elevated at an angle of 45° and started down the Avenue that I would have been lucky to have got as far as Seventh Street before I would have found trouble with some fellow. Nations are not unlike individuals, for a nation is simply an aggregation of individuals. If a nation dons its war paint and buckles on 60 or 70 big battleships, with 40 or 50 submarines concealed in its bootlegs, and starts strutting out over the ocean highways, it is almost sure to run amuck with the inevitable result that that nation is instantly compelled to offer thousands of its best young men upon the altar as a sacrifice to the gods of war. Mr. Chairman, if I had a thousand boys, not one of them would enter the Army or Navy if I could prevent it in any way except as a volunteer citizen soldier, and only then to fight in the defense of their homes and their liberties.

It is a lamentable fact that as soon as the average man puts on the uniform, especially if he happens to be decorated with the insignia of an officer, he immediately conceives a supreme contempt for the civil authority. Ah! More still. His moral ideas seem to undergo a radical change. I fear it is too often true that the lesson of love for his God and his fellow man, lessons which he learned at his mother's knee, is forgotten, and not only that, but he seems to forget his God and learns to hate his fellow man. Do you say that I have put it too strongly? I would only be glad to know that I had, but I fear that I have not. There came to my desk yesterday, and I presume others received it, a pamphlet prepared by Dr. William White, the emeritus professor of surgery in the University of Pennsylvania. In that document I find extracts from the writings of an eminent military man, a citizen of one of the countries now engaged in the terrible war raging in Europe. It is surely the creed of the devotees of the mistaken doctrine of "preparedness." One can scarcely believe that in this age of civilization such astounding and iconoclastic statements could find utterance anywhere, but after all we can not deny that they are but the actions of the militarist expressed in words. Let me read you some of them:

A WAR PRIMER FOR AMERICANS.

Self-preservation is the State's highest ideal and justifies whatever action it may take if that action be conducive to that end. The State is the sole judge of the morality of its action. It is, in fact, above morality, or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral.

* * * * * * *

Any nation in favor of collective humanity outside the limits of the State and nationality is impossible.

War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which can not be dispensed with, since with-

out it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization.

Just as increase of population forms under certain circumstances a convincing argument for war, so industrial conditions may compel the same result.

* * * * * * *

We can, fortunately, assert the impossibility of efforts after peace ever attaining their ultimate object in a world bristling with arms, where a healthy egoism still directs the policy of most countries.

We ought to know that there is no such thing as eternal peace.

* * * * * * *

War is in itself a good thing. It is a biological necessity of the first importance.

The inevitableness, the idealism, the blessing of war as an indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasized.

War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power.

Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they can influence politics.

Efforts directed toward the abolition of war are not only foolish but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race.

* * * * * * *

Efforts for peace would, if they attained their goal, lead to general degeneration, as happens everywhere in nature where the struggle for existence is eliminated.

Huge armaments are in themselves desirable. They are the most necessary precondition of our national health.

* * * * * * *

The State's highest moral duty is to increase its power.

The State is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few minutes, but I will yield for just a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman whether in view of the notice that has been served on the State Department he thinks the shipping bill is a measure that is steering toward peace?

Mr. HAMLIN. I think it is. I see nothing to the contrary.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did we not have a war with Mexico last year?

Mr. HAMLIN. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. I think history will put it down as a war.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not think that the gentleman will conclude that the little skirmish at Vera Cruz amounted to a war.

Mr. BUTLER. Where we seized a port of a friendly nation?

Mr. HAMLIN. And then voluntarily withdrew.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman tell us who the author is from whom he is reading?

Mr. HAMLIN. I have just stated that I am reading from a pamphlet prepared by Dr. J. William White, professor emeritus of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARDNER. But who is the author he is quoting there?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman can consult the document.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman from Missouri will state that the gentleman from Massachusetts can consult the document, and from that can obtain the information which he desires.

Mr. GARDNER. Why does the gentleman conceal that information from the House at this time?

Mr. HAMLIN. Under the circumstances the gentleman from Missouri feels that it would perhaps be the best thing not to state the name of the author.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the name of the author Treitschke?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman can consult the document.

Mr. GARDNER. In other words, he is reading from a German author?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield further. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to say just at this point—and I am not going to object—that Dr. J. William White, whom the gentleman quotes, is one of the most eminent physicians in this country, but he has written a book on just one side of the question.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am neither indorsing nor condemning Dr. J. William White's opinions.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wanted to state that in fairness to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am only reading extracts from writings of his in which he makes certain quotations.

Mr. Chairman, I am for peace, and I do not believe that the best way to secure and maintain peace is to prepare for war. Preparedness precipitates war. The so-called "small Navy" advocates are not alone in that opinion. There reached me through the mail, from what source I do not know, a document entitled "Austrian and Hungarian Notabilities on the War."

In this document I find an open letter to one of our colleagues, Mr. BARTHOLDT, from Missouri. This letter seems to have been written by the very eminent Baron Ernest von Plener, a member of the Austrian House of Lords. The following is a quotation from his letter:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. BARTHOLDT FROM BARON ERNEST VON PLENER, MEMBER OF THE AUSTRIAN HOUSE OF LORDS, OF THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION COURT.

DEAR MR. BARTHOLDT: As an old colleague of yours in the Council of the Interparliamentary Union, I have always highly appreciated your fair judgment and your impartial views; therefore I take the liberty to address to you a few remarks on the origin and real scope of the present war.

The English ministers and newspapers pretend that this war is a necessity and a justified necessity, for it is waged, they say, to put down the intolerable militarism of Germany, which, according to their opinion, is a standing menace to civilization, democracy, and the peace of the world. Now, let us look at the facts, and let us examine whether this war was really brought about by the military policy of Germany or whether the armaments of Germany and Austria-Hungary were not rather provoked by the aggressive military measures of Russia, France, and England.

Since the Morocco crisis the armaments of all European powers were increasing. The annual military expenditure rises in the years from 1908 to 1912 in all States by a little more than 20 per cent; the naval estimates of England rose in that period from 32.3 million pounds to 51.6 million pounds, or more than 59 per cent. The annual levy of recruits in France rose from 248,503 in 1906 to 276,000 in 1910–11, the rank and file of the French Army from 563,000 to 602,766 men, whereas Germany, with a much larger population, did not increase the peace footing of her army. The closer diplomatic connection between France and Russia brought on a positive agreement between the general staffs of the two armies, the purport of which far exceeded the terms of a mere political alliance. England drew the threads between the two allied powers tighter and tighter, and with the increase of her fleet the fighting power of the triple entente surpassed already then that of the triple alliance. In 1912 a new start in the armaments began. In Russia an extraordinary military credit of 1,350,000,000 rubles besides the regular estimates was passed by the Duma, which in the next year voted a supplementary extraordinary credit of 222,000,000 rubles. During the Balkan war Russia began the so-called trial mobilizations, retaining the men of the reserve force much longer in the front and thus increasing the rank and file of her army. The Balkan war had shifted still more the military balance, as the Balkan States, which mostly sided with the triple entente, came out with greater armies. Under these circumstances Austria-Hungary was obliged to increase her annual number of recruits for the common army from 103,100 to 159,500 men, bringing the peace footing from 293,800 to 344,000 men; a comparatively small increase of both landwehrs was a consequence of this measure. Germany, whose army counted in 1911 only 515,321 and in 1912 544,211 men (without officers and noncommissioned officers), could neither be indifferent to Russian armaments, so she raised it in 1913 to 661,176 men. Then followed France, who, under the avowed pressure of Russia, reintroduced the three-years' service and brought her rank and file by this measure to 734,292. Russia continued the system of trial mobilization, prolonging thereby the active service by four till five months, and since 1912 she retained the whole class, which ought to have been discharged, so that her peace strength rose from 1,520,000 to 1,829,000 men. Austria-Hungary, against whom these menacing forces were chiefly directed, increased in the spring of 1914 her levy for the common army by 5,600 men, and for the both landwehrs accordingly, a trifle in comparison with the Russian armaments.

Can anyone with these facts before him reasonably pretend that Germany is the moving agent of militarism in Europe? It was, on the contrary, the clear design of the triple entente to organize and increase her forces, so that they might eventually be superior to those of Germany and Austria-Hungary. It was England who, by her reckless building of battleships, stretched to the utmost the military and naval exertion of all the other States and so prepared the war.

Mr. Chairman, you will observe that he is endeavoring to place the blame on some other nation rather than his own for setting all Europe on fire.

Naturally none of the nations now engaged in that war wants to take the responsibility for that inhuman slaughter. But I especially call your attention to the causes which he says led up to that terrible war. He outlines, by giving the figures, the shameful race of the nations over there in preparing for war by increasing the number of men in their armies—men who were to be the victims to be offered as a sacrifice to the unholy god of war. But note what he says anent the building of battleships:

It was England who by her reckless building of battleships stretched to the utmost the military and naval exertion of all other States, and so prepared the war.

May we not take a lesson from this? We all agree that we want peace; then let us prepare for peace, and not war. Let us quit playing the "tumble bug," by looking one way and pushing the other.

We are about to authorize this year the building of two additional battleships, at a cost to the people of about $35,000,000. Can we justify this expenditure of the public money at this time? I do not believe that we can.

How much more glorious and Christlike it would be, while the world stands appalled at the fearful slaughter of human beings in Europe, if this Nation, instead of building great battleships, would lead the world back to the paths of peace and

to the principle taught by the Prince of Peace. This I conceive to be both our mission and our duty.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman from Missouri is going to talk that way, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to continue——

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman will print in the RECORD——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order. Courtesy is wasted on the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman to order; he is talking without recognition.

Mr. MANN. So is the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for actual and necessary traveling expenses of midshipmen while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks' and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; stationery and recording; religious books; expenses of purchasing paymasters' offices of the various cities, including clerks, furniture, fuel, stationery, and incidental expenses; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service (hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance); all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; care of library, including the purchase of books, photographs, prints, manuscripts, and periodicals; ferriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés; information from abroad, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and purchasing pay offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $290,000; in all, $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That the laws relating to annual leave contained in section 7 of the legislative act approved March 15, 1898, and the deficiency act approved July 7, 1898, shall hereafter apply to classified civil-service per diem employees of the clerical, drafting, inspection, chemical, messenger, and watch forces at navy yards, naval stations, offices of the United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material, offices of superintending naval constructors, and other offices and stations under the Navy Department.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Beginning in line 16?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Beginning line 16, page 3, and ending with line 2, page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I concede it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I still reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order to the entire paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. I request the gentleman not to insist upon the point of order against this proviso, because that prevents a discussion which might show that there is great merit in the proposition.

The "per diem" employees are treated differently from other employees of the naval service with respect to leave. It is now useless to argue their case here, but in fairness to them I submit the following statement from some of my Philadelphia constituents:

In this connection it is stated that there are approximately 2,600 members of the clerical, drafting, inspection, chemical, messenger, and watch forces at the various navy yards and naval stations in the United States. These employees are members of the same group of the classified civil service as employees of the various legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government. They are required to conform to the same entrance-examination conditions, secure the same percentage from the examination in order to be placed upon the eligible list, and are subject to the same rules and regulations. In every respect they have exactly the same status as other members of the classified service, and yet they receive only 15 days' annual leave, while all other employees get 30.

At the present time employees are rated either per annum or per diem employees. The per annum employees receive 30 days' annual leave, while the per diem employees receive 15 days' leave. There are stationed at the various navy yards, inspection offices, and naval stations employees working side by side who are rated as per annum and per diem employees. The expression "per diem" is simply a measure of pay and not of employment. As an illustration, a per diem employee at the Navy Department would receive 30 days' leave, or, in other words, the same consideration as a per annum employee, but if that same employee were transferred to a navy yard, naval station, or other office under the Navy Department, he would receive only 15 days' leave.

It is evident from the above that employees of the same rating, doing the same kind of work, subject to the same rules and regulations, and under the same employer, are entitled to the same treatment in all respects, and at present the technical differences between per annum and per diem employers enables one group to receive 30 days' leave and the other 15. If the clause of the naval bill quoted above is passed by Congress, the inequality of treatment of employees described above will be eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order, as the gentleman from Illinois has reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] took the floor and made a beautiful oration upon peace. I do not think there is any division in this House represented by that aisle upon the question of peace. So far as the President stands for neutrality, he has the undivided support of the American people and of the Representatives in this House; but the question I want to call attention to for a moment is that this morning, according to the press reports, we are notified by Sir Edward Grey that any attempt to buy interned vessels would be considered an unneutral act, and that that notice has been in the State Department for 10 days. Why has that information been kept from the public when the very question was being discussed——

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman mean to say the State Department should make public all the information it has?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman want to continue with this naval bill, or does he want to start some trouble?

Mr. BORLAND. I want the gentleman either to discuss the bill or permit a question.

Mr. MANN. Or let somebody else make his speech, and we are not going to have that.

Mr. BORLAND. Then, the gentleman can discuss the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order there is no quorum if the gentleman is going to have to yield to some one to make some other gentleman's speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman from Missouri a moment ago spoke for 10 minutes——

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order the gentleman is not confining his remarks to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of order of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And you may have to keep one here the rest of the time you are discussing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Eighty-four gentlemen are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Cantor	Eagle	Gudger
Aiken	Cantrill	Edwards	Hamill
Ainey	Carew	Elder	Hamilton, Mich.
Anthony	Carlin	Fairchild	Hamilton, N. Y.
Avis	Carter	Faison	Hart
Baker	Cary	Falconer	Helvering
Barchfeld	Clancy	Farr	Hill
Bartholdt	Claypool	Ferris	Hinebaugh
Bartlett	Collier	Finley	Holland
Beall, Tex.	Copley.	Floyd	Howard
Borland	Crosser	Francis	Hoxworth
Britten	Dale	Gallagher	Igoe
Brodbeck	Davenport	George	Jones
Brown, N. Y.	Davis	Gill	Keister
Brown, W. Va.	Difenderfer	Goodwin	Kelly, Pa.
Bruckner	Donohoe	Goulden	Kennedy, Iowa
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Graham, Ill.	Kent
Bulkley	Dooling	Graham, Pa.	Kindel
Burke, Pa.	Doremus	Green, Iowa	Kitchin
Byrnes, S. C.	Doughton	Gregg	Korbly
Calder	Driscoll	Griest	Kreider
Campbell	Dunn	Griffin	La Follette

Langham	Mondell	Prouty	Taggart
Langley	Morgan, La.	Ragsdale	Talbott Md.
Lee, Ga.	Morrison	Rauch	Talcott, N. Y.
L'Engle	Moss, Ind.	Riordan	Taylor, N. Y.
Levy	Mott	Roberts, Nev.	Townsend
Lewis, Pa.	Murdock	Rupley	Treadway
Lindbergh	Nelson	Sabath	Underhill
Lindquist	O'Brien	Scully	Vare
Linthicum	Oglesby	Sells	Volstead
Lobeck	O'Shaunessy	Sherwood	Walsh
Lott	Paige, Mass.	Shreve	Whitacre
Logue	Patton, Pa.	Small	White
McGuire, Okla.	Peterson	Smith, Idaho	Wilson, Fla.
Mahan	Platt	Smith, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Maher	Pou	Smith, Saml. W.	Winslow
Metz	Price	Stanley	Woodruff.

Thereupon the committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD, having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, reported that that committee, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, when 272 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and that he presented therewith the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in reference to the matter of subscription. I have no objection to authorizing subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals to be paid in advance. It says:

Newspapers and periodicals for the naval service (hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance).

I would like to know how it will be possible for anybody who is printing a volume of the Revised Statutes, bringing the permanent law down to date, to put that in. If you put in the law that subscriptions may be paid for in advance, of course that would be repealing the existing law and allow anything. If you want to identify what is intended, then you have to copy two pages of an appropriation bill. Now, I make a suggestion to the gentleman—this being subject to a point of order—that he strike out there, if he wants to make this paragraph law, and put it in form at the end of the paragraph that "hereafter subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals for the naval service may be paid for in advance out of appropriations made for such purposes." Then one would know what it means.

Mr. PADGETT. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order. Will the gentleman from Tennessee offer an amendment? I want to make a point of order on the language on page 2, lines 21 and 22, which reads:

Hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the paragraph the following: "Hereafter subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals for the naval service may be paid for in advance out of appropriations made for such purpose."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me say to the gentleman this is only for official purposes, and under the ruling of the comptroller they can not be paid for.

Mr. COX. I think there is enough regular law in the naval appropriation bill. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, in the confusion a few moments ago I do not know whether I was granted leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not. The gentleman from Massachusetts objected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing some certain data that I was proceeding to read, and also some other data in regard to preparedness for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

There shall be a chief of naval operations who shall be an officer on the active list of the Navy not below the grade of rear admiral, appointed for a term of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who, under the Secretary of the Navy, shall be responsible for the readiness of the Navy for war and be charged with its general direction. All orders issued by the chief of naval operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be performed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary and shall have full force and effect as such. To assist the chief of naval operations in preparing general and detailed plans of war there shall be assigned for this exclusive duty not less than 15 officers of and above the rank of lieutenant commander of the Navy or major of the Marine Corps.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I concede it.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order very briefly.

Mr. HOBSON. I only desire to discuss it briefly, under the principle of the Holman rule. I will not make an extended statement, but I desire to call the Chairman's attention to the fact that this paragraph itself does not involve any expenditure, and, second, that its effect would be to very materially reduce the expenses of the Government under the present bill and under all future bills, and would enable a return to the Treasury of larger unexpended balances than have ever been so returned.

Now, there is nothing so wasteful as inefficiency. There is nothing so economical as efficiency, and with a given provision for naval or military status the injection of improved efficiency for any part of the establishment will of necessity result in economy of the operations in that part.

Now, to illustrate this concretely. I think the words of the president of the Navy War College would be more to the point than my own words, and I will read these for the Chairman's benefit. They occurred in an address delivered by the president of the War College of the Navy a few days ago before the Efficiency Club of New York, and it dealt with the question of efficiency in the Navy:

He said:

It is not my intention to go into questions of the efficiency of individual ships, the results of target practice, and kindred topics. I propose to deal with the efficiency of the Navy as a whole, considering it as a great and very complicated machine, upon which hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended, with one end in view, and only one—the development of a supremely efficient weapon for the defense of the country against any and every enemy which may come against us.

I was asked a few weeks ago what the War College considered that the fleet should do, and I replied:

"The War College considers that every effort of the fleet and every effort of the department in connection with the fleet should have for its sole aim the war efficiency of the fleet. Every effort which does not directly contribute to this end is in itself a wasteful expenditure of energy, and, so far as it is a diversion from this end, is distinctly harmful."

Now, Mr. Chairman, he then proceeds:

I am not one of those who hold that it is altogether inefficient. Unsatisfactory as conditions are, it would be very easy to exaggerate them. When things are wrong you can always find extremists to tell you that they are much worse than they actually are. Some people think that this is the only way to make an impression. Others are so constituted temperamentally that they can see nothing good in anything which falls short of perfection as they see it. * * *

There is much about the Navy which is splendidly efficient, but as a whole it is far less efficient than it can and ought to be. Our ships are fine. Our officers are capable, industrious, and ambitious. Our enlisted men are the equals of those in other navies. But efficient ships and officers and men do not alone make an efficient Navy. They must be welded into an efficient whole by a unity of organization and administration and purpose which coordinates their capabilities and directs their efforts toward a common end, wisely selected and very clearly seen. Here is the first point at which we are lacking.

Now, I do not desire to detain the Chair too long; but I wish to read further his specifications very briefly. I read:

I come now to what is perhaps the most important part of my subject—the organization of the Navy Department, viewed from the standpoint of efficiency. There can be no question that the existing organization is inadequate and would break down under the strain of war.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order at all. He is discussing the merits of the proposition.

Mr. HOBSON. I am leading up to it directly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has been a long time leading and has not reached it yet; and therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. I only ask the courtesy of the Chair, and I submit I am speaking to the Holman rule. That provision, in the first place, insures to the Treasury a larger unexpended balance than would be returned without it, and therefore it would result in a direct saving to the Government. But I can

not explain that in two minutes, since it involves the question of the efficiency of the whole organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that unless he can show that a reduction of this expenditure appears as a necessary result from this provision in the bill, it would not come within the terms of the rule, notwithstanding some statement of opinion by somebody or by the gentleman himself. Even if the Chair himself believed that it would eventually reduce expenditures, yet that would not be sufficient, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. HOBSON. Suppose I could demonstrate that the operation of the Navy as a whole during the fiscal year provided for by this bill would be made more efficient, so that some of the activities required to be paid for would be found unnecessary and left out; if I could show that the efficiency of the naval service would be materially increased, would the Chair then consider the question of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not. The Chair will read the Holman rule to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. I have just read it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. If the gentleman has read the Holman rule and understands the Holman rule, he must understand that the paragraph is undoubtedly subject to a point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair excuse me once more? Has the Chair taken account of the question of the return to the Treasury of unexpended balances carried in the bill, and the fact that those are returned? Our present fiscal year will end by a return to the Treasury of more than $2,000,000, as I understand it, of unexpended balances from the operations of the previous year.

Now, if an amendment could be provided in the bill which would insure that under the operations during the fiscal year, under a greater efficiency, there would be a larger return to the Treasury of unexpended balances, would not that be exactly the equivalent, Mr. Chairman, of an amendment which would reduce expenditures? You might not be able to specify how much it would reduce in any particular paragraph the expenditures appropriated for in the bill itself, but——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD an account of the first battle between ironclads.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an account of the first battle between ironclads. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, what is this copied from?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. From the Vicksburg Herald. The editor of the paper is Capt. D. S. McNeely.

Mr. MANN. Is it original matter, or is it copied from some book?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is an article written for the Vicksburg Herald. Of course, there are a number of extracts and quotations made from different records.

Mr. MANN. How long is it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think it would make about two columns in a newspaper.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Navy: For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, $46,000: *Provided*, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow in the settlement of accounts of disbursing officers involved payments made under the appropriation "Contingent, Navy," to civilian employees appointed by the Navy Department for duty in and serving at naval stations maintained in the island possessions during the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] what is the object of continuing this proviso from year to year? I understand when the proviso first went in it was to permit certain accounts to be passed where, under an erroneous conception of the law, services had been rendered.

Mr. PADGETT. I am not able to explain why it has been in the bill in past years. I did not know but the same contingency might arise in the future.

Mr. MANN. Has it been in the bill for years?

Mr. PADGETT. It has been submitted in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; the department frequently gets into the habit of wanting to do these things. I may be entirely mistaken, but I have a definite recollection that we put this in the bill before because they had employed certain civilian employees contrary to law, but in accordance with what they supposed was the law. Is it necessary now to continue that, when they know what the law is?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer definitely, but I think it would be safe to keep it in.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I will make the point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes a point of order on the proviso. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. I will reserve it.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will get in later, when we really strike an appropriation.

Mr. DUPRÉ. What I have to say is not exactly applicable to the bill in question, but I think the gentleman from Illinois will be glad to hear it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better wait until another paragraph is read. I make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman what objection he has to this? We have inserted the word "Hereafter" in order to obviate the necessity of including the language in the bill every year.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to it as a proper thing to do, but I am opposed to sticking in here a whole lot of legislation on this bill, which the committee ought to have reported as legislative propositions and taken up in the regular legislative manner.

Mr. PADGETT. This provision was in the bill last year.

Mr. MANN. Not in this form.

Mr. PADGETT. I know.

Mr. MANN. It was not carried as a proviso. It was in the bill as an annual matter for the current year, using the word "That" in place of the word "Hereafter."

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to amend by offering the language in lines 9 to 12, inclusive, leaving out the word "Hereafter" and substituting for it "That."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 8, insert the following:

"That officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the purpose and operation of this. As I understand, it is to permit officers performing engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps to be taken away from those duties and assigned to something else?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is subject to a point of order. It is a designation of the duties of these men. In the personnel act of 1899 it was provided that certain officers in the Engineer Corps should do engineering duty on shore alone. Last year we had this language, authorizing them to be detailed to do duty in the navy yards. It is not to take them from the

shore and put them on sea duty, but it is to allow the Secretary to use them in larger duty in the navy yards.

Mr. BORLAND. When they are taken away from the duty which the law specifies, must not their places be supplied by other men?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it just enlarges their duty. For instance, Capt. Burd, one of the most successful managers that we have, a man who has the largest experience in industrial work at the navy yards, has been made the superintendent of the New York Navy Yard under this language that was put in last year. If it were not for that language, he could not be allowed to do that duty, but would perform subordinate duty—some engineering work in the yard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aeronautics: The sum of $1,000,000 is hereby reappropriated, out of the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and made available for aeronautics, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling air craft and appurtenances, maintenance of air-craft stations, experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and such other aeronautical purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not raise the point of order as to the right to make the appropriation, but as to the right to appropriate the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and to change the purpose for which those appropriations were made. I do not know just what is meant by the term "annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment." All of the appropriations made in this bill are annual appropriations, though many of them are made available until expended, some by the bill and others by the Revised Statutes. Now, the appropriations made last year are for the current fiscal year. A portion of them are made available until expended by the appropriation law, and many of them are made available until expended by the Revised Statutes. But this, if I read it correctly, would make all of the unobligated balances on July 1, to the extent of $1,000,000, available for a new purpose and change the law by which the money was appropriated for other purposes. I do not wish to take the time to discuss on a point of order the method of picking up a dollar here and a dollar there and a dollar somewhere else, in the form of unobligated balances, in order to make a new appropriation, but it is an abominable method of appropriation. It would take no more money out of the Treasury to appropriate $1,000,000 directly for the purpose, instead of directing somebody in the Treasury Department to determine what were unobligated balances, which it is impossible to determine for many months and probably years after the expiration of this fiscal year, in order to spend money for some purpose, theoretically but not in fact, because before they will know what the unobligated balances are this fiscal year will have expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. This is for the fiscal year 1914 and not for the present fiscal year, so that there can be no further obligations.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but there can be.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Many of the appropriations in the appropriation law are made available until expended. There are many others for construction work under the general law made available until expended. You can find appropriations in the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1914 that will be a balance on the books 10 years from now.

Mr. PADGETT. I will call attention to the fact that there is a balance for transportation and navigation, $176,000; construction and repair, $1,030,000; equipment of vessels, construction and repair, $433,000; steam machinery, $446,000; equipment of vessels, steam engineering, $230,000; equipment of vessels, supplies and accounts, $110,000; making an aggregate of $2,427,539.76.

Now, I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy stating that figuring up the accounts that have come in since the report was made——

Mr. MANN. Which shows that this report is inaccurate.

Mr. PADGETT. He states in the report that there will be additional items of more than $1,800,000 that can safely be reappropriated from these items.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that, but that is not the point.

Mr. PADGETT. They are annual, they are not permanent appropriations.

Mr. MANN. That is not the point. If we start in on a system knowing that in nearly every appropriation there is some money left, to gather up these sums and reappropriate them as balances in the Treasury for different purposes, the Lord himself, with all His wisdom, could not tell where we stand financially at any time. The Navy Department has tried to state what the unobligated balances are, but they will not know until the accounts are all audited.

Mr. PADGETT. They know that there is nothing to reduce it below $1,800,000.

Mr. MANN. That has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. The point I make is that this being appropriated for 1914 no further obligations can be placed upon them. Therefore it is money that goes into the Treasury under the law, and can not be used by the department for any purpose except by authority of Congress, and that Congress can give authority to use that money which has not been obligated and can not be obligated under prior legislation; that it is perfectly competent in this bill to appropriate that money, to make it available for this purpose, because it is money in the Treasury which can not be used by the department, because the time for obligating it passed nearly a year ago.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to assume that they can tell what the unobligated balances are. There are certain appropriations which can not be obligated after the close of the fiscal year for which they are made carried in the naval appropriation law, to which reference is made here. There are certain other appropriations which may be obligated until the money is all exhausted. It does not have to be obligated here, you can obligate it next year or the year after. Most of that is provided for in the appropriation law itself, and some apportioned by the Statutes at Large.

Now, under the law there is a provision that these appropriations which are not expended, where they do not remain available made for the fiscal year 1914, shall be covered back into the Treasury and become balances at the end of the year or two years' time from the end of the fiscal year. This committee has no authority to divert these appropriations, which are available until expended, nor has it any authority to change the law which requires that these appropriations shall be covered back into the Treasury in order to appropriate the money for another purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the appropriation is not authorized by law. There is no authority for the Secretary of the Navy to procure, produce, construct, or operate air craft, or to maintain air-craft stations, or to conduct experimental work in the development of aviation for naval purposes, or giving him general authority to spend appropriations for aeronautical purposes, as he may deem proper.

This paragraph proposes to confer on the Secretary of the Navy an authority which he does not have at the present time. I do not believe such authority can be found for the Chair as being possessed by the Secretary of the Navy. I have never known of any legislation which confers on the Secretary of the Navy authority either to establish or to maintain air-craft stations.

This paragraph further proposes to permit him to expend this appropriation as he may deem proper for aeronautical purposes. That is conferring a power that does not now exist.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just one word to supplement the argument of the gentleman from New York. Perhaps the chairman would like to know what was carried in last year's bill, so far as aviation was concerned. It says:

Aviation experiments: For experimental work and the development of aviation purposes, $10,000.

I recall distinctly, as does the Chair, that when this proposition was first placed in an appropriation bill it was in this form of language, and it is only for experimental purposes, whereas the clause under consideration provides for a permanent adjunct of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I call attention to the fact that there are two or three other provisions in the current law of last year and the year before. There is a provision in the bill under "Steam engineering" and under "Construction and repair" for air craft. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have just as much right to appropriate this money as we have the right to appropriate any other money. It can not be used for any pur-

pose until it is authorized by Congress, and we can authorize its use for this purpose. If it were for the current year and could be obligated, we would be changing the law, because it would have been appropriated for a certain purpose, and the time had not expired for its use for that purpose; but this being for the fiscal year 1914, which terminated June 30, 1914, and there being no power to obligate this balance, it is money in the Treasury. I call further attention to the fact that we have air craft and we have stations. We have a station at Pensacola, Fla., where it is being maintained. It is in existence and is being maintained under appropriations heretofore made. I do not think that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The point of order is made by the gentleman from Illinois. It appears that it has heretofore been decided that a reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill for a similar object.

On February 12, 1897, the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole when the paragraph was read:

The Postmaster General is authorized to apply to the payment of the salaries of letter carriers for the fiscal year 1897 the sum of $23,000, being an unexpended balance of $13,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for street letter boxes, posts, and pedestals, and an unexpended balance of $9,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for package boxes.

On February 14, 1907, when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole, this proviso was read:

And provided further, That the unexpended balances under appropriations "Provisions, Navy, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1905 and 1906," are hereby reappropriated for "Provisions, Navy, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1908."

It was held that that was in order; but in this case the reappropriations asked for do not point out from what appropriations this reappropriation is asked, nor the specific amounts; nor does it appear that this appropriation is for a similar object. Therefore, the Chair, differentiating these decisions, which hold that a reappropriation is in order, is constrained to arrive at the conclusion that when the reappropriation is asked for it must specify from what appropriation heretofore made the reappropriation is asked and the specific amounts to be reappropriated. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and does not think it is necessary to pass on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman an amendment prepared upon this paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has it been carefully prepared?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. Why not pass it over until the gentleman can prepare an amendment carefully?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to pass this provision with the permission to return to it when I can prepare an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to be present at that time. Will it be at the conclusion of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Why not say that it will be when the bill is taken up the next day for consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I simply wish to know in order that I may be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to pass over this subject until the bill is taken upon the first day after this day for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arming and equipping Naval Militia: For the pay, subsistence, and transportation of such portion of the Naval Militia as shall engage in actual service or instruction afloat or on shore, and for pay, transportation, and subsistence of any part of the Naval Militia as shall participate in any cruise, maneuvers, field instruction, or encampment of any part of the Regular Navy afloat or on shore; for the purpose of providing for issue to the Naval Militia any stores and supplies or publications which are supplied to the Navy by any department; for the actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem to be established by the Secretary of the Navy, of the Naval Militia Board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and for the necessary clerical and office expenses of the Division of Naval Militia Affairs in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, $250,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. Does not the legislative bill carry the clerical force of the Division of Naval Affairs in the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; not entirely. Under the Naval Militia law in the Sixty-third Congress, a copy of which I have here, on page 7 it provides:

The actual and necessary traveling expenses of the members of such board, together with a per diem, to be established by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be paid to the members of the board. The expenses herein authorized, together with the necessary clerical and office expenses of the Division of the Naval Militia force in the office of the Secretary of the Navy shall constitute a charge against the whole sum annually appropriated under the appropriation for the arming and equipping of the Naval Militia in the annual appropriation for the Navy and shall be paid therefrom.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the date of that act?

Mr. PADGETT. February 16, 1914.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in one respect that act has been modified, and that is by a change in the authorization of a per diem for the members of the Naval Militia Board. Under a more recent law there is a provision which prohibits the payment of more than $5 a day for actual expenses, although a rate of $4 a day may be established as a per diem in lieu of actual expenses. Section 13 of the act of August 1, 1914, for the sundry civil expenses of the Government, provides:

That the heads of executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance not exceeding $4 in lieu of subsistence to persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty when not otherwise fixed by law. For the fiscal year 1916 and annually thereafter estimates of appropriations from which per diem allowances are to be paid shall specifically state the rates of such allowances.

I have sent for another act which limits the payment of more than $5 a day for actual expenses to any person. The provision in this bill permits a per diem to be established by the Secretary of the Navy without limitation. I do not wish to take the whole paragraph out, but I believe the gentleman should modify it to make it conform with the law.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The members of this Naval Militia board should not be allowed any higher per diem than is allowed to an other officer of the Government.

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, I shall withdraw the point of order and suggest the insertion of an amendment that it be not to exceed $4 a day, to be established by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman say $4 or $5 per day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Four dollars in lieu of actual subsistence.

Mr. PADGETT. All right; just put it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They can allow them $5 a day if they return a voucher for their actual expenses, but if they are to be allowed a per diem regardless of vouchers $4 is the limit.

Mr. PADGETT. All right; just offer the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest to the chairman to insert after the words "per diem," in line 9, the words, "not to exceed $4," so it will read, "With a per diem not to exceed $4 to be established by the Secretary of the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 6, by inserting, after the words "per diem," in line 9, the words "not to exceed $4."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of the silence of the parliamentary sharks who have been so much in action in the House this morning to ask the House to turn aside for a moment from the bloody naval engagements that we have been fighting here for the last day or two and take notice of the fact that to-day is the seventieth birthday of one of the most distinguished members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my colleague, Gen. ALBERT ESTOPINAL. [Applause.] I think I voice the sentiment of the House when I steal a clever paraphrase of the toast of Old Rip which I heard the other day and say to the general, "I hope you will live as long as possible." [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Care of lepers, islands of Guam and Culion: Naval station, island of Guam: Maintenance and care of lepers, special patients, and for other purposes, including cost of transfer of lepers from Guam to the island of Culion, in the Philippines, and their maintenance, $14,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Will the chairman of the committee advise us what interest the Federal Government has in paying for these lepers?

Mr. PADGETT. These were transferred under provision of law two years ago from Guam to one of the islands over there in the Philippines in order to segregate the lepers and get them away from Guam. They are on the island of Culion now. The whole expense is paid for under this appropriation, which has been running for a number of years.

Mr. MOORE. Well, do any lepers from the Philippines go to this island?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Has the question been raised as to whether the Philippine Government should pay this cost out of its own funds?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not now.

Mr. MOORE. We hear a great deal about the ability of the Philippine Government to take care of itself in matters of this kind, and it has been frequently commented upon that they receive very little assistance from the United States. May I ask the gentleman whether any other provision of this kind is contained in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; this is all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee; I notice this paragraph proposes to remove some lepers now at Guam.

Mr. PADGETT. They have been removed. This is language that was in the bill in order to take care of it if additional cases should arise, and the original language in the bill of several years ago is preserved. It was to free the island of Guam from lepers and place them at Culion instead of having a portion of them in one place and a portion in another.

Mr. MILLER. It is entirely proper, but I was wondering if there were any lepers remaining in Guam in any considerable number?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any, but they have had them there for centuries, and a case might develop now and then.

Mr. MILLER. I will state to the gentleman I was there about a year ago, and at that time I was informed that the lepers had practically all been removed, but under this phraseology I thought it contemplated to remove some more.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand they have been removed, but if a case should arise they ought to have the power of dealing with it.

Mr. MILLER. One further inquiry. The amount appropriated herein is $14,000. Can the gentleman inform us how many lepers from Guam are now at Culion?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. That was disposed of several years ago, as I stated, and this amount is to take care of all the lepers confined at one place.

Mr. MILLER. Is there a separate account kept as to the expenses of caring for the lepers from Guam who are now at Culion?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not answer.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, the Philippine Government makes quite an extensive appropriation for the care of lepers at the Culion colony, and if we have transported some from Guam there, of course we ought to pay for them; but I was wondering if a separate account is kept or whether we gave a lump sum and they used so much for the care of the Guam lepers.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say, but I do not think it is turned over in a lump sum. I think it is distributed in looking after and caring for the lepers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recruiting: Expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, $130,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the naval service shall be expended in recruiting seamen, ordinary seamen, or apprentice seamen unless, in case of minors, a certificate of birth or a verified written statement by the parents, or either of them, or in case of their death a verified written statement by the legal guardian, be first furnished to the recruiting officer, showing applicant to be of age required by naval regulations, which shall be presented with the application for enlistment; except in cases where such certificate is unobtainable, enlistment may be made when the recruiting officer is convinced that oath of applicant as to age is credible; but when it is afterwards found, upon evidence satisfactory to the Navy Department, that recruit has sworn falsely as to age, and is under 18 years of age at the time of enlistment, he shall, upon request of either parent, or, in case of their death, by the legal guardian, be released from service in the Navy upon payment of full cost of first outfit, unless in any given case the Secretary, in his discretion, shall relieve said recruit of such payment: *Provided*, That authority is hereby granted to employ the services of an advertising agency or agencies in advertising for recruits under such terms and conditions as are most advantageous to the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not offer an amendment until the point of order is disposed of. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not make it, but I would like to have an explanation of this advertising proviso. Many lurid advertisements are posted in the cities. They are in the nature of inducements to young men to join the Navy for the purpose of seeing the world. The descriptive statements are very attractive and tend to lead young men to enlist because of the fraternal features of the service. I fear from requests that come along later asking for releases from the Navy that these highly colored advertisements may be overdrawn. I would like to ask the chairman's view of the matter.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there has been much of that to speak of in late years, and the Secretary has instituted a new policy, and whenever a man is dissatisfied in the Navy, instead of having to desert or run away he just lets him out. They have a waiting list for the Navy and have no trouble in keeping up recruits, and there is no trouble and no necessity for inducing the young men by any methods such as you have described.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us how much money is spent in advertising?

Mr. PADGETT. It is $14,519.39—a small amount.

Mr. MOORE. Does the proviso which precedes the advertising paragraph liberalize the department's treatment of the boys who enlist under age?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the law for a number of years; and this year, instead of repeating the law as we have been doing, and as it has received the approval of the House a number of times, and instead of making it a limitation upon this bill and repeating it every year, we have made that the law, and thought we would just take it out without having to repeat it every year.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not think, then, that the advertising for boys to enlist in the Navy has resulted in any abuse?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the last proviso. I have had enough trouble in regard to that in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, at end of line 11, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used to pay for the printing, publishing, or circulating of posters, papers, or literature of any kind that in any respect gives misinformation as to the character of the service to be performed by men enlisted for service in the Navy or Marine Corps, or that is calculated to deceive men who apply for enlistment, or whose enlistment is sought by recruiting officers, as to the character of the service to be performed, the opportunities thereof, or advantage to be derived therefrom."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the point of order was sustained to the proviso ending on line 14, I would ask unanimous consent that the amendment I offer be put in the proper place—at the end of line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. Having stricken out the whole subject of advertising, the matter is not in the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The money to be used to carry on the recruiting service is not used altogether in advertising, or the printing and publishing of posters and literature of other kinds; it is not all paid to advertising agencies. Some advertising is done by and under the direction of the department itself, and my amendment is aimed at the correction of abuses by the department. It seems to me that the point of order is not good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is in order in the paragraph as to expenses for recruiting for the Naval Service. Now, this is simply a limitation on the expenditure of this appropriation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the answer made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], the chairman of the committee, to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] as to the character

of posters, literature, papers, and so on, printed by or under the direction of the Navy Department, and the methods employed by that department to secure enlistments. Every one of us has seen the great flaring posters, advertising in an attractive way, the Naval Service, and he knows they are calculated to deceive. Other papers and letters are issued by the department, or some agency employed by it, and some of them are calculated to deceive. They give misinformation as to the character of the service, its opportunities, and the advantages to be enjoyed by young men who engage in it. It seems to me the department can not be too careful in representations it makes to young men whom it would engage in its service. I venture to say there is not a Member on this floor but has had experience with the Navy Department in the matter of discipline imposed upon some young man from his district or in the matter of a desertion from the Navy, and he has learned that the young man enlisted on account of misrepresentation made to him by a recruiting officer or on account of a misunderstanding he received from posters or literature issued by or under the direction of the Navy Department. It is well known that enlistments about a year ago were obtained, a large number of them, I understand, by promises by the department, or by its authority, that foreign voyages would be taken, that enlisted men would have opportunity and advantage of visiting foreign countries, and when the men were enlisted and entered the service they found that no such voyages were even contemplated by the department. And so much trouble arose on account of those misrepresentations, or the subsequent attitude of the department, that some voyages were arranged and carried out.

Now, I insist that the department can not be too careful in the representations it makes, and in its methods and means of securing enlistments. A recruiting officer comes to a town and perhaps the first opportunity the boys there have ever had for coming in contact with a representative of the Government is then given them; they rely upon the representations he makes, and a deep and very unfavorable impression is made upon the youth of the country if his statements are false, or if the alluring advertisements which he displays are calculated to give a wrong impression of the service. Every one of them, or many of them, are actually false or misleading on their face. A boy is attracted, is unduly influenced by statements of the recruiting officer and by his beautiful pictures and alluring literature. He enters the service which he is led to believe offers great advantages and opportunities. Later he finds the service difficult and the discipline very severe, with few, if any, opportunities or advantages, such as he was led to believe he would enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes longer. I may not use it all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Further, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, that young men may not find the service as attractive as they thought it was, and instead of deserting they are now permitted quietly and without trouble to retire, I wish to say that I think the gentleman overstates the situation. I know of a case where a young man on leave from his ship overstayed his time, and, on account of the experience he had on the ship, or on account of the severe discipline he had seen imposed in similar trifling cases, he was afraid to return. He remained away for a few days and communicated with his family and with me. I brought that matter to the attention of the Navy Department and offered to return the young man to his service, and he did voluntarily return. Some time elapsed before there was a trial, following an investigation of his case—perhaps several weeks—and when he was permitted to retire—permitted, as the gentleman from Tennessee says—it was on condition that his parents pay a large sum of money, an outrageous sum, it seems to me, to cover the expense, as it was called, of his outfit when he first enlisted. And added to that outrageous amount he was compelled to reimburse the Government by paying an additional sum; that is, the money he would have received from the time he left the ship until the end of the term of imprisonment—the entire pay that he might have received—not the money he did receive, but the money he would have received if he had not absented himself and remained away from his ship. And besides the money he was compelled to pay he was imprisoned 30 days.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is also aware, no doubt, that there are some cases where they are not even permitted to buy their way out under those conditions, especially cases where they have had somewhat of the benefit of the trade schools that have been established. I have in mind a case where a boy completed his first period of service and at the beginning of the second period received some of this benefit and became a coppersmith, and served part of his second year, and although his family needed his services to save their property they can not get him out even by buying.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes. Wrongs are committed that are difficult to characterize. There are wrongs in the system that exists in that department, and the young men are not properly treated. They are induced to enlist on account of misrepresentations made to them, and I am inclined to believe that the discipline is far too severe upon boys who come from patriotic homes to serve their country and, if necessity arises, to offer their lives in its defense.

I say these boys come from the patriotic homes of the country. Some of them are induced to leave school or to give up profitable employment. They are boys from our homes, accustomed to proper and considerate treatment; they are not tramps or outcasts of society, accustomed to the frowns and kicks and cuffs of those with whom they come in contact. They offer their services to their country, willing to do their duty, and in case of war—and service in war is always a possibility to those who enter the Navy—they are willing to offer their lives for the flag under which they enlist. The boys who are enlisting in the Navy are a credit to the service and to the country. They ought not to be deceived in order to induce them to enlist, and after enlistment they ought to be treated considerately and justly, consistent with proper and effective discipline, which discipline every intelligent man knows must be strict, and in some cases severe. If they are guilty of violating the regulations of the service; if, as in the case I have stated, they do not report for duty promptly after leave of absence; or, if by mishap they actually desert from the service, the punishment meted out to them and the treatment they receive ought not to be unnecessarily severe. In my judgment, the discipline and the punishment are in some cases too severe. In some cases called to my attention it is outrageous, and I am offering this amendment and calling the attention of the House and of the department to it with the hope that conditions may be radically changed and the objectionable features of the service as it relates to enlistment and service of the boys removed.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman know of any general complaint being made by the boys in the Navy, or is it just an isolated case now and then?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know how general the complaint is, but I was informed that the punishment imposed upon the young man I speak of and the money demands that were made upon him or upon his parents as a condition of his release from the service was the usual punishment and the usual money demand inflicted and imposed upon a boy who gets into the unfortunate condition in which this young man found himself as a result of carelessness, certainly without wrong intention. I believe these regulations, if they are general, are wrong and ought to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, everybody agrees that false representations should not be made about anything. Certainly they ought not to be made about enlistment in either the Army or the Navy.

I do not agree entirely with the gentleman touching the situation. I have had a great many cases that came up, because I represent a city in which there is a very active recruiting both in the Army and in the Navy, and frequently the complaint of the boy has no basis in fact. Very frequently the young fellow happens to be out of a job or happens to be getting over a spree, and he concludes he will go into the Army or the Navy, without having seriously considered what it means. He gets in there and finds that he is required to do a day's work for a day's pay and to obey orders.

You will never have any army or navy fit to call by the name where a man is not required to obey orders. And then these young men either get homesick or they dislike the discipline or the change from their former free and easy life, and the first thing you know a request is made upon their Congressman to get them a discharge. It is surprising the amount of sickness that gets into a boy's family the moment a boy

enlists in the service, wants to get out, and it is surprising the number of other reasons that can be given.

Now, I thoroughly agree that if there are misrepresentations touching the service in either the Army or the Navy they should be stopped, but I do not believe that it is fair to the service to give the impression that young men are generally unfairly treated and that conditions in the service are such as to warrant young men shunning the service.

Most of the men I know are benefited by having served with the colors. I have in mind one particular instance in which a boy enlisted in the Navy. His mother came here to Washington and made a very pathetic appeal to get him out of the service, and there was some reason, because she was a poor woman and in extreme need. It was not possible to do it. That boy served out his enlistment, and one of the first acts he did after he had finished his enlistment was to come to me and say that he was glad that he had not gotten out of the service, that he had served those four years. The result of that service has been to make him a self-respecting man, a man who knew both how to take and give orders—and both are necessary in life—and he was a better citizen because of his service.

While I again repeat that I do not desire any misrepresentation of any sort, yet I think men ought carefully to weigh before they decide entering the Army or the Navy; but having entered it and having incurred obligations and having put the Government to expense, I think real men stand by their contracts, and there is a good deal of complaint made in life simply by the weaklings who do not want any sort of discipline placed upon them.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. The committee has looked very carefully into this matter, and I do not think there is any necessity whatever for it. If there is any criticism whatever of the Navy, it is that the Secretary has gone too far on the side of leniency.

Now, there was, several years ago, too much rigidity, but the present Secretary has abrogated those rules and has gone to an extent where, as it appears in our hearings, the new rules that the present Secretary has put in force suggested a query from a number of the members of the committee as to whether or not he was not going too far on the side of ease and leniency in dealing with the boys, as against maintaining discipline. And so there is no criticism that can be made of the Secretary along that line, and I believe that members of the committee will indorse that statement.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether in the present state of the labor market there is any dearth of applicants for admission into the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I can state that I have a hearing here in which, last year, Admiral Blue stated that a tabulation was kept, and out of more than 5,000 who made application and enlisted in the Navy that were asked the reason why they enlisted, only about 318, I believe it was, stated that they had joined the Navy because they were out of work. The others gave other and different reasons.

Mr. MOORE. What is the present status of the applications? Have they enough?

Mr. PADGETT. They have a waiting list.

Mr. MOORE. There is a waiting list at this time?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and I want to state that the hearings showed, if I remember the figures correctly, that last year there was only one accepted out of six applicants. They sift them down to the best man and the best class of applicants.

Mr. MOORE. Then there is a greater number of applicants this year than the Navy can accommodate?

Mr. PADGETT. Far more.

Mr. MOORE. Did that condition prevail two years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that there was a waiting list two years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. In 1913; I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Was that so three years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that they were advertising then, because they needed men?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy was not fully enlisted two years ago, but it is fully enlisted to-day.

Mr. MOORE. If the list is full and the Navy is turning away applicants, why is it necessary to advertise?

Mr. PADGETT. It is not at the present time; but we do not know what the condition is going to be a year from now.

Mr. COX. How many desertions are there from the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give the gentleman the exact number, but I understand the percentage is gradually decreasing.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman give an approximate percentage?

Mr. PADGETT. About 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr. COX. And the total enlisted naval strength is how much?

Mr. PADGETT. Fifty-two thousand and a few hundred this morning.

Mr. COX. And the desertions are between 3 and 4 per cent?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; about that. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy this morning stating that the enlistment is entirely filled—52,000 and some hundred.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan provides that it shall not be in order to issue literature of any kind containing misinformation which is calculated to deceive men who apply for enlistment or whose enlistment is sought by recruiting officers. Why should any gentleman object to providing that, in theory at least, the Government shall be on the square, and shall not be authorized to publish misinformation calculated to deceive young men?

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit? I do not think there is any necessity for it, because the administration is not doing it.

Mr. MANN. I did not interrupt the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. PADGETT. I asked the gentleman if he would yield.

Mr. MANN. And then the gentleman proceeded before I did yield; but I will yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I thought the gentleman had yielded. The reason is because the administration is not publishing anything to deceive young men.

Mr. MANN. I heard the gentleman's statement.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is necessary to insert that provision.

Mr. MANN. I heard the statement of the gentleman that he did not think it is necessary; but what objection can there be when other gentlemen charge, what everybody knows is true who has ever seen one of these circulars, that the Government issues matter which is calculated to deceive? I am not criticizing the Navy for attempting to fill up the ranks. I received a telegram yesterday morning from the secretary of the federation of labor in Chicago, stating that they appealed to me on a certain proposition in behalf of 250,000 laboring men in Chicago, most of whom are out of employment, and I assume that they know what the facts are. Of course, there is a waiting list in the Navy. With most of 250,000 laboring men out of employment in one city in the country, and the Navy Department buying foreign-made goods for the Navy and giving men no chance to work at an honest trade, why, they apply for a chance to be fed and have a little left over by seeking to enlist in the Navy. You could suppress all your literature, stop all your advertising, and simply indicate some place where men might enlist, and you could fill up the Navy three times in less than a week with men who are unemployed because of your foolish legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gunnery exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery exercises and target practice; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transportation of civilian assistants and equipment to and from ranges, $99,800.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for employing civilian assistants in these gunnery exercises, and if it is not possible for the service itself to provide all the necessary assistants in that particular?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is not. In this target practice it is necessary to have certain civilian assistants for short periods of time.

Mr. HULINGS. Why is it necessary?

Mr. PADGETT. It is cheaper.

Mr. HULINGS. Is it any cheaper than to have the men do the work themselves?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. I know there is a theory in the Army and Navy, among a certain class, that it is rather derogatory to do any work, and therefore we see in all these bills provision made to employ men to keep these soldiers and sailors at their duty.

Mr. PADGETT. The bill has provided time out of mind for this appropriation, just as it does now.

Mr. HULINGS. The fact that it has provided for it time out of mind is not of itself any reason why it should be provided in the future.

Mr. PADGETT. I rather think so. I think what men find necessary is an argument. The common law grew up out of that.

Mr. HULINGS. I move to strike out, in line 5, page 9, the words "and for transportation of civilian assistants."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 5, strike out the words "and for transportation of civilian assistants."

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean and lake surveys: Hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen and recorders, and for the purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, $105,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding five, as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to inquire first where it is proposed to have the printing done under this appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know whether the Hydrographic Office itself does its own printing or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does its own printing.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We were told by Capt. Washington that the cost of the printing was based on the estimates of the Public Printer. Whether that would indicate that the printing was to be done at the Government Printing Office I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Hydrographic Office prints its own charts.

Mr. MANN. Then, if the cost is based on the estimates of the Government Printing Office, and they are to be printed there, why is not the item for printing carried where it belongs—in the sundry civil bill—instead of in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that I have a copy of some of the sailing directions here. I think there are about 38 volumes. They have to be rewritten and corrected and kept up to date, and the department is very much behind in this work. They have received notice from the British Admiralty that they will not hereafter furnish these sailing directions, and it is necessary that we should do that ourselves. In order to do it properly, it is necessary to have the work done by experienced naval men.

Mr. MANN. What does the British Admiralty do for sailing directions and charts of American waters?

Mr. PADGETT. They copy them from ours.

Mr. MANN. They can get ours, but they are not going to allow us to get theirs?

Mr. PADGETT. We have been purchasing theirs and using the English print.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We never have printed sailing directions for our own Navy. We have always depended on the British Admiralty for the books similar to those on the table before the chairman of the committee; covering all the naval waters, there are 38 volumes. Since the war has broken out the British Admiralty, through the selling agents, have notified the Hydrographic Office that no more sailing directions will be sold, as they are fearful that they may get into the hands of the enemy. We are further told by the Hydrographic Office that since the Admiralty has shut down, the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department has been overwhelmed with requests from American merchants for sailing directions, and the Navy Department is not able to supply them. If we make this appropriation to print the sailing directions by the Navy Department, they can sell more than enough to pay the cost of the printing, and the Government will not only be self-supporting so far as providing the warships with sailing directions is concerned, but they will be able to make a profit on the sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. To get the information that I want to get a little more fully, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. What do the merchant vessels of the world do now in reference to sailing directions?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Up to the time of the breaking out of the European war the merchant captains of the world could buy the British Sailing Directions from the agents in the various ports of the world. We had them in this country, where the Navy Department or any merchant captain could go and buy a book of sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. The question I asked the gentleman was, What do the captains of the merchant vessels do now?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. They are doing without them, relying on the Coast Pilot for sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts is mistaken about that. The merchant vessels of the world know a great deal more about sailing than the officers of the fleet will ever learn, because that is their whole business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Illinois does not mean to say that our merchant vessels do not sail on British sailing directions, does he?

Mr. MANN. Certainly I do not; they do sail on them; and they get them without any difficulty, and they have always got them. When you talk about furnishing secret information to some enemy, why, every nation in the world has these charts; every merchant vessel that sails the seas; and it is nonsense to talk about secret information.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not secret information; it is public.

Mr. GARDNER. Is not this true, that vessels sail on the Coast Pilot and the Coast Pilot might be antiquated? It might not show a breakwater that had been recently constructed, or a new lighthouse, for instance. The merchant vessels and the smaller vessels often do not take pains to keep the Coast Pilot up to date.

Mr. MANN. They do attempt to keep the Coast Pilot up to date where they sail the seas.

Mr. GARDNER. Some do.

Mr. MANN. I do not know about those sailing out of the gentleman's district, but those on the Great Lakes do.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no; no self-respecting coastwise skipper would have one of those Coast Pilots aboard unless it was 20 years old.

Mr. MANN. They are that much behind the times. If the gentleman claims that, I will not deny it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I will read from a communication given us by Capt. Washington. In November last, he says, the following letter was received from the agent for the sale of British Admiralty Charts and Sailing Directions:

I am instructed to give notice that no supplies of Admiralty charts are to be made without authority to any European countries or subjects of those countries, with the exception of France, Russia, Greece, and Portugal. Applications for charts from all other parts of the world are to be submitted for consideration. Further, no sales are to be allowed to any customer until the bona fides of the purchaser has been satisfactorily proved and a certificate stating the name of the customer, nationality, service, and ship or shipping company for which the charts are required has been received.

Mr. MANN. Do they claim this is as the result of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not that apply to European countries exclusively?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will recall that last year they were insisting on the consideration of this bill, which was before the war broke out, that they must make themselves all of these foreign charts and cease to buy them. They made that claim then. The war comes along, and hence the claim is made that the war demands that this be done. They were insisting then that they had the power to do that, and the House on two occasions on a vote refused to give them that power.

Mr. PADGETT. Not only publishing the charts, but these Sailing Directions; and, as I said, there are 38 volumes.

Mr. MANN. No; it is what they are seeking now—power to print sailing charts for the entire world. They want to go into the business of making surveys all over the world, and printing the charts, and have different nations doing the same work over and over again. I can not imagine anything that is more expensively ridiculous than that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These sailing charts are issued and printed from time to time, are they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, if the British Admiralty will not furnish the information about these charts, what are we going to do to make the corrections and changes necessary to keep them and make them of service instead of a menace to men who are relying upon them?

Mr. PADGETT. We have their charts up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But our charts are changed every day almost. Even the charts that we issue of our own coast and the charts the British Admiralty issues of the coasts which they survey are changed and modified by the notations of new obstructions or new lights or improvements in rivers and harbors, or anything else that may be of use to the navigators. Are we to print these Sailing Directions, and then, unable to obtain the information that is necessary to keep them up to date, continue to sell these Sailing Directions that may be more of a menace than an advantage to those who use them?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are to be corrected and made correct up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How can they be corrected up to date if we can not buy any more?

Mr. PADGETT. We have them up to date.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Our own officers will correct them up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have not them up to date.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The last issue of the book is up to date, and our officers correct them from that on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How are our officers going to correct them unless they have survey vessels?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It does not require surveys to correct sailing directions. The gentleman is confused as between charts and a book of sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. Of course it does not require a survey to correct a sailing direction, but it requires a survey to know whether you want to.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No, indeed; the corrections are for the most part from reports that come in through maritime channels and also through naval channels, changes in shoals, and newly discovered obstructions to navigation, and new landmarks, lighthouses, bell buoys, signals, and aids to navigation, and all those things. That is what goes into Sailing Directions and what needs correction.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These reports are sold either by the British Admiralty or the British Board of Trade.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 24, page 10, "and printing," specifically on the ground that this committee does not have jurisdiction over printing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the authorization to detail five officers.

Mr. MANN. That is the proviso which has not yet been disposed of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to be sure that that point of order will not be omitted.

Mr. MANN. First I make the point of order on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order to the words "on printing," in line 24, page 10.

Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving now the point of order on the proviso, what is the reason for the increase in the number of officers transferred?

Mr. PADGETT. They have four now, and it is stated that being so far behind on account of the war, and having to do so much work, they need additional officers. They wanted more than that, but the committee recommended one increase.

Mr. MANN. How much of an increase did they get last year?

Mr. PADGETT. One.

Mr. MANN. And they are further behind now than then?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the question and get some answer to it without some one else trying to answer it. As I understand the gentleman, they are not further behind now than they were last year?

Mr. PADGETT. They are trying to catch up.

Mr. MANN. Notwithstanding the war, they are gaining?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say that they are gaining.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is it; the gentleman answers one way and then when you get that answer and would ask another question he backs water. Are they gaining or not?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Why did not the gentleman say so in the first place?

Mr. PADGETT. I did say so.

Mr. MANN. Until somebody answers who does know, I make the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield a moment. We are informed by the Chief of the Hydrographic Office that they need this additional officer to correct the sailing directions and get ready a large number of volumes for printing.

Mr. MANN. Well, let them use one of the four officers they have now to correct the needed sailing directions. What are they doing with them? Trying to correct 38 volumes in order to print them? That is the trouble with the Hydrographic Office, doing a lot of work it ought not to do instead of doing the work that is demanded——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Sailing directions are as necessary to the battleships as the compass is to the battleships.

Mr. MANN. Nobody ever disputed that. They need a great deal more than sailing directions on most battleships if they ever get to any place.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. While we can not get the recognized sailing directions of the world because of the war in Europe, the gentleman from Illinois would have us continue in the position we are, whereby the United States will be under the thumb of some foreign nation for these needed sailing charts and sailing directions, and when the time of war comes in that foreign country we are absolutely without those needed charts and sailing directions, whereas the expenditure of a few thousand dollars would make us absolutely independent of any nation on earth.

Mr. MANN. I think the best place for the American fleet at present is in American waters. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order on the proviso. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman if he will not make it to the word "five" and let us have the language as it was last year?

Mr. MANN. I am willing to let it go at that if it is expected to stay there.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman——

Mr. MANN. I am not quarreling with the committee now. I know what the gentleman expects to do; but I guess some of us will be here when the Senate amendment comes back. We knocked it out last year, and we can knock out the whole item. The Hydrographic Office will not stand scrutiny.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "four."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can offer his amendment afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment to the proviso as printed with the substitution of the word "four" for the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 25, after the figures "$105,000," insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding four, which may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out, line 25, page 10, "$105,000" and insert "$80,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 25, strike out "$105,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the gentleman to make his motion read $90,000, which was the amount of last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can do that when I have finished what I have to say. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out "$105,000" and insert "$80,000" because that is the amount the department estimated and requested Congress to provide. Ninety thousand dollars was appropriated for the current year. When the estimates of the Navy Department were being prepared the condition of the work in the Hydrographic Office must have been so very satisfactory that the department itself proposed to reduce the appropriation by 11 per cent. The estimates were prepared, it must be remembered, after the outbreak of the European war. The action of the agent of the British Admiralty in the sale of charts may not have been anticipated, but it was apparent to the department that $80,000 was the proper sum to request to carry on this work.

The Hydrographic Office has been for years endeavoring to reach out and grasp considerable power that Congress has repeatedly declined to permit it to exercise. All of the surveys, the furnishing of charts, Coast Pilots, and Sailing Directions for the coasts of the United States, including Alaska, the Philip-

pine Islands, Guam, the Hawaiian Islands, and entrances to the Panama Canal, are furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. All information of a similar character on the Great Lakes is now furnished by the service in the War Department, which makes the Lake surveys.

The Hydrographic Office is supposed to make the surveys and soundings of certain other places and to correct and to keep up to date or to furnish charts of foreign countries. The $25,000 increase was proposed for the purpose of enabling the Hydrographic Office to print the 30 volumes of Sailing Directions heretofore mentioned. After the books are published additional or supplemental statements are continually issued in the form of leaves or pamphlets giving corrections and additional information which are absolutely essential if the books are to be used intelligently. We have no such system in existence, nor is it possible for the United States to institute a system by which in all maritime countries of the world agencies will be established through which the navigators of marine vessels of the world will report to some official of the United States information regarding changes or modifications or improvements in harbors that are essential if the sailing directions are to be continued in such shape as may be essential to be of any value.

I listened to the reading of the letter by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], in which assertion was made that it was impossible to obtain the British Admiralty Charts for sailing directions any further, and I noticed that there was no absolute prohibition against the selling of them to the United States. The object of the instructions issued by the British Admiralty was to prevent the sailing directions falling into the hands of the country with which Great Britain is now engaged in war. There is nothing to lead to the belief that the United States is to be excluded from this information, but if it be we have a simple and effective way to retaliate by refusing to furnish to other maritime nations the Coast Pilot and Sailing Directions of our own coast.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the "80" and make it "90."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "$80,000" and inserting "$90,000."

Mr. PADGETT. That is the amount that has been carried for two or three years. Admiral Blue, chief of the bureau, says:

Since these estimates were made last summer, certain matters have turned up in connection with the war showing that those British Admiralty charts are at present very hard to get, and that there would be a good deal of difficulty in getting all of them if needed. We have recommended the cutting down of the appropriation from $90,000 to $80,000, although I am inclined to believe now it ought to be $90,000, on account of the difficulty in getting the British Admiralty charts.

When they struck out the printing it was my purpose to move to amend to make it "$90,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why did not the department submit a supplemental estimate, as required by law, if it believed an additional amount was required in addition to that estimated?

Mr. PADGETT. I believe they thought the amount submitted in the estimates was sufficient.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman may think that way, but the law requires the department to submit such estimates. If the committee does not insist on the department complying with the law, it will not do so. The head of the department has submitted an estimate for $80,000, and there is nothing but the information furnished, not by the head of the department, but by the chief of some bureau, that an additional amount to what the department requested will be necessary. I do not believe that in a time like the present, with the existing condition of the Federal Treasury, the Congress should go out of its way and offer the department more money than the department requested in the manner provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, page 11, insert: "*Provided*, That no books, charts, and sailing directions authorized hereunder shall be sold or exchanged with any nation that declines, through any governmental agency, the books, charts, or sailing directions published by such Government to sell or exchange them with our Government."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it has been officially called to the attention of this House that the British Admiralty has absolutely refused to exchange these charts and books which the maritime commerce of this country is dependent upon, but continues that policy with certain excepted nations, such as Portugal, Greece, France, and, I believe, Russia. I believe it is time to call a halt to this imperious policy of the British Admiralty. Frequently I have had occasion to present grievances of American shippers to the State Department for infringement by Great Britain of the rights of neutrals to ship merchandise to customers in neutral countries, and the only reply I would receive was that the British Admiralty was dominating the diplomatic policy of Great Britain. Has it come to that pass in the history of our Government when it can be officially brought to our attention by a representative of the Navy Department that the British Government declines and absolutely refuses to exchange its publications or allow us to have the benefit of a publication when we are giving them publications of a like character for their aid without some retaliatory action? They have gone far enough, I say, in trying to impede American commerce while letting their own commerce with neutral countries continue unimpeded.

The purpose of this amendment is to give notice that if they do not wish to exchange the 43 volumes of their publications so that they can come to our aid, then we will decline to furnish them the 14 publications of a similar character that we publish covering our jurisdiction. I think no one who has any American spirit in his veins will object, when we have had called to our attention the autocratic policy of the British Admiralty in trying to thwart and check our American commerce, to adopting this policy of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 6, noes 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, is the greatest age of all time, and it is capable of greater achievements than ever have been enacted before in the world's history; but it is also an age of the greatest bunk endured by humankind. We are susceptible to much that is not real. We are largely in the hands of fakirs, principally on the outside of Congress. We are even swayed in Congress by faking propositions. Men come to us who want to advertise themselves. They organize societies for the public uplift, and they impose themselves upon Congressmen. Some of them do this in order to assure themselves of good audiences when they get upon the lecture platform. I have no desire to pursue this further than to say that while we are discussing the Hydrographic Office in the matter of coast charts, I am reminded that that office still has before it, or in its custody, at least 21 volumes of observations made by Robert E. Peary, a civil engineer of the Government of the United States, who made important discoveries in the Arctic regions. Since those records were deposited with the Hydrographic Office Peary has been generally acknowledged as the discoverer of the North Pole.

It has been conceded by the whole world, but there are still men who love to appear in the public eye and who are actuated by a desire to make money upon the lecture platform, who insist that they have a right to dispute the fact.

The Congress of the United States settled this question; it had settled it not only upon the resolutions of the National Geographic Society, but upon the testimony of scientists the world over. With the acquiescence of the scientific societies of the world Congress passed an act recognizing the services of Robert E. Peary, making him a rear admiral, and ascribing to him, an American, the world achievement of reaching the North Pole. That act was passed and approved by the President March 4, 1911. It read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to place Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, on the retired list of the Corps of Civil Engineers with the rank of rear admiral, to date from April 6, 1909, with the highest retired pay of that grade under existing law.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, tendered to Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, for his Arctic explorations, resulting in reaching the North Pole.

Now, after four years the lecturer's press agency has got to work and Congress is asked to undo its own act. The Committee

on Education of the House has before it now a joint resolution which proposes "to establish the priority of the discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto." The old contention is to be reopened at our expense, for the benfit of whom? I shall read the resolution:

Whereas the discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto involves questions of historic, scientific, geographic, economic, educational, and commercial importance: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the priority of discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto be established and declared by Congress, in order that lands discovered by American explorers in the far North may be described and designated as territory of the United States and so set forth in the maps prepared and distributed by the United States Government.

That is the resolution; but under the rose it might as well read, "*Be it resolved*, That we the Congress of the United States open this whole controversy and invite in all the friends of Doc. Cook to prove that he got somewhere near enough to the North Pole to justify the people coming to hear him on the lecture platform."

Members of Congress have been receiving messages from the press agents of the lecturer and they have been favored with copies of his book, but the limit has been reached when the Committee on Education begins to take the statements of a stenographer as to the doctor's dictation for the magazines from his hotel retreat at Newburgh on the Hudson.

Mr. Chairman, the amount of mail matter that comes to us every morning from people who get the idea that they are the real and only uplifters of the country is amazing. Some of it may be earnest, but much of it designing. We are bombarded with vaporings along with good sense, but we ought to be able to distinguish the work of those who are shrewd enough to employ the services of press agents to inspire us with misinformation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Some of you gentlemen have been receiving communications similar to the one I hold in my hand, showing the extent to which this thing is worked. It is not that the laws that are actually passed here are not sufficient to occupy our attention. We have to deal with certain people who live upon their wits, just the same as if they were "passing it" to us on the street. Here is the latest message bearing the earmarks of the publicity artist. It is coming in now from gullible writers who do not know they are aiding the publicity game:

I believe that Harry K. Thaw has been persicuted enough and should be given his liberty at once; and restored to his Family and beg you sir; to use your influence in Congress to pass a law in accordance with the Constitution.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, in very much of what has been said by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] I think all of us will agree. However, I think the gentleman is very much mistaken when he says that Congress has determined that Lieut. or Capt. or Admiral Peary discovered the North Pole. The difficulty about the action of Congress in regard to that was that it did not say so. The language of the resolution and of the law is that he reached the pole, and these distinctions were given him on that account.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE. The act says that Peary "reached" the pole.

Mr. TOWNER. But it does not say that he discovered the pole. For that reason the question, as these other men claim, is left open for consideration still.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that Lieut. Peary reached the pole near enough for all purposes of discovery?

Mr. TOWNER. I presume it is. I am not arguing that proposition.

Mr. MOORE. Why open this question, then, in the interest of a gentleman who is lecturing and who has press agents paid to furnish us with information about his achievements?

Mr. TOWNER. I hope that all of us have open minds regarding that question now; and certainly I am not here as the advocate or the representative of anybody who believes that anybody else discovered the North Pole. But I am merely correcting the gentleman's statement when he said to the House that Congress had determined that Lieut. Peary had discovered the North Pole.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that it would have been better, perhaps, for all if Congress had so determined, because then, so far at least as official action is concerned, it would have been settled. But to say that the North Pole was reached is not to say that the North Pole was discovered. Both of these contending parties and perhaps others may have reached the North Pole, and still the question of discovery or priority in reaching the North Pole may be an entirely open question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am somewhat acquainted with this dispute, which has been going on now for about six or seven years. May I ask the gentleman what part of the controversy the Committee on Education is hearing—what part of it—whether or not Cook reached the North Pole first? Is that the contention, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Education have taken no action in regard to the matter. They have only given a preliminary hearing to some parties that the chairman decided would perhaps be able to give us information.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Would it be violating the confidence of the committee if the gentleman told us who has appeared before the committee thus far? The newspapers have stated that a stenographer who took notes for Dr. Cook appeared before the committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not know what pertinency this has to the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Does the gentleman from Missouri make the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. MOORE. We are discussing a paragraph that pertains to the hydrographic service of the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is aware of that. The point of order is made that the gentleman is not speaking in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Would it have any effect on the mind of the Chair if I should call the Chair's attention——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair sustains the point of order. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not proper to discuss the matter of coast charts of the Arctic regions when we have reached the paragraph pertaining to the Hydrographic Office in the Navy Department, which prepares those charts?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to pass upon the character of the discussion on any paragraph when a point of order is made. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE. Then the Chair declines to answer?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean and lake surveys: Hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen and recorders, and for the purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, $105,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding five, as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it was refined cruelty to stop me this morning right in the midst of a two-minute speech, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may speak out of order for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will confine himself to three minutes, I will not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not make any promises as to what I may do. I have made the request. If you want to object, you may object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has had time to discuss his political views, but I am willing he should take three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this morning I started to reply to the oration on peace delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY], and I was going to call attention to the fact that this morning the press carried a notice that Sir Edward Grey has served notice upon the State Department that to purchase the interned ships, as proposed under what is known as the administration shipping bill, would be an unneutral act.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If I can get an extension of time of two minutes, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; not now; unless I can get an extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will at the end of three minutes, if I can get any more time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman seemed to want information on this subject, and I thought I would give it to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman can give it in his own time.

The question I started to ask was, If the statement is correct that that information has been in the State Department for 10 days, why has it not been given to the country? That is one of the vital questions in that bill. That is one of the propositions that the body at the other end of this Capitol rejected only yesterday by a vote, declaring that they would not prohibit the purchase of these interned vessels; and we have it upon the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I presume it is fair to say that he represents the administration, that the purpose under this bill is to purchase these interned German ships. Now, if the President is in favor of peace, as we all believe and all hope he is, why is he insisting on this bill being pushed through at the expense of every other matter pending before this Congress, to pass this bill that—as has been expressed by Senator ROOT—means the buying of a quarrel? Is he headed in the direction of peace when he does that?

Just one more proposition in regard to Mexico. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] said we had no war down there. I should like to know what you do term it? Nineteen of our own men and more than 100 of the Mexicans were killed. We are told that they collected a million dollars—and for what? Who had the authority to collect that million dollars? Where is it, and what are they going to do with it? Is that calculated to produce peace?

Mr. Chairman, I did not care to make this speech, only I wanted to demonstrate that I could do it; that is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I expect to make a statement that is not strictly in order; but, in view of what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said, I think it should go into the RECORD at this point. Of course, if any gentleman desires to object, I will surrender the floor.

A great many statements are made in the newspapers, some of which come from reliable sources and some not; but about great matters of state, that involve our intercourse with foreign Governments, I think it is not timely, nor is it wise, for Members of the House to rely on those statements and base their positions upon them without first taking the trouble to inquire as to whether the statements are correct or not. As to the statement which the gentleman has just made, I saw the telegram in the morning paper stating that there was a letter from Sir Edward Grey protesting against the purchase of these ships, and I called up the State Department on the phone and asked if that statement in the morning paper was correct, and I am authorized by the State Department to deny categorically that the statement is correct. There is no such letter there, and there never has been such a letter there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Cal.: Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Cal., namely: Labor and material; buildings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferriage, and street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements, models, and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, $70,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the chairman what is the necessity of this provision for the operation of one horse-drawn vehicle that has not been provided for before?

Mr. PADGETT. We have had it before and maintained it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It does not appear in the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. It was not necessary until the legislative bill of last year was passed, which contained a provision requiring it to be inserted in the proper bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That requires it to be provided for specifically?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and that accounts for these provisions in all these places.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert the words "passenger-carrying" after the word "horse-drawn."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 11, after the words "horse-drawn," insert the words "passenger-carrying."

Mr. MANN. Without that the language in the bill means nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval War College, Rhode Island: For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, and care of grounds for same, $25,250; services of a lecturer on international law, $2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, $300; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, $1,300: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $12,500; in all, Naval War College, Rhode Island, $28,850.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the particular necessity of providing "that the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical inspection, drafting, and messenger service shall not exceed," and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. At the War College they have a large force to do the work. The officers gather there, they suggest plans and devise plans, and they need a large clerical force for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

Ordnance and ordnance stores: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval magazines, torpedo stations, and proving ground; for maintenance of the proving ground and powder factory and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval magazines, the naval proving ground, Indianhead, Md., and naval torpedo stations, and for pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $468,000; in all, $5,795,420: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of shells or projectiles for the Navy except for shells or projectiles purchased in accordance with the terms and conditions of proposals submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to all the manufacturers of shells and projectiles and upon bids received in accordance with the terms and requirements of such proposals: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to purchases of shells or projectiles of an experimental nature or to be used for experimental purposes and paid for from the appropriation "Experiments, Bureau of Ordnance."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. What is the change, if any, made in the proviso to that carried in the existing current law?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any at all.

Mr. MANN. Then what is the object of inserting permanent law again? The gentleman awhile ago wanted to make permanent law in order that the provisions might be eliminated from the appropriation bills hereafter. We carried this item in the bill last year.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no change in it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman ought to move to strike it out.

Mr. PADGETT. I overlooked the word "hereafter," and therefore failed to leave it out.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso beginning with the word "Provided," line 17, page 16, down to the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, at the end of line 2——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that the proviso has been stricken out.

Mr. HOBSON. This has nothing to do with the proviso, and it comes in at the end of the paragraph, and so it would begin on page 16, line 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, at the end of line 17, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells or projectiles for the Navy unless such shells of 12-inch caliber are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10 inches Kruppized plate without breaking up when fired with a standard service-powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the matter?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no argument to make.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that a point of order has been raised?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to standardize the armor-piercing projectiles upon which our Navy is so largely relying for its effectiveness. The requirements provided here simply make it necessary for acceptance of the shell, that the expenditure of money from this appropriation for shell shall not proceed unless this type of shell can be shown to be reasonably effective at the usual battle ranges under ordinary service conditions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this involve the purchase of a particular type of shell?

Mr. HOBSON. No; it involves no purchase at all. It simply puts a limitation upon the purchase of shell of a type unless they comply with the condition imposed.

Mr. MADDEN. Would there be any difficulty in getting the kind of shell that would meet the provisions named in this proposed legislation?

Mr. HOBSON. Not if they are to be effective.

Mr. MADDEN. Would there be any difficulty in getting the type of shell the gentleman describes?

Mr. HOBSON. I think there would be.

Mr. MADDEN. If we could not get them, what would the effect on the utility of the Navy be?

Mr. PADGETT. Just shut up the purchase of all kinds of shells.

Mr. HOBSON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is mistaken. He will get time in his own right in a moment. Mr. Chairman, this armor-piercing shell has as its object the penetration of the heavy armor of naval vessels. Its effectiveness against light construction is meager, because it goes through and does not explode; that is, upon light superstructure work and sometimes upon light armor. Its effect in that case would not be as great as other types of shell. In the penetration of heavy armor, however, at battle ranges of 12,000 yards, this situation will arise. Our ships have 12 and 13 and even 13½ inches of Kruppized armor. All we are building now have that or better; so have similar ships abroad. The armor-piercing shell must penetrate that heavy armor at battle ranges or the shell is not effective. If the armor-piercing shell is to be an effective shell, then it ought to be able to stand up and not go to pieces when it strikes the armor it is intended to penetrate. For my part, I believe that this shell can be so constructed. I will say to the gentleman that in tests not long ago—and all this is the outcome of a long series of tests—the department, speaking in generalities, was disappointed because of the fact that the armor-piercing shell did not perform the service to make it effective at ordinary battle ranges under these conditions. I took up the question with them as to the improvement of the armor-piercing shell. They have undertaken to bring about these improvements. What happened was that the shell itself would break up on the outside of the armor. The effectiveness of an armor-piercing shell depends on its ability to get through the armor so that the explosion of the shell will take place behind the heavy armor. If that takes place then it can blast through the protective deck and get into the vitals and destroy the ship. If that is not the case, then it is ineffective. The Navy has been stocking up for years and years with millions of dollars worth of these ineffective shells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. We have been stocking up for years and years, and now we have a vast supply of these armor-piercing shells on hand; and I feel, as I believe those who have been following these experiments with me do, that the armor-piercing shell must be improved or must give way to another type. Unfortunately only a few manufacturers make the armor-piercing shell, and we are practically compelled to rely upon them. The provision of permanent law which has just been referred to has for years effectively prevented other companies coming in and starting up to compete. Be that as it may, we ought to require that in the expenditure in the future of such large sums of money for shells intended to perform a certain duty that they ought to endeavor to make the shell effective.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's idea is that unless the shell can be made as effective as described in his amendment, instead of purchasing new shells which will not meet the requirements we should proceed to the use of the shells that we already have in stock, until the experiments have improved the efficacy of this shell?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. But that in the meantime no new shells be purchased?

Mr. HOBSON. Not of that type. If that shell can not be effective at a reasonable range, it ought to be abandoned. Twelve thousand yards is a short battle range. It has been used in the present war, even with 8 and 9 inch guns. Off the coast of Chile the battle was fought at twelve and fourteen thousand yards, and likewise the battle of the Falkland Islands, and if this shell can not penetrate 10 inches of armor at 12,000 yards, we ought not to depend upon it in the future.

Mr. MADDEN. Are we purchasing that shell now?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; exclusively.

Mr. MADDEN. What thickness of armor does it penetrate?

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to the gentleman that down here at Indianhead, at a short range, they seem to have reasonable penetration, but when we get up to twelve and fourteen thousand yards, or even 10,000 yards, they fail. They can not penetrate, in fact, even 8 inches of armor at that distance.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the statement made by Admiral Strauss in the hearings, in which he said:

We do not manufacture the armor-piercing shell. We are going to manufacture some experimental armor-piercing projectiles ourselves.

In view of that experimental work on the part of the department, would it not be unwise for Congress to limit the expenditure to a particular class of shell at this time?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, this amendment would not limit the expenditure for any class of shell; that is, would not compel the purchase of any other class of shell.

It covered experimentations which have been going on all these years and which we hope will produce that incentive in private manufacturers that will make a shell that will be effective. Now, in order to make a shell effective, whether from experimentation in the Navy or outside, this appropriation is available for that purpose. In other words, the effect of this would be that instead of having a stereotyped test of a shell at Indian Head Proving Grounds, where under certain conditions close to the muzzle of the gun the shell penetrates certain thicknesses of armor plate, and then by certain calculations they assume it will penetrate an enemy's armor at battle ranges, we have under the direction of the special subcommittee the tests on the long ranges. There is no difficulty in the test. You can hit at those ranges. We fired eighty-odd shots, and got 26 hits—a large part of them at 12,000 yards.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, as I understand it, but——

Mr. HOBSON. So there will be no difficulty in this new type of test.

Mr. TOWNER. But this limitation is on the 12-inch shell.

Mr. HOBSON. If they can not produce an effective 12-inch shell they can not produce an effective shell of other caliber. If the shells are not effective, it is a waste of money to continue buying them.

Mr. TOWNER. That is exactly the point. Now, you are limiting this purchase to a certain type of shell, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment before the department——

Mr. HOBSON. Pardon me, there is no limitation.

Mr. TOWNER (continuing). Has made these experiments in order to ascertain whether it should be of value.

Mr. HOBSON. Pardon me; we are not limiting the purchase of any type. What we do is that while they are now spending so much money on this particular type that type ought to be effective before the money is spent in the future.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Do I understand the gentleman to state that this particular type of shell is a shell that is being used almost exclusively by the Navy?

Mr. HOBSON. Practically exclusively.

Mr. HELM. And it is ineffective?

Mr. HOBSON. It is ineffective.

Mr. HELM. Then please explain to me what is the necessity or sense in expending $100,000,000 of money for battleships when we have shells that are ineffective?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; that is a searching question. If our battleships can not execute at battle ranges, why, it is a waste of money to build battleships; but the experiments that have been going on have convinced me that the A. P. shell can be improved; that they can make a shell, if they would, that would fill these reasonable requirements; and that if they will not do it, they can make other shells that will be effective.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. HELM. How long has the Navy been using this particular type of shell?

Mr. HOBSON. They have been using it for years, but assuming all the time it would do the work, and then, when they tried it, it would not do it.

Mr. HELM. Do I understand, now, we have been expending from $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 for purchase or construction of battleships and have only this type of shell available for use?

Mr. HOBSON. That is the situation. We have spent millions and millions on that shell and we have had the greatest difficulty in obtaining the experimentation to improve that shell, or develop other types if they can, but I believe we can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. I believe a crime has been committed somewhere then, because from the statement of facts made by the gentleman there has never been a time when our battleships could have gone into an action or engagement with an enemy, since they have virtually been without ammunition, if the shells are worthless, as described by the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is a good point.

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman desires to discuss it, I also desire to discuss that phase of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the amendment. Now, I wish to call the attention of the committee to this proposed amendment. I think it is a very hazardous amendment. In the first place the shells that we are using are the same class of shells that are used in all the navies of the world, the armor-piercing shells, and ours are as good as those of any other country, and our experts say they are better. Now you notice the wording of this limitation——

Mr. HOBSON. Would the gentleman yield; I will not take up his time and I will ask for an extension in case he needs it. Can the gentleman tell us that the shells in use elsewhere are limited to this type of shell and are not superior to these?

Mr. PADGETT. My information is that ours are not only equal but superior to the armor-piercing shells in use in all other navies and they are so regarded, and many countries buy their shells here from the same people who make ours.

Mr. HOBSON. I would like for the gentleman to specify in these generalities he is giving, if he has no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I have nothing to specify. I have stated it explicitly. Now let me call attention to the wording: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells and projectiles of the Navy." Now, that includes 14-inch shells, 12-inch shells, 13-inch shells, 10-inch shells, 8-inch shells, 6-inch shells, all of which are armor-piercing shells, and none of these shells are to be purchased if the 12-inch shell does not accomplish what the gentleman thinks it ought to accomplish.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield again there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to say to the gentleman that if he wishes to put in a similar limitation upon the 14-inch shell that it must penetrate 12 inches of armor at 14,000 yards, and a 10-inch that it must penetrate 8 inches at 10,000 yards, I have no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. He prohibits the caliber of all kinds of shell in the event that the 12-inch shell fails to accomplish the purpose he designates.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman does not take the amendment to include all types?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. HOBSON. The double word "shells or projectiles" was used, because projectiles or shells have been found together in the proviso that was stricken out.

Mr. PADGETT. Shells and projectiles are synonymous. Now, the wording, "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells or projectiles for the Navy," comprehends all shapes and classes of shells from the largest to the smallest.

Mr. HOBSON. Of the armor-piercing type?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly. That was what was intended. I thought you meant all types.

Mr. HOBSON. It would prohibit the purchase of 14-inch shells of this type if it was found that the 12-inch shell—a fair representative of the type—did not do its work. The failure of the 12-inch would be a fair index of the whole type.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how long will the debate run on this amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Just a few minutes.

Mr. MANN. Why not arrange the time?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes for myself and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. I do not want to cut it off, however——

Mr. MANN. I would like five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] wants five minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] wants three.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask that debate close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by myself.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like 10 minutes on this.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by myself and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. And I will yield to Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman has not stated yet whether he wishes to close debate on this amendment or the paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. On the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. I will have to object, because I wish to be heard on the paragraph and not on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and the pending amendment close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I object to that, because I want to discuss the question of mines, which I understand is included, although not by name, in this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I will make it on this amendment, then. If that takes up the question of mines, I will want five minutes in which to reply. I will say 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. And 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] and 10 minutes to myself on this particular amendment, and then 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and 5 minutes to myself on the other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I desire to offer myself. During the general debate on this bill I was assured by the chairman of the committee that I could have 20 minutes for the purpose of discussing the question of shells.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman want to use his 20 minutes on this paragraph?

Mr. FOWLER. There is no other paragraph in the bill in relation to this matter.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I thought there was a sort of understanding myself.

Mr. HOBSON. Limit it to this particular amendment.

Mr. MANN. We would never get through. I think there was an understanding that my colleague was to have time.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not know that he wanted it at this time.

Mr. MANN. Make it 50 minutes, of which he will have 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 50 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I want simply to add that, having as good shells if not better than all other nations, it would be wise for us to impede the procurement of projectiles elsewhere. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] reserves four minutes.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee what has been done with reference to the power-explosive shells?

Mr. PADGETT. There have been considerable tests made, and tests are being conducted now.

Mr. WEBB. I was interested in the matter four or five years ago, and I believe I started the fight on the experiment with explosive shells.

Mr. PADGETT. They have expended four or five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WEBB. Has it been effective?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. We are hoping that something can be realized, but heretofore they have not been able to meet our expectations.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. It is very plain from the evidence that we have had here from time to time that we have as good armor-piercing shells as any other nation has?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; if not better.

Mr. BUTLER. And if we do not use these shells, what in the world will we have to shoot out of these guns?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing in the world.

Mr. BUTLER. We will have to shoot mush, probably.

Mr. PADGETT. Just shoot powder. We will have no shells. And, then, I want to add again that our condition as to shells, while it is good, is not plethoric, and we ought to have these shells.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a short question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. What is the lifetime of these shells?

Mr. PADGETT. Just as long as the world lasts, if the shell is not destroyed.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. It is different from the cartridges intended for small arms?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it has no powder to it. It is separate from the powder.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I see.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used three minutes. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to use some of his time?

Mr. HOBSON. I will yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be present at several of the tests which have been referred to, and as the result of my observation at those tests I am in sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

The chairman of the committee says that our armor-piercing shells are as good as, if not better than, the armor-piercing shells made in other nations; but he did not say, as I understood him, that other nations had no other kind of shells than the armor-piercing variety, and if he had said that he would not have convinced me as to the fact. Anyone who has read the account of the Battle of Tshushima Straits in 1898 and noticed the execution done there by Japanese shells will realize they were more efficient than armor-piercing shells. If one will read also of the recent battle near the Falkland Islands or the recent battle in the North Sea, he must reach the conclusion that shells other than armor-piercing shells were there used. According to the experiments I saw the armor-piercing shells would not sink a ship in a week. All they would do at ordinary battle range, if they had penetrated the armor at all, would be only to make a hole in it, and it could be easily stopped and the water kept out, so that no danger would follow.

The experiments I witnessed show that the 12-inch armor-piercing shell at 12,000 yards would simply get its nose through the armor, but the shell would not follow the nose. It would explode outside; and while it made the armor plate look badly, by smudging and discoloration, it did it no further harm. It merely made a hole in the armor plate that could easily be stopped. As battle ranges now are 12,000 yards or more, and the armor-piercing shell will not pierce armor at that distance, I ask what use it is? Why invest money in it? Is it on the theory that the Hindus used to act upon when they would bring out drums and gongs and tin pans and make frightful noises when there was an eclipse of the sun, on the theory that a great dragon was eating it up and they would frighten it away with noise? Are we to frighten our enemy with noise? That is the only use of armor-piercing shells to-day, and this amendment would require them to perfect the armor-piercing shell so that it will do execution; do more than merely make a noise.

But there are other shells. The reading of current history as well as past history proves it. The *Empress of India*, a British ship, was sunk at 18,000 yards by a shell that tore the side out of the ship. The historian of the Battle of Tsushima Straits tells us that the shells made great holes in the ships as big as barn doors. Those could not have been armor-piercing shells, because armor-piercing shells will make only a hole equal to the diameter of the shell—10 or 12 or 14 inches, as the case may be.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] now to use a part of his time. I will be ready after he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like to have five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am not just certain in my own mind what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] contemplates in his amendment. If it is his intention by the amendment to compel the Navy Department to continue tests to perfect the armor-piercing shell, I am in sympathy with him. If it is his purpose, however, to stop the purchase of shells of all calibers, as his amendment provides, until we can secure a shell that will do what he wants it to do, I am not in sympathy with the amendment.

The gentleman from Alabama and many other gentlemen, both on this floor and outside, are criticizing the Navy Department and this Government to-day because we have not a sufficient reserve of war material, and I do not think I disclose any Navy secrets when I say we have not a sufficient supply of shells of all calibers in the Navy to-day. If the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama is adopted, we can not buy a shell in the next fiscal year—a shell of any caliber—unless in the short intervening time a 12-inch shell is perfected that will penetrate armor, Kruppized, 10 inches thick at 12,000 yards, and I do not believe the gentleman from Alabama for a moment thinks that such a shell could be perfected within that short time.

Now, we should go on just as we have been going on, purchasing the best there is in existence to-day, and I agree with him that we should at the same time be making the experiments to discover, if possible, something better than that which we have to-day.

Mr. PADGETT. That is being done.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Alabama will change his amendment so as to provide for a continuation of experimentation, I will be with him. Otherwise it seems to me suicidal for this Government to stop the purchase of all shells until we can invent one that will do a certain thing, particularly when the experts tell us that we have as good if not a better shell than any of the other nations of the earth. And I want to say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], if he will think a moment, the other day down the river he saw a type of shell fired from one of the guns of our battleships, a shell that explodes on impact, a standard service shell, the semiarmor-piercing shell, so that to-day the Navy of this country is not confined solely to armor-piercing shells. We have the armor-piercing, and we have also what is called the semiarmor-piercing, that explodes on impact, and gives the effect of the outside explosion, which the gentleman from Illinois speaks of as doing such great destruction in the Russo-Japanese War.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will if I have time for just a brief question.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Have we any semiarmor-piercing shell which explodes on impact and produces the effect I have described? In other words, are those shells charged with a high explosive?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I presume they are charged with as high an explosive as can safely be fired from a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on ordnance of the Committee on Naval Affairs have been engaged for the last four years, together with gentlemen from the Navy Department, in making certain experiments with certain kinds of shells. We have different classes of shells, one of which has just been described, and I think the others have not been described so thoroughly. We have an armor-piercing shell which, according to the tests, will not pierce 10-inch armor at 12,000 yards. We have the semiarmor-piercing shell, which will explode on impact. Now, the semiarmor-piercing shell that explodes on impact has been for many years practically laid upon the shelf and entirely out of use, and it seems to be outside of the range of contemplation by our experts, who have been trying to get something with which to defend this country.

The time is coming when the experience of the world in warfare, both in the Russo-Japanese war and, I think, in the present war, will have demonstrated that a shell which explodes upon impact is effective. There is in process of experimentation and perfection a shell which is worthy of sincere attention. It is intended to strike the water before it gets to the ship, if it can not hit the ship, and then run upon the water for quite a distance and not ricochet from the water over the ship, but run upon the surface of the water and then sink, and shortly after it sinks explode near enough to the hull of the ship, if it is properly placed, so that the explosion will blow in that portion of the vessel under the water line which is not as well protected as the part over the water. The recent successful experiment in this line was with the Isham torpedo shells. Thus there are three shells.

It has been demonstrated, as I have said, that the armor-piercing shell does not pierce at the battle range of 6 nautical miles, or 12,000 yards. We have observed that it does not, notwithstanding the experiments with varied charges of powder at Indianhead and on shorter ranges. As far as I am concerned, taking into consideration the supply of 12-inch or other armor-piercing shells that we have on hand now, I think it well to instruct the department not to purchase——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. BATHRICK. I am perfectly willing to instruct the department that no part of this appropriation shall be used for purchasing 12-inch shells or larger of the A. P. type, unless the manufacturers can demonstrate that they are effective at the medium battle range of 12,000 yards. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has perfected his amendment, which I hope he will submit in lieu of the one he first introduced, so it will overcome the objections that were made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], that it would prevent the department buying any kind of shell until the A. P. shell is perfected.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What do the manufacturers agree to do in that respect?

Mr. BATHRICK. That is a matter we are coming to. We insist they shall improve these shells, and we want more work put on explosive, or torpedo, shells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I should like to have the gentleman from Tennessee conclude, and then I will close on this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that under the rule the chairman of the committee has the right to conclude the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The chairman of the committee has the right to close. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. Three minutes, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman had six minutes, and yielded four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK]. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that no American really knows what other nations are doing along this line. They are keeping everything secret. Of course, we know that they have used an A. P. type of shell for a long time. They have probably developed their A. P. type to a higher degree of efficiency than ours.

It is a mistake to say that we are furnishing the ships of the Navy with semi-A. P. shells. The semi-A. P. shell has not been issued to ships for years and years. Those that were fired the other day had been brought from a magazine where they had been for 20 years. To-day we are completely dependent on the A. P. shell. Under my amendment, if the A. P. shell is found effective then we can continue to spend the appropriation for them. If it is not effective we could not. Why should we spend any more money for them if they are not effective? We can develop another kind of shell. We can improve this type of shell. Heretofore improvements have been slow. There is practically no competition among producers and manufacturers and little experimentation on the part of the Government. I am perfectly willing to limit this amendment to 12-inch shells and over, and I will offer that amendment when the time comes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with doing everything possible for the high-explosive shell, and yet I am afraid if the gentleman's amendment is adopted we shall not be able to get armor-piercing shells for 12-inch guns for use on ranges of less than 12,000 yards if, by any chance, a battleship of the United States is engaged in action.

Mr. HOBSON. We have a vast supply—of course the chairman might question the use of the word "vast"—but we have a large supply of ineffective shells, and I do not want to increase that supply. We can not fight effectively at battle ranges, and if we can not fight at battle ranges with the armor-piercing shell, we ought to know it and develop the use of the torpedo shell, which has reached the point where it can be used effectively. We ought not to send good after bad——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not think it would be fair to take the five minutes on this amendment. The gentleman was granted time on another matter, and I appreciate his courtesy. Perhaps the gentleman can give me some of his time in discussing other matters, but I understood that on this particular amendment the time has been limited.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The statement of the gentleman from Alabama is correct.

Mr. HOBSON. I appreciate the offer, but I can not accept it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the debate on this amendment is disposed of, can not we dispose of the amendment before we take up the other proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]? I think that would be the better practice.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Tennessee will indulge the Chair, he has three minutes remaining on this amendment, and he has five minutes reserved for the other.

Mr. PADGETT. I know that, but I wanted to know if we can not dispose of this amendment before we take up the other matters.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for unanimous consent.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I will ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the three minutes we vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if it was not the understanding that the question of what is called "mine explosives" and "mine effects," which bears on the use of the torpedo shell that will run under the water and explode under water—if it was not stated that that was to be the subject matter of discussion?

Mr. GARDNER. I was going to move to strike out the last word on that, because we could not get at the situation to which I object by any motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair is informed that there are five minutes reserved to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], and five minutes to the chairman of the committee on another proposition. The request of the gentleman from Tennessee was that at the expiration of three minutes the committee should vote on his amendment.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HOBSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. If the Chairman will refer to his own record, he will find that the request for unanimous consent——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOBSON. There can be but one parliamentary inquiry at a time.

Mr. MANN. I am making the point of order that the gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated the parliamentary status.

Mr. HOBSON. I know, Mr. Chairman; but the request for unanimous consent was that 50 minutes' debate should be entered into and apportioned in such-and-such a way, when debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto should be considered as closed, and that was the unanimous-consent request that was granted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair is informed, there is a distinct understanding as to debate on this particular amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. There is no question about the matter on the debate. The debate on this amendment is to close in three minutes, which the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is to have; but the question of taking the vote on this amendment before we know what the other matters are to be discussed, that question was not involved. The question for unanimous consent was that all debate should continue for 50 minutes, and then close on this amendment and all other amendments, and a variation from that would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Just what does the gentleman from Alabama want to get at?

Mr. HOBSON. I do not know just what is going to be said by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do not know what is going to be said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], but I believe that this discussion will have a direct bearing on the merits of this amendment.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee for three minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can add but very little to what I have said. This proposed amendment would be hazardous to the Navy. It proposes to stop the purchase of all armor-piercing shells that are used by the navies of all countries in the world that have navies, when we are informed by the men who have the best information on the subject that our shells are as good if not better than those of all other countries; when all other countries are using principally armor-piercing shells, and when they are buying largely armor-piercing shells from factories in this country where we buy ours.

And yet the gentleman proposes to stop the purchase of shells and leave the Navy without the use of shells, whether we can use them in 10,000 or 6,000 yards, if his project is not carried out to his satisfaction.

The idea to me seems preposterous, that under the conditions existing, with the situation we have before us, when we need these shells, when they are the best of the kind, when they are the standard shells of the world, for us to attempt to stop the purchase and hazard the safety of the country. I call for a vote.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. Is a vote now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. A vote is in order now under the agreement, as the present occupant of the chair understands.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to my amendment. After the word "Navy" insert the words "of 12-inch caliber or larger."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to do that?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to my own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not offer an amendment to his amendment at this time.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the pending amendment:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells of 12-inch caliber or larger unless such shells are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10-inch Kruppized plates without breaking up the shell, fired with a standard service powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama as amended by the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PADGETT) there were—ayes 65, noes 39.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. PADGETT and Mr. HOBSON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 55, noes 44.

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after the figures "$5,195,420," in line 17, insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be used for the purchase or manufacture of armor-piercing shells until $250,000 shall have been used for the purchase or manufacture of high-explosive shells.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offered a like amendment and discussed it at the last session of this Congress and had all the authorities here and presented them. It is a limitation upon the appropriation. All of the authorities universally, so far as I was able to find at that time, held that an amendment which was a limitation upon an appropriation was not subject to a point of order. I do not have the authorities with me at this time, because I did not think it would be disputed that a limitation upon the appropriation was subject to a point of order. This amendment, in effect, provides that the amount which is carried in this paragraph for armament shall not be used for the purchase of armor-piercing shells until $250 000 have been used for the purchase of high-explosive shells, which is a limitation upon the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while it is true that this amendment starts out in the form of a limitation, yet it is not offered as a limitation. It is not in effect a limitation. The purpose is to control the discretion of the department and direct the department to purchase $250,000 worth of shells of a particular kind. That is not a limitation. That is a direction, a positive direction.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] offered a like amendment to an appropriation bill at a former session of Congress, and it was held that it was a limitation and was not subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not remember whether that was the case or not. The gentleman ought to have his authorities here if that be the case.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is not a fact that I offered a like amendment at the last session of Congress to this same paragraph and if the point of order was not interposed and overruled?

Mr. MANN. I do not recall; but if that is the case the gentleman ought to have the record here to show it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if he did not sit at the time as chairman——

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that I did not, because I was a very humble member of the minority during the entire Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FOWLER. But the gentleman does not let me finish the inquiry. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that he sat as chairman of a like committee when the Hobson amendment was offered to this one, and if he did not overrule the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not think I did, and if I did I am ashamed of such a ruling. I would like to see the gentleman produce the ruling. I do not think I ever made such a ruling.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. No; the gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MANN. Probably if I was in the chair, I held a proper amendment in order. I dare say I did hold an amendment in order, but I defy the gentleman to produce an amendment I did hold in order like this one.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been ruled that an amendment may be offered and is in order as a limitation. While this amendment apparently is a limitation upon an appropriation, it includes a positive enactment which establishes a rule for the department to follow, and therefore is legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad for the Chair to read the ruling at the last session of Congress on an amendment of this same character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not the time to look up all these rulings——

Mr. FOWLER. I know that is true.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). But the Chair read the ruling in the last Congress, and finds the Chair at that time overruled the point of order. But the Chair, while very much averse to differ with the chairman of the committee who presided over the Committee of the Whole last year, yet feels constrained, after looking up the matter as carefully as possible, to rule otherwise.

Mr. FOWLER. I had at that time an amendment just like one offered by Capt. HOBSON at a session of Congress the session before, which I presented to the Chair at that time, and read it, and I think the amendment itself is in the proceedings.

Mr. MANN. Is the Chair still holding the point of order under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois, was trying to find the ruling of the Chair on this amendment at the last session. The Chair sustained the point of order, and recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], under the agreement, for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to enter a motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized, under the agreement, for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate this House upon the action which it has just taken. In my opinion it is the wisest step which has been taken in naval affairs since I became a Member of the House four years ago. I became a student of naval affairs soon after I was elected, and I have devoted a large part of my spare time to the study of this question. I have consulted with experts, I have gone to experiments, and I have read the history of experiments for the last 15 years upon the question of armor plate and upon the question of shells. I have come to the conclusion from reading the authorities on military affairs that an armor-piercing shell falls far short of the contention of the inventor of the shell and of those who advocate it. It has been laid down by the writers upon shells that the armor-piercing shell is helpless beyond 8,000 to 10,000 yards, and the passage of the Hobson amendment just now is in the right direction, and it means that if the armor-piercing shell can not be perfected so that it can be utilized as a successful missile its death knell has been sounded by the vote here to-day. If there is anything which has been demonstrated by the conflict raging in the East it is that superiority in naval engagements consists, first, in the speed of the vessel, and, second, the high-explosive shell thrown from the big gun. The effect of the bombardment at the siege of Liege surely is enough to convince all intelligent readers that that mighty fort was destroyed by high-explosive shells, not shells filled with black powder, but shells filled with a much more deadly and much more highly explosive material than powder. That these shells, which have been used and are now being used by every one of the warring powers in the East, are far superior to the armor-piercing shell no one can doubt, and in the face of our own experiments here in America and the experiments which have been made by other countries and the lesson that we are learning to-day from the European war, how can the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs doubt but what he has been mistaken all the past years of his service in this House when he has stood firmly by and fought the battles for the armor-piercing shell? How can he say that the armor-piercing shell is superior to any other shell manufactured in the world?

The battle at Tsushima was a battle between the armor-piercing shell and the high-expolsive shell, and the armor-piercing shell had behind it superior guns and twice as many battleships, whereas the high-explosive shell had behind it much inferior guns and only one-half as many battleships, and yet the David, the little Japanese Fleet, with the high-explosive shell, felled the Goliath Russian Fleet and sent him to the bottom of the sea. That was a contest between American inefficiency on the question of shells and the eastern efficiency upon shells, for we had furnished Russia her shells. Mr. Chairman, I witnessed a demonstration last Wednesday which, in my opinion, stands at the top of all experiments with shells. It is within the reach of America to reach out her hand and take advantage of that great improvement in shells, and if we as Representatives fail to do this I fear that that invention may fall into the hands of other countries and be used to our great detriment in the future should we be so unfortunate as to be drawn into naval engagements with any of the great powers of the East. My term of service will soon end here in the House, but I never have seen a moment that was so glorious and so gratifying to me as the hour and the time when the Chair announced from the rostrum that an advanced step had been taken for America and for the American Navy. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, on last Wednesday I witnessed an experiment with a semiarmor-piercing shell in its flight of 10,000 yards through the air and its contact with the water. It exploded instantly on hitting the water, having nothing behind it except a small charge of black powder, and the fragments flew into the air, which proved that it was ineffective as an explosive against the side of a vessel; whereas, on the other hand, I witnessed an experiment at the same time with a high-explosive shell, the result of which was highly satisfactory to all present. Its marvelous results indicate that the warship supplied with it would hold a decided advantage over her enemy in naval engagements. If all of the Members of this House could have witnessed this experiment, I have no doubt but what Congress would go still further and provide for the purchase of this new shell, so that our Navy might be supplied with this marvelous invention.

Tell me that the ingenuity of America will not be accepted by an intelligent Congress when we find our Navy perfectly helpless in her projectiles! The vote just now taken on the Hobson amendment, to the effect that no more armor-piercing shells will be bought unless it can be demonstrated that the armor-piercing shell can be improved so that it will penetrate a 10-inch armor 12,000 yards away, answers this question.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am so overjoyed because of the magnificent victory which I witnessed last Wednesday, and the swift victory following it here on the floor of the House, that I am willing to divide my time with other gentlemen, so they may have an opportunity to express their views. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], reserving the other five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I am highly gratified at the half step the Committee of the Whole has just taken in adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. For six years I have been working intermittently in the endeavor to have made experiments with high-power explosive shell as a competitor to the A. P. shell, as it is called. I do not know what influence it is in the Navy Department, Mr. Chairman, that has prevented what I call a bona fide test with these high-power explosive shells, but I know the experiments have been very, very slow, and the reports, for some reason or other, have not been satisfactory. And yet six years ago it became apparent that these A. P. shells would not penetrate armor plate of a certain thickness, and it seemed to me it was a contest between the armor-plate people to see if they could make armor plate that an A. P. shell could not penetrate, while the A. P. shell makers were doing their best to make a shell that could penetrate armor plate. And it was at least suspicious, Mr. Chairman, that the armor-plate people and the A. P. shell people did not want any innovation in the nature of an explosive shell, because if that shell becomes more effective than the piercing shell the armor-plate people and the A. P. shell both will be practically eliminated at once. But whether that is true or not, Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Navy Department ought to have long ago, if it has not done it already, make a bona fide test to see what efficacy there is in the high-power explosive shell, and let the country know it and let this House know it. We have been for six years, in my recollection, trying to get the Navy Department to make these simple tests, and I understand they are making some of them now. For my part, I would like to see the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois adopted, requiring the Navy

Department to expend $250,000 at least in making a sincere, bona fide test, in order to ascertain the efficiency of these explosive shells. I made an effort to get such an amendment adopted long ago.

I heard a lecturer yesterday describing the effect of the German 42-centimeter or high-power shell when it hit the ground. It became necessary for the Germans to place 42-centimeter shells in front of one of the most impregnable forts. The shells were placed with wonderful accuracy. Well, on the occasion of his visit the lecturer went to the ground where the shells had fallen and exploded, and there he found, with great regularity, five different indentures in the earth, each of them 61 feet in diameter, 183 feet in circumference, and 23 feet deep, cut out with the form of a well-shaped funnel, with no earth around it and no dust about it. The power of that explosive shell had blown the dust and dirt into the air, as it were, and out into the wheat fields and the forest. If that can be done, I contend that the Navy Department, which has been spending thousands and millions of dollars every year for penetrating shells and other experiments, ought at least to spend a few dollars in experiments with shells to be exploded on the outside of a battleship, which many experts contend will make it unnecessary to purchase armor-piercing shells.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that the Navy Department is using that high explosive that you refer to in the armor-piercing shell. It is the highest explosive known.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman says they are using the explosive in the armor-piercing shell. Then, why it is that they are so insistent and wedded to the use of the armor-piercing shell? Why do not they make a test of the high-explosive shell? I contend that the Navy Department ought to make some such experiments, and as long as I have a seat in this House I shall insist that they shall make a fair, bona fide test of such shells for the benefit of the people and of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this question of torpedo shells has reached the development stage, though, of course, experimentation has not ended. A little further on, on the next page of the bill, we shall reach the question of the provision for ordnance experiments. It has been cut down from $150,000 last year to $100,000 this year. When we reach that point in the bill I propose to offer an amendment to raise the $100,000 to $200,000, so that we can continue and expand these most valuable experiments. But we have really, Mr. Chairman, reached the point where the purchase of a limited number for use would be advantageous. Before the end of next fiscal year, and probably sooner, it will be advantageous and wise to expend this amount for this type of shell. I do not know that the wording of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is the best. The Army torpedo shell rather than the high-explosive shell would be better perhaps, but the object is the same. Successful torpedo shells are now near realization in our country. In all probability torpedo shells are now in use in the navies abroad and in the armies as well.

If we give due encouragement to our inventors, there are certain elements of our shell that will make it superior to the torpedo shell of other countries. We should keep it superior to other torpedo shells. The time has about come when this torpedo shell ought to be included in our appropriation bills. Now, I realize that the provision of the bill itself permits of the purchase of torpedo shells as well as other types of shells. The discretion of the department ordinarily is all that should be required for making a choice or an allotment between types, leaving the appropriation in a general provision, allowing the department to purchase the shells that it regarded as best.

But I confess, Mr. Chairman, that my experience as chairman of the special Subcommittee on Ordnance Experiments of the Naval Committee, extending now over several years, has convinced me that the Bureau of Ordnance is loath to make any purchase of torpedo shells and is loath to make any experiment with torpedo shells. It is much to be regretted.

Such an amendment as is proposed would be the equivalent of a coercion upon the Bureau of Ordnance. That is what it would mean, coercion as to the expenditure of the $250,000. Under the amendment there would be no option for the bureau for this amount. While it would be with reluctance, I would vote for such an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to get some information from the chairman of the committee, if possible. Admiral Fiske, in his evidence, on page 1007 of the hearings, says:

> I think, of course, it is very well known that we are behind other nations; for instance, the two great naval nations of Europe, in the matter of mines and aircraft. I think that in the case of an attack on our coast by one of those powers our inadequacy would be very keenly felt.

Now, can the gentleman tell me, as a matter of fact, what various different items in the naval appropriation bill the appropriations for mines are drawn from? I understand there are two or three different items under which mines can be provided. How do we stand, as a matter of fact, in the matter of the mines which are under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department?

Mr. PADGETT. The mines are provided for under the appropriation for "Ordnance and ordnance stores."

Mr. GARDNER. Well, it was testified last year by Admiral Strauss that they also could be appropriated for and the money used under "Armor and armament."

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How many more subdivisions are there where appropriations for mines are tucked away?

Mr. PADGETT. Those are the only two that I recall at present.

Mr. GARDNER. How much are you appropriating for mines this year?

Mr. PADGETT. It is embraced in the lump-sum appropriations, in these two appropriations; in the $5,795,420 appropriated for ordnance and ordnance stores.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman give me any idea as to how much you are appropriating for mines in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No. There is no specific estimate submitted for mines. They submitted a total estimate to take care of the mines as well as the other items, but there was no specific estimate submitted for mines.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman tell me what mines we have got in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; I could do so, but I do not think it would be proper to make it public. I will make this statement, however, that the Navy Department had on hand a certain number of mines, and the General Board, of which Admiral Fiske was a member, recommended that we should have a given number in addition to that, and thereupon that additional number was ordered and is now being constructed at the navy yard at Norfolk, and when that number that was ordered is completed we shall have 50 more than the General Board recommended as the proper number to have.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, does that include all sorts of mines—the $70 cheap mines and the anchor mines?

Mr. PADGETT. Those are the expensive mines; the large mines.

Mr. GARDNER. What did Admiral Fiske mean by his evidence, then?

Mr. PADGETT. I am unable to say. Admiral Fiske was a member of the General Board. The General Board recommended that there should be a given number, and thereupon the department ordered the number that it would be necessary to get to make that number, added to what we had on hand; as a matter of fact, 50 more than that number.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman. Now, as a matter of fact, the Army has furnished me a statement as to the mines which they have on hand for seacoast defense. If the Army can reveal not only how many mine cases they have on hand, but also how many mines, the Navy can afford to do the same thing.

Now I am going to read some more from Admiral Fiske's evidence. Admiral Fiske says:

> For carrying and laying mines we have the *San Francisco*, a vessel of about 4,000 tons. She has, I think, 336 mines, mines not of the most modern type, but still good for use. That is all we have at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman three minutes out of my five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER. I will try to get through with less. Now, referring to Admiral Fiske's words there, I assume he refers to mine-laying ships when he says "That is all we have at present."

Mr. PADGETT. Let me call this to the gentleman's attention: The department ordered and has under construction at the present time at the Norfolk Navy Yard 2,200 mines, which is in

addition to the number which I did not state which was on hand.

Mr. GARDNER. And when will they be finished?

Mr. PADGETT. They are commencing the delivery in the present month.

Mr. GARDNER. And when will they be finished? Within two years?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say exactly, but within a few months.

Mr. GARDNER. The whole of them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How are those mines going to be laid? Here is an extract from page 1001 of the hearings:

Mr. ROBERTS. How many of the mine-laying ships should we have?
Admiral FISKE. We have the *San Francisco*.
Mr. ROBERTS. How many should we have?
Admiral FISKE. Germany has five, I believe.
Mr. ROBERTS. Do you think we should have five?
Admiral FISKE. I think so.
Mr. ROBERTS. Should we have more than that?
Admiral FISKE. Yes; I should think so. Our coast is very much longer than Germany's coast. I should think we should have more than that.

Has there been any step taken by the committee to remedy that situation?

Mr. PADGETT. No. There are a number of types of ships that can be used for the purpose of laying mines. There are other ships that are recommended that are more essential and more important, and the committee has provided for that class of ships when we can use other ships that we have for mine laying.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman knows that Admiral Fiske does not agree with him on that point?

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Fiske does not disagree with the idea that they can be used.

Mr. GARDNER. No. He says they are not appropriate for any other Navy purpose, if fitted for mine laying.

Mr. PADGETT. He says the ones they use are better.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, one moment further. I read:

Mr. ROBERTS. Would we need a special appropriation to bear the expense for an extensive development along that line?
Admiral FISKE. I believe Germany spent $500,000 in 1913 on mines. They are supposed to have about 20,000 mines. How close those figures are to the actual facts I do not know. That is what I hear. I have a good many sources of information, and I am under the impression that they have 20,000 mines.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the mines. You were talking about the ships.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but I was taking his evidence in the order in which it appears in the hearings.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any statement further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder, $1,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be expended for the purchase of powder other than small-arms powder at a price in excess of 53 cents a pound: *Provided further*, That in expenditures of this appropriation, or any part thereof, for powder, no powder shall at any time be purchased unless the powder factory at Indianhead, Md., shall be operated on a basis of not less than its full maximum capacity.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 17, in line 6, by striking out the figures "53" at the end of said line and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "50."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the interest of economy. It has been demonstrated that we manufacture powder at a cost of from 30 to 34 cents. In fact, I believe we can manufacture it for less than that. We have been paying 53 cents for the last three years for the powder that we purchase. As I recollect, prior to that time we had been paying a much larger sum, as high perhaps as 80 or 85 cents per pound. It is to the credit of some Members, and especially the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] who is chairman of the subcommittee on coast defenses, that a reduction has been made in the purchase price of this powder. If we can manufacture powder at a cost of 30 to 35 cents a pound, then the difference between that and 53 cents a pound is an exceedingly large profit. That is nearly double. If we could manufacture it for 26½ cents a pound, then the price that we are now paying would be exactly double.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman think that in the present state of affairs, when powder is so much in demand, it is rather dangerous to put a maximum price on it?

Mr. FOWLER. We have already fixed a maximum price at 53 cents. We have done that to my recollection in the last three bills, or at least in the last two, and my recollection is in the last three. Now, if it has been demonstrated that powder can be manufactured for from 30 to 35 cents a pound, then the difference between that price and 53 cents a pound is an exorbitant profit, which ought not to be imposed upon the people of this country. We represent individual districts primarily, and at large we represent America. That being the case, it becomes our duty to see that no company or combination of companies shall impose upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BROWNING. I should just like to ask the gentleman whether it costs any less to manufacture powder now than it did three years ago, when this proviso was put in the bill?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I think not.

Mr. BROWNING. Then why should we reduce it?

Mr. FOWLER. We reduced it then, because we had not, as I recollect, determined exactly what the cost of the production of powder was.

Mr. BROWNING. I think the gentleman will find he is very much mistaken in what he says the cost of Government manufacture is.

Mr. FOWLER. No; I am not mistaken. If I were mistaken about it then I would feel ashamed to offer this amendment; but knowing my ground I feel certain that the amount which we are now paying for powder is exorbitant, and I do not think, in the light of the information which we have received during the last five years concerning the cost of the manufacture of powder, that we can justify ourselves in voting to pay to any corporation or any trust in this country 53 cents a pound.

Mr. BROWNING. If the gentleman will look at the hearings before the Naval Committee, I think he will find it was testified by Admiral Strauss that the powder manufactured by the Government cost it about 44 cents a pound.

Mr. FOWLER. I know what the testimony has been heretofore. I know it has been that it cost about 34 cents a pound, instead of 44 cents a pound, and I believe it can be manufactured at a much less cost than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The figures as to the cost of manufacture are obtained only from the Government manufacture, are they not?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that the powder manufacturers, known as the Powder Trust, have never permitted an examination of their books; that they have refused it, and that the probability is that they are manufacturing it for very much less than the Government is, owing to the fact that the Government pays about 25 per cent higher wages, giving annual leave and other privileges to the working people that the Powder Trust does not?

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that is largely true, Mr. Chairman; and for that reason and others I have seen fit to offer this amendment. I do not think there is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee who will dispute that the Government is now manufacturing powder at not to exceed 34 cents a pound and that we are paying, according to the law which is on the statute books, the sum of 53 cents a pound, which ought not to be the case. The difference between 34 cents and 53 cents is too great. It runs up to nearly 100 per cent, and 10 per cent is considered a handsome profit on any investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the limitation fixed in this bill is the same as is fixed in the Army appropriation bill. Congress has kept the two services upon the same basis. I agree fully with the suggestion made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], that this is not the time to fix a price limitation so low that we might not be able to get powder if we needed it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do they not take off the maximum limitation of 53 cents and leave it open?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we keep it as we had it last year and as the House has fixed it this year in the Army appropriation bill, which has preceded our bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you are in favor of the limitation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you can not agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Illinois made a very positive statement about the cost of powder, and said it was from 30 to 35 cents. The committee went into that matter with Admiral Strauss, and the cost of powder, as will be found on page 200 of the hearings, was thirty-six and a fraction cents a pound, and that did not include any allowance for interest on the investment, nor does it include any allowance for taxes, and there are other matters that enter into the cost of powder by the powder manufacturer that is not expresesed in these items. So that the gentleman's statement is below the figures given by Admiral Strauss.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois) there were 11 ayes and 31 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The item that provides for the Government to run the Indianhead powder mill to its full capacity was an amendment that I offered in the House, and was my first effort in Congress. It passed the House, but was squeezed out in the conference between the two Houses. At that time it seemed to be dangerous for the Government to extend its powder plant and manufacture its own powder, because it was thought that the Powder Trust would go out of business and refuse to manufacture it unless they could be satisfied with the amount of their contract and the amount of the profit that they desired. Of course these trusts, especially the large ones that have been proved guilty of violations of the law are very modest in their requests and demands for profit. We have now just voted down an amendment that provided for reducing the price of powder from 53 to 50 cents, which would give a fair profit to the Powder Trust, but if there was an effort made to increase wages or something of that sort we would hear a great many cry out for economy. This amendment would have probably saved the Government quite a good deal of money. There is no doubt but that there is sufficient profit for the powder manufacturer. If this trust is so powerful as to be dangerous unless we satisfy them, if we are not going to have their powder, probably there would be other manufacturers that would be glad to make a sale of powder at a fair price and a fair profit.

There is no doubt in my mind that private powder manufacturers are manufacturing powder for even less than the Government reports that it cost them to make the powder. While it is true we have had the representative of the Powder Trust before the committee, and he makes it appear that it costs 44 or 45 cents a pound, yet while it is said that figures do not lie, sometimes liars figure, and it is the general custom of these trusts, especially those that have little regard for the law except to keep out of its toils, not to have much regard for truth.

So it is that we do not know the facts. They have refused to show their books; they have refused to let experts of the Government who want to get at the facts as to the cost of these things see what it has cost them; they prefer to see the head of the company, or some one who will not give away their methods and the cost, come before the committee and make explanations. They have always refused to open their books and give the facts in regard to the cost of the manufacture of war munitions.

Instead of the 50 cents that you have just voted down being too small, in my judgment it is too large. There is one gratification about it, and that is that Government powder manufacturing is being extended and becoming much more efficient from the fact that the Government has undertaken to manufacture it. When the people wake up to the fact that they are being plundered by these corporations, they are going to demand of their Representatives that they will support measures that will permit the Government to manufacture all of its war munitions, so that you can have the best and the cheapest that there is and give working men the best conditions by permitting them to have a part in the industry. We know that under Government employment workingmen get better conditions, more wages, get annual leave, get sick leave, and still find the cost of the manufacture of the war munitions much less than it can be purchased or contracted for. Still we find great opposition, as a rule, to extending our plants or establishing plants for the manufacture of munitions of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question and ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's time will be extended for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if two years ago the Naval Committee did not report in favor of enlarging the plant at Indianhead in order to make more powder, and if the gentleman did not file a minority report against the enlargement of the powder plant at Indianhead?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I never was opposed to an enlargement of the powder mill in any capacity that would be necessary to manufacture the powder that the Government needs.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he, in writing, filed a minority report protesting against the enlargement of the powder plant at Indianhead, stating specifically that it was large enough to manufacture all the powder we needed.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Was that true?

Mr. PADGETT. It was not; and we enlarged it over the gentleman's protest and his minority report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I signed a minority report, which in the main, of course, I was in favor with, one year ago, to prevent the building of useless battleships, because the only benefit they are is to give a few men work and the armor-plate ring about $2,000,000 profit to every battleship that is built. If we could stop that useless expenditure of money, perhaps we would have in our plant at Indianhead sufficient capacity to manufacture what powder we need. That was one of the things that the minority was in favor of at that time; but I would like to say to the chairman of my committee, who is a lovable gentleman, that it was over his protest that I secured the passage of an amendment—I think it was four years ago—which provided for the extension of the powder mill, and perhaps he did not exercise his efforts very strongly to keep it in the bill when in conference. Therefore it was squeezed out; so it might be asked of him whether in that conference at that time, when this amendment to increase the capacity for the Government to operate that factory to full capacity—whether or not he did, in representing this House in conference, exercise his influence as he should have exercised it to keep the amendment in. Due to the fact that we did not keep it in, we did not have this sort of legislation for a year afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Not being a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I am obliged to rely in considerable measure on the good judgment of that committee to guide me in my vote on propositions of this kind. But at this point I desire to call attention to certain testimony concerning the cost of making powder, a subject which seems to be in dispute here. On page 207 of the hearings I find the following:

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask you if you can put in the hearings a statement as to the cost of manufacturing powder?

Admiral STRAUSS. The powder for this year?

The CHAIRMAN. I mean for the fiscal year ending June 30.

Admiral STRAUSS. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the cost, including all overhead charges, administration, etc., was $0.38072 per pound. That is, about 38 cents.

Mr. BROWNING. Does that include packing?

Admiral STRAUSS. That includes everything—the packing, tug service——

Mr. BROWNING. And freight?

Admiral STRAUSS. And freight. It includes everything that is incident to the production of power at Indianhead.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it embrace the administration charges of the force that may be used here in Washington?

Admiral STRAUSS. It does not embrace the cost of clerical work here in the department.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate that to be, or have you an estimate of what that would be, if added?

Admiral STRAUSS. Oh, it would be a very small amount, the pay of one clerk and part of the pay of one officer, so far as the Bureau of Ordnance is concerned——

Mr. ROBERTS. It would be a small part of a cent?

Admiral STRAUSS. A very small fraction of a cent.

He was then questioned about insurance, and replied that the Government plant insured itself. Then Mr. ROBERTS, of that committee, took up the inquiry as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS. Does it include interest on capital?
Admiral STRAUSS. Yes, sir; we have allowed 3 per cent on the plant value and the stock in suspension. That is included.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you say 3 cents or 3 per cent?
Admiral STRAUSS. Three per cent on our total investment—that is, buildings and machinery——
Mr. ROBERTS (interposing). And land?
Admiral STRAUSS. Land and stock in suspension. The investment in land is very small.
The CHAIRMAN. What do you include the value of the plant at?
Admiral STRAUSS. We estimate the plant value to be $1,278,870.
The CHAIRMAN. What do you include for stock in suspension?
Admiral STRAUSS. The stock in suspension is estimated at $1,010,000. That includes materials for the manufacture of powder and powder not yet completed.

On page 211 I find the following:

Mr. BROWNING. As I understand you, Admiral, the stability of the powder produced by the Government and that bought from private manufacturers is about the same?
Admiral STRAUSS. I think it is about the same.
Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the difference in the cost?
Admiral STRAUSS. Last year our total cost for powder produced at Indianhead was about 38 cents, and we purchased it at 53 cents.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.: For machinery for extension of powder factory, to be available until expended, $141,620.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 17, strike out the figures "$141,620" and insert in lieu thereof "$350,000: *Provided*, That $200,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, be used for the construction of a Government plant for the manufacture of high-explosive shells."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I concede that if the chairman of the committee or any other gentleman desires to interpose a point of order against the proposition it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Torpedoes and appliances: For the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, to be available until June 30, 1918, $1,000,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it the intention of the Naval Committee to provide torpedoes or to provide for money to manufacture torpedoes to be 21 feet in length and 21 inches in diameter for the use of submarines? In other words, are the long-range torpedoes to be made for submarines?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are not. The submarines are not fitted to use that size torpedo. At submarine range the torpedo is not so large. They go up near the ship. The farther they are off, the smaller the angle and the greater the danger of missing, so they go up close to the ship to fire.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I invite attention to the evidence of Admiral Fletcher. On pages 542–543 of the hearing, speaking of these long-range 21-foot torpedoes, Mr. WITHERSPOON asked:

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Now, what I want to ask you is: Are the latest submarines equipped with that torpedo?
Admiral FLETCHER. No; they are not equipped with that torpedo.
Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, can they be equipped with it?
Admiral FLETCHER. My impression is that they will be equipped with them eventually.
Mr. WITHERSPOON. The highest grade of torpedo?
Admiral FLETCHER. Yes.
Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is no reason why the submarine should not have the same powerful torpedo that a battleship has, is there?
Admiral FLETCHER. No reason; but a long-range torpedo is not so essential on a submarine that can get close to a battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit me just at that point?

Mr. GARDNER. In just a minute I will yield to the gentleman. Now, Admiral Strauss said, and the Secretary of the Navy quoted him when he made answer to something which I had not said, but which appeared in a morning newspaper—Admiral Strauss said that the *Aboukir*, the *Cressy*, and the *Hogue* were blown up at short range, and apparently he drew the inference that short-range torpedoes are all we need for our submarines. Mr. Chairman, the next bunch of ships will not be blown up at short range. Many a man has been killed with a revolver at short range, especially when he was not on his guard; but any sensible man would rather have a long-range weapon than a short-range weapon, if he was bent on the destruction of an enemy. Of course, it must be assumed that the long-range torpedo has high speed and power. I am afraid the great trouble is that Admiral Strauss does not want to scrap his old short-range torpedoes. Let me read you from the admiral's own statement in his report made as Chief of Bureau of Ordnance before this agitation was begun. The report is dated September 23, 1914. Here is what the admiral says on page 8:

The torpedo situation is developing very satisfactorily with the exception of modern torpedoes for battleships anterior to the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*. For cruisers of the *Tennessee* class and for the scouts—

Now, that is a formidable list of vessels he is describing—

At present all of these vessels are equipped with short-range torpedoes which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet.

That statement was made before I began a discussion of the torpedo situation and before it became an issue. Now, Mr. Chairman, the admiral says that the battleships anterior to the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma* are all equipped with short-range torpedoes. The fact is that all our battleships are anterior to the *Nevada* and the *Oklahoma*. Neither of them has yet been completed. In other words, every battleship of the United States Navy is equipped with short-range torpedoes, which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet, but the unpleasant fact is completely shrouded in that paragraph which I just read.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that we have established in this country a range of 4,000 yards as a proper range for the submarine torpedo and later the General Board has considered the matter very carefully, and they have reduced that range from 4,000 to 2,000 yards as a proper range for the torpedoes. And I may say further that the range that the board has established—that is, the reduced range—is twice the range of the submarines of countries in Europe, so that even with our reduced ranges we are twice the range of England, France, and Germany.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.
Mr. GARDNER. How does the chairman know that?
Mr. PADGETT. I have a letter from Admiral Strauss.
Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman read that letter?
Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; I have no objection to putting it in the RECORD.
Mr. BUTLER. Let it be read.
Mr. PADGETT. Now, I want to state this about torpedoes: A great deal has been said about torpedoes. We have a full supply of torpedoes for every torpedo tube we have in submarines, torpedo boats, and battleships, including the ones that were authorized in the last bill.

That is, Congress has appropriated for and we have either on hand or ordered a full supply for every tube that we have up to and including the authorizations in the last bill, and in addition to that we have on hand and ordered a reserve equal to the supply for all of our tubes, lacking only six torpedoes. We had ordered from abroad seven torpedoes, known as the Fumi torpedo, which we were cut off from getting by reason of the war, and if we had had those seven we would have had one extra for all the tubes that we have.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PADGETT. I will yield.
Mr. GARDNER. Now, the gentleman is saying that we have the torpedoes needed according to the estimate of Admiral Strauss.
Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is the amount that has been fixed. There is no secret about it. I did not give the aggregate amount; but I have no objection——
Mr. BUTLER. I think the letter really ought to be read.
Mr. PADGETT. I will read it in a few minutes.
Mr. GARDNER. I would like to have it read in a few minutes; but I would like to ask, counting in all your short-range torpedoes, how many does that give for each torpedo tube on the fleet.
Mr. PADGETT. That is what I am coming to right now. In the vessels of the *Ohio* class, 3 of them, the fill or supply is 24 torpedoes, or 8 torpedoes for each ship. Each torpedo has a fill with that type of ship. Of ships of the *Virginia* class there are 5, and 16 torpedoes is a fill or supply for that class of ship. The *Connecticut* class is 18. The *Michigan*, the *Delaware*, the *Florida*, and the *Wyoming* class is 12. The *Texas* and the *Oklahoma* class is 16, and the *Pennsylvania* and the *California*—the *California* being the one authorized in the last bill—are 24 for a fill or supply, and 24 being reserved would make 48 for each one for that class of ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, that we may get information about these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, you take the cruisers. There are four of the cruisers that require 16 torpedoes each; there are other cruisers that require 8. All of the destroyers that run from 4 to 12 and the submarines, running from 3 to 14, have a fill. Now, then, as I stated, we have not only the complete fill but we have a complete reserve ordered and on hand, lacking 6, and if we had gotten the 7 that were ordered abroad we would have 1 surplus.

Now, the torpedoes that are being manufactured from the million dollars that was appropriated last year are the best types of torpedoes, and the million dollars that is provided in this bill is for the purpose of supplying and remaking and building up to it the older type of torpedoes that we have. In other words, some of the torpedoes are being made shorter in certain respects and with larger heads, in order to carry a larger quantity of high explosives. So this talk you have heard over the country about our torpedo situation is not correct.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman has had his time extended for five minutes, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended.

Mr. PADGETT. I join in the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. You stated a while ago that the board had reduced the range from 4,000 to 2,000 yards.

Mr. PADGETT. The fighting range.

Mr. HELM. I would like to have you make that a little clearer, inasmuch as it is somewhat hazy. In other words, they give instructions that a submarine should endeavor to get within 2,000 yards of the ship before firing?

Mr. PADGETT. They have not reduced the torpedo.

Mr. HELM. You and I are in a battle, or our ships are in a battle with the enemy, and they are going to stand where we tell them to stand. Is that the idea?

Mr. PADGETT. No; but the submarine is to endeavor to sail within 2,000 yards and fire.

Mr. HELM. Now they have only had to sail within 4,000 yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Four thousand yards was the limit that was fixed heretofore; so that 2,000 yards is twice the distance prescribed for England, France, and Germany.

Mr. HELM. In other words, so I understand you, good fighting requires you to be within 2,000 yards of an enemy before you will fire a torpedo?

Mr. PADGETT. No. Now, we started out with the torpedo at a 1,000-yard range. That was their running range. We have in a few years developed until we are manufacturing now torpedoes with a 10,000-yard limit, which is 6 sea miles, or nearly 7 land miles.

Now, I may say—and I am not giving away any secret—that we are developing a torpedo with a range of 13,500 yards. That does not mean, however, that when we get the torpedo with a range of 13,500 yards the 10,000-yard range torpedo is useless and a failure, and that in making the 10,000-yard torpedo now it does not mean that we will throw away the torpedo with a range of 7,000 yards that we made the year before last. They are still valuable and useful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more. I will then yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts some time.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not ask the gentleman for time. I ask the committee to yield time to me.

Mr. PADGETT. I will join in giving it to you. I want you to have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, you can realize at once that if you are firing at 10,000 yards, a little variation at the start with the torpedo will carry the torpedo wide of the mark at that range, but the same variation at a range of 2,000 yards would make very little difference. The angle broadens geometrically as the distance increases.

Now, then, the battleships and the submarines are equipped with those long-range torpedoes, because they fire them at long range. The submarine can submerge beneath the surface, with its periscope above, and can steam under the water and get up closer, so that the General Board has prescribed it as a regulation that they should endeavor to get within 2,000 yards and reduce to the minimum the angle of variation, so as to multiply very largely the chances of hitting.

Now, I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question before he sits down?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, because it must be admitted by everybody that the statement as made by the gentleman is true, otherwise every time you sent a torpedo out from a ship it would sink the other ship, and that is why we have so many torpedo boats that do not sink ships. That is the reason why whole navies are not sunk by torpedo boats every 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Before the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] takes the floor, Mr. Chairman, I desire to have the letter of Admiral Fiske read, and I will ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk, because my voice is not in good condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1915.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT—

1. In response to your request of yesterday I am submitting the following information concerning the torpedo situation:

2. We are building the longest-range torpedoes for all those vessels that, by reason of their construction, are able to take them, and are furnishing torpedoes of improved range for the older ships as fast as they can be turned out. A great many of the vessels already built have been supplied with the increased-range torpedo.

3. The torpedo station is using the million dollars appropriated at the last session in building these increased-range torpedoes; and if Congress appropriates the million asked for this year, that will be allotted to the torpedo station for the same purpose. We have three factories at work on torpedoes—the Bliss Co.'s large plant in Brooklyn, the growing plant at Newport, and last year, in order to further the manufacture of torpedoes in this country, we gave an order to the Washington Navy Yard.

4. No other source of supply is open to us. We had one foreign source of supply, but we did not consider the torpedoes manufactured by that firm equal to our own. We ordered seven trial torpedoes from another manufacturer in Europe some two years ago. They have never been delivered. However, we are fairly well off for torpedoes with respect to the number fixed upon by the General Board as an adequate supply. We are manufacturing great numbers, the majority of which are for ships now being built, and all of which will be ready when the ships are delivered to the Government.

5. Beginning with June, 1913, orders have been placed for torpedoes which to date nearly equal the total accumulation of torpedoes in the United States Navy up to that time. To be exact, for every 100 torpedoes on hand and ordered at that date 96 have been ordered since then.

6. Turning now to the question of torpedoes for submarines I desire to say that it is not now nor has it ever been contemplated that a submarine should fire as long a range torpedo as a surface vessel. The reason for this is so obvious that I will not go into it. Generally speaking, the error of a torpedo is in direct proportion to the distance it has to travel. Therefore an important element in the successful shot is, of course, as short a range as possible. The submarine is able to fire at shorter ranges, with a consequent greater hope of hitting, than a vessel exposed to the fire of the enemy.

7. With a battleship the torpedo is an auxiliary weapon and must await its chance to be used during the general engagement with guns, and a long-range torpedo is therefore necessary. The torpedo boat should have a long-range torpedo for the reason that torpedo vessels are particularly vulnerable, and in order to survive or even deliver their shot they are compelled to sacrifice some chance of hitting by firing at long range.

8. It is an advantage to reduce the size of torpedoes for submarines; and since this can be done with a sacrifice of useless range, it is a wise policy to have a reduced range for submarine torpedoes. On the other hand, if it is determined that the submarine torpedoes at present are not too large to be handy, by keeping the same dimensions the explosive charge can be largely increased. Very recently the General Board has recommended that this latter step be taken; that is, that the range of submarine torpedoes be reduced and the explosive charge increased. The range will still be very large as compared with the range of submarine torpedoes abroad. If we are to trust our information from abroad, the range of our submarine torpedoes, even when reduced, will be about twice that of the submarine torpedoes used in Germany, France, and England.

Respectfully,

J. STRAUSS,
Chief of Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, out of the 520 torpedo tubes in the Navy only 112 are on submarines. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not designed to use 18-inch torpedoes on the new submarines? I think they call them "Mark 7," or something of the sort.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the 18-inch is to be used.

Mr. GARDNER. And what is the range of those 18-inch torpedoes?

Mr. PADGETT. I think they use only the 18-inch on the submarines.

Mr. GARDNER. And what is their range?

Mr. PADGETT. It is less than 4,000 yards. Some of them run up to 7,000.

Mr. GARDNER. It is between 4,000 and 7,000 yards, is it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to criticize the Ordnance Department. I mean merely to state the facts. The mere fact that the Ordnance Department is not to blame or that it is doing the best it can, would not alter the situation if war were to break out to-morrow. I do not mean to say that the Ordnance Department is not justified in retaining old torpedoes of short range if they have none better; but, as a matter of fact, we do have a lot of short-range, out-of-date torpedoes, and I object to their being reckoned as if they were up-to-date torpedoes. I do not in the least care whose fault it is or whether it is anyone's fault. We have not got the goods. I do not mean to say that the Bureau of Ordnance has not supplied long-range torpedoes to all vessels which are fitted to receive them. I do not know whether they have or not. I do mean to say that, whether they are fitted to handle them or not, the fact remains that most of our ships are not fitted with the best torpedoes. I do not mean to say that the Ordnance Department is not supplying torpedoes as fast as they can be turned out, which the Admiral claims in his letter. I suppose, of course, that they are being supplied as fast as they can be turned out, but they can not be turned out fast enough with the appropriations which you have been allowing them to have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit a question just there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to say that provision is made for supplying the vessels that have been authorized, and the letter of Admiral Strauss stated that the torpedoes would be ready at the time the vessel was completed. What is the use of completing the torpedoes in advance of the vessel?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I am not saying that you can put long-range torpedoes on those old vessels. I am saying that the old vessels do not, as a matter of fact, have them, which is another illustration of the obsolescence of the second-line battleships.

Now, let us get down to these short-range torpedoes for the submarine fleet. I am now going to read something from Commander Stirling's evidence, on page 884 of the hearings. Commander Stirling commands the submarine flotilla. Mr. WITHERSPOON said:

> Now, Commander, in regard to these 18 submarine boats on the Atlantic coast that you have described, are they all equipped with torpedoes that you say will shoot 5,000 yards?

As a matter of fact, there are only 12 submarines in commission on the Atlantic coast, unless you count the 5 at the Panama Canal. Mr. WITHERSPOON says:

> Are they all equipped with torpedoes that you say will shoot 5,000 yards?

That is the 18-inch torpedo which the chairman says is desirable. Commander Stirling answered, "No, sir." Then I read further:

> Mr. WITHERSPOON. How many of them are equipped with as powerful a torpedo as that?
> Commander STIRLING. Four.
> Mr. WITHERSPOON. Only four?
> Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that those old-fashioned submarines can be equipped with the best modern 18-inch submarine torpedoes. Very likely it is impossible. What I am pointing out is that they are not so equipped. From the point of view of our national defense it does not make the slightest difference what the cause is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. This item of a million dollars is made available until June 30, 1918, and the item immediately preceding, for ammunition for ships of the Navy, is made available until expended. Is the gentleman able to state what the balance is in the Treasury at any particular time of all the appropriations which have been made for ammunition for the ships of the Navy? In other words, for the current year the amount is $3,178,890. Is that practically expended during the year, or is there a sum accumulating as a balance in the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. My understanding is that it has been practically expended. For instance, on page 220 of the hearings Admiral Strauss states that, based on the bid in 1914, the expenditure amounts to $2,782,535——

Mr. MANN. To cut it short, does the gentleman know what is the balance in the Treasury on this character of appropriations?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that there is an unexpended balance for projectiles at the present time of about $800,000.

Mr. MANN. I am asking about the item of ammunition for ships of the Navy. What is the unexpended balance in the Treasury of that item at any time that the gentleman figures on?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I am trying to give the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is talking about projectiles.

Mr. PADGETT. They purchase projectiles.

Mr. MANN. I know, but I am talking about the item of ammunition for ships of the Navy, made available each year until expended, and I want to know whether they are accumulating a credit balance or whether they are expending the money.

Mr. PADGETT. They are expending the money each year, but this last year, on account of getting projectiles at a very reduced price, far less than they had ever gotten them for before, there was an unexpended balance of about $800,000, so that this year the committee took that into consideration, and we did not appropriate as much as we had heretofore appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Then there is no occasion for making this item available until expended?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the custom.

Mr. MANN. I know, but if it is being spent every year there is no occasion for putting in the bill the words "to be available until expended," so that no one can know how much has been expended and know how much of a credit balance they have unless he goes to the Treasury Department and looks at the figures. It is a very loose system of making appropriations, unless they want to have some money accumulate there, and if this amount is being expended every year, next year, when we reach this item, I will make a point of order on it.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think they are accumulating any fund there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments, Bureau of Ordnance: For experimental work in the development of armor-piercing and torpedo shell and other projectiles, fuses, powders, and high explosives, in connection with problems of the attack of armor with direct and inclined fire at various ranges, including the purchase of armor, powder, projectiles, and fuses for the above purposes and of all necessary material and labor in connection therewith, and for other experimental work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy, $100,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 17, strike out the figures "$100,000" and insert "$200,000"

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, for several years we have been making experiments under this appropriation through a subcommittee of our Committee on Naval Affairs. The experiments have related largely to the development of the torpedo shell. In this connection we experimented with the armor-piercing shell. Experiments along both lines ought to be continued. The experiments with the armor-piercing shell at long range involves placing on a platform of an old ship expensive armor plate.

Again, we should take up experiments to reduce the rolling of vessels in a seaway to produce a steady platform for our guns. There are indications that the German Navy has some such device, reputed to be a tank system, under which it can maintain a steady platform in a seaway. This seems to have been used in the fight off the Chilean coast, where the Germans in a half gale and heavy sea, at 12,000 yards, made excellent target practice against the English vessel, and although one English vessel had heavier guns, they seem to have made no hits at all. At all events, this line of experimentation ought to be taken up. It will involve a considerable expenditure. I do not think the addition of $100,000 would be excessive.

We have heretofore allowed $150,000. Last year and the year before it was $150,000. It is the consensus of opinion of those connected with the experiments that no expenditure has given larger returns for the amount involved. It is a small amount compared with the total expenditure on the Navy, whose whole efficiency is affected. It will tend to make more effective the attacking power of our ships, whether using armor-piercing shells or torpedo shells.

In the Navy Department there is no agency provided by law for experimentation. The chiefs of the bureaus are loaded down with details of administration. This is the main cause of our being backward in experimentation and our relying mainly

upon experimentation and development abroad, causing us to follow instead of leading.

The present great war will certainly cause many improvements, many new lines of attack and defense, abroad, which will require extra experimentation for us to keep abreast of in this country. It would be a wise precaution to have a fund rather in excess of than short of the usual amount for experimentation.

I am hoping that the subcommitte of the House committee may be supplemented by a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the Senate, to make a joint subcommittee on naval experimentation, which will continually cooperate with a special board from the Navy Department.

Since the special board appointed by the Navy Department has taken up the experimental work, progress has been great. In the past progress has been limited, dependent as the work was on the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, burdened by administrative duties; but now a special board of officers has been appointed to conduct the experiments in connection with our subcommittee, and the results have been gratifying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. If there ever was a time, Mr. Chairman, when we can eliminate expenditures for experimental purposes it does seem to me that this is the time and the occasion. With 20,000,000 men now under arms in Europe engaged in war and employing every conceivable instrument of warfare that has ever been invented—in the air, on the land, on the sea, under the sea—when every possible test of every character and kind is now being made in Europe, why the War Department and why the Navy Department can not content themselves for 6 months, or for a matter of 12 months, and see how these tests turn out, I can not conceive. We have simply acquired the habit of appropriating and can not stop it. Such appropriations are neither businesslike nor wise.

These tests are being carried on on the most gigantic scale that has ever been undertaken since the world was created, and here our Army and Navy insist upon spending millions upon millions of dollars merely for experimental purposes, when if they had somebody over there to stick around and see what was going on, who could come back and tell our officers in the War Department and the Navy Department what they saw and how it was done and the correct and approved way to do it, we could save millions of dollars in this experimental business.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield when he gets to a good stopping point?

Mr. HELM. Well, there is no good stopping point in this amendment, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. It is simply to let the gentleman know that any line of attack that is brought to the front there, which they may develop abroad, would have to be developed through experimentations in our country, and we ought to have the money available. For instance, with submarines, when any new line of attack is developed we ought to be able to go on and remain abreast of those nations that are experimenting on a larger scale.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, if the Germans and the English and the French and the Russians work out these war problems, if they demonstrate what can be done in the air, on land and sea, and under the sea, why should we be expending several million dollars here to construct airships, submarines, and torpedoes that are ineffective for war, and if these nations can construct torpedoes or submarines and demonstrate how close you have to go to a warship before you fire, what is the use of our expending two or three million dollars to find out what the angle of departure and the distance of attack is, whether it is 400 yards or 200 yards, and the size, length, and caliber of the torpedo? It seems to me that it is perfect folly for this department to be insisting upon these unreasonable, enormous, and indefensible expenditures. When these problems are being worked out to a mathematical certainty, why should we spend several million dollars, especially when we are told that we are confronted with a deficit of $80,000,000?

Mr. HOBSON. This is only a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HELM. Well, a hundred thousand dollars for a particular type of shell; the bill is full of similar projects. If you will just be content and possess your soul in patience, the history of this war will be written, and these facts in due time will come out, and whether we want battleships hereafter or submarines or whether we want fast ocean cruisers, and the innumerable equations incidental to each. All of these things are being daily tested out. What man on this floor can get up and tell what any of these naval engagements turned on? What did the battle off the coast of Chile hinge on; what did the battle off the Falkland Islands hinge on? Why do you want to set up a target and shoot at it when the nations at war are making daily tests on each other, and every phase of battle is being developed, from which instruction can be derived without cost?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any necessity for this increase in the appropriation, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. They speak of the experiments with the torpedo shells. We have expended already more than $300,000 experimenting with them, and we are now conducting experiments provided for under the last bill that will cost between thirty and forty thousand dollars or more. The department says that this $100,000 is all that will be needed next year. Our appropriations and our expenditures are going to be sufficiently heavy, and I think that we can very safely act upon the assumption that it is not necessary for us to crowd these increased appropriations upon the department. My experience has been that they ask for all that is needed, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Mr. BATHRICK addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. GARDNER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Sunday, January 31, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the president of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1532); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1533); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a complete report for year 1914 of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., to be substituted for the report transmitted January 12, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1534); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting list of property in charge of the Sergeant at Arms on the 1st day of December, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1535); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of receipts and disbursements from December 1, 1913, to November 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1536); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the president of the Capital Traction Co., transmitting report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1537); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 21257) to create the office of Chief of Naval Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 21258) to provide for the repaving and relaying of Broadway between the Watervliet Arsenal Grounds in the city of Watervliet, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) to suspend the final proviso of paragraph 177, Schedule E, of the act of October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 21259) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 21260) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 21261) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 21262) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Overlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 21263) granting a pension to Sarah J. Floyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21264) granting a pension to Flossie M. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21265) granting an increase of pension to William Frailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21266) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 21267) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 21268) for the relief of the legal representatives of John S. Rogers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21269) for the relief of the legal representatives of E. Q. Rogers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 21270) for the relief of the Boonton Building and Loan Association, of Boonton, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of National Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of the Burnett Immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Highland, Ill., protesting against Senate bill 6865, for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Gesangverein Concordia of Concordia, Pa., and Trinity Evangelical Church, of Sheridanville; Branch 14, Knights of St. George, and sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York and Shipowners' Association of the Pacific coast protesting against passage of ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of George W. Haskell and 45 other citizens of South Pasadena, Cal., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Louisiana mass meeting committee, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Mabel Vail, Sarah Huestis, Eunice F. Strathman, Charles H. Johnston, and Isabel Johnston, all of Pasadena, Cal., and Alice E. and Paul Hutchinson, of Altadena, Cal., protesting against increased appropriations for war preparations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Fred Rische, Dr. E. Bentzein, Wisconsin Verein No. 8, L. Bannam, and 162 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, Wis., indorsing and urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of 108 citizens of Napa, Cal., favoring passage of Senate bill 6688, to lay embargo on arms shipped from United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5139, for retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of National Council Daughters of Liberty, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the New York Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, favoring creation by Congress of a national-defense commission; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18666, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Fr. Brede, O. A. Chadde, Hermann Duill, J. D. Garin, A. H. Gefell, Sylvester Hasenauer, Dr. M. S. Jacobson, H. J. Karweick, John Karweick, Charles Kermann, G. G. Kircher, Edward Ledertheil, Christian Lohfinch, Fred Meyer, Fred Nettelman, J. H. Oberlies, W. F. Steinwachs, Rudolph Schlotz, Philip Weber, and Wilhelm Weichbrodt, all in the city of Rochester, N. Y., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Rev. G. Muhlhauser and 44 others, of Hamlin, N. Y., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of Roman Catholic State League of South Dakota, and sundry citizens of South Dakota, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Baraboo (Wis.) Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of National Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARR: Resolutions adopted by the priests of the Scranton (Pa.) diocese, against "certain libelous, obscene, and scurrilous publications regarding priests, nuns, and Catholics in general," transmitted through the United States mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of J. J. Murphy, Patrick O'Hara, M. Good, J. F. M. Quillan, James O'Hara, W. A. Butler, S. M. Hartman, P. I. Dougher, John Hyland, M. Napka, F. J. Lanover, Daniel Conroy, John Meehand, J. L. Casey, of Olyphant; T. V. Gallagher, of Peckville; J. P. Gillespie, Henry Hough, Gerald Lanahan, J. J. O'Hara, Thomas Good, Frank Farrell, Thomas Heary, J. J. Casey, John T. Taylor, R. M. Lynch, Thomas Meehand, Bernard Carr, James McNale, P. J. Swift, Patrick Conny, John F. Kilcullen, Peter Foley, Edward Conroy, M. J. Ruddy, Philip Hastings, John G. McCormick, Patrick O'Malley, J. W. Jordan, B. M. Kennedy, M. J. Carrington, B. J. Lynch, C. V. Robinson, Edward Norton, James L. Kilcullen, Gerald Twaddle, J. J. Dodgson, John J. Loftus, Joseph L. Kennedy, James E. Loftus, Thomas Donnelly, Charles Williams, Patrick Mackrell, James Mackrell, W. L. Burke, William Boland, James J. Flynn, John J. Price, M. F. Walsh, John F. McLaughlin, James Miskell, John Keegan, W. F. Shea, Michael Murphy, Henry Hall, Rev. E. Kuger, William Patten, George R. Mason, Joseph Hines, James L. O'Malley, Frank Sullivan, Thomas J. Doherty, John J. Flynn, H. V. Boland, John Kane, John A. Dempsey, John Dougherty, N. F. Byrne, Michael Lynch, Frank J. Brogan, T. F. Fadden, J. C. Boland, T. J. Carey, John P. Quinn, Edward Hoban, sr., P. F.

McHale, H. O'Boyle, T. F. Swanwick, William Patten, of Olyphant; James Harton, Rev. Joseph Dudkiewich, of Priceburg; James Hughes, of Jessup; Rev. W. Kurytomir, of Old Forge; J. M. Gallagher, John Flynn, of Peckville; Rev. John W. Healey, F. J. Buruk, M. J. Walsh, P. J. Kilken, J. A. Dempsey, of Jermyn; J. F. Homer, Joseph A. Reed, Rev. A. J. Brennan, Rev. Frank V. Zurisatti, Rev. George Oziz, Rev. A. Hopkins, J. L. Pistor, E. V. Brennan, of Scranton; and priests of diocese of Scranton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the circulation of certain anti-Catholic periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of a law providing that when a citizen of one State is acquitted of any and all charges of crime in another State that he should be allowed to return to his own State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring appropriation for coast survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of Rev. P. G. Bergen and 109 others, citizens of Delphos; H. A. Brandt and 14 others, of Covington; W. J. Steinle and 44 others, of Delphos, Ohio, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Frankford Arsenal Association, Philadelphia, Pa., against certain sections of Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and National Councils, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of immigration bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Friends, of Philadelphia, Pa., against increase in national armament; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of F. E. Winslow, of Presque Isle, Me., and 45 other citizens, protesting against excluding certain papers from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of J. F. Emmons and others, of Grandin, Mo., protesting against the enactment of House bill 20644, being a bill to prohibit the circulation through the mails of scurrilous, indecent, and libelous publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition favoring the enactment of House joint resolution 377, signed by Rev. John Krueger and others, of Farrar, Mo.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition favoring the enactment of House joint resolution 377, House joint resolution 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548, to prohibit the sale and export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe, signed by I. F. Silberstein, F. W. Hoetker, and others, of De Soto, Mo.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 20919, for the relief of Edward H. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communications of Herman Vater, George Wessels, Christian F. Recknagel, and Louis Lehr, all of New Britain, Conn., concerning House joint resolution 377, House joint resolution 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Osage, Nebr., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Johnson County, Nebr., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Clinton, Conn., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Germania Lodge, 507, Deutschen Orden der Herngari, Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I., relative to adoption of the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of W. R. Warburton, State secretary Knights of Columbus, Providence, R. I., favoring protection of Catholic clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. King, Providence, R. I., favoring the Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of citizens of New York, protesting against export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petitions of Tow Bralego Orlas Pogoni of Z. N. P., of Milford, and Polish Falcon Athletic Association of Meriden, Conn., protesting against passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of members of St. Francis German Society, protesting against the publication called the Menace being sent through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Friends of Our Native Landscape, Chicago, Ill., favoring project for a Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of J. H. Morrison and other citizens of Weiser, Idaho, favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of W. R. Plughoff and other citizens of Hailey, George Harrigfield and others and Adolf Claussen and others of American Falls, all of Idaho, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, against bill providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Texas, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petitions from the German-American Alliance, of Hartford, Conn.; and citizens of Laramie, Wyo.; Evansville, Ind.; Nebraska; Philadelphia; and New Britain, Conn., memorializing Congress to place an embargo on all contraband of war excepting foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of 6,250 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Gravity, Iowa, relating to the enforcement of the pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of citizens of Boone County, Iowa, relative to branding of foreign agricultural products offered for sale in the United States so as to indicate the country from which same was imported; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of North Dakota State League of the Fargo Diocese and the German Roman Catholic Central Verein, Berwick, N. Dak., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *January 31, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. UNDERWOOD, Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal energy, our God and our Father, out of whose heart came life and all its possibilities, the wisdom that illumines, the faith that sustains, the hope that cheers, the love which binds us together into friendship and families; we are here to-day because of these indissoluble ties in memory of two souls who have answered the summons and passed into the great beyond from whence no traveler returns. To recall their deeds, sing their praises is to put an estimate on their virtues. We thank Thee that the good in man lives to inspire others to the nobler virtues. These men were chosen servants of the

people because in them was ability, integrity, honesty, zeal, high ideals, and lofty purposes, and though they have passed on they live in the hearts of their countrymen. May those who knew and loved them best look forward to a reunion in one of the Father's many mansions where the ties of friendship and love will never again be severed. And songs of praises we will ever give to Thee in the name of Him who taught us faith, hope, love. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read a letter from the Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 29, 1915.

Hon. SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House:

I hereby designate Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, as Speaker pro tempore to preside on Sunday, January 31, 1915.

Your friend,
CHAMP CLARK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of yesterday will be postponed until to-morrow. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the special order.

THE LATE SENATOR JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON AND THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That Sunday, January 31, 1915, be set apart for services upon the lives, character, and public services of Hon. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, and Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Mr. BLACKMON assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 716.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that an opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of the Hon. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, late a member of the United States Senate from the State of Alabama, and to the memory of the Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of their eminent abilities as distinguished public servants, the House at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the families of the deceased.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolutions.

The question was taken, and the resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, we meet to-day to do honor to the memory of comrades who have fallen on the battle field in life's great struggle. We mourn their loss; we cherish their memory; we love the recollection of their friendship; and we honor the high character, the sterling courage, and the purity of purpose that was so eminently portrayed in the lives of our departed colleagues.

I could ask no higher privilege and find no sweeter duty than the right to place on the records of this House my remembrances of Alabama's great son, the late Senator JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON.

He was born in North Carolina in the year 1843. When only a schoolboy he joined the Confederate Army in April, 1861, served during the entire war, was four times wounded in battle, and rose to the rank of captain.

At the close of the war between the States he made his home in Alabama, and for 17 years practiced law in Selma, with marked ability and success, retiring from the active practice to engage in banking in Birmingham for 10 years, when he was elected governor of Alabama, serving the people for 4 years with exceptional ability.

He was unanimously elected to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Alabama to serve out the unexpired term of the Hon. Edmund W. Pettus, ending March 3, 1909, and also for the full term ending March 3, 1915. He died in the city of Washington on the 8th day of August, 1913, at his post of duty.

From the time he first made his home in Alabama until his death Senator JOHNSTON actively participated in public affairs. He was there during what is called the "reconstruction period" and was a leader in the movement by her citizens to drive from the conduct of her affairs the carpetbaggers and their ignorant coadjutors, to end discord and corruption, and to restore to the intelligent and the virtuous the State government. That being secured, Alabama began a period of advancement and development which the world is coming to appreciate. If a story of Senator JOHNSTON'S life were written from 1874 until the date of his death it would tell of nearly every important movement connected with the history of the State itself, so closely was he identified with its political, material, and educational development and policies. He was active in promoting its development. He was interested in whatever tended to the advancement of Alabama and her people. He was willing "to spend and be spent" in her interest, and his willingness to serve gave occasion for many drafts upon his time and energies which he always tried to honor. As a consequence he drew to him a very large number of loyal friends and supporters in all parts of the State who implicitly followed his lead upon all questions. His influence was accordingly far-reaching, and, be it said to his credit, his influence was for good.

Senator JOHNSTON was a man of positive convictions and firm purpose. When he had decided upon his course his perseverance and persistence in following it account for much of his success. His political life illustrates these qualities. He was defeated for the gubernatorial nomination in his own party and then was twice elected by it as governor. He was likewise defeated for Senator and then was twice elected as Senator, once to fill out an unexpired term and then for a full term. In these battles he naturally gave and received hard blows, but he lived to see the day when many strong men who had been pronounced in their opposition to some of his views became his most active supporters, for they realized that whatever view he urged, it was an honest view; that whatever purpose he had, it was a manly and upright one; and whatever conviction he entertained, he had the courage to support it. When he found the way of duty, he never flinched in following it. And it is but natural that such a man tied men to him.

Behind a reserved and apparently cold exterior Senator JOHNSTON had a heart that was very tender. He was responsive to the calls of charity and, without ostentation, he aided many needy ones. His love for the old Confederate veterans who were in need amounted almost to a passion. He cherished the memory of the days when as a mere boy he fought for the South; and, assuming that all honorable men would give him credit for honesty of conviction, he had no unkind words for those whom he opposed in war, and met all men upon the dead level of personal integrity and manhood. But the old Confederate soldiers never appealed to him in vain. When he became governor they did not always address him by that tile, and when he became Senator they did not call him Senator. They preferred, and he liked to be called by them, Captain.

Senator JOHNSTON'S life was a successful one. His few political disappointments seemed but to nerve him for another combat, and he won. His character and life are well worth the study by the young men of his adopted State, and because of the elements of force to be found in it we can see the reason he succeeded. But not alone in his work as lawyer, banker, business man, and statesman do we find the inspiration of his activities, for back of these, as back of all strong American life and hope, is the home. And it was in his beautiful home life that Senator JOHNSTON shone at his best. There he was the devoted husband and affectionate father, and there he received the homage that kindness and sympathy and love elicit and there he placed upon his children "the imperishable knighthood" of the Fifth Commandment.

Senator JOHNSTON possessed the elements of real greatness. His character was strong; his standards lofty. He worked hard and perseveringly. He died at his post of duty, and I have no doubt that if it had been given him to choose the place of his death the choice would have been to die while in the discharge of a duty. He left us a good example of his life, and to his family he left the heritage of a good name.

When Earth's last picture is painted,
And the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded,
And the youngest critic has died
We shall rest, and, faith, we shall need it—
Lie down for an aeon or two;
Till the Master of all good workmen
Shall set us to work anew.

And only the Master shall praise us,
And only the the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money,
And no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working,
And each in his separate star
Shall draw the Thing as he sees it
For the God of Things as They Are!

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, it is but proper that we pause for a few moments and turn aside from the duties of the hour to

say a word of those who have been our coworkers but who have been called to their reward.

JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON was unanimously elected to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Alabama August 6, 1907, to fill out the unexpired term of Hon. E. W. Pettus, deceased, ending March 3, 1909. He was then reelected for the full term expiring March 3, 1915. While still in the service of his country as Senator from Alabama, on August 8, 1913, he died at his post of duty in the city of Washington.

I and the people whom I represent are proud to claim a peculiar interest in his record and achievements.

On March 23, 1843, he was born at Mount Welcome, on the banks of the Catawba River, in Lincoln County, N. C., which is in the district I have the honor to represent. His early youth was spent at Mount Welcome on his father's extensive estate, consisting of about 2,500 acres of land, on which was operated iron forges, flour and saw mills, in addition to the farm. He first attended a school in the neighborhood which was maintained and supported by the community composed of his father, Dr. William Johnston, Rev. Dr. Robert Hall Morrison, Dr. Hunter, the Cahills, and the Rosells. From there he went to Catawba College, at Newton, N. C., which was under the management of Maj. Finger, afterwards superintendent of public instruction in North Carolina. He then spent some time at the Charlotte Military Institute under Gen. D. H. Hill, and later, about 1859, he went to Alabama and entered the Wetumpka Military School.

His father's home was a center of culture, refinement, and genial hospitality. Its environments were wholesome and pleasant, such as should bring out the manly qualities of the boy. Those acquainted with him in his early youth tell us that young JOHNSTON was always a sturdy, manly boy from his earliest days and possessed much dry humor. As illustrating this they relate of him, that when he was only about 6 years old the ball of beeswax, used for the thread in sewing, was missing. Someone said, "I think Josie has it." He stood before them, looked into their faces and said, "Search me." They did and found the missing beeswax.

Although he left North Carolina at an early age and settled in Alabama, where he spent the active years of his life, he never lost interest in his native State. He could not outlive the feeling that the old Johnston homestead in Lincoln County, where his ancestors lie buried, was his home and the people around it his neighbors and friends. His friends in North Carolina always felt that should an occasion arise where they needed his help, that they had in him a true friend and advocate.

He was truly of the aristocracy of the South. He held this rank because of his gentle birth, as well as his manly traits of character. In his veins mingled the blood of the Scotch-Irish, the Huguenot, and the Swiss people, blended to form a character possessed of modesty and gentleness, yet grand in heroic suffering and chivalric daring.

His paternal grandfather, Col. James Johnston, was an active patriot throughout the American Revolution, and one of the immortal heroes of the Battle of Kings Mountain.

His maternal grandfather, Gen. Peter Forney, was likewise a patriot and gallant soldier in the cause of American freedom. His father was a French Huguenot and his mother a Swiss. Gen. Forney served in both branches of his State legislature, represented his district in the Thirtieth Congress, and was a presidential elector on the Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson tickets.

With such an ancestry it is not strange that when the South took up arms in behalf of her independence he and his four brothers, Gen. Robert D., William H., Capt. James F., and Bartlett S. Johnston, entered the Confederate service and were loyal and gallant soldiers.

When the war commenced Senator JOHNSTON was attending high school at Talladega, Ala. He enlisted at the age of 18 in Company I, Eighteenth Alabama Regiment, April 21, 1861, as a private, and was mustered into service at Auburn in that State. This company was under the command of Capt. Mickle and was known as the Shelby Rifles. In the same year he was made orderly sergeant. He was in the Battle of Shiloh, and in the rear-guard fight at Iuka, where he was promoted to second lieutenant by Gen. Bragg. He had his right arm broken while in the Battle of Chickamauga. It is related of him that in that battle, while lying down under fire, a canteen some yards in front of him was repeatedly hit by bullets. He crawled out and, throwing it away, said, "That thing makes me nervous." He was with Gen. Bragg in his march to Kentucky and in the Battle of Perryville. He was transferred to the Army of Northern Virginia as aid-de-camp on the staff of Gen. Robert D. Johnston, his brother, and later appointed captain of Company A, Twelfth North Carolina Regiment.

A shell exploded over his head at the Battle of Spottsylvania, causing him to bleed freely from the eyes, ears, nose, and mouth, and disabling him for duty for some time. He was with Gen. Early in all the fighting in the Valley of Virginia until again wounded by a shell in the right ribs. He fell from his horse and was left on the field. Late in the night he regained consciousness and had the presence of mind to work the piece of shell out of his side and stop the flow of blood by the use of his handkerchief.

As evidence of his cool daring it is related that while he was in the fight in the Wilderness a shell plowed a furrow in front of where he was lying and he immediately crawled into the furrow. A soldier called to him to come back, but he calmly replied, "They can't hit here again."

He was again wounded by a shell, this time in the left side, at Hares Hall, on March 25, 1865. In this fight Gen. Robert D. Johnston fell and sprained his ankle; Capt. Nicholson was killed; and Capt. Hayne Davis, of Gen. Johnston's staff, lost his right arm.

After the war was over he and his companion, Maj. Burton, went to Alabama to bravely battle against the adverse conditions and to give their best efforts to the rebuilding of the South. When Senator JOHNSTON started out for Alabama on his new task he carried with him a mule and an ambulance which he had brought back from the war. His less fortunate friend had only a mule. Senator JOHNSTON stopped in Jacksonville and studied law under his first cousin, Gen. H. Forney. He sold the ambulance and mule, and from them obtained sufficient funds to live on until he was licensed to practice law. He then went to Selma, Ala., and worked in the law offices of Pettus & Harolson. After practicing with them for a short time he formed a partnership with R. M. Nelson. Soon after this he was elected chairman of the Democratic executive committee for the State, and conducted the reconstruction campaign in which Alabama was redeemed.

He was a delegate to the Chicago convention that nominated Mr. Cleveland for President. He was, however, a loyal supporter of Mr. Bayard to the finish. There were with him in this delegation seven of his cousins, who were also for Mr. Bayard. When the convention contest was on he was approached and virtually promised political control in Alabama if he would lead the delegation over to Mr. Cleveland, but his reply was that "I am for Bayard all the time."

He continued to live and practice law in Selma for about 18 years, after which time he moved to Birmingham and accepted the presidency of the Alabama National Bank. In 1896 and again in 1898 he was elected governor of the State of Alabama, serving four years.

In presenting this brief review of the life and achievements of Senator JOHNSTON, I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to my friends, Mr. A. Nixon, clerk of the Superior Court of Lincoln County, N. C., and Bartlett S. Johnston, a brother of the Senator, for many of the facts and incidents which I have related.

I have not spoken of his record while a member of the United States Senate. This is still fresh in the minds of his associates, who have already spoken of it, and these utterances have found place in the permanent records of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we may well repeat of this gallant, splendid gentleman the words Mark Antony used, in Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar, after he had routed Brutus in battle. When Brutus, despondent, commanded his faithful servant Strato to kill him with his own sword, Mark Antony, coming upon him sitting against a tree, dead, halted his triumphant army and, amid perfect silence, pointing to the dead Brutus, said: "His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'This was a man.'"

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON was a rare man, adaptable, capable, successful.

His success in life came to him naturally through a long line of ancestors and associations, and he grew as a sturdy oak grows in the forest, because he had it in him, and nothing could hinder or check his rising above his fellows—a leader because he was born that way.

Of his early boyhood I have heard little. He had early and good schooling, the best to be had in his day. He was educated beyond the school and had barely entered college life when war came, and the boy of 18 became a soldier and a good one. He could not help it. It was his nature to be thorough, and he acted up to his nature. Four wounds and many battles proved his courage and his capacity, and he left the service at the close of the war a captain, still little more than a boy in years. He studied law as he acted the soldier, and he studied to win, and

won. He became a good lawyer, a business lawyer, a man of coolness, sagacity, and judgment. He was not a great lawyer, but ranked high in his profession. The life of an attorney was too slow for him. He gave it up and became a banker, and as a banker and business man of affairs he won his highest recognition in private life.

JOE JOHNSTON, as he was familiarly known throughout the State of Alabama and almost throughout the South, was gifted with social virtues and accomplishments. He could and did hold his own in every gathering together of the people in his community. He was courteous, gentle, attractive in his home life and among his friends and acquaintances. He was a charming host, a fascinating guest, ever welcome, and ever ready with wit and repartee to make an occasion better for his presence.

He was ambitious as is every man of courage, intelligence, and energy. Naturally he entered political life, but not till success in business enabled him to do so without injustice to his family.

For many years his part in public life was active and effective work for his party in the State of his adoption, for he was born a North Carolinian and was proud of it. In the dark days of the South, through reconstruction and its horrors, no man stood more bravely at his post or did more unselfish and effective service than Senator JOHNSTON. He was for a long time chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the State, and he did his work well and faithfully.

When he presented himself for office, he did not succeed at once. He was elected governor after he had failed three times to get the nomination.

But Capt. JOHNSTON learned the battle of life under leaders who knew when to retreat and understood but would not accept defeat. So he tried again and succeeded. He was twice governor of the State. His two administrations were stormy and he made many enemies and bitter ones, but the weight of opinion was and is that he was a good governor, an exceptionally good one, and added much to the history of Alabama that will be matter of pride to our people while time lasts.

I am persuaded to believe Gov. JOHNSTON had for years the largest personal following of any public man in Alabama in his day.

He made friends easily and he held them, for he was loyal to his friends and fearless in the expression of his loyalty when necessity arose to claim evidence of it. It is not to be wondered at that JOE JOHNSTON ended his career as man, citizen, and public officer as a twice elected Member of the United States Senate.

Senator JOHNSTON was a member of the Episcopal Church. His attendance and attention to duty were the same as in business life—regular. He was a busy and a useful Member, as prompt and punctual at services, vestry meetings, at general conventions and convocations, and as faithful as when he was a soldier in the ranks and under military discipline.

Again, it was simply the nature of the man.

Few men have done so well with their lives as this distinguished gentleman, and fewer still have done better. A worthy life well spent and approved by his countrymen, who loved him while living and will honor his memory forever.

In camp and court, in banking house and at church his voice is hushed. He can not answer, but his record answers for him—"Present and accounted for."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, a little less than seven years ago we assembled in this Hall to pay tribute to the memory of Alabama's two distinguished Senators, Morgan and Pettus. They were men whose names were interlinked with the history of Alabama from its early days.

Almost their entire lives were devoted to their State, and they died holding the highest commissions of public trust that their people could place in their devoted hands.

When honor called them they unsheathed their swords for Alabama, and not till the stars and bars were furled forever did they quit the field of courageous duty. When they returned with heavy hearts to devastated homes and saddened people they set about to help inspire the hearts and restore the wrecked and ruined fortunes of sorrowing men and women.

To-day we meet again to pay tribute to the memories of two other Alabama heroes who "died in the harness" while laboring for the people who had honored them. Senator JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON and Representative WILLIAM RICHARDSON, like Senators Morgan and Pettus, dedicated their long and useful lives to Alabama and her people. They were both my friends, and to the memory of both I ask to pay my humble tribute of respect.

Senator JOHNSTON was a native of North Carolina—that grand old State that has given to Alabama many of the bravest and noblest of her sons. Through his veins flowed the blood of heroes of '76. He was a grandson of Col. James Johnston, of the Revolutionary Army, and the great-grandson of Gilbert Johnston, who on Culloden's field shed his blood in the cause of the Pretender.

When a boy at school Senator JOHNSTON heard the bugle call to arms, and from private to captain this brave boy in gray followed the varying fortunes of the "storm-cradled nation" till its sun went down forever amid the gloom of Appomattox. Four times wounded, this intrepid young Confederate rose each time from the bed of suffering to unsheath his sword in behalf of a stainless flag and an honored cause.

Just before the war he came to Alabama and cast his lot with her people, in sunshine and shadow, till God called him, and then with devoted hands and solemn steps we laid him to rest amid her magnolias and her pines.

I first knew Senator JOHNSTON when, as one of Alabama's chosen chiefs, he was called to lead her struggling people against the rule of the satrap and the carpetbagger, who were sapping the very heart blood of his people.

No leader was ever more fully trusted or more highly honored. As chairman of the State Democratic committee he was one of those who helped to throw off the yoke of the oppressor and to redeem his State from the thraldom of those who sought to crush out a prostrate people.

He never sought any office except that of governor and United States Senator. In both these high stations he manifested the same industry and devotion to duty that characterized his life on the field and in the private walks of life.

He had a passion for work. In one of his campaigns for governor he wrote more than 5,000 letters with his own pen.

In 1906 he was nominated alternate Senator and on the death of Senator Pettus was elected by the legislature as his successor.

When the Democrats secured the majority in the Senate he was made chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and was assigned to several other important committees.

In his career as Senator he was thoughtful of every detail of interest to his people. No little pension case or post-office matter was too small for his attention.

His humblest constituent was as dear to him as the greatest steel magnate in his State.

While he was a man of detail, he also had many of the elements of splendid statesmanship. Wherever duty pointed there his footsteps led him.

In one great case which came under his jurisdiction as Senator he knew that a decision one way might mean his defeat, and yet he believed that duty led that way, and with splendid courage he followed what he thought was right.

His fatal illness was only for a few days, and his colleagues, with sad hearts and tear-dimmed eyes, listened with bated breath when the news was brought that Senator JOHNSTON was no more.

I was one of those who attended his funeral, and from all over Alabama came the multitudes to mingle their tears with those of his beloved State.

When I saw this vast concourse that crowded the little church and thronged the streets I said, as was said of another, "Behold how they loved him."

He died as he had lived, "on the field of duty." He is gone, but "his deeds do follow him."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I first met the late Senator JOHNSTON 25 years ago when he was the president of one of the leading banks of Birmingham, Ala., and our second meeting was here in Washington after his election to the Senate and at the beginning of my service in this House in the Sixty-first Congress. During the last few months of his life we were thrown together daily, having our residence in the same apartment house. There not only grew up a close friendship between us, but the members of our families soon learned to love each other.

I had every opportunity to observe the official conduct of the Senator and can truthfully say I do not believe a more faithful, tireless worker ever served in either House of the American Congress. There seemed no limit to his power of endurance, of constant, ceaseless toil, not only for his immediate constituents, but for the country at large. Up to the very hour of his fatal sickness he was at work night and day. During the long extra session of this Congress he was in his seat in the Senate, not only during every day, but in attendance at every night session. He did not leave or do all of his work at the Capitol, but performed much of it at home.

Considering his age and the vigorous, active life he had led, it was a marvel how much he would accomplish; how much hard and difficult work he could crowd into a day. He was so true to the interest of his people, so conscientious in the performance of his duties, so anxious to continue to the end his splendid record as a faithful public servant that he let no opportunity pass to do good—to accomplish results; to advance and promote the interest of his beloved State and Nation. He was not only a constant, endless worker, but he possessed that rare virtue of always having the courage of his convictions. He was not a trimmer; he never dodged; he hated hypocrisy, and had no patience with the demagogue.

He had high and lofty ideals of his duties and responsibilities, and hence he lived the life of an honorable, worthy, patriotic statesman. He was not only loyal and faithful to the State and Nation he served so well, but he was true and devoted to the countless thousands of friends who stood by him in all of his contests before the people of Alabama.

I never knew a more considerate, loving husband—so full of gentleness, tenderness, and sweetness for his thoughtful, devoted wife. This kind and genial man, warm and generous friend, devoted husband and indulgent father, fair and manly opponent, incorruptible and courageous public servant, was a martyr to duty, to the people's cause. Finally, weary, tired out, overworked, and exhausted, "God touched him, and he fell asleep."

Tennessee joins Alabama in paying a just and loving tribute to her fallen leader, her brave and gallant Confederate soldier, her wise and progressive governor, her efficient and faithful Senator.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, again the flag on the Capitol has stood at half mast. Another Member of the national official family has gone. A desk in the Senate Chamber has been covered with flowers. A United States Senator is dead. Alabama heard with profound sorrow of the death of Senator JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, and she mourns the loss of a devoted, able, and honored son. He gave the best years of his young manhood in battle for his State and he spilt his blood in the settlement of the great question that determined finally and forever the indisputable status of the Union.

When the war was over he returned to Alabama and there reconsecrated his heart, his strength, and his all to the highest and best interests of his State. Mr. Speaker, in reconstruction times he was a terror to the vandal horde that came into Alabama to incite the negroes and to plunder our people, and no one did more than he to protect our women from the lust and carnality of the brutes in our midst and to drive out the scalawags and carbetbaggers and to give back home rule and self-government to the State that he loved. He helped to bring his beloved Commonwealth back into cordial relationship with her sisters in the great household of sovereign States. He was honored and loved by our people. They called him to the high office of governor in the State of Alabama, and in that responsible and exalted position he reflected great credit upon himself and the people of the State.

He brought about many substantial and helpful reforms in the civic conduct of the State, and his administration was a distinct blessing to the people of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, he lived to see a man born in the South elected Chief Executive of the Nation, and the people of Alabama, having honored him with a seat in the United States Senate, it was his proud privilege to serve in that august body when a Southern-born Democrat sat in the White House as President of the United States.

His was a unique and splendid career, full of faithful service and distinguished honors, and he died highly esteemed by his associates in the Senate and greatly loved and honored by the people of his State.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled today for the purpose of paying tribute to the lives and characters of two of Alabama's most distinguished citizens, two of the Nation's most faithful servants—former United States Senator JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON and former Representative WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

While I enjoyed the privilege of a personal acquaintance with each of them, while I held them in equal esteem, and while I purpose to pay a tribute to each, I will be pardoned if, on account of my longer and more intimate acquaintance with him, I should speak at somewhat greater length of Senator JOHNSTON. During his incumbency as governor of Alabama I had the honor of being a State officer, a quasi member of his cabinet, and in that capacity had an unusual opportunity to observe his habits, to study his methods, and to appraise his character.

Senator JOHNSTON was born in the State of North Carolina March 23, 1843, and was the son of Dr. William and Nancy (Forney) Johnston. He died in the city of Washington on the 8th day of August, 1913, having attained the age of 70 years 4 months and 15 days. His funeral was one of the most largely attended that ever occurred in Alabama, so universally beloved was he by his people.

In the days of his youth educational advantages were meager and beyond the reach of most people, but notwithstanding those limitations and the exigencies of war that called him from the schoolroom while yet in his teens, he possessed a highly cultivated mind. He was a well-educated man, though he never attended college or university. In this time of schools, colleges, universities, libraries, newspapers, and other educational agencies, it is difficult for us to appreciate the obstacles to learning that beset the youth of that day. Only the most indomitable could overcome them. He belonged to that type. Indeed, for tenacity of purpose he was equaled by few, surpassed by none. Once formed, he never abandoned a purpose except in response to the dictates of reason and conscience.

When 18 years of age, responding to the call of duty as he interpreted it, as did tens of thousands of other young Southerners, he withdrew from the high school in which he was a student and enlisted as a private in the army of the Confederate States of America. He served faithfully and gallantly throughout that mighty struggle, participated in a number of battles, received four wounds, and was promoted to the rank of captain. When the tremendous contest was over, regarding the issue as a closed matter, accepting the result philosophically, he joined his fellows in the task of rehabilitating the Southland, and for the remainder of his eventful life wrought heroically and effectively in that stupendous undertaking.

After reading law at Jacksonville, Ala., in the office of his kinsman, Gen. William Henry Forney, who was subsequently a distinguished Member of this body, he located at Selma, in that State, where he pursued his profession from 1866 to 1884, a period of 17 years. At the bar, as in the army and elsewhere, he was successful. A man of his capacity, diligence, determination, and straightforwardness always succeeds.

As is the case with most successful lawyers Senator JOHNSTON was a good business man, and in 1884 he removed from Selma to Birmingham, where for the next 10 years he was president of the Alabama National Bank. He was one of the organizers and the first president of the Sloss Iron & Steel Co., a pioneer in the development of the Birmingham district, and many of the most successful business and industrial enterprises of that remarkable district are due to his initiative, foresight, and leadership. He was a born leader, and was equally at home as soldier, lawyer, financier, and statesman.

During the exciting, troublesome, and cruel times of the reconstruction era, when the crushed and unhappy Southland was experiencing a perfect nightmare of humiliation, injustice, and horror, Senator JOHNSTON was a wise, fearless, and efficient leader of his people, and in his capacity as chairman of the State Democratic executive committee of Alabama was influential in the ultimately successful struggle for the reestablishment of white supremacy in the Southern States. It was largely through his efforts that the white people of Alabama regained control of the State government, and it was but natural, therefore, that they honored him with every public office to which he aspired.

He was elected governor of Alabama in 1896 and again in 1898. His administration began during the great and widespread financial and industrial depression of that period, and was characterized by the highest types of ability, courage, and patriotism. Taxes were more nearly equalized, schools were promoted, economies were inaugurated, business and industry were encouraged, laws were vigorously enforced, and the State entered upon an era of progress and prosperity. While some of his policies were assailed by political opponents, all now concede that his administration as governor was able, patriotic, and efficient.

In August, 1907, he was elected to the United States Senate to fill the unexpired portion of the term of former Senator Edmund Winston Pettus, who died while in office. He was reelected for the term ending in March, 1915. As a Member of the Senate, he soon won the confidence and esteem of his colleagues, and was noted for his energy, breadth of view, cheerfulness, and devotion to duty. Indeed, it is a matter of common knowledge among his colaborers in Congress, especially among members of his own State delegation, that his death was hastened by close application to arduous duties incident to the frequent and continued sessions of Congress after he became

a Member of the Senate. His colleagues urged him to take a rest, but he refused to do so and went down at the post of duty. When his death was announced, a distinguished member of the Alabama delegation truthfully said of Senator JOHNSTON, "He was a victim of his devotion to public duty."

With all of his varied activities in secular affairs, in each of which he was signally successful, he did not neglect the spiritual side of his nature. He was long a communicant of the church of his choice, the Episcopal Church, and he displayed there the same elements of popularity and leadership that characterized him in secular life. His church conferred many honors upon him, and I have never witnessed so beautiful a testimonial as that incident to his funeral, which I had the honor of attending. The entire city of Birmingham seemed to be in mourning, and every portion of Alabama was represented.

Like most other men of great achievement, Senator JOHNSTON was in large measure the architect of his own fortune. He began at the bottom; he ended at the top. In both private and public life he was wedded to high ideals, and no man was ever more tenacious in the advocacy of the principles for which he stood. A more determined, a more courageous, a more conscientious, a more patriotic man I never knew, and I had opportunity to know him in many trying conditions. But with all of his tenacity and firmness I never knew him to cease to smile. He was cheerful under all circumstances. Indeed, cheerfulness was one of his most striking characteristics, and fortunate is the man who can smile.

> Laugh and the world laughs with you;
> Weep, and you weep alone.

A man's character is measured by his ethical standards. Senator JOHNSTON's code of ethics is reflected in the following quotation from the speech which he delivered in the Senate on the occasion of the death of his illustrious predecessor:

> It seems to me, Mr. President, that a man who nurses an injury and prides himself on relentlessly pursuing an enemy may be an able man, but never can be either a great or a good man. * * * A man who steels himself against forgiveness and goes through life with resentment in his heart will never command the admiration of his people, or deserve their leadership. How much nobler it is to have it recorded of a man that he loved his friends and conquered his enemies by the generosity of his disposition.

Alabama has sent many able men to the Senate of the United States. In the years to come she may send many other able men to that august body, but she will never commission for that high service a man of more stainless honor, of more incorruptible character, of more unwavering courage, of more stalwart patriotism than was JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON.

Mr. MULKEY. Mr. Speaker, we have met to-day in this hall to pay tribute to the memory of two great American statesmen, patriots, and Christians. Both were an honor to the Nation and to their State, and of whom it may truly be said, that the world is better by their having lived.

I did not have the pleasure of knowing, personally, Congressman RICHARDSON, and I shall leave the eulogy upon him to be pronounced by others; but I do not affect to be ignorant of his exalted character, of his achievements in public life, and of his devotion to duty. I shall speak to-day with reference to the late Senator JOHNSTON, whose personal and intimate acquaintanceship it was my privilege to form.

Senator JOHNSTON, a North Carolinian by birth, was a descendant of the Johnstons, a Scotch-Irish family which emigrated to America after the Battle of Culloden and settled in North Carolina, and of the Forneys, a Huguenot family which left Moragne at the time of the religious persecutions.

His grandfather, Gilbert Johnston, with the latter's father, also bearing the name Gilbert Johnston, residents of Anandale, were devoted followers of Prince Charlie in all of the vicissitudes of the pretender after the Battle of Culloden, in which both participated. Both father and son were compelled by the royalists to flee from Scotland. They stopped for a time in Ireland and then came to North Carolina, where a brother of the elder Gilbert Johnston was the royalist governor of that province. The elder Gilbert Johnston was outlawed by the Crown for his adherence to the cause of the pretender, and, although he was protected by his brother, the governor, he was unable to hold property in his own name on account of the law of escheat which would have forfeited his holdings to the Crown.

His grandson, James Johnston, was a colonel of the Revolutionary forces; and he, in turn, was the grandfather of JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON.

JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON was attending a military school for boys in Alabama at the time of the secession of the Southern States. His brothers, some of whom had graduated and some of whom were in attendance at the University of North Carolina, all enlisted; and JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON also enlisted, at the age of 17, in the Eighteenth Alabama Regiment. On the promotion of his elder brother, Robert D. Johnston, to the rank of brigadier general for repeated acts of gallantry in the field, JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, who at that time held a lieutenancy, was transferred to the Twelfth North Carolina Regiment and became a captain upon the staff of his brother, Gen. R. D. Johnston.

Capt. JOHNSTON was wounded five times during the Civil War, and in the fighting near Winchester a shrapnel exploded and a fragment of the shell passed entirely through his chest, so seriously wounding him that he made his way with great difficulty to his home in North Carolina, where he finally recovered from the wound and rejoined his regiment before the close of the war.

The family was of course impoverished, their available resources having been invested in securities of the Confederate Government. His father had died some years before the war, and the product of the plantation owned by his mother was barely sufficient to support the mother and his two sisters. The family resources were further taxed in order to enable his elder brothers, Robert D. Johnston and William H. Johnston, to complete courses at the law school of the University of Virginia and at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York, respectively. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON was accordingly compelled to begin life with a total cash capital consisting of a mule and wagon and a box of tobacco, with which he set out for Jacksonville, Ala., where he began the study of law in the office of his cousin, William H. Forney, who had been a major general in the Confederate service and who for many years represented his district in the Congress of the United States.

After having been admitted to the bar Capt. JOHNSTON moved to Selma, in Dallas County, the home of John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettus. He was at first associated in the office of Brooks, Haralson & Roy, and subsequently, during his residence in Selma, practiced law with Col. W. R. Nelson and with John P. Tillman. He moved to Birmingham in 1884, at the instance of clients who had become interested in the Birmingham district, and induced Capt. JOHNSTON to retire from the practice of law and organize the Alabama State Bank (afterwards the Alabama National Bank). In Birmingham he early identified himself with the industrial development of that city and district, becoming president of the Sloss Iron & Steel Co.

In the days of reconstruction Capt. JOHNSTON was unsparing in his efforts to restore normal conditions. The dangers and burden of the civil strife which beset the people of Alabama at that time, and particularly in those counties in which the recently freed blacks were largely in the majority, were no less acute than those of actual war, and for his consistent and patient service in this respect Capt. JOHNSTON had become a member of the State Democratic executive committee and was serving as chairman of that committee in 1874 when the election by the Democrats of George S. Houston as governor put an end to the intolerable régime of the carpetbaggers in Alabama. Feeling that his militant service of his State and people, beginning with four years of civil war and ending with nine years of no less tempestuous political turmoil, had for a time discharged his public obligations in that connection, he devoted his attention to the practice of law and, on moving to Birmingham, to the development of that city and district.

The experiences of Capt. JOHNSTON and his associates during reconstruction days constitute the most profoundly interesting pages in the history of Alabama, and it is unfortunate that complete annals of that turbulent period have not been made available for the historian of the future.

It is quite proper that we should meet on occasions like this and, in a feeble way, rehearse the character of great men. It is fitting not only because it shows our appreciation of their lives and services to their country, but is high evidence that as a Nation we cherish the memory of those whose judgments have guided us and aided materially in producing that happiness and prosperity and good fellowship so universally enjoyed by us. Moreover, by it we teach future generations the value of great lives and the importance of a cultivation of their ideals. I would not want to live in a country which would not honor its patriot dead. Failure in this regard is the surest sign of national decay.

The erection of statues and monuments to the distinguished dead, and the commemoration of their lives and proclaiming their virtues, must of necessity impress those who are to follow, and upon whose shoulders shall rest the great responsibility of guiding this Nation to its final high destiny, with the idea that no Nation can long endure whose guiding hand is without virtue, character, or patriotism.

It is our duty to transmit to future generations the virtues of our illustrious men, not so much merely to keep these men alive in their memories, but that their examples may be emulated and their high ideals adopted.

No one need be alarmed as to the final destiny of this Republic as long as we, as a Nation, delight to extol the virtues of our truly great men. From it we are inspired by patriotic impulses and press forward with more determined zeal to reach that high mark in whose direction their own strong efforts were aimed.

Senator JOHNSTON is dead. He died as he lived, in the service of his country. He felt a deep interest in the progress of mankind. He directed his talent to their elevation and increased happiness at all times, forgetting himself, or rather unconscious of himself. He was wholly unselfish and always solicitous and considerate of the welfare of others. He never did any act, knowingly, which was calculated to deceive or injure others. He was incapable of it. He was delighted most when he was doing something for the comfort and well-being of his fellowman. The ends at which he aimed, both in public and private life, were his country's and his God's. He was a godly man, the first great essential to wisdom. As a soldier in the unhappy struggle of 1861, he never faltered in what he conceived to be his duty, and came from the battle field to a desolate home, honored by his people for his courage, bravery, and fidelity to the cause he so valiantly espoused. When the smoke of battle cleared away and the burning issue which had divided the two sections of our country had been settled by the sword, he took steps to aid in the rescue of Alabama from misrule and to elevate her to that station among the States of the Union to which she was entitled.

As governor of Alabama he distinguished himself in many ways. His administration of affairs was noted by an era of prosperity in that State without parallel or precedent. He urged many reforms, and his ideas were adopted into statutory laws.

It would not be appropriate here to detail his great work as governor of the State. He set an example of economy and honesty in every department of the State which has resulted to its betterment. Through him the convict system was placed upon a more humane basis; reform schools were adopted; curtailment of child labor in our factories provided for; a more symmetrical system of taxation inaugurated; a system of rigid examinations of public officials and of their books and accounts enacted; and in fine the interest of the people carefully and scrupulously guarded. He was a very popular governor, though, of course, as all men in public life, he had his political enemies. But they respected, though they feared him. The people of his State appreciated his extraordinary talents and powers displayed in the Senate of the United States. Here he shone as a particularly bright star. He was a constructive statesman and yielded his convictions to no man. In casting his vote he did not stop to inquire whether he was with the majority or minority. He voted, spoke, and acted from the dictation of his own conscience, and not from the viewpoint of policy or of the demagogue. He did not have to explain his votes and position on public questions to the people of Alabama. We understood him and knew that his chief joy was in his country's good.

At the time of his death he was a candidate for reelection to the Senate. No one seriously doubted that he would be elected. Most everybody in every walk in life was his friend. How could they have been otherwise? Every public act of his was in sympathy with their needs.

But he met the common fate of men. He has passed from this world. Though no more, yet his character, his notable achievements, and his public spirit will never die. They will endure as long as time itself. He was true to himself, and it followed, as night the day, that he could not be false to others. But, sir, his great work may go on; his great mind may be engaged in the amelioration of mankind. Of the future life but little is known. It is shrouded in mystery and doubt. We all dread to meet it, because we do not know with certainty what it is. We think, we imagine, we often suit it to our own conditions, yet none of us is satisfied with our own diagnosis.

But whatever may be our doubts and fears, who would or could deny that the great mind of Senator JOHNSTON did not die with him, but that it has gone to a happier and better world, there to inspire, improve, and advance in a greater degree than ever before the general condition of mankind, and who doubts that he is now exalting other nations and peoples to a higher degree of righteousness.

Senator JOHNSTON was a Democrat of the old school. He was eminently safe and sane. He did not seize and grab every political heresy sweeping over the country and nurture it in order to advance his own political fortunes. He stood for the Constitution and sound government. He was not swept off his feet, nor was his judgment disturbed, by the vaporings of either the demagogue or the alarmist. He was not afraid of the arguments of political revolutionists as long as reason was left free to combat them. Senator JOHNSTON did not live in vain; his life tended to make the world richer and better; his examples may well be emulated and his character and integrity serve as a model for all. I repeat, he died as he had lived, in the service of his country, and the sky upon which he closed his eye was cloudless.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when the inmost feelings of the heart may find but poor expression in mere words. Especially is this true in moments of exalted joy or in the hour of personal grief, and it is with the latter emotion that I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of one whom I had the privilege of counting as a cherished friend. We were born in adjoining counties in the State of Alabama, and our later lives were spent in cities but 25 miles apart. In our youth the same blue bending skies smiled upon us, our hearts thrilled to the same emotions, our eyes fed on the same delightful scenes, and our ears drank in the same music of the crooning minor strains that softly came from the lips of the simple negroes who picked the snowy harvest of our cotton fields or gathered the golden ears of the ripened corn. When the dark clouds of war burst in their fury over the land we loved we donned the same uniform and fought for the same principles, and when at last the cause we both had bled for was lost we returned to our homes to face the same duties and to solve the same problems. Both of us chose the law as our profession and, living in the same circuit, practiced in the same courts for many years. So when WILLIAM RICHARDSON died I lost not only my Representative in the Congress of the United States, but a brother lawyer, a companion in arms, and a lifelong friend. It is therefore with a heavy heart that I approach this duty, a duty which stirs many memories of the past and brings to recollection the personality of one of the bravest, truest, noblest sons that Alabama ever gave to the world.

But few men in this House, and but few living in this day and generation, can realize and understand the tremendous difficulties and almost unsurmountable obstacles which confronted a young man of Judge RICHARDSON'S age when the Civil War closed.

Reared in riches and luxury up until about 18 years of age, when he enlisted in the Confederate Army, with his education only fairly commenced, he emerged from that terrible war to return home to find the beautiful surroundings which he left in devastation and ruin, with all species of property swept away except the land, and without hope of help from any quarter to face the uninviting future, and you may be sure it took a brave heart and resolute mind for him to overcome such difficulties and build up such a splendid record, which he has left to the world.

WILLIAM RICHARDSON was born in Athens, Ala. His father and mother were natives of Virginia. His mother was the daughter of Capt. Nicholas Davis, also a Virginian by birth, who became a distinguished citizen of Limestone County, Ala., and who was a member of the convention that met in Huntsville to draft the constitution under which Alabama was admitted as a State in 1819. Capt. Davis was a boyhood friend of Henry Clay and a lifelong supporter of that great statesman. On his father's side Judge RICHARDSON was the descendant of a distinguished family of lawyers and planters.

As a boy WILLIAM RICHARDSON was educated in the schools of Athens, Ala., and later in Wesleyan University of Florence. When only a little over 16 years of age he enlisted in the Confederate Army as a private, but was soon promoted to a captaincy for conspicuous gallantry. He was severely wounded at the Battle of Shiloh and was made a prisoner of war, but upon his recovery escaped, and after much hardship made his way to Nashville, Tenn. From there he attempted to get through the Union lines to rejoin his command. His companion in this attempt was James Paul, a daring Confederate spy, of whose identity young RICHARDSON was in complete ignorance. The two were captured by Union soldiers and, incriminating papers being found on the person of Paul, both were taken to Murfreesboro, Tenn., imprisoned, court-martialed, and condemned to be shot. On the very night before the morning set for their execution they were rescued by that wizard of the saddle, Gen. Nathan B. Forrest, who had learned of their cap-

ture, and with a force of 1,100 men suddenly attacked the town, forced his way to the prison, released the captives, and escaped with them.

Capt. RICHARDSON was again seriously wounded at Chickamauga, where he lay on the battle field for six days and was kept alive during this time by his faithful negro servant. Before his full recovery Gen. Lee had surrendered and young RICHARDSON returned to his Alabama home. He studied law, was admitted to the bar, and soon gained an enviable reputation as a brilliant advocate and an eloquent speaker. Entering the field of politics, he was elected a member of the State legislature from his native county in 1874. Soon thereafter he removed to Huntsville, and in 1875 became probate judge of Madison County, which office he held until 1886. In 1890 he became a candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor, and in the convention at Montgomery, although one of the leading candidates, having carried every county in the State north of Birmingham, he withdrew his name in order to harmonize the factional differences of his party.

From 1886 until he was elected to Congress in 1900 he practiced his profession and was recognized as one of the ablest lawyers in the State. His natural eloquence and analytical mind made him especially effective in jury cases, and he was ranked by many of his brother lawyers as one among the leading criminal lawyers in Alabama.

On the 2d of July, 1900, Judge RICHARDSON was nominated for the short term in Congress to succeed Gen. Wheeler, resigned, and from his election in the following November to the day of his death, March 31, 1914, he served the people of the eighth congressional district of Alabama in this House. That he served his people faithfully and well is perhaps best attested by the fact that for almost 14 years he had practically no opposition. Seldom is such universal approbation given to a public servant, and perhaps seldom has it been so well deserved. Of his service to the country while a member of this body I need not speak. Almost all of the Members present served with him and know of his ability, his loyalty, his justice, and his absolute freedom from prejudice and narrowness of mind. His services as chairman of the Committee on Pensions gained for him the esteem and approbation of his colleagues, irrespective of party lines. Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives alike admired him for his courage, his ability, his integrity, and his patriotism. Sectional prejudice found no room in his great heart, and the veterans who had worn the blue always found in him a sympathetic companion and a staunch friend.

Before he had reached manhood's meridian Judge RICHARDSON had the great misfortune to lose his beloved wife, and thenceforth his private life was devoted to the tender care of his five children—four daughters and a son. His devotion to his children was beautiful and only equaled by theirs to him. Strong and fearless as a man, as a father he was all tenderness and love, and perhaps the only pride he ever exhibited was that called forth by his children. May the grief which still wrings the hearts of those children be softened by the gentle hand of time to a blessed and hallowed memory to serve as a guide and a benediction to the end of their days.

Judge RICHARDSON'S service to the district which he so well represented in this House will never be forgotten by his constituents. At a recent meeting of the Tennessee River Improvement Association held in the city of Decatur, Ala., on the 3d day of December, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, since the last annual meeting of this association the Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, one of its most influential and active members, has passed into the beyond: Therefore be it

Resolved by the delegates assembled in annual meeting of the Tennessee River Improvement Association, the death of Judge RICHARDSON is a great loss to this association and a deep sorrow to each and all of its members, and that we hereby express our appreciation of his wise counsel and earnest endeavors in behalf of the purposes and object of this association, upon the floor of our conventions, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Congress of the United States, and as an influential Member of Congress from the eighth district of Alabama, where his fund of accurate and useful information and his aptness in communicating the same was of untold value in our battle for recognition by Congress of the commercial value of the Tennessee River.

Resolved further, That in sorrow we miss his presence here to-day. He was a chivalrous, loyal, broad-minded, courtly, and lovable gentleman.

Resolved finally, That these resolutions be spread on the minutes of this association, and that a copy be sent to members of his family and be published as the secretary of this association may direct.

Mr. Speaker, the ranks are growing very thin now, the ranks of men with eyes growing dim and hair grown gray, who served in that great fraternal struggle which tried their souls, the ranks of the veterans of the Civil War. I miss them sadly as they fall out, one by one, at the stern command of death. A feeling of loneliness creeps over those of us who still are left, and the thought comes to me that not very many days are left before we, too, must hear the soft, sweet notes of "taps." And yet I know that the old veterans are still unafraid. They do not believe with the orator who said that—

Every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jeweled with a joy, will at its close become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death.

For them death is no tragedy deep and dark, for I know they believe that for him who suffers it 'tis but the opening of a portal to the dawn of a grander, richer, more glorious existence, and that when the final summons comes to each of them in turn he may be sure that his loving comrades who have gone before will meet him with outstretched spirit hands to clasp again the hand of him they loved on earth, and bid him welcome as he touches the unknown shore. And so believing, I say in all hope and in all reverence to my companion in arms and friend, Goodby, goodby, until we meet again.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, during my 18 years of service in this House Alabama has had an exceedingly strong representation both upon this floor and upon the floor of the Senate. I shall not recount the names of the distinguished gentlemen who have represented that State here and in the Senate, but I am very sure that during that period of time no other State has had a stronger representation than the State of Alabama, and I doubt very much whether any other State on the average has had the same degree of capacity in its membership in the two bodies as the State of Alabama, and I am glad to say that I think the strength of the representation of the State in the two bodies will continue. We are about to send from this House to the other body one of the strongest men who has ever sat in either body, and I believe the system which they have in that State of returning many of their strong men has been a great benefit to the country, and among the men who have been sent by that State there has been no other one who had a gentler soul, a sweeter disposition, and a more pleasing companionship than Mr. RICHARDSON. I had the honor of serving with him for many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during a time when that committee had charge of many important matters of legislation. The Revenue-Cutter Service was reorganized. The Public Health Service was reorganized. The Lighthouse Service was reorganized. The Life-Saving Service was greatly extended. The Department of Commerce and Labor was created. The Bureau of Corporations was organized. The powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission were made adequate. The Panama Canal was provided for and largely constructed, and in all of these matters Mr. RICHARDSON had very great prominence. He was in the minority during that time, but in that great committee partisan considerations do not have very much influence, and the advice and help of Mr. RICHARDSON was constantly sought and always freely given.

His disposition was of such a character that all who knew him loved him, and those who came most closely in contact with him loved him most. He and I served on several conference committees where the difficulties were many, and it was through his influence and help that many of the good things in the legislation which came from our committee were enacted into law.

When he died I was a member of the committee appointed by this body to attend the funeral exercises. It is the only time I have left the House on an occasion of that character. It was a source of pride to me to be there when the final obsequies were enacted. I myself do not look with dread upon death. Mr. RICHARDSON had lived a long and useful life. He was entitled to leave us and go to the other world and be at rest. And at these funeral exercises one of the most affecting scenes which I have ever witnessed occurred. At practically the close the ex-Confederate veterans, who were there to pay their tribute to their comrade, formed in line and marched around the burial plot—old men who had served as comrades of Mr. RICHARDSON in the great struggle. And among these men was a Senator of the United States, Senator THORNTON of Louisiana, a member of the Senate committee, and bringing up the rear of the procession, as one of the men who had taken, at least, a humble part, was an old colored man—a procession of old men who had taken part in the war, composed of those who loved him, and paying their last tribute to him, from a distinguished Senator of the United States to a humble colored laborer. All who knew him loved him, whether of high or low degree. And there can be no pleasanter recollection for those who remain behind than to know that the one who has departed has been revered, respected, and loved by all.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to speak of Senator JOHNSTON, although I knew him well and loved him well, personally and officially, for 10 or 15 years, and greatly admired his character and great ability. I was more intimately associated, however, with Judge RICHARDSON, of whom I wish to speak.

Mr. Speaker, although Judge RICHARDSON was illustrious in the State of Alabama and to a large extent known throughout the Union before he came to Congress, I had never enjoyed the pleasure of his personal acquaintance until he succeeded the late lamented Gen. Wheeler in Congress as the Representative of the eighth district of Alabama. During that term I became acquainted with him and was glad when at the beginning of the next term he became associated with me on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House.

His industry, his great talents, and wide learning, with his discriminating legal mind, admirably fitted him for usefulness on that committee. From the beginning he took a leading part in its deliberations, grappling with masterful familiarity the manifold and multifarious questions involving every phase, condition, and instrumentality of interstate and foreign commerce. It was his lot to participate in some of the most important legislation that has marked the development of this great country in the last half century, in all of which he did his part and did it well, like a man, a lawyer, a patriot, and a statesman.

At the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress, when the Democrats organized the House, Judge RICHARDSON was made chairman of the Committee on Pensions, but continued his membership on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce until the end of that Congress, when a rule was adopted limiting eligibility to membership on one of the large committees. Thereupon, much to the regret of all the members of our committee, he gave up his place with us and continued as chairman of the Committee on Pensions until his death.

As one of the committee designated by the Speaker to attend the funeral of Judge RICHARDSON I was much gratified to find our estimate of Judge RICHARDSON shared by the people of his home town and district, who manifested their affection for him and their grief over his loss by assembling in thousands to pay a last tribute of respect and affection by casting a flower and a tear on his grave.

He was a good man, a good lawyer, a good friend, an industrious student. He loved his country, and possessed all the elements to make a great Congressman. May it be the good fortune of this Republic to find many others like him to steer the ship of state through perilous storms and breakers to a haven of peace, prosperity, and glory, and perpetuate forever the greatest Republic ever known to man.

Not only in the piping times of peace did Judge RICHARDSON exhibit his exalted character, exemplifying a splendid manhood and capacity to grapple with the great questions of life, but he had illustrated the valor of a warrior and patriot on the tented field. He followed the ill-fated but glorious flag of the Confederacy through four years of hardship and valor, under the leadership of the greatest military heroes who ever led marshaled armies to glory. He was several times wounded, and when he had suffered and fought through the unsuccessful conflict, the cause in which he gloried having gone down before overwhelming numbers and unlimited resources, he laid down his sword in that good faith which characterized his compatriots throughout the South and veritably ended the war at Appomattox, although some people on the other side, more familiar with fighting battles with ink and execrations than with sword and bullets, failed to recognize the end of the war.

Having failed in their efforts to secede and preserve and reestablish the ideal government originally planned by the framers of the Union itself, he and the other leaders and heroes of the South immediately renewed their allegiance to the Union; and from 1865 to the day of his death he labored with unabated energy, patriotism, and devotion, with ability and zeal rarely equaled, to promote the prosperity and happiness of the State of Alabama and the greatness and glory of the Republic of the United States of America.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, during our service together in this House I came to know Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON of Alabama well. He was one of the squarest, ablest, kindliest, and sweetest men I ever knew. In his young manhood he had played his part in the titanic struggle between the States. The marks of two wounds, which he bore in his body, were mute evidence of the fidelity, zeal, and courage with which he served the cause of the Confederacy. Some of the unusual trials and sufferings which he endured during his four years of service in the army have been recounted here to-day. A nature less noble and lovable than his would have been embittered by these terrible experiences. But WILLIAM RICHARDSON was incapable of harboring hatred or bitterness or revenge. When the cause for which he had fought was lost, he adjusted himself to the new conditions and did his part in working out the great problems of his country. How well he performed his part after he came to this House most of us who are here can testify. He was incapable of sectional prejudice, and in the discharge of his official duties had an eye single to the welfare of the people of every section of his country. He was modest almost to a fault, but always faithful to every duty, which he discharged with signal ability.

It is a splendid tribute to the judgment and discrimination of his constituency that they were loyal to him to the end, and returned him to this House term after term without serious opposition. He fully merited their confidence. It is a pleasure and a privilege to render this public tribute to his beautiful, lovable, and noble character, and make this feeble acknowledgment of the value to this House and to his country of his public services.

It should be a source of great pride and satisfaction to his friends and dear ones that without respect to party and without exception his colleagues who have served with him in this great historic body will always remember him, not only with respect for his unsullied character and admiration for his abilities, but with the tenderest feelings of affection for him as a man and a friend.

None knew him but to love him,
None named him but to praise.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our late colleague, Judge WILLIAM RICHARDSON, the State of Alabama lost one of its best and most faithful public servants; the Nation an able and patriotic defender; the men who served in the Mexican War, the Union and Confederate Armies, and in the Spanish-American War a true and tried friend; and this House a beloved and honored Member.

I knew Judge RICHARDSON from my early boyhood days, being natives of adjoining counties in Alabama, and while he and my father were not of the same politics and on opposite sides during the Civil War, they were lifelong friends. The district which Judge RICHARDSON served with signal honor and ability for 14 years borders on the southern boundary line of Tennessee, no great distance from the district which has favored me with a seat in this body.

Many of the pioneer settlers of northern Alabama or the Tennessee Valley came from eastern Tennessee, and were of the brave, strong, and industrious Scotch-Irish stock. The great Tennessee River flows through the two districts, uniting our sections by one of nature's great agencies of commerce and development. There are many common ties between our people, and in the passing of Judge RICHARDSON I lost not only a true friend but my constituents one who was ever ready to cooperate with their Representative in promoting and advancing the interests of east Tennessee.

A short time after my election to Congress in 1908, Judge RICHARDSON, with a strong delegation, visited my district, attending the Tennessee River Improvement Association at Harriman, Tenn. He made a most favorable impression on all who came in contact with him, and I gratefully remember the kind and generous reference he made to me in his speech on that occasion, and his kind assurance that he would aid me in every possible way when I reached Washington City and entered upon my official duties. Like all of his promises, it was faithfully kept.

His career in Congress was but a repetition of the course he had followed as a Confederate soldier; as a practicing attorney; as a State lawmaker; as a judge—one of conscientious devotion to duty. He was an untiring worker, an unselfish patriot, and an incorruptible statesman; an honorable, manly, brave man, and generous to a fault. The possession of these qualities is the explanation of his lasting hold upon the hearts and affections of the splendid people of the eighth district of Alabama. The Republican leader of this House, Mr. MANN, of Illinois, has just mentioned a great number of important, far-reaching constructive pieces of national legislation our late colleague aided in preparing and passing, and for which this and future generations will owe a debt as long as the Republic lives. Of the countless thousands who joined the Confederacy and fought under the Stars and Bars, Judge RICHARDSON was

one of the very first to forget and forgive, and I am sure was proud and happy that we were once more a prosperous, reunited, and happy people. He not only lived to see this, but was a strong factor in bringing it about.

In this connection I could not possibly present a higher, grander tribute to this man of kind, generous, and chivalrous deeds than to close my imperfect tribute by quoting a speech which he delivered in this House on January 21, 1901, when the bill was under consideration to establish a national soldiers' home near Johnson City, Tenn.—a noble, patriotic speech, for which the people of eastern Tennessee will revere, honor, and love his name and memory for all time.

Judge RICHARDSON said:

"Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Military Committee [Mr. Hull] for the courtesy extended me. As an ex-Confederate soldier, I am glad to have this opportunity of bearing testimony in this public manner of my high regard, esteem, and respect for the Federal soldiers. It is true that the district in Alabama that I have the honor to represent lies but a short distance from where this home is to be established, and, not only speaking for myself, but for all classes of my people, I say, without hesitancy, that we welcome the establishment of homes in the South for disabled Federal soldiers. Since the close of our great Civil War I have been a sincere and earnest advocate of fair, just, and liberal pensions, as well as national homes for the disabled Union soldiers. It gives me pleasure to support a bill of this kind appropriating $250,000, and even if you should make the amount $350,000, I would cheerfully do likewise.

"I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way—yea, the best way—to reconcile whatever troubles or heartburnings there may have been in the South, and especially in the locality where it is proposed to establish this home. There has never been any trouble, Mr. Speaker, between the Federal soldier and the Confederate. The history of the world has never presented a parallel to the welding of the lives and friendships that has taken place in the last 30 years between Federal and Confederate soldiers. The effect of these friendly associations between brave men who had met each other on bloody fields of battle is bearing fruit as our numbers daily are passing away. When His Excellency the President of the United States [Mr. McKinley] made his tour, some two years since, through the South and said the time would soon come when the Government would take care of the graves of the Confederate soldiers, this sentiment was greeted and welcomed by millions of brave and true men in the South. We knew that the President was sincere. He spoke it not only as President, but as a brave soldier. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that the location of this home in east Tennessee, and steps of this kind which are being inaugurated and approved, will yet lead to the consummation of the desire which exists in the conservative mind of the North and the South to see a home built which will admit both Federal and Confederate disabled soldiers. Such a home, of course, should be under the rule and government of the Federal homes law.

"I would welcome that time. One of the first bills, Mr. Speaker, introduced by me in this House was to establish a home of that kind in the vicinity of the beautiful city of Huntsville, Ala., the most attractive section of the Tennessee Valley. Such a measure, Mr. Speaker, will do more to allay the passions and prejudices produced by the war than anything else that we can do. The soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Confederate soldier, Republicans and Democrats, among our people, all speak out for such a home. I am glad that this home proposed by the bill under consideration will be established in that beautiful and historic section of east Tennessee. And for myself let me say, as an ex-Confederate soldier, treasuring the memories, as I reverently do, that are dear to my heart in connection with that wonderful struggle, honoring the brave men who fought on the other side, it gives me an amount of pleasure that I can not express in the few minutes allowed me to-day to cast my vote for this bill. [Loud and long applause.]"

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, Judge WILLIAM RICHARDSON was a native of Limestone County, Ala. He, like Senators Morgan, Pettus, and Johnston, was an actor in the most terrific drama that was ever played on the American stage.

In war and in peace he knew no standard but honor and no watchword but duty. He came of a long line of splendid southern ancestors, and every heart throb and pulse beat was for his people and his native State.

When a young man the call to arms was sounded, and young RICHARDSON unsheathed his sword and never returned it to its scabbard until the history of the end of the Confederacy had been written in blood and glory.

He was severely wounded at the Battle of Chickamauga and carried with him to his death the effects of that awful wound. What he suffered from that shot no one but he and God knew, as he never paraded his troubles before his friends.

He was captured during the war and, as I now recollect the story, was condemned to be shot as a spy. He was in his cell with a comrade one night awaiting the execution of the death sentence, which was to be carried out next morning at sunrise, when he heard the clattering of hoofs outside, and he said to his comrade, "That's Forrest's men." Sure enough it was. That wizard of the saddle had heard of the sad plight of these two Confederates, and made a raid on the town where they were incarcerated and released them.

When the titanic struggle was ended Judge RICHARDSON returned to a wrecked and ruined country. A few of his friends joined with those who conspired to complete the financial ruin of our State, and then young RICHARDSON again threw himself into the breach and helped to drive out those who would fatten on a prostrate foe.

With the eye of an eagle, he was ever watchful of the interests of Alabama; with the courage of a lion, he never quailed before her oppressors; with the heart of a maiden, his sympathies were ever with the distressed; and the night was never too dark nor the day too cold for him to go the length of his cable tow to aid a struggling brother.

His home was in Huntsville, one of the most cultured cities of the South. Among lawyers he always stood at the head of the list; among statesmen he always stood the peer of any. In civic life and in devotion to home and friends he had no superior.

Before we had emerged from the dark days of reconstruction he was elected by the people of his county as judge of the probate and county courts of Madison County and held that honored position until 1886. He was elected to fill the unexpired term of the gallant Joe Wheeler, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and had an honorable career in this body until God called him. Much of the most important legislation of the time he was here bears the influence of his mind. His work for Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee River was ardent and indefatigable. If the scheme for water-power development and the opening of that great stream is ever consummated, the people of the Tennessee Valley ought to erect a monument to the name of WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

In his early married life he lost his wife, and with four beautiful little daughters and a baby boy he started life anew, with a sad and dreary heart.

His devotion to the memory of that companion and his love for his little ones restrained him from ever marrying again. He reared his daughters himself, in his own home, and his devotion to them was perfectly beautiful.

On account of the proximity of our districts and the fact that we lived at the same hotel in Washington much of the time that he was in Congress, I perhaps enjoyed more intimate relations with him than any other Member of the delegation.

We came into the Fifty-sixth Congress at nearly the same time. As he filled out an unexpired term, he entered a few months later than I did. During our long and intimate acquaintance I always found him every inch a man. Devoted to his family, loyal to his district and his people, true to his friends, true to himself, devoted to the memory of the lost cause, his like will not always be found.

His memory will long be kept green by those who loved and honored him.

Earth was poorer and Heaven was richer when this noble friend of myself and of my family was called to God.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune when I was only about 15 or 16 years of age to live in Waterloo, Ala., in a county in the congressional district which our departed friend, Judge Richardson, represented. The district which he represented was the eight district of Alabama, and the one that I have the honor to represent is the eight district of Tennessee, and in addition to the fact that each is the eighth district in our respective States, they are contiguous. One of the counties of my district borders on one of the counties of that district, and from earliest childhood I have known more Alabamians than people from any other State in the Union, and nearly all of them came from the eighth district of that State. Consequently, having lived in Alabama, and having associated with her people intimately, although I never knew Judge RICHARDSON while I lived in Alabama or before I came to this body, I felt an interest in him, which was brought about largely by the conditions I have just described.

In addition to that he had two brothers living in Nashville, Tenn., prosperous business men, and men who always took a lively and active interest in the political, moral, and general welfare of our State. I knew both of those gentlemen before I met Judge RICHARDSON, and they were no ordinary men. Consequently, Judge RICHARDSON seemed to me very much as a Tennesseean. When he entered this body, being the successor of the distinguished Confederate general, Joseph Wheeler, and having been a Confederate soldier himself, all these things added to the interest I already felt in him. From the time I first knew Judge RICHARDSON to the last time I ever joined him in service in this House and in service upon the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which we were members for two terms prior to his death, nothing ever occurred that did not add to the good feeling and high opinion which I had of him. And every act of his life after my acquaintanceship with him was such as to make one feel more kindly toward him, until it grew into real affection.

During the latter part of his life, when he would try to discharge his public duties, and when it was evident to everyone he was not able to do so, I often asked him not to go to the committee meetings, because he did not look strong enough, and told him that we would do the work for him, but he was always insistent, and went to his labors when he ought not to have done so. The former distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and also the present distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], have paid tribute to his efficient and hard work upon that committee. He was absolutely independent in thought, and in the many hearings that occurred before that committee, when he and I were members, we would often differ, and sharply differ, as to certain propositions and theories and as to what ought or ought not to be in the proposed legislation, but always with a courtesy and dignity on his part that left no stings, but made you think all the more of the man and admire all the more his courage to thus so sharply differ with men who loved him and whom he in turn loved. On the floor of this House I have sometimes, but not often, differed with him as to what was good legislation and beneficial to our country and as to what was bad as we saw it, but I always knew that he was just as sincere and honest in his views upon the questions which were then being discussed as I claimed to be myself. And although an older man, he was easy to become acquainted with, and the longer you knew him the more he grew upon you until it became a positive pleasure to me to associate with him not only in the duties that were common to us but in every way that men and friends can be associated.

As such associate and companion in legislative labors I feel that I have sustained a great loss, and such no doubt is the feeling of all who were so closely associated with him as to know his true value as a Member of this House. He was one of those men who was so impressive in his genial yet strong personality that he will always remain firmly fixed in the minds of all who were so fortunate as to have known him intimately. Any constituency in any State could well be proud of so able and so good a Representative in this body, and if the able gentleman who has been chosen to represent the good people of the eighth district of Alabama serves his constituents as well, as ably, and as faithfully as did Judge RICHARDSON I predict for him a long term of distinguished service in this body.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been the custom of both branches of Congress to hold memorial services in honor of the men who died while serving their country as Members of Congress. It is a splendid custom, and I commend its observance to all those who are to come after us. It is fitting that the deceased Member's colleagues should have the privilege of recounting his deeds and commending his virtues, and, Mr. Speaker, we are here to-day to pay to the memory of a once brave and able Member of Congress the tribute of our respect and esteem.

It is comforting to the brave soldier to know that if he dies in battle far away from home and loved ones that some of his comrades will tell the story of his valor and heroism, and, Mr. Speaker, it is comforting to a Member of Congress to know that when he has answered his last roll call and gone from the forum of congressional debate, that his colleagues will say something of his work here and speak of his service to his country.

Mr. Speaker, the service here is often strenuous, always exacting, and trying, at times, on both the ability and moral stamina of the Member. It is ours to promote the general welfare—to benefit the country by our service and to guard the Constitution so that we may bequeath to posterity, unhampered and unimpaired, the priceless heritage of civil and religious liberty. Here we have to do with the great problems that affect the destiny of our country and the welfare of the human race, for, as Jefferson has said, "One single good government is a blessing to mankind." Here men have given the best years of their lives striving earnestly to be of value to their day and generation, and here they have rendered noble service to their country.

The man whose memory we honor to-day was an able and faithful public servant. He was a splendid representative of the South "when knighthood was in flower." Judge RICHARDSON, when but a beardless youth, entered the Confederate Army, and no braver soldier ever donned a uniform or drew a battle blade. Believing that the State had the right to secede; that sovereignty resided with the State, and that to the State allegiance was due, he endured the hardships and privations of the Confederate soldier, and participated in a struggle where the mingled blood of brothers, North and South, cemented the sections in the bonds of an everlasting union.

He accepted in good faith the arbitrament of the sword, and this faithful follower of the Stars and Bars became the devoted defender of the Stars and Stripes, and here in the Hall of the National Congress he counseled with men of the Union Army and together they worked for the good of the Republic.

He was a loyal friend, an able and faithful representative of his people, and a splendid type of the American citizen.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is always painful to contemplate death, but as death is inevitable it is meet and proper that those of us who linger behind should by some appropriate ceremony pay our respects to the memory of the friends and associates who have preceded us to the grave. It is more than difficult, Mr. Speaker, to do justice to such an occasion, but it is a privilege which the living have, to make the attempt. Nothing that we can say here will add either to the name or to the fame of those whose spirits have winged their flight to the unknown realm above, but we can at least recall their virtues so that those who come after them may profit thereby.

It is in this spirit that I shall attempt briefly to speak of the life and character of the late Judge WILLIAM RICHARDSON. Notwithstanding the fact that considerably more than a score of years separated our lives, I know that there was a bond of friendship between us. Upon practically all political questions Judge RICHARDSON and I were in entire accord, and our personal relations were of the most friendly character. I recall distinctly my first introduction to Judge RICHARDSON. It was when he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of the State of Alabama. I recall his appearance and his manner. I well remember the dignified black suit and the immaculate white shirt—a style of dress that he was wont to wear unto the day of his death. I well recall also his pleasing conversation and his most cordial manner. It was years afterwards, however, that we met as colleagues in this body. It was then that I came to know Judge RICHARDSON and, knowing him, to honor, to respect, to admire, aye, to love him. Judge RICHARDSON was a modest and a courageous gentleman. He possessed that kind of courage which is always associated with modesty—the finest type of courage to be found among men. Judge RICHARDSON was a patriot, if by patriotism we mean a fearless, intelligent, and conscientious devotion to what one believes to be to the best interest of his country. His record as a Confederate soldier, as a private citizen, as a Member for many years of this body, speaks for itself, and is above reproach. His remarkable career in the Confederate Army he never capitalized politically, and even in private conversation with his closest friends he was diffident in speaking of it.

Judge RICHARDSON belonged to the old, chivalrous school of southern gentlemen—men who were neither boisterous nor ostentatious, as is often pictured by inimical critics of the South, but men who fearlessly discharge their duty, let the consequences be what they may. He was kept in Congress by a fond constituency until claimed by death. Among others, I attended the funeral in his home city of Huntsville, where his remains were interred. I saw gathered there, from all the ranks of life and from all over the Tennessee Valley, a great concourse of people to pay tribute to his memory. I saw gray-haired, wrinkled, and decrepit Confederate veterans, when his coffin was lowered in the grave, march solemnly around it and drop in it a sprig of green. I saw delicate, refined, and sympathetic women cover the new-made grave with all the varieties

of flowers that spring puts forth in that sunny clime, and when I turned away with head uncovered and eyes moistened with tears, I said, "Surely, as I firmly believe, if there be a kingdom of the righteous, the soul and the spirit of Judge RICHARDSON is now resting in peace."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when I entered the Sixty-first Congress, among the first, if not the very first of those who had seen prior service in Congress, to greet and cordially welcome me as a colleague was the Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, of Alabama. From that time until his death he was my good friend, and I profited greatly from his helpful advice and suggestions. The particular interest that he took in me from the outset was no doubt largely influenced by the fact that in my home city there lived two brothers and a sister who were among its most influential and prominent citizens, and who had commended me to him. So deep was my appreciation of his generous friendship and his kindly and helpful advice, so great my admiration for his many noble qualities as a man and as a distinguished Member of this body, that I could not let this opportunity pass without paying a brief, though necessarily inadequate, tribute to his memory. It is not my purpose to speak of the life of Judge RICHARDSON, or to refer particularly to the great service which he rendered to his State and the Nation. I will leave that to others who served for a longer time with him in Congress. We have just listened to an excellent address by his successor in Congress and his lifelong and intimate friend, Hon. C. C. HARRIS, who has pictured to us the high sense of duty which prompted every act of Judge RICHARDSON through all the years of his life.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this high sense of honor and duty was the guidepost which directed him at every turn in the pathway of his life. It governed and sustained him, when, as a mere boy during the Civil War, he was captured at Murfreesboro, Tenn., and ordered to be executed within a few hours, being saved from such a fate only by the timely and unexpected arrival of that wizard of the saddle, Gen. Bedford Forrest. His neighbors will tell you that this same high principle controlled him during all the subsequent years of his life while he lived among them as an honored friend and neighbor. It was surely so, Mr. Speaker, after he became a Member of this House, where, as one of its most useful, faithful, and influential Members, he devoted so many years of his life in splendid service to his State and the Nation. It was particularly so during the last few months of his life, when dread disease had taken hold of him and death was haunting his footsteps. Feeble though he was, he insisted on attending the sessions of the House and giving personal attention to the needs and wishes of those whom he directly represented. To a man of his high ideals I am quite sure it must have been a consolation that he was permitted to pay the debt which we must all ultimately pay while actively engaged in the service of his country, leaving behind him as a heritage to his family not only a high and honorable name, but also an enviable record of earnest and faithful devotion to duty. And, Mr. Speaker, what better fate could befall any man? We all must face death at some time, and I know of no better end than that which fell to the lot of our distinguished colleague and friend. He died after a long life of usefulness, rich in honors and richer in the love and affection of all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I have never feared death very much. Sooner or later it must come to us all. For the same reason, I do not believe that the majority of mankind actually fear death. We dread it rather because of the uncertainty and the fear that the record of our lives may not be such as to entitle us to receive the reward of another and an infinitely more happy life. But there can be no such fear as to our deceased colleague. He was called upon to perform much service in this life, and it can be truthfully said that he was faithful to every trust, whether great or small, and we have the promise of the Divine Master that such a man shall be ruler over many things in the great beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no man who more truly lived up to the injunction of the poet:

> So live that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan which moves
> To that mysterious realm where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
> Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn hour, and it furnishes occasion for serious reflection.

Once more we have been reminded of the verity of the biblical decree, "It is appointed unto men once to die." From that divine edict there is no escape.

Death is the final and common conqueror. With imperial and impartial tread it enters the gilded palace and the lowly hovel. Its awful presence stills the tongue of criticism, silences the voice of anger, restrains the pen of censure, softens the heart of hatred, and turns our thoughts toward those things the contemplation of which elevates the mind, quickens the conscience, and purifies the soul.

How strange it is that we think seriously of death only when confronted by death!

In the death of our friend and colleague Representative WILLIAM RICHARDSON his district lost a brilliant and faithful servant, the State of Alabama a loyal and distinguished son, the United States a devoted and useful officer, the cause of liberty a prudent and zealous champion. Throughout a long and active life, given chiefly to the public service, he was ever a shining example of loyalty to purpose, of devotion to country, and of faithfulness to duty.

He died in Atlantic City, N. J., on the 31st day of March, 1914, at the age of 74 years 10 months and 23 days. His birthplace was Athens, Ala., and the date of his birth was the 8th day of May, 1839. His health had been failing for some time, and his death was not unexpected by his family and friends.

As was true generally of the youth of that time in that new country, his opportunities for the acquisition of an education were limited; but, availing himself industriously of the means within his reach, after attending school in his home town, then a mere village, he entered and in due season graduated with highest honors from the Wesleyan University at Florence, Ala., an institution now long nonexistent. The colleges and universities of that time in all parts of the country were far below those of to-day in both admission and graduation requirements. As a matter of fact, the best of the higher institutions of that day were not superior, if, indeed, they were equal, to the high schools of the present.

The wonder is that so many who came up under the conditions of that period were able to overcome apparently insurmountable obstacles and acquire the education necessary for success and distinction in all the fields of human endeavor. Representative RICHARDSON belonged to that class of men who succeed regardless of untoward conditions. He possessed the rare powers of concentration and application, and these combined with a strong intellect enabled him to acquire much knowledge. He was a man of great learning.

Not long after leaving college he enlisted as a private in the Army of the Confederacy in which he served with great prowess from 1861 to 1865. He was wounded three times, once desperately, and was promoted to the rank of captain on account of conspicuous gallantry on the field of battle. A unique and harrowing experience was his during that sanguinary conflict. While traveling unknowingly with a spy he was arrested by Federal soldiers and, with the spy, condemned to be executed at sunrise on the following day. Only a timely rescue by Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest saved his life. In the performance of duty danger had no terror for him. He was among the bravest of the brave.

When the war ended he returned to his home and studied law, which was his profession for the remainder of his life, and in which he won signal success. Having served a term in the Legislature of Alabama he removed to Huntsville, which was his home thereafter. He was for many years judge of probate, and his friends still boast that his record was the best ever made in that office.

He was a candidate for the gubernatorial nomination of his party in 1890 and was defeated by only a small number of votes. Four years later he served as delegate at large to the national Democratic convention. On the 3d day of July, 1900, following the resignation during the Fifty-sixth Congress of Gen. Joseph Wheeler, who for many years had represented that district, the eighth Alabama, he was nominated unanimously by his party for both the unexpired and the succeeding term in the House of Representatives, and he served continuously thereafter until the date of his death in the Sixty-third Congress.

His health began to fail about two years ago, prior to which time he took a prominent part in the proceedings of the House and participated in many of the debates, always with credit to himself. He served on some of the most important committees and at the time of his death was chairman of the Committee on Pensions. In his capacity as a Member of Congress he had to do directly with those who to him had been both foe and victor in time of war, and from the very beginning of his

service here he had their confidence and esteem. In no other Government than this glorious Republic could a thing like that have happened. It only shows how completely the animosities of the great war have passed away. That is an honor of which his descendants even to the remotest generation may justly feel proud.

In this connection I am reminded of a bill passed during this Congress in furtherance of the feeling of amity to which I have referred. How appropriate and how beautiful it was for a Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to introduce and, by unanimous vote in both the House and Senate, to secure the passage of a bill having for its object the complete obliteration of sectional prejudice so far as that can be done by law. I refer to the act repealing the statute requiring proof of loyalty to the Union of those who seek reimbursement for damages sustained during the Civil War. The speech made by Mr. GRAHAM when that bill was under consideration in the House was one of the most eloquent and patriotic that was ever delivered in Congress or elsewhere. I wish it could have been heard by every citizen of this great country.

As a public speaker Representative RICHARDSON displayed oratorical ability of a high order. In debate he was ready, poised, argumentative, and fair, and on all occasions was lucid, instructive, eloquent, and convincing. As an orator he was in demand throughout Alabama, especially on patriotic occasions, and he never failed to measure up to the expectations of his audience.

But, Mr. Speaker, in view of what others have said, it is unnecessary for me to dwell longer upon the details of the remarkable career of our late friend and colleague. From the date of his entrance into the combat of life his record was one of achievement, and in its every stage discloses a brilliant mind, a determined will, a cultivated conscience, and a generous soul, all of which go to constitute a well-rounded character, and are absolutely essential for real success. A born leader of men, he was ever accorded preferment by his fellows. His career illustrates the power of a combination of intelligence, character, and application, and will stand as a perennial inspiration to the youth of the land.

A good and great man was lost to the world when WILLIAM RICHARDSON died. True to himself, true to his country, true to his God, he abides with Him—

> Who shines in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
> Glows in the stars and blossoms in the trees,
> Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
> Spreads undivided and operates unspent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my affection and respect for the person and character of our friend and colleague, WILLIAM RICHARDSON, will not permit me to indulge in mere words of praise. He was my friend and comrade for many years. I knew and loved him for his charming personality, his high character, and his eminent abilities. He early realized the responsibilities of life as a soldier in the War between the States, and with courage he met every responsibility from that hour to the day of his death. Tried in many and important public and private stations, he was faithful in all. Courteous and kindly in manner, he was determined and persistent in purpose and action. Tolerant and conservative always, he had fixed principles to guide his course through life and positive convictions that he maintained on all public questions. He thought clearly and always expressed himself forcefully. He was a hard worker, a diligent seeker after the truth. Possessed of rare good judgment and great common sense, he was a safe counselor. He made friends through life because people believed in him and trusted him. He carried conviction with what he said because he himself was convinced before he acted. He was a leader of men because his leadership was marked by courage and honesty of purpose. He was respected by all who knew him because he deserved it. He loved his country and was a true American, but he was primarily a son of the Southland, bound in heart and memory to the history and traditions, the honesty and good repute of the old South. He honored his native State of Alabama, and Alabama honored him to the day of his death. Great as is the history of Alabama and her many distinguished sons, there never trod on Alabama soil a more knightly gentleman than WILLIAM RICHARDSON, and there sleeps not beneath Alabama's sod a more loyal, gentle, and brave son than her late Representative.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, in accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 1, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 1, 1915.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are but five Senators on the other side of the Chamber, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson	Ransdell	Thomas
Bryan	Kenyon	Robinson	Thornton
Camden	Kern	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Culberson	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	White
Gallinger	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Williams
Hollis	Perkins	Smoot	
James	Pittman	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is no quorum present.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I ask for the enforcement of the standing order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire what is the standing order?

Mr. KERN. To compel the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will enforce the order of the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. STONE, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. LANE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. WEEKS, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. LIPPITT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. REED, and Mr. CHILTON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is entitled to the floor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the Turners' Society, of New Britain; of the Quartette Club, of New Britain; of the German-American Alliance, of New Britain; of the Teutonia Mannerchor, of New Britain; and of sundry citizens of Clinton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee of Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of Dr. Otto E. Wilde, August von Boecklin, A. H. Hardee, Richard Fechtner, Carl Krummel, and sundry other citizens of Tacoma, and of the Germania Club, of Wenatchee, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Rev. E. W. Wilder and sundry other citizens of Granger, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called immigration bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MCLEAN presented a memorial of Centennial Lodge, No. 118, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of New Britain, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present law relative to the printing of Government return envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Teutonia Mannerchor, the Quartette Club, the German-American Alliance, the Turners' Society, and the Kaiser Franz Joseph Society, all of New Britain, and of the Turners' Society and of sundry citizens of Meriden, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 7503) granting an increase of pension to William D. Eudy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7504) granting an increase of pension to James K. Stebbins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7505) granting an increase of pension to Annia Clark; and

A bill (S. 7506) granting a pension to Mary L. Taylor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7507) for the relief of Sarah J. Ireland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7508) granting an increase of pension to James Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10735) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator yield to me to make a motion?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I do not forfeit the floor.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator has occupied it but once, and he has the right to resume it again.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I certainly can not object to any request made by my honored friend from Arkansas, and I yield for a motion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is very evident to some of the Senators on this side of the Chamber that the proceeding that is now going on can be indefinitely continued. That has imposed upon us the duty of determining whether or not our highest obligations to our constituents require that we submit to that sort of a result when it may injuriously affect interests we deem to be more directly imposed upon us. We see the passage of the great supply bills jeopardized; we see the river and harbor bill again put into a situation where even a fair attack may jeopardize its passage. The people of the section from which I come are vitally interested in that measure.

It is likewise true that there is an ingrained and widespread impression among the farmers of my State that they have not received at the hands of the present Congress the consideration that their interests require should be extended to them, not only because it would be just to do so but because they feel that a generation of fidelity to the interests of the great Democratic Party justifies a thorough investigation into the situation of their affairs and the extension, to the very limit of constitutional power, of any remedy that might relieve them. I believe that the rural-credits bill is one of the measures that would, at this particular time, extend to those people some relief as against the misfortunes which the great calamity that has fallen upon humanity has imposed upon them.

In the regular progress of events, in the regular unfolding of a policy of reform and progress, a rural-credits law is due. I do not believe there is anything connected with this particular shipping bill that addresses itself to the people of that section at this time with sufficient force to justify them in permitting any opportunity to pass, or to justify them in excusing their representatives for permitting any opportunity to pass, that might bring to them the relief that that measure could afford.

In order to give voice to the sentiments of a number of us who share the opinions that I have but briefly and imperfectly stated, I move that the pending bill and all amendments be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has decided to take a vote on the pending question and the yeas and nays have been ordered. No other motion is in order until that is decided. The Senate has determined that, and I make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, with great deference I appeal from the decision of the Chair, and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], who is absent, and will withhold my vote unless I can make a transfer, in which event I shall vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], who is temporarily absent, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CRAWFORD. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call resulted, yeas 37, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	Kern	Robinson	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thornton
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shields	Tillman
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Walsh
Gore	Myers	Simmons	White
Hollis	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Md.	
James	Pomerene	Stone	
Johnson	Reed	Swanson	

NAYS—46.

Bankhead	Colt	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Crawford	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	Cummins	McLean	Stephenson
Brandegee	Dillingham	Nelson	Sterling
Bristow	du Pont	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Bryan	Gallinger	Oliver	Townsend
Burleigh	Gronna	Page	Vardaman
Burton	Hardwick	Perkins	Warren
Camden	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Weeks
Clapp	Jones	Root	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Sherman	
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—13.

Catron	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Fall	Lewis	Penrose	
Goff	Newlands	Ransdell	
La Follette	Norris	Shafroth	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? the yeas are 37, the nays are 46. So the Senate does not agree with the ruling of the Chair. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, to the end that real Democrats may have a conference and that Republicans and their allies may have a caucus, so that we may see just what the new line-up is, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER and others called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as a little while ago and the same transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With the same announcement that was made by me on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. NORRIS entered the Chamber and voted "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, the transfer of my pair is ineffectual, because the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has entered the Chamber and voted. I therefore withdraw my vote, being paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. CHILTON. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Ashurst	Johnson	Ransdell	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Kern	Reed	Stone
Chilton	Lane	Robinson	Swanson
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thompson
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Thornton
Hollis	Myers	Shively	Tillman
Hughes	Pittman	Simmons	Walsh
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.	White

NAYS—49.

Bankhead	Cummins	McLean	Smoot
Borah	Dillingham	Nelson	Stephenson
Brady	du Pont	Norris	Sterling
Brandegee	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Townsend
Bristow	Gronna	Oliver	Vardaman
Burleigh	Hardwick	Overman	Sutherland
Burton	Hitchcock	Page	Warren
Camden	Jones	Perkins	Weeks
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poindexter	Williams
Clapp	La Follette	Root	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sherman	
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	
Colt	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—11.

Catron	Goff	Newlands	Shafroth
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Fall	Lewis	Penrose	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. STONE. I move to lay the motion to recommit upon the table, and upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], who is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). With the same announcement as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 42, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Ashurst	Kern	Reed	Stone
Bryan	La Follette	Robinson	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thompson
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
Gore	Myers	Shively	Walsh
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	White
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—44.

Bankhead	Colt	Lodge	Sherman
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Dillingham	McLean	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Nelson	Stephenson
Bristow	Gallinger	Norris	Sterling
Burleigh	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Burton	Hardwick	Oliver	Townsend
Camden	Hitchcock	Page	Vardaman
Clapp	Jones	Perkins	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Poindexter	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Root	Works

NOT VOTING—10.

Catron	Goff	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	
Fall	Lewis	Penrose	

So the Senate refused to lay on the table the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I listened to the roll call just ended I wondered whether our old friend, the Shipping Trust, was not already congratulating itself upon another legislative victory. It has had many in the past. This vote indicates that it is about to record another triumph.

The Shipping Trust has been very busy in and about the opposition to this bill. Its attorneys have prepared learned briefs to circulate among the Members of the Senate advising us of the great dangers to befall if the Government of the United States shall purchase some vessels, sail them under the American flag, and transport at a reasonable cost the products of this land to European and South American markets.

My own opinion is that the patriots who prepared the brief I have referred to and who forwarded it to the Members of the Senate are not so much concerned in maintaining peace between the United States and Europe as they are in keeping the strangle hold which the shipping combination has upon the commerce of our land. These patriots are not so much agitated about universal peace as they are interested in exorbitant profits.

They regard their opportunity to practice extortion upon the commerce of the United States as of greater importance than the safety of the Republic. They are unwilling that the Government should provide an auxiliary fleet for its Navy lest it also be used to relieve the farmers and manufacturers from their monopolistic exactions.

A few years ago the Shipping Trust came to Congress demanding an immense subsidy. Many of the Senators who supported that outrageous measure, who were then willing to permit the Shipping Trust to thrust its hands deep into the pockets of the American taxpayers, who were "cheek by jowl" with the trust at every step in its attempted raid upon the Treasury, are still in this body. They have all with one accord opposed this bill. Their faces are now wreathed in smiles because the last two or three roll calls have indicated that there is a sufficient Democratic defection to possibly work the defeat of this bill. For days the countenances of these gentlemen have worn the doleful expression of those who see their favorite protégé being led to execution. But now their countenances wear an expression of exquisite glee as they gaze upon the Democratic recruits who have just joined their ranks.

I congratulate, therefore, this hoary old monopoly upon the fact that it appears to have sufficient vigor in this day and age not only to command a unanimous Republican support but to invade the Democratic side of the Chamber and gain recruits.

Mr. President, every man must answer for his own vote, and every man will answer for his vote upon this bill as he must upon any other bill; but there should be no possible misunderstanding by the people of this country as to the exact situation which is presented.

It is a principle of law that a common carrier is only entitled to a fair return upon its investment. With that principle of law staring it in the face, the moment war was declared the Shipping Trust began its scheme of plunder; by extorting enormous sums of money from American citizens who sought to escape from Europe, ten, twenty, and thirty times the usual rates were charged. The American woman with her children in Europe, desiring to return to this land, found herself excluded from the opportunity to take passage unless she could pay the outrageous and illegal toll extorted by the merciless and conscienceless brood controlling trans-Atlantic transportation.

In consonance with the same plan of robbery, the proprietors of freight vessels ran them to the American docks, where cotton and all other products of our farms were waiting for shipment, and demanded from two to ten times the usual price for hauling goods. It was a clear case of a trust employing an emergency for the purpose of plunder. It was a clear case of the robbery of the American producer and farmer. It was a clear case of extortion and of theft, for money taken under such circumstances is as surely acquired by unjust force as is money yielded at the point of a pistol to a highway robber.

Under these conditions the President of the United States sought to give relief to the farmers and producers of the country. He saw the planter with his cotton and the farmer with his grain at the wharves awaiting shipment. Between that planter and the market stood the Shipping Trust prepared to extort the pirates' tariff.

He also observed the fact that one of the great weaknesses of our war Navy is that it is without auxiliary supply ships. He recognized the truth, as must every other man, that if we were at present unfortunately to become involved in war we would be unable to secure vessels to act as auxiliaries to our Navy.

So the President submitted or suggested a plan by which the Government of the United States might acquire vessels to meet the two existing emergencies. The bill came up for discussion. The old Shipping Trust got busy. I have wondered if it hoped there might be war and expected to duplicate its performance during the Spanish War. We were then without vessels. We were obliged to buy them where and how we could. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] put into the RECORD a few days ago the prices at which his party bought and the price at which his party sold those boats. In both instances, in the last analysis, the Shipping Trust was the seller and the buyer. It robbed the Government at both ends of the transaction in a manner so conscienceless that I wonder even the Senator from Utah [Mr.

SMOOT] does not find his ostrich stomach rebel at the possibility of a repetition.

This measure was brought forward. The old trust is now as always on guard. I well remember that about two years ago some patriotic citizens of California, desiring to exhibit the products of that State in the ports of other countries, wanted to buy a vessel. They desired to sail the vessel under the American flag. They were forced to go to the Shipping Trust, for it owned substantially all the vessels under the American flag. That beneficent institution demanded about three prices for a vessel. Unwilling to be robbed, these gentlemen went outside the trust. They found a vessel that had been built in foreign parts, which they could buy for about one-third of the sum demanded by the combination. They caused a bill to be introduced in Congress granting the privilege to that vessel to sail under the American flag, for they did not want to exhibit American products under a foreign flag. When that little bill, permitting the purchase of a single vessel, came before the Commerce Committee all of the shipyards and the representatives of the great Shipping Trust appeared, protesting that the people of California should not have the privilege asked. When the committee informed the representatives of the interests that it proposed to report the bill favorably, the intending purchasers were taken out into the hall and their demands were satisfied.

Mr. President, the shipyards and Shipping Trust of this country have been very potential for a great many years. We have endeavored on several occasions to pass bills for the amelioration of the condition of sailors upon its ships, and I have always found the trust on hand, as it is on hand to-day, as the country knows it is on hand to-day, ready to oppose the public interest in its own selfish interest.

Mr. President, the opponents of this bill well understand the situation. If this bill is killed, then the Shipping Trust will continue to absolutely hold the foreign commerce of this country in its grip. It will continue to extort all that its conscience will permit it to take. History as well as its present conduct demonstrates that its conscience will not balk at robbing a grave or despoiling the blind.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator from Missouri think that the Shipping Trust has such a thing as a conscience?

Mr. REED. Well, there are various kinds of consciences. Frequently a scoundrel employs his conscience as the cloak of his villainy. I doubt not but the Shipping Trust possesses that accommodating kind of mentality. I have generally observed that those who vote with it always invoke their conscience.

But I return to what I was saying a moment ago. If this bill is defeated, then the farmers and manufacturers, both of the North and South, who have goods to transport across the seas will in the future, as at this present hour, remain subject to extortion, outrage, and robbery by the shipping monopoly. Every man who votes against this bill to-day votes in favor of preserving the grip of the trust.

I have not the slightest patience with those gentlemen who are professing to vote against the bill upon the ground that by its passage we thereby endanger our neutrality. That argument is based, in its last analysis, upon the hypothesis that the President of the United States will appoint a shipping board that, in the face of the law and the common sense of the situation, will do something to involve this country in war. Mr. President, that might be a genuine fear if we had as President of the United States the man whom many of you on the other side of the Chamber followed with cheers and acclamations only a few years ago. Thoughtful men might well hesitate if we had as President of the United States the man who so loved bloodshed and war as to boast, after a battle, that his own hand had struck down a human being, that he had "potted a Spaniard."

If we had as President of the United States a man of bluster, a lover of contention, one who preferred the accouterments of the cowboy and the headgear of a Barbary pirate to the more sober uniform of the American soldier, whose stock in trade was bombast and fustian—if we had such a man, we might be fearful of permitting him even to run at large at a time like this. But, Mr. President, if there is one thing above another that has characterized every act of Woodrow Wilson, it is his profound and unalterable devotion to the cause of human peace. Aye, more than that, he possesses the poise, the coolness, the deliberation, and the high intelligence that enables him to carry out that policy with due regard for the dignity of this country and with proper consideration for the rights of all other nations. He has shown that he possesses, along with the coolness and deliberation of a Jefferson, the high courage of a Jackson. That courage will not permit him to be swayed from his purpose by any sudden impulse, clamor, or frenzy that may seize the country. It will enable him to stand calmly at the helm of the ship of state and keep her within the waters of safety. This man, devoted to peace; this man, whose every act shows his love of peace, will not plunge our country into war simply because he is given the right to purchase or build a few vessels. There is not a man in this Chamber who believes the country will be plunged into war by Woodrow Wilson. That pretense is a false pretense. Those who make it deliberately seek to mislead the public.

Let me say to these gentlemen you will deceive no one. The people will understand, and do now understand, that if this bill is defeated, it is defeated at the demand of the shipping monopoly that has so long controlled the commerce of the high seas.

Mr. President, I again congratulate our old friend, the Shipping Trust. There will be rejoicing wherever its representatives meet to-night. Many a bottle of champagne will be broken because the Democratic ranks have been broken. If the trust is strong enough to override a Democratic caucus, if it is strong enough to make Democrats turn their backs upon their party council, aye, if it is wizard enough to amalgamate into a solid body the highly conscientious insurgent and the standpatter whom the insurgent has for four years denounced, it is indeed potential. If it can put to bed under the same cover the turbulent elements of the Republican Party and lull them to peaceful slumber by its siren song, then, indeed, is it the prince of seducers, and is entitled to be congratulated.

As I looked over at the other side during the roll call and beheld the solid line-up, the Progressive and the reactionary, the standpatter and the Bull Mooser, the followers of Taft and the followers of Roosevelt, and the followers of no one in particular, all voting together, I said to myself, "How beautiful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." What a glorious consolation must come to the hearts of all the Republican brethren in the thought that their party has been reunited and all its wounds healed by the soothing touch of that Shipping Trust which has for a quarter of a century been plundering the people of the United States.

The cry of those who oppose this bill is that it is socialistic. That claim sounds strange from Republicans who a few years ago proposed to vote $9,000,000 per year for 20 years, a total of $180,000,000, of the taxpayers' money as a sop to the shipping combination.

There was then no socialism in turning the taxpayers' money over as a subsidy to boats and boat owners. That was highly patriotic; that was entirely constitutional; that was greatly to be desired; that was statecraft; that was not socialism. But now that we propose, instead of giving the money to a shipowner and allowing him to keep the ship, to take the ship over and have something for our money, we are the wickedest of socialists. That may be socialism of a very unpleasant variety to the gentleman who wants to get our money and keep his ship, but the policy will be most agreeable to the man who wants to ship his goods at a fair price.

Mr. President, let me suppose an almost unsupposable case. Let us assume that this Government shall be drawn into the European war—an unthinkable proposition to my mind and lamentable beyond human expression—but assume that it does happen, and that this bill has been passed, and the ships have been acquired. We will then have a hundred vessels under our own flag subject to our immediate call. These ships will be prepared to carry coal and munitions and men wherever they were needed. But if the bill is defeated, and if war shall come, the country will find itself with scarce a vessel to transport a ton of coal or a company of soldiers.

Senators are voting against this addition to the Navy of the United States who have clamored for years for more ships of war. They refuse now to vote for ships of peace which may be invaluable in case of war. They prefer crippling the United States Navy to crippling the Shipping Trust.

Mr. President, we have for days witnessed a most heroic exhibition—the entire Republican side engaging in a filibuster to prevent a vote upon this bill. All night long they have stood and talked about everything except the shipping bill. They have organized themselves into oratorical relays. Every obstruction known to the parliamentarian has been brought into play, and for what reason? It was in order that the forces might be mustered. When a conference action on this side is disregarded, and when on the other side the standpatter and the Progressive get together, the reason is plain.

The old bull moose is said to be shrinking, drying up, almost ready to take its place with the dead dust of the departed.

Some of us fondly hoped that there might be a little vitality left in the animal; that there might remain such a thing as a final kick of independence. Some of us cherished the thought that there still might be a little heat in the expiring embers of that fire of virtuous reform which poured forth so hot a flame a few years ago. But it appears that the Bull Moose Party has just laid down and died—that the Progressives have gone back to the flesbpots of the standpatter. They are all to-day dining out of the same trough. They hunt together. They are enlisted in the same service. They are traveling in the same harness.

They are exhibiting wonderful "teamwork." They answer to the crack of the same lash. The insurgent who has for four years been sitting on the breeching is now tugging at the traces. He will soon have collar galls. If it were not impolite, I would venture to repeat the old scriptural phrase, "The dog is turned to his own vomit and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."

But I will not quote the Scripture—it is sometimes too harsh for polite society—so I will content myself with saying that the insurgents and the standpatters, the bull moose and the elephant, the nondescript and the political "what is it" are now all bedding together.

Democrats, we, at least, will get a little satisfaction out of that fact. The country will no longer be afflicted with the epidemic of political false pretense.

The political Pharisee will cease standing upon the street corner and thanking God that he is not as other Republicans and sinners. He will admit in the future—at least the people will admit it for him—that all Republicans are of one class, bone of the same bone, flesh of the same flesh, now, as in the past, controlled by the same fundamental motives and answering to-day as of old to the lash of the interests.

Let me read you the words of one of the eloquent opponents of this bill, who joins in the cry that if the Government now acquires some ships to haul our grains at a fair price it will be guilty of socialism, who, when he was advocating the plundering of the people through a ship subsidy uttered an argument which is as true to-day as it was then, namely, "that an abundance of shipping is of benefit to the entire country and to all of its people." Mr. LODGE on January 30, 1906, said:

> This is not a mere question of advantage and assistance to the interests which lie along our ocean coasts. It may not be as obvious to those who dwell in the interior as it is to those of us who live either on the shores of the Pacific or of the Atlantic. But it is in the interest of every man in the United States who is interested in our agriculture or our industries that we should have a great merchant marine, able to save us from such foreign combinations and syndicates as the one I have described.

Why, Brother LODGE said then there were syndicates and combinations, and the only way we could get rid of them was by creating a merchant marine. But he wanted to create a merchant marine, pay for it out of the people's money, and give it to somebody, while we want to create a merchant marine and own it ourselves until such time, at least, as it can be disposed of to those who will run it in the interest of the people of the country.

I read you also from Senator GALLINGER and can also read from other distinguished Senators upon that side, who, when they were asking for money to put into the pockets of private citizens, could stand, with tears in their eyes, weeping over the extortion practiced by the shipping combination upon the farmer and the merchant and the manufacturer. Yet, all of these statesmen have to-day opposed the only possible measure that can be brought forward at this time and that will give any relief to the people of the United States.

In discussing the question of ship subsidy in 1902 Senator GALLINGER quoted from an English telegram, which read:

> British shipowners have been watching with great interest the efforts of the United States to foster the growth of the merchant marine. They believe that if the subsidy bill in Congress becomes a law it will deal a severe blow to British shipbuilding. To-morrow the chambers of shipping of the United Kingdom will meet. Col. Ropner, M. P., will be reelected president. In the speech which he will deliver he will point this out as a danger which is threatening Great Britain's supremacy in the ocean carrying trade.

Then, Mr. GALLINGER said:

> In the interests of commerce it is proposed that the Government shall build an interoceanic canal, the cost of which will be hundreds of millions of dollars, and the value of which to the commerce of the United States is largely problematical. No one is wise enough to state with any degree of accuracy the cost of the canal, its value to commerce, or its cost of maintenance.

Then he added:

> I am willing to risk something in the attempt to restore our flag to the ocean and to put lines of steamships on the great highways of commerce. If it succeeds, it will be the grandest achievement of the century, while if it fails it will be no reproach to those of us who made an honest effort to bring about the desired result.

Again, I ask, what was the difference between that proposition and this? The substance of that proposition was to take the taxpayers' money and give it to a shipowner and let him own and have the benefit of the ship. The substance of this proposition is to take the taxpayers' money and buy the ships for the benefit of the people of the United States.

But I return to the argument made here that by buying some vessels we become socialists. Mr. President, the same men who make that argument now, with a front so solemn it would do credit to a professional mourner at a Chinese funeral, sat in the Senate Chamber only a few weeks ago and voted unanimously for the Government to go into the business of insuring ships. If the Government can go into the business of insuring ships without engaging in socialism, then the Government can go into the business of owning ships without becoming socialistic. For what is an insurance policy? When the Government writes a policy upon a ship or its cargo it puts itself in the place of the owner of that ship. It stands between the shipowner and loss. It assumes the great responsibilities of ownership. Its share of the profit is in the premium. It is not as much of a governmental function to insure ships as it is to own ships—aye, it is much less—because the ownership of the vessel is of value to our Navy, and because it has to do directly with the shipment of goods, which is always a governmental function, whereas the business of insurance has always been a private business.

But why were the Senators upon the other side of this Chamber willing to vote with such alacrity for a governmental insurance of vessels? Was it because that bill put the money of the United States back of private enterprise? Was it because we were guaranteeing the boats of the Shipping Trust? When that bill was here the Shipping Trust, through the exchanges that it controls, could hold meetings and pass resolutions demanding that the United States assume the risk of shipping. That was not socialistic. But if the United States does anything to relieve the shipper its action is wickedly socialistic. The argument is a fraud and is not believed in by those who make it. Let me state it in a sentence. If the United States guarantees the Shipping Trust against loss, that is patriotic; but if it guarantees the shipper against extortion by the trust, that is socialistic.

Again, I remark that the very gentlemen who inveigh against this bill and denounce it as socialistic were also, some of them, Members of this body when we acquired a line of vessels which we now own and run. Is it pure democracy to run vessels to the ports of Panama? Is that pure democracy? And is it socialistic to run other vessels through the Panama Canal to Costa Rica or to the California coast? If the one is socialistic, sir, the other is socialistic; and the man who voted to put that Panama line of vessels upon the seas and to have the Government own them voted for the same kind of socialism embraced in this bill.

The gentlemen will justify by saying that it was necessary to use the vessels in connection with the Panama Canal project.

I grant you that excuse existed, but I call your attention to the fact that a greater reason exists now, namely, that the commerce of the ocean is paralyzed. Our cotton lies upon the docks unshipped, our wheat and corn await vessels; and the extortioner and usurer of commerce stands at the docks to demand a Shylock's toll from all the people of the land.

Again, we could take $400,000,000 and build the Panama Canal, and we could buy and own and operate a railroad, not only to use in connection with the canal itself but to transport the goods of private individuals. I make you the prediction now that when the canal is finished, when the railroad is no longer needed in connection with the canal, if that time ever comes, there will not be found in this Chamber a corporal's guard of men who will dare vote to take that railroad out of the Government's control and turn it over to a private corporation. Likewise we are now preparing to build a railway in Alaska.

Mr. President, what is the relief Senators on the other side propose? What have you to bring forward? If you have a better proposition, why have you not submitted it? You have put orators upon the floor who have sung their wearisome songs and filled in their dry platitudes and maunderings with long extracts from newspapers that had nothing whatever to do with the case.

We listened to a speech that was concluded this afternoon presumptively upon this bill that began some time Saturday afternoon. It originated in a burst of poetry, which was some kind of eulogy upon old age. It ran and ranted up and down the scale, through the falsetto, the orotund, the guttural, and all intermediate noises, natural and supernatural, human ears can endure. It continued to run on, like the stream, almost forever,

and it ended, so far as I know, without for a single moment touching this bill; but in the meantime the Republican-Democratic caucus was going on.

We have heard a good deal of denunciation by the other side of caucuses and conferences. How wicked they have been to the holy vision of the unco good! And yet, when I saw the performance here of a few moments ago, I knew there had been a caucus. I knew there had been a hard-and-fast caucus—a caucus that was strong enough to bring in all the insurgent Republicans, except LA FOLLETTE, I understand. Thank God for the exception, if he was not here!

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. POINDEXTER, as well, was out.

Mr. REED. Well, well—if Senator POINDEXTER was out, I will except him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is that, Mr. President? I did not catch it.

Mr. REED. I am making an exception that I think will be agreeable to the Senator. I stated that I understood he did not vote a few moments ago.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator is mistaken about that. I did vote.

Mr. REED. Ah! Then I must withdraw my encomium. I was misled.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very sorry I can not receive the Senator's encomium.

Mr. REED. The caucus reached across the aisle; it invaded the Democratic side. There was an arranged program, a complete understanding, if human evidence means anything. I used to belong, in my callow youth, to the militia. I happened to be captain of a company for a short time. If I could ever have gotten my company of raw recruits to respond to the command "Fall in" with the alacrity that was manifested by the Republicans and some eight or nine Democrats an hour ago, when this motion was made, I would have believed that my militia company was almost ready to be mustered into the Regular Army and entitled to be ranked as veterans.

I trust we will hear no more cant from the other side about "caucuses" and "agreements" and "conferences" and the wickedness of "doing business when the public is not there to see all that is going on." I hope and pray that these gentlemen will no longer wear that threadbare mask, but that standing out in the open, as they ought to do, they will cease pretending that they are too good to have a caucus or a conference.

The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] rose, not early in this discussion but after it had gone on several days, and with a pious unction that would have done credit to the original Pharisee on the streets of Jerusalem said that he did "believe in caucuses, but that caucuses should never be held until there had been full public debate, the bill had been considered, and the views of all men had been heard." Then, Mr. President, he joined in a filibuster to prevent an expression of opinion; and, of course, he joined in to-day's caucus, the purpose of which was to "put something over" when nobody suspected it was coming.

The line of attack that was made here this afternoon is very much like that going on over in Europe. There they burrow under the ground, keep out of sight, let nobody know anything about what is going on; finally, they get up close enough so that they can plant a bomb under the breastworks of the enemy. Sometimes it is said they even acquire a few deserters.

Now, I make no complaint about that. You have the right to adopt these tactics if you want to. But please, please, do not appear here in the future with sanctimonious faces and pious preachments about the evil of conferences and the wickedness of "not doing the public business in the public eye." Let us have done with that. Let this be the last time we ever hear it. Let the almost disappearing modesty of your natures rise up to protest against a repetition of that miserable pretense.

What proposition have the gentlemen on the other side for a naval reserve? What are you going to give us? You have been urging that our fleet is not strong enough. What do you propose? How shall we get these vessels? A naval reserve has hitherto been your slogan.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). The Senator from Missouri will suspend until order is restored. Conversation will cease on the floor.

Mr. REED. Whatever disturbance there is comes from some embarrassed gentlemen who want to discuss the question in the rear of the Hall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. REED. The naval reserve was an important question some time ago. Let me read from a great Senator:

> Our naval fleet is almost the only one in the world, with the exception of that of Russia and China, perhaps, which has no second line—no sea militia—behind it. And we can never have such a second line, such a sea militia, so long as nine-tenths of our foreign commerce is conveyed by foreign ships, even if 10 or 12 per cent of these foreign ships are owned by American capital.
>
> This bill of the merchant marine commission will give us ships of our own—American built and manned by American officers and seamen. It will not give us floating palaces. It is not primarily a bill for fast trans-Atlantic navigation. It aims, rather, to encourage the creation of steam lines of moderate speed and great carrying power to South America, Africa, and Asia—

And so forth.

Those were the words of no less a personage in the Republican Party than Senator PENROSE. Why, you were all of one mind. You all wanted a merchant marine then. You all wanted an auxiliary fleet then. But somehow or some way you wanted a graft in the nature of a subsidy for the old Shipping Trust. The mere thought of that graft aroused your patriotism. How your rhetorical periods resounded in favor of a merchant marine and an auxiliary navy. But when it is proposed that there shall be no graft, that the vessels shall be bought and paid for and owned, that no one shall have his hands in the pockets of the people, that the auxiliary navy shall be really ours, how quick you can discover that there is no necessity for a single ship. With what alacrity you can cry "socialism"!

You sit on the other side of the Chamber without a proposition. You propose to leave the farmers of your State in a position where their products that are shipped across the ocean must pay the extortioners' price. You propose to leave the great manufacturers of the country and the smaller alike at the mercy of the Shipping Trust. You propose to leave our fleet of war without an auxiliary vessel. You have nothing to propose.

Well, it is a proud day for the old Shipping Trust. A naval officer told me, in illustration of how far that concern can reach, that for many years this Nation built men-of-war far below the size of the vessels of other nations, vessels that in size were absolutely obsolete, and that the reason why that was done was because the shipyards of this country were not yet ready to build larger vessels. The very life of our Nation was thus imperiled at the demand of the ship combination.

Mr. President, there have been no legitimate arguments brought against this bill. Gentlemen may cry "Socialism! socialism! socialism!" but there is no socialism in the bill. It is primarily a war measure. It will not necessarily continue in existence six months after the war is over and after normal conditions have been restored. It is simply a question whether the United States will leave the people of the country at the mercy of a merciless combination or whether the Government of the United States in this exigency—in this unprecedented emergency—will come to the rescue of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the vote just taken may mean the death of this bill; I do not know. I do not intend to quarrel with Democratic Senators who do not see the question as I see it. But I recently attended a Democratic conference that sat for several days. It was the best attended conference, first and last, that I have had the pleasure of being a member of since I became a Senator. That conference, with one dissenting vote, pledged itself to the support of this bill. It was the result of common counsel. At the last every man in the conference agreed to support this bill. There were but few Senators who did not at some time attend the conference. I can not understand how a Senator who was present can take any other action than one that is consistent with the resolution of the conference. I can not understand how Democrats who have insisted upon party solidarity, who have been willing to go into conferences heretofore, who have accepted the honors conferred by those caucusses, who hold positions in the Senate to-day by virtue of caucus action, can find it within their conscience to take the course we have just witnessed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it might as well be understood; I think it is quite so by Senators, but it should be understood by the country, precisely what this motion means. If the motion is carried, it means that the ship-purchasing bill is dead, especially for this session. If this motion is carried, all our work, all our hopes, all our time will have been spent in vain. The influences which have brought about this course of things are the influences which will muster all their power so as to prevent this sort of legislation in the future.

Mr. President, it is not news to this body that we have no merchant marine for this great country of ours to-day. It is not news to them that we will never have if we depend upon

private initiative to supply it, without what they demand, a direct subsidy from the Government.

Mr. President, I tell no new story when I recite here that in 1846 American ships carried 87.1 per cent of our imports and 76.1 per cent of our exports, and that American ships carried in 1846, 81.7 per cent of the combined imports and exports of this country. Up to 1860 that percentage was on imports 63 per cent, on exports 69 per cent, on both combined, exports and imports, 66.5 per cent. Beginning with 1861 American ships carried 65.2 per cent of all our exports and imports, and by 1875 they had fallen to 26.2 per cent. Beginning with 1876 the percentage of our commerce, exports and imports, carried by American ships was 27.7 per cent. By 1890 that had fallen to 12.8 per cent. By 1901 American ships were carrying only 8.1 per cent of the exports and imports of the United States, and to-day it is less than 5 per cent.

Have we done nothing to encourage the building of an American merchant marine? We have passed laws exempting from tariff duties the materials and supplies entering into ships built here. We have passed a law, in 1912, allowing the purchase of ships in any markets of the world, to be registered under our flag. We have in various ways endeavored to foster and encourage the building of ships and the establishment of a merchant marine in this country. Yet the situation to-day is that we are utterly helpless at a time when our producers are struggling to get our products into market. We are utterly dependent upon foreigners for the supply of the carriers of the products of farm and factory and mine in this country to the markets where they are in demand and much needed.

That is the situation; and, Senators, will you do nothing to unchain the commerce of the United States? Will you absolutely confess your dependence upon foreign merchant vessels, your absolute dependence upon your foreign competitors in all the markets at a time when we are in sore need of the relief which the establishment even of a beginning of a merchant marine would bring to our people?

Mr. President, it has been urged here as an argument against this bill that the appropriation would be a mere bagatelle; that it would amount to nothing. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to-day said instead of a mountain a mouse would be the result, and all sorts of ridicule has been endeavored to be thrown upon this proposition because it was said it would accomplish nothing on account of the small number of vessels it would provide. And yet in the face of that we find active, open opposition against this measure by the people whose special business it would affect. From Maine to Washington they are down here endeavoring to impress upon Senators in every way in their power the advisability of defeating this bill. These people are to-day combined in a conspiracy to lay tribute upon the manufacturers, upon the farmers, and upon the producers of this country to their heart's content. They are the people who are opposing this measure; and in the next breath they say, "If you pass the bill, it will accomplish nothing of any consequence." They are the people who, on the other hand, say, "We can not put our vessels under the American flag; it costs from 5 to 10 per cent more per annum to operate vessels under the American flag than under a foreign flag"; and they say, "We can not afford it, because there is no profit in the business." They say, "You are wasting the Government's money when you provide for this enterprise, because you will lose that money; there is absolutely no profit in shipping to-day, and you must provide a subsidy if you want to build up a merchant marine for the United States"

I am prepared to show by the authority of those people, by their reports officially made, that practically every line of ships in this country and abroad is making from 20 to 300 per cent upon the capital invested in the business. In this very document is the statement, which has not been questioned by a single opponent of this measure—and I have stated and I reiterate it because it is the truth that—

> The shipping business is one of the most profitable in the world. Special Diplomatic and Consular Reports, page 39, says:
> "The White Star Line in 1910 earned a net profit of £540,000 on a capital of £750,000 after writing off £370,016 for depreciation. A dividend of 30 per cent was paid in that year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will suspend for a few moments until order is restored in the Chamber.

Mr. FLETCHER. If Senators do not want to hear me, I ask them to go outside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please cease conversation on the floor of the Senate. Let there be order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are a great many of us who want to hear what the Senator from Florida is saying, and we should be permitted to hear him without interruption by those in the rear of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must insist that Senators cease conversation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. To continue the reading of this document, it is shown that—

> The Holland Amerika Line earned about 50 per cent net on its capital during the fiscal year of 1913. The Hamburg-American Line earned about 30 per cent net during its fiscal year of 1913. These are only a few specific instances of steamship-line earnings. They are not at all unusual, but are the regular thing in the shipping business.
> F. E. Dixon & Co., of London, who own and operate a large fleet of "tramp" freighters, showed earnings of about 50 per cent net last year, which proves that steamship earnings are large in the irregular services as well as in the regular lines.

Do you suppose these gentlemen want that business interfered with? Do you suppose they will ever allow any independent line to be established in this country to compete with them? Do you suppose that they would welcome the beginning of the establishment of a line that might interfere with the profits they are making? I think not.

That is the situation. These are the gentlemen who say that the Government would sink its money if it went into this venture, although they are making from 20 to 300 per cent per annum in the business year after year; yet they say the Government would waste the people's money if it undertook to establish a line and operate it. These are the gentlemen who do not want competition; these are the gentleman who are willing to spend their time and their money and their energy in employing special agents, lawyers, and what not, to come here to Washington to break down what they regard as the only practicable and feasible opposition that they are likely to have. That is the situation. Do you want to yield to them? If you want to do that, you want to fasten further the chains of this tax burden upon the commerce of the United States. You gentlemen who do that take that responsibility. Thank God, it will not rest on my shoulders.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I intended to make the motion myself, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., Monday, February 1, 1915) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *February 1, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of hosts, humbly we bow in Thy holy presence and wait upon Thy blessing that with clear perceptions, honesty of purpose, high and noble convictions we may meet the new duties of the new day in a faithful service to Thee and our fellow men, and thus merit Thy praise and those whom we serve. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of Saturday, January 30, 1915.

The Clerk read the Journal.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was approved.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of Sunday, January 31, 1915.

The Journal of the proceedings of Sunday was read and approved.

ENROLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 6839. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER BETWEEN WISCONSIN AND MINNESOTA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17762) to authorize the Interstate Transfer

Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15727) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to pass the bill over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF UNITED STATES AGAINST STATE OF TENNESSEE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was Senate joint resolution 65, to amend Senate joint resolution 34, approved May 12, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the resolution is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if he will withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. MANN. Certainly. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I have been to the Department of Justice and I have talked with the Attorney General with regard to this matter. The subject matter of the resolution is not before the department in any way except in a preliminary way. There are a great many papers there in respect to this matter, but nothing as to the merits or the rights of the parties to the controversy. The department is perfectly willing to submit to any Member of Congress or to Congress the statements of facts that they have, or rather a history of the matter so far. I think this form of resolution proposing that this commission, composed of three Cabinet officers, meet with the commission from the State of Tennessee and report on the matter without regard to the question of loyalty ought to meet with the approval of the House, because it leaves the matter to be determined at last by the Congress in all of its phases. It amounts to nothing more than a report similar to a report in chancery as to the facts in regard to the equities in a case. Then the matters can be determined by Congress when they come up on the report of this commission.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Judge HOUSTON, advises me, as he does the House, that he has conferred with the Department of Justice relative to the status of this matter, as it is pending before the department. I regret that it seems impossible to have this information properly assorted and compiled and assembled up to this time by the Department of Justice in such manner as will be satisfactory to the desires and the requests of some gentlemen in the House.

It looks as though the Department of Justice may not be able to do this within any particular time. They might or they might not. I do not know from the conversation of my colleague with the Attorney General as to when they might be able to do this. That leaves the matter before the House for the present as it came before the House in the beginning, and that is something like this: In 1898 this resolution was first introduced, and not in 1868, as my friend from Illinois, Mr. MANN, understood. There were three meetings of this commission with the representatives of the State of Tennessee, and on each occasion the representatives of the Government being very greatly rushed with their own departmental affairs, suggested this question of loyalty, and the matters were not gone into. They have not been brought up for some few years at all. There has been no meeting for some time, at least during this administration. It was the intention of the representatives of the State of Tennessee, according to information given to me by them, that the facts in support of the Government's claims on the one hand and the facts in support of the claims of the State of Tennessee on the other would be assembled and presented in an orderly manner, and that the conclusions of the representatives of the State and the Government would be reported to Congress. Whether they agreed in their conclusions on the merits or items, irrespective of the question of loyalty, or whether they disagreed, their conclusions would be presented with the question of loyalty remaining open for Congress to pass upon.

If Congress should decide that disloyalty was to bar the claims of Tennessee in the event that the commission has favorably agreed upon the merits of the claims, or any portion of them, then the claims would go out. If it should agree, as the courts have often held, that it was not a bar, then the report of this commission would be so elaborate and so well arranged as to enable Congress to act either favorably or adversely on the items as a whole, or any portion of the items, either as to the claims of the Government or of the State of Tennessee. That is the situation. It seems to me that the Government would get relief much sooner if it were allowed to take this course. If gentlemen think that would not be true, but would prefer to allow the matter to remain in abeyance indefinitely, of course this resolution can be objected to and defeated.

Mr. MANN. Well, while it is true that under the terms of this resolution any settlement is not to be effective or final until approved by Congress, the resolution provides that the claims of the parties, respectively, shall be considered, adjusted, and settled on their merits, without regard to any question of loyalty or disloyalty. Just what that amounts to may be a question.

Some time ago I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCOTT] to give some special attention to this bill, and he went to the Department of Justice to get information, and was refused any information at the department. It may be possible to obtain information, but there is not very much in the report, and unless we can get information from the department that has to deal with it, it does not seem to me that we ought to prejudge the case. That is practically what this resolution does.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that I was informed by the Attorney General that no request for information has been refused in regard to this matter, either by himself or by his predecessor. He stated to me that he had asked his predecessor about this, and he stated that no request for information had been refused.

Mr. MANN. He is mistaken.

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, he does not understand that such a thing has been done; and if it has been done, it has not been with his knowledge or approval, because he states the fact that there is quite a history of the matter in the department there, but it would take a good deal of time to go into it, and, of course, he could get opportunity, but has not done it; and if it was desired, he would have the proper parties go through those papers and make a report. I speak of that in order to set the gentleman right, because the Attorney General so stated to me.

Mr. MANN. He may not have been informed. I did not say he was. It was not under the present Attorney General, I think, that the request was refused.

Mr. HOUSTON. This Attorney General asked his predecessor, who had no knowledge of any request having been made. Of course, that was a matter of memory with him. He said that, of course, he had no disposition to refuse any information he had.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next one.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18783) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at St. Petersburg, Fla., be, and the same is hereby, increased from $80,000 to $115,000, of which not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for additional land for the enlargement of the present site, payment for such additional land to be made from any sums heretofore appropriated for the construction of said building.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 6, by striking out "$15,000" and inserting "$12,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was going to reserve the right to object, but I withdraw that.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CLARK of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

FREE TRANSPORTATION FOR MEMBERS OF POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8847) amending paragraph 81 of the act creating a Public Utilities Commission.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe a bill of similar purport was under consideration some time ago, and on that occasion it was represented to the committee that the provisions of this bill were incorporated in the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I believe that was the representation of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE]. If that is the fact, I can not see any reason for considering it now. I would like to inquire of some gentleman on the Committee on the District of Columbia—Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, if he is here—as to whether that was not the statement made at the prior meeting of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will say that we have under consideration a bill, providing for granting to crossing policemen and members of the police force the right of free transportation on the street railways of the city of Washington. I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that a similar bill was under consideration at a prior meeting, and at that time the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] stated that the provisions of this bill were incorporated in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and that there was no need of considering this bill. I would like to inquire about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, since the time to which the gentleman from Wisconsin refers I have looked up the District appropriation bill and find that it is not so broad as the House bill, better known as the Kahn bill, and I would really prefer to see the Kahn bill substituted for the Senate bill. That bill, I understand, is now before us, and I would prefer to have that adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman believe that the provisions in the District of Columbia bill are not broad enough?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; not as broad as this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be reported. It has not been reported yet.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 81 of section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That all street railroads in the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, authorized and required to grant free transportation to members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, members of the Metropolitan police department, and special officers of said department, when said members and officers are in uniform.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 3, by striking out the words "special officers" and inserting "crossing policemen."

In line 4 insert after the word "department" the words "and members of the park police force."

And after the word "uniform," in line 5, insert the following: "However, before any of said officers herein mentioned shall receive free transportation as herein provided for he shall file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an affidavit to the effect that he has not, since the date of this report (July 11, 1914), and will not thereafter pay to any person anything for services in the preparation or passage of this bill."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] know whether he wants to object or not?

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wishes to object.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to have this last amendment made in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I believe it would be better.

Mr. MANN. How would a conductor of a street car know whether a member of the police force had filed an affidavit with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not think that would be a pertinent question at all.

Mr. MANN. It may not be, but it seems to me a very pertinent question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It seems to me it does not come within the scope of the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. MANN. The bill provides that any member of the police force or fire department in uniform shall receive free transportation on the street cars, and then provides that no one of these members of the police force or fire department shall receive free transportation unless he has filed an affidavit with the District Commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Those who do file an affidavit may receive the free transportation.

Mr. MANN. But how will the conductor of a street car know whether he has filed an affidavit or not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Oh, well, how would a conductor know he was a policeman or fireman?

Mr. MANN. He knows he is in uniform, and that is what he goes by.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The conductor could get a certificate from the commissioners stating that the proper affidavit had been made. The policeman would, of course, provide himself with such a certificate, particularly if he had once been denied a free ride by the conductor. Besides, the conductor must continue with all other people to observe the rule that he must know the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps it is proposed to have them furnished with badges like those proposed in the newspapers for Members of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Oh, no. Under this provision no member of either of these forces entitled to this privilege would apply for free transportation unless he had made the required affidavit.

Mr. MANN. He is entitled to it if he appears on the street car in uniform, under the terms of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I take it for granted that the gentleman knows why this amendment was put on. In other words, when the bill for the benefit of the crossing policemen was up, something like a year and a half ago, a man who had never appeared before the committee in behalf of these people afterwards went around among them and collected from them something like $5,000 for alleged services rendered, when he had rendered no service whatever, and this amendment is put upon this bill by the committee for the purpose of preventing a repetition of that kind of money-getting scheme.

Mr. MANN. I understand the purpose of the committee, which is a laudable purpose; but even if some member of the police force has contributed toward a fund to pay an attorney for drawing a bill, it may have been done through innocence or ignorance, and he ought not to be punished for that. But I do not see how the street car company or its officials can tell whether a member of the police force who appears in uniform has filed an affidavit with the commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I believe the gentleman from Illinois, however, will be compelled to admit that this amendment will do no harm, if it may not do any good.

Mr. MANN. I think it might do very much harm. It might raise conflicts right along. The street car company might claim that before any policeman in uniform was entitled to receive free transportation he would have to produce evidence that he had filed an affidavit with the commissioners. Now, it seems to me that the provisions in the amendment to the District bill are far better than the terms of this bill as it stands, with this proposed amendment to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This amendment is intended to protect these people, who are in the laboring class, and I believe it does protect them, and I hope the gentleman will not object to it on that account.

Mr. MANN. I am going to object to it on that account.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then there is no use for us to argue it at all. The gentleman might just as well have objected at first.

Mr. MANN. I thought possibly the gentleman would yield, having accomplished his purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

ISLAND IN THE COOSA RIVER, ALA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17330) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River in the State of Alabama.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the assent of the Secretary of War, that certain island in Coosa River, St. Clair County, Ala., known as Rock Island and described upon the official plat of survey as lot 1, section 24, township 14 south, range 5 east, and lot 1, section 19, township 14 south, range 6 east, Huntsville meridian, containing 2.55 acres, may be restored to entry and the same may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior under existing laws: *Provided*, That the aforesaid land shall forever be and remain subject to the right of the United States to overflow the same or any part thereof in the improvement and development of navigation on the Coosa River; and no claim or right to compensation shall accrue from the overflowing of said land on account of said work of improvement: *Provided further*, That in any patent that the Secretary of the Interior may issue for said land the right to overflow without liability for damage shall be expressly reserved to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

After the word "and," in line 10, strike out the words "the same may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior under existing laws" and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to sell and convey said land to the Rock Island Fishing and Hunting Club at $1.25 per acre."

On page 2, after the word "States," in line 13, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That if said Rock Island Fishing and Hunting Club should at any time use or attempt to use said tract of land for any other purpose than that of recreation or club purposes, or should attempt to sell, lease, or convey said tract the said land shall revert to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman ought to explain this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to allow the sale of 2.55 acres of land, it being a little island in the Coosa River in Alabama. It reserves all flowage and navigation rights, if any there be. It is recommended by both the Interior and the War Departments, and it contains a reversionary clause, so that if the island is not used for the purposes designated it will revert to the United States.

I am told by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the report shows, that this island is used as a kind of rendezvous for lawbreakers, and it really would be an advantage to the local community and the law-abiding citizens there if some legitimate use could be made of the island. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] has made quite an extended investigation about it, as did the committee, and we were all of the opinion that the island had no other use, and that it would be proper and right that this club have the right to buy it.

Mr. MANN. What is the island used for now?

Mr. FERRIS. It is not used for anything, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the bill proposes to sell this island for something less than $10. How much is it rented for now?

Mr. FERRIS. It is not rented at all, as I understand.

Mr. MANN. The report of the Secretary of War says that it is rented to this same club for $31 a year.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman has read it more accurately than I have.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman's statement so far is a little inaccurate, when he says that it is now used by lawless persons. It is now rented to this same club for $31 per annum, as appears at the top of page 3 of the report. Now it is proposed to sell the entire piece for less than $10.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, I introduced the original bill, which provided that the island should be sold under existing law, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell it at such price as he thought reasonable. The committee fixed the price at $1.25 an acre. I have no desire to interfere with the committee amendment, but I am perfectly willing to leave the price to the Secretary of the Interior, as in the original bill, and let him fix a price that will be satisfactory to him.

The whole thing in a nutshell is this: This is a small rocky island in the Coosa River close to where a dam is proposed to be built, and when the dam is built this island will be entirely submerged. The island has no real value. It is good for a hunting and fishing club, and these men want to buy it for that purpose. The bill reserves all the Government's rights.

Mr. MANN. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to selling the island. I asked simply for information as to why it was proposed to sell the land for $5 when the Government is now getting a rent of $31 a year for it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know why the committee fixed the price at $1.25 an acre. I am willing, if the bill goes through, to leave it to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. When this dam is constructed, if the title is in this hunting and fishing club, it will be entitled to compensation, will it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the bill provides that it shall not receive any.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman speaks about the Secretary of the Interior fixing the price, and also of selling it under existing law. Does not the existing law require that the land shall be advertised for sale and disposed of to the highest bidder?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to that, because nobody will buy it except these gentlemen. There is nothing on it except an opportunity for these men to build a cabin there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "the same may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior under existing laws" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "that the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to sell and convey said land to the Rock Island Fishing and Hunting Club at $1.25 per acre."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to the original text of the bill, making it read "and the same may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior at such price as he may determine."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee has no objection to that, and I think perhaps it may be a better course to pursue.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois predicated his amendment on the assumption that this amendment would be voted down.

Mr. FERRIS. I understand that. Let me say a word. The gentleman from Illinois asked me a few moments ago a question, and I gave him some information that was not quite correct. He had read with greater care the letter from the department than I had, and I had still in my recollection what was said about it in committee and also the War Department report. I find in the letter of Secretary Garrison the following:

The primary object of this bill, H. R. 17330, is to confer on the Secretary of the Interior the power and authority, with the consent of the Secretary of War, to dispose of the island under existing land laws, with the express reservation that the premises shall forever remain subject to the right of the United States to overflow all or any part of it in the improvement and development of navigation on Coosa River, and that no liability for damage on account of such flooding shall rest against the United States.

Before the present tenancy was established the island was a source of considerable trouble, being a resort for squatters and lawbreakers, who carried on various evil practices in defiance of the local authorities, more than one murder having been committed there. The proposed legislation is in line with the department's policy in such cases, similar acts having been passed with respect to reserved lands on the upper Mississippi River.

The bill, in my judgment, makes ample provision for safeguarding the interests of the United States, and I see no objection to the favorable consideration of the measure.

I read that simply in justification of the answer I gave the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman remembered a part of the report but not the balance, which is natural.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. The committee amendment is to strike out and insert, and that can not be amended.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move, in line 1, page 2, to strike out the words "under existing laws" and insert "at such price as he may determine."

Mr. FERRIS. Just a moment before the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment. I want to say that the thought of the committee was that if we left the language as it was it would not go quite as gentlemen thought it would, and the committee has adopted a plan, and I think a wise one, that no Government land shall be granted without any charge being made for it, even if it was land suitable for a gratuity, and we have tried to maintain that

policy, which would result in getting $1.25 per acre. With that explanation I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after the words "United States," in line 13, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That if said Rock Island Fishing and Hunting Club should at any time use or attempt to use said tract of land for any other purpose than that of recreation or club purposes, or should attempt to sell, lease, or convey said tract the said land shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8960) incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve a right to object. I have read the bill, but I will reserve the objection if the gentleman from Texas wishes to make a statement.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman from Georgia is inclined to persist in the objection, it is useless to consume the time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to reserve the right to object, and if the gentleman from Texas will state the reasons for the bill I may not make the objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will make a brief statement, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill which proposes to authorize a national charter for an association of gentlemen who are interested in arts and in letters. It is a purely educational institution. It was not the purpose of these gentlemen who propose to thus associate themselves to make money or to indulge in any propaganda except that for better art and superior education. The names of the incorporators would convince any man of that, I think. Among other gentlemen who are associated with it is the President of the United States, from whom I have a letter in my hand at the present moment asking me to do what I could to secure the passage of this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee why the West, which claims to have some literary men, has been so completely ignored in the list of members, only two from that section being included, one of whom I believe has since died, Mr. John Muir? The other westerner is Mr. James Whitcomb Reilly. We from the West or the Middle West know of many as equally illustrious litterateurs as those included in the list. Why should these 48 gentlemen include only those who live on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the explanation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] shows that this bill is not properly upon this calendar. I understand that he expects to call it up later under a motion to suspend the rules, and thus give the House an opportunity to debate it. Therefore I think he ought not to take up time now. Otherwise I feel inclined to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

ADDITIONAL LAND DISTRICT IN ARIZONA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2548) to create an additional land district in the State of Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

FORT ASSINNIBOINE MILITARY RESERVATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman most interested in this bill the reason why the committee went contrary to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior in listing as agricultural land open for settlement such land as contained 50,000 feet of merchantable timber——

Mr. MANN. Fifty-five million feet.

Mr. STOUT. Mr. Speaker, there simply had to be a line of demarcation fixed some place, and the gentleman, being acquainted with timberlands, understands that it is considered more valuable for timber than agricultural purposes when a 40-acre tract contains in excess of 50,000 feet.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think, with the Secretary, that when a 40-acre tract of land contains 50,000 feet of merchantable timber it is more timber than agricultural land, and should be included as timberland.

Mr. STOUT. I will simply say that we had to make the line some place—twenty-five, thirty, forty, or fifty thousand. The committee acted on its best judgment, and thought this was fair. I think, if the gentleman is thoroughly acquainted with timberland, he will realize that a 40-acre tract containing no more than 50,000 feet is not very valuable for timber.

Mr. STAFFORD. Fifty thousand feet of merchantable timber, not 50,000 feet of timber.

Mr. STOUT. I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. The difference between a 40-acre tract containing 50,000 feet of timber and 50,000 feet of merchantable timber is very great.

Mr. STOUT. I will say to the gentleman that I would have no objection to changing it to 30,000 feet, but the committee got such information as it was able to gather on the subject and decided on 50,000 feet.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Fifty thousand feet of timber on a 40-acre tract will be worth about how much in the State of Montana—$50?

Mr. STOUT. Fifty dollars.

Mr. FALCONER. When land is not worth more than $1.25 an acre for agricultural purposes it is not worth very much.

Mr. STOUT. We went into that matter and it seemed to be entirely fair.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the report shows, I believe, that there are 55,000,000 feet of good timber which could be cut off this military reservation and which under the terms of this bill will be given away.

Mr. STOUT. I do not so understand it.

Mr. MANN. What will become of it?

Mr. STOUT. Well, it is all scattered, I will say to the gentleman, and no one claims it contains sufficient to make it valuable for its timber. There are 168,000 acres of land, I believe, in the reservation.

Mr. MANN. It is not generally scattered all over the whole land.

Small portions of the mountains are well wooded; that there are probably 55,000,000 feet of good timber—pine and fir—which could be cut from the military reservation.

I read from the report of the Secretary of the Interior. If there were 55,000,000 feet scattered over the entire area, that would be a different proposition.

Mr. STOUT. Well, I will say that provision reserving all containing 50,000 feet of merchantable timber to the 40-acre tract, it seems to me, would be sufficient to prevent the giving away of any valuable timber.

Mr. MANN. Well, where is that reservation?

Mr. STOUT. In the northeastern part of the State.

Mr. MANN. Where is the reservation the gentleman speaks of in the bill?

Mr. STOUT. In section 2, on page 2:

And in making such classification all lands susceptible of cultivation that do not contain in excess of 50,000 feet of merchantable timber to the 40-acre tract shall be classified as agricultural lands, and all lands containing in excess of 50,000 feet of merchantable timber to the 40-acre tract shall be classified as timberlands.

Mr. MANN. I understand that section. Now, is there any provision in the bill that reserves land classified as timberlands?

Mr. STOUT. It says on the same page, in section 3, further:

That lands classified as timberlands shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be provided by the Secretary of the Interior, with the authority to dispose of the timber and land separately when deemed advisable.

Mr. MANN. What is the effect of the provision on page 6?—

That for lands lost to the State because classified as coal or mineral indemnity may be taken as provided for in sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes.

Is that merely lieu-land selection?

Mr. STOUT. I so understand. I think that is what it refers to.

Mr. MANN. Could the State under the act go out and select other mineral lands?

Mr. STOUT. No; I think not.

Mr. MANN. Why not?

Mr. STOUT. That is not the law.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember whether there is any provision of the law——

Mr. STOUT. I have it here.

Mr. MANN. That may be. There is not very much information contained in the report on this bill or I would not seek to get this information now.

Mr. STOUT. I am very glad to give the gentleman the information. Here is the law, and if the gentleman will permit me I will read him the law. This is section 2275 of the Revised Statutes:

Where settlements, with a view to preemption, have been made before the survey of the lands in the field, which are found to have been made on sections 16 or 36, those sections shall be subject to the preemption claim of such settler; and if they, or either of them, have been or shall be reserved or pledged for the use of schools or colleges in the State or Territory in which the lands lie, other lands of like quantity are appropriated in lieu of such as may be patented by preemptors; and other lands are also appropriated to compensate deficiencies for school purposes, where sections 16 or 36 are fractional in quantity.

Mr. MANN. That does not answer the question I asked. Here is a provision that mineral lands shall be reserved and the State may select those lands if they desire to with a reservation to the Government of the minerals. Now, the gentleman proposed if they do not so desire they can go and make other selections of land. The inquiry I wanted to make of the gentleman was, Can they go and make other selections of land that have minerals?

Mr. STOUT. They can not.

Mr. MANN. Where is the law?

Mr. STOUT. I can not recall the section, but the State can not take mineral lands.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not recollect; there may be a provision that in all lands which the State selects the minerals are reserved to the Government, although I do not recall such a provision.

Mr. STOUT. I do not recall the statute, but I certainly think they could not go and select other mineral lands unless the same restrictions were thrown around them.

Mr. MANN. I do not know; that would depend upon the law. They used to do it right along.

Mr. STOUT. They can not do it now, I feel quite sure.

Mr. MANN. I guess they could if there is not a reservation.

Mr. FERRIS. I think there is a reservation. Under the Pickett Act of June 25, 1910, the President is given authority to withdraw anything and everything that might have mineral value, and while, of course——

Mr. MANN. Of course, if it is withdrawn the State can not take it.

Mr. FERRIS. I think a good deal has been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. In reference to these sections 16 and 36 I would like to ask the gentleman whether the United States in the original grant to the State an account was taken of sections 16 and 36 in the Indian reservations, and whether they were then given lieu lands therefor?

Mr. STOUT. No; I do not know.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, if they were withdrawn it could not.

Mr. STOUT. That is the reason I assume they were not, certainly, or undoubtedly the department would have found that objection in the law; but that point has never occurred to me.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, in some cases in reference to reservations that have been taken into consideration, I understand.

Mr. STOUT. I feel reasonably certain that is not the case, but I could not state positively.

Mr. LENROOT. Then I want to ask the gentleman another question, with reference to the sale of this timber. Under the language of the bill, does not the gentleman think the Secretary would be required to proceed at once with the sale of the timber upon this reservation?

Mr. STOUT. When deemed advisable. You will notice the last three words of that proviso.

Mr. LENROOT. That only relates to selling the timber and lands separately.

Mr. STOUT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think, in view of all the conditions, that it should be mandatory to sell this timber now?

Mr. STOUT. No; I do not. And if the gentleman thinks that would be the effect of that provision, I would be more than willing to have an amendment, although I do not think it is really important. There is comparatively little timber there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Montana if he is a member of the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. STOUT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is there immediate necessity for the passage of this bill?

Mr. STOUT. I will state to the gentleman that this is the urgency of it: This reservation has been abandoned for two or three years or longer. There are some old buildings there which were used by the soldiers, and which the State hopes to be able to take over under the provisions of this bill, with the 2,000 acres of land for which they paid $2.50 an acre, and establish some sort of an industrial school, or make some use of the buildings there, which are now going to rack and ruin very rapidly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This emergency is such that it would bring this bill out of the committee ahead of four or five hundred other bills?

Mr. STOUT. This bill has been in the committee a long while, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Committee on Public Lands have been engaged for a number of months on administration bills.

Mr. STOUT. This bill was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar last session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for one further query: The bill provides for the donation to the State not only of buildings on the former reservation, but 2000 acres of land besides. What is the value of those buildings?

Mr. STOUT. Many of those buildings were built as far back as 30 years ago. They were very good buildings when they were constructed. They are rapidly disintegrating now, and unless the State gets charge of them and repairs the buildings and takes some steps to prevent the disintegration which is in progress there, in two or three years they will be absolutely worthless.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can realize that any building that is not used deteriorates rapidly. What did it cost to erect these buildings? I ask this in order to ascertain what we are giving to the State of Montana by this bill.

Mr. STOUT. Originally those buildings cost, I understand, several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are they of permanent construction, such as of stone and brick?

Mr. STOUT. Some of them are of brick and some of them are frame buildings, and, of course, the frame buildings are practically gone, but the brick buildings are, as I say, in a fair state of preservation, but absolutely worthless for any other purpose that the Government could possibly put them to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose the State declines to accept these buildings for the purposes suggested in this bill. Then what becomes of the buildings and the use of them?

Mr. STOUT. I will say to the gentleman that the State has already passed a joint resolution providing for the taking over of these buildings in the event of the passage of this act. And I will state further that our State legislature is now in session, and if we could get this bill through at this session, in all probability we could get an appropriation through before the legislature adjourns.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any opposition in the State legislature to accepting these buildings for the purposes as stated in this bill?

Mr. STOUT. None whatever. I will say to the gentleman that I was a member of the legislature when that resolution was passed, and it was absolutely unanimous.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, one further query as to the need of including 2,000 acres in the donation to the State for this purpose. Why so large a grant?

Mr. STOUT. Well, they are going to establish quite a large industrial school there, and it was felt that that was no more than ample.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, while this is a very important bill to be considered under unanimous consent, I do not think that I will object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I feel like economizing for a few minutes, if I can. What will the Government get out of this? What advantage will it be to the Government?

Mr. STOUT. The Government gets the proceeds from the sale of this land.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand at $2.50 an acre. But will it be worth any less next year?

Mr. STOUT. It will be worth much less by reason of the disintegration of the buildings, unless somebody steps in there. They are out on the naked plains, being swept by the winds, the doors are blowing off and the roofs caving in, and I think the gentleman can see that they are rapidly deteriorating in value.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I am through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STOUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it has not been reported as yet.

The SPEAKER. As soon as we get the consent, it will be reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to immediately cause to be surveyed all of the lands embraced within the limits of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in the State of Montana.

SEC. 2. That before said lands are opened to entry the Secretary of the Interior shall have said lands classified by an inspector or special agent of the Department of the Interior into four classes—first, agricultural lands; second, timberlands; third, coal lands; and fourth, mineral lands—and in making such classification all lands susceptible of cultivation that do not contain in excess of 50,000 feet of merchantable timber to the 40-acre tract shall be classified as agricultural lands, and all lands containing in excess of 50,000 feet of merchantable timber to the 40-acre tract shall be classified as timber lands.

SEC. 3. That when so classified, all of said lands classed as agricultural land shall be opened to settlement and entry under the homestead laws of the United States, but not to entry or location under sections 2306 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided, however*, That the enlarged homestead act, approved February 19, 1909, shall not apply until six months after said land has been opened to settlement and entry as aforesaid: *And provided further*, That any rights which may have attached to any of said lands under any of the public-land laws of the United States prior to the passage of this act may be perfected and the lands so affected may be patented upon proof of compliance with the laws under which such rights so attached: *Provided further*, That lands classified as timberlands shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be provided by the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to dispose of the timber and land separately when deemed advisable: *Provided further*, That the lands classified as coal lands shall be subject to disposition under the homestead laws, as herein provided for lands classified as agricultural, but those making entry of such lands must agree to a reservation to the United States of the coal deposits therein and of the right in the United States, or those claiming through the United States, to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, and such coal deposits shall be disposed of as provided by section 3 of the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 583), but no purchase of the coal deposits shall confer any right to the surface of the lands excepting such as is necessary to the mining and removal of the coal deposits: *Provided further*, That lands classified as mineral shall be disposed of under the mining laws.

SEC. 4. That entrymen upon said lands shall, in addition to the regular land-office fees, pay the sum of $1.25 per acre for said land, such payments to be made as follows: Twenty-five cents per acre at the time of making entry and 25 cents per acre each and every year thereafter until the full sum of $1.25 per acre shall have been paid: *Provided*, That for a period of six months subsequent to the date on which the lands are opened to settlement entrymen upon said lands shall, in addition to the regular land-office fees, pay the sum of $2.50 per acre for said land, such payments to be made as follows: Fifty cents per acre at the time of making entry and 50 cents per acre each and every year thereafter until the full sum of $2.50 per acre shall have been paid. In case any entryman fails to make annual payments, or any of them when due, all right in and to the lands covered by his entry shall cease; and any payments theretofore made shall be forfeited and the entry canceled, and the land shall be again subject to entry under the provisions of the homestead law at the price fixed therefor by the former entry; but in all cases the full amount of purchase money must be paid on or before the offer of final proof: *Provided, however*, That the commutation provision of the general homestead law shall be applicable to all persons making homestead entry on said land under the provisions of this act, save and excepting entries made hereunder in accordance with the provisions of the enlarged homestead act, approved February 19, 1909, which shall not be subject to commutation, but in instances where commutation is permissible hereunder, the entryman shall pay, in addition to the price fixed for entry, the sum of $1.25 per acre, as consideration for the privilege.

SEC. 5. That this act shall not apply to an area of 2,000 acres embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assiniboine.

SEC. 6. That the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana having enacted a law for the purpose of establishing an agricultural, manual training, or other educational or public institution upon the present site of Fort Assiniboine, Mont., duly approved by the governor of Montana, and to be in full force and effect after the 4th day of July, 1915, and upon the transfer to the State of Montana by the President of the United States of 2,000 acres of land, situate in said abandoned Fort Assiniboine Reservation and embracing the military buildings at said abandoned fort, except the guardhouse at said post; the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, grant, and set over to the State of Montana all right, title, and interest of, in, and to the said 2,000 acres of land hereby reserved, embracing the buildings at Fort Assiniboine, except the guardhouse at said post, upon payment therefor by the State of Montana to the United States of the sum of $2.50 per acre: *Provided*, That the State of Montana shall be required to make its selection of 2,000 acres within one year from the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 7. That sections 16 and 36 of the land in each township within said abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, except those portions thereof classified as coal or mineral lands, shall be reserved for the use of the common schools of the State of Montana, and are hereby granted to the State of Montana: *Provided*, That the State may, if it so elects within one year from the date of the passage of this act, accept, subject to the reservation in the United States of the coal deposits therein, the portion of said sections 16 and 36 classified as coal lands, in full satisfaction of the grant herein made for common schools: *Provided*, That for all lands lost to the State because classified as coal or mineral indemnity may be taken as provided for in sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes: *And provided*, That there is hereby reserved for homestead entry by Mary A. Herron, or her heirs, subject to the terms of this act, the following described land upon said reservations: Northwest quarter of northeast quarter of section 28; west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter, section 21, township 32, range 15 east: *Provided further*, That in case of failure of Mary A. Herron, or her heirs, to make entry within six months from the date of the passage of this act the lands will become subject to settlement and entry in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, the price to be fixed by the period of entry reckoned from the date of the expiration of the reservation in favor of Mary A. Herron and her heirs.

SEC. 8. That the lands shall be opened to settlement and entry by proclamation of the President, which proclamation shall prescribe the manner in which the lands may be settled upon, occupied, and entered by persons entitled to make entry thereon; and no person shall be permitted to settle upon, occupy, or enter any of said land except as prescribed in said proclamation.

SEC. 9. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the survey and classification of said lands and for the expenses incident to their opening to settlement and entry, and for the care of said buildings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That when so classified, all of said lands classed as agricultural land shall be opened to settlement and entry under the homestead laws of the United States, but not to entry or location under sections 2306 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided, however*, That the enlarged-homestead act, approved February 19, 1909, shall not apply until six months after said land has been opened to settlement and entry as aforesaid: *And provided further*, That any rights which may have attached to any of said lands under any of the public-land laws of the United States prior to the passage of this act may be perfected and the lands so affected may be patented upon proof of compliance with the laws under which such rights so attached: *Provided further*, That lands classified as timberlands shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be provided by the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to dispose of the timber and land separately when deemed advisable: *Provided further*, That the lands classified as coal lands shall be subject to disposition under the homestead laws, as herein provided for lands classified as agricultural, but those making entry of such lands must agree to a reservation to the United States of the coal deposits therein and of the right in the United States, or those claiming through the United States, to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, and such coal deposits shall be disposed of as provided by section 3 of the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 583), but no purchase of the coal deposits shall confer any right to the surface of the lands excepting such as is necessary to the mining and removal of the coal deposits: *Provided further*, That lands classified as mineral shall be disposed of under the mining laws.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out lines 13, 14, 15, and 16 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. STOUT] if there are any lands on the reservation to which the enlarged homestead law would not apply—to which its terms would not apply?

Mr. STOUT. I do not know of any.

Mr. MONDELL. It is very evident that this provision was intended to delay for six months the designation of any lands under the enlarged homestead act, but it occurs to me that the department might interpret this language as actually designating all the lands under the enlarged homestead law at the end of six months, this being a congressional designation. The gentleman recalls that lands do not become subject to the enlarged homestead law unless they are designated by the Secretary as not being susceptible to irrigation at a reasonable cost from any known source of water supply.

Mr. STOUT. I would prefer not to have the gentleman's amendment adopted. While I say I do not know of any land on this reservation that will not fall within the limits of a 320-acre homestead, yet——

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, if this language is simply to be interpreted as delaying action on the part of the Secretary of the Interior for six months, then there is no objection to it; but if it is to be interpreted—and it seems to me this language would justify such an interpretation—as a congressional designation of these lands as subject to the enlarged homestead law at the expiration of six months, then the provision is objectionable.

Mr. STOUT. I do not so interpret it. It would simply delay us six months before they will be subject to the enlarged homestead act.

Mr. MONDELL. If that were the only effect, there would be no objection to it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if the insertion of the words "any of said lands" after the word "apply," in line 15 of page 2, would not make it clear?

Mr. MONDELL. In order to make it clear it would be necessary to put language in there such as "until designated by the Secretary of the Interior in any event," not "until six months afterwards."

Let me make this suggestion to the gentleman from Montana: If, after the word "apply," in line 15, you added the words "until designated under such law by the Secretary of the Interior, or in any event not," then you would accomplish just what this seeks to accomplish.

Mr. STOUT. I really can not possibly arrive at the interpretation of the gentleman. It seems to me to be as plain as it can be that it simply holds this off for six months.

Mr. MONDELL. If there is no reasonable ground for the interpretation that I have suggested that this is a congressional designation at the end of six months, then I have no desire to press my amendment. Possibly this discussion and this expression of opinion will serve to guide the department. Clearly it is the intent of the committee not to make a congressional designation of these lands, but simply to leave them subject to designation, if they may be properly designated after six months.

Mr. STOUT. That was the intent of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, with that view of the intent of the language I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. STOUT] and the chairman of the committee to the language in lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 3—that is, "no purchase of the coal deposits shall confer any right to the surface of the lands, excepting such as is necessary to the mining and removal of the coal deposits." The language just before that provides that these coal deposits shall be acquired in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 22, 1910. The provision of that act relative to coal is as follows:

Coal deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal-land law in operation at the time of such disposal.

Now, it might be possible that in the enactment of coal legislation there would be some legislation which would authorize the parties securing the right to the coal to secure the right to a certain amount of the surface, in which event these particular lands would by this legislation be differentiated from other lands affected by the coal-land law. Unless there is some reason why you should have this particular provision with regard to these lands, without regard to what Congress may do in the way of general legislation, it seems to me the language ought to go out.

Mr. STOUT. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as the coal is concerned on this land, it is a negligible quantity. The reports indicate that there are some considerable bodies of very low-grade lignite coal there.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; there are considerable bodies of very low-grade lignite coal there; and therefore it seems to me Congress will in all probability, when it legislates, make some provision in the case of those low-grade lignite lands by which the title to the surface can be secured with the coal. It occurs to me that there is no special reason to provide for it in the bill at this place.

You say all that is necessary when you say these lands "shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 22, 1910." You then place these coal lands in the same condition and situation that the other coal lands of the country are in.

Mr. STOUT. The remaining part of the paragraph also places them in the same position and situation that other coal lands are in now. Does it not?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not insistent in the matter; but it seems to me that in the interest of uniform legislation it would be better to leave out any provision which might differentiate these coal lands from the other coal lands of the country. You cover the matter completely when you provide for the disposition of these deposits in accordance with the act of June 22, 1910.

Mr. LENROOT. Is not that act one with reference to the disposal of the deposits?

Mr. MONDELL. That act is an act in regard to the disposal of the deposits, or the deposits and the land, depending upon what Congress might do. It is a section of the law for the agricultural entry of coal lands.

Mr. LENROOT. Surface entry is provided for in the same act?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. It is a limited entry act. I do not consider the point I have raised especially important, but it differentiates these lands from other lands.

Mr. STOUT. I do not think it is important one way or the other. It is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 23, after the words "disposed of," by inserting the words "whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall so direct," and strike out, in line 24, the words "the Secretary of the Interior" and insert the word "him."

Mr. LENROOT. The purpose of this is to make it discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to the gentleman's amendment, except that I am wondering if the gentleman will not recognize the fact that in the present crowded condition in the Senate the adoption of this amendment might cause the bill to fail if it had to go back there for further action. The bill has been reported without amendment, and unless the gentleman feels very keenly about it I hope he will not press his amendment, for that reason.

Mr. LENROOT. It seems to me that under the language the Secretary would feel a direction by Congress to sell this timberland immediately, and he certainly ought to have the discretion as to when he will sell it.

Mr. FERRIS. The Secretary of the Interior has the right to make all necessary rules and regulations, and he can make them sufficiently rigid so that there will be ample protection, I think; and I really hope the gentleman will not, insist on the amendment, for the reason I have stated.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think there will be any question about the adoption of the amendment by the Senate.

Mr. FERRIS. I think it will cause trouble at the other end of the Capitol. They are so crowded over there, and I feel the bill as it stands will be ample to protect the Government.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think a bill of this importance ought to be considered here upon the theory that no amendment which may be necessary can be adopted to the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. If it were anything very vital; but I do not think it is.

Mr. LENROOT. I feel that it is quite important.

Mr. FERRIS. The land will first have to be classified, and then the department will have to work out rules and regulations, and I think that will cover all that the gentleman cares about. The department can make any kind of rules and regulations and secure any price that it deems proper.

Mr. LENROOT. But under those rules and regulations, when once made, all the timber must be subject to sale.

Mr. FERRIS. I think not. They can make rules and regulations that timber of a certain character shall not be sold for a certain period of time. I have had so much experience in the sale of land under rules and regulations, and have always observed that they take such care and pains and that they have secured such enormous prices that, while I do not want to be insistent upon this, I urge upon the gentleman that there is no danger in the bill as it stands. The danger is when you provide that the lands shall be appraised and that they shall be sold pursuant to the appraisement. There is where the trouble comes. In this instance they will put these lands up to the highest bidder in small tracts, no doubt. I should hate to have the bill fail in the Senate for lack of consideration, and it will have to go back there if we amend it.

Mr. LENROOT. It seems to me we all recognize that under the present conditions it would not be wise or desirable to put all these timberlands up for sale at this time, or in the immediate future.

Mr. FERRIS. There is really very little timber there.

Mr. LENROOT. Fifty-five million feet are not such a very small amount.

Mr. FERRIS. It is scattered. A good deal of it will fall under the 50,000 feet in one lot and will come under the homesteader provision. Not only that, but there are only 168,000 acres in the whole tract.

Mr. LENROOT. I really feel that the amendment ought to be adopted. Of course, the House will take such action as it sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That entrymen upon said lands shall, in addition to the regular land-office fees, pay the sum of $1.25 per acre for said land,

such payments to be made as follows: Twenty-five cents per acre at the time of making entry and 25 cents per acre each and every year thereafter until the full sum of $1.25 per acre shall have been paid: *Provided*, That for a period of six months subsequent to the date on which the lands are opened to settlement entrymen upon said lands shall, in addition to the regular land-office fees, pay the sum of $2.50 per acre for said land, such payments to be made as follows: Fifty cents per acre at the time of making entry and 50 cents per acre each and every year thereafter until the full sum of $2.50 per acre shall have been paid. In case any entryman fails to make annual payments, or any of them when due, all right in and to the lands covered by his entry shall cease; and any payments theretofore made shall be forfeited and the entry canceled, and the land shall be again subject to entry under the provisions of the homestead law at the price fixed therefor by the former entry; but in all cases the full amount of purchase money must be paid on or before the offer of final proof: *Provided, however*, That the commutation provision of the general homestead law shall be applicable to all persons making homestead entry on said land under the provisions of this act, save and excepting entries made hereunder in accordance with the provisions of the enlarged-homestead act, approved February 19, 1909, which shall not be subject to commutation, but in instances where commutation is permissible hereunder, the entryman shall pay, in addition to the price fixed for entry, the sum of $1.25 per acre, as consideration for the privilege.

Mr. LENROOT. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. STOUT] one or two questions about this. The present commutation price under the general homestead law is what?

Mr. STOUT. One dollar and twenty-five cents.

Mr. LENROOT. What does this language men? Does it mean $1.25 in addition to that?

Mr. STOUT. No; it does not.

Mr. LENROOT. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. MONDELL. I can suggest to the gentleman a very good purpose. In some cases where a cash price has been fixed for land and the commutation privilege has been granted, it has been assumed by the department that as there was a cash payment to be made in any case, there was not to be an additional payment on account of commutation, and this is evidently to make it clear that in addition to the sum of $2.50 per acre to be paid the commuter, if he avails himself of the privilege, shall pay an additional $1.25 per acre.

Mr. LENROOT. Is not the payment the very basis of commutation always?

Mr. MONDELL. Very true; but the fact is, as I have stated, that it has been held in some cases—erroneously, it seems to me—that the payment of the cash price relieves the commuter from the necessity of any additional payment under commutation.

Mr. LENROOT. What would he do to commute, then?

Mr. MONDELL. He would simply make his commutation proof.

Mr. LENROOT. It gives him 14 months instead of 3 years.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. I think there have been some Indian reservations where that ruling was made.

Mr. NORTON. The commutation price of $1.25 an acre does not apply to all public lands.

Mr. MONDELL. It applies to all of the old 160-acre homestead entries.

Mr. NORTON. No; it does not apply to all of the old 160-acre homestead entries.

Mr. MONDELL. Unless the lands were opened with a provision that it should not apply.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the general homestead law relating to commutation provide for $1.25 an acre?

Mr. NORTON. Not for all public lands.

Mr. LENROOT. What are the exceptions?

Mr. NORTON. There are some lands in North and South Dakota which are commuted at 50 cents an acre.

Mr. LENROOT. Is not that under a special law?

Mr. NORTON. No; that is the way the lands were thrown open.

Mr. LENROOT. It must be under a special act. The general homestead law provides for $1.25 an acre; and when it says "commuted under the general homestead law" and then provides for a payment of $2.50 an acre, it might mean $1.25 for commutation and then $2.50 in addition for the privilege.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not read the language carefully enough to know whether it is clear, but clearly the intent is to require the commuter to pay $1.25 in addition to the $2.50.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield? Under the terms of the bill the homesteader has to pay $2.50 an acre for a part of the land.

Mr. LENROOT. Within six months; yes.

Mr. MANN. Even if he homesteads it. If he homesteads, he must pay $2.50 and an additional $1.25 an acre. Is not that plain?

Mr. LENROOT. That he would have to do, only we apply it to the commutation provision without any mention of the $1.25.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure. Usually the homesteader gets the land at no price at all; but if he commutes, he pays $1.25.

Mr. LENROOT. The first part applies to the commutation provision.

Mr. MANN. Under existing law the homesteader pays $1.25 an acre, but he does not pay $1.25 in addition to any other price, because there is no other price. Now, while we fix an upset price, with the right of the homesteader to carry out the intent of the law, if he commutes, he pays an additional $1.25.

Mr. MONDELL. I am of the opinion there have been cases where, in the absence of a provision of this kind, the department has held that the payment of a fixed cash price relieved the commuter of the additional $1.25.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There are cases where it provided that the commutation price will be the price fixed for the land. In the case of where we disposed of the surplus in the great Sioux Reservation, in the act of 1889, a price was fixed at $1.25 if the land was taken in the first two years, and then 75 cents per acre for a year and then 50 cents an acre. The department construed the law, in the case of commutation, that they had to pay $1.25 in addition to that price. Congress subsequently by legislation provided that the price to be paid in cases of commutation was the price that was fixed by the original act.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That sections 16 and 36 of the land in each township within said abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, except those portions thereof classified as coal or mineral lands, shall be reserved for the use of the common schools of the State of Montana, and are hereby granted to the State of Montana: *Provided*, That the State may, if it so elects within one year from the date of the passage of this act, accept subject to the reservation in the United States of the coal deposits therein the portion of said sections 16 and 36 classified as coal lands, in full satisfaction of the grant herein made for common schools: *Provided*, That for all lands lost to the State because classified as coal or mineral indemnity may be taken as provided for in sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes: *And provided*, That there is hereby reserved for homestead entry by Mary A. Herron, or her heirs, subject to the terms of this act, the following-described land upon said reservations: Northwest quarter of northeast quarter of section 28; west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter, section 21, township 32, range 15 east: *Provided further*, That in case of failure of Mary A. Herron, or her heirs, to make entry within six months from the date of the passage of this act, the lands will become subject to settlement and entry in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, the price to be fixed by the period of entry reckoned from the date of the expiration of the reservation in favor of Mary A. Herron and her heirs.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana, in relation to the wording of the previous section 6, whether he thinks there will be any difficulty about its construction, providing that the States shall select certain coal land, and so forth. It provides that—

The State may, if it so elects within one year from date of the passage of this act, accept, subject to the reservation in the United States of the coal deposits therein, the portion of said sections 16 and 36 classified as coal lands, in full satisfaction of the grant herein made for common schools.

My query is, if the State should see fit to accept surface land, whether they would be entitled to any other sections 16 and 36 which were not coal lands?

Mr. STOUT. I do not think they would. I am satisfied with the language.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the survey and classification of said lands and for the expenses incident to their opening to settlement and entry, and for the care of said buildings.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Montana whether he has any information as to how much of the $20,000 is to be used for the care of these buildings. I may say to the gentleman, if he is not already aware of the fact, that we have had bills before Congress with an estimate made at various times from the department seeking to get a considerable appropriation for this purpose which Congress has heretofore invariably refused to grant. Now it comes in as a part of this bill, while the rest of the bill is quite meritorious. How much of the $20,000 is to be expended by the Government in taking care of the buildings which it is giving away?

Mr. STOUT. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. That is a very frank answer, and I can not go any further.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the money appropriated limited to a specific purpose?

Mr. MANN. It is not limited to a specific purpose; it is limited to several purposes that are specified, and this is one of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that the major portion of it would be taken up by the care of the buildings?

Mr. MANN. I fear so, because they have been asking for years for a considerable appropriation for this purpose, which Congress has refused to grant.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman from Illinois as to how much of this will be used for the care of buildings, I suggest that there is a keeper there now drawing $40 or $50 a month.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. EVANS. And I anticipate that that is all that will be used out of the appropriation and all they want.

Mr. MANN. That is not all they want. They have been seeking money for other purposes in connection with the care of the buildings heretofore.

Mr. STOUT. It occurs to me that it will take the greater portion of this sum for the survey of the lands and classifying them.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that if they should spend the entire $20,000 on the buildings they would ask for an estimate for additional money to survey the land, and it would be an item that would be in order on appropriation bills and would be granted as a matter of course. Where Congress provides for opening up the lands it will provide the money to make the surveys. The amount is not limited to $20,000; this carries an appropriation of $20,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Montana inform us, if he knows, what regulations will probably be adopted in connection with the disposition of these lands?

Mr. STOUT. I do not know what regulations they will adopt. They adopt different regulations in different cases in opening up reservations.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The area to be disposed of is about 150,000 acres, is it not?

Mr. STOUT. Approximately.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Is the land particularly valuable so that there probably will be a demand for it?

Mr. STOUT. No. It is no different from millions of acres of land that the gentleman is acquainted with in that section. Much of it is not valuable for any purpose, because it is scrub foothill land.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman familiar with the regulations adopted last summer in connection with the surplus land in the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana?

Mr. STOUT. Somewhat.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman any information as to whether the regulations worked satisfactorily?

Mr. STOUT. Not in all particulars.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. My understanding is, and I think some Members of the House may be interested in knowing, that in that opening they abandoned the lottery system and provided that in case of there being more than one claimant for the same tract of land that then the several claimants would draw lots as to which one would be awarded the land, and that that method had worked satisfactorily so far as the reservation in Montana that was opened last summer is concerned. It avoids the speculative element that is involved in the old system of lottery.

Mr. STOUT. It is a much better system than the old one, although it is lacking in some respects at that.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Perhaps like the old lottery system it will be perfected as it is used.

Mr. STOUT. No doubt of that.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And I believe it will be a more satisfactory way of disposing of lands than the lottery system that has prevailed heretofore.

Mr. STOUT. I think so, and I hope so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STOUT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of recent improvements of the Missouri River.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the recent improvement of the Missouri River. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman purpose to extend his remarks by inserting a speech of his own, or by printing a speech by somebody else or some other matter in the RECORD?

Mr. BORLAND. By inserting a speech of my own in the RECORD, together with some data that have been collected from practical steamboat captains.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman whether his request involves any departure from his well-known attitude in the House of objecting to other people extending their remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. BORLAND. No; it involves no departure, and nothing I have not conceded to every other Member.

Mr. MANN. I have observed with great pleasure to myself that the gentleman keeps a good deal of matter out of the RECORD, and frequently saves me from the odium of objecting when other gentlemen make requests to extend their remarks in the RECORD. I wondered whether he was applying the same rigorous rules to himself that he has in the past applied to the rest of us.

Mr. BORLAND. I think I am. I hope so.

Mr. MANN. We will look in the RECORD and see.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if in view of his well-known attitude he would have any objection to my extending my remarks by placing in the RECORD statements that appeared yesterday in the New York Sun and other papers in relation to the State Department being notified by Great Britain that the transfer of interned ships, under the proposed shipping bill, would be regarded as an unneutral act?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the political matter to which the gentleman refers has no relevancy whatever to a great governmental work like improving inland navigation, and while we are endeavoring to increase the business facilities of the country the gentleman is trying to discourage them, and I would not want to have my request objected to——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, remembering that the gentleman objected to my talking the other day, I shall not now object.

Mr. BORLAND. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE CUTTERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18876) to provide for the construction of two revenue cutters.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct one steam revenue cutter for service in the waters of California, at a cost not to exceed the sum of $350,000; and one steam revenue cutter for service as anchorage patrol boat in New York Harbor, at a cost not to exceed the sum of $110,000, such vessel to be especially constructed for ice breaking.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MANN. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman must certainly be joking about objecting to such a good bill as this.

Mr. MANN. I will be very frank with the gentleman and say that I am not sure but that it may be a good bill. I am not sure but that the Government needs the revenue cutters, but I am very sure that the Government is very short of money and can get along for another year without these revenue cutters.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is in earnest about his objection, and I know he is candid about recognizing the necessity for the ships, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to remain, without prejudice, upon the calendar. It may be that by another unanimous-consent day the atmosphere will be clarified a little.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill remaining on the calendar, and if by another unanimous-consent day it appears that the revenues or the amount of free money in the Treasury are increasing, instead of rapidly decreasing, as has been the case for some months now, I do not know but that I would change my views; so if the gentleman will see to it that everybody hurries and pays more money into the Treasury as governmental receipts, he may then accomplish his purpose.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, thanking the gentleman for his concession, I wish to suggest that perhaps some of our economical, patriotic friends will succeed in cutting some large amounts off large bills by the time the next unanimous-consent day rolls around, so that there will be less objection to this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I probably will be found voting with the gentlemen to whom the gentleman from Georgia refers, but I fear that we will be in the minority, because there will be such a small number of gentlemen on the other side of the House who will vote with us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to the present consideration of the bill, and the gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Debate is ended on this bill. The Clerk will report the next bill.

DIVISIONS OF MENTAL HYGIENE AND RURAL SANITATION IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16637) to provide divisions of mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be established one additional division each on mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service, and said divisions shall be in charge of commissioned medical officers of the United States Public Health Service, detailed by the Surgeon General, which officers, while thus serving, shall be assistant surgeons general within the meaning of section 3 of the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act to increase the efficiency and change the name of the United States Marine Hospital Service."

SEC. 2. That the duties of the division of mental hygiene shall be to study and investigate mental disorders and their causes, care, and prevention. The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of rural and industrial sanitation and disseminate information among farmers and others for the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I notice the report accompanying the bill sets forth:

Notwithstanding the many natural advantages of country life, from a health standpoint, certain diseases depending upon insanitary conditions have a higher rate of prevalence in our country districts than in our cities.

Are we to understand from that that the work contemplated by this bill is to be confined exclusively to the country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the bill contemplates two departmental lines of work, one relating to mental diseases, such as insanity and mental disorders, and the other to rural sanitation.

Mr. MOORE. Are these conditions of insanity more conspicuous in the country districts than in the cities?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; one relates to insanity and mental defectives and the other relates to sanitation. The one relating to insanity, I will say to the gentleman, will primarily relate to immigrants.

Mr. MOORE. The immigrants who go to the country or who remain in the cities?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The immigrants who land in this country. There are two divisions in this bill, one dealing with insanity, to speak generally, and the other with rural sanitation, embracing the subjects of typhoid fever, malaria, pellagra, and other diseases.

Mr. MOORE. Has it any reference to the investigation of trachoma?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Since drainage and sanitation are both provided for in the bill, if the bill should pass, why should we not include a provision for dealing with certain insects, like the mosquito, that have so much to do with the spread of such diseases as fever, malaria, and so forth?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That would necessarily be included in an investigation of typhoid and such diseases in relation to their spread.

Mr. MOORE. And the insects which carry diseases of that kind?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That would be included in the investigation.

Mr. MOORE. On several occasions I have tried to secure consideration of this subject in the agricultural appropriation bill, but have been told always that pests of that kind should be treated by the medical service and not from an agricultural standpoint. Now, in some way or other, at some time or other, the medical service should be advised that the spread of diseases, such as malaria or typhoid, if due to the mosquito, is a legitimate source of inquiry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that that is contemplated by this bill, and the hearings clearly establish that that is one of the objects the gentlemen of this bureau had in mind.

Mr. MOORE. The Health Bureau has recently been making investigations in certain States—I think West Virginia is one of them; possibly North Carolina is another—as to the prevalence of the eye disease known as trachoma among the natives. That disease generally is charged up against immigrants, especially those coming from Syria. It is a contagious disease and is one which has been covered in the immigration law, which prohibits immigrants coming in who have that disease.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It has been in the immigration bill for quite a while.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and immigrants infected with that disease are deportable, although I understand a certain treatment has been discovered for this disease which effects a permanent cure. I would like to know whether the money which this new division of the health service will expend would be applied to treatment of such diseases and if in the matter of sanitation and drainage we may expect some action in regard to disease-carrying pests?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will answer affirmatively the gentleman's last interrogatory. I will say this bill simply takes two assistant surgeons out of the existing number of surgeons—one will look after the subject of mental defectives, mental disorders, and the other will confine his duties to rural sanitation and diseases which the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I am inclined to think the bill is good. Has the gentleman any statistics——

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hearings unquestionably show the whole subject of rural sanitation and the disease incident to insanitary life is to be considered from the scientific standpoint, and the purpose is to give these assistant surgeons adequate facilities to do this work.

Mr. MOORE. The ordinary house in the city to-day, the modern house, would have sanitary appliances, such as drainage from inside closets, kitchen sinks, and so forth, and the householder would be protected against disease in this respect. In some of the old farmhouses to-day perhaps those conveniences are still not in evidence. Is it thought that this new service will consider things with regard to the improvement of sanitation in the homes of the farmers, especially the poorer farmers of the country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is one of the chief ideas, to teach the necessities of rural sanitation, what can be done to promote health and to prevent disease, and I will say to the gentleman there seems to be a good deal of public sentiment in behalf of the measure.

Mr. MOORE. This means an inspection of the farmhouses from a sanitation point of view.

Mr. MONTAGUE. To educate the people as to the necessity for the introduction of such processes and how to operate and maintain them.

Mr. MOORE. Would you give them information as to the removal of stagnant pools and things of that kind?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Unquestionably.

Mr. MOORE. And that is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVER. If that is the purpose of the bill, the gentleman ought not to object to it at all.

Mr. MOORE. I do not expect to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the Bureau of Public Health at present has the authority to make the investigations provided for in this bill?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It has not the facilities. It has the authority, but the facilities are inadequate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will you kindly elaborate on the position that they have not the facilities? I understood that when the Bureau of Public Health has the authority to pursue any investigation, they have the facilities to pursue those investigations as far as their appropriation permits.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They want to classify the service, and the administrative features will be under two Assistant Surgeons General. One Assistant Surgeon General, with two clerks, will be confined to the mental hygiene investigation and the other to rural sanitation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under this you do not increase the force in the service, but you promote the present clerical force that is in charge of this work to the position of Assistant Surgeons General?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No. You have already the surgeons and Assistant Surgeons General, but this bill will involve a cost of $900 each for two surgeons who are promoted to the position of Assistant Surgeons General. They must have that rank in order to be at the head of this administrative bureau, as I understand it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill provides for the promotion of two present surgeons to the position of Assistant Surgeons General.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is true. I do not think they are additional employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course they have the facilities to-day, but you merely provide for the promotion of these two officials.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They have authority and have facilities, but those facilities are not adequate.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is merely intended to promote two officials or specialists in their respective line of work?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is intended to secure two officials of the requisite scientific knowledge to devote themselves to work which before now has not been adequately done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether the Chief of the Bureau of Public Health has authority under existing law to arrange the divisions of the work in that bureau?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand he has not the authority to classify them, but the reason for this law is to make proper classification.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the laws that we have passed I do not understand that we have ever assumed the prerogatives to determine the divisions in which the Bureau of Public Health should be arranged. I stand corrected if I am in error as to that position. I do not recall any law we have ever passed providing for the Bureau of Public Health that determines in advance the divisions in which they shall carry on their work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that years ago the work was assigned to the bureau without classification, and there was practically no authority to do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The work was assigned to them by the Chief of the Public Health Service under the authority he has to assign work to various members of his force. Why should Congress determine the administrative features as to the divisions into which a respective bureau should be divided for the respective lines of its work?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not sufficiently apprised about that, but my information is based on the hearings before our committee that the department thinks this bill is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall—and I wish to be corrected by the gentleman—if there is any instance where the Government has assumed the prerogative in determining for the bureau chief the departments or divisions into which his work should be divided, and I think it is questionable practice for the Congress to determine the divisions of administration of a bureau or a department. For instance, in the Post Office Department, concerning which I have a little more acquaintance than with other departments, the Postmaster General from time to time rearranges the divisions in those respective bureaus and transfers them as he thinks best for the good of the service. Here is a bill in which we are determining for a bureau chief the divisions for carrying on the work in his bureau. It is a matter of decision rather than administration. I would like to hear from the gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have answered, but I do not know whether I satisfied the gentleman or not, that the Public Health Department itself asks for these administrative divisions in order that they might better carry on their work.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have not done it before, even when we sought generally the reorganization of their service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not prepared to controvert the gentleman's statement in regard to that, but I do not think that is any reason why this is not a meritorious measure.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman considers for a moment the prerogatives of administrative legislation, I hope he will determine it is not for Congress to determine the respective divisions in the service.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is entirely too much debate on this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had been here——

Mr. ANTHONY. I think some gentlemen talk altogether too much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Some gentlemen talk only when they happen to be in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows that, but the matter has to come to an end some time. The gentleman from Kansas demands the regular order, and the regular order is, Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, somebody was talking to me. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did ask it, and there was objection made.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 16637, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] asks that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized under general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois excuse me one moment? Can I reserve my time?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman did not reserve any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time if he yields time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Virginia desires time I will yield to him. [Laughter.] Does he desire to proceed now?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to call attention, under a reservation of objections to the bill, to some provisions that I think ought not to be in any bill, in the hope that we may have them eliminated.

The bill provides for a division of mental hygiene. I have no objection to that provision of the bill. Then the bill provides that the "duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods," and so forth. I do not think it is proper to give to any bureau of the Government authority to encourage the adoption of something or other that it thinks is proper. It is enough for a bureau of the Government to investigate and make public the results of the investigation.

Now, here is a proposition to have the Public Health Service go entirely outside the investigation of the causes of diseases and start in a propaganda to have people follow a certain prescribed course of medicine.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If I caught the gentleman's objection, it was against the words "and encourage the adoption of improved methods."

Mr. MANN. I would like to have "encourage the adoption" go out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would it meet the gentleman's view to say "encourage improved methods"?

Mr. MANN. No. It is not their business to encourage the adoption of improved methods. Their business is to ascertain facts. I do not agree with the idea that they shall tell people what school of medicine shall be followed in the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the gentleman kindly give me the language that he objects to?

Mr. MANN. The language that I would like to strike out is, first, "to encourage the adoption of," so that it would read so far, "The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate improved methods of rural sanitation."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the gentleman any other objection?

Mr. MANN. Yes. Then, I do think this division ought not to mix up industrial sanitation with rural sanitation. There has been a conflict for quite a while between the Public Health Service and the Department of Labor as to the study of indus-

trial sanitation and improved methods of industrial sanitation. Methods of industrial sanitation are entirely apart from the study of disease.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the gentleman, then, will pardon me, I think the objection of the gentleman is met by the fact that there are two administrative agencies, one to deal with one subject and the other to deal with the other subject, and therefore the confusion that the gentleman objects to would not occur. I submit that under the construction——

Mr. MANN. Well, I think the gentleman is mistaken. I have given considerable study to this subject, and have been in several conferences where there has been conflict on this point. The improvement of industrial sanitation is mechanical to a certain extent. It is not a study of disease. The Public Health Service desires to obtain control of that, and the Department of Labor desires to retain control of the study of the subject of devices or improved methods to preserve the health of people employed in industry. It is entirely apart from the question of disease.

Mr. ADAMSON rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was not an accommodation of the conflict made when a bill was adopted here at the last session of Congress by which the Department of Labor looked into the question of industrial sanitation? I believe something of that kind was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Well, some kind of an agreement was entered into, but not covering this, and not turning it over to the Public Health Service. Now, even if it were to be included, there is absolutely no connection between the study of rural sanitation and the study of industrial sanitation. They do not belong in the same division at all.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then the gentleman would wish to eliminate the words "and industrial sanitation"?

Mr. MANN. Yes; "and industrial."

Mr. ADAMSON. Are there any other things that the gentleman would eliminate?

Mr. MANN. Yes. I would strike out "and disseminate information among farmers and others for." The Bureau of Public Health Service already has the power now to publish the information it obtains. But I am not in favor of having the Public Health Service hire a lot of men to go throughout this country to tell farmers and everybody else—for this includes everybody in the country—how they shall do this or that or anything ad libitum. I do not think my friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] is in favor of that, either.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would the gentleman kindly read the paragraph as he would construe it?

Mr. MANN. I will. I would have it read: "The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate improved methods of rural sanitation and disseminate information among farmers and others for the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases."

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. I am willing to accept that.

Mr. MANN. Now I yield, Mr. Chairman, five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when I was taken off of my feet by the strong opposition of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] I was trying to elicit information from the author of the bill as to the real purpose that was designed to be accomplished by this measure. I am in thorough sympathy with these additional activities as prescribed in this bill, with the limitations as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I think those criticisms are well merited. We had that very question under consideration when it was my privilege to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was the consensus of opinion then that we should not branch out too generally into forcing upon the public generally the ideas of various branches of schools of medicine.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is there one school of medicine to examine rural sanitation that is differentiated entirely from the school of medicine that examines industrial sanitation?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman did not catch the full purport of the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think I did

Mr. STAFFORD. He directed his attention to the language in lines 4 and 5, where it might vest authority in the Bureau of Public Health, or in this division, by allowing them to adopt means to encourage the adoption of these methods, which might be construed as vesting them with authority——

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. As soon as I finish my sentence—as vesting them with authority to enforce certain ideas that would be obnoxious to them.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman be satisfied with the transformation of the sentence as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am entirely satisfied with that.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to say that during the investigation had before the committee I was in perfect accord with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I am yet in accord with them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought it was through an oversight——

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not wish to prefer, promote, or encourage the selection of any school of medicine. We desire to show entire impartiality. The gentleman will remember that two years ago we put upon the statute book a law authorizing wide investigation and great and beneficial work by the Public Health Service. We did not make any subdivisions then, and up to this time, it being a slow and gradual growth, it has never been necessary to make subdivisions; but now, in order that there may be efficient work and no friction in the service, and that the different divisions may understand the duties, one of another, and especially of themselves, it has been suggested that we allow them to make a division of rural sanitation and a division on mental conditions.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, the Chief of the Bureau of Public Health to-day has authority to arrange the work of his bureau in the different divisions.

Mr. ADAMSON. Of course he could.

Mr. STAFFORD. And if he saw fit, he could create a division of mental hygiene, and one also of rural sanitation.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have no doubt he could assume that authority and go ahead and direct each man's work; but he prefers, for the efficiency of the service, that the law shall declare what divisions shall have jurisdiction of certain duties and certain functions. Incidentally he wishes, when those divisions are created, that the head of each one shall be of some dignity and authority, and that it shall have adequate clerical assistance. It is a very small matter, I think only about $7,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the chief of the bureau has authority to divide up the work, and has already done that under general authority, will he not be likely to come to Congress and ask us to give him legislation for other administration matters in the division of his work, after those divisions have been authorized?

Mr. ADAMSON. If he does that, we or our successors will be here to look after it. I presume that our successors will be as vigilant as we are. I assure the gentleman that I am going to continue to agree with him about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. We always get along very well together.

Mr. ADAMSON. This is merely a practical question, for the efficiency and work of the department. The department wants it, and we have great pressure for it from all over the country, as is exhibited by correspondence which has come to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I read this bill, after eliminating the obnoxious features pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], which I understand are going to be eliminated by the committee, I think it is nothing more than a measure to increase the salaries of two present surgeons. The chief of the bureau has authority to divide up the work. He does not have to come to Congress to create an additional division, but he does have to come to Congress to have them given a higher grade than of the number now authorized.

I recognize the value of this special work. I would much rather have supported this bill if the sponsors had come and asked us to promote two additional surgeons to the position of Assistant Surgeons General, and have it show on its face what the real purpose of the bill is rather than in this veiled way try to give the impression that they have not the authority to create divisions, but must come to Congress to have the divisions created, and then have the salaries or grades of surgeons prescribed who will fill these positions.

I intend to support the bill with the provisions eliminated as recommended by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday I made a statement on the floor of the House in reference to the notice that had been received by the State Department from the British Government, notifying the department of their attitude with reference to the purchasing of interned ships. After I had made that statement the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] arose and submitted a denial that he said came from the State Department. Yesterday the New York Sun and several other papers reiterated that statement. They claimed that such a communication, dated January 19, was received by Mr. Bryan, and it is to be presumed that if it was received it is still in his office. I read from the New York Sun of yesterday:

GREY'S WARNING ON SHIPS HELD BACK BY BRYAN—DESPITE DENIALS OF ITS EXISTENCE, THE COMMUNICATION REACHED SECRETARY'S OFFICE—BRYAN SOUGHT RULING ON INTERNED VESSELS.

WASHINGTON, *January 30.*

In view of statements made in official quarters and Congress to-day it is necessary to reiterate what was said in a Washington dispatch to the Sun yesterday, that Secretary Bryan has received a communication making the fact unmistakably clear that the British Government would regard the purchase and operation of interned German vessels by the United States as an unneutral act.

Such a communication, dated January 19, was received by Mr. Bryan, and it is to be presumed that it is still in his office. Developments here, however, indicate that Mr. Bryan has not seen fit to inform the President or his associates in the State Department or administration leaders in charge of the ship-purchase bill of what he has learned of the British Government's views.

At the White House it was declared there is no such communication. Representative UNDERWOOD on the floor of the House made a similar statement. In fact, much comment was caused by the eagerness of those most interested in the passage of the ship-purchase bill to rush forth with denials of the existence of this document. Secretary Bryan himself was out of town to-day.

MR. UNDERWOOD'S STATEMENT.

Representative UNDERWOOD said:

"I saw the telegram in the morning paper stating that there was a letter from Sir Edward Grey, protesting against the purchase of these ships, and I called up the State Department and asked if that statement in the morning papers was correct, and I am authorized by the State Department to deny categorically that the statement is correct. There is no such letter there and never has been such a letter there." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Were it not for the well-known fact that Mr. Bryan often fails to inform other officials of the State Department of communications received the statements made by officials to-day regarding the presentation of British views on a wholesale release of interned belligerent ships would be surprising, particularly in view of the fact that the communication referred to was received in response to a request of Secretary Bryan himself.

In other words, the document, the existence of which is denied, was received by Mr. Bryan for the sole reason that he had asked for it. As a result of the discussions growing out of the exchanges between the two Governments in the *Dacia* case a request was made that the views of the British Government on the subject be presented. This was done.

NO MENTION OF THE BILL.

The British communication was carefully phrased, and contains no mention of the so-called ship-purchase bill. This was necessary, as Sir Edward Grey could hardly be put in the position of lodging a protest against a measure which has not yet passed either House of Congress and which does not in terms declare the intention of the United States Government to purchase and set on the high seas vessels now flying the flag of England's enemies. Just as clearly as these circumstances would permit, however, it was intimated to Secretary Bryan that he could not expect the British Government would silently acquiesce in such action being taken.

It was pointed out that a sharp distinction exists in the minds of the British Government between the commercial transaction of transferring a vessel from one flag to another, and the general release of a number of interned belligerent ships. The latter case would, it was pointed out, bear an intimate relation with the question of neutrality.

The declaration was made that should a neutral power intervene to relieve one of the belligerents from the consequences of the military action of the other belligerent such intervention would be in effect not of a neutral character.

No language could be plainer short of a blunt statement to the effect that Great Britain would regard as an unfriendly act the purchase and operation of the interned belligerent ships by this Government.

NO DOUBT IN SITUATION.

In view of the statements contained in the communication to Mr. Bryan and other authoritative information available in Washington, there is now no room for doubt that Great Britain will not be found resting her case on the technicalities of international law or international conferences should the United States Government become the operator of the interned German vessels.

The complaint will be made that this Government is intervening to offset an advantage which the allies have gained through their supremacy on the seas and the vessels in question will undoubtedly be treated as enemy ships whenever encountered on the high seas.

Difficulty is found here in comprehending the course of the administration in first committing itself to the ship-purchase bill program, then making an eleventh-hour inquiry as to the views of the British Government, and when these were found to be strongly adverse failing to make this information public.

It seems to me quite remarkable that if there is no truth in that statement the great journals of this country should again repeat it. Since I came on this floor, within the last few minutes, I have been informed by a Member of this House that he received the information directly from the British Embassy, that recently a communication was presented to the State Department by the British ambassador setting forth the attitude of the British Government in the matter of the purchase of the interned German vessels. This communication was in response to a request for information preferred by Secretary Bryan. This communication was submitted to the Secretary of State some time before the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made a categorical denial of its existence. In view of these facts, and in view of the recent history of some of the transactions in the State Department, I still have some lingering doubt as to whether or not there is such information in the Department of State. You will perhaps recall that when the proposed Colombian treaty was under consideration that a specific and absolute denial was sent forth by the State Department that the proposed treaty contained anything in the way of an apology by this Government to Colombia. And yet when the treaty was published it did contain such apology, and it was shown that it had been at the State Department for some time when the denial was made.

Now, what is the motive, if there is such information as this in the State Department, for its suppression. I read an editorial from the New York Sun to-day:

INCAPACITY OR WORSE.

The Washington dispatches of the Sun yesterday contained the subjoined specific details concerning a subject of the utmost importance to this Nation

"Secretary Bryan has received a communication, dated January 19, making the fact unmistakably clear that the British Government would regard the purchase and operation of interned German vessels by the United States as an unneutral act.

"Developments here, however, indicate that Mr. Bryan has not seen fit to inform the President or his associates in the State Department or administration leaders in charge of the ship-purchase bill of what he has learned of the British Government's views.

"At the White House it was declared there is no such communication.

"Representative UNDERWOOD on the floor of the House made a similar statement.

"Secretary Bryan himself was out of town to-day."

This communication, it is plain, must have a powerful influence on the ultimate fate of the President's ship-purchase bill.

Has it been willfully suppressed to prevent its contents becoming known while that measure of folly and indiscretion is pending?

Or have we only another incident of the monumental incapacity that presides to-day over the Department of State?

Who is the man who to-day will rise in Congress and demand the exhaustive investigation this amazing conduct of William J. Bryan renders imperative?

In view of these statements repeated by the press throughout the country, giving the exact date of the communication as January 19 last; in view of the statement made by a Member of this House on information received from the British Embassy, I would like to inquire whether gentlemen on that side of the House are ready now to say that there has been no information received at the State Department in reference to the attitude of the British Government with reference to the purchase of these interned vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington five minutes more.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not contend that it is the duty of the Secretary of State to make public all information that comes into his office. I recognize that frequently it ought not to be done; but here is a bill pending before Congress, considered of such importance that great appropriation bills are being held up in order to force its passage through another body; so important that the Secretary of the President has been spending a great deal of his time over on the floor of that other body to see that there is "team work" and to see that there is no neglect on behalf of the Democratic sponsors for this bill. It is reported that he stayed until 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning seeing that Democratic Senators faithfully obeyed orders. When we remember the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, when he appeared before the Committee of the House on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stated that if this shipping bill passed, it was the purpose of the administration to purchase these interned German ships, and in view of the fact that such act would be a violation of our neutrality, in view of the fact that we are all in favor of peace, and that everybody had been praising the President, as he ought to be, for his attitude in that respect, why is it if there is such a communication there and we are headed toward war it is not given to the country?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the gentleman from Washington ought not to misstate what the Secretary of the Treasury said before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the purchase of the German ships. As I recall his statement, he never said that it was the intention of the Government to purchase these ships; he expressed his opinion that the Government would have a right to purchase these ships and that it would not be a violation of international law.

I expect that I am as closely in touch with the administration in reference to the shipping bill as anybody, and I never heard it expressed that it was the intention to buy German ships. On the other hand, if the bill becomes a law, the question of purchasing any ships becomes a matter of consideration, and I assume that the administration, through the State Department, will ascertain if there is any valid objection to the purchase of the ships of any of the belligerents, whether it is Germany or any other nation.

As far as this information in the State Department is concerned, I take the statement that came from the Secretary of State's office, through the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], as authentic, and it ought to have the credit of the House, and not take these statements sent out by correspondents from Washington, who are on a roving expedition, trying to find out, if possible, if there have been any such representations made.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am always glad to yield to my friend, and I will say that I read the statement of Secretary McAdoo before his committee this morning. And in response to a question from Representative SAUNDERS, of Virginia, in regard to these German vessels, the Secretary of the Treasury expressed surprise that there should be any question that they had not the right to purchase the German ships provided they were purchased in good faith, and he then said, "And that is exactly what would be done in this case." That is almost his identical language. If the gentleman from Missouri will get it and read it, he will see that I am right, for I read it to refresh my memory this morning.

If we are not to purchase the interned vessels, the whole shipping proposition is childish, because there are no other vessels we can purchase. If we purchase vessels that are already running, that is not going to relieve the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I wonder if the gentleman has had his attention called to an interview by Secretary Redfield in New Orleans the other day, in the course of which he is quoted as follows:

> Mr. Redfield answered a formal protest against the ship-purchase bill which the association recently sent to Washington. One of the points brought out in the protest was that operation of such a law would involve the United States in difficulties with the foreign powers. This he said was a joke.

If the bill passes, Mr. Redfield will be one of the board to administer it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; the Secretary of Commerce is to be one, and he says it is a joke. Mr. McAdoo will be president of the board, and he says that that is what would be done, and when they submitted the question the other day to a vote in the Senate as to whether they should prohibit the purchase of these ships it was voted down on a roll call. Now, if you do not propose to purchase the ships, where are you going to get the vessels? The whole thing becomes absurd unless that is the object of the bill.

And in view of the direct statement made by a Member of this House, which I have just quoted, in view of the repetition by great journals of the country that such communication has been received, and in view of the former attitude of the office of the Secretary of State, I do not feel any hesitancy in saying that I still have some doubts as to whether or not this communication has been received.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting two clippings from the New York Sun of to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] desire some time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I have not yielded the floor. I was trying to expedite business.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] the other day. Although I am not quite sure of just what he said, my recollection is that he said he was informed by the State Department that they had no letter——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, so that there will be no dispute about what I said, I will call attention to it again. I stated, after the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] had attempted to make his statement about the matter of the letter supposed to have been written by Sir Edward Grey to the Secretary of State, that I had my secretary telephone down to the State Department and make inquiry, and the State Department advised me that there was no such letter there and asked me to deny on the floor of the House that there was.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama covers a part of the case quite fully, and of course the statement of the gentleman from Alabama is to be relied upon—that he had information from the State Department that that department had not received a letter from Sir Edward Grey. I have no doubt that is a correct statement on the part of the Secretary of State or the State Department. As the statement was made by my distinguished friend from Alabama, it gave the impression to many that the State Department had no letter on the subject and had received no communication upon the subject. I am afraid the State Department was not entirely frank with the distinguished leader of the majority on the floor of this House. Information has come to me, in a way which I think makes it reliable, that that department not only has had communications upon the subject but that it has had a letter on the subject from an official of the British Government.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the House in thrashing out this matter. A few moments ago I stated the only direct information I have in reference to the subject, and that came from the State Department. The charge that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] made the other day was that Sir Edward Grey had written to the State Department protesting against the purchase of these interned German ships. I stated then, and I state now, that I telephoned to the State Department and asked for information as to whether such a letter existed. I was advised by that department that it had no such letter, and that department further asked me to deny on the floor of the House that there was such a communication. I do not question for a minute that that is true. As to whether any other communications have been received by the State Department in reference to this matter, of course I have no knowledge, but I am satisfied that distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have no knowledge directly on the subject, because if they had it would have been public property and in the papers before this time. I think that is as far as it is necessary for me to make a statement in reference to the Sir Edward Grey letter.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman is aware that Sir Edward Grey under no circumstances would address a letter to the State Department at Washington, and that no other member of the English Government would do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I assumed that the other day, but I did not rest with that. I asked the State Department.

Mr. MANN. But that is beating around the bush.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; it is not at all.

Mr. MANN. If Sir Edward Grey had written a letter, it would not be addressed to the State Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not disposed to think that the State Department would have authorized me to deny that such a letter existed if there was a letter of that kind in existence. That is my opinion. I do not state that as a fact, because I am not possessed of any facts further than those I have stated to the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Would the statement that the gentleman had from the State Department lead him to suppose that Sir Edward Grey or other responsible authority of the English Government had not sent a letter or a wire or other communication to the ambassador of Great Britain in Washington, the substance of which was to be communicated to the State Department?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that it certainly did lead me to suppose that fact. I do not say that was the statement that came to me from the State Department, but I do judge from the statement that came to me that that department had no such letter.

Mr. MADDEN. But it might have had representations from the ambassador of Great Britain without having them in writing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might have had a thousand things.

Mr. BARTLETT. But the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated there was a "letter" there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The statement was that there was a letter there from Sir Edward Grey.

Mr. BARTLETT. And that the Secretary of State had kept it concealed and had not let anyone know about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly, and it was that fact that I was authorized to deny. All I desire to say in reference to this matter is this: In the first place, the bill now pending in the Senate has not one line in it that compels the purchase of a German ship or an interned ship of the allies. It leaves it discretionary with the board that is to be appointed under the bill to purchase these ships wherever they can be purchased in the interest of commerce. I think it is going far afield for gentlemen in this House to occupy the time of the House and try and convince the country that the President of the United States is going to do some overt act that will put this country in unfriendly relations with any other country in the world. I hold no commission to defend the President of the United States; he is perfectly able to defend himself on all occasions. [Applause on Democratic side.]

But it has only been a few months ago when gentlemen from that side of the House were severely criticizing the President of the United States because he did not commit himself to acts that would have involved this country in actual warfare, and I say that it does not now lie within the mouths of those gentlemen to say that because a bill may pass the Congress of the United States under the terms of which the President might commit an act that would bring about unfriendly relations with other countries of the world, to contend for one minute that the President of the United States would be guilty of such an act.

Gentlemen on that side of the House know as well as I do that of all the people and all the men in the United States the President of the United States would be the last man to involve this country in a war that was not justified or justifiable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And no matter what you may think about the economic reasons for the passage of this bill, no matter what you may think about the reasons that may justify its passage, no matter whether you may think it is a wise piece of legislation from an economic or governmental standpoint or not, there is no man on that side of the House who I believe will stand in his place as an American Representative and say on his honor as a man or Representative in this House that he believes that the President of the United States, if this bill becomes a law, would commit an overt act under its terms that would involve this country in unfriendly relations with any other nation of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In just one minute. Now, if that is the case—and I am sure the past record of the President justifies that position—is not it unwise on the floor of this House to agitate this question in this way? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In one minute. When the whole people of our country desire above all things that in the dangers that to-day confront the world that peace, and peace alone, may rest upon our Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman, in order to be certain that these very desirable results should follow, vote an amendment to the pending bill that would prevent the purchase of these interned vessels?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will consider that question when the bill comes before the House, but I will say to the gentleman that so far as my own judgment is concerned and so far as I believe the opinion of the people of this country rests there is no necessity whatever for an amendment of that kind. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, there is not one word in the pending bill which would violate our neutrality. I do not wish to participate in a political discussion, nor to talk about war, nor to shed any light upon the controversy as to the comparative veracity or audacity of the State Department or the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] or their newspaper friends, but I do request that if further political discussion is desirable that it be postponed until the consideration of the next bill on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar [laughter], and I hope we may have a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and get through with this bill. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time for the present.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has made a very eloquent defense of the President when nobody is attacking him. So far as I know no one on this side has criticized the President or in any way reflected upon him. But the man who is going to be at the head of this ship-purchasing board is Secretary McAdoo, if we can believe the press, and he is the man who stated before the committee that they intended to purchase these interned German ships. Now, I do not know whether the gentleman from Alabama has any particular license to lecture anybody upon the floor of this House for attacking the President or not. My memory goes back not so very long ago when he made a speech upon the floor of the House that was not so loudly applauded upon that side, and if I am correct at that time the President of the United States was urging the passage of the bill about as insistently as he is now urging the passage of the shipping bill, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama stood down here in his place and declared that the proposition was un-American. Is he in a position to lecture this side of the House about attacking the President before he has been attacked? The gentleman has not hesitated to criticize him himself. I agreed with what he said about the Panama legislation, and I think the present shipping legislation is also un-American. I think that for the sake of saving a few dollars in freight it is proposed to bring us into the very shadow of war. It is proposed to place against the peace of this Nation the opportunity to buy a few secondhand ships and run them at a loss, and if the day comes that they ever do make a profit, then we are to abandon them and turn the field over to private parties. The most crude, socialistic scheme that ever has been proposed to the American people. A scheme that does not appeal to the judgment of the majority of mankind and something that is unknown in the history of the world. Never, I believe, has any nation run ships in the foreign trade. Some countries have maintained socialistic schemes inside of their own boundaries, but this is the first time it has been ever seriously proposed that any nation should go out into the international trade and go into the shipping business with all the difficulties and dangers that might follow.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman desire to yield further time?

Mr. MANN. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the State Department ought to split hairs. If it had in its possession a communication handed to it by the British ambassador by direction of the British Government, and if in spite of that circumstance the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was told that no communication had been received from Sir Edward Grey, why all I can say is that the department was guilty of equivocation or worse. But I do not believe that the department knew that the communication was there. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, the communication certainly was there. I assert that it was there, although I do not believe that the officials of the State Department were aware of the situation. I believe they were acting honestly when they made their denial to Mr. UNDERWOOD. I believe that the famous communication went to the Secretary of State; that he did not communicate it to the State Department, but instead of that he went off on one of his lecture tours.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I will.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman consider, if he now has a correct line on the facts, that ordinary frankness would suggest to the Secretary of State that he had better make the truth known at this late hour?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know whether the Secretary communicated the facts to the department or not, but I make the assertion that there was actually submitted to the Secretary of State just such a communication as has been indicated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if anyone criticizes the President on the supposition that he intends to buy those German ships, no one is to blame except the President himself. He has only to say to the American people, "I shall not buy those interned ships," and he will end the criticism in a moment's time. That is all he has to do. Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, the President is the most adroit man who has ever occupied the White House, and I am surprised that he does not make the statement I indicate. Why, the President is so adroit that although he has been two years in office every conservative still thinks him a conservative and every radical still thinks him a radical. When Mr. Taft had been in office for two years every conservative thought he was a radical and every radical thought he was a conservative. [Laughter.] The fact is that on Tuesdays

Thursdays, and Saturdays President Wilson is a radical and on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays he is a conservative. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the shipping bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the shipping bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, while I am loath to indulge in any political discussion and postpone the vote on this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] desires to participate in the debate, and I yield to him five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I will consume that much time, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], in his short speech, saw fit to assail the Secretary of State and to wave him aside with the suggestion that he supposes he had gone off on another lecturing tour. This great man has been slandered and misrepresented time and again by Republicans in this House about the lectures that he has delivered since he has been Secretary of State.

I want to say to gentlemen on that side now, and to my good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. GARDNER, in particular, that in all the time that Mr. Bryan has been secretary of State he has never been absent from that department engaged in lecturing as much as the time allowed to a Government clerk in one year for his vacation. Other men have held the office of Secretary of State and they could leave and be gone for days and days and the public did not know where they were. They could carry on a law practice and go to New York and be consulted maybe in big lawsuits and receive $5,000 or $10,000 for their services, but the public did not know what they were doing. But here is a man who has gone over this country for many years pleading the cause of the masses. He is engaged at spare times in lecturing, a business which enlightens the public and reduces the size of the Republican Party. [Laughter.] His whereabouts is always known, and when he delivers one of his great lectures the time and place is announced in a fashion something like this: "Mr. Bryan will lecture at this place at a certain time on the subject of 'The Prince of Peace.'" And Republicans who want to build up a big Navy and increase the standing Army are opposed to the Prince of Peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No wonder you are always talking about Mr. Bryan's lecturing over the country. You get up on this floor and say he has gone off on another lecturing tour. What this great man does is in the open. He invites the public into his confidence, and he is to-day at his post of duty, standing by the highest and best interests of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. As a matter of fact, on Saturday last was he not inviting the public into his confidence on a lecturing tour in North Carolina?

Mr. HEFLIN. He went down to his home in North Carolina, I understand, Mr. Chairman; but you Republicans who are watching him so closely and always talking about him going on a lecture tour, if you will investigate a little you will find that he has not been absent on a lecturing tour, not counting Sundays, as much as one-fourth of the time that the law allows him for vacation. His lecturing dates altogether during the week days, or work days, constitute a period of time not more than 15 days, which is less than one-fourth of the time that the law allows him for vacation. He has not neglected his duties, and he has not had as much vacation as the Government grants every year to the ordinary clerk. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I do not know whether this will end it or not, but I presume not. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is not correct in his statement. I dare say that the records of the State Department will not show that the Secretary of State has been away a single day, but by compilation of statistics as to where he has been elsewhere than Washington, it is proven he has been away much more of the time than has been indicated by the gentleman from Alabama.

But I do not think the Secretary of State is to be very much criticized for that. The State Department is probably better run when he is away than it is when he is present. [Laughter on the Republican side.] He does not know what is going on in the State Department when he is here. So he has to be excused for going to his home in North Carolina. I am glad to know, and so will Nebraska be glad to know, that he has moved to a home in North Carolina. And I hope he will continue to be permitted to hunt there as he pleases and lecture as he pleases.

But, after all, the question here is not a question of criticism of the President or the policy of the Government, but a question as to whether the State Department, the ranking department of this Government, can furnish information to the floor leader of this House of the majority party of the Government, and have that information spread over the land, which, while technically true, is, in fact, untrue. We ought to know. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] ought to be the first one to ask why, when he inquires of the State Department as to whether it is in possession of certain information, he is answered technically, "We do not have that information," when, in very fact, it has in its possession all the information referred to.

I have been, even as the minority leader of the House, informed by the Secretary of State during a Republican administration, as the gentleman from Alabama has been, and if it had been asserted on the floor of the House that that information was really misleading, I would have asked an investigation of a Republican administration to see whether the ranking department of the Government will endeavor to mislead this great body of the Government. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But gentlemen on the other side of the House, with commendable courtesy, hoot. That is the way they look at it. They believe that it is proper to deceive the people. That is what they have been trying to do for years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MANN. No. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question before he does that?

Mr. MANN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], because of a statement to the effect that a letter had been sent and was on file in the State Department, thought it important enough to inquire of the Secretary of State whether a letter had been received. The point was not whether it was a letter, but whether the representation had been made. If it were important last Saturday to know whether a letter had been received, it ought to be just as important for the gentleman this afternoon to inquire of the State Department whether a representation had been made in some other form and get either an affirmation or a denial of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] wish to yield any of his time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] wish some time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama such time as he wishes to use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlemen on the other side of the House are trying to raise a tempest in a teapot. My distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] usually looks at all questions from the wrong angle and turns the telescope in the wrong direction toward the battle line.

I called down to the State Department to ascertain in regard to a statement of facts, based upon a publication in the morning paper, with reference to a statement said to have been written by Sir Edward Grey. I was authorized to give a categorical denial of that statement, which I did, and which I stand on, and which I think is conceded to be correct by the gentlemen on the other side.

Now, since the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has taken his seat, I have been informed by gentlemen on this

side of the House, but not by the State Department, so far as I am personally concerned, that the State Department has given out this morning to the press a denial that it has in its possession a protest from the English Government upon this subject from any source. I ask the gentleman from Indiana to make the statement.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, since this question arose I called up the State Department and was informed that no protest or objection from any nation had been received against the shipping bill, and that the Secretary of State gave a statement to the press this morning stating that no protest or objection had been made to the bill for the purchase of any ships [applause on the Democratic side], and that the bill raised no diplomatic question for which there should be occasion for such a protest to be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I simply wanted to remind the gentleman from Indiana that nobody has said there is any protest against the bill. That is specifically denied in this article that I read from the New York Sun. It says specifically that no protest was made against the shipping bill. The protest was made against the transfer of these vessels.

Mr. CULLOP. No protest against any action that was proposed has been made, so I am informed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. From the British Government?

Mr. CULLOP. Not from the British Government or any other nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In reference to these interned vessels?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; and none whatever in reference to the proposed legislation or the action that would follow. It is not likely any nation would protest before any purchase was attempted.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Did the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] ask the State Department whether or not it was true that Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, in response to a request from Mr. Bryan as to the way in which the British Government would regard the purchase of these interned vessels—whether, as a matter of fact, Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice did not reply under instruction from his own Government?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under the statement just made by the gentleman from Indiana and the statement issued by the State Department this morning I do not think it is necessary to ask them any further questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for one hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, since this discussion has departed from the bill under consideration, I wish to discuss a matter which is of consequence to the property holders of the District of Columbia.

The subject I wish to discuss relates to the "Insurance Trust," which has just been formed in the District of Columbia. It will be remembered that about two years ago the Commercial Fire Insurance Co., which is located in the District of Columbia and doing business here, increased its capital stock and surplus from about $150,000 to $650,000. In other words, it added from popular subscription about half a million dollars to its capital stock and surplus. Before the addition of that half million dollars—in round figures—to its capital stock and surplus fund it was doing only a small business, and that business was confined to the District of Columbia. But after it had increased its capital stock and surplus fund to about $650,000 it commenced to do a very large business, particularly in the District of Columbia.

One feature by which it increased its business was by the adoption of what was entirely a new feature in the insurance business in the District of Columbia, and that was that this company did away with agents' commissions upon premiums and gave to the assured the benefit of commissions upon premiums which theretofore went to the agents. This action displeased all the insurance agents in the District of Columbia.

Soon thereafter an insurance agent, who is at the head of one of the big financial institutions in the District of Columbia, admitted under oath that he, for his company, had during the next preceding year received commissions upon premiums which came from placing $14,500,000 of insurance. He, I assume, took exception to the inroad which the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. was making upon his companies, because of the fact that the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. was giving to the assured, instead of to the agents, the commissions on premiums for policies of insurance.

This financier to whom I have just referred as having received commissions on premiums for the $14,500,000 of insurance written during the preceding year went to another financier-insurance agent, who was also at the head of a large financial institution in the District of Columbia. This second financier-insurance agent also admitted under oath that the concern of which he was president was receiving something like $25,000 a year profit from this business, which the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. was injuring by giving the commissions to the assured instead of to the agent. Thereupon these two insurance agents went to the then Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and those commissioners took up the matter with certain Members of the House and, by statements which were later developed not to be true, induced this body to enter upon an investigation of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co., which had commenced the practice of giving commissions to the assured instead of to the agent as theretofore. As a result of that investigation I wrote a minority report from the committee to which the investigating resolution was referred. In that report I expressed the belief that this fight upon this insurance company had been inaugurated by these particular people for the reason that this company was no longer giving commissions to the insurance agents, and for the additional reason that this insurance company would not become a member of the proposed insurance trust for the District of Columbia.

Subsequent facts have developed beyond all sort of question or peradventure that this statement made by me in that report was correct. After that investigation was over and all of its aftermath was practically forgotten an insurance trust has been formed here in the District of Columbia, right under the dome of the Capitol, and to-day it is charging the property holders in the District of Columbia from 50 per cent to 150 per cent higher rates than was charged when the Commercial Insurance Co. was offering policies to the people of the District of Columbia minus agents' commissions.

My information is—and I believe my information is reliable—that the insurance agents and financial institutions who originally started this fight upon the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. kept it up and pressed it on and on until that company has been driven out of business in the District of Columbia. No sooner was that done than the Insurance Trust stepped in and established itself here in this community.

Mr. GORDON. What were the means and methods by which this conspiracy drove this Commercial Co. out of business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will tell the gentleman. I regret to say that some of the methods adopted were used through no less a personage than the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia. The present superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia did many things to injure the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. One thing he did was that when the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. had succeeded in renting two stories of its building at the corner of Fifteenth and H, known as the Southern Building, to the Customs Court and the Department of Justice, the superintendent of insurance and another very high official voluntarily stepped in and advised the Customs Court and the Department of Justice against taking the lease. The superintendent of insurance then told the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. that if it spent $150,000 toward improving that part of the building which the Department of Justice was to occupy, he would not allow that $150,000 in its statement; that he would treat that $150,000 as an impairment to that extent of its capital stock. When this gentleman was about to be appointed superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia I believed, from what I gathered, that it was possible, at least, for him to become the instrument of the contemplated Insurance Trust. I did not know him personally. All I knew about him was what came to me voluntarily from people in the District of Columbia. It was represented to me that he himself was in the insurance business, and that he belonged to that particular branch of the insurance business which desired to fasten a trust upon the people of the District of Columbia, rather than become interested in seeing that the people of the District of Columbia secured low rates of insurance.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman give us the name of the president of the Commercial Insurance Co.?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The president of the insurance company of which I was speaking was Mr. Robert R. Tuttle.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell us the result of the investigation which was had in the House some years ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The particular charge that was made against the insurance company was that it was not solvent. The expert accountants who examined their books were chosen by those who were most hostile to the insurance company, but they reported that the company was absolutely solvent. Both the majority report and the minority report show that this company was solvent beyond all sort of question.

Mr. MOORE. I understood the gentleman to say that that company is now out of business, or has been driven out of business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That company is not now doing any business in the District of Columbia because of this war that has been waged upon it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman give us the name of the District superintendent of insurance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. His name is Nesbit. I am not sure of his initials. I think his name is Charles. It is suggested by the Clerk that his name is Charles F. Nesbit.

Now, when these charges were first made by the two financiers and insurance agents of whom I have spoken, and after they had gone to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the purpose of having an investigation brought about as to the solvency of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co., Mr. Charles F. Nesbit, who then was not the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia, according to the testimony of Col. William V. Judson, called upon the commissioners; and, as I say, according to Col. Judson's testimony, the object of his call was to encourage the warfare upon the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. Then, as I have said, after the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. had made arrangements to lease part of its building to the Customs Court or to the Department of Justice—I am not quite sure that it was the Department of Justice, but I think it was—then the present superintendent of insurance interfered and did what he could to prevent this company from making a profitable lease upon part of its building. In this petty piece of persecution he was aided, as I have said, by one who is very high indeed in political affairs and is in position to exercise potent influence.

But the superintendent of insurance did not stop there. He theretofore had been associated with Mr. Walter A. Brown, an insurance agent in the District of Columbia, and he also had been very intimately associated with Mr. William H. West, another insurance agent doing business in the District of Columbia.

After the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. had been so crippled that it could no longer do a profitable business in the District of Columbia, this Mr. Walter A. Brown and this Mr. William H. West canvassed the insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia for the purpose of forming an insurance trust, which is now in existence in the District of Columbia. While they were canvassing the city of Washington for the purpose of forming this trust, upon several different occasions, when noontime came they took lunch with Charles F. Nesbit, the superintendent of insurance in the District of Columbia. Upon one occasion, if not upon both—and I think upon two occasions—immediately after the superintendent of insurance had taken lunch with these two gentlemen, he called upon the president of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. and urged him to sign the articles which created this trust in the District of Columbia, and he never desisted in his persistence in that direction until after the Commercial Insurance Co. had so signed.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Has the gentleman in his possession information as to the character of the so-called trust, what form it has taken?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In a few moments I will present the "constitution and by-laws" of this insurance trust, and will make some comment on it.

Mr. MOORE. One more question. Is the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. still doing business outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the company of which the former Assistant Postmaster General, Robert J. Wynne, was president?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. He was with the company in some official capacity before its referred-to troubles came on, but I do not know whether or not he is now.

As I was saying, the superintendent of insurance called upon Robert R. Tuttle, president of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co., upon more than one occasion, and encouraged him to have his company become a member of this trust.

About two weeks ago I had a conversation with the superintendent of insurance over the telephone relative to some insurance subjects. In that conversation he suggested that he come to my house that evening for the purpose of conferring with me relative to them. He came; and while he was there, unexpectedly to me, Mr. Tuttle, former president of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co., called with his wife to make a visit to me and my wife.

Mr. Tuttle came to my house just at the moment when I was talking to the superintendent of insurance about his having encouraged Tuttle to go into this Insurance Trust, and because of the presence of Mr. Tuttle I brought the question up in the presence of both the superintendent of insurance and Mr. Tuttle.

In that conversation Mr. Tuttle reiterated what he had theretofore said to me, and that was that the superintendent of insurance had come, I think, on two former occasions to him and encouraged him to put his company into the trust.

Mr. MOORE. Was the word "trust" used in that conversation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It was in every part of it.

Now, I have in my hand the Constitution and By-Laws of the Underwriters' Association of the District of Columbia. The bottom of the front page of this pamphlet shows that it was printed, not in Washington, but in New York, in 1913. In other words, the intention to form this trust here was a preconceived one, and they awaited only the destruction of the local company that stood in their way before they brought this trust into existence.

I am informed that Mr. Edward R. Hardy, of the State of New York, is the managing head of the Insurance Trust, which has control of insurance matters in the State of New York. There is apparent proof, at least, that the Insurance Trust which has recently been created in the District of Columbia, was formed under the guiding hand of this same Mr. Hardy. There is an insurance publication in the State of New York which is known to be absolutely controlled by the Insurance Trust. It is a paper edited by a man named Best, who voluntarily appeared before the House Committee on the District of Columbia for the purpose of breaking down the Commercial Fire Insurance Co. In his testimony he admitted that in the State of New York there was an Insurance Trust.

It develops that Mr. Hardy, who is at the head of the Insurance Trust in New York, came down to the District of Columbia, and has formed the Insurance Trust which has recently raised the rates in the District of Columbia from 50 per cent to more than 100 per cent.

Here I ask leave to insert the entire constitution and by-laws as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the paper indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There are, however, some parts of it which I wish to discuss briefly.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is there anything in the by-laws of the Underwriters' Association that shows whether the business therein controlled is wholly within the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will read the gentleman some portions of it which will enlighten him.

Mr. MOORE. Does it go beyond the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It does not.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BARTON. Referring to Mr. Best's statement, to what committee did he make the statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. To the subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, which had charge of the investigation of the Commercial Fire Insurance Co.

Mr. BARTON. Have those hearings been printed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is the gentleman prepared to say that $150,000 expended, as he has suggested, on the repairs or alterations of the Southern Building should as a matter of good practice be carried as an asset?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not propose to discuss that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The gentleman suggested that that was an improper act on the part of the insurance inspector.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes. I do not think it was any of his business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He refused to carry that as an asset. Would it not be properly carried as an expense, just as he suggested?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think not. When a man or a corporation transfers dollars and cents into tangible, valuable property I do not think that property is any less an asset than the money which went into it.

Upon page 2 of the Constitution and By-laws of the Underwriters' Association of the District of Columbia I find the following:

Voting shall be as hereinafter provided, except that only class 1 members shall vote, and each member of that class shall have one vote.

Class 1 members are the insurance companies, and class 2 members are the agents of the insurance companies. It is therefore patent upon its face that they propose to hold the control of this organization within the insurance companies, and not even delegate any part of that control to their insurance agents.

To further show that this is a trust, I quote from page 3, article 4, under the caption "Officers":

SECTION 1. At the annual meeting (and in the manner provided in section 1, article 5, of these by-laws) there shall be elected by ballot a governing committee, a manager, and a treasurer. The governing committee shall elect one of its members as chairman and one as vice chairman.

Then, on page 4 of the same constitution and by-laws I find this statement:

SEC. 4. The duties of the managers shall be:
(a) To make all rates under the rules, schedules, and minimums of the association and promptly promulgate them to all the members, also advising them at once of all changes of ratings and of all rules and regulations adopted or altered.

Thus direct authority is conferred upon the manager to make all rates which shall obtain in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks it is any different here from what it is anywhere else in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think it is. I hope the trust has not yet accomplished its purpose of acquiring control over the entire territory of the United States. However, it may already have done so.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I think in general the insurance companies throughout this country regulate the rates and make them after the same fashion the gentleman has outlined these parties do in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If so, it is just as indefensible elsewhere as it is here; and I do not believe Congress should sit here idly and see this thing go on where Congress makes the laws.

On page 4, article 5, under the title of "Governing committee," I find the following:

SECTION 1. This committee shall consist of 12 members, 3 of whom shall be officers of Washington companies, 6 shall be representatives of companies of other States, and 3 shall be representatives of foreign companies.

From that quotation I think it easily will be seen that outside companies under this organization have fixed it so that they can overrule the local companies, because they give the local companies a representation of only three members upon their board.

Further quoting, I find the following:

In 1913 and thereafter 4 shall be elected at each annual meeting to serve for a term of 3 years, those elected to be representatives of Washington companies, other States or foreign companies the same as those whose terms expired, provided that no member shall be eligible for reelection within 12 months of the expiration of his term of service.

I read that part of the by-laws and constitution for the purpose of showing that this trust was contemplated as far back as 1913, when the local companies that were standing in the way had not yet been destroyed.

On page 5 I find this:

SEC. 4. (a) The committee shall maintain an efficient department of surveys and inspection, and shall arrange for the making of rates, standards, schedules, minimums, and rules which shall be binding on all members as soon as promulgated. Ratings to be made by the managers and all in accordance with the standards, schedules, or minimums.

On the same page, near the bottom, I find this:

Fourth. No application for rerating shall be considered by the manager or governing committee unless the cause thereof is stated therein, and not then unless it be for one of the reasons set forth in these by-laws.

On page 6 I find a provision that the by-laws shall not be altered or amended except by a two-third vote of class 1; and, as I said before, class 1 is composed of the insurance companies themselves.

Article 9, under the title of "Commissions and brokerages," says:

Commissions: (a) Thirty per cent of the following classes of risks:
Dwellings and apartment houses and their contents.
Private stables and private family garages, and other buildings and their contents, when written in connection with dwellings upon the same premises, excluding farm property.
Buildings and their contents occupied on the first floor as stores and exclusively as dwellings above the first floor.
Churches, convents, synagogues, schoolhouses, educational institutions, hospitals, public buildings and their contents (excepting institutions whose inmates are under legal restraint).
(b) Twenty-five per cent on brick buildings and contents occupied for mercantile purposes, office, public or large halls, and not exclusively for dwelling purposes above the first floor, etc.

In other words this constitution and by-laws goes on and fixes not only the rates, from which the companies shall not depart, but it also fixes the agents' commissions, from which no company is also permitted to depart.

As I already have permission, Mr. Chairman, to insert the constitution and by-laws in the RECORD I will not further quote from it, but wish to express the earnest desire that Members read it for the purpose of informing themselves.

I see from the local press that the assistant district attorney is investigating the question as to whether or not there is a local insurance trust, with a view of prosecuting it if there is one. I wish to invite the attention of the assistant district attorney to the fact, as I am informed, that Mr. Walter A. Brown and Mr. William H. West canvassed the insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia for the purpose of having them become members of this trust. If the officers of the local insurance companies could be called, I doubt not that they could tell the district attorney that they were importuned and encouraged by those two gentlemen to join this trust.

For the purpose of supporting this local organization each company doing business in the District of Columbia had levied upon it by Mr. Hardy an assessment of three-quarters of 1 per cent upon its commissions or premiums—I am not quite sure which—and that three-quarters of 1 per cent, when collected, was to be paid to Mr. Edward R. Hardy, to whom I have heretofore made reference.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I do not care to say more upon that subject, but before I resume my seat there is another subject concerning which I propose to make a few remarks. Last spring——

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I just came in and have not had the benefit of all the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky, but I notice that he is discussing the insurance companies of the District of Columbia. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he knows a way whereby some constituents of mine who have invested their good, hard-earned dollars in insurance companies in the District of Columbia could realize? Does the gentleman know anything about the insurance companies who are in bad favor at this time, and who have been selling stock to the people throughout the United States? And now these constituents who have been investing their hard-earned dollars find that they are holding the bag and can not realize; that their stock is worthless, or practically so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know to what company the gentleman from Ohio refers, but if he refers to either the Commercial Fire Insurance Co.——

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe that is the company.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Or to the First National Fire Insurance Co., I will say to him, in giving an opinion, that if this fight never had been made by the then organizing insurance trust in the District of Columbia, that both of those companies would have made money, and that the gentleman's constituents not only would have been able to have gotten back what they invested but a handsome dividend also.

Now, to illustrate for the gentleman's information. While this investigation was going on before the House District Committee these companies brought to the committee daily hundreds and hundreds of policies which had been canceled by the assured because the investigation was being made, and because of hostile publications which were also being made in papers and periodicals controlled by the trust.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is then the opinion of the gentleman that these companies to which he refers have been brought to their present condition through the persecution that has been brought about by these other people——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is my unqualified opinion.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And the men behind the companies are honorable men and had no desire to hornswoggle, to use such a rural-constituent phrase?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; they evidenced no desire to hornswoggle, to use the same expression the gentleman used.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I have some constituents in the same fix as those of the gentleman from Ohio, and I suppose I am authorized to make the same answer to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; and I have some myself.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when interrupted by the question of the gentleman from Ohio, there is another subject to which I wish to devote a few remarks.

Last spring, I believe it was, this House unanimously passed a bill which placed the auditor for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia upon a salary of $5,000 a year, instead of permitting him to continue to be compensated by the unlimited-fee system. Under the fee system the auditor for the District of Columbia is being paid, as I say and as I can establish, an annual compensation of $12,372, after paying all official expenses. To repeat, the House unanimously passed a bill to give to that official a salary of $5,000 and to do away with the present unlimited-fee system of compensation. That bill is now pending in the Senate. On January 16 the auditor went before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and made a statement relative to his fees.

The printed hearing begins by reciting the fact that there appeared before the subcommittee W. Meyer Lewin, Esq., Chapin Brown, Esq., Arthur A. Birney, Esq., J. Morrill Chamberlain, Esq., Matthew E. O'Brien, Esq., F. W. Brandenburg, Esq., Louis A. Dent, Esq., auditor of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and Mr. George W. Evans, president of the West End Citizens' Association.

Mr. ADAIR. Was he "esquire," too?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will answer the gentleman from Indiana by saying that the representative from the citizens' association was not designated as "esquire," but as "mister."

Some years ago when the illustrious and lamented J. Proctor Knott was governor of Kentucky and titles were floating around promiscuously, he formally, as governor, gave the title of "mister" to one of Kentucky's distinguished citizens.

I have looked up the word "esquire," although I thought I knew what it was, and I found that it was properly used to designate a justice of the peace.

Squire Dent, auditor for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, made a very astounding statement when he appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee for the purpose of defeating the passage of this bill in order that he may continue to draw $12,372 net a year as his compensation from the unfortunate litigants of the District of Columbia. He denied that he receives as much as $12,372, but admitted that he does receive about $9,900. He reduces the net amount of his compensation by several methods, one of which is by subtracting expenses. A part of those expenses are law books and furniture, which, when bought, become his own property. Therefore our committee in treating it has included that part of the money so spent as net income, and has found that his net income, as I said, during the last four years would average annually the sum of $12,372.

Squire Dent, in arguing before that committee the proposition that this bill should not be passed, says that this whole proposal to reduce his compensation grew out of spite against him. In so far as this House is concerned the bill originated with me; and when it originated with me I did not even know the name of the auditor of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; and up to this good moment I have never laid eyes on Squire Dent. I would not know him if I were to see him; and God knows I bear him no ill will. I am actuated solely by the purpose to relieve unfortunate litigants in the District of Columbia and at the same time to allow him only a reasonable compensation for his work. The bill which has passed this House has fixed $5,000 a year as his compensation.

But he complains that a man named Masters, whom he characterizes as an extortioner in lending money, is behind the movement to lessen his compensation. He also says that a local attorney—Mr. James Easby-Smith—reported to him—Squire Dent—that Masters had approached him—Mr. Easby-Smith—with a proposition to come to me and get such a bill started as has passed the House. Now, Squire Dent asserts that Masters—whoever he is—sought to have Mr. James Easby-Smith to come to me for the purpose of inducing me to introduce this bill; but Squire Dent failed to tell the Senate committee that he himself did send Mr. James Easby-Smith to me for the purpose of getting the passage of this bill stopped.

Suppose Mr. Masters, the alleged extortioner, did have a grievance against Squire Dent, the charger of unconscionable fees against the unfortunate litigants in the District of Columbia; how could that possibly come to a member of the District Committee with any force? Neither I nor any other member of the committee cared whether Mr. Masters was for or against Squire Dent's fee system. None of us cared whether Mr. James Easby-Smith was sent by Mr. Masters or by Squire Dent. We went ahead and did our duty, and the House has done its duty, regardless of that intended interference.

Squire Dent admitted to the Senate committee that he had been politely invited to appear before the House committee, but that he declined to do so because the House committee had no jurisdiction of the subject matter, notwithstanding a bill had been introduced and the Speaker of this House had referred that bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia. But Squire Dent, who fixes his own fees and rules his department of the court as he sees fit, indirectly criticizes the Speaker of this House for assigning a bill to what he—Squire Dent—thinks is the wrong committee.

But what difference does it make whether Mr. Masters was inspired by ill will against Mr. Dent or not? What difference does it make whether the House committee had jurisdiction or not? The fact still remains that Squire Dent has been receiving an average annual compensation of $12,372, after the payment of official expenses, notwithstanding the fact that he says he has not. However, let me repeat that he admits to about $9,900, which is at least $4,900 too much. The members of the court who appointed him receive only $6,000 a year each. Yet it has been conclusively shown that he receives more than twice as much as either one of the judges who appointed him and who are superior to him. Now, Squire Dent, in his statement before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, says that an accountant from the Department of Justice, by the name of McNish, also investigated the amount of his annual compensation and found it to be less than $10,000 a year. This is not true. Mr. McNish found the amount to be much larger than this. But, in any event, I say, without fear of contradiction, that when Mr. McNish made his investigation Squire Dent, the auditor for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, withheld from him information as to fees he had then earned. The accountant who acted for the House District Committee was an impartial man. He never had seen or heard of Squire Dent before the bill came up; but he arrived at his figures in this way: He took the cases which had been referred to Squire Dent as auditor during the entire time that he had been auditor, and from these cases and the records of the auditor's office he got the amount of the fees which Squire Dent had allowed to himself as auditor, and, when he had gotten this information from the cases and the auditor's own records, he added up the figures so obtained, and then he subtracted the legitimate expenses of the office and found that Squire Dent's net annual compensation was $12,372. He, of course, included fees that had been earned, according to the auditor's method of computation, up to the time to which the investigation extended.

I doubt not that I have dignified Squire Dent's statement entirely too much by undertaking, through these means, of giving light to the public as to his doings or information to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. Squire Dent undertakes to distract attention from his big charge of $50 a day by complaining that a man by the name of Masters ha procured the passage of this bill. And I might say that Squire Dent, in discussing the subject, criticized the district attorney over in Virginia, Mr. Crandal Mackey, and his main criticism of Mr. Mackey is leveled at him because this man Masters, the alleged usurer, has been, according to Squire Dent, a client of Mr. Mackey; and therefore Col. Mackey is contaminated because he associates with Masters. And, as Masters was once indicted, upon the same kind of logic, Squire Dent can also be criticized. There was an infamous lumber company called the Washington Lumber Co., and in that company Squire Dent was one of the directors; and Mr. Eugene H. Taggart was another one of the directors; and Mr. Taggart, the codirector with Squire Dent, also has been indicted for criminal fraud. So it seems that Squire Dent's business associates are no better off in that respect than are Mr. Mackey's alleged clients. One of these criticisms is no better than the other, and neither is sound. Neither will one nor both of them, no matter how adroitly handled by Squire Dent, conceal the fact that he is collecting from litigants more than he should collect. One large estate here in town is owned by a crazy man by the name of Peters. Peters has a committee. Squire Dent has been charging more than $50 a day for overlooking the settlements of his committee, and has allowed that committee during the last few years nearly $100,000 compensation out of that lunatic's estate.

Let me invite your attention to two of those allowances. The lunatic, in charge of a couple of men, was sent over to Atlantic City, and when the week end came the committee visited him over there, and the committee charged $100 for that visit. And that is not all. The committee took along with him his accountant to see the lunatic. God only knows what an accountant would want to see the lunatic about, but that accountant was allowed $150 for going over to Atlantic City on that occasion to see this lunatic. But these are small items. Some of the other allowances are more indefensible.

We have another case of the estate of a lunatic where——

Mr. SHERWOOD. What was the value of the lunatic's estate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. About half a million dollars. As I said, we have another estate of a lunatic who is confined in the asylum. As stated in the House committee report, Squire Dent has allowed enormous and unusual fees, not only to the committee but to the law partners of the committee as well; and one of the committee of this lunatic who is receiving these large fees by the grace of Squire Dent came to me—whether or not he came upon the advice of Squire Dent I can not say—and asked me to stop the passage of this bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I am anxious to know what connection with the court this auditor, Squire Dent, has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Well, the auditor of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia is much the same as a master in chancery in your court or mine.

Now, then, this office that Squire Dent holds was established in 1785, before the District of Columbia was separated from the State of Maryland. By an act passed in 1802 that act of 1785 of the State of Maryland was made applicable to the District of Columbia, so that the fee system, which is still preserved for the benefit of Squire Dent as the auditor of the District of Columbia, was fixed in 1785.

Squire Dent also says that Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, a local attorney, helped to inspire the introduction of the bill which abolishes his exorbitant fees. I do not believe that Mr. Lambert has ever attempted to have anything to do with the matter. For myself I can truthfully say I do not know Mr. Lambert. I never saw him.

Not long ago the Washington Star said editorially that Squire Dent's compensation should be large, because he, while auditor, could not practice law. The editor of the Star seems to have overlooked the fact that the auditor was then practicing law for one of the owners of the Star in the case of Gaddis against Noyes. It is also true that the auditor uses his public office in practicing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I wish to append the following as a part of my remarks:

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE 1.

Name.

The name of this organization shall be the Underwriters' Association of the District of Columbia.

ARTICLE 2.

Objects.

The object of this association shall be the reduction of the fire waste in the District of Columbia, the establishment of just and fair rates, whereby the cost of fire insurance may be equitably distributed among all classes of manufacturers, merchants, private householders, and others, and the prevention of discrimination between one property owner and another; for these purposes this association will establish a system of schedule and minimum ratings, giving the best risks, the lowest rates, and adding specific charges for all deficiencies from required standards, making reductions from such rates when the deficiencies charged for are eliminated, and also provide rules and plans for regulating the practices of the business of fire underwriting, including commissions and brokerages in the District of Columbia.

ARTICLE 3.

Membership.

Shall consist of two classes:

1. Fire insurance companies.
2. Associate members—Local or general agents.

All fire insurance companies regularly admitted to do business in the District of Columbia shall be eligible to class 1, and all regularly licensed fire insurance agents shall be eligible to class 2.

Voting.

Voting shall be as hereinafter provided, except that only class 1 members shall vote, and each member of that class shall have one vote.

ARTICLE 4.

Meetings.

Meetings shall be held at such times and places and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the by-laws. Class 2 members shall have the privilege of the floor.

ARTICLE 5.

Management.

The management of the association shall be under direction and control of such officers and committees as shall be prescribed by the by-laws.

ARTICLE 6.

Any member may withdraw from this association at any time on giving 60 days' notice, in writing, it being understood that at the end of such 60 days and on such withdrawals any other member may withdraw on 2 days' notice.

ARTICLE 7.

This constitution shall not be altered or amended except by a two-thirds vote of the class 1 members represented at any stated meeting or at a meeting specially called for the purpose, copies of such amendments to be sent to the members at least 10 days in advance of said meeting.

BY-LAWS.

ARTICLE 1.

Applications for membership shall be made, in writing, through the manager hereinafter provided for to the governing committee, and, if approved by it, the applicant shall be a member upon signing the constitution and by-laws and company agreement.

ARTICLE 2.

Representation.

Each company may be represented at the meetings of the association by one of its officers or managers, or in the absence of such officer or manager, by its local agent having written authorization of the company, such authorization to be effective at any meeting at which the company may not be represented by one of its officers or managers, and to remain in force until revoked by the company. Each company shall be entitled to one vote, which, in the absence of an officer, may be cast by the agent or firm of agents duly authorized in writing.

ARTICLE 3.

Meetings.

SECTION 1. Stated meetings shall be held on the first Thursday of the months of March, June, September, and December at 2 o'clock p. m. The September meeting to be the annual meeting.

SEC. 2. Special meetings may be called by the chairman of the governing committee at his discretion, and shall be called by him when requested in writing by nine members of the association, but no business shall be transacted at a special meeting except that which is specified in the call for same, except by unanimous consent of the members present.

SEC. 3. Fifteen representatives shall constitute a quorum at any meeting, counting individuals or firms.

ARTICLE 4.

Officers.

SECTION 1. At the annual meetings (and in the manner provided in sec. 1, art. 5, of these by-laws) there shall be elected by ballot a governing committee, a manager, and a treasurer. The governing committee shall elect one of its members as chairman and one as vice chairman.

SEC. 2. The duties of the chairman and vice chairman shall be such as are usual to these positions.

SEC. 3. The treasurer shall collect all moneys due the association, deposit the same in the name of the association in a depository to be approved by the governing committee, and pay all bills when approved by said committee, by check drawn by himself and countersigned by the chairman. He shall keep proper books of account and make a report of the finances at the annual meeting. His account shall be audited quarterly by a public accountant. He shall give a bond for the faithful performance of his duties for such an amount as may be fixed by the governing committee, premium to be paid by the association. He may be the same person as the manager hereinafter provided for.

SEC. 4. The duties of the manager shall be:

(a) To make all rates under the rules, schedules, and minimums of the association, and promptly promulgate them to all the members, also advising them at once of all changes of ratings and of all rules and regulations adopted or altered.

(b) He shall keep a record of the proceedings of the association and its committees and perform such other duties as they shall require.

(c) He shall, under the direction of the governing committee, have charge of all employees and all books and papers.

(d) Surveys shall be printed or otherwise duplicated and the duplicates shall be furnished members and owners of the property surveyed upon request.

ARTICLE 5.

Governing committee.

SECTION 1. This committee shall consist of 12 members, 3 of whom shall be officers of Washington companies, 6 shall be representatives of companies of other States, and 3 shall be representatives of foreign companies. In 1913 and thereafter four shall be elected at each annual meeting to serve for a term of three years, those elected to be representatives of Washington companies, other States, or foreign companies the same as those whose terms expire, provided that no member shall be eligible for reelection within 12 months of the expiration of his term of service. Vacancies shall be filled by the governing committee from the class represented by the retiring members; such election shall be until the next annual meeting only.

NOTE.—In 1913 the four nominees receiving the highest vote shall serve for three years; the four nominees receiving the next highest vote, for two years; and the four nominees receiving the next highest vote, for one year. In case of tie between two or more, lots shall be cast.

SEC. 2. Regular meetings of the committee shall be held at such times and places as it may designate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall have the management of all the affairs of the association unless otherwise provided for.

SEC. 4. (a) The committee shall maintain an efficient department of surveys and inspections and shall arrange for the making of rates, standards, schedules, minimums, and rules, which shall be binding upon all members as soon as promulgated, ratings to be made by the manager and only in accordance with the standards, schedules, or minimums.

(b) Notice of such rates and rules, or changes thereof, shall be given to the members within 24 hours after their adoption, Sundays and holidays excepted.

(c) The committee may also prescribe rules and wording of forms for policies.

SEC. 5. No alteration shall be made in an established rate either by the manager or by the governing committee, except for one of the following-named causes:

First. A change in occupancy, improvements, or a change in the risk, or its exposures material to the hazard, or in case there is a general advance or reduction of rates, or a change in the schedule, standard, minimum, or rules applicable to the risk.

Second. Rates made prior to the adoption of a minimum, schedule, or standard shall be revised to accord with said minimum, schedule, standard, or rules.

Third. If a minimum, schedule, standard, or rule has been erroneously applied by the manager, the governing committee may correct the error upon written appeal from a member, specifying the error.

Fourth. No application for rerating shall be considered by the manager or governing committee unless the cause thereof is stated therein, and not then unless it be for one of the reasons set forth in these by-laws.

ARTICLE 6.

Revenue.

The governing committee shall levy an assessment on or before ——, sufficient to cover the estimated expenses of the association for the current year, said assessment to be based on premiums written within the jurisdiction of this board during the year ending the previous 31st day of December, and shall include all premiums received for insurance or reinsurance on rated and unrated risks, less reinsurance effected in companies, members of this association, and return premiums.

The assessment shall be paid on or before the 31st day of March succeeding. The failure of a member to pay the assessment when due shall be cause for suspension or expulsion at the will of the association, provided that the manager shall notify the members in writing at least 10 days prior to the meeting of the association at which such default shall be reported for consideration.

ARTICLE 7.

Outside risks.

Associate members (class 2) of this association shall observe the rules, rates, commissions, and brokerages of other fire underwriters' associations.

ARTICLE 8.

Alterations and amendments.

These by-laws shall not be altered or amended except by a two-thirds vote of class 1 members of the association present at any stated meeting, or at any meeting to be called especially for that purpose. Notice of any change in the by-laws shall be sent to the members at least 10 days in advance of said stated or special meeting, and accompanying said notice there shall be a copy of the proposed amendment or amendments.

ARTICLE 9.

Commissions and brokerages.

Commissions: (a) Thirty per cent on the following classes of risks:

Dwellings and apartment houses and their contents.

Private stables and private family garages, and other outbuildings and their contents, when written in connection with dwelling upon the same premises, excluding farm property.

Buildings and their contents occupied on the first floor as stores and exclusively as dwellings above the first floor.

Churches, convents, synagogues, schoolhouses, educational institutions, hospitals, public buildings, and their contents (excepting institutions whose inmates are under legal restraint).

(b) Twenty-five per cent on brick buildings and contents occupied for mercantile purposes, office, public, or lodge halls and not exclusively for dwelling purposes above the first floor, and all other risks not coming under class C as hereinafter provided for.

(c) Twenty per cent on all risks specifically rated as special hazards.

(d) The commission on the premiums of policies covering ground rents, leases, rents, use and occupancy, profits and commission to be the commission applicable to the building wherein or whereon or to which such ground rent, lease, rent, use and occupancy, profits and commission insurance applies, builders' risks shall take commission applicable to class for which the building when completed is intended.

(e) Each and all of the foregoing commissions to include all agency expenses, such as postage, exchange, advertising, solicitors' fees, personal local license fees, clerk hire, rent, services in adjusting losses under the policies issued at the agency, and all other agency charges whatsoever, excepting only maps, map corrections, advertising required by law, local board expenses and taxes, salvage corps taxes, and agent's and solicitor's State license fees.

(f) A contingent commission of 5 per cent on the net results of the business of each agency for each contingent year to be computed as follows:

By deducting from the gross premiums written by the agent for the company:

(1) Cancellations and return premiums;

(2) The commissions described herein (which commissions cover agency expenses already described herein);

(3) The amount of losses and loss expenses incurred on business in force on the books of said company at the agency, whether placed there by the present agent or turned over to him for supervision and attention at expiration, and on all business hereafter written by said agent for said company;

(4) All other agency expenses and charges whatsoever, including local board expenses, State and local taxes and licenses, maps, and map corrections, and advertising as required by law; and

(5) Premium consideration for reinsurances effected by or at the request of the agent; and

(6) By adding all collections for losses and loss expenses on reinsurance effected by or at the request of the agent.

(7) Any contingent commission paid shall not be treated as an agency expense in computing the contingent commission of any subsequent contingent year.

(g) At the expiration of the contingent year, or upon the termination of the agency, the company will make up the contingent account, and on request will remit (all premiums for the contingent period being paid to this company and not otherwise) the amount found to be due, if anything, or may request said agent to charge the same in his next monthly account current.

(h) In view of the fact that the agent is not charged with unearned premium in computing the net results for the contingent year he shall have no compensation, contingent or otherwise, on the business or its profits after the termination of the agency.

BROKERAGE.

(i) Brokerages shall be 10 per cent less than commission applicable to each risk, as above set forth, or 10 per cent on the 20 per cent class, 15 per cent on the 25 per cent class, and 20 per cent on the 30 per cent class.

(j) Class 1 members shall not allow nor class 2 accept or pay compensation (commission, contingent or brokerage) greater or different than that above set forth, except that:

(k) An agent representing one company only may receive an annual salary from that company, but no company shall have more than one agent compensated by a salary who shall be counted as one of the six agents provided for in article 11 and who shall be governed by the brokerage rule of the association; and except that:

(l) A principal agent supervising the business of and responsible for other subagents who must write their own policies may receive an overriding commission of 5 per cent on the business only of such subagents, who may receive the regular graded commission and contingent herein set forth, but no contingent shall be paid the principal agent on the subagents' business, all subject to article 11 of the by-laws, the principal agent counting as one agent under that rule, and no class 1 member availing itself of this method may have any direct reporting agent or agents in addition to its principal agent.

ARTICLE 10.

Dwelling-house rates.

The rate on brick dwellings, unexposed other than by brick or frame dwellings and under fire department protection, shall be 15 cents for one year, two annuals for three years (that is to say, 30 cents), and three annuals for five years (that is to say, 45 cents); the rate on the contents of such brick dwellings shall be 25 cents for one year, with the same term rule and rate on frame dwellings and their contents unexposed other than by brick dwellings and under fire department protection shall be 35 cents for one year, with the same term rule. Frame dwellings and contents in rows shall be specifically rated.

ARTICLE 11.

Number of representatives.

No class 1 member shall have more than six representatives compensated at greater or different than brokerage rates. All over that number shall be compensated only by the brokerages as set forth in article 9. Head offices of local companies shall count as one agency under this rule. Class 1 members shall in writing give, whenever required, the names of their agents compensated at greater than brokerage rates.

ARTICLE 12.

Stamp clerks.

Class 2 members shall submit all daily reports and canceled policies to stamp clerks, who shall inspect at reasonable intervals the books of local companies for the purpose of verifying policies not reported by daily reports. Daily reports or other records shall indicate the commission and brokerage, if any, applicable.

When publishing rates the manager shall cause to be noted on each card or schedule of rates opposite each risk or part of risk as listed a letter indicating the grade of commission or brokerage chargeable: (A) indicating 30 per cent grade, (B) 25 per cent grade, and (C) 20 per cent grade.

ARTICLE 13.

Order of business.

SECTION 1. At the stated meetings of the association the following shall be the order of business:

1. Calling of the roll by company.
2. Reading of the minutes.
3. Report of governing committee.
4. Unfinished business.
5. New business.
6. Elections.

The roll by company shall be called upon request of any member.

PARLIAMENTARY RULES.

SEC. 2. This association shall be governed by the rules laid down in Cushing's Manual.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the governing committee, or in his absence the vice chairman, shall preside.

ARTICLE 14.

Agreement.

This constitution and these by-laws shall become effective and in force when all the regular stock companies licensed in the District of Columbia shall have subscribed hereto; or if any company or companies does not or do not hereto subscribe, then when each and every agent of such nonsigning company or companies shall have become an associate member of this association and personally subscribed hereto.

The subscribers hereto, by our signatures, affirm our support and membership in the Underwriters' Association of the District of Columbia. We agree to submit any doubtful questions as to rates, rules, commission, and (or) brokerage that may arise under this agreement to the committee, and we bind ourselves to abide by their decision, whatever it may be, subject to appeal to the association, to the end that harmony and good fellowship may continually prevail.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois desire to use further time?

Mr. MANN. No. I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent that general debate be now closed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent that the general debate be closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the duties of the division of mental hygiene shall be to study and investigate mental disorders and their causes, care, and prevention. The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of rural and industrial sanitation, and disseminate information among farmers and others for the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois desire to offer the amendment suggested, or does he prefer that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], in charge of the bill, offer it?

Mr. MANN. I would rather have the gentleman from Virginia do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move that, on page 2, line 4, the last two words on that line be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 4, by striking out——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me state the entire amendment. It is that the last two words on line 4, and the first five words on line 5, and the last word on line 5, and the first word on line 6, and the last three words on line 6, together with the first four words on line 7, be stricken out, so that the sentence will read as follows:

The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate improved methods of rural sanitation and the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. Will the gentleman offer it again? The Clerk did not catch it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let the form of the motion be to "make the sentence read as follows," and then read what it should be.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he move to strike out all after the word "prevention," in the section, and insert what is desired.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The sentence then would read as follows:

The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate improved methods of rural sanitation and the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 2 by striking out the words "mental hygiene"——

Mr. MANN. No; strike out all after the word "prevention," in line 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "prevention," in line 3, page 2, and insert the following: "The duty of the division of rural sanitation shall be to investigate improved methods of rural sanitation and the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases."

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16637) to provide divisions of mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service, had directed him to report it back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MONTAGUE, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MINING EXPERIMENT AND MINE SAFETY STATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 15869) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining experiment and mine safety stations for making investigations and disseminating information among employees in mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and read the amendments into it.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain in the several important mining regions of the United States and the Territory of Alaska, as Congress may appropriate for the necessary employees and other expenses, under the Bureau of Mines and in accordance with the provisions of the act establishing said bureau, 10 mining experiment stations and 15 mine safety stations, movable or stationary, including those already established, the province and duty of which shall be to make investigations and disseminate information with a view to improving conditions in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, safeguarding life among employees, preventing unnecessary waste of resources, and otherwise contributing to the advancement of these industries: *Provided*, That not more than three mining experiment stations and mine safety stations hereinabove authorized shall be established in any one fiscal year under the appropriations made therefor.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from the several States offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN and Mr. FERRIS demanded a second.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any print of the bill as reported?

Mr. FOSTER. With the amendments, there is not.

Mr. MANN. How many amendments are there?

Mr. FOSTER. There are three amendments. I will state them to the gentleman, if he wants to know what they are.

Mr. MANN. I will not take the time now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to considering a second as ordered?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] will have 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will have 20 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be reported separately, so that the House may know what they are.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, in line 6, after the word "Alaska," insert the words "as Congress may appropriate for the necessary employees and other expenses," so that it will read:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain in the several important mining regions of the United States and the Territory of Alaska, as Congress may appropriate for the necessary employees and other expenses, under the Bureau of Mines—"

And so forth.

Also the following:

Page 1, in line 9, after the word "stationary," insert the words "including those already established."

Also the following:

On page 2, in line 6, after the word "industries," strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That not more than three mining experiment stations and mine safety stations hereinabove authorized shall be established in any one fiscal year under the appropriations made therefor."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

[Mr. FOSTER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. RAKER, Mr. HOWELL, Mr. POWERS, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Mr. SELDOMRIDGE, and Mr. FOWLER were granted leave to extend remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. How many men are there actually at work in all these mines in the United States; what is the total number of men?

Mr. FOSTER. About 2,000,000 men in the United States.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print a letter to me from the director of the geological survey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

OKLAHOMA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Norman, January 29, 1915.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago I sent you a telegram concerning House bill 15869, which provides for the establishment of experiment stations and the installation of mine rescue cars.

I have been informed that this bill, known as the Foster bill, did not come up for consideration on the date referred to in the telegram, but I find that Mr. FOSTER will be the first Member recognized on Monday, February 1. I wish to again call the matter to your attention, urging your support for the bill.

Yours, very truly, C. W. SHANNON, *Director.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 21037) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the amended bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provision and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Emanuel Pollard, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abner Brooks, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Prior P. Baird, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elvin A. Estey, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses Miller, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Hall, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Thurston, widow of George E. Thurston, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sylvester Rumsey, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah P. Deem, widow of Edward W. Deem, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Mann, widow of Jonathan Mann, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James A. Carter, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Thompson, widow of William H. Thompson, late of Company I, Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orion P. Howe, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Hunter, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Casler, widow of Henry Casler, who served as a seaman in United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel P. Beck, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas G. Butner, helpless and dependent child of Samuel Butner, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel Snider, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Guthrie, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Effie A. Smith, helpless and dependent child of Joseph Smith, late of Company A, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sue S. Benson, former widow of Jacob R. Rabb, late of Company E, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Cassius M. Rose, late of Company E, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel C. Derby, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard S. Carr, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie A. Work, widow of Robert A. Work, late of Companies I and A, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George W. Noah, late of Company H, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham S. Foster, late of Company A, Seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johanna Miller, widow of Friedrich Miller, late of Company A, Cape Girardeau Battalion Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ira B. Timmons, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment, and Company K, Seventeenth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Osborn, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Logan McDaniel, late of Company G, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Dryman, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Hill, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Morris, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace E. Jones, late of Company H, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert B. Martin, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel McLaughlin, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda J. Wright, former widow of Adam S. Wright, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Loyd G. Harris, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hinds, late of Company C, Sixty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Cagney, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza J. Butler, now Elliott, former widow of Simon P. Butler, late of Company B, Third Regiment, and Company G, Thirty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Malinda J. Wall, former widow of John H. McMillin, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henrietta H. Blodgett, widow of Frederick Blodgett, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan A. Phillips, widow of William H. Phillips, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Schultz, late musician Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hemstreet, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Shanley, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Battalion Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Miller, late of Battery F, Independent Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Diefenbaugh, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment, and Company C, Eighteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Benson, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Black, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-seventh Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melissa W. Shaw, former widow of Johnson J. Shaw, late of Company H, Third Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Barbara Theiring, widow of Anton Theiring, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Hardin, widow of William H. H. Hardin, sr., late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment, Company H, Fiftieth Regiment, and Company G, Tenth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George O. Steadman, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment, and Company B, Seventeenth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Shirey, widow of Peter Shirey, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fredus H. Aldrich, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $22.50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ambrose E. Beardsley, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan J. Boyer, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet C. Martindale, widow of Stephen Martindale, late of Company C, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James A. Hight, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bonaparte Hunnell, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Venning, widow of Henry Venning, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Moore, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus E. Dodds, helpless and crippled son of William A. Dodds, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Skelton, now Gillespie, former widow of John Skelton, late of Company A, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Nicholas, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine McDermott, widow of Patrick McDermott, late of Company H, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Emma McDermott, helpless and dependent child of said Patrick McDermott, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine McDermott, the name of said Emma McDermott shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine McDermott.

The name of Maggie Adams, widow of John Adams, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Parthenia E. Brown, widow of Charles H. Brown, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Feindt, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Moore, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Papst, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Z. Williams, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Plank, late of Company C, Webster County Missouri Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Fralick, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Grant, alias Jackson Bowman, late of Company E, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. McMiller, former widow of John McMiller, late of Company H, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Albert C. Worthington, alias Amzi W. Cowles, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane Sheck, widow of Giles A. Sheck, late of Companies A and C, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Riggs, widow of Charles S. Riggs, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William M. Wilson, who served as a harness maker, Quartermaster's Department, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Taylor, late of Company C., Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Pennefeather, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Mitchell, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel P. Gill, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte Diller, widow of Francis M. Diller, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ella Charlotte Diller, helpless and dependent child of said Francis M. Diller, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Charlotte Diller, the name of said Ella Charlotte Diller shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Charlotte Diller.

The name of John C. Potter, alias John L. Callahan, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amenda E. Coughanour, widow of George W. Coughanour, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Horace B. Hamilton, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Freeston, late of Company B, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Missoura A. Foster, widow of Louis R. Foster, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nelson J. Letts, late of Company H, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Ashbaugh, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Ramage, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rodney W. Anderson, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Hambright, late of Company B, Fifty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Scott, widow of Joseph Z. Scott, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca S. Merritt, widow of Josiah Merritt, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lovisa Morrison, widow of James C. Morrison, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Aaron F. Miner, late of Company C, Fourth Independent Battalion Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Fowler, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Benson, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Oviatt, widow of Willis S. Oviatt, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katharina Lambelin, widow of Edward Lambelin, alias Joseph Dorie, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Morgan, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Poe, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa V. Dyer, widow of Franklin W. Dyer, late of Company D, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John H. H. Babcock, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Hudson, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milly Schmitt, widow of Isaac Schmitt, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Walter Walsh, who served as a coal heaver, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Pinckley, widow of William C. Pinckley, late of Companies B and A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mordica Terry, late of Company G, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Tally, widow of Lewis F. Tally, late of Company F, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline E. Smedley, widow of William H. Smedley, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Carson, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Dowell, late of Company D, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. McCrillis, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha Sims, widow of Andrew J. Sims, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Carhart, widow of Samuel Carhart, late first-class fireman, United States Navy (United States ships *North Carolina* and *Wyandotte*), and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Brinkman, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia C. Barstow, widow of Isaac C. Barstow, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie M. Fallihee, widow of Patrick Fallihee, late of Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa B. Tittle, widow of Christopher C. H. Tittle, late of Company I, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David E. Brown, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter P. Swensen, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Stout, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Heuser, widow of John Heuser, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Wynn, widow of Robert J. Wynn, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Hodson, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard J. Baugness, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hardenbrook, late of Company H, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Zuker, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ann E. Thomas, widow of Edward H. Thomas, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Munsell, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lavinia S. Kirkpatrick, widow of John Kirkpatrick, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward D. Millis, late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Stackhouse, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah D. Edwards, widow of Albion K. P. Edwards, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose Eastman, widow of William H. Eastman, late of Company D, One hundred and twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Fenimore F. Cochran, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar Stice, late of First Battery Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. McPherson, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Bell, late of Company E, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Battery A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Clayton, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Mowry, late of Company H, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Webber, widow of George Webber, late of Company A, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martin S. McDevitt, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie Sanno, widow of Charles P. Sanno, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Wilcox, widow of William B. Wilcox, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Pauline M. Beach, widow of Henry S. Beach, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Dean, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Seventh Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Adams, late of Company K, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seldon T. Wilson, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louise Strassler, widow of John Strassler, late of Company A, Van Horn's battalion, Home Guards, attached to Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Stone, widow of Michael Stone, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward D. Hurlburt, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fritz Voth, late of Company A, First Battalion Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen Leed, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi T. E. Johnson, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Steen, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Kendig, widow of William H. Kendig, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Milliken, widow of Edward Milliken, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida Grace Milliken, helpless and dependent child of said Edward Milliken, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth J. Milliken, the name of said Ida Grace Milliken shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth J. Milliken.

The name of Adelaide E. Pratt, widow of Harrison T. Pratt, late of Company K, Sixty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Rogers, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Corcilda J. Babcock, widow of Byron D. Babcock, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Almira Linscott, widow of Daniel J. Linscott, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sallie A. Martin, widow of Joseph H. Martin, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James Ford, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Agnes M. Kesler, widow of Andrew Kesler, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mathew Pennington, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Sorreis, late of Company B, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Goodlander, widow of John W. Goodlander, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gertrude E. Cornell, widow of Gilford D. Cornell, late of Company D, Ninety-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Royer, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Burnham, late of Company F, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles U. Burns, late of Company I, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Haugh, late of Company F, First Battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marilla Shakiton, widow of Thomas Shakiton, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Williams, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McGovern, late of Company H, Two hundred and fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Perry, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment, and Company I, Fifty-ninth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilhelm Lietzke, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Meyer, widow of William J. Meyer, late of Thirty-second Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Campbell, widow of John Campbell, late of Company C, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Artillery, and Battery E, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Donehower, late of Company C, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Diehl, former widow of George W. Bartle, late of Company M, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louisa C. Raridon, widow of Charles Raridon, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Farley, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maggie Boos, widow of Jeremiah Boos, late of Company C, One hundredth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Eighth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harriet N. Weeden, widow of George W. Weeden, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and Companies D and F, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Squire L. Gage, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margarethe Kammerling, widow of Frederick A. Kammerling, late musician, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Horatio Ecton, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Hitchens, late of Company F, Ninety-ninth Regiment, and Company C, Fiftieth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Resh, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin P. Elkins, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Kennedy, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bella E. Swartzlander, widow of Jacob Swartzlander, late of Company D, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Almon W. Bennett, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George McDonald, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Powell, late first-class boy, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Davis, now Sharp, former widow of Samuel P. Davis, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Benjamin F. Harris, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allie Truesdell, helpless and dependent child of Samuel Truesdell, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Lamaster, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Talbot, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Berry, late of Company H, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Roark, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Decatur Maynard, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phebe A. Bean, former widow of David Robbins, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ellen Glider, widow of Henry Glider, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jesse P. Earl, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Boling, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Kelly, late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Harvey, late of Batteries 1 and 2, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Marshall, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wilhelm, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Ladd, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Andrews, now Ayars, former widow of George A. Andrews, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John D. McDearmon, late of Company A, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Pickerill, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin V. Hunt, late of Second Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelia A. Shemo, widow of Edward Shemo, late of Company B, Forty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George H. Hendrickson, late of Company I, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Chapman, late of Company B, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Torpley T. Dodge, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment, and Company C, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert N. Jessop, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Tucker, late of Company F, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas E. Hite, late of Companies E and D, First Battalion Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Sullivan, widow of John Sullivan, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alma L. Bruce, helpless and dependent child of John A. Bruce, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lorenzo B. Hines, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Williams, alias George H. Lunt, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albenna B. Sanders, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary T. Phillips, widow of Augustus E. Phillips, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bernard Boyle, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Good, widow of John W. Good, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Samuel J. Caldwell, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Jenkins, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Schmalz, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisabeth A. W. Case, widow of Meigs Case, late surgeon Forty-third New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Richard Dunmore, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Grant, widow of John O. Grant, late of Battery G, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carl F. Jensen, late of Company B, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Pratt, late of Company E, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Ellsbury, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Hoary, widow of Joseph Hoary, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Tichenor, widow of William H. Tichenor, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry,

and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James T. Thrasher, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Canote, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine A. O'Donnell, widow of Hugh O'Donnell, late of Company H, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel W. Barr, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara F. Wiley, widow of John D. Wiley, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Glover, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward F. Daniels, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Hunter, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Carlisle, helpless and dependent child of William H. Carlisle, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Murphy, widow of George W. Murphy, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jannie S. Odell, widow of John L. Odell, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James H. Wendt, late of Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Adams, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah M. Cope, widow of Thomas Cope, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leila O. Eldridge, widow of Lewis H. Eldridge, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William B. Batman, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund N. Hatcher, late of Company F, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minerva Hickok, widow of Harrison D. Hickok, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Stebbins, widow of Edwin Stebbins, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susannah Wells, former widow of William Teaker, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Theresa B. Nash, widow of Warren C. Nash, late of Companies E and D, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Smith J. Dutton, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hinckle, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Gatchell, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fayette B. Vaughn, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel O. McElhaney, late of Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah M. Budd, widow of Joshua Budd, late adjutant One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Keys, widow of Jasper H. Keys, late of Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Moses R. Hardin, helpless and dependent child of Aaron Hardin, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elijah Cunningham, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Zerbe, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Austin Murphy, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Giles, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Lawson, helpless and dependent child of George Lawson, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy Jane Bush, widow of Albert R. Bush, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Bernkopf, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza E. Wells, widow of Alexander N. Wells, late of Companies F and H, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William M. Goad, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Whitney, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Beck, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Mississippi Marine Brigade, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Rector, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hewitt, late of Company I, One hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hart, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Farley, widow of James E. Farley, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lewis M. Jarvis, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Hayward, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Courliss, late of Company G, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Coffin, former widow of Isaac D. Blood, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-eighth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Fredrica C. Gorman, widow of Charles Gorman, late of Company H, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James H. Goodrich, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Forsythe, widow of John Forsythe, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Margaret Ann Forsythe, helpless and dependent child of said John Forsythe, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha J. Forsythe the name of said Margaret Ann Forsythe shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha J. Forsythe.

The name of James Cram, late of Company A, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Wilcox, widow of Malcom W. Wilcox, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Kate Klima, widow of John Klima, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Beach, widow of Benjamin Beach, late lieutenant colonel Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Cummings, late of Company B, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Ryan, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Carver, widow of Wiley Carver, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Tharp, widow of Alfred Tharp, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and twenty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelaide Lee, former widow of Edward Jenkins, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jesse T. Kellett, helpless and dependent child of James T. Kellett, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth E. Brown, widow of Edward P. Brown, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment, and Company D, Seventh Regiment, Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Goldsworthy, late of Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Hall, late of Company H, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca J. Gist, widow of Thomas Gist, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa W. Haun, widow of Wilson Haun, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Augusta Albert, widow of George Albert, late of Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Barbara Mehringer, widow of John Mehringer, late colonel and brigadier general (brevet) Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elijah D. Robertson, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Bryant, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Golding, helpless and dependent child of William Golding, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Amelia Walker, widow of George J. Walker, late of Company E, Independent Battery Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Wilson, late of Company H, Forty-eighth Regiment, and Company D, Ninety-seventh Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah J. Reed, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Swan, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Senters, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Realie Damron, widow of Wright Damron, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine A. Bailey, widow of Richard S. Bailey, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louisa Patrick, widow of Reuben Patrick, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. McElwee, widow of James McElwee, late of Company G, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Maggie J. McElwee, helpless and dependent child of said James McElwee, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. McElwee, the name of said Maggie J. McElwee shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. McElwee.

The name of Riley Howard, late of Companies D and H, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram W. Shroyer, late of Company H, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca A. Scott, widow of John Scott, late of Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary O. Smith, former widow of William F. Wolfe, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Judson, widow of Charles O. Judson, late of Company A, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Smith, widow of Marcus Smith, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora Day Young, widow of Gen. Charles L. Young, late of Company G, Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Vosburg, former widow of Silas W. Stoddard, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Burke, former widow of Nicholas Keitz, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Maggie Ransdell, widow of William Ransdell, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Adelia Kise, now Chadwick, former widow of Reuben C. Kise, late major, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas Mahoney, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Older, widow of Henry M. Older, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment, and commissary sergeant, Fifteenth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert Roberts, helpless and dependent child of William M. Roberts, late of Company I, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William M. King, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Brewer, late of Companies I and F, Thirty-first Regiment Missouri Enrolled Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ada J. Bevell, widow of Benjamin T. Bevell, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Detrick, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minnie S. Rector, widow of John R. Rector, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 561. Emanuel Pollard.
H. R. 591. Abner Brooks.
H. R. 772. Prior P. Baird.
H. R. 871. Elvin A. Estey.
H. R. 1024. Moses Miller.
H. R. 2374. Benjamin F. Hall.
H. R. 2638. Elizabeth Thurston.
H. R. 2846. Sylvester Rumsey.
H. R. 4792. Sarah P. Deem.
H. R. 4795. Catharine Mann.
H. R. 4798. James A. Carter.
H. R. 5091. Rachel Thompson.
H. R. 5130. Orion P. Howe.
H. R. 5326. James Hunter.
H. R. 5384. Catharine Casler.
H. R. 6275. Samuel P. Beck.
H. R. 6300. Thomas G. Butner.
H. R. 8068. Daniel Snider.
H. R. 8109. George W. Guthrie.
H. R. 8172. Effie A. Smith.
H. R. 8212. Sue S. Benson.
H. R. 8895. Cassius M. Rose.
H. R. 8925. Daniel Derby.
H. R. 8962. Richard S. Carr.
H. R. 9097. Jennie A. Work.
H. R. 9153. George W. Noah.
H. R. 9281. Abraham S. Foster.
H. R. 9405. Johanna Miller.
H. R. 9549. James M. Osborn.
H. R. 9550. Logan McDaniel.
H. R. 9569. John Dryman.
H. R. 9572. Ira B. Timmons.
H. R. 9814. Elijah Hill.
H. R. 9875. William A. Morris.
H. R. 10110. Horace E. Jones.
H. R. 10363. Robert B. Martin.
H. R. 10494. Daniel McLaughlin.
H. R. 10926. Rhoda J. Wright.
H. R. 10958. Loyd G. Harris.
H. R. 10984. John W. Hinds.
H. R. 11029. William Cagney.
H. R. 11267. Eliza J. Butler.
H. R. 11488. Malinda J. Wall.
H. R. 11858. Henrietta H. Blodgett.
H. R. 11873. Susan A. Phillips.
H. R. 11961. Charles Schultz.
H. R. 12039. William Hemstreet.
H. R. 12714. Charles Shanley.
H. R. 12974. James P. Miller.
H. R. 13144. Daniel Difenbaugh.
H. R. 13924. Henry M. Benson.
H. R. 13940. Thomas J. Black.
H. R. 13949. Melissa W. Shaw.
H. R. 13988. Barbara Theiring.
H. R. 14030. Margaret A. Hardin.
H. R. 14168. George O. Steadman.
H. R. 14180. Mary A. Shirey.
H. R. 14221. Fredus H. Aldrich.
H. R. 14370. Ambrose E. Beardsley.
H. R. 14452. Jonathan J. Boyer.
H. R. 14507. Harriet C. Martindale.
H. R. 14540. James A. Hight.
H. R. 14555. Bonaparte Hunnell.
H. R. 14569. Elizabeth Venning.
H. R. 14686. Thomas A. Moore.
H. R. 14854. Augustus E. Dodds.
H. R. 14920. Mary E. Skelton.
H. R. 14982. Alfred Nichols.
H. R. 15022. Catharine McDermott.
H. R. 15082. Maggie Adams.
H. R. 15175. Parthenia E. Brown.
H. R. 15179. Henry Feindt.
H. R. 15339. Thomas Moore.
H. R. 15359. John Papst.
H. R. 15416. Edward Z. Williams.
H. R. 15453. George W. Plank.
H. R. 15482. John Fralick.
H. R. 15564. Andrew J. Grant.
H. R. 15586. Martha J. McMiller.
H. R. 15669. Albert C. Worthington.
H. R. 15788. Jane Sheek.
H. R. 15824. Mary C. Riggs.
H. R. 15943. William W. Wilson.
H. R. 15980. John W. Taylor.
H. R. 16016. Edward Pennefeather.
H. R. 16043. William C. Mitchell.
H. R. 16047. Daniel P. Gill.
H. R. 16119. Charlotte Diller.
H. R. 16140. John C. Potter.
H. R. 16179. Amanda E. Coughanour.
H. R. 16261. Horace B. Hamilton.
H. R. 16334. Joseph C. Freeston.
H. R. 16421. Missoura A. Foster.
H. R. 16439. Nelson J. Letts.
H. R. 16442. John H. Ashbaugh.
H. R. 16462. William Ramage.
H. R. 16464. Rodney W. Anderson.
H. R. 16486. Charles M. Hamburight.
H. R. 16554. Nancy J. Scott.
H. R. 16562. Rebecca S. Merritt.
H. R. 16569. Lovisa Morrison.
H. R. 16539. Aaron F. Miner.
H. R. 16703. Francis M. Fowler.
H. R. 16731. John Benson.
H. R. 16769. Mary J. Oviatt.
H. R. 16845. Katharina Lambelin.
H. R. 16925. Henry W. Morgan.
H. R. 16926. Amos Poe.
H. R. 16949. Louisa V. Dyer.
H. R. 16961. John H. H. Babcock.
H. R. 17009. George Hudson.
H. R. 17055. Milly Schmitt.
H. R. 17056. Walter Walsh.
H. R. 17082. Mary F. Pinckley.
H. R. 17090. Mordica Terry.
H. R. 17091. Sarah E. Tally.
H. R. 17095. Caroline E. Smedley.
H. R. 17100. William Carson.
H. R. 17167. George W. Dowell.
H. R. 17250. John R. McCrillis.
H. R. 17333. Martha Sims.
H. R. 17334. Mary E. Carhart.
H. R. 17429. Frederick Brinkman.
H. R. 17437. Julia C. Barstow.
H. R. 17478. Annie M. Fallihee.
H. R. 17512. Louisa B. Tittle.
H. R. 17548. David E. Brown.
H. R. 17571. Peter P. Swensen.
H. R. 17602. John S. Stout.
H. R. 17897. Hannah Heuser.
H. R. 17898. Nancy E. Wynn.
H. R. 17904. Henry Hodson.
H. R. 17946. Richard J. Bangness.
H. R. 18148. William Hardenbrook.
H. R. 18149. William Zaker.
H. R. 18192. Ann E. Thomas.
H. R. 18249. William Munsell.
H. R. 18276. Lavinia E. Kirkpatrick.
H. R. 18285. Edward D. Millis.
H. R. 18317. Charles Stackhouse.
H. R. 18347. Sarah D. Edwards.
H. R. 18367. Rose Eastman.
H. R. 18387. Fenimore P. Cochran.
H. R. 18396. Oscar Stice.
H. R. 18413. James H. McPherson.
H. R. 18415. Isaac Bell.
H. R. 18434. Charles Clayton.
H. R. 18453. Abraham Mowry.
H. R. 18490. Jennie Webber.
H. R. 18512. Martin S. McDevitt.
H. R. 18546. Carrie Sanno.
H. R. 18548. Mary B. Wilcox.
H. R. 18570. Pauline M. Beach.
H. R. 18586. Andrew J. Dean.
H. R. 18595. Thomas Adams.
H. R. 18603. Selden T. Wilson.
H. R. 18611. Louise Strassier.
H. R. 18681. Mary M. Stone.
H. R. 18701. Edward D. Hurlburt.
H. R. 18749. Fritz Voth.
H. R. 18779. Allen Leed.
H. R. 18793. Levi T. E. Johnson.
H. R. 18848. William M. Steen.
H. R. 18850. Elizabeth J. Kendig.
H. R. 18862. Elizabeth J. Milliken.
H. R. 18869. Adelaide E. Pratt.
H. R. 18882. James Rogers.
H. R. 18901. Corelida J. Babcock.
H. R. 18906. Almira Linscott.
H. R. 18909. Sallie A. Martin.
H. R. 18914. James Ford.

H. R. 18018. Agnes M. Kesler.
H. R. 18065. Mathew Pennington.
H. R. 18076. John Sorrels.
H. R. 18086. Mary E. Goodlander.
H. R. 19025. Gertrude E. Cornell.
H. R. 19032. James Royer.
H. R. 19054. Charles L. Burnham.
H. R. 19071. Charles U. Burns.
H. R. 19129. Harvey Haugh.
H. R. 19132. Marilla Shaklton.
H. R. 19133. Thomas Williams.
H. R. 19134. John McGovern.
H. R. 19143. Nathaniel Perry.
H. R. 19184. Wilhelm Lietzke.
H. R. 19207. Elizabeth M. Myer.
H. R. 19238. Josephine Campbell.
H. R. 19240. Thomas H. Donehower
H. R. 19243. Mary E. Diehl.
H. R. 19388. Louisa C. Raridon.
H. R. 19454. Benjamin F. Farley.
H. R. 19466. Maggie Boos.
H. R. 19484. Harriet N. Weeden.
H. R. 19489. Squire L. Gage.
H. R. 19508. Margarethe Kammerling.
H. R. 19571. Horatio Ecton.
H. R. 19592. Charles H. Hitchens.
H. R. 19594. Henry S. Resh.
H. R. 19600. Calvin P. Elkins.
H. R. 19601. William Kennedy.
H. R. 19603. Bella E. Swartzlander.
H. R. 19607. Almon W. Bennett.
H. R. 19628. George McDonald.
H. R. 19636. Thomas Powell.
H. R. 19649. Margaret J. Davis.
H. R. 19656. Benjamin F. Harris.
H. R. 19659. Allie Truesdell.
H. R. 19665. John W. Lamaster.
H. R. 19677. William Talbot.
H. R. 19680. John L. Berry.
H. R. 19684. Jesse Roark.
H. R. 19686. Decatur Maynard.
H. R. 19689. Phebe A. Bean.
H. R. 19702. Ellen Glider.
H. R. 19714. Jesse P. Earl.
H. R. 19724. Thomas Boling.
H. R. 19725. Joseph W. Kelly.
H. R. 19727. James Harvey.
H. R. 19756. William L. Marshall.
H. R. 19762. John Wilhelm.
H. R. 19767. William R. Ladd.
H. R. 19769. Sarah J. Andrews.
H. R. 19771. John D. McDearmon.
H. R. 19775. William Pickerill.
H. R. 19788. Martin V. Hunt.
H. R. 19792. Cornelia A. Shemo.
H. R. 19793. George H. Hendrickson.
H. R. 19809. Samuel Chapman.
H. R. 19810. Torpley T. Dodge.
H. R. 19811. Robert N. Jessop.
H. R. 19842. Frank Tucker.
H. R. 19843. Thomas E. Hite.
H. R. 19848. Amanda Sullivan.
H. R. 19849. Alma L. Bruce.
H. R. 19864. Lorenzo B. Hines.
H. R. 19867. George H. Williams.
H. R. 19871. Albenna B. Sanders.
H. R. 19879. Mary T. Phillips.
H. R. 19883. Bernard Boyle.
H. R. 19888. Hannah Good.
H. R. 19895. Samuel J. Caldwell.
H. R. 19924. William Jenkins.
H. R. 19936. John Schmalz.
H. R. 19940. Elisabeth A. W. Case.
H. R. 19941. Richard Dunmore.
H. R. 19942. Eliza A. Grant.
H. R. 19945. Carl F. Jensen.
H. R. 19948. David Pratt.
H. R. 19950. John Ellsbury.
H. R. 19956. Margaret Hoary.
H. R. 19958. Amanda Tichenor.
H. R. 19960. James T. Thrasher.
H. R. 19964. John Canote.
H. R. 19990. Catherine A. O'Donnell.
H. R. 19995. Samuel W. Barr.
H. R. 20002. Clara F. Wiley.
H. R. 20004. James Glover.
H. R. 20019. Edward F. Daniels.
H. R. 20052. Joseph Hunter.
H. R. 20053. Lewis W. Carlisle.
H. R. 20067. Sarah A. Murphy.
H. R. 20074. Jannie S. Odell.
H. R. 20082. James H. Wendt.
H. R. 20122. Elijah Adams.
H. R. 20130. Hannah M. Cope.
H. R. 20141. Lella O. Eldridge.
H. R. 20142. William B. Batman.
H. R. 20146. Edmund N. Hatcher.
H. R. 20154. Minerva Hickock.
H. R. 20158. Alice Stebbins.
H. R. 20171. Susannah Wells.
H. R. 20206. Theresa B. Nash.
H. R. 20215. Smith J. Dutton.
H. R. 20219. William Hinckle.
H. R. 20221. William M. Gatchell.
H. R. 20223. Fayette B. Vaughn.
H. R. 20232. Samuel O. McElhaney.
H. R. 20236. Hannah M. Budd.
H. R. 20248. Amanda Keys.
H. R. 20274. Moses R. Hardin.
H. R. 20276. Elijah Cunningham.
H. R. 20296. Isaac Zerbe.
H. R. 20299. Austin Murphy.
H. R. 20302. William W. Giles.
H. R. 20304. Edwin Lawson.
H. R. 20332. Nancy Jane Bush.
H. R. 20334. Isaac Bernkopf.
H. R. 20359. Eliza E. Wells.
H. R. 20360. William M. Goad.
H. R. 20402. James R. Whitney.
H. R. 20421. Francis M. Beck.
H. R. 20429. John T. Rector.
H. R. 20445. William Hewitt.
H. R. 20475. Thomas Hart.
H. R. 20506. Jennie Farley.
H. R. 20518. Lewis M. Jarvis.
H. R. 20533. George W. Hayward.
H. R. 20538. William H. Courliss.
H. R. 20539. Mary E. Coffin.
H. R. 20567. Fredrica C. Gorman.
H. R. 20579. James H. Goodrich.
H. R. 20580. Martha J. Forsythe.
H. R. 20581. James Cram.
H. R. 20591. Mary J. Wilcox.
H. R. 20596. Kate Klima.
H. R. 20597. Mary J. Beach.
H. R. 20599. Joseph A. Cummings.
H. R. 20600. Peter Ryan.
H. R. 20620. Anna Carver.
H. R. 20621. Harriet A. Tharp.
H. R. 20632. Adelaide Lee.
H. R. 20654. Jesse T. Kellett.
H. R. 20661. Elizabeth E. Brown.
H. R. 20676. William Goldsworthy.
H. R. 20698. Amos Hall.
H. R. 20715. Rebecca J. Gist.
H. R. 20716. Louisa W. Haun.
H. R. 20725. Augusta Albert.
H. R. 20726. Barbara Mehringer.
H. R. 20744. Elijah D. Robertson.
H. R. 20753. George E. Bryant.
H. R. 20764. Thomas J. Golding.
H. R. 20767. Amelia Walker.
H. R. 20791. William Wilson.
H. R. 20798. Elijah J. Reed.
H. R. 20836. James Swan.
H. R. 20854. George Senters.
H. R. 20868. Realle Damron.
H. R. 20877. Catherine A. Bailey.
H. R. 20880. Louisa Patrick.
H. R. 20881. Mary A. McElwee.
H. R. 20889. Riley Howard.
H. R. 20902. Hiram W. Shroyer.
H. R. 20903. Rebecca A. Scott.
H. R. 20904. Mary O. Smith.
H. R. 20905. Sarah A. Judson.
H. R. 20906. Elizabeth Smith.
H. R. 20966. Cora Day Young.
H. R. 21012. Harriet Vosburg.
H. R. 21032. Mary Burke.
H. R. 6596. Maggie Ransdell.
H. R. 11211. Adele Kise, now Chadwick.
H. R. 17552. Thomas Mahoney.
H. R. 20009. Mary Older.
H. R. 20522. Albert Roberts.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

There was no demand for a second.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD the reports on the amendment that has been read into the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The reports are as follows:

H. R. 6386. William M. King, aged 69 years, served as a private in Company I, One hundred and sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, from May 5 to September 8, 1864—4 months and 7 days—and is now a pensioner under special act at $30 per month from August 23, 1913.

He was formerly pensioned under the act of February 6, 1907, at $12 per month; also, under the act of June 27, 1890, at $8 per month, for left inguinal hernia, loss of vision of right eye, and eczema.

Address, 17 Grant Place, Washington, D. C.

Board of surgeons, January 5, 1907, found impaired vision, slight hernia, slightly impaired hearing, eczema, and loss of teeth.

Medical testimony indicates that the claimant is totally blind. Financial testimony indicates that he has no source of income but his pension.

An increase to $40 per month is recommended.

H. R. 7404. Thomas Brewer, aged 75 years, served as a private in Companies I and F, Thirty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, from August 10 to December 8, 1862—3 months 29 days—and is now a pensioner under special act at $12 per month from June 6, 1896. No. 910372.

Address, McFall, Mo.

Board of surgeons, November 28, 1894, found epilepsy, disease of heart, asthma, and piles.

Claimant's applications under acts of June 27, 1890, and May 11, 1912, were rejected by the Bureau of Pensions on the ground of no title, for the reason that the above-named organization was never mustered into the service of the United States.

Medical and other testimony filed in this action indicates that the claimant is incapacitated for the performance of manual labor by reason of spinal irritation, affecting the nervous system and other vital organs, supplemented by the testimony of others indicating he has a small home place but no other property nor income from any source except his pension, which it is recommended by the committee be increased to $24 per month.

H. R. 10414. Ada J. Bevell, aged 58 years, is the widow of Benjamin T. Bevell, who served as a private in Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Infantry, from January 25, 1862, to January 24, 1865. Post office, Topeka, Kans. Daily Capital Building. No. 989441.

The soldier was a pensioner at $24 per month for disease of lungs, under the general law.

He and this claimant were married June 21, 1887. They appeared to have lived together as husband and wife until on or about June 1, 1896, when, it is alleged, the soldier deserted her. She filed a claim for one-half his pension, under the act of March 3, 1899, and after a thorough special examination of the claim the same was allowed and she was paid one-half his pension until April 16, 1907, when her name was dropped from the rolls, the soldier having surreptiously secured a decree of divorce from her in another State, in the circuit court of Jackson County, Mo. The soldier died January 9, 1909; subsequent thereto this claimant filed a bill to have the decree of divorce set aside by the circuit court in which the decree was rendered, which was done June 14, 1912.

That part of the decree reciting the findings of facts indicating the cause for relief and the grounds on which the decree of divorce was vacated and set aside and setting forth the relief granted reads as follows:

"The court finds that during all the time Bevell lived in Kansas City, Mo., he knew where this plaintiff was; that he knew where their said children were, and other relations of this plaintoff living in Savannah, Mo.

"The court finds that Benjamin T. Bevell filed his suit for divorce against this plaintiff on December 15, 1906, in this court, and that the allegations in said petition as a ground for divorce were for abandonment and indignities. The court finds that these grounds and others alleged in the petition did not exist and were wholly false and untrue and that the said Benjamin T. Bevell was not the innocent and injured party nor entitled to the relief prayed for. That service in said cause was obtained upon this plaintiff by publication. That said order of publication was granted upon an allegation in the petition as follows: 'Defendant is an nonresident of the State of Missouri and has concealed herself and can not be summoned by the ordinary process of law in this State.' This allegation was sworn to by the said Benjamin T. Bevell. The court finds that said Bevell did know where his wife was at the time of making this affidavit and that such affidavit was false; that he knew that she was nursing their said daughter, Mrs. Webster, in Burlingame, Kans., through a spell of sickness.

"The court finds that the said Benjamin T. Bevell committed a fraud upon this court and deceived this court in the very act of obtaining said decree of divorce; that he violated the rule of this court in divorce cases wherein service by publication the plaintiff is required to give to defendant personal notice of the bringing of said divorce suit; that the said Bevell was notified of the rule of court by his said attorney; that said Bevell committed a fraud upon the court when he testified at the trial of said divorce suit that he did not know where this plaintiff was. The court finds that he did know where she was at said time, but that he falsely testified that he did not know where she was and fraudulently and secretly kept such fact from the court at the time he obtained said decree of divorce. The court further finds that said Benjamin T. Bevell testified at the trial of said divorce suit that the charges and allegations made by him in his petition for divorce against this plaintiff were true, but the court further finds that the said Benjamin T. Bevell's testimony was false and charges and allegations against his wife were false and untrue.

"The court finds that he secretly and fraudulently kept the fact of the pendency of said suit and the obtaining of said decree of divorce from this plaintiff until after the March, 1907, term of this court had passed, nor was her pension stopped until after said term had passed.

"The court finds that through the secret and fraudulent acts of Benjamin T. Bevell this plaintiff was kept away from this court and was kept in ignorance of said divorce proceedings until after the term of court had passed; that the process of this court was used by the said Benjamin T. Bevell for the purpose of effecting fraud upon the rights of plaintiff and to deprive her of all opportunity to contest the justice and the merits of the divorce proceedings and deprived her of her one-half interest in the pension aforesaid; that the said Bevell practiced a gross fraud upon this court in obtaining said decree.

"The court finds that defendant, Benjamin T. Bevell, died on January 9, 1909, owing no debts and owning no real or personal property.

"It is therefore adjudged and decreed by the court that by reason of the secret, wrongful, and fraudulent acts and false swearing of the said defendant, Benjamin T. Bevell, that the said pretended default decree of divorce heretofore granted in this court, to wit, No. 17596, on the 15th day of April, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, set aside and for naught held, and is adjudged to be void and of no effect, and that this plaintiff, Ada J. Bevell, is restored to all the rights she had prior to the granting of said decree of divorce, and that all costs herein be paid by and that execution issue therefor against the defendant."

Following the judgment of the court setting aside the decree granting the soldier a divorce from the claimant, she filed a claim for pension as his widow, which claim was denied and rejected August 5, 1912, "on the ground of no title, the soldier having procured a divorce from the claimant April 16, 1907. This bureau declines to accept the decree of annulment of her divorce from the soldier obtained since his death." An appeal to the honorable Secretary of the Interior was entered December 2, 1912, who affirmed the action of the Bureau of Pensions in the following language:

"The bureau refused to consider the vacating decree for the reason that the court was without power to render it. The only question is, therefore, whether the court had such power.

"The law of Missouri is plain and explicit relative to the power of courts to vacate, modify, or review a decree of divorce. By section 2931, Revised Statutes (1899), appeals in divorce suits must be allowed at the term at which the judgment or decree was rendered or a writ of error must be sued out within 60 days after the rendition of the decree.

"Section 2932 provides as follows:

"'No petition for review of any judgment for divorce rendered in any case arising under this chapter shall be allowed, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding; but there may be a review of any order or judgment touching the alimony and maintenance of the wife and the care and custody of the children or any of them as is in other cases.'

"The appellate courts of Missouri hold that under section 2932 where the necessary jurisdictional facts appear of record and are found by the court to exist the opposite party in a divorce suit is precluded from showing that they do not exist as a matter of fact except upon proceedings by appeal or writ of error. (See Salisbury *v.* Salisbury, 92 Mo., 683; Childs *v.* Childs, 11 Mo., App., 395; Nave *v.* Nave, 28 Mo. App., 505; Hansford *v.* Hansford, 34 Mo. App., 242; Smith *v.* Smith, 48 Mo. App., 612.)

"In Salisbury *v.* Salisbury the supreme court held:

"'A decree of divorce becomes final and conclusive as against a petition for review whether under a statute or based upon the ground of fraud after the expiration of the term at which it was obtained where the court had jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter.'

"From the cited decisions it clearly appears that under the law of Missouri a court is without power to vacate a decree of divorce except as provided by section 2932, where no jurisdictional defects in the proceedings appear of record.

"The decree of the circuit court on the bill of the appellant vacating its decree divorcing the appellant and the soldier contains no finding of any jurisdictional defect appearing in the divorce proceedings. It does contain findings, expressly dehors the record in said proceedings, that the soldier did not have a cause for divorce and that the law as to notice was not complied with. But if the soldier, as a matter of fact, had no cause for divorce and the law as to notice was not actually complied with, inasmuch as the record shows such cause and a compliance with the law as to notice, the appellant could not be afforded relief on motion, a bill for review or any proceedings in equity as relief by said methods is expressly prohibited by section 2932. The vacating decree on her bill for review was rendered in direct violation of said section and is therefore void and of no effect."

The records and files of the Bureau of Pensions show the claimant was duly notified of the termination of her right to draw one-half of the soldier's pension April 16, 1906, and it does not appear that she made protest to the dropping of her name from the rolls or to validity of the judgment and decree of the court granting the divorce until something like five years after such action had been taken and about three years after the soldier's death. She apparently acquiesced in the decree of divorce during his lifetime of which she had full knowledge, and admitted its probity in her claim for reimbursement filed February 24, 1909, and which was allowed and paid her from the soldier's accrued pension; and from all the evidence in the case it is manifest she procured the annulment of the decree of divorce for the specific purpose of giving her status for pension as the soldier's widow.

It is clear, however, from the evidence in the case that because of the dishonest and disreputable conduct of the soldier in securing the divorce from the claimant by concealment and fraud must, under existing laws, operate to the claimant's loss and disadvantage, and to deprive her of her rights as his widow, and whatever her legal status under existing pension laws, adverse though it be, it appears to this committee she may have an equitable title to pension.

Testimony filed with this committee indicates the claimant is without means of support; that she has no property of any consequence nor income from any source except her own labor, which amounts to, approximately, $7 per week.

It is recommended by this committee she be granted a pension of $12 per month.

H. R. 18495, Charles A. Detrick, aged 71 years, served as a private in Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Infantry, from August 14, 1862, to September 21, 1863; length of service, 1 year, 1 month, and 8 days; post office, Alvin, Tex.

The claimant is now pensioned by special act of Congress at $24 per month, approved February 13, 1911. He was formerly pensioned under the general law at the rate of $17 per month for chronic diarrhea and resulting disease of rectum, dyspepsia, and disease of lungs, and disease of mouth result of scurvy. He was last examined by a board of surgeons June 4, 1913, when rated at $8 for diarrhea, $4 for dyspepsia, $8 for disease of heart, and $4 for disease of rectum. A rate of $30 per month was recommended by the board. On that certificate his claim for increase to $30 per month under the disability clause of the act of May 11, 1912, was denied on the ground he was not unable to perform manual labor by reason of the diseases for which formerly pensioned under the general law or diseases of service origin.

The claimant presents this committee with the testimony of a physician et al., indicating the claimant is unfitted for and unable to perform labor by reason of disease of ears (total of one ear and only able to hear watch tick with the other) and disease of stomach and bowels, which is supplemented with other information in writing indicating he possesses but "little property and is practically dependent on his pension."

It is therefore recommended his pension be increased to $30 per month.

H. R. 20512, Minnie S. Rector, aged 70 years, is the widow of John E. Rector, who served as a sergeant in Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Infantry, from August 10, 1864, to July 5, 1865 (10 months and 25 days).

Post-office address, Sedalia, Mo.

The soldier was pensioned at $15 per month under the act of February 6, 1907.

He and this claimant were married December 7, 1893, and were recognized as husband and wife to the date of his death, June 17, 1912. She was paid his accrued pension, but has no status under existing laws, by reason of her marriage to soldier subsequent to the passage of the act of June 27, 1890. It does not appear that she has remarried.

The testimony filed in this action indicates that the only property the claimant owns is a small house, presumably made use of as a home; that she has no other means of support and depends upon the kindness of her friends and relatives for her maintenance.

It is recommended by this committee that she be granted a pension of $12 per month.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, is the question on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is; all those in favor of suspending the rules and passing the bill will answer "aye" and those opposed will answer "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 39, answered "present" 12, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 54.]

YEAS—235.

Abercrombie	Dupré	Kelley, Mich.	Platt
Adair	Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Plumley
Alexander	Esch	Kennedy, Conn.	Porter
Allen	Evans	Kennedy, Iowa	Post
Anderson	Falconer	Kent	Powers
Anthony	Farr	Kettner	Raker
Ashbrook	Ferris	Key, Ohio	Rauch
Austin	Fess	Kiess, Pa.	Reilly, Conn.
Bailey	Fields	Kindel	Reilly, Wis.
Baker	Fitzgerald	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rogers
Baltz	FitzHenry	Kirkpatrick	Rouse
Barchfeld	Flood, Va.	Kitchin	Rubey
Barnhart	Floyd, Ark.	Knowland, J. R.	Rucker
Barton	Fordney	Konop	Russell
Bathrick	Foster	Kreider	Saunders
Beakes	Fowler	Lafferty	Scott
Bell, Cal.	Francis	La Follette	Seldomridge
Blackmon	Frear	Lazaro	Shackleford
Booher	French	Lee, Pa.	Sherwood
Borchers	Gallivan	Lenroot	Sinnott
Borland	Garrett, Tenn.	Lever	Sloan
Britten	Gillett	Lieb	Smith, Idaho
Brown, N. Y.	Gilmore	Lindbergh	Smith, J. M. C.
Browne, Wis.	Gittins	Lloyd	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Glass	Lobeck	Smith, Minn.
Bulkley	Goeke	Lonergan	Stafford
Burke, S. Dak.	Good	McAndrews	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, Wis.	Graham, Ill.	McClellan	Stephens, Nebr.
Burnett	Gray	McGillicuddy	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Green, Iowa	McGuire, Okla.	Stone
Campbell	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Stringer
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Sutherland
Carter	Gudger	MacDonald	Switzer
Casey	Guernsey	Madden	Taggart
Chandler, N. Y.	Hamilton, Mich.	Maguire, Nebr.	Talbott, Md.
Church	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Tavenner
Ciancy	Hamlin	Mapes	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Fla.	Harris	Martin	Ten Eyck
Claypool	Haugen	Miller	Thacher
Cline	Hawley	Mitchell	Thomas
Coady	Hayden	Mondell	Thompson, Okla.
Connelly, Kans.	Hayes	Moon	Thomson, Ill.
Connolly, Iowa	Heflin	Morgan, Okla.	Towner
Conry	Helgesen	Morrison	Townsend
Cooper	Helm	Moss, Ind.	Tuttle
Cox	Helvering	Moss, W. Va.	Underhill
Cramton	Henry	Mulkey	Underwood
Cullop	Hensley	Murdock	Vare
Curry	Hill	Murray	Vollmer
Danforth	Hinds	Neeley, Kans.	Volstead
Davenport	Holland	Nolan, J. I.	Wallin
Deitrick	Houston	Norton	Walters
Dershem	Howell	O'Hair	White
Dickinson	Hulings	Oldfield	Williams
Dillon	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer	Wingo
Dixon	Igoe	Parker, N. J.	Woodruff
Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. Y.	Woods
Doolittle	Johnson, Utah	Peters	Young, N. Dak.
Doremus	Keating	Peterson	

NAYS—39.

Adamson	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Stephens, Tex.
Aiken	Eagle	Jacoway	Sumners
Aswell	Finley	Page, N. C.	Tribble
Beall, Tex.	Garner	Park	Vaughan
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tex.	Quin	Walker
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Rayburn	Watkins
Callaway	Goodwin, Ark.	Sisson	Webb
Candler, Miss.	Gregg	Smith, Tex.	Whaley
Caraway	Hardy	Stedman	Young, Tex.
Collier	Harrison	Stephens, Miss.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Bell, Ga.	Carlin	Hughes, Ga.	Montague
Buchanan, Ill.	Crisp	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Burgess	Gordon	McKellar	Taylor, Ark.

NOT VOTING—138.

Ainey	Brockson	Brumbaugh	Carr
Avis	Brodbeck	Burke, Pa.	Cary
Barkley	Broussard	Byrns, Tenn.	Copley
Bartholdt	Brown, W. Va.	Calder	Crosser
Bartlett	Browning	Cantor	Dale
Bowdle	Bruckner	Carew	Davis

Decker	Hart	Manahan	Sells
Dent	Hay	Metz	Sherley
Difenderfer	Hinebaugh	Moore	Shreve
Donohoe	Hobson	Morgan, La.	Sims
Dooling	Howard	Morin	Slemp
Doughton	Hoxworth	Mott	Small
Driscoll	Hughes, W. Va.	Neely, W. Va.	Smith, N. Y.
Drukker	Hull	Nelson	Smith, Saml. W.
Dunn	Johnson, S. C.	O'Brien	Sparkman
Eagan	Johnson, Wash.	Oglesby	Stanley
Edwards	Jones	O'Shaunessy	Steenerson
Elder	Kahn	Padgett	Stevens, N. H.
Estopinal	Keister	Paige, Mass.	Stout
Fairchild	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten, N. Y.	Talcott, N. Y.
Faison	Kinkead, N. J.	Patton, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.
Fergusson	Korbly	Phelan	Taylor, N. Y.
Gallagher	Langham	Pou	Temple
Gard	Langley	Price	Treadway
Gardner	L'Engle	Prouty	Vinson
George	Lesher	Ragsdale	Walsh
Gerry	Levy	Rainey	Watson
Gill	Lewis, Md.	Reed	Weaver
Goldfogle	Lewis, Pa.	Riordan	Whitacre
Gorman	Lindquist	Roberts, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Goulden	Linthicum	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, N. Y.
Graham, Pa.	Loft	Rothermel	Winslow
Griest	Logue	Rupley	Witherspoon
Griffin	Mahan	Sabath	
Hamill	Maher	Scully	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Until further notice:

Mr. DALE with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. DENT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. CARY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. GARD with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. GOULDEN with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. HAY with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. PHELAN with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. POU with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. VINSON with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. TEMPLE.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Before taking up the next bill the Chair desires to make a statement. The rules of the House prohibit smoking inside of this Hall. Complaint has been made to the Chair more than once about Members smoking in the Hall. Now, there is plenty of space outside of this Hall for gentlemen to smoke. And, while the Chair is at it, he will suggest it is a good thing for Members to keep their feet down from the tops of the seats. [Applause.]

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 21089.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, with amendments in it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21089) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Mary E. Dougherty, widow of Frank Dougherty, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Frank Dougherty until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Mary Nachbar, widow of Mathias C. Nachbar, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Mathias C. Nachbar until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Floyd L. Campbell, late of Company M, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward J. Prime, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Thomas D. O'Shea, late of Company L, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of John H. Bostick, late of Company D, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of George W. Burleson, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Herman Grasse, late of Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Rebecca Horn, late nurse, Medical Department United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James P. McClintock, late of Company K, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Ross Robison, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of John Rielly, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company D, Ninth Regiment, United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Frank Sanderson, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis S. Richey, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $8 per month.

The name of Elmer E. Frederick, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Bridget Moran, dependent mother of James L. Moran, late of Company K, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henderson Ramey, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Grant W. Berry, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Miller, late of Troop F, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Bridget Gaffney, widow of Patrick Gaffney, late of Troop K, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert Wilson, late of Company F, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edmund P. Miller, late major, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Julia Ward, dependent mother of Michael J. Ward, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John H. Turpin, late of Company K, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maurice J. Gordon, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $8 per month.

The name of Robert G. Knox, late of Troop L, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Henry W. B. Mechling, late of Troop H, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Berdie Sarratt, widow of Ralph Sarratt, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional for each of the minor children of the said Ralph Sarratt until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles J. German, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William M. Hairston, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bohan, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel A. Kanipe, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment (Custer's brigade, Indian war), and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Eugene F. Clements, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harry Yates, late of Troop B, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Chester A. Walker, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James E. Gallagher, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John H. Wynn, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph Jacobs, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Catherine Patterson, widow of Henry Patterson, late of Capt. Morgan's company, Iowa Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Julia O'Neil, widow of Bartholomew O'Neil, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Everett R. Barrett, late of the Sixty-first Company United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. Tatum, late of Company D, First Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Maggie C. Slaughter, widow of John W. Slaughter, late of Company L, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said John W. Slaughter until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Herbert C. Miller, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Labadie, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Siebert, widow of Max Siebert, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Max Siebert until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Scott F. Wickwire, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Thompson, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Harry V. Hafner, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Jones, dependent mother of William P. Wolf, late of Company I, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward V. Rutter, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ethelyn M. Ulsh, widow of William H. Ulsh, late assistant surgeon, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louis Naegele, late of Troop D, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John J. F. Petty, late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Virginia Craddock, widow of Alexander G. Craddock, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Cunningham (insane), late of Company A, First Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month, payable to the duly appointed guardian.

The name of Georgia A. Bowen, dependent mother of James O. Bowen, late of Company D, First Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Perry B. Bowman, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Daniel Miles, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Mary Guldenzoph, widow of Hervey Guldenzoph, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth N. Hubert, widow of Napoleon W. Hubert, late of Company K, Second Regiment Mississippi Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda D. Clark, widow of Felix G. Clark, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Conley, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Eli M. Blair, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Delia M. Mullarkey, widow of Bernard Mullarkey, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Bernard Mullarkey until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William Henry Gray, late of Troop I, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Hannah E. Bush, widow of Benjamin W. Bush, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Carah, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David A. Kooker, late of Company I, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Susan Dovener, widow of James Dovener, late of Battery E, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virginia Smith, dependent mother of Courtney Smith, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Begien, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George Lee, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob P. Marling, late of Company C, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Fred Finney, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Florence D. Hanna, widow of John P. Hanna, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said John P. Hanna until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Clare D. Fielding, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Hawley J. Smith, late foot service (white), United States Army, and of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Leslie N. Neigenfind, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Eugene Golden, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martha J. Kelly, widow of Zachariah Kelly, late of Company G, and drum major Second Regiment Mississippi Foot Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Franklin L. Babb, alias Frank L. Rose, late of Company K, First Regiment Washington Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of John J. Driscoll, late of the U. S. S. *Bennington*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Green, late of Company A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of W. Irvin Long, late of Company A, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Enoch W. Lancy, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Isiphine Royster, widow of John S. Royster, late of Blackman's company, First Tennessee Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virgil T. Gregory, late of Company I, Second Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Charles G. Farling, late of the Sixty-eighth Company United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Charles N. B. Nicholson, late of United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Gorman, late chief trumpeter Seventy-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles D. Comstock, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of James W. Fisher, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Ann Fisher, widow of David F. Fisher, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward H. Richards, late of Troop G, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Mary F. Carson, widow of William H. Carson, late of Company G, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marian E. Keyes, widow of Charles H. Keyes, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of each minor child of the said Charles H. Keyes until they reach the age of 16 years.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 841. Mary E. Dougherty.
H. R. 966. Mary Nachbar.
H. R. 1037. Floyd L. Campbell.
H. R. 1063. Edward J. Prime.
H. R. 2012. Thomas D. O'Shea.
H. R. 2532. John H. Bostick.
H. R. 2788. George W. Burleson.
H. R. 3081. Herman Grasse.
H. R. 3513. Rebecca Horn.
H. R. 3528. James P. McClintock.
H. R. 4225. Ross Robison.
H. R. 4433. John Reilly.
H. R. 4553. James Frank Sanderson.
H. R. 4595. Willis S. Ritchey.
H. R. 5248. Elmer E. Frederick.

H. R. 5312. Bridget Moran.
H. R. 5322. Henderson Ramey.
H. R. 5374. Grant W. Berry.
H. R. 5566. William Miller.
H. R. 6088. Bridget Gaffney.
H. R. 6475. Robert Wilson.
H. R. 7393. Edmund P. Miller.
H. R. 7587. Julia Ward.
H. R. 8918. John H. Turpin.
H. R. 9498. Maurice J. Gordon.
H. R. 9723. Robert G. Knox.
H. R. 10293. Henry W. B. Mechling.
H. R. 10348. Berdie Sarratt.
H. R. 10429. Charles J. German.
H. R. 10632. William M. Hairston.
H. R. 10922. William H. Bohan.
H. R. 11055. Daniel A. Kanipe.
H. R. 11209. Eugene F. Clements.
H. R. 11413. Harry Yates.
H. R. 11610. Chester A. Walker.
H. R. 12523. James E. Gallagher.
H. R. 13199. John H. Wynn.
H. R. 13253. Joseph Jacobs.
H. R. 13619. Catherine Patterson.
H. R. 13859. Julia O'Neil.
H. R. 13897. Everett R. Barrett.
H. R. 14145. Thomas B. Tatum.
H. R. 14611. Maggie C. Slaughter.
H. R. 14647. Herbert C. Miller.
H. R. 15052. David Labadie.
H. R. 15090. Margaret Siebert.
H. R. 15177. Scott F. Wickwire.
H. R. 15370. Charles Thompson.
H. R. 15382. Harry V. Hafner.
H. R. 15638. Anna M. Jones.
H. R. 15871. Edward V. Rutter.
H. R. 16251. Ethelyn M. Ulsh.
H. R. 16523. Louis Naegele.
H. R. 16621. John J. F. Petty.
H. R. 16797. Virginia Craddock.
H. R. 16888. Thomas H. Cunningham.
H. R. 17258. Georgia A. Bowen.
H. R. 17335. Perry B. Bowman.
H. R. 17337. Daniel Miles.
H. R. 17572. Mary Guldenzoph.
H. R. 17629. Elizabeth N. Hubert.
H. R. 17820. Matilda D. Clark.
H. R. 17848. Thomas Conley.
H. R. 18114. Eli M. Blair.
H. R. 18138. Delia M. Mullarkey.
H. R. 18323. William Henry Gray.
H. R. 18345. Hannah E. Bush.
H. R. 18702. William J. Carah.
H. R. 18726. David A. Kooker.
H. R. 18730. Susan Dovener.
H. R. 18798. Virginia Smith.
H. R. 18952. Charles W. Begien.
H. R. 19103. George Lee.
H. R. 19193. Jacob P. Marling.
H. R. 19206. Fred Finney.
H. R. 19260. Florence D. Hanna.
H. R. 19460. Clare D. Fielding.
H. R. 19490. Hawley J. Smith.
H. R. 19623. Leslie N. Neigenfind.
H. R. 19626. Eugene Goldin.
H. R. 19703. Martha J. Kelly.
H. R. 19897. Franklin L. Babb.
H. R. 20071. John J. Driscoll.
H. R. 20079. William H. Green.
H. R. 20214. W. Irvin Long.
H. R. 20364. Enoch W. Laney.
H. R. 20407. Isiphine Royster.
H. R. 20545. Virgil T. Gregory.
H. R. 20548. Charles G. Farling.
H. R. 20554. Charles N. B. Nicholson.
H. R. 20656. John J. Gorman.
H. R. 20677. Charles D. Comstock.
H. R. 20768. James W. Fisher.
H. R. 20772. Catharine Ann Fisher.
H. R. 20924. Edward H. Richards.
H. R. 20967. Mary F. Carson.
H. R. 20999. Marian E. Keyes.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on this bill? If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in the judgment of the Chair (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)——

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Seven gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one gentlemen are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 30, answered "present" 9, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 55.]

YEAS—241.

Abercrombie	Connelly, Kans.	Good	Knowland, J. R.
Adair	Connolly, Iowa	Goodwin, Ark.	Konop
Aiken	Conry	Graham, Ill.	Kreider
Alexander	Cooper	Gray	Lafferty
Allen	Cox	Green, Iowa	La Follette
Anderson	Cramton	Greene, Mass.	Lazaro
Ashbrook	Cullop	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Pa.
Austin	Curry	Gudger	Lenroot
Bailey	Danforth	Hamilton, Mich.	Lever
Baker	Davenport	Harris	Lieb
Baltz	Davis	Haugen	Lindbergh
Barchfeld	Deitrick	Hawley	Lloyd
Barkley	Dershem	Hayden	Lobeck
Barnhart	Dickinson	Hayes	Lonergan
Bartlett	Dillon	Heflin	McAndrews
Barton	Dixon	Helgesen	McClellan
Bathrick	Donovan	Helm	McGillicuddy
Beakes	Doolittle	Helvering	McKenzie
Bell, Cal.	Doremus	Henry	McLaughlin
Blackmon	Dupré	Hensley	MacDonald
Booher	Edmonds	Hill	Madden
Borchers	Esch	Hinds	Maguire, Nebr.
Borland	Evans	Holland	Manahan
Britten	Falconer	Houston	Mann
Brown, N. Y.	Farr	Howell	Mapes
Buchanan, Ill.	Ferris	Hulings	Martin
Bryan	Fess	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller
Bulkley	Fields	Igoe	Mitchell
Burke, S. Dak.	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Mondell
Burke, Wis.	Fitzhenry	Johnson, S. C.	Montague
Burnett	Flood, Va.	Johnson, Wash.	Moon
Butler	Fordney	Keating	Moore
Byrns, Tenn.	Foster	Kelley, Mich.	Morgan, Okla.
Campbell	Fowler	Kelly, Pa.	Morrison
Cantrill	Francis	Kennedy, Conn.	Moss, Ind.
Carlin	Frear	Kennedy, Iowa	Moss, W. Va.
Carr	French	Kent	Mulkey
Carter	Gallivan	Kettner	Murdock
Casey	Gard	Key, Ohio	Murray
Church	Garrett, Tenn.	Kiess, Pa.	Neeley, Kans.
Clancy	Gillett	Kindel	Neely, W. Va.
Claypool	Gilmore	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nolan, J. I.
Cline	Gittins	Kirkpatrick	Norton
Coady	Goeke	Kitchin	O'Hair
Oldfield	Rucker	Stringer	Underwood
Padgett	Russell	Sutherland	Vare
Palmer	Saunders	Switzer	Vollmer
Parker, N. J.	Scott	Taggart	Volstead
Parker, N. Y.	Seldomridge	Tavenner	Walker
Patton, Pa.	Shackleford	Taylor, Ark.	Wallin
Peterson	Sherwood	Taylor, Colo.	Walters
Platt	Sinnott	Temple	Watkins
Plumley	Sloan	Ten Eyck	White
Porter	Smith, Idaho	Thacher	Williams
Powers	Smith, J. M. C.	Thomas	Wingo
Raker	Smith, Md.	Thompson, Okla.	Woodruff
Reilly, Conn.	Smith, Minn.	Thomson, Ill.	Woods
Reilly, Wis.	Stephens, Cal.	Towner	Young, N. Dak.
Rogers	Stevens, Minn.	Townsend	
Rouse	Stone	Tuttle	
Rubey	Stout	Underhill	

NAYS—30.

Aswell	Dies	Harrison	Sumners
Beall, Tex.	Eagle	Park	Tribble
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	Quin	Vaughan
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	Rayburn	Webb
Callaway	Garrett, Tex.	Sisson	Whaley
Candler, Miss.	Godwin, N. C.	Smith, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Collier	Gregg	Stephens, Miss.	
Crisp	Hardy	Stephens, Tex.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Bell, Ga.	Gordon	Humphreys, Miss.	Page, N. C.
Burgess	Hughes, Ga.	Lee, Ga.	Slayden
Glass			

NOT VOTING—144.

Adamson	Elder	Korbly	Riordan
Ainey	Estopinal	Langham	Roberts, Mass.
Anthony	Fairchild	Langley	Roberts, Nev.
Avis	Faison	L'Engle	Rothermel
Bartholdt	Fergusson	Lesher	Rupley
Bowdle	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Sabath
Brockson	Gallagher	Lewis, Md.	Scully
Brodbeck	Gardner	Lewis, Pa.	Sells
Broussard	George	Lindquist	Sherley
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	Linthicum	Shreve
Browne, Wis.	Gill	Loft	Sims
Browning	Goldfogle	Logue	Slemp
Bruckner	Gorman	McGuire, Okla.	Small
Brumbaugh	Goulden	McKellar	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Mahan	Smith, Saml. W.
Calder	Griest	Maher	Sparkman
Cantor	Griffin	Metz	Stafford
Caraway	Guernsey	Morgan, La.	Stanley
Carew	Hamill	Morin	Stedman
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Hamlin	Nelson	Stephens, Nebr.
Clark, Fla.	Hart	O'Brien	Stevens, N. H.
Copley	Hay	Oglesby	Talbott, Md.
Crosser	Hinebaugh	O'Shaunessy	Talcott, N. Y.
Dale	Hobson	Paige, Mass.	Taylor, Ala.
Decker	Howard	Patten, N. Y.	Taylor, N. Y.
Dent	Hoxworth	Peters	Treadway
Difenderfer	Hughes, W. Va.	Phelan	Vinson
Donohoe	Hull	Post	Walsh
Dooling	Jacoway	Pou	Watson
Doughton	Johnson, Utah	Price	Weaver
Driscoll	Jones	Prouty	Whitacre
Drukker	Kahn	Ragsdale	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Keister	Rainey	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Rauch	Winslow
Edwards	Kinkead, N. J.	Reed	Witherspoon

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SMALL with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. CALDER.
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DRUKKER.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. AINEY.
Mr. McKELLAR with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.
Mr. PRICE with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. GUERNSEY.
Mr. RAUCH with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. JOHNSON of Utah.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. PETERS.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and the widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it and read the amendments into the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Otho Peterson, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Eugene P. Twiford, late of Company M, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Giles A. Woolsey, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel L. Watson, late of Fifty-eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred B. Perkins, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. McAndrew, late of Hroop B, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Schahn, late of Troop C, Fifteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Burns, late of Troop I, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Gardner, late of Troop F, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elmer E. Sprague, late of Company E, Sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month.

The name of Frank Doering, late of Troop A, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lauchling McDonald, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Minnie A. Cullen, widow of William Cullen, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said William Cullen until it reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Maurice Downey, late cabin steward of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas Coriam, late of Battery C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alphonsus L. Crook, late of Companies D and L, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Andrew Mospens, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Egan, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel Madigan, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Zenas A. Hinson, late of Battery A, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. Moore, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas D. Parks, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Ramey, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clay A. Armstrong, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen M. Jackson, late of Troop C, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Dudley C. Griswold, late of Company F, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William J. Mester, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, and Company M, Third Battalion United States Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellis Ames, late of Company D, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Violet P. Winslow, widow of Richard P. Winslow, late captain, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Richard P. Winslow until it reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Homer C. Dodd, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John O. Lind, late of Battery F, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Gertrude M. Haydon, widow of Thomas L. Haydon, late second lieutenant Company D, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said Thomas L. Haydon until it reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of William A. Bowen, late of Company E, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Artaminca A. Conner, widow of Andrew J. Conner, alias Andrew J. Levi, late of Company D, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Shannon, widow of John Shannon, late of Capt. Witherup's company, Pennsylvania Militia, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gertrude S. Kessler, widow of William S. Kessler, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of three minor children of the said William S. Kessler until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Marcella Matlock, widow of John Matlock, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa M. Johnson, widow of William S. Johnson, late of Capt. Holmes's company, First Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 1378. Otho Peterson.	H. R. 15344. Daniel Madigan.
H. R. 3313. Eugene P. Twiford.	H. R. 15979. Zenas A. Hinson.
H. R. 3622. Giles A. Woolsey.	H. R. 16428. Thomas J. Moore.
H. R. 6273. Daniel L. Watson.	H. R. 16971. Thomas D. Parks.
H. R. 6759. Fred B. Perkins.	H. R. 17280. John W. Ramey.
H. R. 7203. John W. McAndrew.	H. R. 18120. Clay A. Armstrong.
H. R. 9057. William Schahn.	H. R. 18208. Allen M. Jackson.
H. R. 9641. Peter Burns.	H. R. 18777. Dudley C. Griswold.
H. R. 10351. James J. Gardner.	H. R. 19333. William J. Mester.
H. R. 10622. Elmer E. Sprague.	H. R. 19465. Ellis Ames.
H. R. 10774. Frank Doering.	H. R. 19576. Violet P. Winslow.
H. R. 11371. Lauchling McDonald.	H. R. 19837. Homer C. Dodd.
H. R. 11437. Minnie A. Cullen.	H. R. 19996. John O. Lind.
H. R. 13034. Maurice Downey.	H. R. 20228. Gertrude M. Haydon.
H. R. 13384. Thomas Coriam.	H. R. 20483. William A. Bowen.
H. R. 14102. Alphonsus L. Crook.	H. R. 20564. Artaminca A. Conner.
H. R. 14148. Andrew Mospens.	H. R. 21038. Mary A. Shannon.
H. R. 15342. George E. Egan.	H. R. 21087. Gertrude S. Kessler.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on this bill?

A second was not demanded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have here a report in support of the two last amendments that I would like to have inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It can not be done unless the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withholds his motion.

Mr. MANN. I will withhold it until that is done, if my motion is taken up afterwards.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the statements will be inserted in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The statements are as follows:

H. R. 21028. Marcella Matlock, 819 South Cecil Street, Louisville, Ky., widow of John Matlock, deceased, who served during the War with Mexico, in Company D, Fourth Kentucky Volunteers, from October 2, 1847, to July 25, 1848. (W. C. 14629.)

The soldier died January 9, 1907, and the widow was pensioned at $8 per month from the day following his death, under the act of January 29, 1887, and the rate of her pension was increased to $12 per month by the act of April 19, 1908, which she now receives, and which is the maximum allowed by existing law. It is shown by evidence filed with the bill, consisting of affidavits of the petitioner and several competent witnesses, that she possesses no property, is 73 years of age, and depends on her pension of $12 per month for a living.

H. R. 19750. Louisa M. Johnson, Gainesville, Ga., widow of William S. Johnson, deceased, who served during the War with Mexico in Capt. Isaac Holmes's company, First Georgia Volunteers, from June 1 to September 19, 1846. (W. C. 9310.)

The soldier died February 11, 1861, and the widow was pensioned at $8 per month from January 29, 1887, under the act of that date. The rate of her pension was increased to $12 per month by the general act of April 19, 1908, which she now receives, and which is the maximum allowed by existing law. It is shown by evidence filed with the bill, consisting of affidavits of the widow and several competent witnesses, that all of the property which the petitioner possesses consists of a note for $700, from which she receives $56 a year, and that she depends on this and her pension of $12 per month for a living. It is also shown that she is over 82 years of age, and very feeble and infirm in health.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, February 2, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $2,000,000 toward the construction and operation of railroads in Alaska (H. Doc. No. 1538); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting report of the Chief of the Division of Safety concerning a test of the automatic train-control system of the American Train Control Co., Baltimore, Md. (H. Doc. No. 1541); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. Letter from the president of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway Co., transmitting the report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1542); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1543); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the president of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington, transmitting report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1544); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the president of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co., transmitting report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1545); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

7. Letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1546); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

8. Letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing the quantity of useless and discarded books and papers which had accumulated in the bureaus of that department and in the office of the Civil Service Commission, and the disposition thereof (H. Doc. No. 1547); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

9. Letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., with a list of its stockholders for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1548); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

10. Letter from the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a memorial on the need of a national advisory committee for aeronautics in the United States (H. Doc. No. 1549); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

11. Letter from the treasurer of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co., transmitting report of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1550); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting detailed estimates of expenses made necessary under the provision of an act approved January 28, 1915, which are in addition to the estimates in the annual Book of Estimates already submitted for 1916 under the separate heads of Revenue-Cutter Service and Life-Saving Service, also an estimate for the Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1551); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

13. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of the communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting two estimates of appropriations for the protection and improvement of Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo. (H. Doc. No. 1552); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1718) to require all transportation companies, firms, and persons within the District of Columbia to provide separate accommodations for the white and negro races and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1340); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4522) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved June 29, 1906, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1341); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20008) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 21271) to provide for the issue of bonds to be known as the popular Government loan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 21272) repealing section 4 of an act to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves, approved June 11, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 21273) to provide an elective remedy and compensation for accidental injuries, resulting in disability or death, to employees of common carriers by railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in the District of Columbia or the Territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FERRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit manufacture, sale, transportation, exportation, and importation of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, asking Congress to pass the Hobson-Sheppard resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting manufacture, etc., of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, urging the Congress of the United States to pass the Sheppard-Hobson resolution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, and importation of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 21274) granting an increase of pension to John W. McDaniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 21275) granting an increase of pension to Tillie C. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21276) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Oaks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21277) for the relief of the trustees of the Mount Moriah Christian Church; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 21278) granting a pension to Sarah Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 21279) granting a pension to Frank W. Godsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 21280) granting a pension to Daniel B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21281) granting a pension to Herbert B. Holloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21282) granting an increase of pension to Buell M. Cobb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21283) granting an increase of pension to John Derf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21284) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Freshour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21285) granting an increase of pension to David F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21286) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 21287) for the relief of the estate of Amon A. Miller; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 21288) granting a pension to Joseph W. Mitcham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 21289) granting an increase of pension to James Hummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of United Garment Workers' Union, International Cigar Makers' Union, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Switchmen's Union, and International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), memorial of Democratic Club, King County, Wash., favoring passage of ship bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Helen Schrader and sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring an embargo on war material, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, the International Typographical Union, the United Mine Workers of America, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the Switchmen's Union, the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, the International Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance, the Bartenders' International League of America, the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, the Tobacco Workers' International Union, and the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, praying the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Newark (Ohio) Grove, No. 41, U. A. O. D., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of O. H. Aichelmann, Juniata, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, placing embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of New York Commandery, the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, urging Congress to create a national-defense commission; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18666, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Gertrude Welker, of New York City, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill, relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of members of Gumia No. 112, of New York, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Louis Marshall, of New York, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Anton Busch, of New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 9292, relative to employees of Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Copy of resolutions of citizens of De Smet, declaration of St. Mary's Society of Salem, and petitions of sundry citizens of Delmont, Hazel, Mansfield, and Tripp, all of South Dakota, in favor of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by the Sheboygan Turnverein, of Sheboygan, Wis., with a membership of 150, asking for the passage of a law at this session of Congress to levy an embargo upon all contraband of war, save foodstuffs, wearing apparel, and surgical supplies only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of M. Buerger and 13 other citizens of the vicinity of Jackson, Wis., asking for the passage of S. 6688, or any similar measure, to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs, wearing apparel, and surgical supplies only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Woman's Board of Trade of Massachusetts, protesting against foreign labels on American-manufactured goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Tobacco Workers' International Union and sundry organizations of workers of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DILLON: Petitions of sundry citizens, mostly of Madison, S. Dak., favoring passage of resolution 377, relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of G. Kleinschmidt, of Union Hill, N. J., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Outlook Association of California, favoring passage of House joint resolution 344, for national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FESS (by request): Memorial of Ohio Canners' Association, urging the passage of reciprocal tariff laws in reference to canned goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of 12 residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against violations of the spirit of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Louisiana, against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse, against H. R. 18666, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of Arkansas, favoring completion of system of locks and dams above Batesville, Ark.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of Frederick Kilguss, of Providence, R. I., urging passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Providence, R. I., urging the passage of civil-service reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Henry and T. H. McCuskee and Thomas B. Flanagan, of Providence, R. I., urging protection for Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial of organized labor of Brockton, Mass., favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Memorial of North American Steamship Co., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of C. J. Edmonson and other citizens of Walnut Grove, Mo., against placing the Rural Free

Delivery Service under the contract system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of George J. Kilguss, of Providence, R. I., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Mrs. W. S. Sims, of Newport, and Mrs. Carl Barus, of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Thomas B. Flanagan, of Providence, R. I., urging protection for priests and sisters in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. E. Chadwick, of Newport, R. I., favoring a bill to incorporate the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of Otto Baumeister, John Meyerholtz, Gilbert Hartke, William Eilert, Henry Eilert, Sam Sollmann, H. H. Hempe, Carl Nass, William Havemeyer, Ernest Ketler, Carl W. Meyer, Ernest Egbert, Ernest Meyer, Henry Meyerholtz, Charles Kielblock, Otto Burst, John T. Sollmann, H. H. Havemeyer, Ernest Meyerholtz, Frank Kempsen, Charles E. Corn, Herman H. Schumaker, G. W. Sollmann, C. H. Ketter, C. H. Poestker, H. O. Brewster, Herman Luker, Dewitt Corn, F. D. Collins, Bernard Carlisle, Wilburn Maxey, Jackson Maxey, Guy Barrett, H. L. W. Sollmann, W. G. Stork, Oliver Martin, H. L. Hartke, John Kranemeyer, jr., W. P. Corn, Frank Sakel, Oscar Krommeyer, C. H. H. Meyer, H. W. Nuhring, Christ Sollmann, Fritz Roundmason, William H. Bartlett, Louis Meyerholtz, Henry Kahle, George F. Heidorn, Fred Schumacher, Carl Havemeyer, Chris Egbert, Oscar Hogemeyer, Aurelius Wellmeyer, William H. Bauemeister, Paul Cornils, Louis Sollmann, John Lippoldt, George H. Hagemeyer, W. Caldemeyer, Henry Caldemeyer, J. H. L. McGlothlin, all of Stendal, Ind., favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of citizens of Calumet and Laurium, Mich., in support of legislation to prohibit the shipment of munitions of war to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Polish Women's Society of Ironwood; Society Sly Wojciecha, of Calumet; Stanislawas Society, of Norway; Polish Society of Stambaugh; Tow Ks Jozef Poniatowski Society, of Wakefield; Polish Roman Catholic Union of Ironwood; Polish National Alliance, of Painesdale, all in the State of Michigan, against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Linden, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 120 citizens of Nebraska, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of the Swedish-American citizens of Portland, Conn., favoring the erection of a suitable memorial in Washington, D. C., to Capt. John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. METZ: Memorial of the Merchants' Association of the State of New York and Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Fulton Street Board of Trade, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 5139, the Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Barbaross Kruger Verein (Philadelphia, Pa.) Branch of the German-American Alliance and St. Peter's Young Men's Society, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against export of war materials, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Maritime Exchange, protesting against the passage of House bill 18666, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens and organizations, favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Outlook Association, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 344, for a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of Catholic Women's League of Pittsburgh, Pa.; L. Frederick and James A. McCann, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Polish National Alliance, No. 38, of Allegheny County, Pa., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of Rev. A. W. Weider and 52 other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Communications from the Cigar Makers' International Union of America and the Switchmen's Union of North America, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, communication from the American Federation of Labor, favoring the enactment of the immigration law with the literacy test included; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, communications from the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America; the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Boston, Mass.; the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America; the Illinois State Federation of Labor; the Iron City Central Trades Council, Pittsburgh, Pa.; the United Mine Workers of America; the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; the Tobacco Workers' International Union of Louisville, Ky.; the International Typographical Union; and the Pattern Makers' League of North America, all favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. POST: Petition of 60 citizens of Piqua, Ohio, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of Meriden, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Mass., favoring embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 1,327 American citizens, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of delegates of Evangelical Protestant Churches of Pittsburgh district; German-American Alliance of Scott County, Iowa; 16 American citizens of Muscatine and 8 citizens of Kingsley, Iowa, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *February 2, 1915.*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come in Thy presence at this time, we trust, with reverence and godly fear. We pray that Thy providence may surround us this day and that we may be led unto all truth. We have found in all our experience that fitness of character is fitness for service, and we pray for the graces of Thy Spirit, that every public act may be the expression of a character conformed to the will of God and that all the work done may have Thy favor and Thy blessing. Give us such strength of character, such purity of motive, as that our life may stand the test of public trial. May we so project the affairs of this great Nation that Thy favor may abide upon us, with peace and prosperity in all the way of our national life. Forgive our sins. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading may be dispensed with.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to oppose or delay the approval of the Journal, but there is a portion of the Journal which, if it were possible to do so, I should be very glad to have laid aside for revision. I do not think that there

is any practicable motion to accomplish this purpose; but I am sure that this Journal ought to be very carefully reviewed by the Secretary and compared with the stenographic record. I was unable to catch from the reading—I give this merely as an example—exactly what is recorded on Saturday just before I took the floor and addressed the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] rose to a point of order—of course, quite properly—without asking my consent, although I had the floor. He was properly recognized to make his point of order, and he made the point of order that there was no quorum present. I am not sure whether or not that procedure is stated in the Journal in exactly that form, but I think that it is so stated in the RECORD. I use this case merely as an illustration; but the portion of the Journal which I think ought to be most carefully revised is that which covers the proceedings of last Friday evening before the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] took the floor.

For some hours, then, we were engaged in a somewhat rapid movement on questions of rules and parliamentary law. Some powerful and acute intellects in the Senate, which had never before been applied particularly to questions of parliamentary law, addressed themselves that evening to that subject, and they made, I may say, some changes, which, as it seemed to me, being more slow going, although beyond doubt dazzling, were a little confusing.

General parliamentary law in conjunction with the rules of a legislative body are essential to the orderly transaction of business. It is very necessary to know what the system is under which we are operating. I confess, after some of the decisions of Friday night, I am not very clear upon a good many points as to just what system of law and rules is now controlling us. Of course there is much to be said, no doubt, for the promptness and vigor of "hold-the-rail" and "strong-arm" methods in dealing with parliamentary questions, supported largely by lungs and language, but the general result of these operations is at first confusing.

I select as an illustration one very important ruling which was made during the night of Friday last. It was then decided by one of the occupants of the chair, there being an almost kaleidoscopic shifting in the chair going on, that when a call of the yeas and nays had been ordered no amendment to the pending substitute was thereafter in order. That, Mr. President, was a decision——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if he is not in error in that statement? Did not the occupant of the chair express that as his tentative opinion, and is it not true that the question was not at that time exactly before the Senate and that no ruling upon a proposed amendment was made?

Mr. LODGE. That is true of one of the occupants of the chair, but I think the Senator will find, if he examines the RECORD, that another occupant of the chair decided the question, and I venture to say that I think I am confirmed in that opinion, because the present occupant of the chair called my attention to the decision, and I think I am not mistaken in saying that it was decided by one occupant, but not by the occupant to whom the Senator from Georgia is now referring.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Was there an amendment offered and formally ruled out of order by the occupant of the chair?

Mr. LODGE. That is my very strong impression.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Or was it simply an expression of opinion?

Mr. LODGE. I think this very difference of recollection between the Senator from Georgia and myself, Mr. President, shows the necessity of the careful revision which I suggest. At all events my belief is that that ruling was made. I am sure that other Senators so understood and that the Senate acted in accordance with that belief.

That ruling then made, if I am right, and which was certainly made yesterday, was not only something wholly new to the practice of the Senate, but, to the best of my belief, it was a great and brilliant addition to the whole field of parliamentary law.

The right to demand the yeas and nays goes beyond any right conferred by the rules; it is a constitutional right, and it is vested in one-fifth of the Senators present, which may be much less than one-fifth of the whole Senate. Under the ruling made on Friday night, as I think, confirmed yesterday, power was placed in the hands of one-fifth of the Senators present to cut off all amendments on a given question, the demand for the yeas and nays being a constitutional demand, which can not be refused. So that if a number of alert and vigorous parliamentarians, like our friends on the other side, or an equal number on this side, wish to cut off all amendments to a bill, we will say an appropriation bill, by demanding as soon as the bill has been read the yeas and nays on ordering the bill to third reading under that ruling, and every amendment will be thereupon cut off. It is a species of hybrid previous question; but the previous question—which, of course, is an old and long-established practice—cuts off not only amendments, but debate. Under our system as proposed by this ruling of using the yeas and nays as a strange kind of previous question, the real previous question requiring a majority instead of one-fifth of those present, we cut off amendments and yet permit debate, while the true previous question is complete and brings a vote at once without debate.

Now, the right to amend is a great parliamentary right. It is included among the privileged motions. I think a change so radical and so startling, not only in the Senate rules but in parliamentary law as that involved in the decision to which I have referred really ought not to be made in the confusion of a struggle such as we had here Friday night. Yesterday the Chair, as I suppose, feeling constrained to follow the ruling of Friday night, from which the RECORD apparently showed no appeal——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Massachusetts pardon the Chair just at this point and permit the Chair to put in the RECORD the reason for the ruling of yesterday?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I ask to have it read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Chair is going to read it, if there is no objection.

The Chair hopes that no Senator will deem what is about to be said as either inappropriate or impertinent. It is not being said for the purpose of criticism, but to place clearly upon the RECORD the reason for the ruling of the Chair upon the right of the Senate to recommit the pending bill; nor would this reason be placed in the RECORD if the Chair thought the action of the Senate was a mere construction of its rules, because no presiding officer should have any personal interest in the rules of the Senate or how the Senate will construe them. But the present occupant of the chair believes that the action of the Senate on yesterday was in direct contravention of the Constitution of the United States. Having known that Constitution when it was young and vigorous and able to take care of itself, now, in its old age and neglect, I feel constrained to speak a kind word about it.

By section 5, Article I, of that instrument, it is provided that "the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal." It is not material for this dissenting opinion to pass upon the question as to whether the yeas and nays should have been ordered on this substitute bill. It is sufficient to say that they were so ordered. Until the yeas and nays were entered upon that question, in my judgment, all conflicting rules of the Senate were suspended, and no action could be taken which would prevent the entry on the Journal of the yeas and nays on the particular question on which they were ordered. The Chair does not want to be understood that the motion to recommit would not be in order immediately after the entry of the yeas and nays.

It has been suggested that if this view of the Chair be correct, it is in the power of one-fifth of the Members to prevent amendment and debate; but one-fifth have not seconded the request until the Chair so announces, and the present occupant, notwithstanding custom to the contrary, believes that the procedure should be altered so that while there is an amendment to be offered or an argument to be made the Chair would not announce that the request is seconded by the necessary one-fifth, but that when once announced a yea-and-nay vote upon the particular question, and that without debate, should immediately be had and entered upon the Journal.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that statement made to accompany what I was saying. I do not need to enter into a long discussion of this rule, which would take, I think, several hours, if properly debated by the Senate. I venture, however, to say, with all submission, that the Constitution gives the right to make the demand, but the recording of the vote is simply settling the method by which the vote shall be taken. A vote can be taken viva voce; it can be taken by a division and a count; it can be taken by a call of the yeas and nays; it can be taken, in the House, by tellers. It is a mere method which the House or the legislative body determines upon as the manner in which it desires to make its will known; and the fact that they have selected one method of making their will known in preference to another method does not, to my mind, constitute anything resembling the previous question.

The motion to recommit, as we all know, having examined parliamentary law, is in its essence—and it has been so held

by all the great authorities—a motion to amend, because the idea of recommittal carries amendment with it by necessary implication. The motion to recommit takes precedence of the motion to amend, but they are both rights secured by special rules of both Houses, and I think in all parliamentary bodies.

This new conception of the power of the order of the yeas and nays was submitted to the Senate yesterday and dissented from by a majority of the Senate. The Senate, by a decisive vote, set aside that rule and restored us to the ground hitherto held, not only in the Senate but, so far as I am aware, in all parliamentary law, and I suppose that judgment of the Senate will stand until the Senate changes it itself or, in some excited night session, some new parliamentarian gets possession of the chair who has not heard of the action of the Senate.

I did not mean when I arose to say even so much as this, Mr. President, but I wished to point out, if there is any way in which it could be done, that it is of very great importance, in the case of what was done on Friday night—and whether we agree to the rulings or not, we must have a complete record of what was done and said—that that portion of the Journal, before it is put into print, should be carefully compared with the stenographic notes. From my very imperfect examination of the RECORD, which is a very confusing one, it seems to me that there were many cases where Senators were recognized, and yet there appears to be no account of that recognition. I think that whole subject ought to be looked into.

I did not mean, as I said when I began, to make any opposition to the approval of the Journal. I think it ought to be approved, but I also think that in doing so we should understand that what was done on Friday night should be very carefully examined before it goes into permanent print.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether it is his intention to allow the Journal as read to be approved now?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to prevent the approval of the Journal, but I know of no parliamentary method by which we can detach a portion of the Journal and postpone it for further examination. I wish that it could be done. I think that it ought to be done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. So do I; but my inquiry was for information. I did not see, if we approved the Journal as it now stands, and as it has been read to the Senate, how any correction can be made in it if the stenographic notes show that there are errors in it. If the matter is of such importance as the Senator from Massachusetts thinks it is—and I agree with him in that—I wondered if it would not be possible, by unanimous consent, to leave the Journal unapproved, subject to action when it could be compared with the official reporters' notes, and then we could go on with business.

Mr. LODGE. There is no objection to that, and it would not delay the business this morning. I, of course, should be very glad if the Senator would make that request.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am only interested in the accuracy of the Journal. As the Senator from Massachusetts says, it raises grave constitutional questions and questions of the correct interpretation of the rules of the Senate. I have looked over the RECORD, so far as I have been able, of the occurrences of Friday night, and it is very confusing in the RECORD. I am not at all certain that the very hasty and partial reading of the Journal which was had this morning is even in accord with the RECORD, much less with the stenographic notes of the official reporters.

I have no interest whatever in the matter, except in the accuracy of the Journal of the Senate, which will be referred to during all time and is the authority upon which precedents are established. If there be no objection, and in order to ascertain that, I would proffer the request and ask unanimous consent that the approval of the Journal as read by the Secretary this morning be deferred until opportunity is had to compare it with the official reporters' notes, and that business in other respects proceed as usual in the Senate to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR AERONAUTICS (S. DOC. NO. 797).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two memorials from a committee of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on the need of a national advisory board for aeronautics.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, some time ago, at the last meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, a committee was appointed to take up and consider questions relating to aeronautics, and to make such recommendations as might be thought proper. A day or two ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] introduced a joint resolution in duplicate relating to this subject, one of which resolutions was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which the Senator is chairman, and the other to the Committee on Military Affairs. A few days ago the committee appointed by the chancellor of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, the Chief Justice of the United States, had a meeting and determined to present the memorials which have just been handed down by the Chair.

Without taking the time to state the general outline of the memorials I will ask that they may be printed in the usual form, and that one of them—the two being exactly alike—be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the other to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that they be printed as a Senate document and that one of the memorials be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator if there are any illustrations in the document?

Mr. STONE. I think there are no illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are no illustrations in it. It is a very brief document.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the printing. I was simply going to suggest to the Senator that if there were illustrations it would be necessary to have the matter referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Missouri will be complied with. One memorial will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the other to the Committee on Military Affairs. Memorials will be printed as a document, and one of the memorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial referred to is as follows:

MEMORIAL ON THE NEED OF A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

The United States is the only first-class Nation that does not have an advisory committee for aeronautics and suitable research laboratories placed under its direction.

This country led in the early development of heavier-than-air machines. To-day it is far behind. When the European war broke out France had about 1,400 aeroplanes, Germany 1,000, Russia 800, Great Britain 400, the United States 23. The Navy has 12 of these.

The Smithsonian Institution became interested in aeronautics in 1860. At a meeting of the Board of Regents held December 10, 1914, it was:

"*Resolved*, That a committee be appointed by the chancellor, to consist of four members of the board and the secretary, to consider questions relative to the Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory."

The chancellor, Chief Justice White, appointed the following: Dr. A. Graham Bell, Senator WILLIAM J. STONE, Representative ERNEST W. ROBERTS, Mr. John B. Henderson, jr., and Secretary Charles D. Walcott.

On January 30, 1915, the committee had under consideration a memorandum in relation to the Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory and the need of a national advisory committee for aeronautics. After discussion it was—

"*Resolved*, That the memorandum be approved and presented to Congress as a memorial in relation to the advancement of aeronautics in the United States by the appointment by the President of an advisory aeronautical committee."

MEMORANDUM ON THE NEED OF A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

On May 1, 1913, the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, approving a general scheme, authorized Secretary Walcott, with the approval of the executive committee, to reopen the Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory; to secure an advisory committee; to add, as means were provided, other laboratories and agencies; to group them into a bureau organization; and to secure the cooperation with them of the Government and other agencies.

The first action taken by the secretary was to request the approval of the President of the United States of the designation of representatives from the Departments of War, Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce to serve on an advisory committee. On May 9, 1913, the President approved the request, and the departments named designated members for the committee. A number of civilians were also selected for membership. The committee then organized, but before effective work could be undertaken a decision made by the Comptroller of the Treasury stated that under section 9 of the act approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1027), it was unlawful for any Government employee to serve on an advisory committee for aeronautics without authority being granted by Congress.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution also authorized the secretary to send an estimate to Congress for the carrying on of operations in such a laboratory. The estimate was made and explained to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in January, 1914 (hearings, sundry civil bill, 63d Cong., 2d sess, pp. 419–429). A statement was also made in relation to the desirability of having an advisory committee for aeronautics.

No action was taken by the committee or by Congress, and the United States remains to-day the only first-class Nation in the world that does not have an advisory committee or board on aeronautics and one or more aeronautical laboratories devoted to the solution of problems which the manufacturer and practical aviator meet with in connection with the advancement of aerial flight.

America invented and led in the early development of the heavier-than-air flying machine through Langley, the Wright brothers, Curtiss, and others, and a small grant was made by the Congress to the Navy Department for experimental work in aeronautics, but nothing was done to encourage or assist American inventors and manufacturers beyond the purchase of a few machines.

Prof. Langley wrote in 1897 (McClure's Magazine, June, 1897. Reprinted in Smithsonian Report for 1900), after describing the account of the flight of his first experimental machine made in 1896:

"And now it may be asked, What has been done? This has been done: A 'flying machine,' so long a type for ridicule, has really flown; it has demonstrated its practicability in the only satisfactory way—by actually

flying—and by doing this again and again under conditions which leave no doubt.

"There is no room here to enter on the consideration of the construction of larger machines or to offer the reasons for believing that they may be built to remain for days in the air or to travel at speeds higher than any with which we are familiar. Neither is there room to enter on a consideration of their commercial value or of those applications which will probably first come in the arts of war rather than those of peace; but we may at least see that these may be such as to change the whole conditions of warfare, when each of two opposing hosts will have its every movement known to the other, when no lines of fortification will keep out the foe, and when the difficulties of defending a country against an attacking enemy in the air will be such that we may hope that this will hasten rather than retard the coming of the day when war shall cease.

"I have thus far had only a purely scientific interest in the results of these labors. * * * For the next stage, which is the commercial and practical development of the idea, it is probable that the world may look to others. The world, indeed, will be supine if it do not realize that a new possibility has come to it, and that the great universal highway overhead is now soon to be opened."

Mr. Langley later, at the request of the War Department, undertook the construction of a large man-carrying machine, but owing to defects in the launching apparatus in its two trials in 1903 this machine was not successfully launched into the air. Means for further experiments not being available, no further trials were made with this machine until June, 1914, when it was sent by the institution to Hammondsport, N. Y., and successfully flown over Lake Keuka, bearing the additional weight of pontoons and supports amounting to over 300 pounds.

A list of the publications of the Smithsonian Institution relating to the subject of aeronautics will be found at the end of this paper.

The development of a biplane by the Wright brothers was one of America's great achievements; that was followed by the development of the Curtiss flying boat by Glenn H. Curtiss. Both the Wrights and Curtiss have expressed themselves as strongly in favor of an advisory committee for aeronautics, and came on to Washington to take part in the preliminary meetings looking forward to such an organization.

The Langley medal, established by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, "to be awarded for specially meritorious investigations in connection with the science of aerodromics and its application to aviation," was presented by the Smithsonian Institution to Wilbur and Orville Wright, respectively, on February 10, 1910, "for advancing the science of aerodromics in its application to aviation by their successful investigations and demonstrations of the practicability of mechanical flight by man," and the same medal was presented, on May 6, 1913, to Curtiss in recognition of his advancing the art of aerodromics by the development of the hydroaerodrome.

The aeronautical service of the Navy Department took an active interest in the development of aeronautics as affecting the Navy, and established a small experimental plant at the Washington Navy Yard, under a grant by Congress of $25,000 in 1912, for the development of aviation for naval purposes, and an appropriation of $10,000 in each of the past three years.

European countries: As soon as Americans demonstrated the feasibility of flight by heavier-than-air machines, France took the matter up promptly and utilized all the available agencies, including those of the army, navy, and other public and private establishments. Large sums were devoted to the research work by wealthy individuals, and rapid advance was made in the art.

Germany quickly followed, and a fund of $1,700,000 was raised by subscription.

Later England established an advisory board, placing the manufacturing and the operation of flying machines in the charge of the army and navy, and turning over the working out of the numerous problems arising to the advisory board, an annual appropriation of $25,000 being made for expenses and investigations.

Russia also began serious investigations and construction under the Government, and encouraged private enterprise.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

At the present time the United States is proposing to appropriate a million dollars for the Navy and a large amount for the Army for the purchase and operation of flying machines, but there is no provision in law authorizing the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics, and the utilization of all of the resources of the Government and of private laboratories and manufacturing plants, as far as may be, in the development of aviation in America.

There does not appear to be any good reason why America should not be fully abreast of, if not in advance of, other nations in the development of aeronautics in a practical and useful way, not only for purposes of war but for other activities, where great speed in transit through the air, over mountains, bodies of water, or like obstacles, is desirable. If as rapid progress is made in the coming decade as has been made in the past 10 years, the flying machine will become as permanent a part of the means of rapid and safe transportation, within certain limitations, as the automobile to-day is in land transportation.

A national advisory committee for aeronautics can not fail to be of inestimable service in the development of the art of aviation in America. Such a committee to be effective should be permanent, and attract to its membership the most highly trained men in the art of aviation and such technical sciences as are connected with it.

Through the agency of subcommittees, the main advisory committee could avail itself of the advice and suggestion of a large number of technical and practical men.

The work for which the British advisory committee was appointed was defined in the announcement made by the prime minister in the House of Commons on May 5, 1909, which was as follows:

"The Government is taking steps toward placing its organization for aerial navigation on a more satisfactory footing. As the result of a report made by the committee of imperial defense, the work of devising and constructing dirigible airships and aeroplanes has been apportioned between the navy and the army. The admiralty is building certain dirigibles, while certain others of a different type will be constructed at the war-office balloon factory at Aldershot, which is about to be reorganized for the purpose. The investigation and provision of aeroplanes are also assigned to the war office. With a view to securing that the highest scientific talent shall be brought to bear on the problems which will have to be solved in the course of the work of the two departments, the national physical laboratory has been requested to organize at its establishment at Teddington a special department for continuous investigation—experimental and otherwise—of questions which must from time to time be solved in order to obtain adequate guidance in construction.

"It is no part of the general duty of the advisory committee for aeronautics either to construct or to invent. Its function is not to initiate, but to consider what is initiated elsewhere, and is referred to it by the executive officers of the navy and army construction departments. The problems which are likely to arise in this way for solution are numerous, and it will be the work of the committee to advise on these problems, and to seek their solutions by the application of both theoretical and experimental methods of research.

"The work desired thus falls into three sections:

"1. The scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution.

"2. Research and experiment into these subjects in a properly equipped laboratory with a trained staff.

"3. The construction and use of dirigibles and aeroplanes, having regard mainly to their employment in war.

"The advisory committee are to deal with the first section, and also to determine the problems which the experimental branch should attack, and discuss their solutions and their application to practical questions. The second section represents the work referred to the laboratory, while the duties connected with the third section remain with the admiralty and the war office."

The British Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was constituted as follows in 1914:

President: Right Hon. Lord Rayleigh.

Chairman: Dr. R. T. Glazebrook, director National Physical Laboratory.

Members: Horace Darwin, M. A., F. R. S., chairman Cambridge Scientific Instrument Co.; Sir George Greenhill, formerly professor of mathematics in Artillery College, Woolwich; Brig. Gen. David Henderson, director of military training; F. W. Lanchester; H. R. A. Mallock, F. R. S., consulting engineer of the ordnance board; Mr. Mervyn O'Gorman, M. Inst. M. E., superintendent of His Majesty's Army Aircraft Factory; Prof. J. E. Petavel, F. R. S., professor of engineering and director of the Whitworth laboratories, University of Manchester; Acting Com. C. R. Samson; Dr. William N. Shaw, director of Meteorological Office; Capt. Murray; F. Suetler.

Secretary: F. E. Selby, Bushy House, Teddington.

AGENCIES, RESOURCES, AND FACILITIES.

Smithsonian Institution: The advisory committee may be provided by the Smithsonian Institution with suitable office headquarters, an administrative and accounting system, library and publication facilities, lecture and assembly rooms, and museum space for aeronautic models. The Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory has an income provided for it not to exceed $10,000 the first year (of which $5,000 has been allotted), and $5,000 annually for five years.

United States Bureau of Standards: For the exact determination of aerophysical constants, the calibration of instruments, the testing of aeronautic engines, propellers, and materials of construction, the cooperation of the Department of Commerce, by the United States Bureau of Standards, would be invaluable. This bureau has a complete equipment for studying the mechanics of materials and structural forms used in air craft; for standardizing the physical instruments—thermometers, barographs, pressure gauges, etc.—used in air navigation; and for testing the power, efficiency, etc., of aeronautical motors in a current of air representing the natural conditions of flight.

In these general branches the technical staff of the bureau is prepared to undertake such theoretical and experimental investigations as may come before the advisory committee on behalf of either the Government or private individuals or organizations.

United States Weather Bureau: For studies of and reports on every phase of aeronautic meteorology, besides the usual forecasting, the committee should have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture, through the United States Weather Bureau. This bureau has an extensive library of works on or allied to aeronautics, an instrument division for every type of apparatus for studying the state of the atmosphere, a whirling table of 30-foot radius for standardizing anemometers, a complete kite equipment with power reel, and a sounding-balloon equipment with electrolytic hydrogen plant, all of which are available for scientific investigations. For special forecasts, anticipating field tests or cross-country voyages, the general service of the bureau may be called upon.

War and Navy Departments: These departments, while especially interested in aeronautics for national defense, can be of service in advancing the general science. Each has an aeronautical library; each has an official representative in foreign countries who reports periodically on every important phase of the art, whether civil or military; each has an assignment of officers who design, test, and operate air craft, and who determine largely the scope and character of their development; each has its aeronautic station equipped with machines in actual service throughout the year. Besides various aviation establishments, the War Department has a balloon plant at Fort Myer, Va., and at Omaha, Nebr. The Navy has its marine model basin, useful for special experiments in aeronautics; its extensive shops at the Washington Navy Yard, available for the alteration or repair of air craft, or the manufacture of improved military types; and at Fort Myer three lofty, open-work steel towers suitable for studies in meteorology or aerodynamics in the natural wind. Furthermore, the Navy Department has detailed an officer for special research in aeronautics at one of the principal engineering schools.

Because of their fundamental interest in aeronautics, each of these departments would undoubtedly cooperate most effectively and be able to place at the service of the committee one or more skilled aviators and aeroplanes for systematic experimentation.

Aeronautical committee: There should be a national advisory committee for aeronautics, to be appointed, with the authority of Congress, by the President, the committee to consist of two representatives from the War Department, two representatives from the Navy Department, a representative of the Smithsonian Institution, the Weather Bureau, the United States Bureau of Standards, together with not more than seven additional persons who shall be acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, both civil and military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences. The period of service of the seven additional members of the aeronautical committee who are to be appointed by the President should be so arranged that one member retire each year. Appointments thereafter should be for a period of seven years each, and appointments made to fill vacancies occurring other than in the regular manner shall be made for the remainder of the period for which the vacancy exists.

The aeronautical committee should advise in relation to the work of the Government in aeronautics, and the coordination of the activities of governmental and private laboratories in which questions concerned with the study of the problems of aeronautics can be experimentally investigated.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION RELATING TO AERONAUTICS.

Memorial of city of Philadelphia relative to aeronautic voyage of T. S. C. Lowe across the Atlantic and reply to Joseph Henry. In Smithsonian report, 1860.

Aeronautic voyages performed with a view to the advancement of science. By Frances Arago. In Smithsonian report, 1863.

Lectures on the phenomena of flight in the animal kingdom. By E. J. Marey. In Smithsonian report, 1869.

On aerial locomotion. By F. H. Wenham. In Smithsonian report, 1889, No. 789.

Experiments in aerodynamics. By S. P. Langley. In Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, volume 27, No. 801.

The internal work of the wind. By S. P. Langley. In Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, volume 27, No. 884.

The empire of the air. By L. P. Mouillard. In Smithsonian report, 1892, No. 903.

Practical experiments in soaring; the problem of flying. By Otto Lilienthal. In Smithsonian report, 1893, No. 938.

Story of experiments in mechanical flight. By S. P. Langley. In Smithsonian report, 1897, No. 1134.

On soaring flight. By E. C. Huffaker. In Smithsonian report, 1897, No. 1135.

Letters from the Andrée party. In Smithsonian report, 1897, No. 1149.

Scientific ballooning. By J. M. Bacon. In Smithsonian report, 1898, No. 1197.

Count Von Zeppelin's dirigible airship. In Smithsonian report, 1899, No. 1248.

The progress of aeronautics. By M. Janssen. In Smithsonian report, 1900, No. 1267.

Lord Rayleigh on flight. In Smithsonian report, 1900, No. 1268.

The Langley aerodrome. In Smithsonian report, 1900, No. 1269.

The Zeppelin airship. By T. E. Curtis. In Smithsonian report, 1900, No. 1270.

Santos-Dumont circling the Eiffel Tower in an airship. By E. P. Lyle, jr. In Smithsonian report, 1901, No. 1352.

The greatest flying creature. By S. P. Langley. In Smithsonian report, 1901, No. 1358.

Recent aeronautical progress, and deductions to be drawn therefrom, regarding the future of aerial navigation. By B. F. S. Baden-Powell. In Smithsonian report, 1902, No. 1379.

Some aeronautical experiments. By Wilbur Wright. In Smithsonian report, 1902, No. 1380.

Various modes of flight in relation to aeronautics. By J. B. Pettigrew. In Smithsonian report, 1867, No. 1443.

Progress with airships. By B. Baden-Powell. In Smithsonian report, 1903, No. 1494.

Aerial navigation. By O. Chanute. In Smithsonian report, 1903, No. 1495.

Graham Bell's tetrahedral kites. In Smithsonian report, 1903, No. 1496.

The structure of wing feathers. By E. Mascha. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collection, volume 48, part 1, No. 1575.

Experiments with the Langley aerodrome. By S. P. Langley. In Smithsonian report, 1904, No. 1597.

Relation of wing surface to weight. By R. Von Londonfeld. In Smithsonian report, 1904, No. 1598.

On the clasping organs attaching the hind to the fore wings in Hymenoptera. By Leo Walter. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 50, part 1, No. 1712.

The air sacs of the pigeon. By Bruno Muller. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 50, part 3, No. 1724.

Researches and experiments in aerial navigation. By S. P. Langley. (Containing Nos. 1134, 1269, 1358, 1597) No. 1809.

The mechanics of the earth's atmosphere. By Cleveland Abbe. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 51, No. 4, No. 1869.

The present status of military aeronautics. By G. O. Squier. In Smithsonian report, 1908, No. 1888.

Aviation in France in 1908. By Pierre-Roger Jourdain. In Smithsonian report, 1908, No. 1889.

Bibliography of aeronautics. By Paul Brockett. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 55, No. 1920.

The flying apparatus of the blowfly. By Wolfgang Ritter. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 56, No. 12, No. 1947.

Langley memoir on mechanical flight. Part I, 1887 to 1896, by S. P. Langley, edited by C. M. Manly. Part II, 1897 to 1903, by C. M. Manly. In Smithsonian contribution to knowledge, volume 27, No. 3, No. 1948.

Presentation of Langley medal to Messrs. Wilbur and Orville Wright. In secretary's report for 1910.

Recent progress in aviation. By Octave Chanute. In Smithsonian report, 1910, No. 2018.

International air map and aeronautical marks. By Ch. Lallemand. In Smithsonian report, 1911, No. 2108.

On the positions assumed by birds in flight. By Bentley Beetham. In Smithsonian report, 1911, No. 2117.

Traveling at high speeds on the surface of the earth and above it. By H. S. Hele-Shaw. In Smithsonian report, 1911, No. 2130.

Holes in the air. By W. J. Humphreys. In Smithsonian report, 1912, No. 2198.

Review of applied mechanics. By L. Lecornu. In Smithsonian report, 1912, No. 2199.

Advisory committee on the Langley aerodynamical laboratory. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 62, No. 1, No. 2227.

An account of the exercises on the occasion of the presentation of the Langley medal and the unveiling of the Langley memorial tablet, May 6, 1913, including the addresses of Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, his excellency the French Ambassador, Mons. J. J. Jusserand, Dr. John A. Brashear, and Secretary Walcott. Special publication, No. 2233.

Hydromechanic experiments with flying boat hulls. By H. C. Richardson. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 62, No. 2, No. 2253.

Report on European aeronautical laboratories. By A. F. Zahm. In Smithsonian miscellaneous collections, volume 62, No. 3, No. 2273.

Mr. TILLMAN. In this connection I wish to have printed as a public document a letter I received on yesterday from Hon. Charles D. Walcott, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, upon the same subject. I would also like to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1915.

The Hon. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 30, 1915, asking for a report showing what action has already been taken by the Smithsonian Institution regarding the joint resolution providing for the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics in the United States.

In response thereto I have the honor to submit the inclosed memorandum.

I am transmitting also a report on European aeronautical laboratories, which gives an outline of what was being done in Europe prior to the outbreak of the present war.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHARLES D. WALCOTT, *Secretary.*

MEMORANDUM.—A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

HISTORICAL NOTE.

On May 1, 1913, the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution authorized Secretary Walcott, with the approval of the executive committee, to reopen the Langley aerodynamical laboratory; to secure an advisory committee; to add, as means were provided, other laboratories and agencies; to group them into a bureau organization; and to secure the cooperation with them of the Government and other agencies.

The first action taken by the secretary was to request the approval of the President of the United States of the designation of representatives from the Departments of War, Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce, to serve on an advisory committee. On May 9, 1913, the President approved the request, and the departments named selected their members for the committee. A number of civilians were also selected for membership. The committee was then organized, but before effective work could be undertaken a decision made by the Comptroller of the Treasury stated that under section 9 of the act approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1027), it was unlawful for any Government employee to serve on such an advisory committee without authority being granted by Congress. (SEC. 9. That hereafter no part of the public moneys, or of any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by Congress, shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, or any members thereof, or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work or action of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law; nor shall there be employed by detail, hereafter or heretofore made, or otherwise, personal services from any executive department or other Government establishment in connection with any such commission, council, board, or other similar body.)

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution also authorized the Secretary to make an estimate to Congress for the carrying on of operations in such a laboratory. The estimate was made and explained to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in January, 1914 (hearings, sundry civil bill, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 419–429). A statement was also made in relation to the desirability of having authority to appoint an advisory committee for aeronautics.

No action was taken by the committee or by Congress, and the United States remains to-day the only first-class Nation in the world that does not have an advisory committee or board on aeronautics, and one or more aeronautical laboratories devoted to the solution of problems which the manufacturer and practical aviator meet with in connection with the advancement of aerial flight.

America invented and led in the early development of the heavier-than-air flying machine, through Langley, the Wright brothers, Curtiss, and others, and a small grant was made by the Congress to the Navy Department for experimental work in aeronautics, but nothing was done to encourage or assist American inventors and manufacturers beyond the purchase of a few machines.

European countries: As soon as Americans demonstrated the feasibility of flight by heavier-than-air machines France took the matter up promptly and utilized all the available agencies, including the army, navy, and similar establishments, both public and private. Large sums were devoted to the research work by wealthy individuals, and rapid advance was made in the art.

Germany quickly followed, and a fund of $1,700,000 was raised by subscription, and experimentation directed by a group of technically trained and experienced men.

Later England established an advisory board, placing the manufacturing and the operation of flying machines in the charge of the army and navy, and turning over the working out of the numerous problems arising to the advisory board, an annual appropriation of $25,000 being made for expenses and investigations.

Russia also began serious investigations and construction under the Government and encouraged private enterprise.

When this European war broke out France had, exclusive of dirigibles, about 1,400 aeroplanes; Germany, 1,000; Russia, 800; Great Britain, 400; the United States, 23. The Navy has 12 of these.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The joint resolution authorizing the appointment of an advisory commitee for aeronautics is based on the experience of the advisory committee of Great Britain and study given to the subject before asking the appointment of an advisory committee for the Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory of the Smithsonian Institution.

The amount of the appropriation asked is not large, but it will be sufficient to test the working possibilities of the committee, and the results obtained by it will determine if it will be of sufficient value to warrant an increase in the appropriations.

At the present time the United States is proposing to appropriate $1,000,000 for the Navy, and a large amount for the Army, for the purchase and operation of flying machines, but there is no provision in law authorizing the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics and thus leading to the utilization of all of the resources of the Government and of private laboratories and manufacturing plants, as far as may be, in the development of aviation in America.

The Navy Department will go ahead as best it can, the War Department as it can, and private interests as means and opportunity permit. With no central body or clearing house for the various agencies, no place to meet and discuss problems of research, no place to try out new ideas, and no body of expert advisers for the Government and civil in-

forests, aeronautics in America will be simply drifting and trusting to luck that all will come out well through sporadic and scattered efforts. What is needed is team work that may be rendered possible by a wisely selected advisory committee.

A national advisory committee for aeronautics can not fail to be of inestimable service in the development of the art of aviation in America. Such a committee to be effective should be permanent and attract to its membership the most highly trained men in the art of aviation and such technical sciences as are connected with it.

Through the agency of subcommittees the main advisory committee could avail itself of the advice and suggestion of a large number of technical and practical men.

The work for which the British advisory committee was appointed was defined in the announcement made by the prime minister in the House of Commons on May 5, 1909, which was as follows:

"The Government is taking steps toward placing its organization for aerial navigation on a more satisfactory footing. As the result of a report made by the committee on imperial defense, the work of devising and constructing dirigible airships and aeroplanes has been apportioned between the navy and the army. The Admiralty is building certain dirigibles, while certain others of a different type will be constructed at the war office balloon factory at Aldershot, which is about to be reorganized for the purpose. The investigation and provision of aeroplanes are also assigned to the war office. With a view to securing that the highest scientific talent shall be brought to bear on the problems which will have to be solved in the course of the work of the two departments, the National Physical Laboratory has been requested to organize at its establishment at Teddington a special department for continuous investigation—experimental and otherwise—of questions which must from time to time be solved in order to obtain adequate guidance in construction.

"It is no part of the general duty of the advisory committee for aeronautics either to construct or to invent. Its function is not to initiate but to consider what is initiated elsewhere, and is referred to it by the executive officers of the navy and army construction departments. The problems which are likely to arise in this way for solution are numerous, and it will be the work of the committee to advise on these problems and to seek their solution by the application of both theoretical and experimental methods of research.

"The work desired thus falls into three sections:

"1. The scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution.

"2. Research and experiment into these subjects in a properly equipped laboratory, with a trained staff.

"3. The construction and use of dirigibles and aeroplanes, having regard mainly to their employment in war.

"The advisory committee are to deal with the first section, and also to determine the problems which the experimental branch should attack, and discuss their solutions and their application to practical questions. The second section represents the work referred to the laboratory, while the duties connected with the third section remain with the Admiralty and the war office."

AGENCIES, RESOURCES, AND FACILITIES AVAILABLE FOR THE WORK OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Smithsonian Institution: The advisory committee may be provided by the Smithsonian Institution with suitable office headquarters, an administrative and accounting system, library and publication facilities, lecture and assembly rooms, and museum space for aeronautic models. The Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory has an income provided for it not to exceed $10,000 the first year, of which $5,000 has ben allotted, and $5,000 annually for five years.

United States Bureau of Standards: For the exact determination of aerophysical constants, the calibration of instruments, the testing of aeronautic engines, propellers, and materials of construction, the cooperation of the Department of Commerce by the United States Bureau of Standards would be invaluable. This bureau has a complete equipment for studying the mechanics of materials and structural forms used in air craft; for standardizing the physical instruments—thermometers, barographs, pressure gauges, etc—used in air navigation; and for testing the power, efficiency, etc., of aeronautical motors in a current of air representing the natural conditions of flight.

In these general branches the technical staff of the bureau is prepared to undertake such theoretical and experimental investigations as may come before the advisory committee on behalf of either the Government or private individuals or organizations.

United States Weather Bureau: For studies of and reports on every phase of aeronautic meteorology, besides the usual forecasting, the committee should have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture, through the United States Weather Bureau. This bureau has an extensive library of works on or allied to aeronautics, an instrument division for every type of apparatus for studying the state of the atmosphere, a whirling table of 30-foot radius for standardizing anemometers, a complete kite equipment with power reel, and a sounding balloon equipment with electrolytic hydrogen plant, all of which are available for scientific investigations. For special forecasts, anticipating field tests or cross-country voyages, the general service of the bureau may be called upon.

War and Navy Departments: These departments, while especially interested in aeronautics for national defense, can be of service in advancing the general science. Each has an aeronautical library; each has an official representative in foreign countries, who reports periodically on every important phase of the art, whether civil or military; each has an assignment of officers who design, test, and operate air craft, and who determine largely the scope and character of their development; each has its aeronautic station equipped with machines in actual service throughout the year. Besides various aviation establishments, the War Department has a balloon plant at Fort Myer, Va., and at Omaha, Nebr.; the Navy has its marine model basin, useful for special experiments in aeronautics; its extensive shops at the Washington Navy Yard, available for the alteration or repair of air craft or the manufacture of improved military types; and at Fort Myer three lofty open-work steel towers suitable for studies in meteorology or aerodynamics in the natural wind. Furthermore, the Navy Department has detailed an officer for special research in aeronautics at one of the principal engineering schools.

Because of their fundamental interest in aeronautics, each of these departments would undoubtedly cooperate most effectively and be able to place at the service of the committee one or more skilled aviators and aeroplanes for systematic experimentation.

Conclusion: There does not appear to be any good reason why America should not be fully abreast of, if not in advance of, other nations in the development of aeronautics in a practical and useful way, not only for purposes of war but for other activities where great speed in transit through the air, over mountains, bodies of water, or like obstacles is desirable. If as rapid progress is made in the coming decade as has been made in the past 10 years, the flying machine will become as permanent a part of the means of rapid and safe transportation, within certain limitations, as the automobile to-day is in land transportation.

While it is recognized that an advisory committee for aeronautics will not create or invent new machines, it may be the means of encouraging both governmental and civil activities in such a manner as to lead to results of great value to the Government and all who are interested in the development of successful aviation as an agency of peace as well as of war.

At the present time the thought of aviation is in connection with war, but there is no apparent reason why, as in the case of the automobile, the flying machine will not be of far greater service in peaceful pursuits than in war.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 803).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a proposed amendment to be included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill in lieu of the clause providing for salaries for the office of the Life-Saving Service, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

USELESS PAPERS IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and lists of papers, documents, and so forth, which are not needed in the transaction of business of the Treasury Department and which have no permanent value or historic interest. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

USELESS PAPERS IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of useless papers and discarded books, and so forth, which have accumulated in the Department of the Interior and which have no permanent value or historic interest. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

USELESS PAPERS IN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a list of papers which are not needed in the transaction of business in the Department of Labor and have no permanent value or historic interest. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

TIME STOP AND PREMIUM PAYMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 800).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, directing attention to a proposed amendment to the Army appropriation bill against time stop and premium payments at Government establishments, which, with accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AUTOMATIC TRAIN-CONTROL SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 1541).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, as a supplemental report of the Chief of the Division of Safety submitted to Congress January 8, 1915, a report of the Chief of the Division of Safety concerning a test of the automatic train-control system of the American Train Control Co., of Baltimore, Md., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1548).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co. of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1533).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1543).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1546).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1545).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CITY & SUBURBAN RAILWAY (H. DOC. NO. 1544).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CAPITAL TRACTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1537).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1534).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

EAST WASHINGTON HEIGHTS RAILROAD CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1532).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON & OLD DOMINION RAILWAY (H. DOC. NO. 1542).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

T. L. LOVE V. UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 851).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion and opinion filed by the court in the cause of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son, v. United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Lewis H. Hazeltine v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 920);
Melvina Soard, daughter of Vincent Meyers, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 919);
Charles Mallatte v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 918);
David L. Jewett v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 917);
Daniel N. Kelley v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 916);
Barbara E. Lane, widow of John E. Lane, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 915);
George W. Holeton v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 914);
Martha V. Jones, widow of William M. Jones, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 913);
George Hansen v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 912);
Thomas Jordan v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 911);
Thomas Monroe v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 910);
Hannibal Landon v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 909);
Jane E. Lawson, widow of Frank Lawson, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 936);
John A. Willoughby v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 935);
Olive J. Pierce, daughter, and Minnie Taylor Maxon, granddaughter, sole heirs of James A. Taylor, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 934);
Lewis L. Spayd v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 933);
George C. Wooley v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 932);
James Skidmore v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 931);
Levi S. Walker v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 930);
John W. Watts v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 929);
Herman A. Van Epps v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 928);
James Donahue v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 927);
John B. Gunning v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 926);
William J. Harding v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 925);
William Moseley, administrator of Temperance Moseley, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 850);
Catherine A. Rhodes, widow of John G. Rhodes, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 849);
Annette W. Brackett, administratrix of Joseph F. Twitchell, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 848);
Andrew J. Thomas v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 847);
George H. Ruple v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 846);
Harvey N. Rogers v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 845);
Benjamin J. Robertson v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 844);
Samuel S. Hess v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 843);
Samuel H. Sanders v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 842);
Bertha Ethel Turner, sole heir of John H. Turner, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 841);
Jemima R. Clevinger, widow (remarried) of Henry Richardson, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 840);
Charles M. Shailer v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 839);
Thomas J. Smith v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 838);
Allison J. Pliley v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 837);
Earl M. Rogers v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 836);
John W. Taylor v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 835);
Flora B. Tenny, widow of William Tenny, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 834);
Ancil B. Spencer v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 833);
Sarah E. Straughn, widow of John W. Straughn, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 832);
Mark H. Sherman v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 831);
William Seager v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 830);
Charles A. Stockdale, son and sole heir of Sidney A. Stockdale, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 829);
Harrison T. Chandler v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 828);
Ansil H. Couch v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 827);
Richard A. Wood v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 826);
Catherine Weirick, widow of Ephraim B. Weirich, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 825);
Kate M. Lehn, widow (remarried) of William A. Maetzke, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 824);
Rebeckah S. Manderson, widow of Charles F. Manderson, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 823);
Morris Strauss v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 822);
Clarence M. Spaulding v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 821);
Thomas A. Peironet v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 820);
James A. Rodman v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 819);
John Rogers v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 818);
Peter H. Pierson v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 817);
Nellie W. Dodge, sister and one of the heirs of Frank H. White, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 816);
Stephen P. Petteys v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 815);
Edward L. Shaw v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 814);
Alfred Bugh v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 888);
David C. Brewer v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 887);
Mary A. Britton, widow of Charles E. Britton, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 886);
John J. Callahan v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 885);
John Clouts v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 884);
Thomas C. Bennett v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 883);
Mary E. Cole, widow of Warren Cole, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 882);
George L. Wright v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 881);
Martha A. E. Fox, widow (remarried) of Marion Roberts, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 880);
Mary L. Oliver, widow of Joseph J. Oliver, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 879);
Edwin B. Parsons v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 908);
John E. Phelps v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 907);
Michael Trucks v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 906);
Henry T. Whitaker v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 905);
John H. Shaver v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 904);
Marion J. Sitter v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 903);
John Beals v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 902);

George D. Acker *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 901);
Mollie Allen, Maggie A. Hacker, and W. W. Anderson, children of Edward M. Anderson, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 900);
Simon Baringer *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 899);
Lucius E. Brooker *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 898);
William J. Stokes, son of William B. Stokes, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 897);
John H. Sellers *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 896);
Ralph W. Tucker, son and sole heir of Burwell S. Tucker, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 895);
Samuel H. M. Byers *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 894);
David H. Cortelyou *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 893);
Nevada B. Snyder, daughter of Charles F. Brookbank, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 892);
Peter Costelloe *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 924);
William White *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 923);
W. H. Pierce, son and sole heir of Edward R. Pierce, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 922);
Trustees of McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Nashville, Tenn., *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 921);
Wesley F. Fallon *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 860);
Lucinda M. Hascall, widow of Moses G. Hascall, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 859);
Don E. Downing *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 858);
James B. Wilde *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 857);
Thomas B. White *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 856);
Adam Williams *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 855);
Samuel S. Tower *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 854);
Mary E. McPherson, widow of William McPherson, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 853);
Milton Peden *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 852);
Samuel L. Smith *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 878);
Andrew J. O'Neil *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 877);
Samuel Purdum *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 876);
William H. Miles *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 875);
Samuel M. Morgan *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 874);
Alfred Miller *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 873);
George W. Smith *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 872);
Ada Shuman Fissel, widow (remarried) of Levi D. Shuman, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 871);
William H. Page *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 870);
Mollie S. Pulliam, widow of Alanson M. Pulliam, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 869);
Septer Patrick *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 868);
Emogene E. Swimm, widow of George T. Swimm, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 867);
Wilber F. Stone *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 866);
Curtis B. Stone *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 865);
John W. Moore *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 864);
Charles M. Nesbit, Mattie Nesbit, Mary Nesbit Cowan, and Helen Nesbit Hite, children and sole heirs of John J. Nesbit, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 863);
John W. Gorse *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 862);
John H. Frederick *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 861);
William B. Ford, administrator of William M. Ford, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 891);
Mary Ella Fales, widow of James M. Fales, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 890);
John D. Heslep *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 889);
Hibernia Bank & Trust Co. *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 802);
William C. Lewis *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 804);
Thomas C. Laird *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 805);
Andrew Lybold *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 806);
Esther C. Kelly, widow of Matthew Kelly, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 807);
Elizabeth A. Morris, widow of Florillo B. Morris, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 808);
Myron H. Hale *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 809);
Harry Jones *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 810);
Francis L. Ferguson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 811);
William H. Feagans *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 812); and
Llewellyn W. French *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 813).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15869. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining experiment and mine safety stations for making investigations and disseminating information among employees in mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16637. An act to provide divisions of mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service;

H. R. 17330. An act to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 18783. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla.;

H. R. 21037. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 21089. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 21218. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life and public services of Hon. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, and also on the life and public services of Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Ohio Association of Master Bakers, of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against exportations of wheat and flour, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local District No. 48, International Association of Machinists, including Minnesota and parts of Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of the Traffic Club of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship-purchase bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Democratic Club of King County, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called ship-purchase bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilkinsburg, Springdale, Erie, Beaver Falls, Ellwood City, and Rochester, all in the State of Pennsylvania; of sundry citizens of York and Walton, in the State of New York; of sundry citizens of Stafford, Topeka, Holton, and Denison, all in the State of Kansas; and of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., Spokane, Wash., and Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Jersey, organized as the Committee of One hundred of Hudson County, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I send to the desk a telegram, which I ask to have read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

ECORSE, MICH., *February 1, 1913.*

WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Why don't the Democratic administration let our own shipyards build the ships they want to buy instead of buying foreign ships? We have 10 shipyards idle here on the Great Lakes that are able to build these ships.

G. A. RAUPP,
FRED J. PILTON.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. With more than a passing interest in the petitions which I send to the desk, considering the question of the shipment of arms to belligerent nations, I ask that they may be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. THORNTON. I present a petition signed by a large number of citizens of Louisiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the President of the United States to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies only. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THORNTON. I also present resolutions adopted by the Louisiana State Farmers' Union and resolutions adopted by the Louisiana State Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, urging complete freedom of the seas in the transportation of articles of commerce. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented petitions of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Fremont, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent interstate shipment of convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of the Turnverein of Leavenworth and of the German-American Alliance of Marysville, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WORKS. I send to the desk a number of petitions numerously signed by citizens of California in favor of legislation prohibiting the exportation of munitions of war. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WORKS. I present a petition signed by 200 proprietors of barber shops in the District of Columbia, petitioning for legislation authorizing the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I present a memorial of the Philadelphia Bourse in protest against the passage of the ship-purchase bill. It is a short and concise statement, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it is similar to one handed down by the Chair to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not know it had already been ordered printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can only order one inserted in the RECORD, which will be the one presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well.

The memorial is as follows:

PROTEST AGAINST THE PASSAGE OF A BILL H. R. 18666–S. 6856 (63D CONG., 2D SESS.) PROVIDING FOR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF MERCHANT VESSELS IN THE FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Memorial of the Philadelphia Bourse, an organization composed of over 2,500 business men, firms, and corporations having as one of its objects the improvement of the commercial interests of the city, State, and Nation, acting through its board of directors by its committee on commercial affairs, at a meeting held January 22, 1915.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

This memorial of the Philadelphia Bourse respectfully represents:

Whereas section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act officially designated the "Panama Canal act," provides for the admission to registry as vessels of the United States foreign-built "sea-going vessels, whether steam or sail, which have been certified by the Steamboat-Inspection Service * * * not more than five years old at the time of application for registry * * * for trade with foreign countries * * * the Philippine Islands, etc.," with certain restrictions as to the citizenship of the owners or managers of such vessels; and

Whereas by H. R. 18202, Sixty-third Congress, approved August 18, 1914, the restriction contained in the Panama Canal act reading "not more than five years old at the time they apply for registry" was repealed, and the President of the United States granted authority to suspend the provisions of law requiring inspection and measurement by officers of the United States of foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry; and

Whereas under the terms of the legislation above quoted American citizens desiring to engage in the operation of vessels in the foreign trade are free to purchase ships in the cheapest markets of the world and obtain American registry for such ships; and

Whereas the failure of American citizens to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the legislation hereinbefore referred to is conclusive proof that ships registered under the American flag can not be profitably operated in the foreign trade; and

Whereas before a merchant marine can be created under the American flag to compete with foreign ships engaged in the over-seas trade a complete revision of the navigation laws of the United States must be made, so that the cost of operating ships under the American flag may be reduced to the level of the cost of operating foreign ships competing for the same business; and

Whereas no such revision is proposed by the bill H. R. 18666–S. 6856, which provides for Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, in consequence of which the Government will operate under the same disadvantages that apply to privately owned vessels, magnified by the greater demands which will be made by seamen in Government employ; and

Whereas Government-owned and operated ships operated primarily "to regulate the rates for carrying the mails and for passenger and freight service" (see majority report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries No. 1149, accompanying H. R. 18666) will unquestionably be operated at a loss; and

Whereas such loss will be the most insidious form of subsidy or subvention, appearing under the disguise of a deficit incurred in operating such ships, with no limitations upon the amounts of such deficits; and

Whereas according to the report of the majority of the committee hereinbefore mentioned "the country is opposed to subsidies, and with good reason," and such granting of subsidies is opposed by all Democratic doctrine. (See Rept. No. 2755, pt. 2, of the Senate, 58th Cong., 3d sess., accompanying S. 6291, submitted by Mr. Mallory of Florida for himself, and Messrs. Spight, of Mississippi, and McDermott, of New Jersey, which stated inter alia:)

"These sections provide for direct subsidies and are so obnoxious to Democratic principles and to the economic sense of the country that we are compelled to enter our earnest protest against their enactment into law. Its chief difference from former direct subsidy bills (reference is made to a bill 'To promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage,' introduced by Senator GALLINGER) is that it is not as honest as these bills were. It displaces the word 'subsidy' with the word 'subvention' * * * without any limitation of the subsidy * * * without any sort of limitation of the total to be paid out of the Treasury now or hereafter * * *.

"We mean no reflection of duplicity against our colleagues on the commission (Merchant Marine Commission), but the situation seems to be such that they can not get away from the idea of direct governmental aid. * * * Section 2 ingeniously introduces the subject by the sugar-coated expression 'In the interest of the national defense and for the performance of public services.' Will the Congress of the United States and the American people permit themselves to be deceived by this transparent disguise? Public sentiment and the sober judgment of the people's representatives have united to condemn every previous effort to enact such legislation, and surely this effort must meet the fate of its predecessors despite the canting phrase 'In the interest of the national defense and for the performance of public services,' and the substitution of the euphonious title 'subvention' for 'subsidy.' * * *

"It will be observed also that unlike other previous bills which have been offered from time to time, there is absolutely no limit to the amount which may be expended under this bill."

Whereas, to still further quote the language of the committee, "Whatever objections to previous subsidy bills have been valid are of equal weight to-day against this section," there is every reason why the bill H. R. 18666–S. 6856 should be defeated and no valid reason for its enactment.

Therefore the Philadelphia Bourse earnestly opposes the passage of the bill H. R. 18666–S. 6856, believing it be futile for the purposes sought to be accomplished, vicious in principle, and indefensible as a piece of economic legislation.

We hold that a temporary condition should not be met by paternalistic legislation subversive of all precedent and the traditions of our people; embarking our Government in business as a common carrier on the high seas in competition with the ships of the world, and not for gain but to regulate rates, with the complications which would result with foreign nations from such "unfair competition," denounced and prohibited by section 5 of the act creating a Federal Trade Commission; and further

We respectfully urge that the Congress should "strike the shackles from business" on the ocean by revising all those sections of the navigation laws which by their restrictions on American ships and shipowners enhance the cost of operation of vessels under the American flag.

PHILADELPHIA BOURSE,
By GEORGE E. BARTOL, *President.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] EMIL P. ALBRECHT, *Secretary.*

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry employees of the Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of stop watch and time study of employees, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry camps, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and also from various labor organizations in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the immi-

gration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry pupils of the Springside School, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry branches of the United Mine Workers of America, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the work of the Bureau of Mines, which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Stoneboro, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the Army and Navy equipment, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KENYON. I present a letter from the German-American Alliance of Scott County, Iowa, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *January 25, 1915.*

Hon. W. S. KENYON, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At the last regular meeting the German-American Alliance of Scott County, Iowa, an organization having a membership of over 3,000 citizens of the United States, resolutions were adopted favoring the adoption of the following measures pending in Congress: House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; and the officers of the organization were instructed to urge Senators A. B. CUMMINS and W. S. KENYON and Representative HENRY VOLLMER to give their earnest support to these measures.

Respectfully,

GERMAN-AMERICAN ALLIANCE OF SCOTT COUNTY, IOWA,
By ALFRED C. MUELLER, *President,*
P. RADENHAUSEN, *Secretary.*

Mr. KENYON. I present a large number of petitions and resolutions on the subject of exportation of munitions and arms to belligerents. I ask that one be printed in the RECORD. It is short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, most earnestly request the President of the United States, the Senators of our State, and the Representative of our district to pass the necessary laws that will enable the President of the United States to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies only, and thereby withdraw from all contending powers all aid and assistance of this Republic.

We especially request our Senators and the Representative of our district to vote for Senate resolution 6088 or any similar measure of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hamburg, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STERLING presented petitions of sundry citizens of Memo, Redfield, Ramono, and Goodwin, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, in lieu of presenting petitions I simply want to say that every day I am receiving many letters urging the passage of the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war. I am also receiving many petitions to the same effect. I wish to state that I have not received a single letter or memorial protesting against the bill.

Mr. REED. I present two memorials from the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, and ask that they be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 30, 1915.

Hon. JAMES A. REED, United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to certify to you that the following resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the Forty-eighth General Assembly of Missouri, on the 29th day of January, 1915:

"*Be it resolved by the House and Senate of the Forty-eighth Missouri General Assembly,* That it is the sentiment of this body that the rivers and harbors bill recently passed by the House of Representatives of Congress is a meritorious measure, and if the same is passed by the Senate the sums appropriated for the various streams and harbors will result in great improvement to navigation being brought about to the various parts of this country.

"Therefore the Forty-eighth Missouri General Assembly urges the two United States Senators from Missouri to use their best efforts to secure the adoption of said rivers and harbors bill as now pending in the Senate; and be it therefore

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution, signed by the clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of the senate be sent immediately to WILLIAM J. STONE and JAMES A. REED, United States Senators from Missouri, with a request that the same be presented to and read to the United States Senate as soon as possible."

Very respectfully, yours,

R. E. L. MARRS, *Chief Clerk.*

STATE OF MISSOURI,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 28, 1915.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to certify to you that the following resolution was passed by the House of Representatives of the Forty-eighth General Assembly of Missouri on the 28th day of January, 1915:

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States Congress has passed a bill appropriating liberal sums to continue the work on rivers and harbors projects heretofore begun; and

"Whereas there are more miles of navigable streams contiguous to or traversing the State of Missouri than any other State in the Union, thereby making the passage of said rivers and harbors bill made by the House of great importance to this State: Therefore

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the Missouri Legislature respectfully urges the United States Senators, regardless of political affiliations, to pass the House rivers and harbors bill with only such amendments made thereto as are absolutely necessary in order to conserve the public interest.

"*Be it further resolved,* That the clerk of this house be instructed to forward to the Secretary of the United States Senate a copy of this resolution and a copy to each United States Senator from Missouri, with the request that the same be read in the United States Senate while in session."

Very respectfully, R. E. L. MARRS,
Chief Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Halls Summit and Minneapolis, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to curtail the liberty of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Atchison, Poek, Buhler, Lincoln, Paola, and Offerla, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Broad Brook, Meriden; of the Kaiser Franz Joseph Society, of New Britain; and of the Turner Society of Meriden, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Central Elevator & Warehouse Co. and the Board of Trade of New Orleans, La.; American Hay & Grain Co., of Marietta, Ohio; Merchants' Elevator Co. of Minneapolis, Minn.; the Board of Trade of Atchison, Kans.; J. H. Wilkes & Co., of Nashville, Tenn.; Ballard-Messmore Grain Co. and Toberman Mackey, of St. Louis, Mo.; the J. Chas. McCullough Seed Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the grading and inspection of grain, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon relative to an amendment looking to the improvement of the navigation laws of the Pacific coast. I ask that the joint memorial may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 4 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the 27th day of January, 1915, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 27th day of January, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial No. 4.

Whereas in the Oregon Daily Journal of Tuesday, January 12, 1915, there appears an editorial in which is recounted one of the conditions obtaining in Oregon to the great detriment of one of Oregon's leading industries, said editorial in part being as follows:

"Many things are troubling Oregon lumbermen. At the lumbermen's dinner in Portland Saturday night O. M. Clark stated that his firm closed a contract for delivery of 500,000 feet of lumber to a Philadelphia buyer. Transportation could not be obtained. Ships in the trade between Portland and the Atlantic ports refused to carry the shipment to Philadelphia, because they preferred to sell the lumber themselves and make a profit in addition to the regular freight charges.

"So the delivery could not be made. Mr. Clark's firm thereupon, for a small commission, transferred the contract to Robert Dollar, a San Francisco shipowner, who purchased the lumber in British Columbia and used it to fill the Philadelphia order.

"A thing that contributes to the power of the shipowners who thus refuse to deliver Portland cargoes in Atlantic ports is that none but American-built ships can engage in domestic trade. The amendment last fall to the navigation law admitting foreign-built ships to American registry did not include an admission of such vessels to the domestic trade, but restricted them to purely foreign business"; and

Whereas the lumber industry is one of the principal industries of the State of Oregon and gives ready employment to a large number of Oregon citizens, and as a result of the present condition of our national laws the lumber industry in Oregon is badly handicapped, with the result that mary of our citizens are now out of employment who have heretofore enjoyed regular and lucrative employment in the Oregon lumber industry; and

Whereas the United States of America constructed the Panama Canal at a great expense to the general public of this country, and by a recent act of Congress has opened said canal to the ships of all of the principal nations of the world upon terms as favorable as to the ships of this country, and by another act of Congress the protective tariff on manufactured lumber has been removed, with the result that our eastern lumber markets are now open to the producers of all lumber-producing countries; and

Whereas the navigation laws of the United States are such that lumber from one port can not be transported to another port in the United States except upon vessels built in the United States, and by reason of the navigation laws of this country such transportation is more expensive than transportation from competing foreign ports, with the result that lumber can be purchased and transported from ports in British Columbia to the Atlantic seacoast in the United States at a considerably less price than the same can be transported from the ports of Oregon: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to so amend our national navigation laws that the lumber industry of the Pacific coast may transact its business with its natural customers on the Atlantic coast on terms at least as favorable as are now held by competitors operating in British Columbia; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby instructed to transmit by mail a copy of this resolution to each of the Oregon delegates in Congress.

Concurred in by the house January 26, 1915.

BEN SELLING,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 20, 1915.

W. LAIR THOMPSON,
President of the Senate.

(Indorsed:) Senate joint memorial No. 4, by Senator Bingham. J. W. Cochran, chief clerk. Filed January 27, 1915, at 3.45 o'clock p. m. Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state, by S. A. Kozer, deputy.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington and Jamaica, in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drink and drugs in the Philippine Islands, which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 941), accompanied by a bill (S. 7509) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that Committee:

S. 1695. Charles F. Schantz.
S. 2282. Arthur W. Martin.
S. 3358. Blanche Wood.
S. 3643. Jane M. Brown.
S. 3977. Andrew F. Venable.
S. 5018. Anna L. Power.
S. 5270. Charles M. Gregory.
S. 5558. Patrick J. Hyde.
S. 6129. Benjamin F. Klippert.
S. 6158. Reinhard Anschuetz, alias Charles Reinhard.
S. 6168. Odelon Valcour.
S. 6186. James N. Yates.
S. 6256. Henry P. Logsdon.
S. 6279. William C. Campbell.
S. 6314. Edward Louden.
S. 6401. Joseph H. Dawson.
S. 6477. Jennings J. Pierce.
S. 6554. Wilhelmina Myer.
S. 6659. Raymond S. Sheldon.
S. 6764. Willard D. Cook.
S. 6791. George P. L. McCarty and Mildred G. McCarty.
S. 6824. Edward F. Collins.
S. 6845. Winfield S. Taylor.
S. 6848. William G. Taliaferro.
S. 6864. Minnie Lord Henderson.
S. 6899. Allan E. Pugh.
S. 6901. Eugene Helm.
S. 6917. David Roach.
S. 6939. Sarah A. Boll.
S. 6996. William A. Taylor.
S. 7012. Edward M. Booe.
S. 7031. Alice Pollock.
S. 7032. Mary R. Kendall.
S. 7063. Caro G. Moore.
S. 7125. Robert H. Trollinger.
S. 7193. John Johnson No. 2.
S. 7355. Louisa M. Fletcher.
S. 7453. Alice S. C. McNaught.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on the Philippines, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those Islands, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 942) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 283) for the relief of Lester A. Rockwell, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 943) thereon.

Mr. O'GORMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 7091) to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 944) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 7041) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 945) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 6194) to provide for the acquisition of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Hood River, Oreg., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 946) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16136) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 947) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to reserve the right to file minority views upon House bill 16136, which has just been reported from the Committee on Public Lands by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6373) to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 948) thereon.

Mr. MYERS. I also report back from the Committee on Public Lands, favorably and without amendment, the bill (H. R. 15799) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 949) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the bill goes to the calendar.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 7255) to provide a harbor boat for the Revenue-Cutter Service to replace the *Hartley* at San Francisco, Cal., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 950) thereon.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WORKS. I present the minority views of the Committee on Public Lands on House bill 16673, commonly known as the water-power bill. The paper consists mainly of a discussion of the legal questions involved, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the views of the minority were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Rept. 898, pt. 2, 63d Cong., 3d sess.]

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. WORKS, from the Committee on Public Lands, submitted the following views of the minority, to accompany H. R. 16673:

The report of the majority of the committee states the object of the bill, as follows:

"The object of the measure is the better and speedier development for useful and beneficial purposes of the great undeveloped water power of the country, now lagging on account of inadequate and inefficient laws."

If this were the real object and purpose of the bill and this object would be attained even in reasonable degree and without unwarranted and dangerous encroachments by the National Government on the constitutional rights of the States, the signers of this minority report of the committee would not be found contending against its enactment, as they represent a constituency that is vitally interested in the development of all natural resources and their application to beneficial uses, freed as far as possible from limitations, obstructions, or unnecessary burdens of any kind. In any attempt to bring about such legislation we should carefully consider:

1. The rights of the States in the waters flowing through them in the natural streams and to regulate and control their appropriation, diversion, and use.

2. The limitations of the National Government in dealing with the appropriation, regulation, and use of these waters.

3. The rights of the people of the States to the use of the waters of the streams, as provided by law, commonly called the consumers.

But after all and in the last analysis, it is the consumer that should be protected and his individual right to the use of the water maintained and preserved under reasonable rules and regulations that will insure the greater and more beneficial use of the water for all legitimate purposes.

The western semiarid States, where irrigation is necessary to their full development and prosperity, are peculiarly and vitally interested in making every drop of water beneficially useful and in supplying every acre of land possible with the water, without which much of their lands are sterile and unproductive. This being true, it must be seen that these States are interested and will support any just law that will extend the use of water either for the irrigation of their land or the development of power. And if it were believed by us that this bill, if it should become a law, would have that effect without violating any of the fundamental and constitutional rights of the States, it would receive our earnest and united support. It is because we are fully convinced by our own knowledge of the subject and the testimony taken at the hearings before the committee that the bill will not conduce to the better or speedier development of the water power of the country, but will hinder and retard such development, and that its real object, purpose, and effect is to usurp by the National Government the rights and jurisdiction of the States in and over the flowing waters of the streams to the detriment of the States and to water consumers, that we earnestly oppose the passage of the bill. And this attempt at what seems to us to be revolutionary, detrimental, and unwise legislation is so far-reaching and important that we feel it to be our duty to lay before the Senate our reasons for opposing the passage of the bill.

In dealing with the subject we assume that certain fundamental principles of law, controlling in their influence as affecting such legislation as this, have been firmly and unalterably established by both Federal and State decisions. They are as follows:

1. The ownership of flowing water and the right to dispose of and to regulate and control the use thereof within their borders belong exclusively to the States as a part of their sovereign power, subject only, in case of navigable streams, to the power of the Federal Government to regulate and promote commerce between the States.

Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., U. S., 212);
Withers *v.* Buckley (20 How., 84);
Escanaba Co. *v.* Chicago (107 U. S., 678);
Kansas *v.* Colorado (206 U. S., 46);
Illinois Central Railroad *v.* Illinois (146 U. S., 387);
Shively *v.* Bowlby (152 U. S., 1);
Sands *v.* Manistee River Improvement Co. (123 U. S., 288);
Veazie *v.* Moor (14 How., U. S., 568);
Hudson Water Co. *v.* McCarter (209 U. S., 349);
City of New York *v.* Miln (11 Pet., 102);
Gutierras *v.* Albuquerque (188 U. S., 545);
County of Mobile *v.* Kimball (102 U. S., 691);
Cardwell *v.* American Bridge Co. (113 U. S., 205);
Willamette Iron Bridge Co. *v.* Hatch (125 U. S., 1);
United States *v.* Railroad Bridge Co. (6 McLean, 517).

2. That as a consequence the United States have no such right either of ownership, regulation, or control.

Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., U. S., 212);
Kansas *v.* Colorado (206 U. S., 46);
Ward *v.* Race Horse (163 U. S., 504).

3. The rights of consumers to the use of the water are dependent upon State and not Federal laws and subject to State regulation and control, exclusively, unless the use is interstate.

Kansas *v.* Colorado (206 U. S., 46);
Osborne *v.* San Diego Land & Town Co. (178 U. S., 22);
Los Angeles *v.* Los Angeles Water Co. (177 U. S., 558);
St. Anthony Falls Water Power Co. *v.* St. Paul Water Commissioners (168 U. S., 349);
Bean *v.* Morris (221 U. S., 485).

4. The Federal Government owns the public lands as a proprietor only and not in its sovereign capacity.

Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., U. S., 212);
Ward *v.* Race Horse (163 U. S., 504);
Woodruff *v.* North Bloomfield Gravel Mining Co. (18 Fed. Rep., 753);
Boggs *v.* Merced Mining Co. (14 Cal., 279, 376).

5. The Federal Government has no power or jurisdiction to fix rates or regulate the use or disposition of water within a State.

Sands *v.* Manistee River Improvement Co. (123 U. S., 288);
Osborne *v.* San Diego Land & Town Co. (178 U. S., 22).

6. The power to fix rates or regulate the use of water not given to the Federal Government by the Constitution can not be bestowed by act of Congress as a condition to the leasing or sale of the public lands.

New Orleans *v.* United States (10 Pet., 662, 736);
Leovy *v.* United States (177 U. S., 621).

7. Absolute property in and dominion and sovereignty over the soils under the tidewaters in the States are reserved to the several States.

Kansas *v.* United Land Association (142 U. S., 161).

8. Public lands owned by the United States are not subject to taxation by the States.

California *v.* Shearer (30 Cal., 645, 655, 658);
Van Brocklin *v.* Tennessee (117 U. S., 151).

9. The power of Congress to legislate or exercise sovereignty over lands within a State is confined to lands acquired by the Federal Government for certain specific purposes, and with the consent of the State.

United States *v.* Cornell (2 Mason, 60);
Woodruff *v.* North Bloomfield Gravel Mining Co. (18 Fed. Rep., 753).

The far-reaching effects of this proposed legislation and the evident attempt of the Federal Government to usurp the sovereign powers of the States move us to consider more extensively the effect of the principles above laid down and the cases supporting our views. In doing so we rest our views and conclusions largely upon the following premises:

1. Before the formation of the present Government all sovereign powers were vested in the several States within their borders.

2. The Federal Government formed by the States has only such powers as the States bestowed upon it by the Constitution. All others are reserved to the States.

3. The powers thus granted do not include the power to regulate or control the use of the waters of streams flowing within a State except to maintain and regulate commerce between the States, with foreign nations, and under treaties with the Indians.

4. The ownership of land within a State as a proprietary owner and not for governmental uses and purposes gives the Federal Government no power or jurisdiction to regulate or control the use of the waters of a stream on which the land borders.

5. Therefore any legislation attempting to vest any such power in the Government will be unconstitutional and void.

That the bill under consideration does provide for such usurpation of power we will show further along.

Having laid down these general principles that should guide and control our action, we quote, for the information of the Senate, some of the language of the courts on the subject which we regard as conclusive.

In Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., 212) the question was as to the title to lands covered by the waters of a navigable stream and involved the power and jurisdiction of the United States Government over such lands. The court said:

"The right which belongs to the society, or to the sovereign, of disposing in case of necessity, and for the public safety, of all the wealth contained in the State, is called the eminent domain. It is evident that this right is, in certain cases, necessary to him who governs and is consequently a part of the empire, or sovereign power. (Vat. Law of Nations, sec. 244.) This definition shows that the eminent domain, although a sovereign power, does not include all sovereign power, and this explains the sense in which it is used in this opinion. The compact made between the United States and the State of Georgia was sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States, by the third section of the fourth article of which it is declared that 'new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union, but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any others State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of Congress.'

"When Alabama was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States she succeeded to all the rights of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and eminent domain which Georgia possessed at the date of the cession, except so far as this right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States, for the temporary purposes provided for in the deed of cession and the legislative acts connected with it. Nothing remained to the United States, according to the terms of the agreement, but the public lands. And if an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement granting the municipal right of sovereignty and eminent domain to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, because the United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain, within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in the cases in which it is expressly granted.

"By the sixteenth clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution power is given to Congress 'to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same may be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.' Within the District of Columbia, and the other places purchased and used for the purposes above mentioned, the national and municipal powers of government of every description are united in the government of the Union. And these are the only cases within the United States in which all the powers of government are united in a single government, except in cases already mentioned of the temporary territorial governments, and there a local government exists. The right of Alabama and every other new State to exercise all the powers of government which belong to and may be exercised by the original States of the Union must be admitted and remain unquestioned, except so far as they are, temporarily, deprived of control over the public lands.

"We will now inquire into the nature and extent of the right of the United States to these lands, and whether that right can in any manner affect or control the decision of the case before us. This right originated in voluntary surrenders, made by several of the old States, of their waste and unappropriated lands to the United States, under a resolution of the old Congress of the 6th of September, 1780, recom-

mending such surrender and cession, to aid in paying the public debt incurred by the War of the Revolution. The object of all the parties to these contracts of cession was to convert the land into money for the payment of the debt and to erect new States over the territory thus ceded; and as soon as these purposes could be accomplished the power of the United States over these lands, as property, was to cease.

"Whenever the United States shall have fully executed these trusts the municipal sovereignty of the new States will be complete throughout their respective borders, and they and the original States will be upon an equal footing in all respects whatever. We therefore think the United States hold the public lands within the new States by force of the deeds of cession, and the statutes connected with them, and not by any municipal sovereignty which it may be supposed they possess or have reserved by compact with the new States for that particular purpose. The provision of the Constitution above referred to shows that no such power can be exercised by the United States within a State. Such a power is not only repugnant to the Constitution, but it is inconsistent with the spirit and intention of the deeds of cession. The argument so much relied on by the counsel for the plaintiffs, that the agreement of the people inhabiting the new States, 'that they forever disclaim all right and title to the waste or unappropriated lands lying within the said territory, and that the same shall be and remain at the sole and entire disposition of the United States,' can not operate as a contract between the parties, but is binding as a law. Full power is given to Congress 'to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States.' This authorized the passage of all laws necessary to secure the rights of the United States to the public lands and to provide for their sale, and to protect them from taxation."

The case of Withers *v.* Buckley (20 How., 84) involved the powers of the Federal and State Governments over navigable streams. It also lays down the rule since adhered to that the fifth and other amendments to the Constitution were intended to modify the powers granted to the Federal Government and do not limit or affect the powers of the State.

Quoting from the language of Chief Justice Marshall in Barron *v.* Baltimore (7 Peters, 247–248), the court said:

"The question thus presented we think of great importance but not of much difficulty.

"The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States for themselves; for their own government, and not for the government of the individual States. Each State established a constitution for itself, and in that constitution provided such limitations and restrictions on the powers of its particular government as its judgment dictated. The people of the United States framed such a government for the United States as they supposed best adapted to their situation and best adapted to promote their interests. The powers they conferred on this government were to be exercised by itself; and the limitations on power, if expressed in general terms, are naturally, and we think necessarily, applicable to the government created by the instrument. They are limitations of power granted by the instrument itself, not of distinct governments, framed by different persons and for different purposes.

"If these propositions be correct, the fifth amendment must be understood as restraining the power of the General Government, not as applicable to the States. In their several constitutions they have imposed such restrictions on their respective governments as their own wisdom suggested, such as they deemed most proper for themselves. It is a subject on which they judge exclusively and with which others interfere no further than they are supposed to have a common interest."

Again, reverting to the causes which led to the proposal and adoption of the amendments of the Constitution, the same judge remarks (ib., p. 250)—and these remarks embrace the whole series of articles adopted: "In almost every convention in which the Constitution was adopted, amendments to guard against the abuse of power were recommended. These amendments demanded security against the apprehended encroachments of the General Government, not against those of the local governments.

"In compliance with a sentiment thus generally expressed, to quiet fears thus extensively entertained, amendments were proposed by the required majority in Congress and adopted by the States. These amendments contain no expression indicating an intention to apply them to the State governments. This court can not so apply them. (Vide also the cases of Fox *v.* The State of Ohio, 5 How., 411, and of The West River Bridge Co. *v.* Dix et al., 6 How., 507.)"

And further, in considering an act of Congress relating to the subject, the court, in same case, used this language:

"In considering this act of Congress of March 1, 1817, it is unnecessary to institute any examination or criticism as to its legitimate meaning, or operation, or binding authority further than to affirm that it could have no effect to restrict the new State in any of its necessary attributes as an independent sovereign Government, nor to inhibit or diminish its perfect equality with the other members of the Confederacy with which it was to be associated. These conclusions follow from the very nature and objects of the Confederacy, from the language of the Constitution adopted by the States, and from the rule of interpretation pronounced by this court in the case of Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., p. 223). The act of Congress of March 1, 1817, in prescribing the free navigation of the Mississippi and the navigable waters flowing into the river, could not have been designed to inhibit the power inseparable from every sovereign or efficient government to devise and to execute measures for the improvement of the State, although such measures might induce or render necessary changes in the channels or courses of rivers within the interior of the State, or might be productive of a change in the value of private property. Such consequences are not infrequently and indeed unavoidably incident to public and general measures highly promotive of and absolutely necessary to the public good. And here it may be asked whether the law complained of and the measures said to be in contemplation for its execution are in reality in conflict with the act of Congress of March 1, 1817, with respect either to the letter or the spirit of the act. On this point may be cited the case of Veazie et al. *v.* Moor (in 14 How., 568)."

The case of Escanaba Co. *v.* Chicago (107 U. S., 678) involved the right of the States to legislate respecting the use of navigable streams over which, for purposes of commerce between the States, the Federal Government has jurisdiction. In dealing with this question the court said:

"The power vested in the General Government to regulate interstate and foreign commerce involves the control of the waters of the United States which are navigable in fact, so far as it may be necessary to insure their free navigation, when by themselves or their connection with other waters they form a continuous channel for commerce among the States or with foreign countries. * * *

"But the States have full power to regulate within their limits matters of internal police, including in that general designation whatever will promote the peace, comfort, convenience, and prosperity of their people. This power embraces the construction of roads, canals, and bridges and the establishment of ferries, and it can generally be exercised more wisely by the States than by a distant authority. They are the first to see the importance of such means of internal communication and are more deeply concerned than others in their wise management. Illinois is more immediately affected by the bridges over the Chicago River and its branches than any other State and is more directly concerned for the prosperity of the city of Chicago, for the convenience and comfort of its inhabitants, and the growth of its commerce. And nowhere could the power to control the bridges in that city, their construction, form, and strength, and the size of their draws and the manner and times of using them be better vested than with the State or the authorities of the city upon whom it has devolved that duty. When its power is exercised so as to unnecessarily obstruct the navigation of the river or its branches, Congress may interfere and remove the obstruction. If the power of the State and that of the Federal Government come in conflict, the latter must control and the former yield. This necessarily follows from the position given by the Constitution to legislation in pursuance of it as the supreme law of the land. But until Congress acts on the subject the power of the State over bridges across its navigable streams is plenary."

And further:

"The doctrine declared in these several decisions is in accordance with the more general doctrine now firmly established—that the commercial power of Congress is exclusive of State authority only when the subjects upon which it is exercised are national in their character and admit and require uniformity of regulation affecting alike all the States. Upon such subjects only that authority can act which can speak for the whole country. Its nonaction is therefore a declaration that they shall remain free from all regulation."

Kansas *v.* Colorado (206 U. S., 46) involves directly the power of the Federal Government to legislate respecting the irrigation of arid lands. The question presented for decision is thus stated by the court:

"Turning now to the controversy as here presented, it is whether Kansas has a right to the continuous flow of the waters of the Arkansas River, as that flow existed before any human interference therewith, or Colorado the right to appropriate the waters of that stream so as to prevent that continuous flow, or that the amount of the flow is subject to the superior authority and supervisory control of the United States. * * *

"The primary question is, of course, of national control. For if the Nation has a right to regulate the flow of the waters, we must inquire what it has done in the way of regulation. If it has done nothing, the further question will then arise, What are the respective rights of the two States in the absence of national regulation?"

In discussing this question, as stated by the court, it was said:

"Congress has, by virtue of the grant to it of power to regulate commerce 'among the several States,' extensive control over the highways, natural or artificial, upon which such commerce may be carried. It may prevent or remove obstructions in the natural waterways and preserve the navigability of those ways. * * *

"That involves the question whether the reclamation of arid lands is one of the powers granted to the General Government. As heretofore stated, the constant declaration of this court from the beginning is that this Government is one of enumerated powers. 'The Government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted, must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication.' (Story, J., in Martin *v.* Hunter's Lessee, 1 Wheat., 304, 326.) 'The Government of the United States is one of delegated, limited, and enumerated powers.' (United States *v.* Harris, 106 U. S., 629, 635.)

"Turning to the enumeration of the powers granted to Congress by the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, it is enough to say that no one of them by any implication refers to the reclamation of arid lands. The last paragraph of the section, which authorizes Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof, is not the delegation of a new and independent power, but simply provision for making effective the powers theretofore mentioned. * * *

"We must look beyond section 8 for congressional authority over arid lands, and it is said to be found in the second paragraph of section 3 of Article IV, reading: 'The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.'

"The full scope of this paragraph has never been definitely settled. Primarily, at least, it is a grant of power to the United States of control over its property. That is implied by the words 'territory or other property.' It is true it has been referred to in some decisions as granting political and legislative control over the Territories, as distinguished from the States of the Union. It is unnecessary in the present case to consider whether the language justifies this construction. Certainly we have no disposition to limit or qualify the expressions which have heretofore fallen from this court in respect thereto. *But, clearly, it does not grant to Congress any legislative control over the States and must, so far as they are concerned, be limited to authority over the property belonging to the United States within their limits.* Appreciating the force of this, counsel for the Government relies upon 'the doctrine of sovereign and inherent power,' adding, 'I am aware that in advancing this doctrine I seem to challenge great decisions of the court, and I speak with deference.' His argument runs substantially along this line: All legislative power must be vested in either the State or the National Government; no legislative powers belong to a State government other than those which affect solely the internal affairs of that State, consequently all powers which are national in their scope must be found vested in the Congress of the United States. But the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers, is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a Government of enumerated powers. That this is such a Government clearly appears from the Constitution, independently of the amendments, for otherwise there would be an instrument granting specific things made operative to grant other and distinct things. This natural construction of the original body of the Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment. This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience

of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted. With equal determination, the framers intended that no such assumption should ever find justification in the organic act, and that if in the future further powers seemed necessary they should be granted by the people in the manner they had provided for amending that act. It reads, 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people * * *.'

"One cardinal rule underlying all the relations of the States to each other is that of equality of right. Each State stands on the same level with all the rest. It can impose its own legislation on no one of the others and is bound to yield its own views to none. Yet, whenever, as in the case of Missouri *v.* Illinois (180 U. S., 208) the action of one State reaches through the agency of natural laws into the territory of another State, the question of the extent and the limitations of the rights of the two States becomes a matter of justiciable dispute between them, and this court is called upon to settle that dispute in such a way as will recognize the equal rights of both and at the same time establish justice between them."

The court then proceeded to consider and determine the rights, not of the Federal Government, but of the States of Kansas and Colorado, in the waters of the Arkansas River, a stream which flows through both States.

The case of Shively *v.* Bowlby (152 U. S., 1) involved the title to lands below high-water mark in the Columbia River in the State of Oregon. It is one of the leading cases on the subject of the powers of the Federal and State Governments over navigable streams. That the power and jurisdiction of the States over nonnavigable streams and lands lying under them is exclusive is not questioned. It is only where the question of navigation for interstate purposes is involved that any question of sovereign power in the States has ever been controverted. In this case the laws of the several States on the subject and the numerous decided cases bearing upon it are fully reviewed, and the doctrine laid down in Pollard's Lessee against Hagan, quoted from above, confirmed and approved. The opinion in the case is an exceedingly interesting and instructive one, and should receive attention in this connection. In closing, the court said:

"The United States, while they hold the country as a Territory, having all the powers both of national and municipal government, may grant for appropriate purposes titles or rights in the soil below high-water mark of tidewaters. But they have never done so by general laws; and, unless in some case of international duty or public exigency, have acted upon the policy, as most in accordance with the interest of the people and with the object for which the Territories were acquired, of leaving the administration and disposition of this sovereign right in navigable waters and in the soil under them to the control of the States, respectively, when organized and admitted into the Union.

"Grants by Congress of portions of the public lands within a Territory to settlers thereon, though bordering on or bounded by navigable waters, convey, of their own force, no title or right below high-water mark, and do not impair the title and dominion of the future State when created; but leave the question of the use of the shores by the owners of uplands to the sovereign control of each State, subject only to the rights vested by the Constitution in the United States.

"The donation land claim, bounded by the Columbia River, upon which the plaintiff in error relies, includes no title or right in the land below high-water mark; and the statutes of Oregon, under which the defendants in error hold, are a constitutional and legal exercise by the State of Oregon of its dominion over the lands under navigable waters."

The following statement in the opinion in Illinois Central Railroad *v.* Illinois (146 U. S., 387, 435) is to the same effect:

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found, with the consequent right to use or dispose of any portion thereof, when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the waters, and subject always to the paramount right of Congress to control their navigation as far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States. This doctrine has been often announced by this court and is not questioned by counsel of any of the parties." (Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan, 3 How., 212; Weber *v.* Harbor Commissioners, 18 Wall., 57.)

As establishing the claim we make that the Constitution vests no power in the Federal Government to regulate or control the use of the waters of a stream within a State, and that this power can not be given by a statute enacted by Congress, we quote this language from the opinion in New Orleans *v.* United States (10 Pet., 662, 736):

"The Government of the United States, as was well observed in the argument, is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects, except those which have been delegated to it. Congress can not by legislation enlarge the Federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power."

That the States have the right to regulate the use of even navigable streams within their borders where Congress has not acted or where such action does not interfere with the paramount power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce between the States, is affirmed by Leovy *v.* United States (177 U. S., 621), in which it is said:

"Subject, then, to the paramount jurisdiction of Congress over the navigable waters of the United States, the State of Louisiana has full power to authorize the construction and maintenance of levees, drains, and other structures necessary and suitable to reclaim swamp and overflowed lands within her limits."

And in the *Daniel Ball* (177 U. S., 10 Wall., 557) it is said:

"Those rivers must be regarded as public navigable rivers in law which are navigable in fact. And they are navigable in fact when they are used, or are susceptible of being used, in their ordinary condition, as highways for commerce, over which trade and travel are or may be conducted in the customary modes of trade and travel on water."

Respecting the right of a State to control the navigation of a stream wholly within its limits it was said in the case of Veazie *v.* Moor (14 How., 568, 573):

"Upon a comparison of this decree and of the statute upon which it is founded with the provision of the Constitution already referred to, we are unable to perceive by what rule of interpretation either the statute or the decree can be brought within either of the categories comprised in that provision.

"These categories are: 1. Commerce with foreign nations. 2. Commerce amongst the several States. 3. Commerce with the Indian tribes. Taking the term 'commerce' in its broadest acceptation, supposing it to embrace not merely traffic but the means and vehicles by which it is prosecuted, can it properly be made to include objects and purposes such as those contemplated by the law under review? Commerce with foreign nations must signify commerce which in some sense is necessarily connected with these nations, transactions which either immediately or at some stage of their progress must be extraterritorial. * * * The phrase can never be applied to transactions wholly internal, between citizens of the same community, or to a polity and laws whose ends and purposes and operations are restricted to the territory and soil and jurisdiction of such community. Nor can it be properly concluded that, because the products of domestic enterprise in agriculture or manufactures or in the arts may ultimately become the subjects of foreign commerce, the control of the means of the encouragements by which enterprise is fostered and protected is legitimately within the import of the phrase 'foreign commerce,' or fairly implied in any investiture of the power to regulate such commerce. A pretension as far-reaching as this would extend to contracts between citizen and citizen of the same State, would control the pursuits of the planter, the grazier, the manufacturer, the mechanic, the immense operations of the collieries and mines and furnaces of the country; for there is not one of these avocations the results of which may not become the subjects of foreign commerce and be borne either by turnpikes, canals, or railroads from point to point within the several States toward an ultimate destination, like the one above mentioned. Such a pretension would effectually prevent or paralyze every effort at internal improvement by the several States; for it can not be supposed that the States would exhaust their capital and their credit in the construction of turnpikes, canals, and railroads, the remuneration derivable from which and all control over which might be immediately wrested from them, because such public works would be facilities for a commerce which, while availing itself of those facilities, was unquestionably internal, although intermediately or ultimately it might become foreign.

"The rule here given with respect to the regulation of foreign commerce equally excludes from the regulation of commerce between the States and the Indian tribes the control over turnpikes, canals, or railroads, or the clearing and deepening of watercourses exclusively within the States, or the management of the transportation upon and by means of such improvements."

In New York *v.* Miln (11 Pet., 102, 139) the absolute right of the State in this respect is more clearly and emphatically declared in this language:

"But we do not place our opinion on this ground. We choose rather to plant ourselves on what we consider impregnable positions. They are these: That a State has the same undeniable and unlimited jurisdiction over all persons and things within its territorial limits as any foreign nation where that jurisdiction is not surrendered or restrained by the Constitution of the United States. That by virtue of this it is not only the right, but the bounden and solemn duty, of a State to advance the safety, happiness, and prosperity of its people, and to provide for its general welfare by every act of legislation which it may deem to be conducive to these ends, where the power over the particular subject or the manner of its exercise is not surrendered or restrained in the manner just stated. That all those powers which relate to merely municipal legislation, or what may, perhaps, more properly be called internal police, are not thus surrendered or restrained, and that consequently in relation to these the authority of a State is complete, unqualified, and exclusive.

"We are aware that it is at all times difficult to define any subject with proper precision and accuracy; that if this be so in general, it is emphatically so in relation to a subject so diversified and multifarious as the one which we are now considering.

"If we were to attempt it we should say that every law came within this description which concerned the welfare of the whole people of a State or any individual within it, whether it related to their rights or their duties, whether it respected them as men or as citizens of the State, whether in their public or private relation, whether it related to the rights of persons or of property or of the whole people of the State or any individual within it, and whose operation was within the territorial limits of the State and upon the persons and things within its jurisdiction."

Applying this doctrine to the right of a State to protect and control the flow of water in the streams within its limits, the court said, in Hudson Water Co. *v.* McCarter (209 U. S., 349, 356):

"The problems of irrigation have no place here. Leaving them on one side, it appears to us that few public interests are more obvious, indisputable, and independent of particular theory than the interest of the public of a State to maintain the rivers that are wholly within it substantially undiminished, except by such drafts upon them as the guardian of the public welfare may permit for the purpose of turning them to a more perfect use. This public interest is omnipresent wherever there is a State, and grows more pressing as population grows. It is fundamental, and we are of opinion that the private property of riparian proprietors can not be supposed to have deeper roots. Whether it be said that such an interest justifies the cutting down by statute without compensation, in the exercise of the police power, of what otherwise would be private rights of property, or that apart from statute those rights do not go to the height of what the defendant seeks to do, the result is the same. But we agree with the New Jersey courts, and think it quite beyond any rational view of riparian rights that an agreement, of no matter what private owners, could sanction the diversion of an important stream outside the boundaries of the State in which it flows. * * *

"The right to receive water from a river through pipes is subject to territorial limits by nature, and those limits may be fixed by the State within which the river flows, even if they are made to coincide with the State line."

Respecting the effect of the admission of Wyoming as a State upon a treaty with the Indians by which they were given the right to hunt on the public domain, the court in Ward *v.* Race Horse (163 U. S., 504) used this language:

"The argument now advanced in favor of the continued existence of the right to hunt over the land mentioned in the treaty, after it had become subject to State authority, admits that the privilege would cease by the mere fact that the United States disposed of its title to any of the land, although such disposition, when made to an individual, would give him no authority over game, and yet that privilege continued when the United States had called into being a sovereign State, a necessary incident of whose authority was the complete power to regulate the killing of game within its borders. This argument indicates at once the conflict between the right to hunt in the unoccupied lands within the hunting districts and the assertion of the power to continue the

exercise of the privilege in question in the State of Wyoming in defiance of its laws.

* * *

"The act which admitted Wyoming into the Union, as we have said, expressly declared that that State should have all the powers of the other States of the Union, and made no reservation whatever in favor of the Indians. These provisions alone considered would be in conflict with the treaty if it was so constructed as to allow the Indians to seek out every unoccupied piece of Government land and thereon disregard and violate the State law, passed in the undoubted exercise of its municipal authority. But the language of the act admitting Wyoming into the Union, which recognized her coequal rights, was merely declaratory of the general rule."

As to the limitation of the powers of the Federal Government based upon its proprietory ownership of lands within a State, this is said in Woodruff v. North Bloomfield Gravel Mining Co. (18 Fed. Rep., 753, 772):

"Upon the cession of California by Mexico, the sovereignty and proprietorship of all the lands within its borders in which no private interest had vested passed to the United States. Upon the admission of California into the Union, upon an equal footing with the original States, the sovereignty for all internal municipal purposes, and for all purposes except such purposes and with such powers as are expressly conferred upon the National Government by the Constitution of the United States, passed to the State of California. Thenceforth the only interest of the United States in the public lands was that of a proprietor, like that of any other proprietor except that the State, under the express terms upon which it was admitted, could pass no laws to interfere with their primary disposal, and they were not subject to taxation. In all other respects the United States stood upon the same footing as private owners of land."

Having demonstrated, by reference to the decided cases, the respective rights of the Federal Government and the States in the subject matter of the bill, we proceed to consider the provisions of the bill itself and the bearing of the principles we have discussed above on its terms and conditions.

But before taking up the various provisions of the bill in detail we desire to consider it briefly as a whole.

The bill in its entire scope and purpose is an infringement upon and an usurpation of the sovereign powers of the States. This is not only its effect, but it is the avowed intention of its friends to transfer, in part, at least, from the States to the National Government the control over the use of the waters of the stream within the States. Ostensibly it is proposed to authorize the Government to lease its own lands. To this there are serious objections, as we shall point out further along. But the public lands that may be leased for power sites are of themselves practically worthless. The Government has no ownership or interest in the water flowing in the stream except that of a riparian owner, and that only in States where riparian rights are recognized. In most of the Western States riparian rights are abolished and the ownership of the water vested in the whole people of the State, to be appropriated and applied to beneficial uses, as the laws of the State may provide. The Government owns the land precisely as a private individual owns his land, and with the same rights and privileges as to the use of the water that flows by it—no more, no less. It does not own it in its sovereign capacity, as we have shown, and has no sovereign power over it or over the water that flows past it. But the effect of the bill is to lease, not alone the land it owns, but the waters of the stream upon which it borders, and by conditions and restrictions in the lease to determine how and for what purposes the lessee shall use the water, as well as the land. This is in violation of the principles enunciated by the courts, as above pointed out, and an encroachment upon, and a plain and open violation of, the sovereign rights of the States to govern and control such use.

It is an ingenious effort to fasten upon the private ownership of the land, by the Government, the sovereign right to control the use of the waters, a right that the Government does not possess under the Constitution and can not be given it by statute, and which admittedly does belong to the States. The rental to be paid by the lessee is not based upon the value of the use of the land, but upon the amount of power that can be produced by the water, which belongs to the State, and, as the water, in which the Government has no ownership or interest, is thus leased, the attempt is made to control the use of the thing leased, namely, the water. It may be conceded that the Government, as lessor, and the lessee may agree upon any basis they please in fixing the rental or royalty to be paid. Of this the State could not justly complain. The trouble is that because the Government fixes the amount to be paid for the land by the amount of power that can be produced by the water, over which it can have no right or control, it is attempting to vest in itself the unwarranted power to determine how the water shall be used and what for. Ostensibly this is done to protect the Government, as lessor, and secure to it a compliance, on the part of the lessee, with the terms of the lease. But the intention and the effect of it is to draw to the Federal Government the right to control the use of the water. And this is the matter in controversy. Of this the States have every reason to complain. The granting of any such privilege is a betrayal of the sovereign rights of the State.

If any private owner of lands bordering on a stream should lease his lands for a power site and impose any such terms and conditions, affecting the use of the water, as this bill provides for, they would undoubtedly be inoperative and void. And, as the National Government, in this respect, has only the rights of a private owner, such conditions, made by the Government, would be equally so.

Having submitted these views on the general scope and effect of the bill, we proceed to verify what we have said of it by calling attention to some of its specific provisions.

In its first section the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to lease lands of the Government for the "development, generation, transmission, and utilization of hydroelectric power." The effort is to devote not only the land leased, but the water, to a specific and exclusive purpose, namely, the generation of power. This is a direct violation of the right of the States to regulate and control the use or uses to which water should be applied, and in direct opposition to the policies of the States. In nearly all of the States where irrigation is practiced and in which this law, if enacted, will operate, have, either by direct statutory provisions or rules and regulations adopted by utility commissioners or other authorized official bodies, provided what uses of water shall be preferred over others where the water supply from any source is insufficient to meet all needs, usually in the following order: Domestic use, irrigation, development of power. This whole bill proceeds upon the theory that the Government can fix and designate the use to which the water shall be devoted, in spite of contrary rules fixed by the States. But we apprehend that if such a lease as is proposed were made and the power plant erected, the State could at any time require that the water used for the purpose of generating power be applied to domestic use or irrigation, if the water is needed for that purpose, and the lessee's lease and plant rendered valueless. If not, then the Government has, by its lease and the application of the water to a single and specific use, deprived the State of its undoubted sovereign right to determine the uses to which the water shall be applied. No one can doubt under the authorities we have cited that in a conflict of this kind between the two governments the right of the State to say how and for what purposes water shall be used would be sustained.

The vice of this first section runs through the whole bill. All of its provisions and limitations relate wholly to the use of the water for the generation of power. There is a feeble attempt to remedy this defect by section 20, added as an amendment by this committee, which provides that the plant may be enlarged by the lessee "for the purpose of impounding and conveying water for irrigation, mining, municipal, domestic, and other beneficial purposes." But this does not correct the evil. It is a mere consent of the Government that the water may be used for other purposes if the lessee desires. It is a consent given in a matter over which the Government has no control and about which it has no power either to give or withhold consent. And its consent, when given, amounts to nothing as affecting the use to which the water shall be applied. That is a matter exclusively within the power and jurisdiction of the States.

There is another apparent effort to avoid this and other void provisions in the bill that we will come to directly, by section 14, which provides that it shall not affect or interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water. Either this provision must have no effect at all or it will nullify every important provision of the bill, because the whole scope and effect of the bill, as we have shown, directly interferes with such laws of the States.

We now pass to the consideration of other provisions of the bill equally objectionable.

1. LIMITATION OF LEASE TO 50 YEARS.

Any attempt to limit the life of a plant for the distribution and use of water is wholly at variance with the whole theory of water rights in the Western States. Where water is put to use for irrigation, for example, the use must be perpetual and not for a limited term, otherwise a landowner might have the use of the water until his trees are matured then lose his supply, bringing destruction upon his trees and his crops. To prevent this it is provided by statute in most, if not all, of the irrigation States that if a public service corporation shall once supply water to land for irrigation the right to its continued and perpetual use, as an appurtenant to his land, attaches and passes, like other appurtenances, by a conveyance of the land. This is not so important as applied to the use of water for the development of power, except where the power is used, as it is very generally, for the pumping and other means of supplying water for irrigation. In that case it is equally important with the direct supply of water for irrigation.

2. RIGHT TO USE WATER MUST FIRST BE OBTAINED FROM STATE.

It is provided that no lease shall be granted until the right to the water is secured from the State. In some of the States this provision will be impossible of execution, because no right to the water can be obtained from the State until the plant to be used in applying it to a beneficial purpose is completed and approved by the State authorities and then no title to the water is granted, but only a license to use it. For example, in California a water commission is provided for by law. This commission is given complete and plenary power over the appropriation and use of water for any and all purposes. The commission is authorized to investigate all streams and determine the amount of total flow of the different streams in the State, the amount appropriated and in proper and necessary use, and the quantity open to appropriation. Anyone desiring to appropriate water from any stream must apply to this commission and state in his petition therefor certain required facts. Upon a proper showing being made, a permit is issued allowing the construction of proper works for its diversion and distribution.

The statute provides:

"SEC. 16. Every application for a permit to appropriate water shall set forth the name and post-office address of the applicant, the source of water supply, the nature and amount of the proposed use, the location and description of the proposed head works, ditch, canal, and other works; the proposed place of diversion and the place where it is intended to use the water; the time within which it is proposed to begin construction, the time required for completion of the construction, and the time for the complete application of the water to the proposed use. If for agricultural purposes, the applicant shall, besides the above general requirements, give the legal subdivisions of the land and the acreage to be irrigated, as near as may be; if for power purposes, it shall give, besides the general requirements prescribed above, the nature of the works by means of which the power is to be developed, the head and amount of water to be utilized, and the use to which the power is to be applied; if for storage in a reservoir, it shall give, in addition to the general requirements prescribed above, the height of dam, the capacity of the reservoir, and the use to be made of the impounded waters; if for municipal water supply, it shall give, besides the general requirements specified above, the present population to be served, and, as near as may be, the future requirements of the city; if for mining purposes, it shall give, in addition to the general requirements prescribed above, the nature and location of the mines to be served and the methods of supplying and utilizing the water." (Cal. Stat., 1913, pp. 1012, 1021.)

The statute further provides:

"SEC. 19. Immediately upon completion, in accordance with law, the rules and regulations of the State water commission, and the terms of the permit, of the project under such application, the holder of a permit for the right to appropriate water shall report said completion to the State water commission. The said commission shall immediately thereafter cause to be made a full inspection and examination of the works constructed and shall determine whether the construction of said works is in conformity with law, the terms of the approved application, the rules and regulations of the State water commission, and the permit. The said water commission shall, if said determination is favorable to the applicant, issue a license which shall give the right to the diversion of such an amount of water and to the use thereof as may be necessary to fulfill the purpose of approved application." (Cal. Stat., 1913, pp. 1012, 1023.)

So it will be seen that in California the provision that the applicant must first secure the right from the State can have no effect, because his right can not be passed upon until the whole works are completed

and approved by the water commission. And if not approved, the applicant is refused a license to divert and use the water. And under the following provision of the statute all water not appropriated in accordance with the laws of the State is declared to belong to the people:

"And all waters flowing in any river, stream, canyon, ravine, or other natural channel, excepting so far as such waters have been or are being applied to useful and beneficial purpose upon, or in so far as such waters are or may be reasonably needed for useful and beneficial purposes upon lands riparian thereto, or otherwise appropriated, is and are hereby declared to be public waters of the State of California and subject to appropriation in accordance with the provisions of this act." (Cal. Stat., 1913, pp. 1012, 1023.)

3. PROVISION AS TO TIME AND MANNER OF DOING THE WORK OF ESTABLISHING THE PLANT.

This matter is completely covered by State laws, and the provision conflicts directly with those laws. The California statute to which we have referred places in the hands of the water commissioners the power to determine when, where, and how the water shall be applied and continued in actual use. It provides:

"SEC. 12. The State water commission shall have authority to, and may, for good cause shown, upon the application of any appropriator or user of water under an appropriation made and maintained according to law prior to the passage of this act, prescribe the time within which the full amount of the water appropriated shall be applied to a useful or beneficial purpose."

And certain rules for determining what is a reasonable prosecution and completion of the work are laid down for the guidance of the commission. The statute further provides:

"SEC. 18. Actual construction work upon any project shall begin within such time after the date of the approval of the application as shall be specified in said approval, which time shall not be less than 60 days from date of said approval, and the construction of the work thereafter shall be prosecuted with due diligence in accordance with this act, the terms of the approved application, and the rules and regulations of said commission; and said work shall be completed in accordance with law, the rules and regulations of the State water commission and the terms of the approved application, and within a period specified in the permit; but the period of completion specified in the permit may, for good cause shown, be extended by the State water commission. And if such work be not so commenced, prosecuted, and completed, the water commission shall, after notice in writing and mailed in a sealed, postage-prepaid, and registered letter addressed to the applicant at the address given in his application for a permit to appropriate water, and a hearing before the commission, revoke its approval of the application. But any applicant the approval of whose application shall have been thus revoked shall have the right to bring an action in the superior court of the county in which is situated the point of the proposed diversion of the water for a review of the order of the commission revoking said approval of the application."

Thus we have a complete system of regulation in the State intended to secure an early application of the water to a beneficial use. To this end work is required to be commenced in not less than 60 days and prosecuted with due diligence, under rules and regulations prescribed by the commission.

This bill provides in section 2:

"That each lease made in pursuance of this act shall provide for the diligent, orderly, and reasonable development and continuous operation of the water power subject to market conditions."

In other words, the State, admittedly the only authority having jurisdiction over the matter, provides that the work must commence within 60 days, be prosecuted with diligence, and completed under rules and regulations prescribed by the water commission. By this act we fix no time when the work shall be begun, prosecuted, and completed, but require it to be done as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe in a lease and subject to market conditions. We have shown that the Federal Government has no power or jurisdiction over this matter of supplying water or power in a State; but if it had, this would involve a conflict of authority between the State and Federal Governments that must lead to conflicts and be intolerable.

4. ALLOWING INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO FIX RATES AND DETERMINE THE ISSUE OF STOCKS AND BONDS.

It is possible that where a corporation is engaged in transmitting power into another State the Federal Government would, because it is interstate business, have power to fix the rates to be charged against consumers, at least in the State to which it is transmitted. It is submitted, however, that it has no such power respecting power furnished by the corporation in its own State. And in no event could the Government justify itself in assuming to control the issue of stocks and bonds of a corporation as against the laws of the State of its creation. This would be an unwarranted exercise of authority based upon the mere fact that the corporation is its tenant, holding Government land within the State. Referring again to California, the railroad commission of the State has authority, conferred upon it by statute, to fix and determine not only the rates to be charged by a corporation furnishing power within the State, but to determine its bond and stock issue and other indebtedness. In other words, that commission has full and ample power to deal with the whole subject. Now it is proposed by this bill to give the same power to a Federal commission. This necessarily brings the two into direct conflict. The power can not be exercised by both Governments. It belongs of right to the State where it is organized and doing business and dealing with the water that belongs to the State and is being supplied to its people. There can be no just or valid claim that this power belongs to the Government, or can properly and legally be vested in it by statute.

5. AUTHORIZING COMBINATION OF PLANTS OR LINES.

The bill provides in section 3 that the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may allow "the physical combination, distribution, and use of power or energy under this act or under leases given hereunder not in violation of law."

By what possible right could the Government, as a mere lessor of land, grant or withhold any such privilege? It is completely within the control and jurisdiction of the State.

Referring again to California. In that State the water can be diverted and used only under a license issued by the water commission after the works are completed, and for the purposes and in the manner the commission shall determine. And thereafter the exercise of the right is under complete control of the State authorities, as we have stated. The statute, after providing for the issuance of the license, further provides:

"All permits and licenses for the appropriation of water shall be under the terms and conditions of this act, and shall be effective for such time as the water actually appropriated under such permits and licenses shall actually be used for the useful and beneficial purpose for which said water was appropriated, but no longer; and every such permit or license shall include the enumeration of conditions therein which in substance shall include all of the provisions of this section and likewise the statement that any appropriator of water, to whom said permit or license may be issued, shall take the same subject to such conditions as therein expressed."

The commission has ample power to determine whether there shall be combinations of plants or lines or not. They are fully authorized to say, in the license granted, whether this shall be done or not. And any effort to place this power, in whole or in part, in a Federal officer is in plain violation of the rights of the States and a usurpation of power.

6. FORBIDDING THE INCUMBRANCE OF THE PROPERTY LEASED.

Section 4 of the bill provides against the incumbrance of the property leased if within a Territory, or where the intention is to transmit power into two or more States, except upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for certain purposes.

This is much the same as the last previous question presented. It is, where the property leased is within a State, and it may be the corporation organized under the laws of that State, the assumption of a power that belongs to and, in some of the States, is being actively and satisfactorily exercised. It is no part of the authority, power, or duty of the Federal Government and can not be acquired by the mere proprietary ownership and leasing of lands. The incumbrance may be necessary to carry on the work authorized and required by the State to complete the works and put the water which it owns to a beneficial use. This matter of determining whether the property devoted to a public use shall or shall not be incumbered, and if so, in what amount, belongs exclusively to the State and can not be exercised legally by the Government. To do so is a plain infringement of the sovereign rights of the States. It may prevent a public improvement that the people of the State need and have the right to have.

7. PROVISION AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE OVER THE LAND AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE LEASE.

By this provision the Government is authorized to take over not only the land it has leased but a water-power plant to be used, and which must continue to be used, for the generation of power for public use and to become a public-utility corporation, obligated to operate the plant and supply power to the public. When it assumes this function it becomes at once bound by the contracts and other obligations of the lessee to supply the power. It at once becomes amenable to the State authorities having power to regulate its business. If not, then the effect is to deprive the State of the right to regulate the use of the waters of the State as an exercise of its sovereign power. It may well be asked how, when the National Government becomes a utility corporation, the State can exercise as against it the power it has to regulate rates or otherwise control the use and operation of the plant, even to the extent, as it may, of taking away the use of the water and requiring it to be used for other purposes more necessary for the public good than the development of power. Neither the State nor any consumer under the system could sue the Government or compel it in any way to perform its duty as a public-service corporation. This provision, if not illegal, is, it seems to us, absurd. It would lead to untold and innumerable conflicts of governmental authority and complications.

8. MAKING CONTRACTS FOR POWER.

Section 7 of the bill provides for the making of contracts for power upon the approval of the proper State authority and of the Secretary of the Interior.

We think we have demonstrated above that the Federal Government has no power or jurisdiction over this subject within a State. In this instance the right of the State to deal with it is recognized, but the Secretary of the Interior is given the power to nullify the action of the State in giving its approval by refusing to give his own. So, action by the Secretary of the Interior, an officer who has no jurisdiction in the matter, and can be given none legally, is made necessary to any such action on the part of the utility corporation, for no better reason than that this particular corporation rents its power site from the Government. Other power corporations are not subject to any such limitation or double regulation. The State can not thus be shorn of its sovereign power over the subject matter by the Government in its capacity of a real estate dealer. It can not be possible that a renter from the Government must be subject to two regulating powers and two rules of regulation and other corporations owning their power sites or leasing them from some one else subject to but one. The mere statement of some of the results should be sufficient to condemn this provision.

9. OBJECTIONABLE MEANS OF ARRIVING AT RENT TO BE PAID.

The amount of rent to be paid for the land to be used as a power site is not fixed by the rental or other value of the land, but the amount of power produced by the use of the water belonging to the State. The land in and of itself is practically of no value. The profit, if any, resulting from the use of the water depends upon the rates collected by the corporation for the powers, which must be fixed by the State, if by anybody. In fixing the rates the State must allow the corporation the amount of rental it is required to pay to the Government as a part of its yearly operating expenses. The consumers must pay, not the interest on this amount only, as a part of the capital investment, but must pay it all each year as a part of the fixed annual charges of the company. A reasonable charge by the Government for the use of its land may be justified as a real estate transaction. It is not the exercise of sovereign power. It is nothing but a contract of lease, the same in all material respects as a transaction of a like kind by a private individual, with the Secretary of the Interior acting as the real estate agent. This should be kept constantly in mind. But the basis upon which the rental is founded is a false and unjust one. It compels the consumers of water belonging to the State to pay a charge to the Government that it is unconscionable to make. It compels the people of the State to pay the Government for the use of the water that belongs to them and to which the Government has no right and over which it has no power nor jurisdiction. The whole thing is unjust and unconscionable.

10. DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS OF THE LEASE.

The injustice of the rental founded on the use of the water is made clear and accentuated by the provision, in the eighth section of the bill, that the proceeds shall be paid one half to the State and the other half to the Reclamation Service. This is clearly unjust to the State. The use of the water that belongs wholly to the State is the valuable thing. The Government has no interest in the water and is entitled to none of its benefits. But it assumes to rent it with the practically worthless land, the people of the State pay back the whole of it to the

corporation, and the Government provides how the rental shall be divided without the approval or consent of the State. This is extending the power of the Federal Government over the sovereign rights of the States with a vengeance.

11. CONTROL GIVEN TO THE GOVERNMENT WHERE STATE HAS NO UTILITY COMMISSION.

In section 9 of the bill it is provided that where a State has no utility commission or other authority having power to regulate rates and service of electrical energy and the issuance of stock and bonds by public-utility corporations engaged in power development, these powers shall be vested in the Secretary of the Interior or committed to such body as may be authorized by Federal statute until such time as the State shall provide a commission or other authority for such regulation and control.

This attempt to vest in an officer of the Federal Government the power to control the power-developing corporations in their service and to determine their issuance of stock and bonds is in violation of the rights of the States and unconstitutional. We have shown that the Federal Government has no power whatever to deal with these questions within a State, and that the power can not be created or conferred by statute. The fact that the State, for the time being, does not exercise the power can not have the effect of vesting it in the National Government. As the power of the Government can be conferred only by the Constitution, and as this was not so conferred, it is reserved to the States. This we submit is beyond question.

12. AUTHORITY TO EXAMINE BOOKS OF LESSEE.

By section 11 the Secretary of the Interior is given authority to examine the books and accounts of the lessees and to require them to submit "statements, representations, or reports, including information as to cost of water rights, lands, easements, and other property acquired, production, use, distribution, and sale of energy; all of which statements, representations, or reports so required shall be upon oath, unless otherwise specified, and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require."

This again is a plain usurpation of the power that belongs to the States. Both the water commission and the railroad commission of the State of California, under its laws, have the right to require all of the information that is provided for in this section. This would subject a corporation that rents from the Federal Government to double examinations and double reports for which the consumers under that particular system must pay while other corporations, not renting from the Government, would be subject to only one examination and one report. Besides, the Government, as a mere lessor, of the property used as a power site, has no interest whatever in any of the things that are required to be reported upon by this section of the bill. As it is proposed to base the rents to be paid for the land upon the amount of power developed—if that be legal and justified, the Government has the right to satisfy itself of the amount of power developed. It has no interest further than that, and any effort to interfere with the business of the corporation or the operation of its plant, which belong alone to the State, is entirely unauthorized.

13. FORFEITURE OF LEASE.

Section 12 provides that this "lease may be forfeited and canceled, by appropriate proceedings, in a court of competent jurisdiction whenever the lessee, after reasonable notice, in writing, as prescribed in the lease, shall fail to comply with the terms of this act or with such conditions not inconsistent therewith as may be specifically recited in the lease."

This would place the lessee in a very unhappy situation. As the State has the undoubted power to regulate the use of the water and the operation of the plant, the lessee might be compelled by State regulations to violate numerous terms provided for in the lease or the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. Where the power exercised by the Government—and that authority would be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior by this bill—and the State commission should conflict, the unfortunate lessee would have to take his chances of being prosecuted by the State authorities and his right to furnish power forfeited, or to comply with the rules, regulations, and orders of the Federal Government whereby his lease may be subject to forfeiture. This perhaps shows quite as clearly as anything else why it is utterly impossible that the provisions of this statute and the rules and regulations that may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior can not by any possibility be allowed to stand as against the sovereign power of the State to regulate and control all these things.

Can the Government by a system of long leases perpetuate its ownership in the States of untaxed lands? We have shown by the decided cases that the Government owns the public lands as a proprietor and not in its sovereign capacity. This is too clearly and firmly established to admit of doubt. In a sense the Government owns the land in trust to dispose of it for use by the citizens of the country. Laws have been enacted, from time to time, providing for their disposition. Until now the national policy has been to convey the absolute title to the land in whatever way it may be disposed of. But it is now proposed to hold the title to the land in the Federal Government and lease it on long leases. This would be a radical change in governmental policy. It is a very important one to the States. The land in the hands of the Government is not subject to taxation by the States.

In the hearings by the committee this startling statement was made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]:

"I believe that any leasing bill for the public domain or resources thereof is a direct attack on the sovereignty of the States containing the same, because it must result in a perpetual ownership of the property in the United States Government. Inasmuch as taxes can not be imposed upon property owned by the Federal Government, it means, to carry it to its ultimate result, the depriving of the States of their means of existence.

"I want to call the attention of the committee to a list contained in an article by Mr. W. V. M. Powelson of the number of acres of land in the various Western States now in the ownership of the Government. In Arizona, 92 per cent of the lands within the area of that State are in Government ownership; California, 52.58 per cent; Colorado, 56.67 per cent; Idaho, 83.80 per cent; Montana, 65.80 per cent; Nevada, 87.82 per cent; New Mexico, 62.83 per cent; Oregon, 51 per cent; Utah, 80.18 per cent; Washington, 40 per cent; Wyoming, 68 per cent."

Thus it is shown that lands in the several Western States ranging from 40 to 92 per cent are held in Government ownership and not subject to taxation by the State. And it is proposed by this and other bills pending in the Senate, making up the system of conservation proposed to be inaugurated, to perpetuate this condition and perpetually deprive the States of the right to tax this large percentage of the lands within its borders to maintain and support the State government. Whether the Government has the power to deal with its lands in that way or not, it must be seen by any observing person that it will be a rank injustice to the States in which these lands are situated. But we go further and maintain that the Government, holding the public lands in trust to dispose of them, has no right or authority to thus perpetuate its ownership of nontaxable lands and withhold them from purchase by the people of the country, where the title should be vested.

Referring again to the case of Pollard's Lessee *v.* Hagan (3 How., 212), one of the leading cases on the subject, and from which we have quoted above, it will be seen that as to the public domain, not including lands acquired for permanent use for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings in the District of Columbia, the right and ownership of the land by the Government is "temporary," and so it has always, up to this time, been considered. The theory and understanding has always been that public lands are held by the Government temporarily and in trust to dispose of them and vest the permanent fee simple title in those who might acquire them under rules and regulations prescribed by Congress. It was never intended that title to such lands should be held permanently in the Government, and in our judgment any law that vests this right to permanently hold the lands free from State taxation will be an open violation of the trust under which the lands are held and of the sovereign rights of the States.

At the expense of further extending this already long report, we quote again a short extract from the case last mentioned:

"We will now inquire into the nature and extent of the right of the United States to these lands, and whether that right can in any way affect or control the decision of the case before us. This right originated in voluntary surrenders, made by several of the old States, of their waste and unappropriated lands, to the United States, under a resolution of the old Congress of the 6th of September, 1780, recommending such surrender and cession to aid in paying the public debt incurred by the War of the Revolution. The object of all the parties to these contracts of cession was to convert the land into money for the payment of the debt and to erect new States over the territory thus ceded; and as soon as these purposes could be accomplished the power of the United States over these lands, as property, was to cease.

"Whenever the United States shall have fully executed these trusts the municipal sovereignty of the new States will be complete throughout their respective borders, and they and the original States will be upon an equal footing in all respects whatever. We therefore think the United States hold the public lands within the new States by force of the deeds of cession and the statutes connected with them, and not by any municipal sovereignty which it may be supposed they possess or have reserved by compact with the new States for that particular purpose."

It clearly appears from this decision that the title of the Government in such lands is not permanent, but ceded only for the purpose of disposing of them, and that the Government can not make its title permanent or deprive itself for any length of time of the power to comply with the obligation of its trust to dispose of them.

Will the bill, if enacted, bring the desired results? As stated in the beginning, the purpose of this proposed legislation, as stated by the majority of the committee, is to bring about a speedier development of our undeveloped water power. It may be said that this is a purpose not within the power or jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The whole purpose of the bill, as thus stated, is beyond the power of the Government. It has no undeveloped water power. It is only a landowner in the States and nothing else. The development, as well as the regulation and control of undeveloped water and water power, is a purely State matter. The States alone have power to deal with the subject. The Government may, in its generosity, offer its land to the State, as any other landowner might do, to aid the State to develop its natural resources. It can not constitutionally do anything more. The assumption of some conservationists that the National Government has anything to do, as a Government, with the development of the natural resources in a State is without the slightest foundation. As a landowner it may be interested in such development as a means of increasing the value of the land it holds in trust for the people, but nothing more. It may hinder the State in its efforts to develop its resources by withholding its lands, available for dam, reservoir, or power sites, or by placing burdensome terms and conditions of sale or lease of its lands, if it has power to lease them, as would make it impossible or impracticable to use them for such purposes. But any private landowner might do the same thing and with the same effect.

And we submit that this is just what Congress will do for the Government if it enacts this bill. The terms upon which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease land for power purposes are so unreasonable and burdensome and so clearly in conflict with State rights and State laws as to prevent any prudent business man from investing any money in a power site in any State. He would be unable to determine whether, in constructing and managing his plant, he would be bound by the Federal or State law, or both where they are not in direct conflict. If he obeyed one, in many instances, as we have pointed out, he would violate the other. A compliance with the State law would in some cases forfeit his lease. On the other hand, if he followed the provisions of the lease, particularly as to the time of commencing and completion of his plant, he would, in California at least, forfeit his right to the water, the really valuable thing, and a license to use the water would have to be denied him for failure to comply with the State laws. This would be true in other States as well. We have used California and its laws only as an illustration of the conflicts that would arise between the Government and the States if this bill should pass. The same conflicts would arise in the other Western States.

The present law relating to the use of public lands for power and irrigation purposes is entirely inadequate because of its uncertainty. But this proposed legislation would be infinitely worse, because it is so certainly and fatally wrong. It would, if enacted, soon put an end to any development of water power. Witness after witness, practical and experienced men, appeared before the committee and pointed out that the law would be impractical and unrevokable and prevent investments in enterprises of this kind, and the reasons were clearly pointed out. On the other hand, we had information to the contrary from Government officials who sincerely believed the law would be beneficial; but they could only theorize about a very practical matter. They had no practical knowledge on the subject. There were others who appeared in support of the bill equally sincere, but without knowledge. And the friends of the bill made no effort to sustain its constitutionality

or to defend it against the legal objections that we have been pointing out in this report.

We have given but little attention to the merely business objections made to the bill. To our minds the legal objections to it are so numerous and so conclusive that this is unnecessary. As to this phase of it we refer Senators to the public hearings, that were full and fair. The friends of the bill gave its opponents every opportunity to point out and support their objections to it. These hearings on so important a matter should receive the careful attention of every Senator who desires to be informed on the subject.

For the reasons we have pointed out and for others that may be developed later on, we could not concur in the favorable report on the bill, and submit that it should not pass.

REED SMOOT.
JOHN D. WORKS.
C. D. CLARK.

VIEWS OF SENATOR CHARLES S. THOMAS.

I am unable to accept the reasoning of the minority report in toto, but agree in the conclusions announced. My own view of the proper solution of the so-called water-power problem in the "public-land States" is the transfer by the Government to the States wherein they are located of all power sites upon the public domain in trust, and, conditioned upon their development by the transferers for the use and benefit of the public at rates sufficient to defray the cost of construction and operation, the sites to be forfeited to the General Government upon noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the trust. This insures development, prevents monopoly, and assures to the people an adequate supply of cheap power. It is conservation in the true meaning of the term.

C. S. THOMAS.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7510) to declare Ollala Slough, in Lincoln County, Oreg., nonnavigable; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 7511) for the relief of George W. Mellinger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7512) to fix the compensation of the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 7513) to acquire and preserve the battle ground of the battle variously known as the Battle of Apache Canyon, Pigeons Ranch, and Glorieta, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7514) providing for the holding of terms of the district court for the southern division of the western district of the State of Washington at Aberdeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 7515) to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 7516) granting an increase of pension to John Lampke (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7517) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 7518) to make the gold and silver certificates issued by the United States full legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 7519) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lamar, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 7520) granting an increase of pension to George E. Smith;

A bill (S. 7521) granting a pension to Mary A. Frank; and

A bill (S. 7522) granting an increase of pension to Leonard L. Redfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 7523) to reimburse the heirs of Chief Heavy Runner on account of his death and property taken from him at the time of the Baker massacre (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7524) authorizing any nation, tribe, or band of Indians to submit claims against the United States to the Court of Claims with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 7525) for the relief of the widow of Thomas Harrison Beatty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7526) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Lane (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 7527) dividing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma into three divisions, fixing the time and place for holding court therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 7528) to correct the military record of Jesse J. Clemmons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7529) providing for the erection of a public building at Coalgate, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 7530) granting an increase of pension to Lenora Hoyt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 7531) to increase the appropriation for a public building at Elkins, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 7532) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 7533) for the relief of William E. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7534) for the relief of Joel J. Booth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (S. 7535) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 7536) granting an increase of pension to Irwin E. Scott;

A bill (S. 7537) granting a pension to Verona H. Coon; and

A bill (S. 7538) granting a pension to Alice Quigley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 7539) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7540) granting an increase of pension to Hazlet A. Jacobs; and

A bill (S. 7541) granting an increase of pension to Elias Lloyd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 7542) granting an increase of pension to John Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7543) to compensate the Delaware Indians for services rendered by them to the United States in various wars; and

A bill (S. 7544) quieting and confirming the title of the Methodist University of Oklahoma in and to certain tracts of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) withholding from allotment the unallotted lands or public domain of the Creek Nation or Tribe of Indians, and providing for the sale or lease thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment authorizing the President to retain Maj. Gen. Arthur Murray, United States Army, on the active list of the Army as an additional officer of the line of the Army and as major and as commanding general Western Department, United States Army, from April 25, 1915, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20347), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment proposing that from and after March 4, 1915, the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be paid the sum of $730 per annum in lieu of the compensation which they are now being paid, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment providing that not less than $15,000 of the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting cereal and forage crops shall be set aside for work in the Pacific Northwest, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $60,000 for experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $50,000 of the funds now on deposit to the credit of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians for constructing and equipping dormitories at the Southeastern State Normal School at Durant, Okla., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. GORE. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), the amendment being Senate bill 7184, the rural credit bill, prepared by the United States Rural Credit Commission, and introduced by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without reading, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That there shall be in the Department of the Treasury a bureau charged with the execution of all laws passed by Congress relating to the creation and supervision of farm-land banks, the chief officer of which bureau shall be known as the commissioner of farm-land banks, and he shall perform his duties under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold office for the term of five years, unless sooner removed by the President upon reasons to be communicated by him to the Senate; and he shall be entitled to a salary of $6,000 a year.

The commissioner of farm-land banks shall, within 15 days of notice of his appointment, take and subscribe the oath of office, and he shall give to the United States a bond in the penalty of $50,000, with surety or sureties to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office.

That the Secretary of the Treasury may appoint one deputy commissioner, who shall be entitled to a salary of $3,500 per year, and who shall possess such powers and perform such duties under the commissioner as the commissioner may direct. During a vacancy in the office of the commissioner, or during his absence or inability, the deputy commissioner shall possess the powers and perform the duties attached by law to the office of the commissioner. The deputy commissioner shall take the oath of office, and shall give a like bond in the penalty of $50,000, with surety or sureties to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks shall adopt a seal of office to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, a description of which seal, together with an impression thereof and a certificate of approval thereof signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

That there shall be assigned from time to time to the commissioner of farm-land banks by the Secretary of the Treasury rooms for conducting the business of the bureau of farm-land banks, containing safe and secure fireproof vaults, in which the commissioner shall keep all original articles of association and other valuable documents and things belonging to his department; and the commissioner shall from time to time furnish the necessary furniture, stationery, and other proper conveniences for the transaction of the business of his office.

The commissioner shall employ from time to time the necessary clerks, to be appointed and classified by the Secretary of the Treasury, to discharge such duties as the commissioner shall direct.

That it shall not be lawful for the commissioner or deputy commissioner, or for any clerk employed in the bureau of farm-land banks, either directly or indirectly, to be interested in any farm-land bank formed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

That the commissioner shall make an annual report to Congress at the commencement of its session, exhibiting—

First. A summary of the state and condition of every farm-land bank from which reports have been received during the preceding year, at the several dates to which such reports refer, with an abstract of the whole amount of mortgages or deeds of trust held by them and collateral trust bonds (hereinafter described as national land-bank bonds) issued by them, the whole amount of their other assets and liabilities, the amount of their capital stock, and such other information in relation to such associations as in his judgment may be useful or as may be requested by Congress.

Second. A statement of the associations whose business has been closed during the year, with the amount of their mortgages or deeds of trust and of their national land-bank bonds redeemed and the amount outstanding.

Third. Any other information which he may deem desirable to present and such special information as may be called for by Congress.

Fourth. The names and compensation of the clerks employed by him, and the whole amount of the expenses of the bureau of farm-land banks during the year, together with a full and complete list of all officers, agents, clerks, and other employees of his office, including examiners, receivers, and attorneys for receivers, and clerks employed by them, or any other person connected with the work of said bureau in Washington or elsewhere whose salary or compensation is paid from the Treasury of the United States or assessed against or collected from existing or failed companies under supervision or control.

When the annual report provided for in the last section is completed, or while it is in process of completion, if thereby the business may be sooner dispatched, the work of printing shall be commenced under the superintendence of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the whole shall be printed and ready for delivery on or before the 1st day of December next after the close of the fiscal year to which the report relates. There shall be printed not to exceed 10,000 copies; 1,000 for the Senate, 2,000 for the House, and the remainder for distribution by the commissioner.

That within 90 days after the approval of this act, or as soon thereafter as may be, the Secretary of the Treasury shall formulate and adopt plans, rules, and regulations governing the operations of the bureau of farm-land banks in accordance with this act, which plans, rules, and regulations shall be enforced by the said commissioner of farm-land banks.

POWERS OF COMMISSIONER OF FARM-LAND BANKS.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks is authorized and empowered within his discretion, upon proper application, to issue charters or certificates of incorporation for the establishment of national farm-land banks as herein provided for, and to exercise supervision and control over, and to require examinations of, all of the national farm-land banks established under this act, under such general rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, and to withdraw or forfeit such charters or liquidate such banks as hereinafter provided, subject in all respects to the requirements and provisions herein contained. The commissioner shall perform such other duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may assign.

That the said commissioner of farm-land banks is hereby authorized, by general rules and regulations to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, applicable alike to all national farm-land banks organized hereunder, to specify the conditions under which the privileges herein authorized (by section 34 of this act) to be granted to said national farm-land banks shall be extended to such banks, and particularly to provide for the extension of such privileges only to national farm-land banks operating in those States which, by the passage of suitable laws, have met the requirements of the said commissioner of farm-land banks (first) as to the simplification of land-title registration and conveyancing, (second) as to the simplification, promptness, and economy of methods of securing farm-land loans and of foreclosing the same, and as to other matters, as more fully set out in section 34 of this act. And the said commissioner of farm-land banks shall have the power, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to specify the time when such rules and regulations, or certain of them, shall go into effect, and the time within which such conditions, or certain of them, must be complied with, and to extend such time and to withhold such privileges, or certain of them, from the national farm-land banks operating in any State failing to comply with the required provisions and regulations until the same are fully complied with.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks, by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall from time to time prepare and publish amortization tables covering periods of from 6 to 35 years, at varying rates of interest, to meet all the requirements of the banks organized hereunder. Such tables shall be adopted and used by all of such banks as the basis of all repayments of long-term mortgage loans herein provided for.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL FARM-LAND BANKS.

That the associations for carrying on the business of farm-land banking under this act may be formed by any number of natural persons, not less in any case than 10. They shall enter into articles of association, which shall specify in general terms the object for which the association is formed, and may contain any other provisions not inconsistent with law which the association may see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs. These articles shall be signed by the persons uniting to form the association, and a copy of them shall be forwarded to the commissioner of farm-land banks to be filed and preserved in his office.

That the persons uniting to form such a national farm-land bank shall, under their hands, make an organization certificate, which shall specifically state:

First. The name assumed by such association. The words "national farm-land bank" shall be a part of the title of every such institution, and these words shall not be used by any institution other than those incorporated under this act: *Provided, however,* That if the persons uniting to form such a national farm-land bank shall wish to apply cooperative principles in the formation and management of the same, the words "national farm-land bank, cooperative," shall be a part of the title; and the word "cooperative" shall not be used by any national farm-land bank other than those which accept the following principles and provide in their by-laws that—

(a) No stockholder shall own more than 10 per cent of the share capital at any time.

(b) At all meetings of the stockholders of such banking corporation each stockholder shall have one vote and only one on all matters pertaining to the organization or management of the institution, irrespective of the number of shares of stock owned by such stockholder.

(c) The net earnings of such banking corporation available and set aside for the payment of interest and dividends shall be distributed as provided in section 37 of this act.

(d) In all other respects such national farm-land banks, cooperative, shall conform to and be governed by the general laws as herein provided.

The words "national farm-land bank" or "national farm-land bank, cooperative," shall be prefixed by such descriptive title or name as the applicants may indicate, subject of the approval of the commissioner of farm-land banks. Each said national farm-land bank shall be designated by an official number provided by the commissioner of farm-land banks.

Second. The State in which the operations of such national farm-land banks are to be carried on, and the place in said State where its principal office is to be located, which place may be changed from time to time upon the request of such national farm-land bank, with the approval of the commissioner of farm-land banks.

Third. The amount of capital stock and the number of shares into which the same is to be divided: *Provided,* That such capital stock shall in no case be less than $100,000: *And provided further,* That such capital stock may be increased or decreased from time to time, subject to the approval of the commissioner of farm-land banks, but at no time to be less than the minimum herein set forth.

Fourth. The names and places of residence of the shareholders and the number of shares held by each of them.

Fifth. The fact that the certificate is made to enable such persons to avail themselves of the advantages of this act.

That the organization certificate shall be acknowledged before a judge of some court of record, or before a notary public, and shall be, together with the acknowledgment thereto, authenticated by the seal of such court or notary public, transmitted to the commissioner of

farm-land banks, who shall record and carefully preserve the same in his office.

POWERS AND LIMITATIONS OF NATIONAL FARM-LAND BANKS.

GENERAL POWERS.

That upon duly making and filing the articles of association and an organization certificate the association shall become, as from the date of the execution of its organization certificate, a body corporate; and as such, and in the name designated in the organization certificate, shall have power:

First. To adopt and use a corporate seal.

Second. To have succession for the period of 50 years from its organization, unless it is sooner dissolved according to the provisions of its articles of association or by the act of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its capital stock or unless its franchise becomes forfeited by some violation of law, except that, in the case of cooperative farm-land banks, a vote of two-thirds of the stockholders shall be necessary: *Provided*, That the charters of all national farm-land banks shall be at all times subject to change, amendment, or repeal under general laws enacted by Congress: *Provided*, That no such change, amendment, or repeal shall in any way affect the rights of the creditors of such national farm-land banks.

Third. To make contracts.

Fourth. To sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any court of law and equity as fully as natural persons.

Fifth. To elect or appoint not less than five nor more than nine directors, and by its board of directors to appoint a president, vice president, and other officers, to define their duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalty thereof, dismiss such officers or any of them at pleasure, and appoint others to fill their places: *Provided*, That the officer herein described as Federal fiduciary agent shall not be subject to removal by the board of directors or officers of said bank, but shall be subject to removal only by the commissioner of farm-land banks.

Sixth. To prescribe by-laws not inconsistent with law regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its directors shall be elected or appointed, its officers elected or appointed, its property transferred, its general business conducted, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed, except that in the case of cooperative farm-land banks the by-laws shall be approved by two-thirds of the stockholders before being adopted and put into effect.

Seventh. To exercise by its board of directors or duly authorized officers or agents, subject to law, all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of farm-land banking: *Provided*, That the powers of such association shall include the following specific powers and shall be subject to the following specific restrictions:

A. SPECIFIC POWERS.

Every national farm-land bank shall have the following specific powers:

(a) To make loans upon farm lands anywhere within the State in which such national farm-land bank is operated: *Provided*,

First. That such loans are made for not more than 35 years.

Second. That such loans are secured by a first mortgage or first deed of trust on farm lands within the State in which the bank is operated.

Third. That such loans shall be made for any of the following purposes: (a) To complete the purchase of the agricultural lands mortgaged; (b) to improve and equip such lands for agricultural purposes; (c) to pay and discharge debts secured by mortgages or deeds of trust on such lands.

Fourth. That such loans do not exceed 50 per cent in amount in the case of improved farm lands, and do not exceed 40 per cent in amount in other cases, of the value of the said lands; to be determined by an appraisal, as provided in this act.

Fifth. That every such mortgage shall contain an agreement for the reduction of the face of the loan so secured through annual or semi-annual amortization payments: *Provided*, That the loan extends over a period exceeding five years.

Sixth. That every such loan made under this act shall provide for its extinguishment, at the option of the borrower, in whole or in part, at any date set for the payment of interest after five years from the date upon which the said loan was made, by the payment of cash or by the tender of national land-bank bonds hereinafter provided for as specified in section 46 of this act.

(b) To issue, sell, and trade in its own collateral trust bonds which shall be known and described as "national land-bank bonds" secured by the deposit, as elsewhere herein provided, of first mortgages or first deeds of trust (and of notes or bonds secured thereby), in an amount equal at least to the face value of the national land-bank bonds so issued and sold by the said bank: *Provided*,

First. That no such national farm-land banks or national farm-land bank, cooperative, shall issue or sell any bonds until it shall have made application for suitable authority and permission from the commissioner of farm-land banks. Such application shall state the amount of the series desired to be issued and the denominations preferred by the bank. Such bonds shall be issued in series of $20, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000, and shall run for specified maximum periods. No series shall be authorized of less than $50,000. Any such farm-land bank may advertise for bids on any proposed series of national farm-land bonds or fractional part thereof in advance of making application to the commissioner of farm-land banks for authority to issue such series.

Second. That the rate of interest upon the farm-land loans evidenced by the mortgages or deeds of trust held by the bank as security for its own national land-bank bonds shall not exceed the rate of interest paid on such national land-bank bonds by more than 1 per cent annually upon the amount unpaid on the loan, which said 1 per cent shall cover all charges of administration.

Third. That all national land-bank bonds issued by the said bank shall be payable on a date specified and shall be subject to call at par, at any interest period, after the date of issue, or after a specified time, by such proper notice and advertisement as may be provided by the commissioner of farm-land banks. Such bonds shall have interest coupons attached, and the bonds and coupons shall be payable to bearer.

Fourth. That such national land-bank bonds shall be always protected by the deposit, as security therefor, of at least an equal amount in valid face value of first mortgage or first deed of trust farm loans (and of notes or bonds secured thereby), maturing not less than five years after their date.

Fifth. That as the amortization payments are credited upon the first mortgage or first deed of trust farm loans so deposited as security, the national land-bank bonds issued by the bank and secured thereby shall be called and paid, or purchased in the open market and retired, to the extent of the credits made upon such first mortgage or first deed of trust farm loans held as security for the same, under rules and regulations made by the commissioner of farm-land banks: *Provided*, That all amortization payments, after being noted on the documents and entered, shall be deposited as a separate fund, and semi-annually, on the 1st days of January and July of each year, shall be applied to retiring national land-bank bonds in the amount of the sum total of such payments then on hand in the manner herein provided: *Provided further*, That the land bank, with the approval of the commissioner of farm-land banks, may substitute first mortgages or first deeds of trust of the same kinds and descriptions as those reduced by such amortization payments in amounts equal to the gross amortization payments received by the bank.

Sixth. That the first mortgage or first deed of trust farm loans (and the notes and bonds secured thereby) held as security for such national land-bank bonds shall at all times be in the joint possession and under the joint control of the said bank and of the Federal fiduciary agent hereinafter provided for, and that a register of such first mortgages or first deeds of trust shall be at all times kept by the bank, entries or cancellations in which shall only be made with the approval in writing of such Federal fiduciary agent. When it becomes necessary to foreclose a mortgage or enforce the terms of a deed of trust by legal proceedings, such mortgage or deed of trust may be withdrawn for such purpose, and there shall be immediately substituted in its place another mortgage or deed of trust, approved and accepted in the regular way, in equal amount, or national land-bank bonds in like amount shall be purchased to cover the withdrawn security and the surplus and capital of the bank may be used for such purpose, to be reimbursed, as far as may be, from the proceeds resulting from such legal proceedings.

Seventh. That no national land-bank bond shall be issued against any mortgage or deed of trust (or notes or bonds secured thereby) which falls due earlier than five years after its date.

(c) To use its capital stock, surplus, and deposits as a revolving fund for the negotiation of such first mortgage or first deed of trust farm loans, or to use the same for the purpose of buying in its national land-bank bonds and of holding them temporarily, or to loan its capital and surplus on first mortgages or first deeds of trust for a period not exceeding five years: *Provided*, That not to exceed 50 per cent of such capital and surplus may be permanently invested in such national land-bank bonds and the remainder of the capital and surplus can be permanently invested only in United States Government bonds, in the bonds of the State in which such bank is operating, or in such other securities as may be approved by the commissioner of farm-land banks.

B. SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS.

Every national farm-land bank shall be subject to the following specific limitations:

(a) The amount of national land-bank bonds that may be issued and outstanding at any one time by such national farm-land bank shall not exceed fifteen times its capital and accumulated surplus.

(b) The charges of administration imposed by such national farm-land bank upon the borrower for handling such loan shall not in each instance exceed an annual charge of 1 per cent upon the amount unpaid on the loan.

(c) The payments to be made annually or semiannually by the borrower shall in all cases be sufficient to pay the interest charge upon the loan, the administration charges of the bank, and an amortization payment sufficient to retire and pay off the amount of the principal borrowed (as evidenced by the face of said first mortgage or first deed of trust and the notes or bonds secured thereby), at its maturity.

(d) No national farm-land bank shall at any time loan to, or on the credit of, any one individual or institution, either on the security of land or on any other security, an amount in excess of 20 per cent of the sum of its then paid-in capital and surplus.

Eighth. But no national farm-land bank shall transact any business except such as is incidental and necessarily preliminary to its organization until it has been authorized to commence business by the commissioner of farm-land banks.

HOLDINGS OF REAL ESTATE.

That a national farm-land bank may purchase, hold, and convey real estate for the following purposes and for no others:

First. A suitable banking house for the transaction of its own business, which, however, may be in part leased to others for revenue purposes.

Second. Such as shall be mortgaged to it by way of security for loans made by it, as elsewhere herein provided.

Third. Such as shall be conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts contracted in the course of business dealings.

Fourth. Such as it shall purchase at sale under judgments, decrees, or mortgages or deeds of trust, held by the bank, or shall purchase to secure debts due to it.

But no such bank shall hold the title and possession of any real estate conveyed to or purchased by it to secure any debts due to it for a longer period than five years.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.

That every national farm-land bank incorporated under the terms of this act and the capital stock and surplus therein and the income derived therefrom and the mortgages and deeds of trust (and the notes and bonds secured thereby) held by said bank and the national land-bank bonds issued by the same shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation, except in respect to taxes upon real estate.

FEDERAL FIDUCIARY AGENT.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks shall, at the time of organization of each national farm-land bank, appoint a competent individual who is not an officer or director of any farm-land bank as a "Federal fiduciary agent" for that bank. As such Federal fiduciary agent he shall have the following powers and perform the following duties:

First. He shall certify to each national land-bank bond issued by the said bank, and no national land-bank bond issued without his signature shall be binding upon the said bank.

Second. He shall have joint possession and control with the bank of the mortgages and deeds of trust (and of the notes and bonds secured thereby) which are deposited as security for the national land-bank bonds issued by the bank, and no mortgage or deed of trust (or note or bond secured thereby) so placed in the joint possession of himself and the said bank shall be withdrawn or changed or have any credit made thereon except by and with his consent in writing.

Third. He shall have the supervisory control of all entries in the mortgage ledger kept by the bank, in which ledger shall be kept a detailed statement of each issue of national land-bank bonds made by the bank, and of all the mortgages or deeds of trust (and notes or bonds

secured thereby) held by the bank and himself jointly, to secure the national land-bank bonds of the bank, as well as such other information as may be required by the bureau of farm-land banks.

Fourth. He shall execute such bond with such security as may be required by the commissioner of farm-land banks. The salary and expenses of said Federal fiduciary agent shall be fixed by the commissioner of farm-land banks and shall be paid by the national farm-land bank with which he is acting: *Provided*, That where the same individual shall be appointed as fiduciary agent for two or more farm-land banks his salary shall be prorated among the several banks in proportion to their paid-up capital and surplus.

CAPITAL STOCK.

That the shares of stock of each national farm-land bank shall be of the par value of $100 each, and each stockholder shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock standing in his name: *Provided, however*, That in the case of national farm-land banks, cooperative, each stockholder shall be entitled to one vote, and only one, and the shares of stock may be of the par value of $25 each. Shareholders may vote by proxies duly authorized in writing; but no officer, clerk, or employee of such bank shall act as proxy, and no shareholder whose liability is past due or unpaid shall be allowed to vote. Any national farm-land bank may, in its by-laws, authorize cumulative voting for directors.

That at least 50 per cent of the capital stock of every national farm-land bank shall be paid in before it shall be authorized to do business, and the remainder of the capital stock of said bank shall be paid in in installments of at least 10 per cent each on the whole amount of the capital as frequently as one installment before the end of each succeeding year from the time it shall be authorized by the commissioner of farm-land banks to commence business, and the payment of each installment shall be certified to the commissioner of farm-land banks, under oath, by the president or cashier of the bank.

That whenever any shareholder or his assignee fails to pay any installment on the stock when the same is required by the preceding section to be paid, the directors of such bank may sell the stock of such delinquent shareholder at public auction, having given three weeks' previous notice thereof in a newspaper of general circulation published in the city or county where the bank is located—or if no newspaper is published in said city or county, then in a newspaper published nearest thereto—to any person who will pay the highest price therefor, to be not less than the amount due thereon, with the expenses of advertisement and sale; and the excess, if any, shall be paid to the delinquent shareholder. If no bidder can be found who will pay for such stock the amount due thereon to the association and the cost of advertisement and sale, the amount previously paid shall be forfeited to the association, and such stock shall be sold as the directors may order, within six months from the time of such forfeiture; and if not sold it shall be canceled and deducted from the capital stock of the association. If any such cancellation and reduction shall reduce the capital of the association below the minimum of the capital required by law, or below one-fifteenth of its outstanding national land-bank bonds, the capital stock shall, within 30 days from the date of such cancellation, be increased to the required amount, in default of which a receiver may be appointed, according to the provisions of section 5234 of the Revised Statutes, so far as it may be applied hereto, to close up the business of such bank.

That any bank formed under this act may, by its articles of association, provide for an increase of its capital from time to time, as may be deemed expedient, subject to the limitations of this act. But the maximum of such increase to be provided in the articles of association shall be approved by the commissioner of farm-land banks; and no increase of capital shall be valid until the total amount of such increase is paid in and until notice thereof has been transmitted to the commissioner of farm-land banks, who shall thereupon issue to such bank his certificate, specifying the amount of such increase of capital stock, with his approval thereof, and after it has been duly paid in it shall be treated as part of the capital stock of such association.

That any bank formed under this act may, by the vote of shareholders owning two-thirds of its capital stock, or in the case of national farm-land banks, cooperative, by the vote of two-thirds of the stockholders, reduce its capital to any sum not below the amount required by this act to authorize the formation of such a bank; but no such reduction shall be allowed which will reduce the capital and surplus of the association below one-fifteenth of its outstanding national land-bank bonds as herein provided; nor shall any such reduction be made until the amount of the proposed reduction has been reported to and approved by the commissioner of farm-land banks.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

That the affairs of each bank shall be managed by not less than five nor more than nine directors. All directors shall be elected by the shareholders at a meeting to be held at any time before the association is authorized by the commissioner of farm-land banks to commence business, and afterwards at meetings to be held on any such date in January of each year as is specified therefor in the articles of association. The directors shall hold office for one year and until their successors are elected and qualified.

That every director must, during his whole term of service, be a citizen of the United States, and at least three-fourths of the directors must reside in the State or Territory in which the bank is located for at least one year immediately preceding their election, and must be residents therein during their continuance in office. Every director must own, in his own right, at least five shares of the capital stock of the bank of which he is a director. Any director who ceases to be the owner of five shares of stock, or who becomes in any other manner disqualified, shall thereby vacate his place.

That each director, when appointed or elected, shall take an oath that he will, so far as the duty devolves on him, diligently and honestly administer the affairs of such bank, and will not knowingly violate or willingly permit to be violated any of the provisions of this act, and that he is the owner in good faith, and in his own right, of the number of shares of stock required by this act, subscribed for by him or standing in his name on the books of the bank, and that the same is not hypothecated or in any way pledged as security for any loan or debt. Such oath subscribed by the director making it, and certified by the officer before whom it is taken, shall be immediately transmitted to the commissioner of farm-land banks and shall be filed and preserved in his office.

That any vacancy in the board shall be filled by appointment by the remaining directors, and any director so appointed shall hold his place until the next election.

That if, from any cause, an election of directors is not made at the time appointed, the bank shall not for that cause be dissolved, but an election may be held on any subsequent day, 30 days' notice thereof in all cases having been given in a newspaper published in the city, town, or county in which the bank is located; and if no newspaper is published in such city, town, or county, such notice shall be published in a newspaper published nearest thereto. If the articles of association do not fix the day on which the election shall be held, or if no election is held on the day fixed, the day for the election shall be designated by the board of directors; or if the directors fail to fix the day, shareholders representing two-thirds of the shares may do so, or in the case of national farm-land banks, cooperative, two-thirds of the stockholders may do so.

That one of the directors to be chosen by the board shall be the president of the board. One or more vice presidents shall likewise be chosen by the board.

LIABILITY OF STOCKHOLDERS.

That the shareholders of every national farm-land bank shall be held individually responsible, equally and ratably, and not one for another, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such bank, to the extent of the amount of their stock therein, at the par value thereof, in addition to the amount invested in such shares, unless, in the case of national farm-land banks, cooperative, by a two-thirds vote of the stockholders a larger liability shall be undertaken, and in every such case, when a greater degree of liability is assumed by any national farm-land bank, cooperative, the degree of such liability shall be set forth on the face of all farm-land bonds issued by such bank.

That persons holding stock as executors, administrators, guardians, or trustees shall not be personally subject to any liabilities as stockholders; but the estates and funds in their hands shall be liable in like manner and to the same extent as the testator, intestate, ward, or person interested in such trust funds would be if living and competent to act and hold the stock in his own name.

CONVERSION OF EXISTING LAND-MORTGAGE COMPANIES AND OTHER STATE INSTITUTIONS INTO NATIONAL FARM-LAND BANKS.

That any land-mortgage association or corporation, or any similar institution, including building and loan associations or savings and loan associations lending exclusively on farm mortgages, now incorporated under the general or special laws of any State, may become a national farm-land bank under this act, under a suitable name, upon complying with the provisions of this act; and in such case the articles of association and the organization certificate may be executed by a majority of the stockholders of the existing institution, and the certificate shall declare that the owners of two-thirds of the capital stock of the old institution have authorized the directors to make such certificate and to change and convert the institution into a national farm-land bank. The majority of the directors, after executing the articles of association and organization certificate, shall have power to execute all other papers and to do whatever may be required to make its organization perfect and complete as a national farm-land bank. The directors of the old company may continue to be the directors of the national farm-land bank until others are elected or appointed, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. When the commissioner of farm-land banks has given to such association a certificate under his hand and official seal, after the provisions of this bill have been complied with and after it is authorized to commence the business of farm-land banking, the bank shall have the same powers and privileges and shall be subject to the same duties, responsibilities, and rules, in all respects, as are prescribed for other banks originally organized as national farm-land banks, and shall be held and regarded as such a national farm-land bank; but no such bank shall have a less capital than the amount prescribed for national farm-land banks organized under this act, and no such corporation shall be authorized to do business as a national farm-land bank until the amount of its outstanding collateral trust bonds is so reduced that it does not exceed fifteen times the capital and surplus of the said bank and until it complies in all other respects with the provisions of this act.

PRIVILEGES GRANTED TO NATIONAL FARM-LAND BANKS.

That the national land-bank bonds of any national farm-land bank shall be available for the following purposes:

First. As security for the deposit of postal savings funds in all banks authorized to receive such deposits.

Second. As a legal investment for time deposits of national banking associations, as provided in the Federal reserve act, and for the funds accumulated in savings banks organized and doing business in the District of Columbia.

Third. As a legal investment for trust funds and estates under the charge of or administered by any of the courts of the United States.

Fourth. As a security for loans from national banking associations to national farm-land banks or to individuals, for not exceeding five years, to an amount aggregating not over 25 per cent of the capital and surplus or to one-third of the time deposits of the national banking association making such loan. Such loans to be made and held by the national banking association making the same, as being within the provisions of section 24 of the Federal reserve act, so as to permit national banking associations to lend to national farm-land banks, on their obligations secured by their national land-bank bonds, in place of making the loan directly on farm lands, as provided for in said section.

The foregoing privileges (or such of them as the commissioner of farm-land banks, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may, by general rules applicable to all banks organized hereunder, from time to time designate), shall apply to national land-bank bonds issued under authority of this act, only as and when the following conditions (or such of them as the commissioner of farm-land banks, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may from time to time by like general rules designate) are likewise put into effect in any State or States.

(a) That laws decided to be sufficient by the bureau of farm-land banks have been enacted by the State in which such national farm-land bank is operating, withdrawing, or canceling the right to claim exemption, or providing for the waiver of such exemption, whether homestead or otherwise, against the mortgages or deeds of trust (or notes or bonds secured thereby), held as security for the national land-bank bonds of such national farm-land bank: *Provided*, That if the right to waive such exemption is given, then that all the mortgages or deeds of trust (and bonds or notes secured thereby) deposited as security for such national land-bank bonds contain such waiver.

(b) That in the judgment of the commissioner of farm-land banks, the State laws providing for registration of land titles, conveyances, and foreclosures in any given State are such as to give reasonable protection to the holders of first mortgages and first deeds of trust on lands located within that State.

(c) That the national land-bank bonds of all national farm-land banks, which are accepted under this law as security in the various matters above set out, shall be likewise accepted, under the State laws of the State in which such national farm-land bank is operated, as a legal investment for the funds of savings banks operating in that State, and of trust funds and estates held by or under the control of the courts of that State, and as a legal investment for the reserves of insurance companies incorporated under or operating under the laws of that State.

EXAMINATIONS.

That there shall be appointed by the commissioner of farm-land banks examiners, subject to the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency. The said examiners shall be named in the same manner and shall be subject to the same requirements, responsibilities, and penalties as are applicable to national-bank examiners under the national-bank act, the Federal reserve act, and other provisions of law. The said examiners shall be required to examine the condition of every national farm-land bank and report the same to the commissioner of farm-land banks at least twice each year.

The said examiners shall receive salaries to be fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency, which shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Any examiner accepting a loan or gratuity from any bank or association examined by him, or from an officer, director, or employee thereof, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be imprisoned not exceeding one year or fined not more than $5,000, or both, and may be fined a further sum equal to the money so loaned or gratuity given, and shall forever thereafter be disqualified from holding office as an examiner under the provisions of this section. No examiner shall perform any other service for compensation while holding such office for any bank or officer, director, or employee thereof.

Other than the usual salary or director's fee paid to any officer, director, or employee of a national farm-land bank, and other than a reasonable fee paid by said association or bank to such officer, director, or employee for services rendered, no officer, director, employee, or attorney of an association or bank shall be a beneficiary of or receive, directly or indirectly, any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration for or in connection with any transaction or business of such association or bank. No examiner, public or private, shall disclose the names of borrowers to other than the proper officers of a farm-land bank without first having obtained express permission in writing from the commissioner of farm-land banks or from the board of directors of such association or bank, except when ordered to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction or by direction of the Congress of the United States, or of either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or of either House duly authorized. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks shall require statements showing the condition of each bank to be published in a newspaper or newspapers published in the vicinity where the bank is located at such times as calls for such statements may be made by him, and in general conformity with the practice as to call for statements from national banking associations by the Comptroller of the Currency: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury any or all examinations of national farm-land banks may be made by examiners who are commissioned to examine national banking associations.

DIVIDENDS.

That the directors of each national farm-land bank shall be authorized to declare a dividend upon the outstanding and paid-up capital stock of such an institution out of the net earnings of the same: *Provided*, That in no case shall any dividend be paid which will impair the capital stock of the said institution, nor shall any dividend be paid which will reduce the amount of capital and surplus of each bank to less than one-fifteenth of the outstanding national land-bank bonds of the said bank: *Provided*, That no dividend in excess of 6 per cent annually shall be declared by any national farm-land bank until it shall have accumulated a surplus of at least 15 per cent of its authorized capital: *And provided further*, That in the case of cooperative farm-land banks the net earning of such banking corporations available and set aside for the payment of interest and dividends shall be distributed as follows: To each owner of stock of such corporation may first be paid a dividend in the form of interest upon the par value of the shares of stock owned by such owner of stock, but not exceeding 6 per cent per annum, if said net earnings are sufficient for that purpose; otherwise, to be paid to each owner of such stock pro rata computed upon the par value of such stock. The balance of such net earnings, if any, shall be distributed among the patrons of such banking corporation in proportion to the amount of business transacted with such bank: *Provided, however*, That in such distribution the share-owning patrons may, if approved by a two-thirds vote, take dividends at a rate twice as great as that paid to nonshare-owning patrons: *Provided further*, That no dividend shall be paid until a special reserve fund shall be earned and maintained by each national farm-land bank, which special reserve fund shall be created out of the net earnings of the bank and shall at all times be equal to 5 per cent of the total annual interest charge on the land-bank bonds which are outstanding against such bank at the close of the last fiscal year. Such special reserve fund may be invested in any securities which may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the permanent investment of the banks, and it shall not be disbursed for any other purpose except to meet arrears in interest payment on land-bank bonds issued by such bank.

DIRECTORS' MEETINGS.

That the directors of each national farm-land bank shall meet at least once in each month, and at such other times as are necessary. They shall have power to appoint committees and to delegate to such committees such portion of their powers as may be necessary for the convenient operation of the bank, subject to the approval of the bureau of farm-land banks.

APPRAISEMENT COMMITTEE.

That the board of directors of each national farm-land bank shall immediately upon its organization, and before making any loans upon farm lands, appoint an appraisement committee, consisting of three members, not less than two of whom shall be members of the board of directors. The names of said appraisement committee shall be at once delivered to the commissioner of farm-land banks, and any change in the said committee shall be at once communicated to him. The duty of said committee shall be to appraise, or cause to be appraised, and report on the value of real estate offered as security for loans. All reports of the appraisement committee shall be made in writing, signed by a majority of the committee, and shall give a description of the property, the value at which it is appraised by them, the value at which it is assessed for taxation, and such other information as may be required by the directors of the bank or by the commissioner of farm-land banks. Such report shall be filed and preserved with other papers relating to such loan, and no loan shall be made on any farm land unless and until such report in writing has been filed with the said bank.

POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

That section 9 of the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositaries for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes," shall be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding a new paragraph at the close of such paragraph to read as follows:

"National land-bank bonds authorized by the commissioner of national farm-land banks and issued by any national farm-land bank may be purchased by the trustees in lieu of United States bonds or other securities for the purpose of investing postal savings deposits under the provisions of this section. At their discretion the said trustees may invest such sums as shall be withdrawn from the postal savings depositaries by the purchase of national land-bank bonds at not above par direct from any national farm-land bank authorized to issue the same."

That upon becoming satisfied that any national farm-land bank has refused to substitute mortgages for others upon which default has occurred, as required by section 15 of this act, or upon receiving satisfactory evidence that any such national farm-land bank has failed to meet its outstanding obligations of any description whatever when due, and is in default, the commissioner of farm-land banks may forthwith appoint a receiver, and require of him such bond and security as he deems proper. Such receiver, under the direction of the said commissioner, shall take possession of the books, records, and assets of every description of such association, collect all debts, dues, and claims belonging to it, and, upon the order of a court of record of competent jurisdiction, may sell or compound all bad or doubtful debts, and, on a like order, may sell all the real and personal property of such association on such terms as the court shall direct; and may, if necessary to pay the debts of such national farm-land bank, enforce the individual liability of the stockholders. Such receiver shall pay over all money so made to the Treasurer of the United States, subject to the order of the commissioner of farm-land banks, and also make report to the commissioner of all his acts and proceedings.

The said commissioner shall, upon appointing a receiver, cause notice to be given, by advertisement in such newspaper as he may direct for three consecutive months, calling on all persons who may have claims against such national farm-land bank to present the same and to make legal proof thereof.

From time to time, after full provision has been made for redeeming the farm-land bonds issued by said national farm-land bank, the commissioner shall make a ratable dividend of the money so paid over to him by such receiver on all such claims as may have been proved to his satisfaction or adjudicated in a court of competent jurisdiction, and, as the proceeds of the assets of such national farm-land bank are paid over to him, shall make further dividends on all claims previously proved or adjudicated; and the remainder of the proceeds, if any, shall be paid over to the shareholders of such national farm-land bank, or their legal representatives, in proportion to the stock by them respectively held.

DESTRUCTIBLE PROPERTY TO BE INSURED.

That wherever the value of buildings or destructible property attached to the land is a part of the security for any loan, such buildings or destructible property shall be properly insured against loss by fire, and policies representing such insurance shall be properly assigned and deposited along with the mortgages under the joint control of the said bank and the Federal fiduciary agent. In such case provisions shall be made in the mortgages or deeds of trust for the payment by the borrower of an amount sufficient to pay the premiums on such insurance policies, in addition to the interest, amortization, and administration charges to be paid by him as herein set out. In appraising property for loans the buildings and destructible property shall not be valued at more than 20 per cent of the total appraisement.

BRANCH BANKS.

That no national farm-land bank shall be authorized to operate branches, but each said institution may, with the approval of the commissioner of farm-land banks, employ and maintain agencies throughout the State in which it is operated.

SALES AGENCIES.

That any national farm-land bank may, with the consent of the commissioner of farm-land banks, maintain, outside the State in which it is operating, sales agents or agencies for the sale of its national land-bank bonds, or for trading in the same.

HOW PERIODIC PAYMENTS MADE BY BORROWER ON MORTGAGE TO BE DETERMINED.

That to the rate of interest to be borne by the national land-bank bonds to be issued by the bank shall be added the administration charge, together with a charge sufficient to amortize the loan by the time of its maturity, and in this way the periodic payment to be paid by the borrower on his mortgage shall be fixed, and this shall be set out in every mortgage and shall not be changed during the term thereof.

LOANS MAY BE PAID WITH NATIONAL LAND-BANK BONDS OF SAME SERIES—BANK MAY BUY IN ITS NATIONAL LAND-BANK BONDS AND HAVE CORRESPONDING AMOUNT OF MORTGAGES RELEASED.

That any borrower shall be entitled to pay off the amount of his mortgage or any portion thereof by presenting to the bank, on any interest period after the first five years, the national land-bank bonds of the bank of the same series as those issued against his mortgage. To the extent of such national land-bank bonds presented and canceled at such time, the borrower shall be relieved of his mortgage indebtedness and proper credits shall be made upon his mortgage. The Federal fiduciary agent shall evidence such credit. The bank issuing such national land-bank bonds shall also have the right at any time to buy in the open market its national land-bank bonds and to cancel the same, and thereupon to release a proportionate amount of the mortgages securing such national land-bank bonds. But in case any of such national land-bank bonds of the bank are called for payment by the bank, as hereinbefore provided, then the same must be paid off by the bank at par.

That whenever the borrower pays his debt in full the bank shall promptly satisfy and discharge the lien of record.

GENERAL POWERS GIVEN TO COMMISSIONER OF FARM-LAND BANKS.

That the commissioner of farm-land banks, by general rules and regulations, shall prescribe the methods of keeping the mortgage register;

of holding and preserving the mortgages and the bonds secured by deed of trust in the joint possession of the bank and of the Federal fiduciary agent; of crediting payments on mortgages; of canceling mortgages; and of releasing the liens of mortgages in whole or in part; and the general rules and regulations for the conduct of the institutions provided for under this act. Such rules and regulations, not in conflict with the provisions of this act, shall be binding upon all the banks created under the same.

That all matters relating to the organization and operation of said national farm-land banks created under this act shall be under the direction and control of the commissioner of farm-land banks, except as herein specified.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF LAW.

That any officer, clerk, or agent of any national farm-land bank, or any Federal fiduciary agent herein described, who commits any offense or malfeasance such as described in sections 5208 and 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 13 of the act approved July 12, 1882, being the law relating to national banks, shall be punished upon conviction as prescribed in the said laws relating to national banks.

That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS (H. R. 20189).

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr WORKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GORE. I submit an amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to Senate bill 6856, to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES. I present a brief amendment, which I intend to offer at the proper time to the shipping bill. I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the close of the last section of the latest substitute add the following proviso:

Provided, That no revenues derived through taxes or duties collected from unenfranchised women of the United States shall be available or used for any of the purposes of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a proposed amendment to the pending measure, the ship-purchase bill, in the nature of a substitute, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. LODGE to the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the President is hereby authorized to construct in the United States of America, at a cost not exceeding in the aggregate $30,000,000, vessels which shall be both suitable for naval auxiliaries and for use in foreign commerce. In order to provide a fund for the cost of the construction of vessels so to be built and equipped hereunder, the President may issue and sell or use any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to an amount not exceeding $30,000,000: *Provided*, That the bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section may be made payable at such time after issue as the President in his discretion may deem advisable, but not exceeding 50 years.

SEC. 2. That all vessels constructed under the last preceding section shall become a part of the Naval Establishment of the United States and shall, except as hereinafter provided, be under the direction and management of the Secretary of the Navy as are other naval ships.

SEC. 3. That when the United States is at peace vessels constructed under this act not needed as a part of the naval force may be leased by the President to any responsible person, partnership, or corporation engaged, or which proposes to engage, in the business of a common carrier between the ports of the United States and the ports of a foreign country. The lease, which shall be in writing, shall, among other things, provide—

First. The period of the lease.

Second. The rental, which shall be either a fixed sum, to be agreed upon between the President, representing the United States, and the lessee or lessees, but which shall not in any event be less than 4 per cent annually upon the cost of the vessel, with proper addition for depreciation; or, if it be found impracticable to rent them, or any of them, for such fixed compensation, then for a conditional or contingent rental as follows: That proportion of the profits of operation that the cost of the vessel to the United States bears to the entire capital necessarily invested to operate and carry on business with the ship as a part of a transportation enterprise.

Third. The ports between which the vessel shall ply.

Fourth. That the United States shall have the right to cancel or terminate the lease and retake the vessel whenever in the judgment of the President it is needed for use as an auxiliary in the naval force of the United States.

Fifth. That the vessel shall, at all times while in commercial use, be registered under the laws of the United States, and that the lessee or lessees shall observe all the laws of the United States relating to commercial vessels.

Sixth. That the United States undertakes no obligation or responsibility connected with or growing out of the operation of the vessels.

Seventh. Such other provisions as in the judgment of the President may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to carry out the objects of the act.

SEC. 4. That the President is further authorized to lease in like manner and upon like terms any vessel now belonging to the Naval Establishment suitable for commercial use and not needed for naval purposes, and also vessels of the War Department suitable for commercial use and not needed for military transports in times of peace, and also the vessels now owned by the Panama Railroad Co.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect upon its passage.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to the pending shipping bill, which I shall propose later. I ask that the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. 12. No ship shall be purchased under the authority of this act from a belligerent nation, nor the citizens thereof, and no ship shall be operated by the United States, nor the shipping board, nor the corporation provided for herein, nor any lessee thereof, under the authority conferred by this act, to or from any port of a belligerent nation, nor to or from any European port during the continuance of the present war in Europe.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a proposed amendment to the pending bill, the unfinished business. I ask to have it read and lie on the table.

The amendment was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Insert after line 12, page 2, Senate bill 6856, the following additional proviso:

"*And provided further*, That said corporation shall make no charter or lease of any vessel to any corporation, firm, or individual for a longer period than six months, and said corporation shall specify in the charter or lease the rates, charges, and fares to be observed by such corporation, firm, or individual chartering or leasing any such vessel or vessels, as the maximum to be charged during the life of such charter or lease, and there shall be contained in said charter or lease a provision terminating the same whenever the charterer or the lessee shall violate any of its provisions. It is hereby made the duty of such corporation to take such steps as may be necessary to terminate any such charter or lease whenever the corporation, firm, or individual party to such charter or lease shall violate the provisions of the same."

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. SWANSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 529), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to subpœna witnesses, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and the expenses thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

SHIPS OF BELLIGERENT NATIONS.

Mr. BURTON. I submit a resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 527) was read, as follows:

Whereas the pending ship-purchase bill, being Senate bill No. 6856, contemplates by certain of its provisions the purchase of shipping tonnage already constructed, and therefore suggests the possible acquisition of ships belonging to belligerents, some of which are interned in American and other ports as the result of the war; and

Whereas the purchase of such vessels would raise questions of vital importance to the interests of the United States, a knowledge of which is of supreme importance, in order that the Senate may reach an intelligent conclusion as to the advisability of enacting said bill and as to the propriety of incorporating in its provisions certain amendments: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested, and is hereby directed, to transmit at his earliest convenience to the Senate of the United States information responsive to the following queries:

1. Has the Secretary of the Treasury knowledge that any officer of the Government has made overtures or addressed inquiries to the owners of ships under the flags of belligerent nations, including those ships now interned in ports of the United States or other neutral ports, for the purchase of such ships on the part of the Government of the United States or any of its authorized agencies?

2. Have tenders of sale of any interned merchant ships or other merchant ships carrying the flag of any of the belligerent nations been made to the United States or any of its officers or agencies?

3. Have there been any tenders for the sale of vessels at present carrying the flag of any neutral nation to the United States or any responsible officer or agent thereof?

4. Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that any person, firm, or corporation, acting either in private capacity or that of agent for the Government, holds any option upon any vessels of a belligerent nation interned in ports in the United States or elsewhere, contemplating their transfer either to private citizens of the United States or the Government of the United States or any agency thereof?

5. Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Government of the United States or any official thereof has in his employ or under his direction any person or agent who is making inquiry as to the possibility of purchasing any ship or ships of any description whatsoever, contemplating their eventual transfer to the United States or an agency thereof?

In each of the above instances the names of the persons, ships, and terms involved in each contemplated sale or purchase is requested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. The resolution is quite lengthy, and it involves a great many things which I could not clearly understand while it was being read. Therefore I shall have to ask that the resolution go over.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the resolution lie on the table. I may say, however, Mr. President, that I regard the information called for by the resolution as of great importance to the consideration of the pending shipping bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio desire that the resolution shall go over under the rule or that it be printed and lie on the table?

Mr. BURTON. Let it go over under the rule and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. BURTON. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 528) was read, as follows:

Whereas the pending ship-purchase bill, being Senate bill No. 6856, contemplating by certain of its provisions the purchase of shipping tonnage already constructed, and therefore suggests the possible acquisition of ships belonging to belligerents, some of which are interned in American and other ports as the result of the war; and

Whereas the purchase of such vessels would raise questions of vital importance to the interests of the United States, a knowledge of which is of supreme importance in order that the Senate may reach an intelligent conclusion as to the advisability of enacting said bill and as to the propriety of incorporating in its provisions certain amendments: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested and is hereby directed to transmit at his earliest convenience to the Senate of the United States information responsive to the following inquiry:

Has the Secretary of State, through private or official channels, received any information from any responsible foreign source as to the attitude the Governments of the belligerent nations, or any of them, might be expected to assume in relation to the transfer to the American flag and American register of merchant ships which have heretofore carried the flag of a belligerent State?

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the resolution may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

LOYAL CREEK INDIANS.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 530), which was read and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas an agreement between the United States and the Muskogee or Creek Tribe of Indians was adopted by the act of Congress entitled "An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Muskogee or Creek Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1901 (31 Stat., 869), section 26 of which provided that the Senate of the United States shall determine the amount of the Loyal Creek claim for what they suffered because of their loyalty to the United States Government during the Civil War, and shall make an award of such amount so found due to said Indians within two years from date of said act; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs reported to the Senate that the sum of $1,200,000 was justly and properly due upon said claim under the terms of said agreement (see Senate Committee Rept. No. 3088, 57th Cong., 2d sess.); and

Whereas on February 16, 1903, the Senate of the United States adopted the said recommendation contained in the said report of its Committee on Indian Affairs (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 36, pt. 3, 57th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 2252–2254); and

Whereas the sum of $600,000 was appropriated by the act making appropriations for the Indian Department, approved March 3, 1903 (32 Stat., 995), which declared said amount to be in full settlement of said award and required said Indians by the terms of said appropriation to receipt for the same as a settlement in full of said award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the said award of $1,200,000 as made by the Senate of the United States in favor of the said Loyal Creek Indians on February 16, 1903, was the award of the Senate made under the terms of said agreement and that said appropriation and payment of $600,000 was a partial payment thereof. (See Senate Committee Repts. Nos. 5587, 59th Cong., 2d sess.; 975, 60th Cong., 2d sess.; 849, 62d Cong., 2d sess.,; and 917, 63d Cong., 3d sess.)

THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 531), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is directed to inform the Senate if it is the understanding and intention of this Government that such canal as may be constructed on the Nicaragua route, to be acquired by the treaty with Nicaragua recently submitted to the Senate, will be subject to the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty with Great Britain, and if under that treaty the United States will be prohibited from defending or fortifying said canal or collecting munitions of war therein, and if citizens of the United States will be deprived of the free use thereof, and if it is the intention and understanding of this Government that citizens and subjects of foreign nations shall have equal rights and privileges in said canal with citizens of the United States.

DISTRICT EXCISE BOARD.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from service upon the committee to investigate the excise board of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kentucky is excused. There are now two vacancies on that committee, and the Chair fills the same by the appointment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to give notice of an amendment to the rules, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment to the rules will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be a standing committee of the Senate known as the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to be composed of five Senators elected in the same manner as the members of other standing committees, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and to which shall be referred all matters relating to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over one day under the rules as a notice.

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES.

Mr. SMOOT. In accordance with the notice which I gave on last Saturday of a proposed amendment to Rule XL, I submit a resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 532) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XL be amended as follows:

On line 4 of said rule as printed on page 37 of the Rules and Manual, United States Senate, after the word "thereof," insert the following: "; and a motion to suspend any rule or any part thereof shall require a vote of two-thirds and shall be decided without debate."

RIGHTS OF NEUTRALS (S. DOC. NO. 801).

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a short address of only about six typewritten pages of the ambassador from Argentina, the Hon. Rómulo S. Naón, before the governing board of the Pan American Union, delivered December 8, 1914, on the subject of "Rights of neutrals."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FEDERAL RESERVE LAW.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have a copy of an address by Charles G. Dawes, delivered Saturday, January 9, 1915, before the Union League Club, of Chicago, Ill., on the dangers of the Federal reserve law in its present form and how it should be amended to avoid them. I ask that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

[Address of Charles G. Dawes before the Union League Club, Saturday, Jan. 9, 1915.]

THE DANGERS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE LAW IN ITS PRESENT FORM AND HOW IT SHOULD BE AMENDED TO AVOID THEM.

Gentlemen, my subject was announced, as the chairman has said, "The Federal reserve bank; its benefits, its dangers, and its relation to the future business of the country," but my address will be for the most part upon "The dangers of the Federal reserve law in its present form, and how it should be amended to avoid them," for what has happened in our community within the last two weeks in connection with criticism of the management of the local Federal reserve bank is but the beginning of a controversy which in time to come will sweep over this country, and which, if not foreseen by change in legislation, may (as twice before in our history) bring us into commercial chaos and financial ruin.

The ever-live question in a Republic is the relation of the centralization of power to the diffusion of power. Underneath every question of politics in a Republic, underneath every question of economics in its public aspect, is that difference among our people between the policy of the concentration of power and the policy of the distribution of power among a large number of competing units. And if in the Federal reserve bank act we find certain principles which have been overlooked in their public relation, which are certain to bring upon sensitive institutions (for a bank is a sensitive institution) this old, old controversy, it is time to point out these principles, it is time to point out the dangers, before the credits of the banks have gone into general business, before the whole commercial edifice depends upon them as a foundation, and before the time when political attacks upon the Federal reserve law and the banks organized under it may result in a contraction of credits from which we suffered twice before, in the case of the First and Second Banks of the United States, and in the latter instance brought us into the chaos and the panic and the ruin of 1837.

I wish to show why, in my opinion, the Federal reserve law as it is at the present time upon our statute books will inevitably, in the course of a few years, bring our people face to face with the controversy through which this country went in 1837, when Andrew Jackson, at the head of the radicals, supported by the independent State banks, attacked the United States Bank—a controversy which resulted in the destruction of the bank and of the commercial prosperity of the United States at that time.

The Federal reserve banks are great credit-creating devices designed to use as a foundation of credits money of the United States Government, and money belonging to other banks already in use by these other banks as a foundation of existing credits. They were designed to relieve us from an inelasticity, not a dearth, of currency. Whatever may be their present impression, the people eventually will never consider the Federal reserve banks as "banks for bankers," but as banks to be operated primarily, as well as secondarily, in the public interest, and not solely in the interests of the national banks of the United States. This will result, not only from the fact that the cooperation of the United States Government is essential to make the Federal reserve bank fully effective in times of emergency, but because to exist and still preserve a reasonable capacity for public usefulness in times of emergency the Federal reserve banks must loan chiefly in the open market in competition with other banks. This results from the fact that we have ample currency in the United States except at times of special demand when the crops are to be moved, or in times of financial panic. Under the Aldrich bill the immediate retirement of our $700,000,000 national bank-note circulation, secured by Government bonds, was provided for, which would have made a vacuum in existing circulation which the Central Reserve Association could fill by loans to member banks.

The Federal reserve law, however, makes no material reduction in the outstanding bond secured national-bank note circulation, since it provides for the retirement of not to exceed $20,000,000 per year. The Federal reserve banks therefore will be forced into the open market for loans, not only by the general demand of the people but as a matter of business necessity. Over a year ago I pointed out that in normal business times banks will not pay a higher rate, as a rule, to borrow money from Federal reserve banks than they now pay in open competition for the money of the depositing public; in other words, about 3 to 4 per cent for time money and 2 to 3 per cent for demand money. This is the reason why so few Federal reserve notes have been thus far issued. If the Federal reserve banks should loan their money to the member banks at these low rates in normal times they would employ so much of their resources to pay their expenses and dividends as to impair their usefulness in times of emergency. The higher the rate which they receive upon their loans the less will their credits have to be expanded in normal times and the greater will be their note-issuing capacity in times of emergency. They can make these open-market loans under one of the least discussed and yet one of the most important provisions of the Federal reserve law, which authorizes the purchase of domestic bills of exchange without the indorsement and guaranty of member banks. Nothing is easier than to change the form of ordinary commercial paper into domestic bills of exchange. But the law should be amended to clearly define powers which, while now existing under the law, require to be exercised a change in the usual form in which credit is now granted.

This brings me, then, to my first point against the law in its present form, that it provides for a dual trusteeship and for the control of Federal reserve banks by bankers whose institutions will be in competition with the Federal reserve banks in the open loan market. And let me say here, in connection with this local controversy which has arisen, that it is not necessary for me, in this presence or in any other, to defend the competency or ability or the honesty of the two leading bankers of this city now members of the board of directors of the Federal reserve bank of the city of Chicago. [Applause.] As a member of the board of directors and executive committee of the People's Trust & Savings Bank of Chicago, and knowing his ability and competency, I happen to be the man who first suggested Mr. Earle M. Reynolds for its president upon Mr. Bosworth's resignation, and I seem to have involved George M. Reynolds in some criticism by it. It is hardly worth while before such an audience to discuss such things as that, except as they are related to the great coming controversy, in which the impossible principle of dual trusteeship provided for by the Federal reserve law will eventually involve all of the Federal reserve banks. This first controversy has arisen upon apparently unessential things, but wait until all over this country these banks commence their operations, and listen to the clamor of the demagogue that the business of the Federal reserve banks is being repressed in order to protect the banks of those men which are in competition with them—that they are not being used as agents of the public or in the public interest, but in the interests of the national banks of the United States, which seek to use them and the money of the United States Government deposited in them. I only mention this local controversy, which is not worthy to be dignified by detailed discussion, as indicating what in a few years, when the credits of the Federal reserve banks are expanded, will, unless the law be amended, be an issue upon every political stump of the country in a great campaign, when the Federal reserve banks, as did the Second Bank of the United States, will fight for their continued existence and for the maintenance of the foundations of general credit.

And now I come to a very important part of this argument, the future relation of the United States Government, through the United States Treasury, to the Federal reserve banks and the political and business consequences which will arise because of it. I want to make important in your minds the relation of the Secretary of the Treasury—the Government—to the Federal reserve banks, because it is through that relationship chiefly that the banking system of the United States from now on will become a subject of political controversy unless the law is amended. The note-issuing capacity of the 12 Federal reserve banks of the United States, based upon that provision of law which allows them to issue notes with a 40 per cent gold reserve, after maintaining a 35 per cent lawful-money reserve on their deposits, is $427,225,000. Bear in mind that these figures assume that the full 40 per cent gold reserve is maintained. Through the power of the Federal Reserve Board to suspend reserve requirements the note-issuing capacity of these banks can be much increased, but I am now considering the banks as operating in normal times. Their expenses—roughly estimated, but near enough, I think, for the purpose of argument—dividend requirements and surplus requirements, will be about $4,500,000 per year. To provide this sum they can loan in the open market $100,000,000 at 4½ per cent or to the member banks $180,000,000 at, say, 2½ per cent. In the first case they would have left a note-issuing capacity of $327,000,000 and in the second case of $247,000,000.

As the deposits of the Federal reserve banks increase under its provisions requiring reserve deposits from national banks these amounts will be somewhat increased. The net deposits of the national banks of the United States—to protect against the fluctuations in which is the chief function of these banks—is $7,291,342,479. In my judgment, this approximate amount of notes would be inadequate to care for the situation in times of emergency, and the banks, to perform their functions, must encroach upon the 40 per cent gold reserve or rely upon the assistance of the Government deposits made by the Secretary of the Treasury. We must remember that the net deposits of the State banks of the United States aggregate a sum greater than those of the national banks of the United States; that in times of emergency the inability of the State banks to meet the currency situation will greatly stimulate the demands upon the national banks. Even if the Secretary of the Treasury has not deposited Government money with the Federal reserve banks before, he certainly would do it at any time that the Federal reserve banks would otherwise have to encroach upon their 40 per cent gold reserve in issuing Federal reserve notes.

Do you realize that when the Secretary of the Treasury deposits the general fund holdings of the United States Treasury, as he is authorized in his unlimited discretion to do, in Federal reserve banks, that he will have more money on deposit than all the national banks of the United States put together have on deposit with them at the present time? The deposits of the Federal reserve banks now aggregate $249,786,000. The general fund holdings of the United States Treasury which can be deposited and withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury at his sole and unlimited discretion amount to $255,722,000. If he deposits that money, $99,700,000 of which is in gold, and these banks expand their business, and there should be put out by these banks, on the basis of these Government deposits, several hundred millions of notes, tell me, after this credit has gone into circulation, who will be the great power in connection with the Federal reserve banks—the Federal Reserve Board or the Secretary of the Treasury? Supposing that in any State bank, with $40,000,000 of deposits, one depositor controlled $20,000,000 of them, what would be his influence upon any business engagements which the bank might consider?

The Secretary of the Treasury is a political officeholder, the representative of a political administration. If for the third time the money of the United States Government goes into the business of the country through the Federal reserve banks and the independent subtreasury system which grew out of the last disastrous experience of this kind is abolished, the position of power of the Secretary of the Treasury will be that exercised by R. B. Taney, the Secretary of the Treasury under Andrew Jackson.

Before we consider what he might or might not do let us consider for a moment the situation which, whenever the United States deposits have gone into business, he is not only likely but certain to confront. A great clamor will have arisen in the country against the control of the Federal reserve banks by competing bankers. A claim will be made, if the money of the Federal reserve banks has been loaned to member banks, that if it had been loaned to the public general interest rates would be lower. If, on the other hand, these deposits had been loaned to the public by the Federal reserve banks a great clamor will be heard about the tremendous power exercised by those dominating the banks, and opposition will arise from the independent banks, both State and national, suffering from competition in the loan market from funds taken from national banks, without interest, and from Government deposits. A clamor will come from those unable to secure credit from the Federal reserve banks, which would accommodate in normal times large institutions as distinguished from small institutions because the credit emissions of large institutions are better than those of small institutions as a rule. A clamor will arise that these Federal reserve banks, possessing great power over credits and business conditions, are dictating terms under which general business can be transacted.

Imagine the position of an administration under such a situation. If it did not yield to it, it would go out of power and another would be put into power which would yield to it. Let us see what R. B. Taney said and let us see what he did. And if anybody sees anything inappropriate in this attitude taken by Taney, who afterwards became Chief Justice of the United States, as applied to the situation in which this country will be after the expansion of the credits of the Federal reserve banks, let him say so. I am reading from the financial report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for 1833:

"It is a fixed principle of our political institutions to guard against the unnecessary accumulations of power over persons or property in any hands, and no hands are less worthy to be trusted with it than

those of a money corporation. In the selection, therefore, of the State banks as the fiscal agents of the Government"—

This is when he commenced to withdraw the Government deposits, because of the political pressure against the system, because of the political prejudice in this country against the power which must necessarily attach to semipublic banks if they are to perform the function for which they were created—

"In the selection, therefore, of the State banks (that is, as distinguished from the second Bank of the United States) as the fiscal agents of the Government, no disadvantages appear to have been incurred on the score of safety or convenience, or the general interests of the country, while much that is valuable will be gained by the change. I am, however, well aware of the vast power of the Bank of the United States and of its ability to bring distress and suffering on the country. * * * But I have not supposed that the course of the Government ought to be regulated by the fear of the power of the bank. If such a motive could be allowed to influence the legislation of Congress, or the action of the executive department of the Government, there is an end to the sovereignty of the people and the liberties of the country are at once surrendered at the feet of a moneyed corporation. They may now demand the possession of the public money, or the renewal of the charter; and if these objects are yielded to them from apprehensions of their power, or from the suffering which rapid curtailments on their part are inflicting on the community, what may they not next require? Will submission render such a corporation more forbearing in its course? What law may it not hereafter demand, that it will not, if it pleases, be able to enforce by the same means?"

In that year, 1833, the Government of the United States had on deposit with the second Bank of the United States less in proportion to the other deposits of the bank than the Secretary of the Treasury is now authorized to deposit in the Federal reserve banks as compared with its present deposits. The Government then had on deposit with the second Bank of the United States $6,512,000, while the private deposits of the bank were $9,868,000, about 50 per cent more than the United States deposits. Three years later the Secretary of the Treasury had completed his part of the war against the second Bank of the United States. In March, 1836, the United States deposits were but $324,000, and the private deposits had shrunk from $9,868,000 to $3,390,000. The country was on its way to financial ruin. The great panic of 1837 which followed was brought about not alone by the war of Andrew Jackson and the radicals of the country, but by the war of the independent State banks which resented the competition of Government money used by the second Bank of the United States. I am not here to criticize Andrew Jackson. As a result of his war while panic and disaster ensued for a time, there was laid the foundation of our great independent competing banking system composed of 27,000 units which have aided in building up and developing the richest and most powerful business Nation of the world. As a result of that war were laid the foundations of the independent subtreasury system, through which Uncle Sam, having had trouble in getting his money out of the banks where he had deposited it, from that time on kept the bulk of it in his own pocket. He had so much in his pocket in 1907 that in that panic he could spare enough to the banks of the country to tide them over. It is far from my intention to criticize Andrew Jackson or the result of his war, but I do say that it is nothing short of folly for us to reestablish by law the conditions which brought about the Jacksonian war and the prostration of business. It is not a popular thing to criticize a law from which everybody hopes good, but I say that the time to correct this law is before the credits of the Federal reserve bank have been expanded.

Two great amendments in addition to the one regarding open-market operations must be made to this law to remove its menace to our future prosperity. The law must be amended to take the control of the Federal reserve banks from their competitors. I realize that the law has compelled the national banks to buy the stock of the Federal reserve banks—that they are the owners of them—that ordinarily control should not be divorced from ownership—that it seems unjust from a banking standpoint that the bankers should not control them, but this is a case where the interests and attitude of the public are involved, and the banks in time will suffer more from the retention of control than from its elimination. I say this without any hesitation; I give warning that the people of this country will demand that these banks be operated independently, and not by trustees already charged with the duties of trusteeship over competing corporations. I am here to say that this principle of dual trusteeship established by this law is wrong, not only as a principle, but as a policy. Amend this law so as to keep the banks under the control of business men and not politicians, but take that control away from competitors. If you do not, you have laid the foundations of a political controversy in which the Andrew Jackson of the future, voicing the demand of the people, will again lay our commercial edifice in ruins. This can be avoided; and the stand of true patriotism is to make an effort to avoid it rather than to wait in an unreal and fancied security until danger has become disaster. There was a day one spring when Johnstown, Pa., was at peace and quiet in the feeling of security and the enjoyment of prosperity. But was it out of danger because the danger was not realized? There ought to be some man in the Senate of the United States, some man, somewhere, who, in connection with this great danger which threatens the United States, could do as the man did who rode down before the flood from that crumbling Johnstown reservoir and cried to that peaceful people the warning of the disaster which was coming. If the Federal reserve banks are built upon the crumbling foundation of false principles, make no mistake, their reservoir of credits will break in time and our prosperity will be submerged.

The second great amendment which must be made to the Federal reserve law is the curtailment of the immense power over Government deposits in the banks, which is now left to the sole and unlimited discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. In the first place, he should not be permitted to place any of the general-fund holdings of the Treasury in the Federal reserve banks, to become a foundation of banking credits in normal times. He should not be allowed to deposit the general-fund holdings of the Treasury in the Federal reserve banks until the Federal reserve banks had reached the limit of their possible expansion without Government deposits, and then only under such restrictions as would compel the banks to return the money after the crisis was past. The right to deposit and draw United States money in the Federal reserve banks should not be left to one man's discretion, but should be subjected to proper checks against the possible wrongful use of such vast power. But some one may say that our protection is the Federal Reserve Board. Is that permanent? Let the Federal Board be conservative as it is now, how long, against the pressure which will come from the people of the United States, can the Federal Reserve Board stand? We must make up our minds that these great credit-creating devices are going to be used, and the power of any one administration or any one Secretary of the Treasury to deposit and draw at his unlimited will and discretion what would amount at this time to one-half of the total assets of the Federal reserve banks must be prevented by amendment of the law. I care not who the man is—I have confidence in Secretary McAdoo, but that power should not be his or that of any other one man. This law must for the first time be discussed with relation to the politics of the country. For the most part the law is conformable to sound economics. It is capable of being made of great usefulness to our people, but in order to be so it must be amended before your business and my business becomes adjusted to and dependent upon the existence of a large volume of credits, which, when these wrong principles involved in the law are justly attacked, and contraction sets in, will overwhelm us in the ruin which our forefathers went through 78 years ago. The question of whether political appointees are put in charge of the bank, injurious as that would be, is subsidiary; the most important question is whether we can correct this law and prevent an attack upon these institutions upon whose proper handling of credits and currency our prosperity of the future depends. I thank you. [Applause.]

HAWTHORNE'S TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am about to offer a concurrent resolution for the printing of the sketch of the life of Franklin Pierce by Nathaniel Hawthorne, one of New England's foremost novelists, which was written by him in 1852. I wish to make a short statement which, I think, will have the approval of my colleague [Mr. GALLINGER], the leader of the minority.

Franklin Pierce was a resident of New Hampshire all his life, except when he was in the service of his country as a Representative, a Senator, a soldier in the Mexican War, and afterwards as President of the United States. No statue of Franklin Pierce had been erected in New Hampshire until the past year. Two years ago the New Hampshire Legislature made an appropriation for the erection of such a statue, and it was unveiled in Concord, N. H., on the 25th of November, 1914. At that time ex-Senator William E. Chandler, for many years a Member of this body, made one of the principal addresses. Another address was by a distinguished Republican of New Hampshire, Judge Edgar Aldrich, of the Federal court. Other addresses were made by distinguished men of both parties, whose names I do not now recall.

The statue is by Mr. Augustus Lukeman, of New York. It was unveiled by Miss Susan H. Pierce, of Hillsboro, N. H., the great-grandniece of Franklin Pierce. The Hon. HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, and the Hon. FRANCIS S. WHITE, of Alabama, both distinguished Members of this body, were invited to take part in those exercises, but were unable to be present at the time of the unveiling.

I feel it an honor, Mr. President, to offer this concurrent resolution, which I do with the full approval of my colleague, and I hope that the Senate and the House of Representatives by adopting this resolution will make a public document of this very felicitous sketch of the life of Franklin Pierce, written by an author who is so well known as Nathaniel Hawthorne.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of Congress 3,000 copies of the tribute given by Nathaniel Hawthorne to Franklin Pierce during the presidential canvass of 1852, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SHIPMENTS OF COPPER ABROAD (S. DOC. NO. 798).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, in response to the resolution adopted in the Senate on January 8, 1915, calling for all correspondence with any belligerent nation concerning the treatment of shipments of copper from the United States to neutral countries, a report of the Secretary of State in the premises. I concur in the view of the Secretary of State that it is at this time incompatible with the public interests to communicate to the Senate the correspondence called for by the Senate's resolution.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1915.*

SHIPMENT OF NAVAL STORES (S. DOC. NO. 799).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, in response to the resolution adopted in the Senate on January 6, 1915, calling for all correspondence with any belligerent nation concerning the treatment of certain naval stores as contraband of war, a report of the Secretary of State in the premises. I concur in the view of the Secretary of

State that it is at this time incompatible with the public interests to communicate to the Senate the correspondence called for by the Senate's resolution.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1915.*

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, I inquire if morning business has been completed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to inquire whether there was further morning business. If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of omnibus pension bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIVELY. The first bill is Senate bill 6980, being Calendar No. 738.

The bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rate per month stated:

James A. Fancher, late of U. S. S. *Ohio* and *Princeton*, United States Navy, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Katie A. Beardsley, widow of John F. Beardsley, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary Lotty, widow of John Lotty, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Andrew A. Kelley, late captain Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Meekin, late pilot United States gunboat *Tyler*, United States Navy, and U. S. S. *Baltic*, Mississippi Marine Brigade, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas H. Kennedy, late of Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Edwards, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amanda Parmelee, widow of Owen Parmelee, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Herman Sebert, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Franklin Comstock, late of U. S. S. *North Carolina*, *Potomac*, and *Richmond*, United States Navy, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonathan S. Nickerson, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. Eding, late of Company D, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Augustus M. Barnes, late of Company F, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. Magers, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Smith, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha J. Whiting, widow of Solomon E. Whiting, late second lieutenant Company I, Ninety-ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Joseph R. C. Hunter, late captain Company A, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Grace E. McDonald, widow of James F. McDonald, late of Seventh Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary J. Gooding, widow of John Gooding, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Wabash*, and *New Ironsides*, United States Navy, $12 per month.

George T. Smith, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna F. Quinn, former widow of David P. Quinn, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

James H. Nale, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hattie A. Harris, formerly Hungerford, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and widow of Charles O. Harris, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Harlan Gause, late captain Company I, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Rodgers, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frank A. Olney, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment, and Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nelson W. Armstrong, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jeremiah Lyshon, late of Company B, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ormiston C. Wing, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

M. Theresa Sampson, widow of Enoch Sampson, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Almond R. Spaulding, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alfred Deforest Walker, late of Company F, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John R. Boso, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lucinda E. Nelson, widow of Daniel J. Nelson, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elizabeth J. Mullin, widow of Sidney F. Mullin, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Charles J. Herring, late of Company F, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Sarah E. Badley, widow of Robert A. Badley, late of Company G, Third Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and former widow of John Eckroat, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Hugh K. Godding, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Dial, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph M. Lansden, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph M. Conway, late of Company K, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Philamena B. Mahoney, former widow of George Bush, late of Company A, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month.

Justine M. Thrift, widow of William H. Thrift, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and major and additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Caspar Schiesser, late of Company A, Second Independent Battalion, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Moses Bahney, late of Companies F and B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Peter Smith, late unassigned, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia Sitz, widow of Charles Sitz, late musician, band, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Amanda M. Startsman, widow of Lawrence Startsman, late of Company G, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emily Morang, widow of William Morang, late of Company L, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and former widow of Ivory W. Thompson, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Marcus E. Ferguson, late second lieutenant Company G, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Hurley, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Whitman M. Colby, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna M. Foster, widow of George W. Foster, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jacob C. Rennaker, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Minerva Freeman, widow of Louis Freeman, late of Company M, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and captain Company B, First Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cornelia A. Anderson, widow of John P. Anderson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and U. S. S. *Rodolph* and *Itasca*, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Margaret A. Bitgood, widow of Joel K. Bitgood, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Almira E. Briggs, widow of George L. Briggs, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and fifty-ninth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Maria Lewis, former widow of John L. Seignious, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elisha W. Ellis, late first lieutenant Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Pangburn, widow of Benjamin Pangburn, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-first Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary M. Calef, widow of John H. Calef, late lieutenant colonel, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and colonel, United States Army, retired, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John A. Patterson, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Annie Wilson, widow of Charles P. Wilson, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Benjamin F. Bourne, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert S. Clark, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lucy Carey, widow of Jesse Carey, late of the Seventeenth Independent Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, $12 per month.

Frances Terry, widow of Albert O. Terry, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary A. De Lany, widow of Arthur W. De Lany, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charles Nettleton, late of Companies K and E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orville Choate, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick W. Schaeffer, late of the United States Marine Corps, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catharine Terwilger, widow of John W. Terwilger, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Stephen D. Mitchell, late of Company D, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin Williams, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ezra W. Conant, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura C. Bailey, widow of Charles P. Bailey, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

David Frank, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harriet J. Weddle, widow of John R. Weddle, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, $12 per month, the pension to cease upon proof that the soldier is living.

Amanda F. Powell, widow of John F. Powell, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

King R. Olmstead, late of Company D, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John S. Perriton, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel L. Cole, late of Company H, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Egbert W. Reed, late of Company A, Hatch's Independent Battalion, Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Crockett, late of Company H, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary J. Sanders, former widow of Nathan Hardy, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charles A. Dick, late of Company K, Thirty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Fenton Butterfield, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month, the same to be paid him without further deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

Margaret Sheridan, widow of James Sheridan, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elizabeth Buckless, widow of Henry S. Buckless, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Martha V. Coleman, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emma S. Rowe, widow of John M. Rowe, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Martha J. Bretney, widow of Edwin V. Bretney, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Peter M. Fritts, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Calvin Barker, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John G. Berry, helpless and dependent child of Eben L. Berry, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Oscar Avery, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ella M. Decker, widow of James L. Decker, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant and adjutant Eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

William P. Stone, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Alfrey, former widow of James W. Alfrey, late second lieutenant Company E, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Mary M. Nolan, widow of James Nolan, late of Company E, Sixth Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emily S. Keller, widow of Jacob W. Keller, late captain Company A, Third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and major United States Army, retired, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Georgia Ann Taylor, widow of Edward R. Taylor, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jean H. G. Kitchel, widow of Horace B. Kitchel, late of Company B, One Hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Samuel R. Littrell, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles T. Blumenrother, late of Company H, Sixty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jerome B. Wood, late of Second Battery, Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. McCarty, late of Company B, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George D. Carter, late of Company G, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hiram Bender, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Juliette Pierce, widow of Lewis T. Pierce, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Two hundred and forty-sixth Company, First Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, $12 per month.

Frank Pugsley, late of Company I, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Callie E. Kooken, widow of Daniel S. Kooken, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Seraphina Kain, widow of Alexander L. Kain, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment, and Company D, First Regiment, California Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Ellen Milam, widow of John S. Milam, late first lieutenant Company D, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elmina Swan, widow of Benjamin F. Swan, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, United States Navy, $12 per month.

Harriet L. Willis, widow of Hugh Willis, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Sixty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Clara R. Squier, widow of John M. Squier, late first lieutenant Company C, and late captain Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John S. Colbath, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane Letcher, widow of Benjamin Letcher, late assistant surgeon, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lovina J. Nudd, widow of David K. Nudd, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Rufus N. Brown, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sara J. Titsworth, widow of William L. Titsworth, late of Company C, Second Regiment New Jersey Militia Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

May C. Moore, widow of William W. Moore, late of Company F, Sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Horace L. Farmer, late of Company G, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. Stoddard, widow of Elbridge I. Stoddard, late sergeant major, Twelfth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George H. Lewis, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Sharpshooters, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert F. Wright, late of Company B, Fifty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David M. Hilton, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hannah C. Van Tassel, dependent mother of Alonzo Van Tassel, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Samuel Brenner, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward E. Teter, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph McKinsey, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Miller, late of Company G, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Brewer, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Crouso, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gertrude Cornwell, helpless and dependent child of Green B. Cornwell, late of Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Eden N. Leavens, late regimental quartermaster Tenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Murray V. Livingston, late of Company D, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George A. Blose, late of Company C, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Militia Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joel A. Ginter, late of Company K, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hiram E. Tinker, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John C. Leith, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lydia Irene Cheney, widow of Warren Cheney, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Drafted Militia Infantry, and Company A, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Louisa Schenk, widow of John Schenk, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster Seventeenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William H. Howell, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emily L. Small, widow of Orange F. Small, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Isaiah Davis, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas H. Core, late of Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Coleman, late of Company H, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles M. Milligan, late acting third assistant engineer, United States Navy, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Grubb, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. Sargent, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah B. Hamer, widow of Amos W. Hamer, late of Company H, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eliza J. Riggs, widow of William Riggs, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Louisa C. Pangburn, widow of James E. Pangburn, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment, and Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John W. Gaddis, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Caroline Dufner, widow of Andrew Dufner, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month, the pension to cease upon proof that the soldier is living.

Smith C. Hotchkin, late of Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles Pettys, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret Williams, widow of Calvin T. Williams, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Murrandia Martin, widow of David Martin, late of Company B, Second Regiment Florida Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Thomas Winegardner, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles L. Stuck, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Annie E. Yelton, widow of Oliver P. Yelton, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Amanda E. Bateman, widow of John H. Bateman, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ammazetta L. Nettleton, widow of Joseph F. Nettleton, late of Company D, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Byron C. Davis, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew J. Hall, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gordon H. Shepard, late of Company M, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles Wickliffe, late of Company D, Ninety-third Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hugh Smith, late of Company K, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John C. Wilson, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maggie S. Northway, former widow of Edward C. Northway, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William H. D. Lancaster, late of Company D, One hundred and Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jay D. Morse, late of the Second Battery Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Nelson, late of Company A, One hundred and eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Perry B. Glines, late of Company L, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. Flournoy, late of Company E, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. The next is Order of Business No. 739, Senate bill 6981.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 6981) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors. It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates per month stated:

Mary F. Gaddie, widow of John E. Gaddie, late of Troop A, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Edwin R. Gibson, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Richard L. Miller, late captain Company L, Third Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $30 per month.

Patrick P. Finnerin, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Fritz Hedlund, late of Battery F, Second Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Charles S. Allen, late of Troop H, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, $10 per month.

Maggie Norment, widow of Richard M. Norment, late of Battery I, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Mexico, $12 per month.

William R. Faulkner, late of Company I, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

F. Isabelle Lawrance, widow of James P. S. Lawrance, late captain, United States Navy, retired, $30 per month.

William M. Swart, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Michael Grace, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Lillian J. Hartley, widow of Le Roy Hartley, late of Company A, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said Le Roy Hartley until she reaches the age of 16 years.

William L. Rouner, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Harry Jackson, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $10 per month.

Nathan Long, late of Troop B, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company H, Second Battalion United States Engineers, Regular Establishment, $12 per month.

Catherine E. Prine, widow of Henry A. Prine, late of Capt. Sparkman's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida Seminole Indian War, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alice I. Henderson, widow of Edward E. Henderson, late of Battery F, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Edward E. Henderson until she reaches the age of 16 years.

Frank Knitter, late of Company K, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaretha Matthes, widow of Alfred Matthes, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, $12 per month.

Samuel C. Cochran, late of Company E, First Regiment Idaho Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Osco L. Robinson, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Burke, late of Company C, First Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Martin L. Williams, late second lieutenant Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James L. Redding, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Downs, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Minnie Wadsworth Wood, widow of Oliver E. Wood, late colonel, Artillery Corps, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Joseph G. Winkler, late of Battery B, Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, $16 per month.

Frank Varney, late of Company B, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frank Sutterfield, late of Company A, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Oscar Gray, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $17 per month.

Oscar O. Lee, late of Company L, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Margaret A. Bennett, widow of Robert A. Bennett, late captain Company F, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

David O. Scott, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

John F. Davis, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask the Senate to consider House bill 19545.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 19545) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 2, line 19, before the words "per month," to strike out "$22.50" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of David Jewell, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 6856.

Mr. SHIVELY. I appeal to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to allow the unfinished business to be laid aside long enough to dispose of these omnibus pension bills. I think it will take but 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator from Indiana how long he expects it would take?

Mr. SHIVELY. About 30 or 40 minutes, or something like that time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business for half an hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to say for half an hour.

Mr. SHIVELY. I myself expressed the opinion that we might get through in that time. I hope the Senator will not fix a definite time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will not fix a definite time. I will say for half an hour or such a matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Until the private pension bills are passed.

Mr. THOMAS. How many private pension bills are there?

Mr. SMOOT. There are not very many of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are only five or six left.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall certainly object to any undue postponement of the regular order.

Mr. SMOOT. So will I, but I certainly think that they can be passed in 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, but I understood the suggestion of the Senator from Utah to include a considerable number of bills.

Mr. SMOOT. There are half a dozen of them, perhaps.

Mr. SHIVELY. Nearly half of them have been passed this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside. The next amendment of the Committee on Pensions to the pending bill will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "$22.50" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel S. Van Wye, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 7, before the words "per month," to strike out "$24" and insert "$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Ludlow Walker, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 21, before the words "per month," to strike out "$40" and insert "$50," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nathaniel T. Hoover, late of Company H, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 14, before the words "per month," to strike out "$40" and insert "$50," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Rufus G. Blanchard, late of Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Infantry, and Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. On page 12 I move to strike out lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 in the following words:

The name of Milo B. Stewart, late of Independent Battery F, Pennsylvania Light Artillery, and Company D, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

I offer the amendment because the soldier is deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 13, before the words "per month," to strike out "$22.50" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John F. Messick, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, after the word "Kentucky"; to strike out "Mounted," and in the same line, after the word "Volunteer," to insert "Mounted," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George W. Everman, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 5, after the name "Norton," to strike out "insane (William A. Titcomb, guardian)," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Oliver D. Norton, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 1, after the word "One," to strike out "hunderd" and insert "hundred," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Martha P. Clingerman, helpless and dependent child of Harrison Clingerman, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 16, after the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Secret Service" and insert "Sharpshooters," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Erwin D. Bulen, late of Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 5, before the words "per month," to strike out "$30" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of John N. Hall, late of Company F, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 20, to strike out:

The name of Martha Rodgers, now Bodine, former widow of George N. Rodgers, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 24, before the words "per month," to strike out "$26" and insert "$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Nancy C. McCurdy, widow of David F. McCurdy, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and

pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 4, to strike out:

The name of John T. Hetherlin, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "$22.50" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Richard B. Winn, late of Company H, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 21, after the word "late," to strike out "of company," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Charles Black, late unassigned, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. On page 30, I move to strike out lines 13, 14, and 15 in the following words, the soldier having deceased:

The name of Samuel Fox, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 14, before the words "per month," to strike out "$24" and insert "$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Emma L. Ackley, widow of Andrew F. Ackley, late of Company H, Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension to the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Katie A. Armstrong, former widow of George Croffoot, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 8, after the words "New York," to strike out "Secret Service" and insert "Volunteer Sharpshooters," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Margaret Lloyd, widow of John Lloyd, late of Sixth Company, First Batallion, New York Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 15, before the words "per month," to strike out "$24" and insert "$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Harriet I. Dagwell, widow of George A. Dagwell, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 25, before the word "Volunteer," to insert "Veteran," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Homer A. Bidwell, late of Company B, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of John Ramsey, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 18, before the words "per month," to strike out "$40" and insert "$30," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henry M. Seitzinger, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. On page 51, I move to strike out lines 23 and 24, and lines 1 and 2 on page 52, in the following words:

The name of John W. Hudelson, late of Company A, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This soldier is deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 15, after the word "late," to strike out "of company," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Henry H. Smith, late unassigned, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of David E. Stanwood, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 9, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain"; in line 10, before the word "First," to insert "and major"; and in line 11, after the word "Cavalry," to strike out "and major in the same regiment"; so as to make the clause read:

The name of Andrew W. Duggan, late captain Company L and major First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 61, to strike out:

The name of Frederica Pence, widow of Samuel Pence, late of Company B, Sixty-first and Eighty-second Regiments Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 7212.

The bill (S. 7212) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

David R. Todd, late of Troop F, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, $16 per month.

Samuel Rook, late of Company B, Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Letta D. Webster, widow of Edmund K. Webster, late major Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

Mary B. Howland, late nurse, Medical Department United States Army, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Horace M. Patton, late first lieutenant Company E, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John A. Shannon, late of Company I, Second Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Noah E. Curtis, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Lenfesty, late of Company M, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

John Howard, late of Troop F, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel W. Setzer, late of Company F, Second Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

William Quinlivan, late of Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob Smith, late of Company F, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, $16 per month.

Charles Gustoson, late of Troop D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Oscar Ernst, late of the Eighth Battery, United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Vernon D. Blalock, late of the Sixth Battery, United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

Ray M. Sherman, late of Company M, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frank D. Brown, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Marie A. Berry, widow of John F. Berry, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John F. Berry until they reach the age of 16 years.

Charles W. Coolidge, jr., late of Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Edward J. Gainan, late first lieutenant Company D, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

David W. Cutting, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

George J. Newman, late of Company E, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $20 per month.

Richard M. Longfellow, late of Company A, First Regiment North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month.

Frank F. Judson, late of band, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert S. Smylie, jr., late of Troop G, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, $20 per month.

Matthew H. Jackson, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, $30 per month.

Mary E. Wash, widow of George Wash, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said George Wash until they reach the age of 16 years.

Samuel L. Hess, late of Companies A and B, Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, $15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask the Senate next to consider Senate bill 7213.

The bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to pension the following-named persons at the rates stated:

Frederika B. Trilley, widow of Joseph Trilley, late rear admiral, United States Navy, retired, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George F. Brown, late of Company B, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Bachtler, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and Company B, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George D. Stebbins, late of U. S. S. *Vermont* and *Grand Gulf*, United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isabell C. Dean, widow of Charles Dean, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Nancy J. Northrup, widow of Stephen L. Northrup, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Lucy P. Wheeler, widow of George H. Wheeler, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Catherine Kelly, widow of Daniel Kelly, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

William C. Hinson, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia C. Nickerson, widow of Henry Nickerson, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Frances E. Berry, widow of William Berry, late first lieutenant Company C, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary Parsons, widow of Milo C. Parsons, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Watie H. Stodder, widow of Louis N. Stodder, late acting volunteer lieutenant, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alfred Dearmy, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clarkson D. Ayers, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane Hubbard, widow of Benjamin Hubbard, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James T. Kent, late of U. S. S. *Huntress*, Mississippi River Squadron, United States Navy, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David R. Forsha, late of Company E, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jesse Monticue, late of Company D, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Martin, widow of William M. Martin, late of Company G, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James H. Givens, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Egbert Dart, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Larkin Russell, late a scout in 1863 and 1864, under Gens. McNeil and Sanborn, United States Army, $12 per month.

Anthony Krass, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Miller, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. Lansberry, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Condon, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George D. Hamm, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Wealthy L. Kelsey, widow of Evelyn Kelsey, late musician, band, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry C. Jacks, late of Company D, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harrison Welch, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Martha Lance, widow of William Lance, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Mary Jane Campbell, widow of John W. Campbell, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry S. Gay, late of Company M, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Agnes M. Heck, widow of John M. Heck, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Thirtieth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Louise M. Hunie, widow of Adolphus F. Hunie, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Maria B. Hyde, widow of William E. Hyde, late of U. S. S. *Sabine*, *Princeton*, and *Mohican*, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Johanna Mansfield, widow of Patrick Mansfield, late of Company B, Battalion, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Isabella Neff, widow of Nathan D. Neff, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Francis Robinson, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Harding, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Hayes, late acting assistant surgeon United States Army, $12 per month.

Robert G. Calhoun, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert A. Lance, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, $15 per month.

Maria E. Pitts, widow of Edward A. Pitts, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Clara B. Randall, widow of William B. Randall, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eugene Lenhart, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William D. Boyd, late of Company D, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ann Simons, widow of John W. Simons, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Warner, late of Company C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary A. Selleck, widow of Theodore W. Selleck, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Adam F. Wilson, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David L. Cross, late of Company H, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna B. Fay, widow of George H. Fay, late captain Company B, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and major and additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Roswell Sayers, late unassigned, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph L. Williams, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John T. Allen, late of Company F, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Lockwood, late of Company H, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Wintemute, late of Company C, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Roseberry, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert W. Dyer, late of Company F, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Gossage, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Crouch, late of Company H, Seventy-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Jefferson Stafford, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin McClelan, late of Company K, One hundred and seventeenth and One hundred and forty-third Regiments Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David W. Mead, late first lieutenant Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hymelius Mendenhall, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Deering, jr., late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Francis C. Wood, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Augusta A. Crommett, widow of Francis W. Crommett, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Ella V. Jones, widow of Rufus L. Jones, late of Company C, First Battalion Sharpshooters, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Horatio Tibbetts, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $12 per month.

Charles E. Ewing, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Barnett, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Esli A. Bowen, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John F. Grayum, late first lieutenant Company E, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph L. Hays, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. Squires, widow of Newlon Squires, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Newlon Squires until they reach the age of 16 years.

Elizabeth Scott, widow of William D. Scott, late quartermaster sergeant, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James M. Tackett, late of Company E, One hundred and twelfth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hester Morse, widow of George W. Morse, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company I, Eighth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary T. Ryan, widow of Patrick J. Ryan, late of Company I, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lewis Walker, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Covey, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Graham, late of Company E, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sylvester Chaplin, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amy D. Wetherell, widow of Philander L. Wetherell, late of Company H, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Henry Quint, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sanford B. Sylvester, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah M. Hicks, widow of John Louis Hicks, alias Louis Hicks, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jacob Jones, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jonathan Thuma, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John M. Miller, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James F. Brown, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Miller, late of Troop I, First Regiment United States Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Fountain, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert E. Magoffin, late sergeant major Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John M. Herder, late musician, band, Thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Carrie M. Case, widow of Augustus R. Case, late of the United States Marine Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Amanda Baxter, widow of James Baxter, late second lieutenant Company K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cora H. Alward, widow of Arthur Alward, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Adam J. Grantz, late of Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $12 per month.

Alfred J. Adair, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Porter, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Clay, late of Companies A and F, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hannah M. Bates, widow of Richard C. Bates, late of the United States Marine Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Joseph N. Stockford, late of Sixth Battery, Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Salome Northhardt, widow of John G. Northhardt, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jefferson Wood, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli C. Walton, late of Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Philip Crowl, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nathaniel Trueblood, late of Company C, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna Mary McOmber, former widow of Henry Witte, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Charles H. Morrison, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Roth, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John C. Hamilton, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Sigman, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Helen A. Underhill, widow of James K. Underhill, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susan E. Holt, widow of James E. Holt, late of U. S. S. *Galena* and *Princeton*, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Robert S. Thomas, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Wyatt C. Crawford, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia M. Sayles, widow of John W. Sayles, late of Company F, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Nicholas Metzer, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gertrude Edmonds, helpless and dependent child of Thomas R. Edmonds, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

John T. Hayes, late of Company G, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Franklin Stotts, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary J. Wilcox, widow of Willett M. Wilcox, late captain Company K, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Turnbaugh, late of Company F, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac Baker, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Ryan, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jasper McPhail, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa Bendel, widow of Henry C. Bendel, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Stephen K. Ashley, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel McClure, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Earl W. Soper, late of Companies M and H, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles Fredrick, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment, and Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John E. Saunders, late of Company E, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nancy I. Williams, widow of Mastin E. Williams, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James O. Anderson, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment, and Company H, Twenty-eighth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Pilot, late of Company E, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James K. Deyo, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment, and Company D, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susan E. Manning, widow of George A. Manning, late captain Company M, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Juriah Cline, widow of Felix Cline, late of Company B, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Annette M. Lamoreaux, widow of Isaac V. Lamoreaux, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Esen Z. Guild, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emanuel Klepper, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment, and Company E, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hiram W. Babcock, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Carpenter, late of Company D, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose Anna Nagley, helpless and dependent child of James W. Nagley, late of Company B, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Robert Jenkins, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles P. Harmon, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Inman, late second lieutenant Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Masterson, late of Company D, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Carter, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maria T. Jones, widow of Austin A. Jones, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Joseph S. Herndon, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellen M. Bellows, widow of Josiah W. Bellows, late of Company A, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Victoria S. Day, widow of David F. Day, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lucy W. Osborne, widow of Leslie K. Osborne, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Theodore M. Burge, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin Rudrauff, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eliza M. Doran, widow of James G. Doran, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Louisa Walters, widow of John E. Walters, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. STERLING. On page 27, line 1, I move to strike out "$30" and to insert "$40," so as to read:

The name of Charles P. Harmon, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SHIVELY. I will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask the Senate to take up House bill 20562.

The bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was considered as in Committee of the Whole, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 3, after line 8, to strike out:

The name of Elizabeth McManus, former widow of Owen Lyons, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 12, before the word "surgeon's," to strike out "who served as a" and insert "late," and in the same line, before the words "United States," to strike out "in the," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary J. Hill, widow of Robert L. Hill, late surgeon's steward, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Stringer White, who served as a landsman in the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, before the words "per month," to strike out "$30" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of George W. Rank, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 16, before the words "per month," to strike out "$30" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Daniel O'Donnell, late of Company F, Third Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company F, Thirty-third Regiment, United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 21, to strike out:

The name of Edward A. Kinney, late of Companies C, D, and A, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and former widow of Lewis A. Hoke, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of J. Berdina R. Bierbower, widow of Jacob Bierbower, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Lewis A. Hoke, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 20, before the word "nurse," to insert "late," and in the same line, after the word "nurse," to strike out "United States Army" and insert "Medical Department, United States Volunteers," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Lettie E. Wilson, formerly Lettie E. Thayer, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 13, to strike out:

The name of Daniel Williams, late musician, United States Marine Corps, and drummer in Company K, Twenty-third Regiment, and Company H, Eighty-second Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "$30" and insert "$24," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Hezkiah B. Hulbert, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 10, to strike out:

The name of Catharine Doty, widow of Townsend Doty, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, after the name "Samuel," to strike out "Nicholas" and insert "Nichols," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Samuel Nichols, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, before the words "first lieutenant," to strike out "who served as a" and insert "late," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Catherine M. Hazleton, widow of Frank B. Hazleton, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 15, before the word "second," to strike out "as," and in the same line, after the word "lieutenant," to strike out "in the," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Isaiah H. McDonald, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and second lieutenant, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 17, to strike out:

The name of Abner W. Fletcher, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 8, before the words "per month,' to strike out "$24" and insert "$20," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Irene M. Bush, widow of Christian M. Bush, late of Companies C and A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 12, to strike out:

The name of Rhuamah Wilson, now Vincent, former widow of Charles Wilson, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 19, before the word "surgeon," to strike out "who served as a" and insert "late," and in the same line, after the word "surgeon," to strike out "in the," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Maria H. Redfield, widow of John S. Redfield, late surgeon Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 15, before the word "ordnance," to strike out "who served as an" and insert "late," and in the same line, after the word "sergeant," to strike out "in the," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mary A. Keller, widow of Lewis Keller, late ordnance sergeant, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 4, before the word "landsman," to strike out "who served as a" and insert "late," and in the same line, after the word "seaman," to strike out "in the," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jennie C. True, widow of William H. True, late landsman and ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 13, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and widow of David D. L. McCulloch, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Anna C. McCulloch, former widow of Albert Bell, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and widow of David D. L. McCulloch, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 16, to strike out:

The name of Silas P. Rainey, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "Militia," to insert "Infantry," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Uriah Golder, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to strike out:

The name of Hannah L. May, widow of George H. May, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 9, before the words "per month," to strike out "$36" and insert "$40," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Jacob Schopp, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 16, before the word "hospital," to strike out "who served as a" and insert "late," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Mettie Baymore, former widow of Addis Hays, late hospital steward in First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 12, after the word "determine," to strike out "*And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah A. Bennett, the name of said Chloe A. Bennett shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah A. Bennett," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Sarah A. Bennett, widow of Rolley E. Bennett, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Chloe A. Bennett, helpless and dependent daughter of said Rolley E. Bennett, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 3, before the word "widow," to strike out "(insane)," and in line 10, after the word "determine," to strike out "*And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Alice E. Atherton, the name of said Charles W. Atherton shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Alice E. Atherton," so as to make the clause read:

The name of Alice E. Atherton, widow of Charles W. Atherton, late of Company D, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles W. Atherton, helpless and dependent son of said Charles W. Atherton, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. I ask the Senate to consider Senate bill 7402.

The bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to pension the following persons at the rate stated:

Edwin B. Wright, helpless and dependent son of John W. Wright, late of Company A, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Mary W. Gross, former widow of Richard Robbins, late of Companies E and B, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Delia E. Godfrey, widow of Solomon Godfrey, late first lieutenant Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Thomas Buckley, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel G. H. Whitley, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Johnson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marcus W. Bates, late first lieutenant Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Otto Kuehn, late acting assistant and contract surgeon, United States Army, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah H. Alldis, widow of Thomas J. Alldis, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. Arnold, widow of Albert F. Arnold, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Laura F. Lawton, former widow of Nicholas E. Lawton, late of Battery G, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, $12 per month.

Daniel Hilliard, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lovina J. Reeves, widow of Forest Reeves, late of Company M, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Charles F. White, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose V. Stoops, widow of Randolph T. Stoops, late captain Company C, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Julia F. Brewerton, widow of Henry F. Brewerton, late first lieutenant, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, and lieu-

tenant colonel, United States Army, retired, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mary Carpenter, former widow of Leonard W. Carpenter, late lieutenant colonel Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month.

Isaac Nebbenburgh, late of Company E, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Forsyth Harrison, late of Quartermaster Department, United States Volunteers, $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin Clark, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane E. Myers, widow of John H. Myers, late of Company I, One hundred and twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Vesta V. Holden, former widow of Benjamin S. Holden, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Loucette E. Glavis, widow of George O. Glavis, late hospital chaplain, United States Volunteers, $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John F. Miller, late of Company A, Second Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Healy, widow of Cornelius Healy, late captain Company K, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Clara G. Branch, widow of Charles F. Branch, late of Companies C, H, and A, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

Harriet M. Marks, widow of William T. Marks, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment, and Company D, Sixteenth Regiment, Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George M. Getts, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Horace Page, late of Company M, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jessie A. Maxson, widow of Charles B. Maxson, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Elizabeth C. Service, widow of Thomas Service, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Tucker, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellen Twomey, widow of Patrick Twomey, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Julia F. Whipple, widow of John A. Whipple, late of Company K, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emily J. Williams, widow of William E. Williams, late of Company G, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John W. Sullivan, late of U. S. S. *Victory*, *Great Western*, and *Exchange*, United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Paul Phillips, alias Duncan Dunbar, late of the United States Navy, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susan J. Flye, widow of Elijah Flye, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William Henry Soule, late of Company A, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary L. De Mars, widow of Nazaire De Mars, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Margaretta B. Benjamin, widow of Edward A. Benjamin, late midshipmen, United States Navy, and second lieutenant, Third Regiment United States Infantry, $12 per month.

Frances A. Rogers, widow of Nathan B. Rogers, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cynthia Buel, widow of Charles Buel, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment, and Company D, Seventh Regiment, Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Cornelia S. Hitchcock, widow of Oliver A. Hitchcock, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James M. Watkins, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George M. Taylor, late of Twenty-fifth Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Buril Caton, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Hanoch, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nelson E. Haskell, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Boal, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli Reese, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Tyson, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William T. Davidson, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John B. Doolittle, late chaplain Fifteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry G. Dearmond, late of Company D, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Johnson, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth Reed, widow of Alfred Reed, late captain Company K, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and lieutenant colonel Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Katie M. Penfield, widow of Charles W. Penfield, late of U. S. S. *Vermont*, United States Navy, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Robert J. Martin, late of Comuany K, Eighty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel W. Smith, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charlotte A. Crowell, widow of John H. Crowell, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Joseph P. Kridelbaugh, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. Lewis, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Hutton, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah J. Crackel, former widow of Stephen W. Dawson, late of Company E, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, $12 per month.

Jennie Jones, widow of Edward A. Jones, late of Company K, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charlotte S. Manley, widow of Randolph M. Manley, late of Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Militia Infantry, $12 per month.

George W. Read, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Beatty, late of Company I, Ninety-sixth Regiment, and Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Braginton, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John G. Avery, late of Company A, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susie E. Harris, widow of Andrew J. Harris, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Walter Morrell, late of Company I, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. Jacobs, late of Company I, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Seventh Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Rankin, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Krone, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment, and Company H, Two hundredth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jeremiah Adams, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Cartwright, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Shaffer, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Fifth Regiment, and Company B, Sixth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Warren J. Hazell, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frank B. Gillespie, late of Company F, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Bays, late of Company F, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nancy J. Nicholson, widow of Benjamin J. Nicholson, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Samuel Roberts, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles S. Morse, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sanford A. Herendeen, late of the U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Princeton*, and *New Ironsides*, United States Navy, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Brown, late of Company D, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry A. Smith, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George O. Miller, late of the Second Battery Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Peter P. Chacey, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eloise Warner, widow of Jared A. Warner, late commissary sergeant Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George W. Case, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma Perkins, widow of John L. Perkins, late of Company D, Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

John C. Simpson, late of Fourth Battery D, New Jersey Volunteer Light Artillery, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aquilla M. Hizar, late captain Company I, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Luther M. Blackman, late major, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, $45 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John J. Calkins, late first lieutenant Battery C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jennie O. Collins, widow of William S. Collins, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

James L. Van Allen, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clarence C. Tritle, late of Company L, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Dickerson, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joana Boone, widow of William Boone, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Fletcher N. Wilson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Beulah C. Hicks, widow of James R. Hicks, late of Company B, Seventy-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

A. Paul Horne, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ellen C. Gardner, widow of Charles H. Gardner, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Annie R. Jewett, widow of Joseph A. Jewett, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ann Jolly, widow of Benjamin Jolly, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Allen P. Gilson, late of Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rachel W. Carney, widow of John Carney, late of Company D, Stone County Missouri Home Guards, and former widow of Thomas J. Taylor, late captain Company I, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Alie McGloughlin, widow of John W. McGloughlin, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William A. Reames, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Delilah Lobenthal, widow of Leo Lobenthal, late of Company E, One hundred and first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Hammond, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Walker, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Prudie M. Reynolds, widow of Joseph B. Reynolds, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Fernando W. Moon, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Ludiker, late of Companies L and B, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jerome B. Wright, late of Company B, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry and Company B, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert Conn, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George L. Neal, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Fernando Miller, late of Company I, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Anna E. Babbitt, widow of William P. Babbitt, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, $12 per month.

George W. Shoop, late of Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, and Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clifton Whittum, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George R. Davis, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ai Clark, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment, and Company A, Nineteenth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles F. Smith, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa E. Catterson, widow of Robert F. Catterson, late colonel Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and brigadier general, United States Volunteers, $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Arvilla B. Hammond, widow of Royal Hammond, late of Company C, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and that in the event of the death of Raymond R. Hammond, helpless and dependent child of Royal Hammond, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine, and that in the event of the death of Arvilla B. Hammond the name of Raymond R. Hammond shall be placed on the pension roll at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY. That completes the consideration of the omnibus pension bills on the calendar.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I desire to present an amendment which I shall offer to the pending shipping bill. I ask that it be read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The Secretary will read the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HITCHCOCK:

Add, at the end of the substitute, a new section, to be numbered 12, as follows:

"SEC. 12. That it shall be unlawful and treated as a breach of the neutrality laws of the United States for any person, partnership, or corporation to sell or contract to sell, or deliver or contract to deliver, during the existence of war between nations with which the United States is at peace, any arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives of any kind whatsoever to be used against a country or nation with which the United States is at peace; and during the existence of war it shall be unlawful to sell for exportation or to export arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives except upon filing with the Secretary of Commerce satisfactory sworn proof that said arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives are not intended to be used in violation of this act.

"Any person violating this act shall be fined not more than $100,000 and imprisoned not more than three years, and any arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives the exportation of which is attempted in violation of this act shall be forfeited, one-half to the use of the informer and one-half to the use of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to have the Senate consider a bill, and I thought probably it would not consume very much time.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the Senator's request.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 5484) modifying and amending the act providing for the disposal of the surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont. It is a bill which probably will not require very much time.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 2, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be with us, O God, our Father, in the passing hours of this day, that with wise conceptions, pure motives, true judgments, we may do our work with perfect urbanity, according to others whatsoever we desire for ourselves; that we may find favor in Thy sight and grow unto the perfected manhood exemplified in the Lord Jesus Christ, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 717 (H. Rept. 1342).

Resolved, That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order, in the consideration of H. R. 20975, a bill making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, to consider the following paragraphs of said bill, notwithstanding the rules of the House, beginning with the word "section," in line 12, on page 28, and ending with the word "kind," in line 4, on page 30, to wit:

"Section 9 of the naval personnel act of March 3, 1899, entitled 'An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States,' be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Navy all officers who may have been transferred from the active to the retired list of the Navy under the provisions of section 9 of said personnel act and from the active to the retired list of the Navy or the Marine Corps by the action of any board: *Provided*, That the action in these cases has been examined by the Naval Committee of the Sixty-third Congress of the House or of the Senate and either or both of said committees have reported, or ordered to be reported, favorably to the House or the Senate a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of the service: *Provided further*, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have held if he had not been retired or to which he had passed a satisfactory examination for promotion and shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or at any time thereafter be promoted: *And provided further*, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion, as now provided by law, in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination.

"That the President be, and he is hereby, also authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Navy any other officer who may have been retired under the said section 9 whom he may consider physically and professionally qualified to discharge his duties on the active list: *Provided*, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have held if he had not been retired and shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or at any time thereafter promoted: *Provided further*, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination as now provided by law: *And provided further*, That any officer transferred to the active list shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay or allowances of any kind."

In the consideration of said paragraphs of the bill there shall be general debate not exceeding two hours—one half of the time being alloted to those in favor of the same and controlled by Mr. WITHERSPOON and the other half to those opposed to the same and controlled by Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

It shall be in order to offer amendments to said paragraphs while the same are being considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] for a moment. I noticed, when the Clerk was reading or purporting to read the language of the bill which is made in order, on line 25, page 28, he omitted "the Naval Committee of the Sixty-third Congress."

Mr. HENRY. Yes; that is a clerical mistake. I was going to ask unanimous consent that that be inserted in the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is the intent of the rule to cover the exact language as printed in the bill?

Mr. HENRY. Yes. The rule did not follow the exact language of the appropriation bill, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that it be made to conform to the language of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that the language of the rule may be made to comport with the language of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the rule provides that I shall control the time in opposition to the provision. While I

am opposed to the provision in the bill, I would rather not control the time. I would be perfectly willing that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] should control the time, if he desires.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not desire to control the time. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman should control it.

Mr. HENRY. If it is so desired, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] can control it.

Mr. MANN. All right.

Mr. HENRY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the name of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] be substituted for that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the name of Mr. ROBERTS be substituted for that of Mr. MANN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to propound an inquiry with reference to the rule. The last proviso in the rule as read by the Clerk reads as follows:

That any officer transferred to the active list shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay or allowances of any kind.

I do not understand that the provision is in the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That appears in the bill. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find it from line 1 to line 4 at the bottom of page 30.

Mr. LENROOT. Then I am mistaken.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas if he desires to discuss the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are requests over here for time in which to discuss the rule.

Mr. HENRY. I will ask for the previous question, with 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will move the previous question, and ask unanimous consent that not exceeding 20 minutes be allowed to a side on the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks for the previous question and that not exceeding 20 minutes be allowed to a side on the rule. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I serve notice to the gentleman from Texas and the Committee on Naval Affairs that there is much objection to one part of this resolution. There is little or no objection to that portion which abolishes the plucking board.

Mr. HENRY. You can state that when you get to the bill. This rule only makes it in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know it only makes it in order, but the previous question will prevent an amendment of the resolution and bring the matter to the House for a vote. The same question can be decided, of course.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit, I understand the rule allows amendment of the paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But the previous question being ordered, no amendment is allowed to the rule.

Mr. PADGETT. The rule simply makes the whole matter in order for consideration. While I am not in favor of all the provisions in the matter and think there ought to be very material amendments, and think it is bad legislation to incorporate it on an appropriation bill at all, still I do not see any objection if you are going to make it in order under the rule as it is drawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] that the previous question be ordered, with argument not to exceed 20 minutes on each side on the rule?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether it is his intention to proceed immediately with the consideration of these paragraphs after the rule is adopted?

Mr. PADGETT. No. We will take them up in their regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is to be done with the general debate on this paragraph for two hours? Is that for consideration of the paragraph when reached?

Mr. PADGETT. That will be when we reach them. I am hoping that it will not take two hours, and I want to state here at this time—and I think it is a good place to state it—that it is my purpose to ask the House to remain in session until we can complete the reading of the bill to-day down to the "Increase of the Navy," so that only the "Increase of the Navy" will remain to be passed over to a subsequent day.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not try to rival another body in having all-night sessions.

Mr. PADGETT. No. I think we can do what I suggest, because there is a large part of the bill to which I can conceive of no objection, and only the time expended in reading it should be consumed. I want to get consideration down to the "Increase of the Navy."

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I assume that as soon as the rule is adopted we will proceed with the reading of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. With the other part of the bill; yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the purpose of the chairman to sit to-night?

Mr. PADGETT. It will be unless before to-night the reading of the bill down to the "Increase of the Navy" is completed. The gentleman knows that the provisions in the bill with reference to appropriations for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, the Naval Academy, the Marine Corps, and many other matters will simply take the time to read them.

Mr. BUTLER. The chairman knows the luck we have in keeping a quorum at night sessions, and I suggest that if we are to sit in the evening the rest of them come here.

Mr. HENRY. If we can hurry the matter along now, perhaps that will save the time.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not taking much time. I could make a fuss, so that we could not get through this afternoon.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 26, two pages ahead of the provision that is covered by the special rule, comes an appropriation for the enlisted personnel, which to my mind is the most important question of the whole lot. I know that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] proposes to offer an amendment, and so do I. I think that will take some time unless the gentleman from Tennessee, who has the power, shuts off debate.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that it is my purpose to allow a reasonable debate on that provision. I have no desire to cut it off.

Mr. GARDNER. That, with other matters—for instance, I have an amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk when we adjourned the other day, which will take some time, and that will bring a vote on the plucking board along toward midnight; that is, the vote on the new legislation on pages 28 and 30.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, I think not.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Under the rule as proposed, which provides for two hours' general debate, when will that be in order? There are three paragraphs in the bill covered by the rule; will the general debate come before the reading of any of the paragraphs?

Mr. HENRY. I think that was the intention.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that will be the better way.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that be understood.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that that be understood. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the rule, and have not exceeding 40 minutes' debate? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I yield the gentleman from Georgia five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I do not claim to have any superior knowledge on this question to that of any other Member of this House, but if the membership will listen for 10 minutes I think I can give them information that they probably have not had before. The chairman of the committee has heretofore defeated any efforts to abolish the plucking board on the statement to this House that the efficiency of the Navy would be impaired by the abolition of the plucking board.

I am going to show you gentlemen that that statement has no foundation, and I am going to show it on the statement of those who have nourished, those who have protected, those who have held sacred the Navy plucking board. The whole foundation is cut from under the chairman of the committee by the members of the Navy plucking board themselves, who have held it sacred all these years.

Admiral Knight, one of the best-known men in the Navy, was the first man called before the Naval Committee. Listen to what he said I do not want you to make up your decision on this question altogether on what I say in this speech, but I do beg you to give attention to the witnesses that I call. Every one of them says that the plucking board now injures the efficiency of the Navy instead of benefiting it. Here is what Admiral Knight says:

In my opinion there was no officer who was eliminated from the captains' list last year or this year whose elimination was deserved because of anything he had done, and hardly one whose elimination contributed anything to the absolute efficiency of the service. I consider that the elimination of Capt. Gibbons was a distinct loss of efficiency to the captains' list as a whole.

I am taking the language of one of the men who has protected, who has held sacred this plucking board and been keeping it from coming on the floor of this House, although I have been fighting to bring it here four years.

There is another thing that I want to call to the attention of the membership of this House. I dare say that many Members have not understood my position. It is natural to follow the chairman of the committee on such questions, and he has stubbornly opposed me, and I fear my position has not been properly considered, because of the opposition of the Navy Department to my position and the efforts of the chairman to sustain the department. I am now going to repeat the charge that I have frequently made that the plucking board does not only take out of the Navy 15 men each year, but it takes out an unlimited supply. You may have thought me in error when I stated that to you before, but when these men come before the committee and confirm my statement it should open your eyes to the great wrong being done the American people. They are honest; they would not tell a falsehood; they tell the truth when pressed for an answer. Under the law you can take out of the Navy by volunteer retirement 102 men annually and yet the Members hear the discussion about only 15 officers annually. Remember that these officers are retired on salary and render no service to the Government that educated them and pays them from $5,000 to $10,000 annually as salary in retirement.

I asked the question of Admiral Wainwright. There were three admirals before the committee—Admiral Knight, Admiral Mason, and Admiral Wainwright. Let us see what Admiral Wainwright says in response to a question I put to him. I want the attention of the chairman of the committee, because if I do not state the facts I want him to come forward and show to the House that I have not stated the truth. Listen, Members of the House:

Mr. TRIBBLE. I gather from your statement that when you find a man whom you think is more deficient and might be plucked, if you can get him out by some other method you take the other course and do not pluck him?

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And the purpose of that is to get out as many as possible?

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. To promote as rapidly as possible.

The only fellows that they pluck are the ones who stand pat, who say, "You can not force me out of the Navy by voluntary retirement. You must pluck me if you get me out." The officer who stands pat and says, "You have got me to pluck," that is the fellow they go after. The other fellows they run out by threats of plucking them.

In order that you may know that I am giving the facts about voluntary retirement I give you the law, as follows:

SEC. 8. That officers of the line in the grades of captain, commander, and lieutenant commander may, by official application to the Secretary of the Navy, have their names placed on a list which shall be known as the list of "applicants for voluntary retirement," and when at the end of any fiscal year the average vacancies for the fiscal years subsequent to the passage of this act above the grade of commander have been less than 13, above the grade of lieutenant commander less than 20, above the grade of lieutenant less than 29, and above the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) less than 40, the President may, in the order of the rank of the applicants, place a sufficient number on the retired list with the rank and three-fourths the sea pay of the next higher grade as now existing, including the grade of commodore, to cause the aforesaid vacancies for the fiscal year then being considered.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the basis of selection? Is it class?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes; mostly class. These fellows who sit around in easy-bottom chairs have a little coterie of their own, and these other fellows who do not get into the coterie, but discharge their official duty and seek no favors, if they happen to have something against their record, real or imaginary, are pushed out of the way, and they suffer instead of the fellows who sit around in the easy chairs. I am now discussing forcing officers to retire under threats, but I fear the Members have not understood my argument, as the impression prevails that only 15 officers can retire annually. I read from page 1102:

Mr. TRIBBLE. If you can shut a man out by another route, you do so?

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. I would not say shut him out.

Mr. TRIBBLE. You said Potts was going by another route?

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Your officers are looking for as many routes to get them out of the way as possible, and the Navy Department is calling for more.

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. Yes; getting them out at the top.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And saddling them upon the people, who have to pay their salaries.

Now I turn back to the former page, and I will read again from the same witness. The charge had been made before this subcommittee that one man, named Mertz, was addicted to the use of liquor. I would not be personal, but I give this explanation. I think it is necessary at this time, in order that you may understand the reference to Capt. Mertz. I read again:

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. I will try to tell you the different influences that enter into it. I do not remember; but it is possible we knew that Capt. Mertz could not be sent to sea; he had no sea service. That is one of the reasons that affected me and others. We knew the minute he was ordered to sea he would retire. You know, you let everything of that sort affect you.

Here is an officer telling that these things affect them, and here is where Mr. BRITTEN comes to the front, and I say, hurrah for BRITTEN; he is a good man, even if he does stay on the Republican side. He is not the only good Republican. There are others. I simply emphasize the fact that he is a capable Republican Representative, and I am pleased to recognize his service on the Naval Committee and in this House:

Mr. BRITTEN. I remember Admiral Mertz was afterwards promoted.

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. He did not go to sea as an admiral.

Mr. BRITTEN. But he was promoted, and is now retired as an admiral and drawing an admiral's pay.

Admiral WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Then Mr. BRITTEN comes to the front again and asked Admiral Wainwright if Mertz was not promoted after he had and the plucking board had refused to retire Mertz. When they should have plucked the least efficient, instead the board did retire Capt. Veeder, one of the most capable men in the service, with 14 others, true and tried, by plucking them, while Mertz was promoted to be an admiral and was retired by voluntary retirement on salary. Yes; the board knew Mertz would not object to promotion and voluntary retirement, so they let him alone.

Mr. Speaker, am I telling the truth when I stand here and state to you that men are charged with some little offense that does not amount to anything for the purpose of pushing them out of the Navy by voluntary retirement on salary? But some officers say: "No; I am not going to retire; I want to stay in the Navy; I have a good record, and I can do as good service as any officer." I claim that they receive some kind of information to retire and escape the plucking board, and I am informed often sent around through the back door.

When I was solicitor general down in my State there was a system of giving notice to grand juries of offenses when the prosecutor did not want to come to the front and indict some person by placing his name to an indictment. These secret prosecutors would then slip a little paper under the door with information to the jury and name of witness, and get what they called a presentment from the grand jury, which served the purposes of prosecution without making known the prosecutor. The plucking board serves the same purpose to force voluntary retirement by some one giving notice. "If you do not get out of the way you will be disgraced by being plucked the next time the plucking board meets." They get the same money by voluntary retirement. If they are plucked, they are disgraced; therefore not less than 40 are retired annually on pay, frightened and forced out of the service. Now, my point is this: The plucking board is only used on the fellow who has the bravery to stand up and say, "No; if you get me out of the Navy, you have to pluck me, for I will take the disgrace, for I have done nothing."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the purpose underlying the taking of efficient men out of the Navy? What is the real purpose?

Mr. TRIBBLE. The real purpose is to make vacancies that there may be promotions to positions with more distinction and increase of salary to those promoted. If an officer high in rank is removed, a vacancy is made for officers to be promoted all along the line of promotion, to officers seeking higher positions and more salary in the service. I say if you take efficient men out of the Navy you make the service more deficient, and I say to you that these admirals—Wainwright,

Mason, and Knight—all say when summoned before this subcommittee that the plucking board is now making the Navy Department more inefficient instead of efficient. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely in sympathy with the provisions in the bill proposing to repeal the plucking board, and giving to the President of the United States general authority to restore to the active list those retired officers who are the victims, or who have been the victims, of the plucking board, and if this rule contained nothing more than those two propositions I should favor it. But there is another proposition contained in this rule that ought not to be passed over lightly. It is found in the second paragraph of the three paragraphs made in order by the rule. The second paragraph, after giving to the President of the United States authority to restore these men to the active list, has this proviso:

Provided, That the action in these cases has been examined by the Naval Committee of the House or of the Senate and either or both of said committees have reported, or ordered to be reported, favorably to the House or the Senate a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of the service.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that this provision and the policy which it embodies is absolutely unprecedented in the history of this Government, and it involves a question far more important than the mere question of whether certain officers shall be restored to the active list. It involves a policy of whether the Congress of the United States shall seek to control the action of the President of the United States through one of its committees, and that is exactly what this does. It seeks to limit the action of the President in making these appointments to an inquiry by him of what the Naval Committee of the House or the Naval Committee of the Senate has done with reference to certain private bills which have been introduced.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it has been admitted on the floor of the House that that part of it can be stricken out if it is necessary.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, yes; I understand that can be stricken out, but I undertake to say, and I assert, that a question of so much importance ought not to be permitted to be discussed and settled in a rider upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. LENROOT. No. I can not yield further, because my time is limited.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LENROOT. Just for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Would not that paragraph also permit a review of the action of every board as well as the plucking board, boards that retire men for disability, and so forth?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; that is all of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This very section does not restrict them to the action of reviewing the work of the plucking board. I understand under that provision men retired in the Marine Corps some years ago could now be restored to the active list of the Navy.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true under this provision, but the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the question of policy ought not to be settled by a rider upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further. I can sympathize to some extent with our Democratic friends in attempting to limit the action of the President upon what they themselves or one of their committees have done. We all know that in everything that has transpired through the past two years a vast majority of the Democrats have been nothing but rubber stamps for the President of the United States. You have surrendered to him your conviction, your votes, and every prerogative that you have, and I wonder if now by this provision seeking to control the action of the President you think that you are going to assert your independence of the President and say to the country that we ourselves are going to have something to say about these things by saying to the President that while you can do with us as you please upon all legislation of general public importance, you shall not, Mr. President, appoint a retired officer to the active list unless you come to us and ask us if you can. But, however that may be, the great question involved, Mr. Speaker, is whether this Congress proposes to adopt an absolutely new policy in endeavoring to control the action of the President of the United States and not in a constitutional way but by a committee of this body and a committee of the Senate. Why do you put that in there? Is it because you are afraid——

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield. Is it because you are afraid to trust the President of the United States in making these appointments? You have trusted him in everything else. You have let him do with you as he would, but in this little matter of appointment of a few retired officers back to the active list you say we can not trust President Wilson to do that thing or to remedy this terrible outrage with reference to some of these officers of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be defeated. It ought to be defeated for the reasons I have named, and if it is, there will be no difficulty in securing from the Committee on Rules another rule long before these paragraphs are reached making in order the provisions with reference to the repeal of the plucking board and giving to the President authority untrammeled by any action of any committee of this House to do justice to those officers who have been plucked by the plucking board. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has had to say about being rubber stamps, I only wish to say it is my recollection, as our legislation has been so good, that the gentleman has voted for practically everything the Democrats have proposed and the President has proposed, and therefore he must be one of the rubber stamps, too. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman would like to be accurate, and I want to say that is not true.

Mr. HENRY. Well, practically all of it. We have considered him closely allied to us in reference to such legislation. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield the gentleman from Georgia two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to confine myself strictly to this plucking-board proposition. All men who know anything about the personnel of the Navy know that the plucking board has long since served the purpose for which it was in the first instance inaugurated, and some of the best officers in the United States Navy are being plucked from the service by this board. That is an admitted fact. Now, then, if this board has served its purpose, why continue it any longer? The trouble about this whole thing is this: They are starting at the wrong end of the personnel of the Navy to do the plucking. Instead of holding down the graduates from the Naval Academy, who are less efficient and keeping them on the reserve list to come in when ready, they start at the other end and put a whole lot of admirals and captains on the retired list who could render efficient service and who have just about reached the height of their efficiency. Now, in reply to my good friend from Wisconsin, the third paragraph, to which he refers, in this rule says:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Navy all officers who may have been transferred from the active to the retired list of the Navy under the provisions of section 9—

Section 9 refers to this plucking board—

of said personnel act and from the active to the retired list of the Navy or to the Marine Corps by the action of any board—

And provides such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination before reinstatement. Now, what does that mean?

It means that the two committees of the House and the Senate simply act in an advisory capacity, to wit, in that they go into an investigation of the fitness or unfitness of an officer who has been plucked, and after this committee of the House or the committee of the Senate has determined that this man was plucked without any view to his efficiency and that he is capable of rendering good service to the Navy they recommend to the President of the United States that he be placed on the active list, with confidence that the President will act with the best interests of the service in mind.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I can not understand the theory upon which gentlemen act in this House in opposing this legislation, when the Secretary of the Navy and everybody who knows anything about the Navy knows that the Navy is short, woefully short, of officers, and yet every year this star-chamber proceeding is carried on and looked upon as

a farce by the American people. Why, Mr. Speaker, I knew in one instance of a distinguished naval officer who was plucked where it was known that he was going to be plucked a year before it happened, and that man's services to the Navy Department were almost invaluable.

Now, I want to read in conclusion one little statement about the plucking board. There is more than the matter of efficiency in the plucking of an officer. Sometimes an officer's social standing will be one of the main objections urged against him and in favor of his being plucked. It says:

> Laws should not be countenanced that permit anything so contrary to American principles as star-chamber methods. Such laws will not only lead to carelessness and injustice, but are apt to be used to promote personal ambitions and to revenge personal grudges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that this rule ought to be adopted, that the plucking board ought to be abolished, because of the fact that it can be used as a source of gratification of personal revenge, and that it has done injustices that can not be measured by words in this House to honorable officers in the service.

Why, Mr. Speaker, talk about submarines causing a nervousness among officers and men on ships in the English Channel! When this plucking board meets in June there is hardly an officer in the Navy in possession of his faculties to the extent that he can perform his duties that is not perturbed because of the fact that he does not know, no matter what his record has been, where the lightning is going to strike, and he will hear the humiliating news that he has been "plucked."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. HENRY. And I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman in the course of his remarks tell us how this plucking board is made up and where they get their authority?

Mr. BRITTEN. I did expect to deal, Mr. Speaker, with that particular subject in the course of general debate. I only have eight minutes now, but I probably will get to that point. I want to call to the attention of the House, particularly at this time, an extract from a letter from the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet—Admiral Fletcher—written less than 30 days ago, to the Secretary of the Navy, in which he said that in our battleship fleet alone there was a deficiency of some 300 commissioned officers and 5,000 men. He said, in substance, that the maximum efficiency of a battleship can only be attained by having the required or necessary number of officers on board. The idea to-day on the floor of the House, and as has been expressed by various Members, indicates that we are all unanimous on the elimination of the plucking board. We all agree that it does not add anything to the efficiency of the Navy at this time. We agree, I believe, that something must be done to prevent this annual slaughter of the hopes and ambitions of men who have given the best part of their lives to the service; and that can only be accomplished by the passage of the rule this morning. It is true that the paragraph in the bill which the rule refers to is not exactly what it should be; but that can be amended under the five-minute rule. If we do not pass this rule to-day a plucking board will be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy to sit between June 1 and June 30, this year, and 15 officers who to-day are apparently in the zenith of their strength, their efficiency, their value to the Navy, will be plucked out of the service and retired for life.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Just for a question.

Mr. COX. Do they pluck any of these men before they reach the age of retirement?

Mr. BRITTEN. All of them. The officers who will be plucked on June 1 or thereabouts, or the majority of them, have each survived 16 different sets of plucking. The plucking board, as you all understand, is appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, and is composed of five rear admirals, and a different board is appointed each year. They go over the various grades——

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the average age of the men who are plucked?

Mr. BRITTEN. That depends, I will say to the gentleman, on the grade of the officer.

Mr. MADDEN. The men in the grade, then?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I can answer that question as to the last plucking. It was 42 years of age. I have the list, and it speaks for itself.

Mr. BRITTEN. The men in the grade of lieutenant commander would naturally be younger than those in the grade of captain.

These yearly boards for retirement by selection are appointed by the Secretary of the Navy from time to time. They do not pluck or ask for the retirement of an officer on his service record as it appears in the department. That has been demonstrated or stated by the various admirals comprising the plucking boards of the past. They say, on the contrary, that a man is plucked on the general impression that prevails in the Navy as to the value of that particular man. Does it not stand to reason that the human side is going to play a large part in the selection or the plucking of an officer? Does it not stand to reason that they are going to pluck men they do not know instead of those they do know? Admiral Knight said that they plucked several officers this year without regard to their value to the service. Their service records were not considered. There is no special marking system by which these men are retired. They are retired on the general impression that prevails in the Navy regarding their value. Purely hearsay.

It developed before our committee this year that each and every one of the officers plucked had never been under the direct observation of any member constituting the plucking board. In other words, they were plucked on hearsay. A straw vote is taken, and they account to no one for what has been done. There are no minutes of the proceedings.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is a straw vote taken?

Mr. BRITTEN. Undoubtedly; and they agree upon 5 or 10 or 15 officers to be plucked.

Mr. COX. Is that straw vote taken by the board or by the officers of the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. By the board. There is a star-chamber session of the plucking board, and no record is kept. An officer to-day would assume, because of his desirable command or of his position in the Navy or in the department, that he would be immune from plucking, but on the following morning his name may be reported to the Secretary, and from there to the President, and the next day he is put out of the service. The plucking board accounts to no one.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman state when the plucking board was instituted?

Mr. BRITTEN. Sixteen years ago—1899.

Mr. MILLER. Just after the Spanish-American War?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; just after the Spanish-American War, when it had developed that a number of captains in the service did not have the ability or the efficiency to handle men and ships properly. There was no way then of retiring them until they got to be 62 years of age. Then the personnel act, including this now vicious paragraph for the plucking board, was inserted, in order to remove those captains and other officers who had demonstrated their inefficiency. But now, whom, in the name of Heaven, is the plucking board of June, 1915, going to pluck? Perhaps a man who a few months ago was superior to the men who are plucking them; men like Capt. Gibbons and Capt. Hill, two of the greatest officers in the service at the time they were plucked. The service record of an officer of the Navy, indicating great ability and efficiency, does not prevent his being plucked.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do? Do they put the names of the officers in a hat and pick them out?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. They take a ballot and decide among themselves upon mere hearsay who is to be plucked, what lieutenant commander or which commander or captain shall be decided upon for plucking. Then the question passes around. "Who is he?" "I do not know. He has never served with me." "Do you know him, Admiral So-and-so?" "No; he never served under me, but Capt. ——— does not think much of him." "Does anybody know anything about him?" "No; well, then, we had better pluck him." So he is plucked, purely on hearsay and general—or lack of—information, and not upon his department service records, which should be the guiding element.

It was evidenced before our committee that 15 officers were plucked in 1913 without the plucking board having brought to its star-chamber session the records of the men to be plucked.

To-day should go down in naval history as marking the death of a once valuable paragraph in personnel legislation, which has grown to be most vicious and inhuman in its tendency to demoralize the efficiency and the fighting value of our Navy. Gentlemen, I ask your support of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] to use some of his time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much more time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has two minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has seven minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I yield two minutes to the gentleman also.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to be able to vote for this rule in the Committee on Rules, and I am glad to favor its adoption and passage at this time.

It is not a question of private bills being considered, as the gentleman from Wisconsin would have us believe, because the questions included in these private bills are of the greatest public importance. The facts brought out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and the others before our committee prove that there has been great injustice done, and no public duty is more important than to establish justice and prevent injustice.

The plucking board, established in 1899, has served its purpose and has outlived its usefulness. Those officials who were inefficient have been plucked, and now even the purpose of the law of plucking the least efficient is not considered. The law itself is not being carried out, because it specifically states that the least efficient shall be retired. To determine that means a careful study of records. The last plucking board would have had to consider the records of as many as 732 officers, including thousands of pages of records, which could not be done in less than 30 days; and yet in a very short time the decisions were reached and certain officials retired. On July 1, 1912, a number of officers of the Navy were plucked, and among them was one man who had a record of the very highest type, excelled by no man in the service. That man was Commander Armistead Rust, then in command of the U. S. S. *Baltimore* and captain of the Charleston yard. In spite of the record of 25 years of efficient and faithful service, that officer, just one day before he would have been promoted to the rank of captain, was plucked. So far as the records show, his entire career proves him to be one of the highest grade officials, the kind which the highest efficiency in the Navy demands. I want to read a synopsis of his record, which was never considered by this star-chamber plucking board. It shows that—

He was under 50 years of age when retired, or about 3½ years below the average age of the captains on the active list.

That his average mark, taken from 74 reports made by 36 commanding officers, covering a period of 25 years, was excellent, or 3.68 against a possible maximum of 4, or 92 per cent perfect.

That his health and character were and always had been excellent.

That in 25 years of service he had never been unfavorably reported by either a senior or junior officer.

That he had more sea service as a commander than any other man on the commander's list and four times as much as the average.

That he enjoyed the full confidence and respect of his commanding officers, who had especially commended him for—

"An excellent, very steady, and reliable character."

"An excellent deck officer."

"Very efficient in dealing with enlisted men."

"Very conscientious in the performance of every duty."

"Intelligent and zealous to a marked degree in dealing with enlisted men."

"For gallant, courageous, and manly conduct in risking his life to save that of an apprentice."

"That they were highly gratified to have him assigned to their ships."

"That he could be trusted with hazardous independent duties, because they would be zealously and satisfactorily executed."

He was recognized by the Bureau of Ordnance "as a competent and efficient officer in matters pertaining to ordnance."

There are on file with his record letters of appreciation or commendation for special service from Admirals Lamberton, Bradford, Sigsbee, Andrews, and Dewey.

There is on file in the department, as a part of his record, a long list of special extra work to his credit, which gives conclusive evidence of this officer's excellent mental equipment, painstaking industry, and great interest in the welfare of the service.

His work in the development of the science of navigation proves him to be an authority on the subject and an independent and advanced thinker. Every vessel in the Navy has in its library two books on the subject of navigation for which he is responsible—practical books that reduce the navigator's labor and the probability of error.

He designed a steel signal tower for use in hydrographic surveying, the adoption of which by the Navy Department has saved the Government many thousands of dollars.

He has made important improvements and inventions in navigators' and surveyors' instruments, including a range finder of greater accuracy and much less delicacy than any other now in use, one of which has been installed on the U. S. S. *Delaware*.

By sticking to an undesirable assignment in charge of a surveying party on the coast of Cuba, he, through hard work and originality, multiplied the output of that expedition more than four times.

The volume and variety of the extra professional work, accomplished by this officer almost wholly at times when he was off duty, is the strongest possible corroborating evidence of his "professional ability" and "aptitude for the service." It bears indisputable testimony to his great industry and versatility. Each portion of this work represents an earnest and successful effort to improve the service, and stands as incontestable proof that he has persistently applied a trained intelligence along original profesional lines to such success as to increase in some degree the efficiency of every department in which he has been employed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania realize that the officer to whom he has just referred was plucked by the plucking board without their having seen the records to which he has referred?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is absolutely true, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. Without any attention having been paid to a record like this, covering 74 separate reports, this gifted man, who has written books that are in the library of every ship in the service; this man, who has invented devices that are on every ship in the service, only one day before he would have been promoted to the grade of captain, was plucked without right or reason, upon mere gossip or hearsay. Behind closed doors, in star-chamber session, a vote was taken, and the board plucked him, though he was admittedly one of the most efficient officers in the Navy.

That is not a private question; that is a public question, as much as any question considered in this House. For that reason I believe this rule should be passed. It makes in order three provisions, each one of them being worthy and commendable, even though, as a general proposition, legislation of this kind on an appropriation bill is not to be commended. But in this case justice demands action, and immediate action, that grievous wrongs may not be continued. The first provision is the abolition of this plucking board, which is so fruitful a source of injustice. The second is the proposition of putting on the active list those officers whose cases have been considered by committees in the Sixty-third Congress and reported favorably. That does not take any power out of the hands of the President, but simply means that those cases carefully considered by the Sixty-third Congress shall be acted on by this Congress. In the third place, power is given for the President to act on other cases, and where an unjust decision is proven, to remedy the wrong and place the officers so wronged on the active list. These provisions should appeal to every fair-minded man, and I hope that the rule making them in order will be adopted and the provisions themselves written into the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. HENRY. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this rule. The first paragraph of the rule makes it in order to consider the repeal of section 9 of the personnel act. That section gives the plucking board the power to retire from the naval service 15 officers every year. The reason why that ought to be repealed is this: According to every officer in the Navy who has ever been before the Naval Affairs Committee in the last four years, it is overwhelmingly proved that we are woefully lacking in officers to use the ships that we now have. There is no question about that proposition, and I want to call attention to the effect of that lack of officers. It has resulted in this: That 12 out of the 33 battleships that we have in the Navy can not be given any target practice, can not be given any battleship exercises, can not be given any maneuvers of any kind, for the lack of officers; and in time of war, according to the testimony of these experts, those 12 ships would be absolutely useless to us because we have not the officers to use them and prepare them for war.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield just for a moment?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have no time. I will yield to the gentleman, but I can not yield to anyone else. I want to explain the reasons for this.

Mr. HELM. What is the age of these officers who have been retired?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. It depends upon their rank. Some of them have one age and some another. Now, I must decline to yield to anybody else.

They tell us that if you authorize two battleships in this bill the only way you can get the officers to use those ships when they are built is to put two more of our battleships, in addition to the 12, in reserve or in ordinary or out of commission and take the officers out of those ships to use on the new ones you are building. That is the woeful condition in which we find ourselves for the lack of officers.

Now, one other fact. According to the testimony of the members of this plucking board themselves they have told us that there are no incompetent and inefficient officers in the Navy, and that the officers whom they plucked did not deserve that stigma upon them, that they are all highly efficient and competent and that the country needs them, and therefore I submit

to you that it is nothing but nonsense to have a board to reduce the number 15 every year when we are in such need of them. That is the reason that first section ought to be passed.

It has been stated twice here in the debate that gentlemen favor this first section; that they favor repealing the plucking-board provision, but that they are opposed to the second section. That is utterly illogical. Why are we in favor of repealing the plucking-board law? It is because under that law an injustice has been done and the naval service has been injured; and if you let the law stand on the statute books, that wrong will be repeated every year. That is the reason we are in favor of repealing it. Now if you are in favor of preventing the repetition of this injustice every year in the future, how can you logically refuse to undo the wrongs that have already been done? [Applause.]

Let us look at this second section. It provides that wherever a committee of the Senate or the House has investigated a case, taken the testimony and come to the conclusion that an officer was improperly removed then the President ought to be given authority to restore him. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a minute or two, pro bono publico.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman desire to speak about?

Mr. ADAMSON. About a bill alleged to be reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is misleading, and I wish to make a statement about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read a marked extract from the Traffic World of January 30, 1915.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TRAFFIC SERVICE NEWS BUREAU,
Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was expected on Friday to order a favorable report on the so-called Adamson bill, making the commodities clause of the act to regulate commerce more drastic to the end that there may be a complete divorce between transportation and all other forms of business. The committee considered the matter in secret session on January 27 and tacitly agreed that at its meeting on Friday the favorable report should be ordered.

The favorable report is made because Attorney General Gregory desires it. No attempt will be made to pass the bill through the House unless it appears that during a lull in the legislative grind in that body it can be passed without exciting opposition that will delay other matters. In other words, House Members are expected to vote for its passage on the theory that, inasmuch as it can not be passed through the Senate at this session, it will be safe to put it through the House without an adequate consideration of what would be its effect if the bill should become law.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, my sole purpose in bringing this to the attention of the House is to compliment the imaginative powers of the author. If his purpose was to give to the world a statement of fact, he has made a dismal failure. If romance and sensation were the objects of his effort, he has achieved a shining success. The only trouble about the article is the entire absence of any element of truth. With that exception it is all right. [Laughter.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement it is in order for the gentleman from Tennessee to offer an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment to come in on page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 12, as a separate paragraph insert:

"Aeronautics: The sum of $1,000,000 is hereby reappropriated out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, construction, and repair of vessels for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and made available for aeronautics, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, purchasing, constructing, operating, reserving, storing, handling air craft and appurtenances, maintenance of air-craft stations and experimental work in the development of aviation for naval purposes."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman to state the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That it is not authorized by law.

Mr. PADGETT. I am ready for the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out of the amendment, after the figures "$1,000,000," the words "is hereby reappropriated out of the unexpended balance," and so forth, down to the figures 1914, and to insert the words "is appropriated."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out, after the figures "$1,000,000," the following words: "Is hereby reappropriated out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, construction and repair of vessels for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," and insert in lieu thereof the words "is appropriated," so that the amendment as amended will read:

"Aeronautics: The sum of $1,000,000 is appropriated and made available for aeronautics, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, purchasing, constructing, operating, reserving, storing, handling air craft and appurtenances, maintenance of air-craft stations and experimental work in the development of aviation for naval purposes."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, if an appropriation is to be made for aeronautics, it should be made directly out of the Treasury. The only purpose of reappropriating an unexpended balance in this instance is to mislead as to the amount of money carried by this bill. The report of the Naval Committee states that the amount recommended in this bill is $148,589,786.88, an increase of $3,721,070.27 over the current year. The inference to be drawn is that the charge upon the Treasury to be made on account of the Navy because of the passage of the naval appropriation bill in the next fiscal year is $148,589,786.88. As a matter of fact this bill imposes obligations of $2,200,000 in excess of the amount stated as being carried in the bill, so that the bill actually involves obligations on the Treasury of $150,789,786.

This shrinkage or apparent saving of $2,200,000 in the statement of the amount carried by the bill is effected by the method of providing that certain unexpended balances appropriated for purposes wholly different shall be reappropriated by this bill for some different purpose.

It has been the custom where money is appropriated for some specific purpose and it has not been possible to expend the money during the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made, and the object for which it was appropriated has not been accomplished, to reappropriate the unexpended balance. But this proposition is something novel—not entirely exceptional, but novel in that it is an attempt to make it appear that the Navy in the next fiscal year will cost $2,200,000 less than it actually will cost.

If we are to appropriate a million dollars for aeronautics, it should be appropriated out of the general fund in the Treasury. This roundabout, indirect method of obtaining money for a specific purpose in order to keep back the information and knowledge that there is actually to be expended a sum in excess of that stated on the face of the bill and in the report itself should not be approved by the House.

If the House is to appropriate $1,000,000, or any other sum, I believe it should be appropriated directly. If this method were to be adopted and unexpended balances reappropriated for specific purposes in the bill, it would be possible for the Committee on Naval Affairs to report a bill creating all the obligations imposed in this bill on the Treasury and to make a statement that the bill only carries $135,000,000 or $130,000,000. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing strange about this or unusual. It is a matter often resorted to in the House. This appropriation was carried in the bill last year under "Construction and repair." They did not use it for the purpose that it was appropriated for, and we are simply making this available in this bill for aeronautics. It has already been appropriated. The Navy has been charged with it, and I see no necessity of charging the Navy with it last year and then again this year. We call attention to it in the report clearly and fully, and the House understands it, and I hope the amendment to the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York to the amendment will prevail. It is a mere matter of form of making appropriations. It is not at all unusual where an appropriation is made for a specific purpose and is not used, or not entirely used, to reappropriate it for a succeeding fiscal year. That is quite proper, but it is very unusual, indeed, to make an appropriation for one purpose one year and then in a subsequent year to reappropriate that money for some other purpose, so that it will not show how much is appropriated. It is misleading to the House.

Mr. PADGETT. Last year we reappropriated money for building slips at the Boston Navy Yard for an entirely different purpose. It was first appropriated for marine barracks, and the appropriation was changed and made available for building slips.

Mr. MANN. It is true that is sometimes done, but it is very unusual. That is the statement I made, that it ought not to be done as a matter of orderly procedure. The gentleman from Tennessee stated that this fund which was appropriated last year covered air craft but the gentleman is mistaken. This appropriation which it is proposed to reappropriate was for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and that did not cover air craft.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. I am not mistaken. We made an appropriation specifically for experimental purposes for air craft, and in the appropriation which the gentleman refers to we included the term "air craft" for the purpose of making repairs, and that was all. When gentlemen say that we appropriated an amount under that item for the purchase of air craft, airships, and all that, they are mistaken, or else they intentionally misled and deceived the House, because if they had appropriated a million dollars for air craft and had not intended to deceive the House, they would not have inserted an item of $10,000 for experimental purposes with which to purchase air craft.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the act of March 4, 1913, which was for the fiscal year of 1914, it contains a provision for the construction and repair of aeroplanes and all their auxiliaries.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I just made the statement in regard to it which the gentleman did not hear. I say that if the gentleman intended that that item was to cover the purchase of aeroplanes he deceived the House, because he proposed and secured an appropriation last year of $10,000 for experimental purposes of aeroplanes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute only. The appropriation of $10,000 under the Bureau of Navigation has been carried in the bill for several years, and was for experimental purposes, and the purchase and construction was under the lump-sum appropriation of construction and repairs that I have just read, and under steam engineering a lump-sum appropriation of $10,000 for experimental purposes, and it was so stated.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] both fall into the same error in stating that the reappropriation here sought is of money which was appropriated for an entirely different purpose. The chairman of the committee has pointed out that under the act of March 4, 1913, which made the appropriation for the year ending June 30, 1914, there was carried a lump-sum appropriation amounting to $8,250,000, under "Construction and repair," which could have been used, every cent of it, for aeroplanes and other auxiliaries. That was not the only appropriation, however, carried in that bill or in last year's bill. It has been the habit heretofore to have an appropriation of the small amount of $10,000 under "Navigation for experimental purposes only" especially limited to experimental purposes, and under "Steam engineering" and "Construction and repair" in lump sums running high into the millions there has been authority to procure or construct or provide for aeroplanes and other auxiliaries without any limit whatever as to the amount that could be expended from those separate lump-sum appropriations. What is sought here is to reappropriate for aeronautics $1,000,000 out of that $8,250,000 which was unexpended, and which could have been expended for aeronautics, so that the reappropriation not only is in order under the rules of the House, but it is a reappropriation of the money for the identical purpose for which it was in the first place appropriated.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, why this reappropriation should be favored by this House. It has been the habit of certain people both in and out of Congress for many years to claim that the American Navy was the most extravagant Navy on the face of the earth, and they have pointed to the annual appropriations of each year in confirmation of their statements. The Navy is, and always has been, charged with the total amount that has been appropriated. It never has been given any credit whatever for unexpended balances; and for that reason, if for no other reason, it seems to me that we should take advantage of these unobligated balances and reappropriate them from year to year, especially when we do so to carry out the original purpose of the appropriations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, under the heading "Bureau of Construction and Repair," subtitle "Construction and repair of vessels," language covering a great many items is found, and an appropriation of $8,250,000 is made. It included the purchase of aeroplanes. No one will contend for an instant, however, that it was contemplated that $1,000,000 should be expended out of that appropriation for aeroplanes. The appropriation was intended for construction and repair of vessels, preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks, and ordinary purchase of materials and stores of all kinds, and innumerable other things. This appropriation made for the fiscal year 1914, under the covering-in act, remains available until June 30, 1916, to meet obligations incurred and which may be outstanding at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman, of course, like everyone else, is desirous that the true facts as to the amount of money that is spent on the Navy from year to year shall be accurately known?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am.

Mr. GARDNER. The chairman of the committee has indicated that in making up the figures showing what we spend on the Navy from year to year the Navy is debited with the amount appropriated whether it is expended or not, and therefore he says that if this item is put in as a new appropriation the Navy will be debited with a total which, as a matter of fact, it has not expended. For my own information I should like to know what is the custom—to debit the Navy with the amount appropriated or to debit the Navy with the amount actually expended when it comes to making up these estimates of what we are spending on the Navy?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there are two ways of computing the cost of a service. One is by taking the annual appropriations made for the service. The other is by taking the statement of the amount actually expended on the service. No one can tell at the end of any fiscal year how much any service of the Government has cost during that fiscal year, because under the covering-in act annual appropriations made for any service during the fiscal year remain available for two years thereafter to meet obligations incurred during the fiscal year. No one can tell to-day how much actually was expended for the Navy during the fiscal year 1914, because all of the payments for the fiscal year 1914 have not yet been made. This very balance which it is now proposed to divert for some other purpose still remains available to meet obligations incurred during the fiscal year 1914. But it is possible, if the appropriation bills are framed in the manner in which they should be, to tell how much the Navy Department is authorized under the law to expend or to incur obligations for during a fiscal year.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not just at this moment. Under the statement contained in the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs it appears that $148,589,000 are appropriated by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That sum is the amount of direct appropriations carried in the bill. In addition to the $148,589,000, reappropriations aggregating $2,200,000 are carried in the bill. So that the Navy Department, if this bill as reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs becomes a law, instead of carrying authorizations of $148,589,000, as one would be led to believe from reading the report, actually carries authorizations and appropriations for $150,789,000. If an appropriation of $1,000,000 is to be made for aeroplanes it should be made directly. These balances are covered into the Treasury every two years under the operations of the covering-in act, and the only way in which it is possible to keep our fiscal years separated and to keep the statements accurate is by making direct appropriations.

It would be possible to take a bill like the sundry civil appropriation bill in which probably the unexpended balances at times will aggregate ten or fifteen million dollars, and by this

method of reappropriation make it appear to the House that the bill was actually carrying ten or fifteen million dollars less than were authorized to be expended. It seems to me that what we wish to know is how much the bill will authorize encumbering the Treasury. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield there for a few words?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Of course anyone can see that if this bill actually authorizes the expenditure of $150,000,000, and if on its face it appears only to authorize $148,000,000, so far as this particular bill is concerned the face estimate is misleading, but it is not misleading if taken in connection with last year's appropriation bill. For instance, suppose that last year we had had Navy appropriations amounting to $150,000,000 and that of that amount only $148,000,000 had been spent. It would not be sound reasoning to calculate our Navy expenses at $300,000,000 for two years. Yet that is exactly the situation if the plan which the gentleman from New York advocates is to prevail. Now, the gentleman is perfectly correct——

Mr. FITZGERALD. But you can not tell for two years whether the $150,000,000 will be spent.

Mr. GARDNER. Allow me to continue my line of thought, because it is a little difficult to follow it. It is perfectly obvious that the gentleman is correct in holding that the statement that this bill only carries a hundred and forty-eight million dollars is misleading. It is misleading. On the other hand, you must impale yourself on the horns of one dilemma or the other. Either the estimate of the amount carried in this particular bill will be misleading, or else the statement as to the amount spent on the Navy in the last two years will be misleading.

Mr. GILLETT. If the gentleman will allow me, suppose this whole $2,000,000 in the next two years is spent. You do not know it will not be, so consequently it is misleading.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It can not be in this case because of the unobligated balance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In authorizing appropriations there is some attempt sometimes by some persons to keep in touch with the probable revenues of the Government in connection with expenditures. I do not say that notion has been very contagious or too prevalent, but there are some such Members of Congress. It would be very easy by a series of appropriations of unexpended balances——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from New York. I do not want to have an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. FITZGERALD. To continue this statement, if the gentleman will yield, it might be by a series of reappropriations to have a financial statement on the face of which it would appear that we propose to expend a sum within the estimated revenues, but, as a matter of fact, actually authorizing expenditures far in excess of our estimated revenues. In making our statement it does not make so much difference whether the total of the appropriation bills from year to year may enable some one to charge that one service or another is costing too much money so long as there is information upon which men can intelligently determine whether the Congress is authorizing expenditures far in excess of the probable revenues of the Government. That is the information that is important to the public and to the Congress in the performance of its duty. If at any time it is desired to know how much the Navy actually costs in any one year, at the end of the two years following the end of a particular year when no other moneys can be paid out on that account, a correct statement can be had by examining the report of the Treasury Department, which gives the actual expenditures.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield back a little of my time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield, although I do not think I encroached on the gentleman's time more than he did on mine.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, it does not make one picayune of difference the way you word this paragraph, so far as the actual expenditure of money is concerned. The only question is which way we deceive ourselves and the public most. It is inevitable that we must deceive ourselves to some extent whether we do the one thing or the other. If we amend the bill the way the chairman suggests, the public is deceived as to the amount carried in this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I differ with the gentleman on that, because we expressly state here and call attention to the fact that it is a reappropriation.

Mr. GARDNER. I mean the casual public, which does not go into the details, but merely asks how much money is carried in the bill. On the other hand, if we have it the way the gentleman from New York wishes it, then in casting over a series of years to see how much money our Navy is costing us we shall deceive ourselves and deceive the public into thinking the Navy is costing more than it actually is costing, because the $2,000,000 will appear not only in this appropriation bill but will also be added as an amount appropriated in a former appropriation bill. Therefore, as it seems to me less important to know what is carried in this bill than it is to know what our Navy is costing us, I shall vote with the chairman of the committee to reappropriate the money. It will, of course, require some explanation in order not to be misled. The amount spent over a series of years, however, will be shown and the Navy will not be charged with money which it has not expended.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in five minutes on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I object. There are other amendments to be offered. On the pending amendment it is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on the amendment to the amendment be closed in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in the Navy Yearbook, on pages 805, 806, 807, 808, and 809, will be found the annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment from 1883 down to and including 1914, and also the additional appropriations for the Naval Establishment and the deficiency appropriation. Those figures are the figures that are commonly accepted by the public and used by those arguing pro and con on the expense of the Navy, as indicating what it has cost this Government over that period of years to maintain its Navy.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not equally true as to all the other departments?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It may be; but I am only speaking of the Navy Department.

Mr. SHERLEY. If we changed the rule as to the Navy and not as to the others——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. There is no rule of the House prohibiting it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not talking about a rule of the House; I am talking about a rule of practice.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But we are not changing the rule of practice, so far as it pertains to the Navy Department.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman. I think I have some knowledge of the usual appropriations. It is not usual to do that. Now——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech, but only to ask a question. I have only five minutes, and the debate will be closed then.

Mr. SHERLEY. Go ahead. I do not want to take your time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] stated it was impossible to tell now how much money had been expended in the maintenance and upkeep of the Navy Department in the year 1914. That statement is absolutely correct so far as it goes, but entirely misleading so far as this argument is concerned, because the appropriation bill for the Naval Department, as the gentleman well knows, carries annual appropriations, appropriations that are extended for two years, and appropriations good until expended. Now, the point that I think the gentleman had in mind, or, at least, the thought that might come from his statement, is that we do not know how much there will be of unobligated balance in the appropriation for construction and repair on June 30, 1914.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not that one alone.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am confining myself to that one alone, because that is where we are reappropriating an unobligated balance. That appropriation of $8,250,000 for that year could only be obligated during that year, and it is well known to-day how much of the $8,250,000 was unobligated. So it is a matter of mathematical calculation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the last two months certain information was furnished to the Naval Committee as to the amount of unexpended balances, and thereupon the Secretary of the Navy said that further information coming to hand——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is seeking to confuse the issue between unexpended and unobligated balances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and repeated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS], that it was impossible to know how much money was spent on the Navy during any fiscal year, ought to go without some understanding. It may be impossible at the end of the year to know how much the Navy Department has obligated itself to pay, but it is not only feasible to know how much money has been spent during the year, but that is promptly published by the Treasury Department at the end of every fiscal year. The amount of money which is spent may not be payable wholly out of the appropriation for that year. If the gentleman would say that they do not know how much of the appropriation was to be spent, of course that is accurate, but we know at the end of every fiscal year exactly how much money has been spent in that fiscal year on the Navy, on the Army, and in every other department of the Government. And if we did not know it, we would be in a sad way as to bookkeeping.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the figures "$1,000,000" and inserting "$300,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for aeronautics for the Army of the United States for the next fiscal year is $300,000. A special corps of aviation officers in the Army was created by Congress, consisting of 60 officers and 250 enlisted men. Certain requirements were established for officers who desired to be attached to the Aviation Corps. At the last report it had been possible to obtain only 26 of the 60 officers authorized by law. The War Department maintains a training school at San Diego, Cal., and an aeronautic station at Fort Sam Houston, in Texas, and has been engaged in the work of developing and experimenting with aeroplanes a much longer time than the Navy. These aeroplanes cost about eight or ten thousand dollars apiece. We have about 33 or 34 first-class battleships. If we were to obtain an aeroplane for every ship in the Navy that can accommodate one of them, and if, in addition, we were to provide the Navy with as large and extensive a service as the Army now has, it still would not require in any one fiscal year within 50 per cent of the amount proposed to be carried in this bill. This is one reason, Mr. Chairman, why these lavish unexpended balances are found in the appropriations for the naval service. For 1914, on the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs, $8,250,000 was appropriated for construction and repair of ships, and before the expiration of the time within which that money can be expended this bill proposes to reappropriate $1,000,000 of the $8,250,000.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In one moment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not yield at this point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is proposed to appropriate $1,000,000, which is only a part of the excess of the appropriation made upon the recommendation of the committee. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if Congress at this time provides for the Navy for aeronautics by appropriating $300,000, the same sum which is appropriated in the Army bill for the Army for the next fiscal year, we shall not only do everything that reasonable men can expect, but we shall provide every dollar that can be properly and legitimately expended by the Navy for this purpose.

Of course, if the purpose be, in making these appropriations, simply to evidence our enthusiasm and our interest in some of the services by making appropriations in large sums, enabling us to tell those who inquire that Congress has given a million dollars for aviation, without regard to the possibility of its use, without consideration of the ability of the department to expend the money, then it is desirable to appropriate $1,000,000. But we might just as well appropriate $5,000,000, not on the theory that it would be expended but simply because it would sound well to say that we had appropriated that much money.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized. He is a member of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is to reduce this appropriation from $1,000,000 to $300,000, the same amount appropriated for the Army. If that is the only reason he has to give for the reduction, it is the most absurd proposition I have ever heard advanced. Why aeronautics in the Navy should be limited to the same amount of money as is provided for aeronautics in the Army I fail to see. The needs of the two services are entirely different.

But, Mr. Chairman, the trouble with aeronautics in this country has been the lack of interest and encouragement on the part of the Government. That has been the difficulty. There is the reason why this country, which first discovered and made feasible the heavier-than-air machine, is so far behind all the other nations of the earth in the matter of aeroplanes. The only customer we have, practically, is the Government, and the Government has had no definite amount of money at its disposal with which to purchase these craft, and therefore there has been no inducement to go on and perfect them in this country. And as long as we go on making these niggardly little appropriations that condition will be accentuated. It will grow worse.

The gentleman speaks of appropriating $5,000,000. Does the gentleman know that the General Board of the Navy recommended $5,000,000 for aeronautics in the Navy alone?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did; and that is the reason I pay so little attention to their recommendations.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would pay attention to those who know he would be better off.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman know that to-day we are sending Curtiss aeroplanes to Europe?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I decline to be interrupted, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we had before us Capt. Bristol, of the Navy, who has charge of aeronautics, and he was asked how much money he could probably expend in the next fiscal year, and he gave a detailed list, which you will find on page 286 of the hearings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Read it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And it totaled $1,187,000. As one member of the committee I would vote and did vote to give him that whole amount, but the wisdom of the committee fixed the amount at $1,000,000.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York that there are a good many things necessary for aeronautics besides the flying machine or the balloon or the dirigible. They are absolutely as helpless until they have the auxiliaries necessary as would be a battleship in midocean without any motive power, without ammunition, without guns.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Is the attitude of the gentleman on the Committee on Naval Affairs toward other appropriations the same as that which the gentleman has mentioned on this subject? Is the inquiry how much you can expend, or how much you can expend efficiently and properly?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is how much you can spend efficiently and properly, and particularly on this subject of aeronautics.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is not what the gentleman said a moment ago. I wanted to give the gentleman an opportunity to correct himself.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I suppose the gentleman will concede that no one wants to expend money unwisely. We assume that the officials of this Government have common sense and will spend the money to the best advantage of the Government, and we do not specify in these bills that they shall spend it wisely and judiciously any more than money carried on an

appropriation bill is a command to them to spend it riotously and extravagantly. And when Capt. Bristol told us that he could spend to advantage $1,187,000 we accepted his statement.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say to him that I like it much better that way than the way the gentleman first stated it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Well, if the gentleman is fussy, I am quite willing to change it in the way I have done.

Besides aeroplanes, Mr. Chairman, and your dirigibles, you must have hydrogen sets for your dirigibles, you must have floating sheds for your dirigibles, you must have hangars, gasoline storage, and there must be an appropriation for the maintenance of all this outfit, so that the million dollars recommended to be appropriated, if it is authorized by this Congress, will be but a drop in the bucket compared with what we should have for our Navy alone.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, does the chairman of the committee desire to speak first?

Mr. MANN. A motion is pending.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, there is an advantage in the flying machine which some of us, perhaps, do not appreciate. One reason why I favor a larger appropriation is this: I do not know whether the newspaper reports of the different engagements supposed to have taken place in European waters are true; but if they are half true, the destructive fighting machine in the Navy is the submarine, and some attention must be paid to that vessel if we are to have what is known as an "adequate national defense," which I expect to discuss before this bill is completed.

And if gentlemen will think of it a minute, and I would be glad if they would turn it over in their minds, so that before the bill is completed we shall better know what constitutes an adequate defense.

But, to go back a step, the fighting power in the Navy is the torpedo. The instrument with which it is to be fired effectively is the submarine, and against which we should seek to protect ourselves.

I was amazed at the statement made to the Committee on Naval Affairs that at the height of 2,000 feet it was possible to see a submarine 100 feet under the surface of the water. I could not believe that could be true, and yet I had no way of disproving the accuracy of the statement, because I never was in a flying machine and never was in a submarine.

Mr. GORDON. And never will be.

Mr. BUTLER. Just so, my friend; I never will be, if I am alive. I can do as well as other Americans if you decide not to allow this money, but I think we ought to be rational in what we do. If necessary for all purposes of government, let us appropriate less for ships in order that we may protect ourselves against the submarines built by other nations. The only means known at this time by which we can locate the presence of a submarine is from one of these flying machines. So absolutely incredible to me was the statement, that I made an effort to find out whether or not other people had had the same experience that these gentlemen have had in these flying machines. A friend living in my native town, by name, P. M. Sharpless, in company with a balloonist in Philadelphia, whom I know very well, Mr. Anton Atherholt, followed the course of the Delaware River testing this phenomenon, and at the height of 1,500 feet could discover the rocks in the bottom of the river. They discovered plainly the shoals and were able to trace the channel.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman think the Delaware River is a fair test?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I think it is quite a fair test. Anyhow, it is a sufficient test to make me believe that there is much in the statement that at the height of 2,000 feet, unless the ocean is very rough, the presence of a submarine may be discovered at the depth of 100 feet under water.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] were here, does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would admit that the Delaware is only 10 or 15 feet deep, and that you could not help seeing the shoals in the bottom?

Mr. BUTLER. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is here, as he always is, right on the job.

Mr. MOORE. What the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wanted was to get a rise, and they have gotten it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. And I have furnished the time for both gentlemen to get in.

Mr. BARTLETT. Was that at high water or low water that this observation was made?

Mr. BUTLER. Where?

Mr. BARTLETT. In the Delaware River.

Mr. BUTLER. They did not furnish me with that information.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman should never tire of praising the Delaware River. I do not.

Mr. BUTLER. I repeat when I first heard this statement of an official it was utterly incredible to me; but because of the observation of these gentlemen on the Delaware River in a balloon, I believe it is possible, as stated by them, at the deepest point in the Delaware River to see a horse and cart if they had been located on the bottom. Therefore I have become impressed with the importance of providing this means of detecting the presence of submarines. If we are to provide a national defense according to the money that we have in the Treasury, the time may come when we will put up a signboard on the New Jersey coast notifying an enemy who might approach that we have no money, and that they must go down to Costa Rica or elsewhere if they want some. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from New York. When Capt. Bristol was before the committee, as appears on page 288 of the hearings, the chairman asked him how many aeroplanes we ought to have, and he replied that we ought to have 100 in active service and 100 in reserve. In other words, he said we ought to have 200 aeroplanes for the Navy. The chairman asked Capt. Bristol what these aeroplanes cost, and he replied that they cost $11,000 apiece. The chairman remarked, "That is $2,200,000 for aeroplanes."

And that is what Capt. Bristol would like to have in place of the $1,000,000 that we propose to put into this bill. He would like to have $2,200,000, so that he could have 200 aeroplanes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state how many officers we now have in the Navy trained to fly these machines?

Mr. BROWNING. I can not answer that. Probably the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs can. Capt. Bristol says that we need 400 commissioned officers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is proposed to buy 100 machines. How many officers are trained to use them? Of course if they are all like our friend from Pennsylvania, who never intends to go up in one of them, it would not be of any use to have them.

Mr. BROWNING. I can not tell the gentleman how many officers we have who are trained in aviation. I think probably the chairman of the committee may have that information.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. BROWNING. There is no use in training officers unless we have the machines. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. Can the gentleman tell us at how many places these machines can be built to-day in this country?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not think they can be built at more than two places in the United States, if that.

Mr. GOULDEN. I do not think there are more than two or three places. There certainly should be many more.

Mr. BROWNING. I think that is correct, and that is one reason why the committee propose this, in order that it may be an incentive for manufacturers to build some of these aeroplanes, so that we can get them.

Mr. GOULDEN. Was it the purpose or the intention of the committee to have them built by the Government itself at some navy yard as an experiment?

Mr. BROWNING. No, sir; we could not have them built at any navy yard. We have no plant for the purpose.

Mr. GOULDEN. Could you not create a plant?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes; we could create a plant.

Mr. GOULDEN. Would not that be cheaper and better in the end?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. You could not get the engines.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman know what amount of work is now being done for European countries in the manufacture of aeroplanes in this country? I understand that the Curtiss aeroplane is being built in some numbers for European countries.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand the gentleman to ask how much work is being done in this country in the manufacture of aeroplanes for foreign Governments?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. We do not know. That was information which we tried to get, but could not.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the gentleman does know, if the statements in the press are to be believed, that aeroplanes are being built in America for use in foreign countries?

Mr. BUTLER. I saw that statement in the papers. I call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to what seems to be an effort of the officers of the Navy to obtain an engine from Europe, the Mercedes, said to be the best, and they have not obtained it. That is the reason we are behind in the supply of aeroplanes, and we have now to make it up.

Mr. SHERLEY. I knew all that.

Mr. BROWNING. There were two engines brought over, the Mercedes and the Salmson, but we can not get them.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I do not believe there is any necessity for the expenditure of a million dollars for air craft. I think $300,000 would be ample for the purpose. That would purchase about 30 aeroplanes. The Navy already has about a dozen aeroplanes, and you would then have in the neighborhood of 40. I can not see the slightest necessity for any more than that.

The argument brought out in the committee to induce us to make an appropriation of $1,000,000 rests on the ground that France has a thousand aeroplanes, Germany has 800, that England has a large number, and consequently they jump to the conclusion that we ought to have that many. In other words, we ought to ape foreign Governments in everything they do. So far as the Navy is concerned, if you take the history of the present war, according to the newspaper reports, all the belligerents engaged in that war have not used as many as 40 aeroplanes in the naval service. A large number of air craft of different kinds used by Europeans are used on land. It may be necessary for them, because they have millions and millions of men engaged in that war, and it is necessary to have these scouts to report the movements of all these troops, a condition that will never arise in this country, for it is utterly impossible for any country on earth to land a million men on our shores. If we should have a war, we would have but one use for aeroplanes, and that would be to serve as scouts and to report the movement of a hostile fleet on the ocean.

Forty aeroplanes could do that as well as a thousand could do it. We not only have aeroplanes for scouts, but destroyers are used as scouts and armored cruisers are used as scouts, and, with all the other scouts that we have, I submit to this committee that 40 aeroplanes would be the greatest abundance for us, and we do not need any million dollars spent for this purpose, except to gratify the taste of these gentlemen who want to do everything that foreign Governments do.

Now, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] thinks we need a million dollars for aeroplanes, because aeroplanes can discover submarines down under the water. Let me remind my friend that the testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee by experts, by naval officers—who are the only men that know about these things—is that if we had a war with a foreign Government they could not bring their submarines over here, and they would not have any submarines for aeroplanes to discover under the water.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], with his usual omniscience about naval technique, with a wave of his hand, can dispense with all use for aeroplanes like he can with battleships. It requires 100 aeroplanes to successfully scout for one fleet. The scouting has to be done at 300 miles distance, and these aeroplanes have to come in every night, starting at nightfall to report to the fleet. Topedo vessels 300 miles away can not then cover that ground before daybreak, when it would be too late to attack. Of course, a submarine could cover only a fraction of that distance.

Now, in the scouting 300 miles from the fleet, each aeroplane scout covers a certain sector of the circle whose radius is 300 miles. The number of aeroplanes necessary to cover that circle on the high seas around one fleet, the minimum number of aeroplanes absolutely necessary for constant scouting is 50. When 50 come in, 50 must take their place. There must be one relief. So to make one fleet efficient in modern warfare will require 100 aeroplanes.

The gentleman scouts the idea of seeing submarines under the water. He is entirely mistaken. The aeroplane does not have to be high over the water when it is observing for submarine craft. It can come down close to the water's surface, and the testimony before the committee shows that they can locate without difficulty submarine boats at the distance that these boats navigate. They can locate submarines signaling to destroyers and other vessels their whereabouts and permit attack.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our Navy is three years behind. For more than three years we have utterly neglected the question of development of navigation of the air as a part of the essential defense of the Nation. We have not begun experimentation of lighter-than-air machines like the Zeppelins. Yet the importance of those implements can not be overstated. To-day the people of the British Isles, the United Kingdom, are kept in constant tension. The whole nerves of a nation are racked; the efficiency of that nation in self-defense is undermined by the fact that that nation has not experimented with this type of vessel when its foe has experimented. We need not think that we can buy these implements when war comes. No nation can. If they could be bought with money, the English would have more Zeppelins to-day than the Germans. You have to develop the art in your own country, and it requires money to develop the art. We have not provided the money in these years to develop the art. We are short in equipment, in buildings, and so forth. We are behind in training our men to fly. We need not one million dollars but many millions of dollars, not only to speedily equip our Navy as fast as we can efficiently do so with the required number of these craft, but also to develop our training service.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks about our getting the aviators. Why, a part of this million dollars will be used to develop the training of our men. This present bill authorizes 48 officers and 98 enlisted men from the Regular Navy and 12 officers and 24 enlisted men in the Marine Corps. We need this money to develop the men. We are just as backward in developing our fliers as in providing them with suitable machines. We need both the aeroplanes and the Zeppelins and the trained men for both types. It is certainly high time our Nation should make a good beginning. A million dollars is a small sum for the needs of the Navy to make an efficient start.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to see something done in this business of air craft. We have been loafing along for years and doing nothing. We have been estimating and we have been reporting and we have been adopting plans and drafting designs, but we have not been building. Finally last year we sent abroad and we made a contract with a firm in Germany to send us over one aeroplane with a couple of Mercedes motors, and we made a contract with a French firm to send us over an aeroplane with a couple of Salmson motors. When the war broke out, of course those aeroplanes were commandeered, and we did not get them. About two years ago a board was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to look into this whole question of naval air service and make recommendations. That board reported over a year ago and recommended $1,297,700 as the amount that was necessary at that time. What did we give them a year ago? We let them take about $350,000 to $400,000 out of the appropriations for various bureaus, and that is all we did. That is all they had to spend, and the result is they have not been able to do much. Now along comes Capt. Bristol, and he says that we need 100 aeroplanes for the active fleet, and that we need 100 aeroplanes in reserve. We do not expect to get them this year, but that is what we need. Moreover he says that we can expend a million and a half of dollars before the 1st of July, 1915, and another million and a half of dollars before the 1st of July, 1916. That is what Capt. Bristol says, and instead of that we give him only $1,000,000. He says it can be expended most admirably.

As to the statement that there has been only $300,000 given to the Army air service, that is true. I tried to get that amount increased by amendment on the floor of the House. At the time my amendment was defeated I did not have in my possession a copy of a letter which is now in my possession. Since that time I have been furnished with a copy of the letter written recently by Gen. Scriven to the Secretary of War, in which he says that that amount of $300,000 is absolutely inadequate, and merely means that the air service of the Army must necessarily deteriorate.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention particularly to the testimony of Capt. Bristol with reference to the number of aeroplanes that are needed. Of course in determining this matter it must be borne in mind that in former days the scouting in the event of war was done by scout ships with a speed of probably 30 to 35 knots per hour, while these aeroplanes of the best type have a speed of about 90 knots an hour. Therefore, in the event of war, if we have nothing but ships for scouting, and the enemy be provided with aeroplanes with a speed of 90 knots per hour, we will be at a considerable disadvantage. Capt. Bristol explains just why we need 100 aeroplanes, and I want to read that portion of his testimony, which is found on page 288 of the hearings. Speaking of the amount to be invested in aeroplanes, he says:

I will explain a little how you come at that. You have a fleet of 16 battleships, and that represents about 3 miles in length. With a radius of 300 miles around that battleship fleet you have a circle of

1,900 miles; and there should be one aeroplane to every 40 miles of the circumference of that circle for scouting work. That would require 50 aeroplanes for one fleet, with 50 in reserve, which is the least allowance that could be considered. That makes 100 in the fleet actually, and then another——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Do you mean that around your battleships you would have——

Capt. BRISTOL (interposing). Aeroplanes going out on the radii of this circle so that at the end of 300 miles there would be one scout arriving at the circumference at nightfall every 40 miles apart to come back and report the position of an enemy. That is, so that at nightfall you would know that there were no submarines nor torpedo craft within the distance they could cover during darkness to make an attack on the fleet.

And so, if we are going to provide the Navy with suitable scouting vessels, it is necessary that this be done in modern warfare by air craft; and the number specified by Capt. Bristol seemed to the committee to be a reasonable number.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word suggested by the question put by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a little while ago. He inquired as to the number of men or officers in the Navy who could fly aeroplanes, and said that there would not be a sufficient number of men qualified to fly the machines even if we had them. Here, on page 288, is what Capt. Bristol said on this point. Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, of the Naval Committee, said:

Let me ask you right here, have we enough officers skilled in aviation to man 48 more machines?

Capt. BRISTOL. We have not; but, strange as it seems, it does not require a very long time to train an officer to handle an aeroplane, so we could have them by the time we could get the craft.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it may not take long to train them, but it takes some time to get them, as has been evidenced by the experience of the Army, which has an authorized corps of 60 officers and has been able to get only 26.

Mr. COOPER. But so far as qualifying them to fly the machine is concerned, he said that the department could get the necessary number of qualified aviators by the time it could get the craft.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am very heartily in favor of this amendment. I think it is sound business. I think it is the wise thing under existing conditions to do. I submit to you this proposition: With $80,000,000 staring us in the face as a deficit—and this should especially appeal to this side of the House—we are in a serious situation. There is no doubt but that the revenues are running behind and we are getting deeper and deeper in arrears.

Now, if a man were to get up on this floor and undertake at this inopportune and unseasonable time, considering the condition of the Treasury, to develop some machine that would harvest wheat and put it in a sack at 2 cents a bushel, why, he would be laughed and pooh-poohed off the floor. Yet men will stand up and vote for a million dollars to unnecessarily test out something that is being tested in every possible phase and angle in the European war. You can not wait; you are the most impatient set of men who ever were gotten together when it comes to spending money. All you seem to deem necessary is to appropriate whether the money is available and forthcoming or not. The last thing you are concerned about when you come to write the check or the draft is to know whether the money you are appropriating is on hand. The fact is we are $80,000,000 in the red. Now, can not we, as sensible men, wait six months, when all these propositions are being thrashed out day and night? It is stated in this morning's papers, I think, that there are being manufactured in the United States aeroplanes that are going to Europe for war purpose. Do you believe that the European nations who are engaged in war would buy American aeroplanes of no value and which do not serve their purpose; that they are spending their money for something that is of no use? It is preposterous. We are making progress in the manufacture of flying machines. We are not falling behind, as some of these warriors here are trying to convince the country. We are unquestionably keeping pace with the up-to-date types if those people abroad are willing to buy our machines and pay good money for them. So it does seem to me that the sensible thing to do, especially when our revenues are falling short, is to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that aeroplanes are properly considered as war machines, as far as the Navy Department are concerned, although I see the Secretary of State holds, I do not say improperly, that aeroplanes are not to be treated as war machines, so far as permitting their export is concerned. Now, I am in favor of making reasonable provision for aeroplanes in the Navy and the Army. I have great respect for the Committee on Naval Affairs, though I think they would have done more wisely if they had followed the example of the committee presided over by the gentleman who is now presiding over the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, who brought in a bill and had it passed, providing for a special corps in the Army to handle aeroplanes or air craft, and then providing for a special school where a considerable sum of money is being expended to train both officers and enlisted men in the handling of aeroplanes. I think the Navy has a small school costing a few thousand dollars a year, four or five thousand maybe, and hence the man in charge of that, having not acquired much knowledge of the subject, thinks it is easy to pick naval officers off the street who can handle air craft flying at the rate of 90 miles an hour out at sea, and he cooly suggests that he can get 100 officers, or thereabouts, in the Navy overnight who can handle these machines. The Army with more experience has discovered otherwise, because they have the experience and are not merely talking through their hats. Three hundred thousand dollars is the amount which we provided in the Army bill, and on a vote in the House proposing to raise that amount to $1,000,000, my recollection is that the $1,000,000 proposition only received about 30 votes in the House. I know that some gentlemen here claim that the Navy has more use for the aeroplanes than the Army, but that is contradictory to all common sense, barring the opinion of the gentlemen who assert that they need it. The air craft are being made use of wherever there are armies, and they are not being made constant use of anywhere by the Navy.

The principal occupation of the navies of the world to-day is to keep out of each other's reach, and in the main that means to stay safely near home. They do not need aeroplanes to do that. We appropriated $300,000 for the Army where it really needs the aeroplanes, and it seems to me that an appropriation of $200,000 for the Navy for the next fiscal year is amply sufficient. Under the law as it now stands, the current appropriation act, the Navy is authorized now to use more than $18,000,000 for the purchase or construction and repair of aeroplanes. It is true that is in items covering other things; but, as the gentleman has said, there was a large surplus left over from the year before. Having had authority to use such a sum as they pleased out of the appropriations, amounting to more than $18,000,000 for this year, how much have they used? It is $18,000,000, and I speak to a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs who does not know what they could use. There are two items in the current appropriation law which authorize the purchase and construction of aeroplanes, one of nearly $10,000,000 and the other $8,000,000, and they had a surplus in one of those amounts for the preceding year. Now, they are not using any such sum of money. They are not using a million dollars, although they will have left at the end of this fiscal year a considerable sum in those two items of appropriations. That is the proof of the pudding. Having the authority, they do not need the money, and we ought not to appropriate at the present time any more than they really need. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a long time to discuss this matter. The matter of aeronautics and its usefulness is being demonstrated every day in the European war. Foreign countries have large numbers of aeroplanes. For instance, in Austria-Hungary they have 600; Great Britain, 900; in France, 1,400; in Germany, 1,400; in Russia, 1,000; and we have in this country 23—the Army and Navy combined.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The Government does not own them all?

Mr. PADGETT. Not all of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Those are privately owned.

Mr. PADGETT. I can give the Government-owned ones, if the gentleman wishes. In Austria-Hungary they have 110; in Great Britain, 421; in Germany, 475; in Russia, 262; I was not counting the dirigibles in that number, but I was speaking of aeroplanes.

The dirigibles and Zeppelins are in addition to those numbers. Heretofore these appropriations for air craft have been embraced under the lump-sum appropriations for construction and repair and steam engineering and machinery, and the gentleman said there was about $18,000,000 that could be used. Of course if you could cut out everything else that had been appropriated—the construction of the ships, the repair of the

ships, and all of the many hundreds of other things that were provided for—and use it all for aeroplanes, we could have done so, but we have appropriated for these in connection with these various other items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This $1,000,000 could have been used in 1914.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it could have been.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They had both the money and the authority.

Mr. PADGETT. But not the $18,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they could have used the $1,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. They could have used it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much did they use?

Mr. PADGETT. About $300,000. Now, then, I want to state that the Secretary said that under the conditions that were existing he could not use advantageously more than he has used in the past year. But in the past year conditions have changed very materially and substantially and a new phase is put upon the question and a new necessity presents itself to us. And I think it would be very wise to appropriate or make available this $1,000,000 that was appropriated to construction and repair last year and make it available for aeronautics next year, not only for the purchase of machines and the construction of them, but for the maintenance of stations and auxiliaries, which amount to several hundred thousand dollars, to equip us and prepare us for the suitable and proper management and handling of these matters. So I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to reduce it to $500,000 will be voted down, and that the $1,000,000 heretofore appropriated may be made available for the air craft.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 43.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered and Mr. MANN and Mr. PADGETT took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 52, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 58, noes 42.

Mr. PADGETT. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. MANN and Mr. PADGETT took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 23, after the word "proper," insert: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is directed to expend $30,000 for establishing a plant to manufacture and construct air craft."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, upon what ground can the point of order be sustained against the amendment?

Mr. MANN. On the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The whole paragraph is legislation to a certain extent.

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The Chair overruled the point of order on the paragraph and held it in order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. MANN. It is 2 o'clock now, I will say to my colleague, and we are notified that we are going to stay here until we reach a certain point in the bill, and it seems to me that we ought to make some progress.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have some information here.

Mr. MANN. Extend your remarks and insert the information in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have some information that the gentleman most probably has not.

Mr. MANN. I will read it in the RECORD if the gentleman will put it in.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, under the vote of the House the debate on this paragraph and amendments is closed.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 17, after the figures "$1,000,000," insert: "*Provided*, That $20,000 of this appropriation shall be expended to test the reinforcements of the hulls of battleships and cruisers against submarine attack, and for this purpose, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, charges of high explosive as powerful as 300 pounds of picrate of ammonia shall be detonated under target sections of hulls similar to the hull of a battleship of the first line."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clearly a restriction on the words, in line 14, "for other experimental work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance."

Mr. PADGETT. The whole matter you referred to is for construction and repair. This only deals with shells and powder and ordnance. It does not deal at all with ships or hulls of ships. Ships and hulls of ships are dealt with under steam engineering and construction and repair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that this is a limitation.

Mr. GARDNER. It is not meant for a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think it is.

Mr. GARDNER. But, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order? If so, the Chair will hear the gentleman briefly on the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not care to speak on it if the Chair has made up his mind.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair ruled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do so for the purpose of giving the House some information, although it may not be worth while if we do not consider matters that are of real importance in regard to the air craft. But I have a letter here which I received from the Navy Department, showing that we could establish a plant very cheaply for the manufacture of air craft. The letter comes from the Bureau of Construction and Repair and the Bureau of Steam Engineering. I will make my statement as brief as I can. It is recommended that if this work be done by the Government, it should be done either at the Norfolk Navy Yard or at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, these yards having an amount of space for testing work. I read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 29, 1915.

Hon. JAMES P. BUCHANAN, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: Referring to my letter No. 26983–364 of January 2, 1915, concerning the estimated cost of a Government plant for the construction of air craft for the Navy, I take pleasure in forwarding herewith a copy of a joint letter from the Bureaus of Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair on this subject.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

—

DECEMBER 14, 1914.

From: Bureau of Construction and Repair and Bureau of Steam Engineering.
To: Navy Department (material).
Subject: Aeroplanes.
Reference: (a) Department's memorandum, December 12, 1914.

1. While the initial successes in air-craft work were attained in this country, the design and construction here on a successful scale are

still in the development stage. Foreign countries are far in advance of our builders. The marked progress of this class of work abroad is due mainly, if not solely, to the encouragement given to private manufacturers by foreign Governments. While there are only a few companies in this country that can at present be considered as competent designers and builders, their number is sufficient to stimulate competition and bring about great improvement in design, provided there is a reasonable amount of Government business in sight. Furthermore, there are other companies that are only awaiting the existence of sufficient business to develop their ideas along the same line.

2. While the Government has resources, including a few officers specially trained in aeronautical-design work, this force can at present be considered as only a nucleus and is capable of carrying on only a very limited volume of work. It would be a tremendous loss to the advancement of aeronautical work to lose the ideas and results of private invention and experiment.

3. In view of the above and in view of the extremely hazardous nature of air-craft work, involving the loss of life and property, if not designed and manufactured with extreme care and along what experience has taught to be the safest lines, the bureaus believe that it would be a great mistake for the department to undertake at the present time the manufacture of air craft except on an experimental scale.

4. Preparations have already been under way for about two years looking to the design and construction of an experimental machine, with a view to developing ultimately the necessary plans, specifications, and detail instructions for the manufacture of aeroplanes, both hulls and power plants, by private manufacturers, including shipyards, and by navy yards in an emergency. This experimental work includes a continued series of laboratory experiments on a large scale at the navy yard, Washington. The preliminary work toward the experimental construction above mentioned is already in hand, and it has been the bureaus' intention to take up the manufacture of such an experimental aeroplane at the Washington Navy Yard in the near future.

5. The establishment of a Government plant for the general manufacture of air craft would require a complement of officers that can ill be spared at the present time, not only because the Navy has a very limited number of specially trained designers in this class of work, but because such a plant would call for the diversion from actual flying work of many of the most competent operators. As stated above, the establishment of such a plant would tend greatly to discourage the valuable initiative and resources of private manufacturers, who should be encouraged and stimulated as a most valuable asset not only in the development of air craft but also for turning out such craft in quantities in time of an emergency. Any Government plant which could be established in the near future would be entirely inadequate in war time, as air craft would be required in large quantities in such an emergency.

6. It is therefore recommended that the utilization of existing plants for aeroplane work be confined to the construction of one or more experimental aeroplanes on the department's design at the navy yard, Washington, and the construction of an aeroplane engine at one of the navy yards, with a view to the preparation of departmental plans, specifications, and manufacturing instructions in sufficient detail for use in an emergency.

7. However, if the department directs the establishment of a plant for the manufacture of air craft, it is recommended that the work be done either at the navy yard, Philadelphia, or the navy yard, Norfolk, these yards having a moderate amount of space for testing work. A considerable portion of the necessary plant is already available at these yards, but certain special tools would be required; some delay would be experienced in training a special force of mechanics, who would have to be instilled with the supreme importance of perfect workmanship. The approximate estimated cost of putting the shops at one of these yards in order and establishing an air-craft factory with a capacity of two or three machines per month is placed at $30,000. The estimated cost of turning out such machines under the present navy-yard cost system is about $6,000. This does not include the cost of the commissioned personnel, classified employees, leave, holiday, and disability, and certain other overhead charges not at present included in the cost of work, and does not include the question of patent rights; all of these would probably run the actual cost much above the above figures.

(Signed) SCHAEFER, *Acting.*
R. S. GRIFFIN.

That is the information I desired to get in before the point of order was raised against my amendment, thinking perhaps that if gentlemen understood how cheaply a plant could be established, it would be of great advantage to the Government, due to the fact that there have been statements made before our committee that it was very difficult to purchase these machines. Therefore by having a Government plant, in my opinion, it would tend to develop and improve our air craft in a way that would be of great importance to the Government.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the question of patents on some of these machines?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes. There is something about that here.

Mr. COOPER. That is a very important consideration.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. He says, in respect to the cost that it "does not include the cost of the commissioned personnel, classified employees, leave, holiday, and disability, and certain other overhead charges," and "does not include the question of patent rights; all of these would probably run the actual cost much above the above figures."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. During the debate it was stated that the reason why the Navy had not obtained more airships was the difficulty of obtaining the very delicate motors, the Mercedes and the Samson, from abroad. Is it proposed to obviate that difficulty and have them manufactured in the navy yards, or is it proposed to manufacture merely the frames?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It would be the purpose to develop those parts by scientific men who are studying this question. I think if the Government had a plant, as it has in the case of powder and other things of that kind, it would develop men who would become expert along that line.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it proposed by the gentleman's project to manufacture the entire machine and airship?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Everything that they can manufacture. That would be my purpose, to have such a plant to manufacture every part of the machine and assemble them.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to the negative of the motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat startling to find out that the ships of our Navy have not got hull protection against submarines. When gentlemen say that, ship for ship, our Navy is as good as the German Navy I am not sure that they know what they are talking about. The German Navy, it is said, has 20 dreadnaughts with double bottoms. They were designed, I understand, with a view to withstanding the explosion of 200 pounds of picrate of ammonia, or guncotton. They have five dreadnaughts with triple bottoms, we are told. Those were built in consequence of experiments with 300 pounds of picrate of ammonia, or guncotton, an experiment such as is provided in the amendment which I suggested.

Now, what are the facts? We have had one or two experiments made, but I think that 200 pounds of explosive was all that was used.

There may have been another experiment, but we can not find out anything about this special hull protection in the hearings. Why? Because the committee struck out the special hull protection discussion when Capt. Winterhalter gave his testimony. We do know that the German dreadnaughts have got these double bottoms and these triple bottoms, and we know that, except for the *Pennsylvania*, the *Arizona*, the *California*, the *Mississippi*, and the *Idaho*, we have not attempted to provide these inner bottoms for our vessels. In December the *Pennsylvania* was 61.7 per cent finished, the *Arizona* 43.6 finished, down to the *Mississippi*, which is only 2 per cent finished, while the *Idaho* and the *California* have not yet been begun.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield.

Mr. FOWLER. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to why experiments have not been made on the bottoms of vessels?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I suppose that it is the same old story of dawdle, dawdle, dawdle.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs, Bureau of Ordnance: For necessary repairs to ordnance buildings, magazines, wharves, machinery, and other items of like character, $30,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking leave to print in the RECORD the letters of ex-Secretary Long and ex-Secretary Herbert, addressed to the present Secretary, relative to the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the communications referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the letters referred to:

COPY OF EX-SECRETARY LONG'S LETTER.

HINGHAM, MASS., *December 21, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I thank you for sending me your valuable and very interesting report as Secretary of the Navy. I am very much struck with the great development of the Navy since my day. I think that you are right, on the one hand, maintaining the present reasonable program of naval construction adapted to our ordinary preservation of the peace, but not, on the other hand, getting panic stricken over the present European condition, as if we were in danger of attack by the great nations which will come out of that conflict bankrupt and exhausted and recognizing the vital need of a long peace for their recuperation.

I am glad to see that your steps for promoting the efficiency and morale of the Navy—officers and men—by the expulsion of intoxicating liquors from the service is vindicated by the test of experience.

With all good wishes for your great department and with personal greetings of the Christmas season, I am,

Very truly, yours, JOHN D. LONG.

COPY OF EX-SECRETARY HERBERT'S LETTER.

1612 TWENTY-FIRST STREET,
January 30, 1915.

The honorable SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I followed in the newspapers with deep interest the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and now have to thank you for an official copy, an examination of which has much impressed me with the knowledge you have acquired of naval affairs and the readiness with which you have been able to use it as occasion has demanded.

Your explanation of what the President meant by saying that the administration was not "nervous or excited" and your elucidation of the present status of the Navy and the program of the department were capital. The old maxim, "Festina lente," never was more applicable than it is to our naval program now. But the horror of the war in Europe has swept many well-meaning people off of their feet, and there are even those who see political advantage in an attack on the Navy Department because you have not asked for larger appropriations; but, in my opinion, you can afford to stand pat where you are, first, because sound public sentiment in this country demands that politics be kept out of naval as well as out of foreign affairs, and, secondly, because now is precisely the time when we should keep cool and study carefully the lessons that are being taught by the war in Europe.

Let me reminisce a little. Thirty years ago the first Cleveland administration found that a modest but efficient beginning of a new Navy had been made under Arthur. The Democratic Naval Committee of the House at the session of 1885–86 reported a bill for quite a number of new ships. Tom Reed, the opposition leader, under the rules of the House for a time successfully obstructed its passage. The bill was tacked onto an appropriation bill, points of order evaded, and it passed.

Mr. Reed later thought better of the matter, and never again, either under Cleveland or his successor, Harrison, was there any partisan opposition to naval appropriations. When I became Secretary of the Navy one of the first to congratulate me and tell me that he had written to President Cleveland urging my appointment was Nelson Dingley, of Maine, and during my administration of the department Senators Chandler and Hale and other Republicans of the Senate Naval Committee cooperated with the Secretary of the Navy as heartily as did the Democrats in the House committee. And there was no politics in naval affairs under McKinley or Roosevelt or Taft, nor was there any in the discussions of the first bill under your administration; and, beyond all doubt, the orderly progress of the Navy for the last 18 months, as the hearings and your reports prior to the hearings clearly show, has been quite as rapid under you as it was under any of your predecessors. Under none of them was the Navy any better prepared for immediate war with a great power than now. All this the public will fully understand.

If the Navy is not to be made the football of politics, then should the Congress decide at this short session, just because there is a great war in Europe, on an extensive program of construction? We have already before us several lessons from this war about the efficiency of submarines, of contact mines, of fast fighting ships, of swift commerce destroyers, or long-range guns; and we have learned also something about aeroplanes and Zeppelins, but we do not know yet the relative values of all these or what are to be the decisive factors in the great naval war that is now on; and that, before it is ended, will try out to the utmost every implement of destruction that human ingenuity has been able to devise.

If Congress now appropriates, no matter how many millions, it must specify the amounts for each item, the department must begin work upon each and all, and it may be that before the program is fairly entered upon it will become clear that grave mistakes have been made and much money is being wasted.

Twelve months hence we shall know better how much we should expend for naval construction and what to spend it for. Congressman GARDNER, in introducing his "searchlight" resolution, said he was convinced that the German cause was "unholy and a menace to the principles of democracy," and further expressed his belief that "the god of battles will visit defeat upon the Germans." If Mr. GARDNER is right in his opinion and his prophecy proves correct, German menace to our democratic institutions will be removed, and that important fact will be up for consideration in future appropriations. On the other hand, if Germany should win, even though her success should be a vast menace to America, no one can for a moment believe that, exhausted as the winner in this great war will be when it is over, our country would be in danger of immediate attack from that quarter.

I have no doubt of the wisdom of your construction program.

Yours, sincerely,

H. A. HERBERT.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the letter from which I read extracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, not only upon this paragraph, but as to any other part of the bill that I may discuss in debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill generally. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: Fireproof general storehouse (cost not to exceed $225,000), to complete, $125,000; railroad system, improvements and extensions, $10,000; electric system, extensions, $10,000; in all, $145,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking permission to have the Clerk read at the desk, as my voice is bad, a letter from Admiral Fiske.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 1, 1915.

From: Board on torpedo shell.
To: The Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Experiments with Isham shell.

1. In obedience to your verbal instructions, the board on torpedo shell has the honor to report that in its opinion the experiments held with the Isham shell on January 27 were not conclusive and fell far short of demonstrating that the Isham shell can be considered an effective weapon of naval warfare. All the shell ricocheted that fell at distances of 8,000 yards or less. Out of seven fuses, only two operated correctly; and, the shell being filled with black powder only, no proof was given that if high explosive had been in the shell it could have been detonated by safe means. The experiments, however, are to be continued.

2. In regard to your additional instructions, that the board give its opinion as to the wisdom of the amendment adopted by the House, whereby "no part of the appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells of 12-inch caliber or larger, unless such shells are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10-inch Kruppized plates without breaking up the shell, fired with the standard service powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards," the board is of the opinion that such a provision would jeopardize the readiness of the Navy for war. We believe that our armor-piercing shell are as good as any that any antagonist could use against us and are as good as can be made in the present state of the metallurgical art.

B. A. FISKE, *Senior Member.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely: For books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery; operation or repair, purchase, maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes, and including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards; tools and repair of the same; stationery; furniture for Government houses and offices in navy yards and naval stations; coal and other fuel; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up yards and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, and fire apparatus and plants; incidental labor at navy yards; water tax, tolls, and ferriage; pay of watchmen in navy yards; awnings and packing boxes; and for pay of employees on leave, $1,595,496: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the navy yards and naval stations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $425,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why are motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles included for this bureau, which does not now have them?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that they have one.

Mr. MANN. Is it paid for out of this appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The existing law does not authorize it, as I recall. I believe the existing appropriation act provides for maintenance of horses, driving teams, and so forth, and of vehicles, including motor-propelled vehicles, for freight-carrying purposes only. Now, with an item in the current appropriation law like that, do they disregard it and go ahead?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think so. I am not sure that this is a passenger-carrying vehicle. I will have to look it up.

Mr. MANN. I just asked out of curiosity, to know whether they paid any attention to the law.

Mr. PADGETT. I assume that they observe it strictly.

Mr. MANN. If so, they have no motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle.

Mr. PADGETT. It is freight carrying only, as I understand.

Mr. MANN. Or else they intentionally deceived the committee and the House when they made their estimates, because the law reads:

And all vehicles, including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards.

If under an appropriation like that they operate passenger-carrying motor vehicles, it is intentional deceit. If they have any occasion for a motor-propelled vehicle, I have no objection to their having it. I simply take the gentleman's statement that they have one there under the current law. It may be that the gentleman was misinformed.

Mr. PADGETT. I can explain the matter to the gentleman now. There was an estimate submitted for a motor-propelled vehicle, and the committee disallowed it and did not include it, but we failed to correct this language here. They asked for a passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicle, and we did not give it to them.

Mr. MANN. Then they have not any now?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. Did they say they needed one?

Mr. PADGETT. They wanted one, but we did not give it to them.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to giving it to them if they need it.

Mr. PADGETT. But we did not report it.

Mr. MANN. But the committee did report it, and it is in the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. No; there is no authority to purchase.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether there is or not:

Operation or repair, purchase, maintenance of horses and driving teams, carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes.

That clearly authorizes the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles for passenger-carrying purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The other day the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked with reference to the item in the bill appropriating $14,000 for lepers. A general statement was made, but I have here a specific statement giving the information in detail. I ask to have that printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 1, 1915.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: That you may be able to give further enlightenment to those desiring information with respect to the lepers of Guam, I desire to place the following facts before you.

In January, 1912, there were 23 lepers recluded on the island of Guam, but even though segregated it was deemed advisable, in order to effectually and permanently eradicate the disease from this island, to remove therefrom every source from which leper bacilli was transmitted. Accordingly the governor of Guam, in the spring of 1912, sought and secured the permission of the Governor General of the Philippines to transfer all Guam lepers to the island of Culion, in the Philippines, where the Philippine Government had established a leper colony for the segregation and treatment of lepers found among the inhabitants of the Philippines, with the view to the ultimate elimination of leprosy from those islands.

Culion is well isolated, is roughly 20 by 40 miles in size, and is located about 240 miles southeast of Manila. The lepers are permitted to establish themselves at any place on this island, and if they desire to take up farming the necessary animals and implements are provided at Government expense. In actual practice, however, it is found that they practically all live in the town of Culion, where everything is furnished for them by the Philippine Government. A large modern hospital has been established for those who are bedfast or those who desire to undergo special treatment. The town is located on an elevated site, has a modern sewage system, and is practically controlled by regulations and ordinances which the lepers themselves make.

The permission for the transfer of Guam lepers to Culion was conditional upon the Navy providing the transportation and bearing the cost of their maintenance after establishment there. The Comptroller of the Treasury held that the appropriation as then phrased would not permit of expenditures on account of their transfer to and maintenance at Culion, and the department then asked that the wording of the appropriation be extended, which was done in the naval act approved August 22, 1912. In the following December the transfer was made.

It was stated in the last annual report of the governor of Guam that there were 17 Guam lepers at Culion and that during the fiscal year 1914 they had cost the Government $7.65 per leper per month, which would make the yearly cost of maintaining 17 lepers $1,560.60. However, during the present fiscal year, the report states, the cost will be $8.79 per man per month, owing to certain ration changes made in pursuance of complaint by the lepers.

In 1914, according to our records, this appropriation was deficient by $310.69. Besides maintaining the lepers in Culion it is charged with the pay of the hospital force at Guam, amounting to a trifle over $3,000 per annum, with the rations of patients and nurses amounting, in round numbers, to $8,000 per annum, with the cost of hospital supplies and drugs amounting to about $3,000 per annum, with repairs and general items of maintenance varying in cost, and sundry charges, the aggregate of which would exceed the appropriation if assistance were not given by the Bureaus of Medicine and Surgery and Yards and Docks.

This is the only special appropriation which is made for expenditure at Guam, the island, apart from the naval station, being self-supporting, but not sufficiently so to get along without this aid, unless heavier taxes were levied, which, it is understood, the people can ill afford to bear.

Very sincerely, JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.: Dredging, to continue, $20,000; paving and grading, to continue, $10,000; in all, $30,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill how it happens that it costs just exactly $10,000 in many cases to do the dredging every year?

Mr. PADGETT. The dredging amounts to more than that; but those are the items submitted to do that much of it during the year.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that they always have the same amount.

Mr. PADGETT. Not always; but in this bill we allowed generally $10,000 for each item.

Mr. MADDEN. Last year the items for given work were just exactly the same.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not know whether they had any systematic way of reaching what it really cost or whether they just guessed at it and put that figure in.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the estimates submitted were more than that, but that was the amount that was allowed to do the work during the current year.

Mr. MADDEN. How did the committee reach the conclusion that $10,000 was just the right sum?

Mr. PADGETT. Those were the amounts submitted by the department.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought the gentleman said the estimates were a good deal more.

Mr. PADGETT. The estimates that came from the yards.

Mr. BUTLER. But the department said they could get along with $10,000 in each case.

Mr. MADDEN. I was struck by the similarity of the amount in each case, and I wondered whether it was just a haphazard way of making the appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it was done in the way I have stated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Cal.: Dredging and diking, to continue, $20,000; railroad system, extensions, $10,000; garbage crematory, $7,500; improvements and extensions to distributing systems, $15,000; oil storage, $12,500; in all, $65,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out the last word. I notice that in nearly all the items for the different navy yards there is an extension of the railroad system. I was wondering whether they were tearing up the yards and reconstructing the railroad tracks, or whether it was necessary to build new railroads in every yard, or whether the extensions went beyond the yards, or where they went to, and what they were built for, and why it was necessary to continue building new railroads every year.

Mr. PADGETT. The railroad does not go out of the yard, but it is to reach different parts of the yard where the shops are located. The reason why the appropriation extends through different years is because Congress does not appropriate the amount asked in one year to complete the work.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles of railroad are built in any one yard?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell.

Mr. MADDEN. In a given year?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not run up into miles.

Mr. MADDEN. If it does not run up into miles, I could build a mile of railroad in one of these yards for less than $10,000; and if it costs $10,000 every year, it seems to me that there must be a good many miles of railroad, or else a lot of extravagance, I do not know which.

Mr. PADGETT. The road runs from one portion of the yard to another.

Mr. MADDEN. If you lay a railroad track once, it is laid permanently unless you tear the shops down, locate them in another place, and want to build new tracks to the different shops. If the shops are located in a permanent place, the railroad must be permanent; and if they are, why rebuild them?

Mr. PADGETT. I will call the gentleman's attention to this statement in the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is for "railroad system, extensions, $10,000."

Admiral STANFORD. It is desired to double-track Mare Island Avenue in front of building 69, to extend the track in the northern part of the yard around the old machine shop, to install an extension to the south to Dry Dock No. 2, and to provide additional cars.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I should think there would be an item here for the purchase of cars.

Mr. PADGETT. It says railroad-system extension. It extends the tracks and the operating part of it, too.

Mr. MADDEN. I can not read that language with that understanding. The only thing I can see in the language employed in this section is the authority to extend the railroad system, and that means tracks.

Mr. PADGETT. The system is not limited to tracks.

Mr. MADDEN. It is where I was brought up.

Mr. PADGETT. Any system could not be very well operated if it had nothing but tracks.

Mr. MADDEN. The system is one thing and the equipment is another.

Mr. PADGETT. It all comes under the word "system."

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so. It seems to me that the language ought to be so clear that the department authorized to expend the money should not be authorized to expend money for any purpose except that set forth in the bill. It is not right,

it is not fair, and it is not frank to the House to come in with a provision in the bill authorizing the extension of railroad tracks and then use any part of it for equipment and operation.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not say "tracks"; it says "system."

Mr. MADDEN. And the gentleman believed when he introduced the language that "system" covered everything?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not introduce it.

Mr. BUTLER. This is not a new appropriation, the amount is different.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman to strike out the last word. The language in this bill regarding this appropriation is the usual language; it has been used in every appropriation bill for years. It says "for railroad system extensions." That does not mean for the extension of the rails alone. Railroad extension means the upkeep, double-tracking, buying new cars, and repairing the old cars. I venture to say that the railroad system in which my friend from Illinois is interested, and from which he draws some little profit, has to be kept up, and tracks once laid have to be relaid, and cars have to be repaired, and sometimes new cars have to be built. "For railroad system extension" does not mean for the extension of the line and nothing else, but includes double-tracking, repairs, and other items incidental to improvement and maintenance of the road. As a matter of efficiency and economy the railroad at Mare Island should be kept in repair, double-tracked, and from time to time extended. To permit of that is the purpose of this item in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.: Dredging, to continue, $15,000; railroad system, extensions, $25,000; building slip for submarines, $20,000; in all, $60,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, after line 13, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to exchange certain land at the navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash., not needed for naval purposes for certain other land of equal value adjacent to and lying outside of the present boundaries of said yard, and to execute and to accept on behalf of the United States such papers as may be necessary and appropriate to effect the exchange: *Provided*, That before said exchange is effected the Attorney General shall pass upon the sufficiency of the title to the land proposed to be conveyed to the United States."

Mr. MANN. To that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from Assistant Secretary Roosevelt of the Navy and a report of the board. They are not very long, and accompanying them is a map of the lands. I will ask the Clerk to read the letter and the report in my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. This amendment was not called to the attention of the committee?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it was sent to me a little while ago. It is simply to exchange a little lot that they do not need and to get one that they do need.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 1¼, 1914.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: I have the honor to submit the following statement in respect to the desirability of exchanging certain naval land at the navy yard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash., for certain land adjacent to this yard and now in private ownership.

The principal entrance gate to the navy yard used by the civil employees is located at the foot of Chester Street, Bremerton. This street for a distance of about 330 feet along the navy-yard boundary has a width of only 30 feet. On the westerly side of the street and abutting the main entrance gate to the yard a general store is located. In February, 1913, the proprietor of this store was granted by the city authorities a license to establish a pool room, and the commandant at the yard learned that he was also taking steps to purchase the property. The litter around this store has been very objectionable for some time past, and with the increased use of the Chester Street entrance gate, due to the closing of the Warren Street gate, the objectionable features have become more noticeable.

The particular property on which this store is located has since been purchased by Mr. C. E. Thomas, president of the First National Bank at Bremerton, the purchase having been made by Mr. Thomas at the request of the commandant of the yard, and with the understanding that title to the property was to be transferred to the Government in exchange for other land of equal value at the navy yard that was not needed for naval purposes. This understanding between the commandant and Mr. Thomas was approved by the department, and Mr. Thomas was advised that the department "will take steps to have the exchange authorized by Congress."

In order to fix an equitable basis on which the proposed exchange might be accomplished, a board of naval officers at the yard was appointed by the commandant to consider the matter. This board (copy of report herewith) found that the Government could with advantage exchange four lots at the foot of Park Avenue (formerly Dock Street) for the two lots on Chester Street, saying "that an exchange on this basis will be fair to both parties."

The present owner of the Chester Street lots has expressed his willingness to effect the exchange of lands on the basis outlined by the board.

The two lots on Chester Street are designated as lots Nos. 1 and 2, block 1, Phillip's addition, Bremerton. These lots are each 30 by 140 feet, and contain a total of about 8,400 square feet.

The four lots of naval land proposed to be given in exchange were originally described as lot No. 48, block 14, and lots Nos. 21, 22, and 23, block 19, Bremerton. These lots are each 30 by 100 feet and contain a total area of about 12,000 square feet. These four lots are a part of the tract of 17½ lots in Bremerton acquired by the Government under deed dated June 6, 1900, at a total cost of $1,000. The purchase of these lots was authorized by the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., 1035), as additional land to protect the water supply at the navy yard. Since the purchase of this land other arrangements have been made in respect to the water-supply system at the yard and little or no use has been made of the land that it is proposed to give up, nor have public improvements been placed thereon.

It is considered that it would be of material benefit to the public interest for the Government to acquire the two lots at the Chester Street entrance gate to the yard, and that for this land the naval property described above may be exchanged without detriment to the public interests.

In view of the foregoing, I have to respectfully submit the matter to the consideration of the Committee on Naval Affairs with the recommendation, in case such action meets with the approval of the committee, that there be included in the naval bill a clause authorizing the effecting of the proposed exchange.

For the convenience of the committee there is inclosed a draft of a clause that will, it is believed, cover the matter.

There is also inclosed a blue print showing in red the two tracts of land mentioned.

Sincerely, yours, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary.

Hon. LEMUEL P. PADGETT, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

(3 inclosures.)

(Draft of clause, proposed to be inserted in naval bill, authorizing exchange of certain land at the navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.)

NAVY YARD, PUGET SOUND, WASH., *February 24, 1913.*

From: Commander A. H. Robertson, United States Navy; Assistant Civil Engineer R. M. Warfield, United States Navy; Paymaster's Clerk A. G. King, United States Navy.
To: Commandant.
Subject: Exchange of certain lots.
Reference: Commandant's order F-1464, February 20, 1913.

1. In compliance with your order appointing us a board to ascertain valuation of lots Nos. 1 and 2, block 1, Phillip's addition to Bremerton, and to decide what portion of lots owned by the Navy Department on Fourth Street, Bremerton, are of equal value to the two lots above referred to, the board finds that lots Nos. 1 and 2, block 1, Phillip's addition to Bremerton, are valued at $3,600. This includes a two-story house located on lot No. 1. The value of these lots is dependent upon their location adjacent to Chester Street gate and also by the beautiful view obtained from them of the water front. It is believed that lots Nos. 21, 22, and 23, block 19, together with lot 48, block 14, facing on Fourth Street, are of equal value to the above-mentioned lots and improvements. Lots owned by the Navy Department are on low land and are not as desirable for residence property, and at the present time can not be considered as business property. It is believed that an exchange on this basis will be fair to both parties.

2. There is forwarded herewith blue print of plan No. 2A-222, showing position of lots referred to. Attention is invited to the fact that lots Nos. 1 and 2 of block 1, Phillip's addition to Bremerton, are approximately 30 feet by 140 feet each, whereas lots owned by the Navy Department are approximately 30 feet by 103 feet each.

A. H. ROBERTSON.
R. M. WARFIELD.
A. G. KING.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have very little information other than is set forth in the communication that has just been read. I know something about the conditions personally, and I am satisfied that it would be to the advantage of the Government and the public to have this exchange made. Of course, it is true that it is somewhat complicated, and I wish, under the circumstances, that the gentleman from Illinois would withhold his point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question—whether he thinks it a very good method of legislation for the Navy Department to expect us to authorize an exchange of lands that can just as well be made next year, or could have been made last year, upon a letter read at the desk, so that no one has an opportunity to understand the facts?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the navy yard at Bremerton at times needs more land. I want to call the attention of Members to the fact this proposed exchange has never been referred to me, although I lived at Bremerton for 10 years and up to the time I was elected to Congress two years ago. If this transfer was to be made, it would seem that, owing to my personal knowledge of all the facts, some reference would have been made to me, so that I could know when the matter was coming up and could give the House the benefit of my first-hand knowledge of the situation. Mr. Thomas, president of the First National Bank, referred to in the departmental letter, is, or was until recently, president of the Bremerton Commercial Club, and in more or less continuous correspondence with me; and of course he could write me quite easily.

These four lots which it is proposed to transfer to Mr. Thomas are part of what is generally known as Burwell Park. They were acquired by the Government to protect the yard water supply while the village of Bremerton was very small and when wells were used. These lots are not now needed for that purpose. That statement is true. Further, I will say there has not been complete and adequate improvement of the area as a park, nor has the Government made a permanent dedication of it for such purposes. Permission to so use it has been granted. Some trees were planted by a women's organization, a band stand was erected at public expense raised by popular subscription at a mass meeting in the park, and a lawn-tennis court was laid out and established by clerks in the yard. I am not sure that the four lots particularly involved actually contain the tennis court or the stand, but the whole area has been fenced and improved as a public area. The boys play ball on one part of the tract. It stands as a recreation ground which may be further improved later. A very substantial sum, more than the entire value of the Chester Avenue lots, was spent by the Government and the city in leveling these Park Avenue lots and in grading and sidewalking the streets.

Those four lots on Park Avenue that are to be exchanged for the two lots on Chester Avenue are worth, each of them, the equivalent of three, or to be safe I will say two, of the Chester Avenue lots. In other words, if this deal were to go through, the Government would give four lots each of which is worth twice as much as the Chester Avenue lots for two. The Park Avenue lots are within one block of the principal business section and paved streets of the city of Bremerton. It is proposed to give four of those lots right next to the business section of Bremerton for two lots away up on the hill in the residence section. I lived within half a block of these two lots the Governments is to acquire and passed by both tracts every morning and evening for years, and I have passed on an abstract of title, acting as attorney in the sale of two lots adjoining the lots the Government is to part with, so that I know the facts about the matter, and I repeat, one lot on Park Avenue is easily worth two lots up on Chester Avenue, and the exchange would be a gross injustice. The Government would give up at least four dollars for one, and there is a great demand for those other lots that are down on Park Avenue. They are right next to the Masonic Hall, and close to the business section. They are valuable and the lots on the hill are of intrinsically much less value.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman thinks that I really performed a public service when I reserved the point of order?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I think the gentleman did; but I am sure the House would have voted it down, even if the point of order had not been reserved, after the information I am able to give to the House.

Mr. MANN. But I think it was safer to really reserve it than to depend upon the gentleman's argument. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, but I would have had the gentleman from Illinois as a recruit and support.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the name of the banker who tried to make this exchange?

Mr. BRYAN. C. E. Thomas, president of the First National Bank. I suppose a good exchange of land appeals to him as strong as to anyone else. He is a very nice gentleman, however.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, I know. He may be clean and sweet, all right; but is he in the habit of working jobs of this kind?

Mr. BRYAN. He looks out for Mr. Thomas; but he is a gentleman of the very highest standing.

Mr. BATHRICK. What is the name of the commandant who was willing to have the banker put up the job?

Mr. BRYAN. That is the trouble about our navy yard commandants. The commandants are itinerants. They come and go, and instead of having an industrial management—a man to look after the manufacture and business of the yard—we put in itinerant admirals, one after another, who have very little interest in or knowledge of local conditions as a rule. Sometimes we get a good one and sometimes we do not. If you were to impose on an ordinary private shipbuilding plant the admiral that very often goes to these yards, the shipbuilding plant would give the admiral $5,000 a year to stay away. We do not manage our yards for industrial efficiency. We ought not to leave it to an admiral to manage them, but we ought to leave it to some one who is versed in the management and manufacture of things that are to be produced at the yards. We should have some kind of industrial management such as the Secretary of the Navy is now advising.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want a moment to say that this matter has been investigated by the department and is recommended by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The department appointed a board, and that board investigated the matter, and reports in detail. I do not jump to violent conclusions with the rapidity with which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] does. I shall accept the statements of the gentleman with many grains of salt.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I just wanted to suggest to the chairman that I am well acquainted with the banker, Mr. Thomas. I have known him a great many years, and I know nothing whatever to his discredit, unless it be that he is the leading Democrat in the city. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRYAN. I lived there about 10 years, and the exchange would be at least four dollars to one against the Government.

I must add, under the consent granted, that the use of this Park Avenue property for speculation by Mr. Thomas or anyone else would be a distinct loss and a source of great regret to the men and women of Bremerton. It would be very unfortunate for the Government to part with it unless it transferred it to the local public authorities for use of the public. I have hoped to see a public building erected there or a building erected by some philanthropic person for a naval Young Men's Christian Association. The Park Avenue lots are so located as to be of great value for such a purpose, right in the heart of the city as they are. We blackballed the liquor traffic out of the State of Washington at the last election, and there should be a gymnasium and reading room for the Navy boys on one corner and the civilians on the other. There are four corners here owned by the Government, outside of the navy yard, on Park Avenue. I have valued them very low when I put that value at two to one for the property up the hill at Chester Avenue. This Park Avenue corner would be an ideal location for a Government post-office building if the park features are to be eliminated. There are 19 lots in the tract. They extend from Burwell Street—formerly Third Street—to Fourth, with Park Avenue running through the tract, thus providing four admirable corners. To expedite the parking of the lots, the city some years ago vacated an alley running east and west through them. To devote that alley area to private speculation would be a gross injustice.

The alleyway should be returned to the public if the Government does not propose to retain it. I have no grievance against Mr. Thomas, but I say here that it is my duty as a Representative of the rank and file at Bremerton as well as the speculators to do all I can to prevent this property being handed over to private parties to the detriment of the public and all parties interested except through speculation. I will add this, which may help to explain the situation: Certain splendid gentlemen who are officers in the Navy own the Kitsap Inn, a high-class apartment and boarding house, very near to this side entrance to the navy yard on Chester Avenue. Of course, the owners of this inn would be advantaged by the Government taking over the Chester Avenue lots and beautifying them in front of their property. At present the workingmen of the yard stop at this little store as they go to and come from work and buy their tobacco and something for their noon lunch, and so forth. The inn owners would doubtless prefer not to have this little workman's store so near their apartment. This letter from the Navy Department might be deemed to indicate that this Chester Avenue entrance to the navy yard was the main entrance. Such is not the case. The main entrance is about half a mile away on Front Street, in the business section of the city. This is a side entrance far removed from the business activity and main Front Street entrance to the yard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval proving ground, Indianhead, Md.: Toward extension of powder factory (cost not to exceed $500,000), to complete public work features, $158,380.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph for the purpose of getting a little information. As I recall, in the current appropriation law for this fiscal year we provided for this extension of the powder factory at the naval proving grounds, and appropriated not to exceed $500,000.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. And this bill carries two items designed to complete the appropriation of the $500,000?

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. And there will be no other appropriation in order next year under that original authorization?

Mr. PADGETT. None whatever beyond this one and one following later.

Mr. MANN. Well, this one and the one on page 17.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval magazine, Fort Mifflin, Pa.: One shell house, $25,000; fixed ammunition storehouse, $13,000; one magazine, $13,000; reforming plant extension, $7,000; railroad system, extensions, $6,000; in all, $64,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I just wish to make a few remarks in connection with the letter which the chairman has just read from the senior member of the Board on Ordnance and Equipment, Navy Department. I think it is only just and fair to have a proper impression prevail as to the experiments which were actually made and their result. That letter says:

The board on torpedo shell has the honor to report that in its opinion the experiments held with the Isham shell on January 27 were not conclusive and fell far short of demonstrating that the Isham shell can be considered an effective weapon of naval warfare. All the shell ricocheted that fell at distances of 8,000 yards or less.

The armor-piercing shell fired at 12,000, or even 14,000, yards ricochets. The Isham shell if fired at 8,000, 6,000, 4,000, and 2000 yards, with one bag instead of two bags of powder, would ricochet at all these ranges. The shell bites the water and goes under, making an underwater run. This would give the impression that in the experiment the shell failed, as far as the ricochet test was concerned. On the contrary, every shell fired at 10,000 yards bit the water and went under. Now, there were three shells fired at 10,000 yards, all of which bit the water and made the underwater run. Two of them had their fuses operate out of the three. There were three fired and two fuses operated. All but the first one operated, and that one was a peculiar one and marked "No. 4." It was stated in advance that would not count, but they wanted this fired for certain experimental purposes. The question of fuses and the question of ricocheting are entirely different. The impression prevailing from the letter read would indicate failure in both features. The shell does bite, and with slight modifications the shell would bite even more than it bit before, and the fuse does operate, and it is believed that the fuse, with slight change, would operate even when the shell ricocheted. A change of the size of a little hole in connection with the locking and unlocking device of the shell, the effect of one-eighth of an inch in the size of the hole, it is believed will make all the fuses operate. Now, the reason why——

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I will.

Mr. HENSLEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what encouragement, if any, has ever been given this man Isham in the construction of these shells by the Naval Establishment? In other words, has he had any encouragement, or has he had——

Mr. HOBSON. I will answer that question by citing the experience in the development of this fuse. A fuse is one of the most delicate pieces of mechanism in all the world. I do not except clockwork; I do not except torpedoes or anything else; the fuse is the most delicate, complex, complicated piece of mechanism in the world. We are to-day probably not over the experimental stage with the fuse that is used in the armor-piercing shell; that to-day is partially unsettled, for it was not certain in the failure of the armor-piercing shell whether the fault was in the shell or in the fuse; we have experimented for 25 years on the armor-piercing shell fuse, and the Government itself has spent thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars in helping inventors to develop these fuses. Mr. Isham requested that he be allowed to use simply the machine tools down at the navy yard, tools of precision, for developing his fuse. The board, of which Admiral Fiske is chairman, recommended that the Navy Department allow him to go and use those tools of precision, but the Bureau of Ordnance refused to do it, and Mr. Isham had to go to a boiler shop and make these fuses by himself. Think of that; to make this complicated piece of mechanism in a boiler shop, and then to go down and fire them, and two out of three operated.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I will.

Mr. COOPER. What reason did the Bureau of Ordnance give for denying him the request?

Mr. HOBSON. Oh, they said that if Mr. Isham's shell failed he would lay the blame to them, and Mr. Isham repeatedly and repeatedly and repeatedly disclaimed that he would lay any blame to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. The information I have from the Navy Department, and what I have in addition, is that Mr. Isham accused the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance of all sorts of misrepresentations and wrongdoings, not only the present chief but the former, Admiral Twining, and when this matter came up Admiral Strauss stated to him, "You have it made wherever you want to, get any concern in the United States to make it for you, and we will pay for it, but we do not want to assume the responsibility of making it when you have accused the department of all sorts of corruption and malfeasance and misfeasance and wrongdoing." He said, "You have it made wherever you select in the United States, and we will pay the bill."

Mr. COOPER. Would that contract have bound the department? How could Mr. Isham, a poor man, as I understand him to be, go to some private manufacturing establishment and say, "The Bureau of Ordnance said if I came and had this work done they would pay for it." What sort of a contract would that be?

Mr. PADGETT. The department proceeded to give him assurance they would pay for it, and he could have it done at any place he might select.

Mr. COOPER. Assurance in writing?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not know that it reached that far. Mr. Isham declined to do it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Is it not also a fact that Mr. Isham has accused the officials of both the Navy Department and the War Department in years past of not handling his experiments properly, of so conducting them, the material, particularly, as to prejudice the success of his experiments?

Mr. HOBSON. He certainly has made that accusation a hundred times.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And is it anything strange that any official of the Government to-day should decline to take the responsibility of making anything connected with his experiments?

Mr. HOBSON. Of course, it is not the chief of bureau, and that is why we had to have a board appointed.

Mr. PADGETT. And that board was appointed at the request of Admiral Strauss.

Mr. HOBSON. And I was with him when we decided that was the only thing to do.

Mr. PADGETT. I suggested, in face of all these accusations that were made, to have the board appointed, of which Admiral Fiske is president. I want to state another fact, that the department has spent over $300,000 heretofore experimenting with and trying to develop this Isham shell.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is a thousand miles wrong in that statement. Most of the money has been spent on the A. P. shell.

Mr. PADGETT. These experiments were made at the request of Mr. Isham and under his direction, to demonstrate his theories.

Mr. HOBSON. Demonstrate no theories. It was to demonstrate whether the A. P. shell is effective or not, and we found it was not. The money should be charged to the A. P. shell. There has been only the smallest amount comparatively spent to develop the Isham shell.

Mr. COOPER. What is the A. P. shell?

Mr. HOBSON. The armor-piercing shell on which the Navy now depends.

I am glad the chairman of the committee has brought out the question of personal equation which has existed for 13 years between the chiefs of bureau of both the Army and the Navy Departments in regard to this line of experiment. To start with, as the gentleman has stated, the chief of bureau did not wish to have anything to do with it. When the chief of bureau washed his hands and let it go to the board he was free from responsibility. But when the request was made of the Navy Department to let Mr. Isham use the instruments of precision at the navy yard there was no question of responsibility of the chief of the bureau. Moreover, the chief of the bureau told Mr. Isham if he did make the fuses outside they would pay for them. Mr. Isham made the fuses in a boiler shop

with crude tools and a small number of workmen, and the sum total of cost was but a few hundred dollars, but the chief of bureau declined to pay the bill. With the labor and material on these first fuses, the cost averaged about $37, but the chief of the bureau told him that he could get fuses for $10 apiece on the average, and that he would pay only $10 apiece for them. That is the way he is expending $300,000 on developing the Isham shell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes' additional time.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Chairman. If we are to be kept here by the committee until we read to a certain point in the bill, I think we ought to confine ourselves to the items in the bill.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I have seen the gentleman from Illinois sit right here and make points of order that took hours and hours of our time. He is not the man to put up to me the question of wasting the time of this committee.

Mr. MANN. I object, then.

Mr. HOBSON. I expected the gentleman to object. The gentleman has objected to more meritorious propositions than any man that ever lived, and I dare say he is proud of his record.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Alabama is never here, anyway, unless he is personally interested in something.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval magazine, Puget Sound, Wash.: Shell house, $15,000; 2 magazines, $30,000; storage sheds, $4,000; house on pier, $2,000; pier extension, $4,000; lightning protection, $3,000; in all, $58,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to continue my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I will say that Mr. Isham never expected his shell——

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. HOBSON. I will ask the Chair to rule on the point as to whether I am in order or not.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. That the gentleman from Alabama is not talking to the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. If magazines do not have something to do with the storage of shells, then I do not know what they are for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Depots for coal and other fuel: For additional fuel-oil storage at Melville, R. I., $40,000; additional fuel-oil storage at Norfolk, Va., $90,000; fuel-oil storage at San Diego, Cal., $40,000; fuel-oil storage at Puget Sound, Wash., $80,000; fuel-oil storage at Mare Island, Cal., $80,000; fuel-oil storage at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $50,000; fuel-oil storage at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $80,000; custody and care of naval petroleum reserves, $10,000; contingent, $30,000; in all, $500,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOBSON. I desire, Mr. Chairman, under the practices of the House on the pro forma amendment to discuss matters strictly relating to this bill.

Mr. Isham considered it doubtful if his shell would bite under 8,000 yards. He expected ricochets at that and shorter ranges. He did not assume that his fuses would always operate in cases of ricochets, though he expected them to do so. The fact that the fuses did not operate under ricochets shows remarkable safety of the fuse when the locking piece is not released. Mr. Isham now renews his request that he be allowed to make good slight defects in his fuse at the navy yard, and then that experiments will go on with his fuse in shell charged with T. N. T.

The board, in a letter to Mr. Isham received by him to-day, says:

The board has now reached a stage in its proceedings where it considers it desirable to take up the question of the ability of your fuse to detonate the high explosive now used in the naval service.

This practically means that they regard the tests of the fuse on the 27th were successful.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What is that?

Mr. HOBSON. Trinitotoluol. That is a high explosive, though not as strong as nitrogelatin. The Navy Department is loath to use nitrogelatin, which would be the most powerful, although it has been fired under these experiments without exploding. Nevertheless, Mr. Isham has designed a shell now to carry the Navy Department's T. N. T., which the Navy Department says is safe in every respect. The final success of this new type now depends upon whether this fuse, with its construction, will successfully explode T. N. T.

Now, in the construction of the fuse you will find that the delay part comes from the train. At the end of the train a fulminate goes off, and that sets off the booster, and that sets off the charge. The Navy Department has developed boosters and the fuse used for the fulminate at the end of the train, so that the whole question is a question of practical operation. There is no question of principle involved or a question of further invention. It is simply an adaptation to really try whether in actual practice this fuse does do what the tests the other day indicated it would do.

In the second paragraph the board goes on to say that they believe that our armor-piercing shell is as good as any shell of that type that might be used against us by a foreign enemy. It does not say that that is the only type, nor does it say that that is the type that would be used against us.

Now, I am convinced by my experiments for the last few years in connection with the subcommittee that every nation in the world with the present art can develop the power of the torpedo shell, and I assume they have developed it, and that would be the one department of their development that would not be known and given out. The assumption by the board that our armor-piercing shell is as good as the armor-piercing shell of other nations may be correct, although I am not so sure. We may have a good armor-piercing shell, but in the statement of the board we find an admission that they do not expect either the 12-inch shell or 14-inch shell to penetrate 10 inches of armor at ordinary battle ranges. This is conclusive evidence that it is of the utmost importance that torpedo-shell attack should be developed as fast as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to get some information about this paragraph. Am I in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Will the chairman of the committee explain whether these items for additional fuel-oil storage at the points named are for construction work?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is new.

Mr. MOORE. Does this mean more oil tanks or more fuel to go into oil tanks?

Mr. PADGETT. It means more oil tanks.

Mr. MOORE. It means the construction of tanks only?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made by my colleague [Mr. DIES] at the banquet in Baltimore of the Manufacturers' Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by his colleague [Mr. DIES] on the occasion named. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the appropriation of $400,000 for erection on the Isthmus of Panama of barracks, quarters, and other buildings for accommodation of marines, contained in the act of March 4, 1913, is hereby reappropriated, and $200,000 thereof made available for the erection of marine barracks at Mare Island, Cal., and $200,000 thereof made available for the erection of marine barracks at Norfolk, Va.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] make points of order against the paragraph. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations: For repairs and preservation at navy yards, coaling depots, coaling plants, and stations, $1,097,436.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. What is the proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman, if he will reserve his objection a moment, that I tried to obtain time during general debate, but could not.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman could not have done that. There was a considerable time on general debate that was not used.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I could not get time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman could have secured time. I am not willing to stay here and allow people to talk until to-morrow morning on subjects outside the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I move to strike out the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. There will be debate. I will say to the gentleman, in the next few days, when the gentleman can get in.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I am going to talk on war, and this bill applies to war effectively, and I think I shall discuss the subject as closely as it has been discussed this afternoon.

Mr. MANN. I am going to object unless the gentleman confines himself to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. My remarks may perhaps be unique. Although the gentleman may not think so, I do. My constituents are greatly disturbed over this war situation.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is not discussing the subject before the committee. I think no paragraph has been read since the last one went out on a point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. The gentleman can not know what I am going to talk about.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska will confine himself to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for 10 minutes, as he deems proper, to discuss this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS] may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to my friend from Nebraska that there will be ample opportunity in a few days to come in on some bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I know, Mr. Chairman; but I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that I want to talk now about a particular thing, and I have special reasons for it. Of course, he can object if he desires to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

THE PROPOSED EMBARGO ON THE EXPORT OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly, principally for the benefit of many of my constituents, House joint resolution 377, which proposes an embargo on arms and ammunition destined for the belligerent nations now at war in Europe. There is a very vigorous propaganda being waged throughout the United States in favor of this resolution, with the result that thousands of naturalized citizens of this country are being misled into believing that this Nation is not now observing neutrality in its intercourse with the belligerents.

The result of this agitation is the receipt of a flood of letters and petitions by Members of Congress requesting them to support this resolution. The petitions are nearly all alike, showing a common origin, and from all sections of the country, indicating a nation-wide movement directed from a central organization. The letters and petitions almost always, directly or indirectly, ridicule the Nation's apparent inconsistency in praying for peace while we permit the export of arms and ammunitions to the belligerents. The letters clearly show that they have been influenced by reading bitter attacks against this Government charging it with failure to enforce neutrality. The German-American is among the most loyal of our citizenship, and these printed attacks, paid for, no doubt, at space rates, have done him a great injustice by leading some to believe he is not loyal to his own adopted country. No greater mistake could be made. The naturalized American is for his adopted country first, and he wants his adopted country to keep hands off the European situation, and I want him to know that that is exactly what his country is doing.

One of my correspondents had been so inflamed by the misrepresentations he had read that he was led to ask me if I had a son-in-law in England who had told me to oppose the resolution, which indicates the methods employed to injure the administration in the eyes of our naturalized American citizens. For the benefit of my correspondent and for the purpose of qualifying myself to discuss the subject impartially in the eyes of those who favor this resolution, and who usually charge everyone who is not in favor of it as being a partisan of England, I will state that I am a full-blood German by descent on my own account. Upon the account of my wife we have several first cousins, natives of Germany by naturalized parents, who are now fighting in the kaiser's army, if they have not already given their lives for their country. We are very much concerned about the welfare of these relatives, and our natural sympathies for Germany are very great. But we have no political sympathies whatever as between the belligerents. We refuse to permit the call of the blood to bias our political judgment in passing upon a national policy.

NOT A MORAL QUESTION.

Many, if not all, of my correspondents base their support of this resolution upon high moral grounds. My own contention is that it is not a moral question in a general sense at all. It is purely an economical question at this stage of our evolution. There is just one class of people who have any logical right to consider this question from a moral point of view, and that class is so small it is not worth considering. In fact, I am not certain that such a class exists except in theory. I refer to the class that is in favor of peace at any price; the class that is ready to disband the Army, scrap the Navy, and demolish our seacoast defenses and undertake to lead a Christlike existence in this world of riot and ruin and rapine. Those who have faith enough to embark the Nation upon the sea of "peace at any price" have a right to base their support of this resolution on moral grounds; because if it is wrong to sell arms to belligerent nations now, it was wrong to sell arms and ammunition to them in times of peace, when they were preparing for this war. If it was wrong for us to make arms and ammunition in times of peace for sale to other nations at peace, it necessarily follows that it is wrong for us to make arms and ammunition to use ourselves; because if it is wrong to make arms and ammunition to sell to others, to be used with which to kill their enemies, it necessarily follows that it is wrong for us to make arms and ammunition with which to kill our own enemies.

Therefore, if there is any moral side in this question at all it leads us straight as a line to the absolute prohibition of the manufacture of arms of any kind or character. And if we adopt this end of the dilemma, we are led absolutely to the peace-at-any-price program and to the absolute prohibition of the manufacture of arms and ammunition for war purposes. We would then be led to an abandonment of our Army and Navy and our seacoast defenses and accept whatever consequences might follow. Now, those who believe in this doctrine of "peace at any price" have a right to base their support of this resolution upon moral grounds. Those who do not believe in it have a moral right to continue to sell arms and ammunition to be used by belligerent nations, because they contend that it is a moral right for them to use them in the defense of themselves. Therefore I dismiss the moral phases of this question as irrelevant and immaterial, having no value in this argument.

It is true there will be many, either through superficial thinking or hypocrisy, who will harp upon our wickedness in permitting a few exports of arms and ammunition, while at the same time they will aid and abet their own Nation in maintaining a reasonable Army and Navy against the day we may want to begin the slaughter of innocents on our own account.

It is an honest war when we wage it, but brutal and unjust war when waged by other nations; brutal murder when other nations indulge in the pastime of killing each other, but when we kill it is ordained by God. Let a belligerent blow up one of our battleships to-morrow and the Nation would blaze with wrath and Congress would be mobbed if it did not order the killing to begin at once. We would pawn our last shirt to raise money to buy arms and ammunition to revenge the outrage. Our claptrap sentimentality would be shed, as the skin of a snake is shed, showing glinting armor beneath, and no doubt these hot-headed partisans who have a sob in their voices as they plead for an embargo on arms would be among the first to grab a gun and start for the front to defend their country.

We are now spending about three-fourths of the Government's revenues for war purposes, past and present, and the pressure for a larger expenditure is great. It is not likely therefore that the Nation as a whole will suffer much of a moral shock because some manufacturer of squirrel rifles secures a small order for guns from one of the belligerents.

The facts are we are all quite human, and it is most difficult for naturalized citizens of this country not to favor their respective fatherlands to the extent of injuring their own by impulsive acts. I consider it very unfortunate that the different classes of naturalized citizens of this country should permit themselves to become partisans under any circumstances. They ought not to contribute to a propaganda in support of their own respective fatherlands, which can not fail to greatly injure the administration and embarrass it in its diplomatic relations with other countries. The destiny of this Nation is of more vital concern to naturalized citizens of this country, who are protected by its laws, than can possibly be their concern for the destiny of any of the belligerents. They ought to be willing to trust questions of diplomacy to their own chosen representatives—the President and his advisers. International questions can not be settled in the workshop and on the farm. They must be settled by the people's representatives chosen for that purpose.

AMOUNT OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION EXPORTED.

It is commonly understood that we are shipping vast quantities of munitions of war to the belligerent nations, which is entirely erroneous, and on account of the allies having practically blockaded the ports of Germany and Austria these countries are not able to secure any of these supplies. The friends of Germany and Austria therefore contend that we should immediately place an embargo upon arms and ammunition, because neither Germany nor Austria can secure them from us. The reasoning is not sound, because whatever the tradesman has to sell he has for sale to anyone who has the money and the desire to buy, regardless of who they are or where they come from. The Constitution of the United States guarantees to our citizens the right to pursue their peaceful avocations without interference, and unless the action of the citizen in his trade activities affects the peace and welfare of the Nation the Government of the United States should not interfere with him.

Since the war broke out in August and up to January 1, 1915, we have exported to all the nations of the world $4,514,989 worth of ammunition of all kinds and character. These shipments have been distributed among the countries of Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, Russia in Europe, Turkey in Europe, United Kingdom, Canada, and Japan. The quantity is infinitesimal in amount as compared to the consumption of munitions of war by the nations now at war. It is not a drop in the bucket, compared to other supplies that are furnished. For example, it is reported that an order was recently taken by an American manufacturer for $15,000,000 worth of automobile trucks for a belligerent. This is approximately four times the amount of all the munitions of war that have been shipped to all the nations in the world since the war broke out. Compare it with the order reported to have been taken from a belligerent by Henry Ford, the great automobile manufacturer of Detroit, a few days ago for 50,000 automobiles for immediate delivery. This order probably will amount to $50,000,000. These articles are of more benefit to the belligerent nations, a hundred times over, than the few million dollars' worth of arms that we are exporting.

EXPORTS FOR BELLIGERENTS NOT OVER $2,000,000.

Of the total exports of arms and ammunition of all kinds, amounting to about four and one-half million dollars, about one and a quarter million dollars was for 12 large cannon shipped to Russian Siberia, probably for the Pacific coast defense of that country. Another million no doubt should be charged to the account of the sporting trade, leaving a bare $2,000,000 worth of arms and ammunition which may have gone direct to the belligerent nations in Europe. This amount of war materials is not sufficient to supply one of the belligerents a fraction of a day when in action. In fact, it is possible to lose that much material by oversight on a battle front of 150 miles in a single retreat or a forward movement of the forces.

This amount of exports of arms and ammunition is of so little consequence to the warring nations that one is forced to the conclusion that other motives lie back of this propaganda. The noise that these propagandists have made has been sufficient to lead the citizens of my own district to believe that this country has turned all of its implement factories into the production of arms and ammunitions for the slaughtering pen of Europe.

OTHER SUPPLIES THAN GUNS.

The motive back of the movement to place an embargo on arms and ammunition is no doubt to ultimately stop the exportations of all supplies that go to support an army in the field. These gentlemen who favor an embargo on arms and ammunition know that if the resolution should ever be considered at all it would certainly be amended to make it effective by including supplies of every kind that an army can use. Such a law as that would completely paralyze the industry of the Nation more effectually than did the outbreak of war in Europe last August, when we found ourselves without the ships to move our products. Products of every kind suffered a decline in price at that time, and if it had not been for the general anticipation of the people that the war would ultimately enhance prices there would have been a still greater decline. As ships were procured and exports again began to move, conditions improved correspondingly all over the country. But even now, with the ocean freight rates increased from three to fifteen times the rates in force prior to the war, our ports are still congested with products destined for Europe. The Pennsylvania Railroad has refused to take any more grain for the ports at Philadelphia and Baltimore, because the yards are filled now with thousands of cars of corn and wheat awaiting ships to carry it abroad.

EMBARGO ON WAR SUPPLIES WOULD BANKRUPT NATION.

It requires only a small amount of business experience for one to see what would happen to the prices of products in this country should an embargo be placed on the real sinews of war—food and clothing and the factory supplies, automobiles, saddles, harness, tools, and so forth. The economic disaster that would follow such legislation would bankrupt the Nation and cause widespread suffering unparalleled in the history of this country.

There is not the slightest prospect of such legislation, but that does not dispose of the subject, for there are large numbers of citizens in this country who are pressing for its consideration and who must be answered. The question I wish to put to them is this: Are we ready to make the sacrifice? There is no doubt about where the road leads us, nor what the results of such legislation will be. To place an embargo on a handful of arms, comparatively speaking, on the ground of humanitarianism, and continue to ship vast cargoes of supplies for the belligerent armies would make us ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

AMOUNT OF OTHER EXPORTS FOR BELLIGERENTS.

On the face of it the object of the resolution is clearly intended to prevent, if possible, further carnage in Europe. With that object I am wholly in sympathy, but I do not want to be fooled into believing that there is any value whatever in the passage of that sort of a resolution. I deny that any such results will follow. I am opposed to the resolution, and I am opposed to any resolution that attempts to place an embargo upon the commerce of the citizens of this country who are carrying on legitimate trade. I wish to call attention to the character of the exports that we are now sending to Europe. Take, for example, the order for 50,000 automobiles reported to have been received by the Ford Automobile Co. for one of the belligerent nations. These cars are capable of transporting a quarter of a million of soldiers, or their equivalent in weight of provisions for the army, a hundred miles in a single day over the hard roads of Europe. There was nothing ever sold by a neutral nation to a belligerent in the history of the world, which, under favorable conditions, would contribute so effectively to a successful movement of a great army.

Then, following these 50,000 automobiles will be the supplies for their maintenance—gasoline, oil, tools, and accessories of all kinds. To provision the army, wheat, corn, oats, beef, pork, and clothing in vast quantities must be provided—every item equally important in the successful movement of an army; every item a link in the chain. The gun is really no more important than any other link in the chain; in fact, not so much so, because men can not fight unless they are fed and clothed.

The ammunition maker, the automobile, saddle, harness, blanket, and clothing manufacturers, would not object very much, perhaps, to an embargo on foodstuffs; nor would the farmer seriously object to an embargo on factory products. We are all much in the attitude of the man who wanted all property divided up equally among all of the people—land, horses, money, everything except hogs, for he owned quite a drove of them. But as a representative of a great agricultural State, I propose to be an exception to the rule and object to an embargo on either class. We own quite a drove of hogs and uncounted millions of bushels of wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, and potatoes, and hundreds of thousands of head of horses, cattle, sheep, and so forth, that we desire to sell to those who need them and have the money to pay for them, and I deny the moral right of the National Government in times of peace to say to a citizen that he can not sell his products to anyone who desires to buy them.

We are furnishing five times as much wheat, six times as much corn, twice as much flour, and twelve times as much beef, and, on an average, five times as much breadstuffs, generally, to Europe as we did last year, nearly all of it going to the armies of the warring nations. Not only are we feeding the armies, but we are sending them tens of thousands of auto trucks, hundreds of thousands of saddles, hundreds of thousands of blankets, hundreds of thousands of sets of harness, thousands of wagons, and countless tools of every kind and character. Millions of our people are engaged in this profitable business, and these millions also buy other hundreds of millions of dollars worth of our farm products for their own sustenance. We are all tied together in a mighty mass, and when any portion of our body politic suffers the shock is felt throughout the whole.

WILL FORCE DOWN FARM PRICES.

Should we conclude to place an embargo on all war supplies so as to really hamper the belligerents, the results would be as disastrous to us as to the belligerents. The day the law would go into effect the surplus on our markets would drive prices down probably on an average of from 30 to 50 per cent. Wheat would drop possibly to 60 or 70 cents a bushel, corn to 35 or 40 cents a bushel, and all other products accordingly. The value of the season's farm products in the State of Nebraska alone would shrink at least $100,000,000 from present prices; thousands of factories would discharge half their employees or close down entirely; and our home market would suffer proportionately.

These are not vague fears; they are facts borne out by the experience of every business man. Nearly every port in the United States on the Atlantic seaboard is congested with cars loaded with our products destined for European markets, unable to get ships fast enough to supply the demand. Place an embargo on this trade and throw this surplus back on the home market, and this country would face a financial disaster of the greatest possible magnitude. Are we ready to create such a condition with a very worthy, though misguided, belief that we will thereby check the war movement in Europe? Are we willing to make the useless sacrifice? That is the question for every citizen to consider before he commences to clamor for a resolution that contemplates the National Government interfering with the trade of its citizens. My own honest judgment is that our efforts would produce no results that would be anywhere in proportion to the cost. The misery in Europe would go on, and maybe would be prolonged, and we would add to it our own misery. There are many beautiful sentiments expressed by the advocates of this resolution, with which no one disagrees and with which all are in hearty accord. They simply have no value in this argument, but greatly befog the question by bringing into it a force that blindly interferes with a sane and sensible solution of the problem.

GERMANY'S ATTITUDE CONSISTENT.

Germany does not contend that we are unneutral in selling war supplies to the belligerents, though she is unable at present to buy from us. Germany knows our actions in selling to all who can reach our markets are in perfect accord with international law and customs. She has never asked us to alter our laws in her behalf. Her interest now that she is blockaded by the allies would be enhanced by this proposed legislation, because the allies would suffer by such a law in having one source of supply shut off. Germany has an enormous capacity for producing war materials, greatly out of proportion to all other nations. In fact, it is an open question whether Germany would buy guns and ammunition from us if she could. She needs automobiles, horses, saddles, harness, and our wheat, corn, and meat vastly more than guns. These are the war supplies Germany needs. They are also the war supplies the allies most need.

The United States has been selling these supplies to all nations without discrimination. Now, it has transpired since the war broke out that two of these nations can not reach our markets because of a war blockade. As a result of this condition we have lost an immense trade with these two nations—Germany and Austria—through no fault of ours. They can not reach us. Now, the proponents of this measure want us to make a clean sweep and quit trading with the remaining nations that can reach our markets because Germany and Austria can not, and thereby wipe out the rest of our commerce. It is certainly an absurd suggestion from an economic point of view, and since the question is not a moral question at all, because the proponents of this measure are not willing to have this Nation stop making arms and ammunition for its own defense or to disband our Army and throw our fleets of warships into the scrap heap, it remains purely a question of economics and observance of neutrality. If the advocates of an embargo on arms are not ready for the United States to go out of the business of preparing to kill future enemies of her own, they are certainly hypocritical in their claim that we are criminal because we make arms for other nations with which to kill their enemies. The whole scheme of arms and armaments is a hellish business and clearly a device of the devil that is in us, so why talk about morals when we know just what we are, the passions that move us, and the wars that are sure to afflict mankind for ages to come. Peace at any price is only possible with Christlike men, and there are too few of them to count for much in these mighty passion waves that sweep the earth.

GERMANY ALWAYS SOLD ARMS TO BELLIGERENTS.

German diplomats are careful not to take the position that we are unneutral in selling arms and war supplies to her enemies who are able to reach our markets, because they know that Germany has always followed that practice herself. No protest has ever been made officially by this country or any other, so far as I have heard, against the practice. It no doubt would be a precedent, if established at the request of Germany, that would greatly embarrass her when this war is over, for Germany has the greatest manufactories of arms and ammunition in the world. She not only has the greatest gunmakers in the world, but the greatest in all history. She has supplied the markets of the world, impartially, selling to all who wished to buy.

During the titanic struggle between Russia and Japan Germany furnished vast quantities of guns and ammunition to both belligerents. No one in this country complained that Germany was wading in the blood of these two nations for the profit she could make. German-American citizens were not outraged by the conduct of their cousins, brothers, and countrymen in Germany at that time. Nor did we protest when German arms factories supplied the Boers in South Africa with their arms and ammunition during the Boer War with England. No one protested against Germany furnishing the great bulk of war supplies for the horrible war in the Balkan States, so recently closed. Nor was there a voice raised in this country, that I now recall, against the acts of Germany in supplying arms and ammunition to Spain during the Spanish-American War to be used by that country against our own country, when we were waging one of the most unselfish wars for human liberty in history. German-American soldiers by the tens of thousands were serving in that Army of liberation under the Stars and Stripes, and they were shot by Spanish oppressors with guns made by their German cousins in Germany. Our soldiers were not particular about the make of the gun with which they were shot. There were no neutrality meetings held at that time anywhere in this country declaring that Germany was unneutral and should stop selling supplies to our enemies. Such an action would have appeared foolish to us then, and it would so appear to us now were it not for the fact that we have been misled by the propaganda that has had for its motive the securing of support for Germany and Austria in this conflict against our well-known declarations of neutrality.

I do not blame Germany for doing all in her power to secure the sympathy and support of her blood relations everywhere in the world, but I think every naturalized American citizen should know that this propaganda is not being waged at all in the interest of neutrality but solely against neutrality. I have read the proceedings of these so-called neutrality meetings, and invariably they develop into the most rabid and partisan defenses of Germany's attitude in this war. The advocates of so-called neutrality soon throw off their pretense of neutrality, by lauding Germany to the skies, abusing Great Britain, and slandering their own country. The gross misrepresentations of the administration, the charges that it is an ally of England, the charges that it permits England to do as she pleases with

our commerce, are so common at these meetings that one sometimes wonders whether some of the most rabid have not forgotten their allegiance to our own beloved country that guarantees to them liberty and the pursuit of happiness. One of these so-called neutrals in a speech delivered January 24, at a so-called neutrality meeting held in Washington City, after slandering his own Government shamefully, charged that a British warship had fired a shot across the bow of the U. S. battleship *New York*, ordering her to stop. The captain of the *New York* cleared his ship for action and a fight was barely averted by the English captain apologizing. As a reward for this brave defense of our rights and dignity the speaker charged that the captain of the *New York* was reprimanded by the administration.

The whole story was a malicious falsehood, fabricated and circulated for no other purpose than to injure the administration in the eyes of our naturalized citizens, and force, if possible, the Congress to pass this embargo resolution in favor of Germany and Austria under the fraudulent pretense of neutrality. The man who made the charge appears to be wholly unable to appreciate the blessings of peace that this country now enjoys, largely due to the fact that it has as President and as Secretary of State two of the greatest advocates of peace in the world, who refuse to be turned from an observance of absolute neutrality by the misrepresentations of men of this character. Such hot-heads as these constantly harassing and hounding the administration at such a critical period in our history, when every loyal American ought to be holding himself in restraint, merits the condemnation of honest men.

LOYALTY OF GERMAN-AMERICANS.

The naturalized citizens of the United States appreciate the blessings of this new and wonderful land where they have made their homes and to which they owe their allegiance. They are all bitterly opposed to war and they want to be neutral. It is true they have a deep and profound sympathy for their respective fatherlands, and it is commendable that they have; but in spite of it all they are for their own adopted country first, and the hot-headed partisans who have tried to mislead them into believing that President Wilson and Secretary Bryan are not observing absolute neutrality will find that their efforts have been wasted. If there is one virtue greater than any other in our German-American citizen, it is his sense of loyalty to his Government. He feels that he must depend upon this Government for life, liberty, and opportunity. He knows that his Government must be loyally supported in times of stress like these, and he hates most cordially an agitator. It is true he feels keenly the dire stress of his fatherland, and he may follow his very natural and worthy sentiments of affection for his countrymen by wishing success to the German cause. No one can criticize him for that. My own blood and kin are now serving in the Kaiser's army fighting for Germany's cause, if they have not already died for their country; but that is no reason why I should insist upon this country becoming an ally of Germany. I wish my country to give Germany a fair deal in this deadly struggle with the allies, and that is what this country is doing, its slanderers to the contrary notwithstanding.

INTERNATIONAL LAWS OR CUSTOMS.

We are not to blame because the allied navies have blockaded German and Austrian ports. We do not own these navies, nor did we aid or abet this horrible war in any particular. We can not be expected to change our laws or morals in a crisis like the one confronting this Nation simply because Germany and Austria, our old-time friends and customers, have got pinched in the war game. If the situation were reversed, and Germany and Austria had England surrounded, we would go right on trading with Germany and Austria just as we always have before this nightmare came upon the world.

Trade takes no cognizance of diplomacy and diplomacy does not interfere with trade save when the peace and welfare of the nation is at stake. At such times military law supersedes civil law. But we are not at war with any nation. Our peace and welfare are not menaced by trade, because we defend trade only when it is legal. Therefore there is no national reason why our usual laws of trade should not continue in force.

International law is the result of centuries of usage and formal agreements of international conventions of nations. International agreements are made in times of peace for the guidance of nations in times of war. For the United States now, after all Europe is aflame with war, and one side has the other at a disadvantage in the matter of getting outside supplies, to attempt to change our attitude on the subject in question would be an affront to the nations which temporarily have the advantage. The allies would very properly ask us why we did not say that we would not live up to international laws and customs before the war broke out. Why did we wait until our actions would injure them only before declaring a new policy in regard to supplying provisions to belligerents? If the allies did not have all they could do to meet their enemy they might even consider our conduct in passing such a resolution an affront that we would have to make good by force. We would be in the attitude of supplying freely all of the demands of the belligerents on both sides of this controversy when they both were free to buy from us, but when one has obtained the upper hand of the other and shut him off from our markets, to refuse to sell to the other would certainly be an unfriendly act against the allies and a friendly act to the Germans and Austrians, who are at present shut off from our markets. If the situation were reversed, and Germany and Austria had the allies completely shut off from our markets, I apprehend that the German and Austrian sympathizers would not now be petitioning Congress to pass this resolution; but, on the other hand, the sympathizers of the allies would no doubt be petitioning us to pass this resolution. It depends altogether upon whose ox is gored.

It is certainly a good time for the citizens of this country to leave delicate matters of foreign relations to our diplomats. It is a splendid opportunity for us to show the world our loyalty to our own country by holding up the hands of President Wilson and his great Secretary of State. We are at peace with all the world, and the way to keep at peace is for our citizens to quit fighting the battles of their respective belligerent favorites. This Nation needs the support of all of its citizens.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday and the day before there was some dispute here on the floor of the House as to what information had been received by the State Department and what information had been given out with reference to those interned ships. To-day I have been handed a written statement given out by the State Department in relation to that matter. I want to insert it in the RECORD, so that the country may see just how definite and specific and free from any evasion or attempt to conceal is the statement that the Secretary of State gives out to the public. Therefore I ask to insert it in the RECORD, so that everybody can read it and understand the whole situation. No one will have any doubt, after reading this statement, just what has been done at the State Department. This statement will demonstrate how fair and frank the Secretary is about this matter and how plain and explicit this great orator can be when he takes the time and trouble to place his statements in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the document to which he refers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Q. Any correspondence from British Government on the purchase of ships?—A. I have no statement to make except that which was given out this morning, namely, no nation has protested against the passage of the shipping bill, and it is not likely that any nation will or would, since that bill does not necessarily raise a diplomatic question.

If you desire to ask, as they did this morning, whether I would make any answer to inquiries in regard to this matter, I will say that this department does not think it proper to discuss with any nation the manner in which the authority will or should be exercised, if conferred.

Q. That is the authority to buy these ships?—A. Yes. How that authority will be exercised if conferred. The department assumes that if the authority is conferred it will be exercised by the President and those associated with him in a proper manner and with due regard for the Nation's welfare.

Q. I do not think that the original statement in the newspapers in regard to an alleged British representation said there had been any protests made.—A. I am not responsible for any statement made on that subject.

Q. You say that you have had no discussion with any representative of any foreign Government?—A. I am not willing to discuss with any foreign Government the manner in which the power, if conferred, will be exercised.

Q. Has the department received, upon its request, an expression of views on the general question of ship purchase?—A. The department has not requested of any government an expression of opinion as to how the President should exercise that authority, if it is given.

Q. I do not think the reports which started this discussion while you were away stated that there had been any discussion.—A. I am speaking of the manner in which the authority would be exercised if conferred; that is, the authority to purchase the ships.

Q. It would be impossible for a foreign Government to discuss that?—A. Yes; certainly.

Q. You understand the distinction I make?—A. Yes.

Q. It appears to me that if your statement referring to newspaper reports——A. I simply answer the questions that have been asked me. I do not care to discuss with the newspaper men any more than with foreign Governments the manner in which that authority will be exercised.

Q. That is not the question I want to ask you. It does not refer necessarily to the ship-purchase bill. It refers to any presentation of

views of any of the allied Governments regarding the transfer of ships.—A. I do not care to discuss now questions that are not connected with this particular proposition, since the newspapers are attempting them with this proposition.

Q. While you were away the statement was made that the British ambassador had said to you that the British Government looked upon the transfer of any vessels now interned in American ports—German and Austrian vessels—as an unneutral act.—A. Did you get that statement from me?

Q. No.—A. Go to the person who gave you the statement and let him confirm it. I do not intend that men shall get statements from others concerning State Department matters and then come to me for confirmation. I do not intend to discuss a statement like that; it did not come from me. If anybody in the State Department gave out that statement, you may go to him.

Q. It was not given out by the State Department.—A. Neither do I think it the duty of the State Department to confirm or deny a statement given out elsewhere. I have stated the attitude of this department on this question. I do not think it is proper for us to discuss how the authority will be exercised if it is conferred.

Q. The only ship up so far is the *Dacia*?—A. They have attempted to connect the *Dacia* with the ship-purchase bill. That is not my fault.

Q. Those last reports give something distinct and separate from the *Dacia*.—A. We have not felt it proper to discuss that.

Q. What representations have you had?—A. It is premature to discuss that question.

Q. Is it a question of policy which comes from the White House and not from here as to the expenditures under the bill? Is anyone able to say what ships we are going to buy?—A. It certainly is not the business of this department to discuss in advance a question which may not arise.

Q. Will the Treasury Department buy the ships?—A. You may hunt your authority elsewhere; you will not find it here.

Q. The Treasury Department, I imagine, will buy the ships.—A. As I said, I will not discuss that.

Q. The Japanese news bureau sent out last night what purported to be extracts of a letter from President Wilson and one from yourself and one that had been read by some gentleman at a meeting held in Tokyo to improve the relations between the two countries. Has there been such a letter?—A. I can give you a copy of it in the morning. It was to Dr. Shailer Matthews himself, the president of the Federated Council here. I will have it to-morrow afternoon.

Q. Do you know where Mr. Phelan is going to have his hearings here?—A. No; I do not know.

Q. Are you to appear before him?—A. I do not know whether I shall have anything to say. If there is any statement necessary from me, it will be made.

Q. Is Mr. Phelan a commissioner of the President or of the State Department?—A. I do not think that is a very material matter, because the President asked that some one be appointed, and I appointed him with the President's approval. I gave out the letter asking Mr. Phelan to make the investigation.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of this committee a question with reference to a certain matter in the bill. A point of order was sustained against the paragraph appropriating $400,000 for barracks, quarters, and other buildings for the accommodation of the marines on the Isthmus of Panama. I wish to ask what has been done with the appropriation of 1913, with reference to providing such quarters on the Isthmus of Panama.

Mr. PADGETT. The money is in the Treasury unexpended. The department and the administration have concluded to place the Army in control at Panama, and do not propose to place marines there. For that reason they have not expended the money in building barracks, because they do not expect to keep marines at Panama. The fortifications will be manned under the control of the War Department.

Mr. CULLOP. Then the erection of barracks there, which was proposed in 1913, is abandoned now in 1915.

Mr. PADGETT. They have not expended the money, and they propose to use the money at these other places.

Mr. CULLOP. By waiting two years before expending the money the department has come to the conclusion that it would be wise not to spend it there, but to apply it to some other point in the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The former administration recommended and purposed to keep marines in Panama, but the present administration adopted a different policy and therefore did not expend the money.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that the Navy Department has come to the conclusion that there is one place in the world where it is not necessary to expend the public money for the purpose of defense. It is refreshing to learn this fact. With the war scare hovering over the world, as it is, I supposed there was no place where authority had been given to expend money where they would not be perfectly willing to make the expenditure and ask for an increase of the appropriation. But here, it seems, is one place where it had the opportunity and abandoned it. It deserves congratulations for this act, and I have no doubt the people will appreciate its consideration in this regard.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state to the gentleman, with his permission, that there was more than $1,800,000 appropriated in the bill last year that was not expended or even obligated.

Mr. CULLOP. I am very glad to have that information from the distinguished chairman. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee another question. Did that unexpended balance go back into the Treasury, or is it attempted to be appropriated for some other purpose in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Part of it has been reappropriated. The committee recommended $1,000,000 for aeronautics and $800,000 to be used for submarines. A little while ago the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union adopted an amendment reducing the amount for aeronautics to $500,000 instead of $1,000,000, and that is in the bill.

Mr. CULLOP. It seems from the answer of the chairman that it was not the purpose of the department to let this unexpended balance revert to the Treasury, but it attempted to divert it to another purpose. I suppose this is in consonance with "alarm" policy which is so industriously circulated around this Capitol and throughout the entire country. At no time was there ever less prospect of our country being engaged in war than now, but the advertising scare of war never did overtime more completely than it is doing at this time. This is about the time of year when it seems to always be at its zenith, and yet at this time it is apparent no leading nation in the world would under any circumstances declare war upon us, because all such nations already have all the war they want and more than some of them can successfully handle. We are in a safer position to-day than ever heretofore.

But, Mr. Chairman, annually when the naval bill is before this House for consideration an unusual number of "alarmists" appear on the scene and predict all kinds of dire disasters as apparent unless very great precautionary preparations are made to strengthen our national defense, increase our armament, and swell the proportions of our Navy. They pretend to see war clouds hovering around our borders and all over our fair land. They prophesy the enemy is about ready to fire upon us and invade our country to capture and dispoil it. They assert we are defenseless and that in a contest we would soon fall prisoner to our foe, come from whence it may. And now, when Europe is in the throes of a great conflict, the most destructive ever known in the history of warfare, they imagine they see, or at least pretend to see, it more imminent than ever, and urge, if possible, with more persistency than heretofore, our want of "preparedness" for war and the immediate need of the same. It is the same old scare they have presented for years, except it is dressed in a somewhat more elaborate garb, intended to be a little more attractive than when previously presented. They give emphasis to the fact that Europe is engaged in war and that some of the belligerents there engaged will attack us, and hence the necessity of our Nation being prepared to repulse the attack and defend our borders against invasion. Every nation in Europe, all know, has just as much war as it can handle, and has neither time, facility, nor inclination to become further involved. For this reason there is less necessity for increasing our armament, making greater preparations for war than at any time in the past. What nation in all the world is in a condition to declare war on us? What nation desires an engagement with us, the only large Nation practically in all the world enjoying peace? Is it reasonable to suppose that any of the belligerent nations now involved in the great war raging throughout European countries desire to or would attack a great and powerful Nation like ours? Such a course is not probable, and all who entertain such an idea should banish it at once.

The most reasonable conclusion that can be entertained in view of existing conditions throughout the world is that never before in our history were we less likely to be attacked by any foreign foe than at the present time and that never before have we had less need for armaments, battleships, a large Army and Navy than we have to-day. In other words, there is less danger now of war than we have ever known in our entire history. The "alarmists" may sound the alarm and plead for militarism, for dreadnaughts, and a large standing army, for munitions of war, but scan the nations of the earth, look at their conditions, their sorry plights, and search will be made in vain for one prepared to attack us, much less one that would want to do it. Then why this cry for "preparedness," this sounding of alarm, this demand to expend our treasure for something which will only deplete our resources, consume our supplies, and contribute nothing to our production.

If we were to increase our Navy, who knows what kind of a battleship to build? The types are so rapidly changing that those suitable for to-day are obsolete to-morrow. The dreadnaughts, as demonstrated by the European war, are things of the past in view of the dreadful and deadly work of the submarines. Doubtless if we construct submarines, about the time millions are squandered on them some ingenious mind will invent something far better and much more effective to supersede them. Inventive genius is at work devising missiles of death and destruction so rapidly that scarcely one is introduced until

another much superior for the intended work is created, which displaces it and relegates it to the scrap pile. It is clearly apparent there is no great foreign nation now but has all the war it can handle at this time, and doubtless when through with what it now has it will be content to remain at peace for generations to come, and the war prophecies of the "militarist" will not arouse much excitement among the peace-loving Americans, who prefer the conquests of "industrialism" to that of "militarism."

It is most fortunate that at this time, when certain interests are attempting to create a war scare, emanating doubtless from a desire to exploit a helpless and overburdened people, to promote financial advantages, whose zeal for personal gain exceeds many times their patriotic devotion to the universal welfare of nations and their people, that we have in the White House Woodrow Wilson, resolute and determined to prevent these emissaries of war from plunging this Nation into the maelstrom of sanguinary disaster or uselessly deluging it with the blood of her patriotic people. He will never be driven, scared, or cajoled by their eloquent pleas and defenseless theories, however plausible. Thus far, amid perils precipitated by jingoes who pretend to see danger of attack from every quarter, he has piloted the Nation through the perilous surroundings, avoiding conflict, preserving its honor unblemished, and the people have such confidence in his wisdom and patriotism that they rely on him to avert war and preserve peace—that he will elevate our national standard in the eyes of the nations of the world by furnishing an example that will earn the gratitude of every nation for promoting the doctrine of arbitration for the settlement of all national disputes, which will eventually lead to universal peace.

As a complete answer to those who are constantly declaring we are in danger of attack from foreign foes, that our Army and Navy should be increased, that our armaments and munitions of war should be enlarged, I desire to quote from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler a refutation of their contention and which clearly shows the fallacy of their position. In an interview on December 7, 1914, he made the following statement, which I most cordially indorse:

> Our people can have war with somebody or almost anybody in due time and on some excuse, if they want to go to the trouble and expense to prepare for it. They can have peace with everybody by preparing for that.
>
> The true alternative to a policy of new and greatly enlarged military expenditures under the pretext of national defense is the policy of moral and intellectual leadership in the constructive work of national cooperation. Personally I have very little doubt as to which alternative the American people will chose to follow when they clearly understand the situation.
>
> In modern democracies the functions of the army and navy are police, philanthropic, and sanitary functions. Our Army and Navy have performed these functions admirably and well. Let them continue to do so. Keep them efficient for doing work of this kind, but put behind us forever the notion that we must arm in peace as a preventive of war, and that we must be perpetually defending ourselves or getting ready to defend ourselves against new enemies. No people will be hostile to us, unless we by our conduct make them so.

Here is the real situation stated by one of the great minds of the country, and his conclusions are worthy of serious consideration by every citizen in this great Republic. It is a correct solution of the question, and, if followed, will promote the welfare of the people and secure the triumph of peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes instead of a resort to arms.

Mr. VARE. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, since "Tipperary" was abolished from the Navy by order of Secretary Daniels, there has been considerable anxiety among the enlisted men and officers as to where a lively and strictly neutral substitute might be found. It is in the interest of a cheerful and contented Navy that I make the announcement that such a substitute has been discovered at the Philadelphia Navy Yard in the form of a song entitled, "Cheese it! We should worry! In good old U. S. A.!" Its composer-author is Frederick Hall, for four years organist and choirmaster at historic old Christ Church, where George Washington worshiped in the early days of the Republic. Mr. Hall is well known in Philadelphia as the composer of special music for many historical celebrations. He wrote the words and set them to music within the last 10 days.

This substitute for "Tipperary" made its debut at the Young Men's Christian Association at League Island last Christmas night, when 600 marines assembled for a Christmas entertainment. The song was introduced as a special number and the marines continued to sing it for 22 minutes, and it has been very popular at the Philadelphia Navy Yard ever since. Other navy yards will want to know about this song in order that they can comply with the instructions to avoid "Tipperary."

I ask the Clerk to read it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Why not sing it?

Mr. NORTON. I think the gentleman ought to favor us with the song.

Mr. VARE. I will furnish each Member with a copy.

The Clerk read as follows:

"CHEESE IT! WE SHOULD WORRY! IN GOOD OLD U. S. A.!"

[Copyright, 1914, by Frederick Hall. All rights reserved.]

I.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle dandy—
For I am not so very bright, but yet I'm kinda handy.
And this I know quite well, and I'm not afraid to tell,
That we should have a bigger, better Navy.
I hate the very thought of war and love my cup o' grape juice,
I love the dove of peace, of course, and my own little fireside,
And while I'm democratic, I am very patriotic,
And this is what's been working on my mind—

CHORUS.

Oh! We have got the money, and we have got the men,
And we have got the courage to use them once again;
But if we had to fight—though I hope we never will—
The Nation should be ready to jump right in and win.
And when we have a Navy that's ready any day
To turn back any people who may come in war's array
(Cheer) Hooray! Hooray!!
We'll never need be sorry, for we can grin and say—
(Cheer) Hooray! Hooray!!
"Cheese it! We should worry! In good old U. S. A.!"

2.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle dandy;
And I have got a friend who is a sojer in the Army.
Says I to him one day, just a year ago last May,
"Say! Tell me what you think, and leave out the blarney."
He looked me in the eye right straight, and answered, "Sure as fate, sir,
We'd tackle anything on earth for the country of our birth, sir;
But when we sight a gun, if it's empty as a drum—
Say, how much shooting do you think it's worth?"

3.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle dandy.
And we've a neighbor down our street; his name is Uncle Sammy.
His wife will hold her breath and be almost scared to death
If anybody says a word of burglars.
Not long ago, 'tis true, they kept the police on the run, sir;
So Sammy—careful man he is—he wants to buy a gun, sir.
His wife near had a fit—"Keep a gun? Why, I guess nit!
If burglars knew it, they'd be sure to come."

4.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle dandy,
And I respect the good intent of friend "Library Andy"
And many more like him, who all say, with lots of vim,
"There's nothing worse than 'taint of military.'"
And "When we are prepared, that we will go a-hunting trouble."
But just a word of common sense will quickly burst that bubble;
For you can bet your hat it will never come to that,
For Uncle Sammy isn't built that way.

5.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle Dandy—
My father he is Irish and his name is Handy Andy.
We're neutral as can be in this country of the free,
Though mother's people mostly came from Germany.
But we all love the Stars and Stripes in every kind of weather,
And you can bet your boots that it will hold us all together.
We're with it heart and head, and we'd fight till we were dead,
But this is what's been working on my mind—

6.

Oh, I'm a Yankee lad, and I'm like Yankee Doodle Dandy—
From 'way down South in Dixie land my wife is Sal Mirandy.
'Tis eight years since we've wed, as perhaps I may have said,
And now we have our own sweet little family.
It's "Home, Sweet Home," for me, you bet, with kiddies calling "Daddy!"
But if I went to war, indeed, 'twould break my heart quite sadly.
It makes me want to pray, and I've got a right to say
That this is what's been working on my mind.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes in this symposium. I desire to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not offer any amendment; he asked unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I think the Chair and the committee can afford to give me two minutes. I want to communicate some real information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that he be allowed to address the committee for two minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this poetic effusion from Philadelphia is worthy of serious and profound sympathy. At least our profound sympathy should be extended to those whose misfortune it is to have to sing it. Nevertheless I am glad to see that in that beautiful city of Philadelphia there is left among the

descendants of William Penn, even in these days of melancholy, the spirit of song. It may be a spirit of weakened days, of fading strength, yet it is a song spirit. The cadence of these words strikes the ear somber and melancholy, emanating, as it were, from a soul oppressed with sorrow and deadened with grief; as such, perhaps, it is fitting that it should be sung by the sailor lads of our Navy. Sailor lads, in these grape-juice days, to whom Tipperary is forbidden, may well pour forth their soul thoughts in sepulchral strains and melancholy tones. Is the singing of this song, I wonder, calculated to stimulate enlistments in the Navy? Rather its singing would appear designed to drive out of the service all the men behind the guns, hastening the day when our battleships shall be scrapped and the American flag be furled upon the deep. But if it is designed that this song is to take the place of Tipperary, if it be designed that these melancholy strains shall be substituted for those lively, tripping notes, then I desire vigorously to protest. Military discipline may compel the lads of the Navy to sing this song, but no power on earth can compel a free people, as we claim to be, to sing it. Some executive power has said our sailor lads shall not sing Tipperary. Why not? Tipperary is not an English song; it is not a European song; it is an American song. It is not the product of warring spirit or belligerent enthusiasm. It is an American song, written by an American. Tipperary was written in Minnesota by a splendid Minnesotan, in the city of Owatonna, a city of vigorous, progressive, and cultured people, a city near which I was born. The song of Tipperary was written there by one of its citizens, by its merit seized the multitudes of Europe, and to-day moves to activity more Americans than any other strain. To me it is the high-water mark of ridiculousness for an executive officer to put a ban on the exuberant spirit of men who would sing Tipperary; but what a crime that ban becomes when it forces them in its place to sing such a melancholy dirge as this. In order to live man must sing, and I insist that American manhood and womanhood be permitted to sing the Minnesota-American song of Tipperary and that we be saved from the lockjaw that this song would give us. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Total public works, navy yards, naval stations, naval proving grounds, and magazines, naval training station, San Francisco, naval hospital, New York, and depots for coal and other fuel, $2,527,816, and the amounts herein appropriated for public works, except for repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations, shall be available until expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I wish to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for the words "available until expended"?

Mr. PADGETT. This provision for public works has always contained this language "shall be available until expended."

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to the fact that the total under the head of "Public works" is not now correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is one of those cases where the total is not affected by a reappropriation.

Mr. MANN. That may be. I was going to suggest that the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals where necessary.

Mr. PADGETT. I thought I would do that after I got to the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of remains: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, $15,000: *Provided*, That no deduction shall hereafter be made from the six months' gratuity pay allowed under the naval act of August 22, 1912, on account of expenses for preparation and transportation of the remains: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be available for payment for transportation of the remains of officers and men who have died while on duty at any time since April 21, 1898, and shall be available until June 30, 1917.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the two provisos.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman reserve that a moment?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The reason the committee inserted that is it was stated by the Surgeon General that the comptroller has ruled that they are compelled to deduct the amount whether the Government pays for the transportation or not. The family pays the burial expenses, and when they go to receive the six months' pay credit under the law the comptroller holds that they must deduct the $35 for burial expenses, although the family paid it and the Government did not pay it. For that reason the committee inserted it in the bill.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against both provisos.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, $10,598,933; officers on waiting orders, $500,000; officers on the retired list, $3,070,230; clerks to paymasters at yards and stations, general storekeepers ashore and afloat, and receiving ships and other vessels, $320,520; 2 clerks to general inspectors of the Pay Corps, $3,625; 1 clerk to pay officer in charge of deserters' rolls, $2,000; not exceeding 10 clerks to accounting officers at yards and stations, $17,355; dental surgeon at Naval Academy, $2,400; commutation of quarters for officers on shore not occupying public quarters, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, and mates, naval constructors and assistant naval contructors, $550,000; and also members of Nurse Corps (female), $1,000; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops, $1,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, $340,000; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, $927,000; interest on deposits by men, $15,520; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with Naval Militia, and for the Fish Commission, forty-eight thousand men, $23,616,000; and the number of enlisted men shall be exclusive of those undergoing imprisonment with sentence of dishonorable discharge from the service at expiration of such confinement, $200,000; and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint, not to exceed 20 in any one year, $200,000; and 3,500 apprentice seamen under training at training stations, and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $742,560; pay of the Nurse Corps, $116,940; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, $15,480; in all, $41,240,563; and the money herein specifically aprpropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 26, in lines 9 and 10, after the word "commission," strike out the words "forty-eight thousand" and insert "fifty-three thousand."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to increase the enlisted personnel of the Navy by 5,000 men. The additional cost in this year's appropriation bill would amount to about $2,200,000. The ultimate total increase cost per year would amount to about $3,000,000. I desire to read a part of the report made by Admiral Fletcher as to the shortage of officers and men in the battleship fleet in commission and put the whole report in my remarks:

UNITED STATES ATLANTIC FLEET,
U. S. S. "WYOMING," FLAGSHIP,
Navy Yard, New York, January 12, 1915.

From: Commander in chief.
To: Secretary of the Navy (Bureau of Navigation).
Subject: Shortage of personnel of battleships, Atlantic Fleet.

1. There are forwarded herewith reports of the boards ordered to consider the necessary personnel for the different types of battleships, together with the comments of the division commanders. Reports of the necessary personnel for destroyers, gunboats, and other types of ships will be forwarded at an early date.

2. I desire to invite the department's attention to the serious shortage of officers and men in the battleships of the Atlantic Fleet. The battleships form the bulwark of our national defense, and as our Navy is gradually dropping behind foreign navies in size it is of urgent importance that such ships as we have be at least the equal in efficiency of any similar ships in the world. This condition it is possible to attain only by having each ship fully manned and thoroughly drilled. Our material is equal to an other afloat, but I desire to emphasize the fact that only the efficiency of our personnel can give us a fair chance of victory in the naval battles to come.

3. I submit that the situation is peculiarly pressing in our Navy, owing to the fact that our short enlistments give each ship a large number of untrained men. This handicap entails a large additional amount of work on both officers and petty officers. If to this handicap is added that of a shortage of both officers and men, inefficient ships will surely result. The situation admits of no temporizing. In the battleships alone there is a shortage of 5,000 men and more than 300 commissioned officers, as shown in the appended tables. There is no palliative for this situation. I desire to make the point that our battleships are undermanned, and the efficiency that is in these units can not fully be attained until the shortage in both officers and men is filled. In support of my opinion I quote the following from the report of the First Division commander on the same subject:

"While it is possible to operate these ships on a reduced complement, if this is done it must be realized that all the guns can not be manned; that the ship can never steam at her maximum speed; that the ship can never throw an effective landing party ashore; that practically all of the working day will be devoted entirely to the upkeep and preservation of material, with the consequent loss of time to be devoted to drills. In other words, the ship will never be ready for battle. In addition, it is apparent that there will be at no time a battleship available for the full duty of such a ship."

4. I quote further from the report of the Third Division commander:

"In time of peace the ships of the active fleet have a twofold duty to perform, each part of almost equal importance. The first duty of the ship is to maintain a trained personnel, wholly adequate to insure the ship's efficiency at the outbreak of war. The second duty is to train additional personnel which will inevitably be required to man ships newly commissioned and ships in reserve called into active service when the threat of war is imminent.

"Unless this latter duty of the active fleet is fully recognized and provision made for training a surplusage of men and officers to furnish the leaven of green crews called into service to command newly commissioned and reserve ships the result is sure to be disastrous. Unless a good proportion of the crews of newly commissioned ships for active service are experienced men, the ignorance and inexperience of green crews will soon set the standard of the ship's efficiency and result in merely preparing the ship for return to a navy yard for extensive repairs or for easy capture by the enemy."

5. The situation admits of no compromise. I urgently recommend that steps be taken without delay to fill the shortage of both officers and men in the battleships of the Atlantic Fleet, to the end that this organization, vital to the protection of the Nation, may be kept fully prepared for the grave and important duties that have called it into being.

F. F. FLETCHER.

The 5,000 men here called for would simply enable the commander in chief to have 21 battleships, on which we now rely as a part of our defense, efficient. He goes on to report that it would require 5,000 more men to make the auxiliaries efficient. Testimony before our committee shows that it would require in the neighborhood of 20,000 men to properly man the ships that would be put in commission the day that war was declared. It is imperative that we have these men ready when war comes. It is further reported to the committee that to put our whole Navy on a sound basis of national defense under war conditions, to add the auxiliaries necessary, would require anywhere from 30,000 to 50,000 men.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply be a beginning to make the ships we now have effective. The Secretary of the Navy himself in the hearings said that we need the men, but he said that on account of the condition of the Treasury he is going to wait until the next appropriation bill to recommend them. It takes time to train a man. We ought to have 5,000 additional men now; we ought to have 5,000 additional men in the next appropriation bill, and in the next appropriation bill, and in the following appropriation bill. We ought to have 5,000 additional men each year for the next five years to put our Navy on a basis of efficiency in time of war. The 5,000 men called for by my amendment would not be enough to man the new ships now building and that we are going to authorize in this bill. I offer the amendment for 5,000 men as the minimum that ought to be supplied in the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if I had offered the amendment instead of the gentleman from Alabama, I should certainly have fixed the figure of increase at 10,000 men. The shortage to which the gentleman has referred is merely the shortage for the 21 active battleships. It takes no account of the shortage in the rest of the Navy. The gentleman has quoted a letter written on the 12th day of January by Admiral Fletcher to the Secretary of the Navy. Here is what the admiral says:

UNITED STATES ATLANTIC FLEET,
U. S. S. "WYOMING," FLAGSHIP.
Navy Yard, New York, January 12, 1915.

From: Commander in chief.
To: Secretary of the Navy (Bureau of Navigation).
Subject: Shortage of personnel of battleships, Atlantic Fleet.

1. There are forwarded herewith reports of the boards ordered to consider the necessary personnel for the different types of battleships, together with the comments of the division commanders. Reports of the necessary personnel for destroyers, gunboats, and other types of ships will be forwarded at an early date.

2. I desire to invite the department's attention to the serious shortage of officers and men in the battleships of the Atlantic Fleet. The battleships form the bulwark of our national defense, and as our Navy is gradually dropping behind foreign navies in size it is of urgent importance that such ships as we have be at least the equal in efficiency of any similar ships in the world. This condition it is possible to attain only by having each ship fully manned and thoroughly drilled. Our material is equal to any other afloat, but I desire to emphasize the fact that only the efficiency of our personnel can give us a fair chance of victory in the naval battles to come.

3. I submit that the situation is peculiarly pressing in our Navy, owing to the fact that our short enlistments give each ship a large number of untrained men. This handicap entails a large additional amount of work on both officers and petty officers. If to this handicap is added that of a shortage of both officers and men, inefficient ships will surely result. The situation admits of no temporizing. In the battleships alone there is a shortage of 5,000 men and more than 300 commissioned officers, as shown in the appended tables. There is no palliative for this situation. I desire to make the point that our battleships are undermanned and the efficiency that is in these units can not fully be attained until the shortage in both officers and men is filled. In support of my opinion I quote the following from the report of the First Division commander on the same subject:

"While it is possible to operate these ships on a reduced complement, if this is done it must be realized that all the guns can not be manned; that the ship can never steam at her maximum speed; that the ship can never throw an effective landing party ashore; that practically all of the working day will be devoted entirely to the upkeep the preservation of material, with the consequent loss of time to be devoted to drills. In other words, the ship will never be ready for battle. In addition, it is apparent that there will be at no time a battleship available for the full duty of such a ship."

4. I quote further from the report of the Third Division commander:

"In time of peace the ships of the active fleet have a twofold duty to perform, each part of almost equal importance. The first duty of the ship is to maintain a trained personnel, wholly adequate to insure the ship's efficiency at the outbreak of war. The second duty is to train additional personnel which will inevitably be required to man ships newly commissioned and ships in reserve called into active service when the threat of war is imminent.

"Unless this latter duty of the active fleet is fully recognized and provision made for training a surplusage of men and officers to furnish the leaven of green crews called into service to command newly commissioned and reserve ships the result is sure to be disastrous. Unless a good proportion of the crews of newly commissioned ships for active service are experienced men, the ignorance and inexperience of green crews will soon set the standard of the ship's efficiency and result in merely preparing the ship for return to a navy yard for extensive repairs or for easy capture by the enemy."

5. The situation admits of no compromise. I urgently recommend that steps be taken without delay to fill the shortage of both officers and men in the battleships of the Atlantic Fleet, to the end that this organization, vital to the protection of the Nation, may be kept fully prepared for the grave and important duties that have called it into being.

F. F. FLETCHER.

The General Board of the Navy has worked out plans which show that between thirty and fifty thousand additional men will be needed in the Navy in time of war. But you can not put untrained men in the Navy in time of war. Let us see what material we have with which to fill those thirty to fifty thousand places that must be filled in time of war. We have a Naval Militia which consists of 7,132 men, if every man jack of them turns out, which, of course, will not be the case. We have no reserve at all, none whatever. To be sure, it is proposed to establish a reserve, but if it is no more successful than the attempt which has resulted in an army reserve of 16 men, it will be many years before we can count on a navy reserve. By the way, as to this question of counting on reserves, Mr. Chairman, the rapidity with which invention marches nowadays makes me think that we ought not to depend too much in time of war on a Navy and Army of "has beens." Can we get these men for war duty from the merchant service? Not a bit of it. Let me read to you from the testimony of Assistant Secretary Roosevelt:

Mr. HOBSON. How long do you think would be required to make a good man-of-war's man out of a merchant marine sailor?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. About the same length of time that it takes to make a good man-of-war's man now out of green material.

If we go ahead on the plan of having our war vessels so short of men in time of peace, some future Commodore Dewey may find himself in difficulties at some future battle of Manila Bay. This discussion is nothing new. The General Board again and again has called attention to the necessity of giving our Navy a greater number of men. There is no use building battleships if you are going to put them away in "cold storage," because you have not the crews to man them. Of our battleship fleet to-day we have 12 in "cold storage," where we can not get them ready for battle under three months' time, and it would take a year to get at all of them. We have three battleships in reserve, six in ordinary, and three out of commission.

I am going to read to you what the General Board of the Navy says in their report of this year:

In view of all that has been set forth, the General Board recommends (a) that legislation be asked for providing an active personnel, officers and enlisted force, capable of keeping in full commission all battleships under 15 years of age from date of authorization, all destroyers and submarines under 12 years of age from authorization, half of the cruisers, and all gunboats and all necessary auxiliaries that go with the active fleet, and of furnishing nucleus crews for all ships in the Navy that would be used in time of war and necessary men for the training and other shore stations.

Mr. Chairman, not only have we 12 battleships that are not in full commission, but we have nearly 80 other craft of the Navy keeping them company in "cold storage"—all on account of this lack of men.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. I have had occasion to read some of the hearings taken by the committee, and I have been attracted by a statement made by some of the officials of the Navy Department. I had in mind when the amendment was offered something I had read, a statement by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, when he appeared before the committee, in answer to questions asked by members of the committee. He was asked how long it would take to get a reserve force of 25,000 men, the reserve force on which the regular Navy could call in time of war, and he said four or five years. He was asked how long it would take to get that number of men in time of war, and he said that would be pure guesswork; that they might not be able to get them at all. He was then asked how long it would take to secure enlistment of 25,000 men in the Navy, and he said that that would be pure guesswork. He was asked how large a number of men who had previously served in the Navy would be willing to come back, and he replied that we might be able to get 5,000 or 10,000, or possibly 15,000, but that nobody knows how many.

Mr. Chairman, those are the words of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy when he was considering the very matter or a

related matter to the one presented by the gentleman from Alabama. It seems to me that proper attention ought to be paid to securing men in time of peace and of training them so that they will be available with experience for efficient service in time of war. I believe the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, because I do not think it is necessary at this time. The Secretary of the Navy, who is charged with the duty and responsibility of the administration of the Navy, states that it is not needed at this time. Admiral Blue, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, who had immediate charge of the personnel of the Navy, states that it is not needed, and that with the men we have we can man fully 90 per cent of our effective fighting ships, and that is as much, if not more, than any nation in the world keeps in active condition during time of peace.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What list does the Navy Department have of the men who have formerly served in the Navy, and if they have a list do they keep track of the men, where they are, and how soon they can get in touch with them if occasion needs?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I had a letter from Admiral Blue—he got it up, I believe, although it was signed by the Secretary—stating that they had a list of about 30,000 men who had been discharged within the last 10 years, and that within the last 3 or 4 years they had gone over the earlier discharges and had corrected the addresses of about 3,000, if I remember it correctly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the department keep up a correspondence with those men who had formerly served in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not say they keep up an active correspondence; but they have this list, and, as I stated, lately they have had correspondence and gotten corrected addresses of three or four thousand of those earlier discharges.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not true they have only been able to get in touch with three or four thousand?

Mr. PADGETT. They went back over the earlier ones; the ones lately discharged they assume they have their addresses.

Mr. GARDNER. That is, they have their addresses on discharge?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and that they have their correct addresses, because they have been lately discharged.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me finish the statement, and then I will yield. I want to get this matter clearly before the committee, and I will ask permission to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee that he may proceed for 10 minutes?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if he will have any objection to my asking unanimous consent for five minutes after he has finished? I have had five.

Mr. PADGETT. I never have objected to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to this state of affairs, that we have at the present a full enlistment of 52,400 men, which is about 4,600 more than we have ever had heretofore in any enlistment. Last year we sold the *Mississippi* and the *Idaho*, and that released 1,400 men, and these others have run up enlistments at the present time to something like 10,000, if I remember, more than we have had heretofore available for manning the ships. Now, with that additional number of men that we have in the present enlistment there is no necessity for increasing at this time. Now, I wish to call attention to this fact that appears here. I have a statement showing the condition in England, Germany, France, Japan, and the United States based upon a tonnage basis of 1,000 tons.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Who is that statement by?

Mr. PADGETT. This is a statement gotten up from the publications of the different nations, and is in the hearing of the Secretary of the Navy and is furnished by him. You will find it on page 578 of the hearings. In England the bluejackets are 54.42 on a tonnage basis of 1,000 tons; in Germany, 69.13; in France, 87.83; in Japan, 96.32; and in the United States it is 68.70, so that you will see that the bluejackets we have in reference to tonnage are 68.70 as against 54.42 for England and for Germany 69.13; and, taking the marines, England has 9.42 marines on the tonnage basis of 1,000, Germany has 6.9, and the United States has 10.34. Now, when you combine the marines and bluejackets—because they do similar duties—England has 65.34, Germany 76.22, and the United States has 79.04, so that we have on the tonnage basis more than either England or Germany. Now, the Secretary states that it is his purpose during the coming year to have an investigation and redistribution of the personnel, so as to meet, where there may be an apparent shortage, by taking away from the smaller ships where there is a surplus, and when you take the tonnage we have more men per ton of ships than either England or Germany.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does that include all ships or simply the ships in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. It includes all ships in which we have the men distributed. It is on the basis of our tonnage and our men, and it includes all ships.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman attach importance to this statement made by the Secretary, found on page 577, where he was asked when the last increase was provided for, and he said it was four years ago when he was authorized to increase the number by law and he scoured the country and he could not find the men?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, that was four years ago when they needed men.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And men were employed reasonably in the country, as they sometimes are and not as they are now.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, well, if the gentleman wants to introduce that subject; but I have a statement here where a tabulation was kept and the question was asked of some 5,000 men as to why they joined the Navy—enlisted in the Navy—and about 318, as I remember, stated that it was because they wanted a job, that they were out of work, and all the others gave a different reason. Only 318 out of over 5,000. But let us leave out politics in this matter and stick to the discussion of the merits of this question. Now, I have a comparative statement here showing our complement, the British complement, the German and the Japanese, and the amount recommended by this board, to which attention was called by Capt. HOBSON a moment ago. Now take the *New York*. We have allotted to the *New York* 975 men. Upon a ship of the character of the *New York* in the English Navy they would have 900. On the *Arkansas* they have 984. On an English ship of that character they would have 900. On the *Wyoming* we have 984, and on an English ship of the same kind they would have 900.

Mr. GARDNER. Will not the gentleman read the complement of the German ships the size of the *Arkansas*?

Mr. PADGETT. I am going to do it; I am taking them one at a time.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman read the *Arkansas*, and read the English complement, but he did not read the German complement or the Japanese.

Mr. PADGETT. I said I was taking the English and the United States for comparison now.

You take, for instance, the *North Dakota*, and we have 894 men, and the English ship 870. And you take the *Utah*, and we have 894, and the English ship has 900, the only one so far that has more, and she has only 6 more. You go down and you will find that we have our ships manned as well as the English, and many of them better.

Now, you take the Germans, and on their large dreadnaughts they have a larger complement than we have, but on their smaller battleships they have fewer than we have. The Japanese have away out of proportion to any of the rest of the countries. They have 1,350 and 1,100 on their dreadnaughts, and then they run down below us, to 817, on the ships corresponding to our battleships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Would the gentleman like more time?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more, if I be allowed an equal length of time.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to make any objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I will not ask any further time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

I will take the ship the gentleman has just referred to. He referred to the *New York*. He recited the fact that the complement in the Navy list for the *New York* is 975 men. He is correct, Mr. Chairman, but he failed to tell this House that right alongside that column there is a column showing the number of men on board the *New York* on December 1, 1914, to be 922—53 men short in the complement. He cited the *Arkansas*. Its complement is 984. That sounds liberal enough, but on the 1st day of December they had on board only 889 men. They were 85 men short. The *Wyoming* is 70 men short;

the *Texas* 62 men short; the *Delaware* 29 men short; the *North Dakota* 35 men short; and the *Utah* 55 men short, and so on.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Blue states that with the men he has he can place this complement on the ships. I have read the amount allowed by the department for these ships, and by taking the surplus from the others, with the men we now have, he can place these complements on the ships.

Mr. HOBSON. Of course if Admiral Blue proceeds to put out of commission a large number of other ships he can get an equivalent number of men. Referring to Admiral Blue, I think it is about time to pay a little attention to that agile prestidigitator in making briefs to bolster up the positions taken by the Secretary of the Navy.

Take his hearing on page 36. He proceeds to demonstrate that we have enough men. When he gets through and has cut down everything on earth, he still leaves a shortage of 4,565 men. By his own analysis, if we conceded every point he made, he would admit that we would need 4,565 more. But let us see how he has arrived at these low figures. He said, for instance, in time of war from the gunboats we could gain 2,000 men, because the gunboats would be interned. Every time a ship is interned the crew is interned along with the ship. If the gunboats are interned in foreign lands, how is he going to be able to get hold of the crews? That is item No. 1, 2,000 men. Next, he goes on to state that from station ships and at work in navy yards he could get 300 men. But what would he do? Who would take the place of the men he took? In item No. 4 he speaks of training stations and trade schools. He would get 3,000 men from them. There are only a little over 4,000 men there altogether. Instantly on the outbreak of war he assumes he could take more than three-fourths of all of these. If he did so, they would be almost as green as fresh enlistments. He refers in item No. 7 to 111 men taken from ships that are building. He would take all the men needed around ships that are building. In item No. 8 he says he could take from navy yards and shore stations 400 men, nearly half, though the work these men are doing would be increased in time of war. In item No. 10 he refers to general detail, 750 men. He would take all of these.

And so it goes. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have analyzed Admiral Blue's statement, and here is what it amounts to: From his admitted figures there are 4,600 men, and the shortage for the year 1915 he admits to be 1,086, of ships that are going into commission—the new ships. The fact is, you need 3,000 additional men. You can not get those men without sacrificing other stations. He says he can make up 1,614 men—from "general detail," 750; "from ships building," 111; available for enlistment, 753. He will have these items as large as before. But with his own figures he admits that you need 1,000 and more men for the current year to man the ships going into commission. That makes 5,686 men short by his own figures. As a matter of fact, we need the whole 27,000, making the shortage 6,300. Now, the ships to be authorized in this year's program recommended by the department would require 2,700 men more. The vessels recommended by the Naval Committee and carried in this bill would require more than 3,000 men, and it will take longer to train the men than to build the ships. Taking the department's figures, this brings up the shortage to 9,000 men. Taking the 2,000 men on gunboats makes 11,000. Now allowing for casualties 10 per cent—5,000—brings the total to 16,000. Admiral Blue's list of men on shore duty totals 12,518, from which the admiral imagines he could draw 5,669, although more work would be required than before. It is charitable to take only 3,000 as the evident error here. We would have from Admiral Blue's figures 19,000 men short.

In Admiral Badger's testimony he placed our shortage at about the same figure. Admiral Fiske's testimony gives the shortage at about the same figures, and says it would take about five years to put the personnel of the Navy in an efficient condition. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy places the figures about the same, and says we should really need from 30,000 to 50,000 more men upon the outbreak of war.

Reference has been made to investigations ordered by the Secretary of the Navy as to shortage. The report of Admiral Fletcher showing in detail an "alarming" shortage in the battleship fleet is the first report. Are we to expect any better showing from reports elsewhere? Yet Admiral Blue is trying long-distance handsprings on the report of Admiral Fletcher. Presto; with a wave of his magic wand, and the "alarming" condition in the fleet is all over.

Members are getting the economy fever as usual. They may vote down my amendment, conservative as it is, but they can not escape the responsibility for permitting to continue this alarming condition of shortage in the personnel upon which our country must depend. England was cited, and Germany. Those nations have 60,000 and 100,000 men in their reserves. They have large ocean merchantmen. We must depend more than any other nation upon the men ready and trained when war comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief machinists, chief carpenters, and chief pharmacists shall be termed commissioned chiefs: *Provided*, That the commissioned chiefs shall, after six years from date of commission, be recommissioned with the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, and six years from date of commission as chief with rank of lieutenant, junior grade, or after having served as a commissioned officer for 12 years, and after examination as hereinafter provided, shall be recommissioned as chief, with the rank of lieutenant in the naval service: *Provided further*, That the commissioned chiefs shall receive the pay and allowances, including longevity pay, heat, light, and quarters allowance, as are now allowed or may in the future be allowed officers in the line of the Navy of equal rank as that of the commissioned chiefs: *Provided further*, That warrant officers shall receive the same heat and light allowances as are now allowed or may in the future be allowed an ensign in the line of the Navy, this to be in addition to the pay and allowances already provided by law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. The point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. For how long?

Mr. BATHRICK. For five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard a discussion on a subject that is correlative to this, namely, the difficulty of securing enlistments in the Navy. We have had it developed beyond any question that it has been very difficult to get men to enlist in the Navy, and one of the primary and most important reasons is simply because we offer them no prospect of future advancement and development for themselves.

This can not be better illustrated than by the record showing what number or proportion of the men who enlist for the first time reenlist, and I beg the attention of the House to this very serious matter——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman before he proceeds whether this provision is in substance what was contained in the Bathrick bill?

Mr. BATHRICK. It is a part of the Bathrick bill. The other parts of the bill have been accepted by the Navy. The bill was shot to pieces, and the Navy authorities took those parts that they wanted, but they balked at the part which would give to the enlisted men a chance to rise on efficiency and stand shoulder to shoulder with the line officers. This is the last part of it.

Now, I was going to call your attention to the difficulty of getting men into the enlisted force of the Navy. In 1911, out of 29,734 men in the Navy, only 5,862 enlisted the second time. On the second reenlistment there were only 1,600. Why? Because the doors were closed against every hope of advancement to a higher grade.

In 1914 there came out other illuminating facts. The number in the Navy who had been there under 4 years was 34,027. The number of those who had been there over 4 years and under 8 years was 10,909. But the number of those who had been in the enlisted force of the Navy more than 12 years and less than 16 years was only 1,588.

Now, gentlemen of the House, to-day is only one milestone in the long fight of the enlisted men of our Navy, of the men who want to go through and make something of themselves; and this amendment provides that all but 12 of those warrant officers who would come up under this bill shall come through upon a practical examination prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and they can not advance except on efficiency.

The 12 men referred to are men who have served in the Navy about 30 or 40 years, most of them occupying responsible and important positions as officers, but who would receive no help

by this measure, which would give them advancement without examination. They deserve this recognition, which is much less than that accorded to some line officers by recent legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much does the boatswain or chief gunner receive?

Mr. BATHRICK. I can not tell exactly what they receive. This is not a pay bill. The purpose of this provision is to offer promise of advancement, and pay will go with it. I think it is something like $1,800.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Can they retire them at the end?

Mr. BATHRICK. They can retire when they are 62 years of age.

Mr. MOORE. There is an impression that this contemplates retirement. Is there anything in that?

Mr. BATHRICK. No.

Mr. MOORE. I think some objections have been made on that account.

Mr. BATHRICK. I know certain reasons have been floated through this House by those who are opposing this amendment, and their objections are based upon the very same thing that they desire for themselves, namely, retirement. For 50 years the enlisted men have been insisting upon this opportunity for advancement. Year after year they have looked for the improvement in their position in the service, with the laudable desire that every American citizen, of every class, nourishes in his heart, and which seems capable of realization everywhere except to the enlisted man in the American Navy.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. What chance have they of promotion by faithful service?

Mr. BATHRICK. I will explain that. You take a young man 17 years of age. He must have seven years' sea duty, and if he has that sea duty all the time and is not left on shore part of the time he may become an ensign at 30 upon examination. If, by the order or his superior officers or by some other mishap, or choice of those who rule above him, he passes the age of 35, the iron doors are forever closed against him. Thus this young man, who may have mastered the technique of the Navy, who may have while on shore duty graduated at the Georgetown or other college, who is just entering into the period where his services of mind and body might mark their greatest usefulness to the American people, has reached his dead line of advancement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Will that be sufficient?

Mr. BATHRICK. I think it will.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question has been raised as to the effect upon the efficiency of men in the Navy. I want to call the attention of gentlemen in this House to the fact that a young man leaving the academy at Annapolis at the age of 20 may go aboard one of these ships and take precedence over and give command to a grizzled old engineer in the engine room who has been running that engine for 20 years. He can go into a turret and give command to the best gunner in the American Navy—a man who has taken the prize in our target practice—and he can go on the bridge and give commands to the man who has steered ships around the world and who knows more about practical navigation than the young ensign could possibly have known through technical education in the academy. These Annapolis graduates are commissioned as ensigns immediately upon their graduation and are made superior in rank by the law without practical knowledge and without knowledge how to do things which they have learned about only from books and oral instruction. But the enlisted man must actually do the things for many years before he can become an ensign. There are many enlisted men in our American Navy who never can, because of their incapacity, advance in rank. There are also a great many who have capacity, but who are held back by custom and regulation from receiving a just reward for their loyalty, study, and industry.

Among the 23 highest officers of the Pennsylvania Railroad there are 17 who rose from the lowly position of trackman. Under present circumstances there is no such prospect for young enlisted men in our Navy.

The assumption of authority over the practical warrant officers by the callow youths of Annapolis robs the men of their spirit and depletes their efficiency as a class. That is the condition to-day, and these enlisted men are galled by it. They are human; they are just like you and I. If a young man just graduating from college would come to us and undertake to tell us how to do things which we know more about by actual experience than he does by theory, we would be galled and feel that we were misplaced. It would take the heart out of us.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Are not these enlisted men under some extra expense occasionally, due to their desire to look well when meeting men of similar or higher grades from other navies?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes. This is an occasional hardship upon them.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BATHRICK. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman in that connection whether the Navy is maintained as an arm of our national defense, or is it supported for the benefit of the men in the Navy?

Mr. BATHRICK. I am talking upon this subject strictly and wholly from the standpoint of national defense. I believe there are some men in the House who think it is their duty to assassinate everything that can be put out on a point of order. It is an arbitrary and high-handed method of disposing of legislation. In this case it is trifling with the honest desire of many thousands of men in our Navy and is obstruction to good legislation and a proper national defense. No one will help to get economy by this kind of blackjacking to-day, and I will tell you why.

Mr. CALDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I can not yield for just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BATHRICK. I have just explained to you how few reenlistments there are. In the five years last preceding this we expended $4,869,700 for clothing for recruits, and on top of that we paid transportation charges for them. If you would open up the door of hope for these men there would be more reenlistments, and you would save vastly more than the increased cost of the pay that would be allowed to them. That has been demonstrated in one particular, and the Secretary of the Navy himself says it has been demonstrated. That particular is this: About three years ago I brought to the attention of the Naval Affairs Committee a proposition to compel our naval officers on board ships to teach the men who were working at night in correspondence school courses, trying to come up from the ranks, to learn navigation, to know something about steam engineering. I have seen them on board these ships burning the midnight oil trying to improve themselves; and men educated at Annapolis, at an expense of $15,000 to $20,000 were not assisting them except as they were actuated by the kindly spirit which I admit is maintained between the line officers and the warrant officers of the Navy. There was no system about it. But by the grace of Secretary Daniels we got an order to compel these line officers to give systematic assistance to the warrant officers and men who were taking these correspondence school courses. The Secretary of the Navy says that it is better to have the enlisted men in the Navy feel that there is prospect and hope of advancement for them, and that we get a better class and more of enlistments. But what is the use of educating them, and what is the use of these poor fellows training themselves along that line, if we can not give them the rank to which they are entitled? They are capable, they can do the work. If every lieutenant on board should fall off a battleship into the sea; if every line officer, hardly excepting the captain, should fall into the ocean and be drowned, we have men among our warrant officers, of the enlisted men, who could fire the guns, run the engines, and navigate the ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I do not undertake to dispute any of the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio, although I am not sure that I agree with all of them.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I think if this proposition were in order and submitted to a vote, with what little knowledge I have on the

subject, I should vote for it; but these propositions have no place in the naval appropriation bill. The Naval Committee this year have filled up the bill with legislative propositions which they might have reported in the proper way and might have had considered at the proper time, when that committee was called on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can see that I am not yielding yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not decline; but a gentleman who has had 10 minutes ought to have patience enough to wait a moment without interrupting me.

I do not believe in this method of legislation—making an important change in the Navy without consideration by the House. It is impossible now to give it the consideration that it ought to have. Members of the House ought to have an opportunity to examine matters of this sort after they are reported in bills which come before the House in the regular way, instead of on an appropriation bill, in the consideration of which we are always crowded for time. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATHRICK. I just want to make this statement to the gentleman from Illinois: It is a matter of the utmost difficulty to get personnel legislation from our committee.

Mr. MANN. That shows either that the committee is not in favor of it or is incompetent to act. I do not assume the latter.

Mr. BATHRICK. I think that is an error. This proposition has been before the committee, off and on, for over three years. It was considered two days and a half by the committee. It was given every consideration that could have been given to it in any other way, but the difficulty of personnel legislation is because of the technical character of that legislation. I have striven for three years to get this legislation presented.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman that he has striven for three years. This bill bears on its face the impress of trading in the Naval Committee, to have reported in it specific items of various kinds which different gentlemen of the committee wanted to favor, which do not, in my judgment, in any of them represent the sense of the committee itself on the particular propositions. That is the reason I am making a point of order, because I do not believe in passing legislation merely by trading instead of on merit.

Mr. BATHRICK. This was not done by trading. There was no sign or shadow of any such thing.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I do not say it was an open trade.

Mr. BATHRICK. It passed the committee after proper and careful consideration by a large majority.

Mr. MANN. I did not say that it was by an open trade.

Mr. BATHRICK. It passed on a roll call of the committee, and the gentleman can find the record of the vote in the committee.

Mr. MANN. Well, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That immediately on the passage of this act such commissioned chiefs as are entitled to the advance to lieutenant's rank by the provisions of this act shall be commissioned as such, and thereafter all warrant officers and commissioned chiefs in the naval service shall be examined for promotion by a board of commissioned chiefs, who shall require them to pass an examination in navigation (staff officers excepted), the requirements of same to be decided by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That before being given any independent command at sea or being assigned to duties as navigator, commissioned chiefs of the rank of senior lieutenant shall pass an examination in navigation (staff officers excepted), the requirements of the same to be decided by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of $150,000 is hereby appropriated to carry into effect the foregoing provisions relating to commissioned chiefs.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order; and the committee having arrived at that point in the bill which is provided for in the rule adopted this morning, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] is recognized for one hour and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may.

Mr. HOWARD. Under the rule adopted this morning I understand that these sections are subject to amendment. I have an amendment that I desire to offer to one of the sections, and I should like to know when that amendment will be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment will be in order when the paragraph is read under the five-minute rule after the general debate is over.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, beginning where I left off this morning, I had begun to give the House some illustrations of the able men who have been plucked from the Navy. I would do violence to my own State if I did not mention the fact that eight years ago one of the ablest men who ever served in the American Navy, Capt. Davenport, was plucked, and I want to tell you the circumstances under which he was plucked. He was on the battleship *Georgia*, a Georgian, and was in command of that ship when target practice began. There was a contest among all the ships as to which could shoot the best and was in the best fighting condition, and a prize was to be given to the best ship. Capt. Davenport had trained his crew and had begun the practice in this contest for that trophy. The plucking board took him out under those circumstances and sent him from the ship over to the shore, where he was forced to look over the back fence and see the crew that he had trained win the first place in the Navy.

Is that fair treatment? I am giving you the facts, and I challenge the Navy or anybody to contradict the statements I am making to you.

I will take up another illustrious man in the Navy, and that is Capt. Gibbons. I mentioned him this morning. A committee of this Congress was appointed, as they are each year, to go to Annapolis and investigate that institution. This committee, when Capt. Gibbons was in service there, made the following report:

The administration of the affairs of the academy under the superintendence of Capt. John H. Gibbons, United States Navy, deserves more than passing commendation. It is apparent that all the departments have been brought to a high degree of efficiency.

He served in 12 different high capacities, and his record throughout shows an official mark of excellence. Secretary Daniels stated in regard to his service at the Naval Academy as follows:

I deem it my duty to report to the department, after careful investigation, that I find an exceptional condition of efficiency in every department of this academy.

After Capt. Gibbons left the station at the Naval Academy he was placed in charge of the *Utah* with hopes, with aspirations, full of desire to do his duty, and responding to the American call, and the call of his country, he went to Vera Cruz and there distinguished himself as commander of the *Utah*. He came back to New York in charge of that dreadnaught, proud of his record as an officer in charge of that giant of the sea, and expected when he landed in New York to be received with open arms by the American people, with great demonstration in recognition of duty well performed. Instead of that, when he came into the harbor the *Utah* was met by a little tug, and this little tug brought a message to Capt. Gibbons, and the message ordered him to take off the uniform and retire from the service. I appeal to the membership of this House if they can not see that brave and efficient officer who distinguished himself at Vera Cruz walking down the gangplank with bowed head, with his crew of men and spectators looking on—a brave, distinguished officer in disgrace.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Was that done by the plucking board?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes; and that is the thing I stood on the floor of this House for four years pleading with Members to investigate this question and to repeal it. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Admiral Knight was a member of the plucking board, was he not?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. And he testified before the committee?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman recall this statement made by Admiral Knight in regard to Capt. Gibbons, "I consider that the elimination of Capt. Gibbons was a distinct loss to the efficiency of the Navy"?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes; I mentioned that this morning. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that when the public mind of the country was outraged by this plucking of Capt. Gibbons and others last July, the newspapers stated that Secretary

Daniels denounced it at that time. He was quoted as saying "it was cruel." "The retirements of this date are tragedies." I presume he still stands with us. I have heard no official statement from him. I wish he would speak officially and give us his help to relieve the people of this unjust burden. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied from what I have heard in the Committee on Naval Affairs that the days of usefulness of this forced-retirement board are over. There may have been in the beginning a reason why men should be retired from the various grades of the Navy by a board of this kind, but that time has gone by, because now, in the case of captains in the Navy at any rate, they have been passed upon, every one of them during the last 15 years by various boards, and the weak material has long since been culled out.

I do not blame the board for the retirement of five captains last July, because, under the law, the board had no option but to retire five captains and a certain number of officers in other grades. It was necessary for them to pick out five captains and retire them, and it did not make any difference whether all the captains were efficient men or not, five had to go under the law.

And so it comes about, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] says, that in July last one of the most distinguished men of the entire service was selected to go—Capt. Gibbons.

I want to say to you that Capt. Gibbons entered the Naval Academy in 1875, and he is now only 55 years of age, and from the hour that he entered the Naval Academy up to this moment, in all the various grades of service under the flag of his country, there is not one single mark recorded against him all the way along the line, from midshipman to captain of the *Utah*. And yet the captain was retired by this board last July. He served in the Spanish War, he served in the Boxer expedition in China, he served in the Philippines, and he served at Vera Cruz.

After he entered the grade of captain he was appointed as a member of the General Board—a board whose duty it is to advise the Secretary of the Navy in relation to our naval affairs. He was put on that board—a mark of distinction in itself—and then, if there is any doubt in the minds of anybody as to the esteem in which he was held by the officers of this Government, it must be dispelled by the fact that after he had served for about a year on the General Board he was put in charge of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, an institution where we train the young men to become officers of the Navy. He served there three years, or nearly so, with distinction, an exemplar to the young men of the country. Then, to show that he still held the regard of those in authority, he was given command of a dreadnaught, another mark of distinction and a further recognition of his ability. Upon his return home from the Mexican war he was relieved from duty and placed upon the retired list when only 55 years of age, with all of this splendid experience to his credit and not one mark against him during the whole 35 years of his distinguished career. Any system, Mr. Chairman, which will deprive this Government of such services has outlived its usefulness and should be done away with. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is very unpleasant for me either to debate or vote upon this question, because it affects men for whom I feel warm friendship and for whose professional knowledge and attainments I have the greatest respect. I am glad to indorse all that my friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] has just said about Capt. Gibbons—he can not say too many complimentary things of him to please me—but it seems to me that this legislation brings before us a conflict between the rights of individuals and the rights of the service. The question is, Shall we benefit individuals or shall we benefit the service at large? And disagreeable as it is to make the choice, it seems to me that when that choice comes before us we ought to vote for what we believe is the good of the service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. I would rather not, but I yield for a question. I have very little time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I am always interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I desire to ask him this question: In view of his concurrence in the estimate of Capt. Gibbons by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], does he think it is for the good of the service to perpetuate a system that reaches that end?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I do. It is indispensable for the service that some men shall be removed. In order that men may attain high rank at an age where the service needs them, there must be some system of removal. I know of no better system than to have some board of officers exercise that function. Personally I believe that it is better that such removal should be made by selection in some form than by mere seniority, because in that way the spur of ambition is fixed upon the officer, there is some reward for good service and some punishment for inefficient service; the loafer and the worker are not treated exactly alike.

I recognize that perhaps in this instance, perhaps in many instances, the board of retirement will make mistakes. They are human and fallible, as are the rest of us; but our service must be filled with splendid officers when any board can select such men as these to be removed, not because they are unfit—retiring them does not indicate that they are unfit—but because in the judgment of the board their retirement is better for the service than the retirement of any others. When all are good, good men must be retired. So it seems to me we should indorse and continue some such board as this, and when it comes to the issue, as we have now come to the issue, whether a board of naval officers is better to decide on a man's relative merit or a committee of this House, or this House in Committee of the Whole or the whole House, it seems to me there can be no question. I would rather trust a professional board than a political body.

I presume a retirement board often brings ill feeling in the service. Every man who is retired thinks he has been done an injustice. Undoubtedly some of them are treated with injustice; but it is better for the service that individuals should be occasionally treated with injustice by such a board of their own, when the whole service knows the necessity and will pass upon it, and will probably generally indorse it, than that the service should believe that retention of place depends upon political influence, depends upon pull with the committee, depends upon lobbying Members here. That, I believe, is the very worst evil that can come to our Navy—to have officers think that their positions depend upon political influence. And so, with great personal reluctance, I feel it my duty to vote against this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY].

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, before I get into the argument on the proposition of abolishing the plucking board, I desire to say that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] is entitled to a great deal of credit for his persistence in keeping this matter before the House and getting the House to focus its attention upon the situation that exists in the Navy, which, I believe, should not be permitted to continue any longer.

Some Members insist that this law at one time served a good purpose. It may be said in some regards that the conclusions reached under this law were right, but I do not believe that the law in the first instance was based upon the proper premise, though it may have served a good purpose in certain instances, as I have said. The law had for its purpose, as was explained to the Committee on Naval Affairs by the officers in the Navy as well as by others who are familiar with it, increasing the flow of promotions in the service. I insist that when you frame a law for that purpose wholly, you are very apt to lose sight of the good of the service. In other words, if there were incompetent officers in the Navy at the time this law was enacted they should have been eliminated by making the requirements for promotion stricter, so that only those who were efficient could have been promoted or would have been permitted to remain in the service. The law provides that the service records of all those officers whose cases are considered by the plucking board, as well as all others in those grades, must be compared so that those selected are the ones considered on the whole least efficient, not inefficient, but less efficient than those who remain. Anyone can very plainly see that the law makes a very unreasonable requirement. It is entirely impossible to comply with this requirement of the law, because it would require so much time to make this comparison so as to ascertain the least efficient.

The spirit of the law may have been all right, but the application of the law, because of what that involved, has not reflected that spirit. It is absolutely impossible for these gentlemen constituting the plucking board to go over the service records of all the officers in the Navy within the limited time they are called upon to do it. It is absolutely preposterous. It can not be done, and it follows, just as Admiral Knight said in response to a question I asked him when he was before our committee, and in this connection I desire to say that I never met a fairer officer

of the Navy, or anywhere a gentleman who impressed me more favorably than did Admiral Knight. I asked him this question: "Take two officers of the same rank, men of the same ability and of the same age, in every particular they are on a parity. One man, for instance, Admiral, has a wife and family to whom he is devoted. The other officer has no family and therefore, as is sometimes the case, he gives considerable of his time and attention to his clubs and to society generally, and you meet this one man often, and you have not met the other gentleman who has quite as good a record as the single individual. Which of those two officers will you pay most regard to under your system?" And he very naturally and honestly confessed that there was no dispute upon that proposition, that human nature was the same the world round. Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts who insists that this is a personal matter with those who are asking to be restored, a matter where the individual officer alone is concerned, that in my opinion the service suffers more than the individual. Here are men educated at a considerable expense to the Government, as we all know. In the case of Capt. Gibbons, for instance, I desire to read the following:

Capt. John H. Gibbons entered the Naval Academy in 1875 and graduated in 1879. His record is flawless. During his service in the junior grade his special fitness was shown in many and varied positions. While ensign he was commended for conspicuous coolness and courage during the hurricane at Apia, Samoa, in 1889; showed special fitness while in charge of all work connected with and relating to the first 5-inch guns for the Navy; had charge of the mobilization of the Naval Militia for service in the Spanish War; served during the Spanish War on the U. S. S. *Newark*, seeing service in the blockade and in the bombardment of Santiago and Manzanillo; served as navigator of the *Brooklyn* during a cruise to the Philippines; was selected to command the *General Alava* in an expedition, where he rescued from the insurgents about 500 American and Spanish prisoners, and served in the Boxer campaign in China.

From 1902, when he was promoted to lieutenant commander, he was intrusted with many important commands, including the U. S. S. *Dolphin*, the U. S. S. *Charleston*, the U. S. S. *Louisiana*, and the U. S. S. *Utah*. While in command of the *Dolphin* and *Charleston* he received commendation from the Navy Department for excellence in gunnery shown by these ships and received trophies for the highest final merit of vessels first in the gunboat class and second in the cruiser class. During a long and varied career of 35 years it appears that he was selected by the Navy Department, which presumably had his special fitness and the efficiency of the service in view, for many important positions at sea and on shore, in all of which he received the highest commendation.

A record equally as good, I may say, can be cited in the cases of several other officers whom this legislation will restore to the active list.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a little computation here. You take the pay of a captain, $5,000 a year, and he is given sea service at $5,500 a year. He is retired on a basis of $3,750, three-quarters pay, computed upon the basis of pay for sea duty. Now, the difference between what he receives on the retired list and what he receives when he gives his whole time serving the Government would be only $1,750. Now, I insist, gentlemen of this committee, that it is a preposterous proposition that men who have been educated as these gentlemen have been—Capt. Hill, Capt. Rust, Capt. Gibbons, and others—and when they are at the very zenith of their mental and physical strength, should be retired in this fashion. They are now better able to serve the Government than they have ever been at any other time, and why should we not have their services when they have reached the very zenith of their strength mentally and physically?

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SISSON. I would like to ask the gentleman who passes upon the record of these naval officers who constitute this plucking board?

Mr. HENSLEY. Oh, they are gentlemen who have escaped the plucking board and reached the grade of rear admiral.

Mr. SISSON. How is this plucking board selected; who names the plucking board?

Mr. HENSLEY. The Secretary of the Navy names five rear admirals, who constitute the plucking board, and it is not responsible to anybody on earth for what it does. There is no way you can inquire into the actions of the plucking board.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. They do not keep any record.

Mr. HENSLEY. And, as the gentleman from Mississippi says, they do not keep any record.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. I yield.

Mr. FIELDS. Is there not a shortage of naval officers at this time?

Mr. HENSLEY. All who are familiar with the subject agree that there is a shortage; that we need additional officers.

Mr. FIELDS. And we are educating, of course, additional officers all the time?

Mr. HENSLEY. That is true.

Mr. FIELDS. And then, in order to give promotion to some men of a lower rank, they will retire men in the zenith of their strength?

Mr. HENSLEY. Absolutely. That can not be disputed by anybody. I can not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. While, of course, I do not want the service to suffer, I would never sit idly by and permit it. But I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that a wrong done a single individual is a wrong done to the whole. It is not right to single out these men and treat them in this fashion when they are capable of giving service to the Government of the United States, and not only capable but anxious to give service. And I insist that this plucking board if it ever has had and served a useful purpose that time has gone by. It was founded on a wrong proposition in its incipiency, because you can not consider a law wholly from the standpoint of increasing promotions, because when you do you lose sight of the service itself. That is the position I take.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. How much time does the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman yielded back seven minutes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] use some of his time?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman from Missouri use all of his time?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. He yielded back seven minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me one minute?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the ship-purchase bill and the merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the shipping bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Attention should be directed to the fact that the question before the committee is not only the repeal of the plucking-board provision but the reinstatement of all the men who have not only been eliminated from the service by the decision of the plucking board, but also the men who have been eliminated by any other board. The attention of the committee should be directed quite closely to the phraseology of the two paragraphs succeeding the one that repeals section 9 of the personnel act. Here we have in lines 22 and 23 on page 28, the authority vested in the respective Committees on Naval Affairs of the House and the Senate, upon their ipse dixit, to reinstate every person who for cause or no cause whatever has been eliminated from the service by reason of the plucking board or any other board, and then, in the following paragraph, we find a very different provision, that pertains to an entirely different case, which vests it with the President alone to reinstate them after first determining whether they are efficient and qualified to do active duty.

The strongest advocates of the repeal of the plucking board have stated here that when this provision was first adopted the reason for it was to eliminate from the service the inefficients and incompetents, who in the Spanish-American War had demonstrated as not being fit for continuance in the service. It may be admitted, as a reading of the hearings will disclose, that at the present time we do not have that condition confronting the service any more, but I believe there should be continued in the service some means, when the condition of the service is found that there are men who will not voluntarily retire or who are not disabled by reason of service, that can force their retirement. There should be some means to compel their retirement.

A close reading of section 9 will show that the Secretary of the Navy is entirely deprived of discretion; that it is mandatory upon him to appoint a plucking board of five rear admirals when the number that will be retired for disabilities and other causes, including voluntary retirement, do not aggregate the

number that is set forth in section 8. I think it should be left discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy rather than mandatory, so that he can at some time, when the conditions confronting the service are as they were at the close of the Spanish-American War, when there were too many inefficients in the service, find some means to rid the service of that kind of men.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will, gladly.

Mr. HOWARD. There is a safety valve now whereby these inefficients can be eliminated from the service when they stand their examinations for promotion to the next higher grade? Then, if they show their condition is not satisfactory, the board can retire them.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no way to show that they are inefficient until they are ready for promotion to the next higher grade.

To continue further, how can anyone justify the power that is vested in this first paragraph that will leave it to the committees of the House and Senate to reinstate all of these men who have been eliminated not only for cause and those without cause?

Of course, it is customary when a person is making an argument to pick out those meritorious cases, as has been done in this debate, and show the injustice that has been inflicted upon these efficient officers. But who will deny that since the personnel act was placed upon the statute book in 1899 there have not been many who have been removed for good cause by this plucking board?

Gentlemen stated this morning that these officers would have to take examinations. Oh, let me point out to you the difference in the phraseology between the last proviso in the second paragraph and the last proviso in the third paragraph. As to those men who are to be permitted to be reinstated by the action of the respective committees, there is no examination required. Permit me to read it. It says:

Provided further, That the officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion, as now provided by law, in all cases where he had not before retirement passed the examination.

This second paragraph puts it in the power of the committees to reinstate all these men, even though they may not be physically equipped to perform the service, and the President will be obliged under the authority given to reinstate them, because it does not say that he "shall in his discretion," but that he is authorized to do so.

Let me read to you the phraseology of the third paragraph and see how different it is. These are the men other than those who may be recommended by the committees who may be reinstated by the President upon their taking a satisfactory examination. Follow this phraseology and see wherein it differs from that which pertains to the other cases:

Provided further, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination as now prescribed by law.

It does not say they shall take that examination only in case they have never taken the examination for promotion as provided by law, as in the preceding paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts would give me three minutes more.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose to reinstate these men, who have been forced out of the service, though competent, can be attained by eliminating entirely the second paragraph and by striking out, in the third paragraph, the words "any other," in line 16 of page 29, so that the President can reinstate these men if upon examination they are found to be efficient officers for the service.

I hope no one wishes to reinstate men in the service who after retirement for several years have become superannuated or from some other reason are inefficient in the performance of their duties. We, as legislators, who by the second paragraph are supposed to pass upon their merits, should not be vested with log-rolling authority to reinstate these men. You have confidence in the President, and I have confidence in the President. It is a matter of administration alone. Why should you reinstate all these men who have been retired by the plucking board—reinstate them without any examination at all? That would destroy the whole discipline of the service, to reinstate men who are absolutely inefficient and incompetent to perform these responsible duties.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman opposed to the reinstatement of any of the officers who have been plucked previously?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not opposed to the reinstatement of any of the officers who have been plucked previously if they are found upon examination to be efficient.

Mr. BRITTEN. It so provides.

Mr. STAFFORD. The second paragraph does not provide for it; and the gentleman, if he had read the provision closely and had followed my discussion carefully, would know that it does not so provide. The committee is vested with the whole authority as to reinstatement.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the committee reinstate?

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee submits those names for reinstatement, and the President, taking the language of the law, is authorized to reinstate; whereas in the third paragraph you require them to take an examination to show that they are worthy of reinstatement. But in the second paragraph, as to those men who have been passed upon by the committee, you do not require an examination.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does it not in the final analysis depend entirely upon the President?

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not. The authority under the third paragraph would leave it entirely with the President. Why not leave it with the President entirely, and not hamstring him by this restriction?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, although it is with some physical difficulty that I take the floor, the question before us has been stated so inaccurately that, if there had been nothing more, anyone reading this RECORD would come to the conclusion that the House had never understood it at all. It has been stated repeatedly that the object of this personnel act, commonly known as the act creating the plucking board, was to increase the flow of promotions. That statement is correct, so far as it goes; but, left there, it conveys an entirely erroneous impression. The object of increasing the promotions is not for the benefit of the men to be promoted, but for the benefit of the Navy, in order that men may have the proper experience for their commands whenever the call of action and the hour of battle come upon them. Nor was this act passed, as has been stated here several times, because the Navy had been filled with incompetent and inexperienced officers at the time of the Spanish War. I have read the debates upon this subject carefully. No such reason as that was given. The real reason was that it was found that under the operations of the law as it stood every lieutenant commander in the Navy was over 50 years of age, and that such an officer might continue for several years more in that grade before he would be put in command of a ship. The result would be that before he became accustomed to his duties the age of retirement would be upon him. If it had not been for this personnel act, we would have had a Navy in which those highest in command—those, for example, who might be put in command of our fleets in case of war—would be so inexperienced that disaster would inevitably follow. We had an example in the case of an English admiral a number of years ago. He was inexperienced in fleet maneuvers and caused one of his vessels to collide with another, which resulted in the sinking of the *Victoria*, a first-class battleship, by the *Camperdown*. The same could be said of the captains who would have so short an experience that they would have had no real knowledge of their duties.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. The elimination of Capt. Potts and Capt. Hill and Capt. Gibbons permitted others to follow right up after them, so they could reach the point where they could have the experience. Is not that true?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. The gentleman had a good deal of time, and I have only five minutes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman believe that anybody in the service could have been promoted to those places and have taken the places of those officers who could render better service to the Government than those officers could have rendered?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As far as Capt. Gibbons was concerned, I am not clear. As far as the others are concerned, I am inclined to think there could have been, but that is not the point here. It is the experience of all naval authorities that command should be exercised early in order that experience may be gained thereby to render them competent to exercise that command. Mr. Chairman, Paul Jones won his celebrated victory when he was only a little past 30. Nelson won the Battle of the Nile when he was under 40. Admiral Farragut stated that he believed it was of the utmost importance that men should rise to command young, and that if they did not have that experience they would not be accustomed to taking responsibilities, and when the hour of responsibility came upon them they would shrink from it and be incapable of fulfilling their duties.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman know at what age our officers are assuming command in the Navy to-day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think I do, but I do not care to go into that at this time. I have not time for it, with only five minutes. Now, with the exception of my friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], all whom I have heard speak in favor of the repeal of this act have impugned the motives of the plucking board. No real hearings were had upon this subject, but in the few hearings that were had it was expressly stated that they did not impute to the plucking board any wrong intentions, but at most only an error of judgment. Yet if some assertions are true which have been made on this floor to-day, every one of those officers who acted on the plucking board ought to be dismissed from the Navy. It is said that they have retired men from motives of jealousy; that they have retired men because they did not belong to the easy-chair fleet, because they were not proficient in society, and I know not what else has been urged. Can gentlemen really think that five rear admirals, some selected one year and others another, until, I think, practically every one of our rear admirals has served on this board, have been guilty of such conduct as that?

But it is objected that they have not determined this matter entirely upon marks and grades, but have, on the contrary, determined it to some extent by the general estimation which was placed upon these officers by their companion officials.

Who is a better judge of a lawyer than the members of his own profession? Who is a better judge of a doctor than the members of his own profession? And if members of the board succeed in placing on men retired the judgment and estimate which generally prevailed, they did what was intended by Congress in passing the act. There are men with perfect records that served in the Army and the Navy, and it was especially so during the Civil War, who were the greatest failures when they came to exercise important commands and go into the field.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] spoke of the ignominious surrender of Detroit in the War of 1812. The man who was in command was an officer of the Regular Army who had served with credit in the Revolutionary War, but owing to the fact that there was no plucking board he had not been retired, as he ought to have been long before that time. It was not a case where the militia was cowardly, for they were not afraid and wanted to fight, but it was because of the incompetence of the officer who commanded at the time the fortress was surrendered. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to a system that retires efficient men, in the prime of life, when they want to serve and when their country needs them. Such a system is incompatible with efficiency in the naval service; such a system is incompatible with economy in the naval service; such a system is incompatible with discipline, harmony, and cooperation in the naval service.

It defeats the object for which men are appointed in the naval service. It defeats the object for which men are educated in the naval service; it defeats the object for which men are trained in the naval service; it defeats the object for which men are commissioned in the naval service and the objects for which such service is performed.

An officer may have all the requirements and qualifications for the naval service; he may have the education, he may have the training, he may have the special talent and ability, he may be willing and anxious to serve, he may be ambitious and enthusiastic to continue in the service, and yet under this arbitrary system he is not allowed to serve when his country needs him. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the hearings before the Committee of the Whole House this morning developed almost a unanimous opinion regarding the elimination of the plucking board, but this evening some of the arguments on this side of the House are made in a sort of apologetic manner, saying they would like very much to vote for the paragraph because they have friends on each side, and so forth.

My good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT, said in opposition to the paragraph that he does not like to vote for it because it will benefit individuals at the expense of the service.

Now, I do not think that our distinguished friend is a naval expert in comparison with the many rear admirals who appeared before our committee in the last two years during my short incumbency in that honorable position. They all declared without equivocation that the plucking board to-day rather decreases the efficiency of the Navy than it tends to increase it.

He also says that the plucking board as it now exists will select for retirement certain officers, and then they will use their political influence to get back into the service. Would the gentleman rather have them stoop in humility to the admirals in the service all their lives and keep from treading on their toes, keep from criticizing their plans and construction from time to time, in order to prevent being plucked; and after all, that is what it amounts to. It has developed before our committee that officers who were retired were plucked because they had trod on the toes of their superiors from time to time, I am going to call attention to one of these cases in a moment.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] wanted to know from my colleague on the committee [Mr. HENSLEY], "Who reviewed the record of this board before they were appointed?" I will say to him that the plucking board as constituted last year comprised two rear admirals who less than than a year ago were quaking in their boots as captains, lying awake nights for fear that they were to be plucked by the plucking boards of 1912 and 1913.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. For a question.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Has the gentleman ever heard any excuse for the plucking of Capt. Potts, the aide of a former President, and one of the most gallant officers of the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I never have. Then, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], who also opposed the provision in a half-hearted manner, says that he desires command early in life. Officers in the Navy to-day are reaching command rank at the ages of from 40 to 42 years. That certainly is young in the service. He recalls certain notable naval victories, and recites the ages of the officers of that time as being 40 and 38 and 46, and so forth.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason the power is exercised at that early age is on account of this provision, is it not?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; and you would have those very men plucked to-day at an average age of 42 years. That is what the average age of the last plucking was.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Captains?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; all of those plucked.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman think of a single, solitary thing of benefit that the plucking board has brought to the Navy to-day?

Mr. BRITTEN. None whatever. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] also says, who is better qualified to pass on the value of a lawyer than a lawyer, who is better qualified to pass on the value of a doctor——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I have a couple of minutes more?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have not the time.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield me two minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, who is better qualified, says the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], to pass on the value of a doctor than his doctor friends? That is very true; but where is the set of physicians and lawyers who will in a star-chamber session take away a man's practice, take away his business or his profession, a profession to which he has given the best of his life to master?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have only two minutes, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. SHERLEY. I wanted to know what advantage, personally, in the way of advancement can come to any member of the plucking board by plucking any officer?

Mr. BRITTEN. None whatever.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, why make the comparison of taking away a competitor?

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not make the comparison. The comparison was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. In one instance, in the action of the plucking board of 1914, Capt. Gibbons was removed from service because he had not sufficient sea service, and letters brought before our committee indicated that he had requested of the Secretary to give him sea service, but the Secretary desired to hold him at the Naval Academy, where he typified the ideal example of manhood to the young men there about to become officers. In the next instance that same plucking board plucked a captain who has had more sea service than the majority of the admirals comprising the board. They plucked this officer because he had an untidy ship six or seven years ago, but who has since survived six or seven different sets of annual pluckings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, everybody ought to be in favor of the efficiency of our Navy. It is reported that the fame of the naval plucking board of America spread so far and so wide the world over that it reached the ears of King Ogula, of the island of Onapolula. He, believing in the virtue of the American system of retiring men from the Navy, appointed a plucking board for his kingdom, comprised of Owala, his secretary of state; Suhama, his secretary of war; and Bolawa, his secretary of the navy. These three gentlemen met in the public hall at the capital for the purpose of discovering how they might improve the efficiency of the navy of that little kingdom. The evidence revealed that one Bomloputa, who was an admiral of one of the three vessels belonging to the island kingdom, had been guilty of a conspiracy to turn his vessel over to a warring neighboring island, which was the enemy of Ogula. So they plucked him. Another gentleman, a rear admiral, Ashawalla, had been discovered in a murder plot for the purpose of destroying the king's life. They removed him. Another gentleman, Capt. Monogula, the father of the king, was found to be 100 years old, and they plucked him. Now, unless these gentlemen between can show that the American naval plucking board has been guilty of such gross conduct in plucking our naval officers as was found in this island kingdom, then there is no need for this new legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to use some of his time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use that moment to return the attention of the committee to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] in his reference to the Battle of Detroit. Gen. Joe Wheeler was the grandson of the officer in command at Detroit. Gen. Wheeler investigated the case, examining the records in the War Department, and wrote a book on the subject, showing that Gen. Hull was a gallant and patriotic officer, and that the fault lay somewhere else, and, as I recall it—I have not read it myself—that Dearborn was the author of a conspiracy that was responsible. I wish to cite this for the benefit of those who may desire for the sake of history to look up the case further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be an impression among certain members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and possibly that impression has spread in the House, that I am opposed to all of the bills which have been covered under what has been termed the second paragraph of the proposition we are now considering. I refer to that part beginning in line 17, on page 28, to line 14, on page 29. A number of officers who are affected or would be affected by this legislation are personally known to me. I have been acquainted with them for a good many years, most pleasantly so. I have every sympathy for them and would like to see something done for them, but I do not believe in trying to do it this way. There is one bill at least that will be affected by this legislation that I have fought for in committee for years, but at the same time I do not believe this is the place to pass on it nor this the method. We have been treated to-day to a very delicious explanation of Democratic love for the common, everyday fellow. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] told you about the efforts that have been made for 50 years to enable the enlisted man to rise, and that he gets some legislation in this bill this year, but you will notice that the enlisted man did not get a rule to make it in order on the bill. The commissioned officers from the Democratic Committee on Rules got their rule making in order some of the most vicious legislation I have ever seen in my experience in this body. The chief object in the minds of most of the members of this committee seems to be to abolish the plucking board. I have no brief to defend the plucking board nor the provision of law creating an annual plucking board, but I call the attention of the committee to this.

If you repeal section 9, abolish the plucking board, you leave nothing in its place, and men can go on up to the highest grade with only a possibility of a court-martial to stop them. And you do what is infinitely worse. You reduce by 15 retirements a year the number of men who can go up in the lower grades. Now, the plucking board was not created, as was very well stated by the gentleman from Iowa, to benefit any individual officers in the service, and the gentleman from Missouri asked the question a moment ago, "Do you suppose you can get as good an officer in the grade of captain as some one who has been retired by the plucking board?" I do not know whether we can or not. We may get a better one, and we may not. When we retire a captain that allows an ensign to go up to the grade of junior lieutenant, the junior lieutenant to go up to that of senior lieutenant, and he to the grade of lieutenant commander, and the lieutenant commander to the grade of commander, and the commander to the grade of captain, and you give all these men an opportunity to become familiar with the duties of the grades next above them; but if you make no retirements these men must stay back in those grades. Why, all sorts of purposes have been attributed to this section 9 in reference to this plucking board. Some say that it was to get rid of the incompetent; some say it was to provide a flow of promotions to benefit the officers. It was provided to prevent as far as might be by legislation a hump in the Navy. Now, that hump exists in the Navy to-day, and when you stop the retirements that are provided for annually by the plucking board, you are increasing the evils of that hump by just the number of men you prevent being promoted. It is getting so in the Navy to-day that young men of the rank of junior lieutenant see nothing ahead of them in the service, and they are retiring, going out of the service into private life.

Why are they doing it? Because they see when they get to the rank of senior lieutenant or lieutenant commander they will be gray-headed men before they can get to commanding rank, and it takes the courage all out of a man to think of living from the time he is 30 until he is in the "forties" on the meager salary of junior lieutenant, especially if he has a wife and family dependent on him. And when you create this stagnation in the flow of promotion, which is technically called the "hump," you are discouraging then the entrance of men into the naval service, because no man with any ambition in him wants to get into a position of inferiority, where he must spend the best years of his life at a miserable pittance. So I say this committee should be very careful indeed about repealing this plucking-board provision unless it is ready to substitute something in its place.

I do not say the plucking board is the best means for providing for this flow of promotions, but it is all we have. Now, why throw it away? We have a personnel proposition before the Naval Committee, sent in recently by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is aware that under the provisions of this measure if it becomes a law every man who is restored becomes an extra number and goes up parallel and with a corresponding man in the regular line, and will increase the number of captains and rear admirals in a very remarkable degree? The rear admirals are fixed now at 18. If these men who become extra numbers go out of the line, not subject to being retired, and pass up, all of them become rear admirals and will be retired as such if they live to be 62 years of age.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I thank the chairman of the committee for calling that to my attention. I had intended

to refer to it. The same personnel act of 1899 that carried section 9 fixed the number of commissioned officers in the Navy at 18 rear admirals, 70 captains, 112 commanders, 170 lieutenant commanders, 300 lieutenants, and not more than a total of 350 lieutenants of junior grade and ensigns. If the gentlemen who are contemplated in this proposed legislation are restored to the service, they do not take the place they formerly occupied; they have lost their number. Other officers below them have moved up, and it would be a gross injustice to those officers to push them back and allow these men to be put back into the original place. Hence it is provided that they shall be carried as extra numbers. Now, the law limits the number of captains, but when you put in extra numbers you are adding to the number of captains, or admirals, or whatever the grade may be.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not also true that every one of these men reached the point that he reached when he was retired by virtue of the very plucking board that made way for him to come up prior to his own dismissal?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Why, I would not say that as to every one of them, but I will say this, that unquestionably all of these officers have benefited to some extent in their promotion from one grade to another by the fact that a plucking board has been working since 1899, creating a certain number of vacancies each year and creating and providing for a certain flow of promotions each year, and it is possible that some of the officers who have been plucked within recent years might never have made the high grade they did but for the operation of the plucking board in the years preceding the action taken in their cases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this committee to what seems to me is the most thoroughly vicious—and I might use an even stronger word and say asinine—piece of legislation proposed here. I have heard all sorts of queer things suggested in my time of service, but I have lived to this year of our Lord to find Members of the House of Representatives seriously proposing to confer power on the President of the United States through the simple action of a committee of the House or the Senate. Think of it! Suppose we adopt that proposition? Suppose I introduce a bill that affects the tariff of the country, and suppose the Committee on Ways and Means reports favorably on my bill, and thereupon the President could change the tariff of this country? No more foolish than the proposition before us. I tried to find out how many men would be affected by this provision allowing the President to restore to the Navy men who had been plucked or retired by any other board of the Navy or Marine Corps and whose case had been passed on by a committee of the Sixty-third Congress. Who can tell me to-day how many such cases have been passed on by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs? Who can say now how many cases will be affected by the action of the House Committee on Naval Affairs? The author of the bill, which we find word for word almost now in the naval bill, made in order by a rule, was not able to tell me in committee the number who would be affected by this legislation.

The nearest approach I can get to it is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi last October, in which he provided that the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House "for the consideration, in the order named, of the following bills," and he mentioned 12 bills, 2 of them being Senate bills—bills where the Senate committee had acted and the Senate had ratified that action and sent the bills over to the House. But there is nothing to tell us how many of those cases had been reported upon by the committee that the Senate itself had not acted on, and I find in this list two cases where officers failed on their examination for promotion.

Now, those officers were retired from the service through the action of a board. The examining board's action caused the retirement of those men. They retired because they failed on their examination for promotion to the next higher grade. And yet if you adopt this provision in the bill, and if you put it in the power of the President, without this committee or this House hearing a single word on those cases, you will make it possible to restore them as extra numbers and allow them to go on up to the grade of rear admiral, possibly vastly increasing the number of rear admirals over the number contemplated by law.

I find that several of the cases, at least two of them, affect Marine Corps officers. In one of those cases the officer was retired by a medical board. He developed some functional trouble that the medical board in the Marine Corps at that time thought incapacitated him from duty, and he was retired by the operation of the board for physical disability. And yet under the provisions of this action, having been retired by the action of a board in the Navy Department or the Marine Corps, the President can restore him. Where? Read the bill, and you will find that he is restored to the Navy—a marine officer under the provisions of this loosely drawn measure is restored to the line of the Navy as an extra number. That is one of the foolish things that this committee and this House is asked to sanction in this bill.

While there are some bills for restoration that I have not favored, yet the subcommittee of which I am a member has passed upon them by a majority vote and the Committee on Naval Affairs has ordered them reported by a majority vote, and I would like to see those cases brought on the floor on the merits of each individual case and have them thrashed out here, so that the whole House may know the merits of each case, and I will be perfectly content with the action of the House. But I shall never be content to have this House authorize one of its committees, by its mere report on the matter, to confer the power of reinstatement on the President of the United States.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. TRIBBLE. As to that part of the bill that the gentleman is speaking about, will the gentleman vote to repeal the plucking board?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; I will not. I will tell you what I will do, if the gentleman will give me his attention.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am listening to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman or anybody else will present a reasonable substitute for it that will be better than the plucking board, then I will vote to repeal the plucking board and adopt that proposition.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Can the gentleman suggest a worse system than the present one?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is much worse than the present system to provide no flow of promotion; much worse; not for the particular officers that might be selected out, but for the whole personnel below them. There is where the injury is done, not to the men themselves, but to the service, which is paramount to the interests of any individual in it.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman has asked me a question. He ought to know that I, as one member of the committee, have been favoring the proposition that if these men are retired by a plucking-board system, they shall be put on the active list and given work to do. While they are taken out of the flow of promotion, they are not taken out of the service. Will the gentleman vote for a bill of that kind?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman knows that the Secretary can now take advantage of the service of these men on the retired list, no matter how they got there.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if the Secretary has ever taken advantage of that law you claim exists and used a single one of them after they got out?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes. During the administration of Secretary Meyer there were numbers and numbers of officers on the retired list who were doing active duty and getting pay; and, if I am not mistaken, it was last year only that we limited the amount of compensation that those officers could get, no matter what their rank might be.

It was in 1912 we passed this proviso:

Provided further, That any such officer whose retired pay exceeds the highest pay and allowances of the grade of lieutenant (senior grade) shall, while so employed in time of peace, receive his retired pay only in lieu of all other pay and allowances.

In other words, we made it impossible to utilize the services of the men who were of higher grade on the retired list, because they would not take the lower pay when they could stay out and receive the higher pay.

Mr. TRIBBLE. In answer to the gentleman's question I recall that there have been a number of such bills before the committee. The committee has reported several favorably, but the President of the United States has never allowed one of these men to be restored after the plucking board has plucked him.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is talking on another proposition. I have not said that there was any proposition to restore plucked men to the active list. What I have said is this, that under the personnel act of 1899 the services of any man on the retired list could be utilized at the full pay and allowances of the active list, until we made that amendment in 1912. Now, there were many men whose services were utilized under those conditions.

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But for some reason the policy of the department changed, and they gradually weeded

them out, so that I think to-day we have very few if any retired officers doing active duty.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not the gentleman know that these officers, if they are getting their retired salaries, unless they are forced to go back into the service or unless they get more for going, will not voluntarily go back into the service and work?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I know if a man is on the retired list at three-fourths pay, and he is capable of doing certain duty of his grade, he would be very glad to be on full pay, adding 25 per cent to his yearly stipend.

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is what I am in favor of.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He would be glad to get it, and the Secretary can make use of that very provision of law to-day and utilize the services of these men on the retired list if he wishes to do so.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But the gentleman knows that the Secretary never wishes to do so.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But some Secretaries have wished to do so and have done so. Why the present Secretary does not I do not know. And while speaking about what some Secretaries do I will say that if it had not been for the action of the present Secretary the case of Admiral Potts would not be here. If Admiral Potts had received decent treatment at the hands of the present administration of the Navy he would not be before Congress asking for reinstatement.

Mr. TRIBBLE. If the gentleman had joined me two years ago to abolish the plucking board Admiral Potts would be in the service right now, because they could not have plucked him.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is another question. He would not have been in a position to be plucked if the Secretary of the Navy had treated him fairly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard all that has been said, but I gather from what I have heard that the gentleman has the idea that if this provision is passed the President will have authority to return a man to the service and put him in line for advancement and promotion, when perhaps he has been disqualified, and has been plucked for that reason.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. A man who has been court-martialed can be returned to the service by act of the President.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What is the meaning of the two provisos on page 29?—

And provided further, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion, as now provided by law, in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination.

And the next one—

Provided further, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination as now prescribed by law.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That goes with all such provisions. An officer has to go through that satisfactory professional and medical examination for promotion from one grade to another.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would not that provision apply?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Certainly it would apply.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And preclude the President from picking up one of these men and restoring him to service and advancing him?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He could not restore him to the service arbitrarily; he has to go before the Senate. But it gives the President a power that he has not got, and it is given to him through the mere action of a committee of this House and not through the action of the House. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has spoken 26 minutes, and has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would not the provision make it absolutely necessary that the President should conduct an examination or direct one to be conducted?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That would have to be done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And would not that do away with the trouble that the gentleman suggests, that the President would take unworthy men?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman may have heard it said, faintly whispered, that the President of the United States has some influence with another body. I have heard of it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. He has too much sometimes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We have known of a case where the President of the United States selected a staff officer and put him at the head of the line officers of the Army. Nobody thought a President would ever do that, but it was done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts rather trust a plucking board working in secret than to trust the President of the United States and Congress working openly?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Absolutely. I know scores of officers who have sat and will perhaps, if this is not repealed, sit on future plucking boards. They are honorable men, but they are charged with a most disagreeable duty. The gentleman must not forget that feature of it. Admiral Evans has sat on this board, and there is not a prominent admiral now living or dead for the last 14 or 15 years who has not been detailed to this duty, and it is a most disagreeable one as you can imagine.

Suppose a committee of this House was formed, made up of the chairmen of the committees, for instance, to select a certain number of Members from this House for retirement. Do you suppose that would be a duty that anyone would seek? Do not you suppose that it would be the most disagreeable duty that could come to any man? And yet that is the position of the rear admirals placed on the plucking board. They do the best they can. Until we can get a better system, I would rather put up with the ills of a plucking board than to fly to those of an ever-increasing hump in the Navy which so troubles the commissioned officers and departmental heads in the Navy Department.

I want to say one word more. There is not one of the bills contemplated in this legislation that has not been disapproved of by the Secretary of the Navy with one possible exception, and that was not a plucking-board case. When we are legislating I believe in doing something that will have a practical result, that is going to accomplish something. Can you imagine a President of the United States recommending for restoration to the Navy an officer who has been separated from the Navy by due process of law when the Secretary of the Navy is opposed to that restoration?

Suppose that possible, suppose that foolish provision giving committees of the House power to clothe the President with authority that he does not now possess, what is going to come from it, practically? Nothing. But we go on record as authorizing our committees—and it is well known that they are largely influenced by subcommittees—to clothe the President of the United States with power without our passing on the merits of a single one of the cases. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there will be only one other speech on this side, and I would like him to use the balance of his time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will close in one more speech?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I will vote for the paragraph which repeals the plucking-board provision of the personnel act. I have heard so much said against it—although I did not have the pleasure of hearing the gentleman from Massachusetts—that I think a word ought to be said in defense of the proposition as originally agreed upon.

The personnel-act proposition was pending in Congress in various ways when I entered Congress. There was a very hot contest in regard to it, both in Congress and in the Navy, but the reasons given for the plucking-board provision then were not those which I have heard assigned to-day—that it was for meeting the temporary condition in the Navy. Of course the fact is that when a large number of men in the Navy are commissioned officers in the lower ranks, if they live, there soon becomes a great congestion in the upper ranks of the Navy.

And many of the naval officers desired some method of eliminating a portion of the number so that promotions might be made more rapidly. I think that at that time the naval officers would have been quite willing to have had those who were to be eliminated selected by lots. It is a very easy matter, where there are 100 men and it is proposed to select one of them to be sacrificed, to get all of the hundred to agree to the proposition, for each one will believe that he will be lucky enough to escape. That is the fortunate condition of mind of most men who go into the Army or the Navy at all, or who go into a battle. Each hopes to escape. But when one of them is plucked and put out, then the situation seems quite different to him. He believes then that he has been imposed upon, and especially so where nominally the dismissal is on account of lack of efficiency. I have no doubt that the officers who have been retired by the plucking board are probably on the whole

quite as efficient as those who have remained in the service; and if some of those who had remained in the service had been plucked, they would have had the same objection to the plucking board that those have who have now been retired. Of course most of them are now in favor, I take it, of a proposition which proposes to restore men and carry them as extra numbers, which does not interfere at all with promotions in the future, so far as the past action of the plucking board is concerned. I never have been in favor, and am not now, of dismissing from the Navy efficient men in order to make promotion a little easier for those who desire it and for those who remain in the Navy. Take this House for an illustration.

If all of the Members who entered this House in this Congress should remain in the House for a period of 5 or 10 years, much less a lifetime, there would soon be some method found of revolutionizing the appointment of committees in the House so that the older ones who had attained places at the top of committees would not be permitted to remain there. Under the immutable laws of elections some Members are retired from the House, and yet I know Members who have been in this House nearly as long at least as I have been, and some of them longer, who are not yet chairmen of committees, although many of the men who came in after them, owing to the retirement of Members on their particular committees, have become chairmen of committees. It is natural for men to want these promotions, it is natural for them to complain if they do not receive that which they want, and it is utterly impossible in the Navy by simply promoting the ones senior in number to the upper rank to satisfy the Navy and keep it in the order in which it ought to be kept. I take it, of course, that the plucking-board provision will temporarily go out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, these paragraphs in the bill propose three things: The first is the repeal of section 9 of the personnel act of 1899. That act provides that each year the Secretary of the Navy may appoint five rear admirals to constitute what is called the plucking board, and in one contingency that plucking board had the power to retire not more than 15 officers from the grades of captain, commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant. It can only do that in one contingency. Section 8 of that act, preceding the one we propose to repeal, provides a method for voluntary retirement by which as many as 40 officers can resign in one year, and the President, I believe, is authorized to accept their resignations. In case there should be 40 retirements under section 8, then this plucking board could not do anything at all. The idea is that if there are not 40 retirements in other ways, then the plucking board is authorized to pluck as many officers as is necessary when added to the voluntary and other retirements to make up 40.

Mr. PADGETT. Not exceeding 15.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Not exceeding 15. There is, therefore, in section 8 a provision for the flow of promotions just to the same number as this plucking board law would permit; and if there were 40 officers in the Navy who had tired of the service—who did not like it—they could get out under section 8, and there would be just as much flow of promotions in that case as if the President had refused to accept their resignations, to the number of 15. Then this plucking board would be authorized to kick out 15 officers who did not want to go out of the service.

I called attention earlier in the day to the woeful lack of officers in the American Navy. One of the naval experts told us that we were short 203 officers, and that is the lowest estimate that has ever been made. Admiral Knight said that we were short four or five hundred. Admiral Badger said that we are short 933, and some other officers said we were short 700, and one of them said 3,000, and that it would take the Naval Academy 20 years at the present rate to furnish enough officers to use the ships we already have if we did not build any more.

Mr. MANN. Would it inconvenience the gentleman if I asked him a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Not at all; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman refers to the number of officers short in the Navy. Do these people who speak of this mean short of the number they ought to have, or short of the number for whom we appropriate salaries?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; they mean, as I understand it, we lack that many officers of being able to use 12 of our battleships.

Mr. MANN. Short of the number which they think we ought to have, not short of the number for whom we make appropriations?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; we make appropriations for everyone we have.

Mr. MANN. Then I think we stop right there—do we not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know whether we have ever stopped or not when it comes to appropriations. Now, Admiral Badger was asked this question. He had stated that there are 12 of our battleships, more than one-third of them, which were given no target practice, no battleship exercise, no maneuvers, no training of any kind, and that was because we do not have officers enough to do it, and it was further stated that if this House authorizes two more battleships the only way we can get the officers to man those battleships will be to put two more of our battleships in reserve, in ordinary, or out of commission, and take the officers from them and use them on the new battleships we are going to build.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will yield.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In line with the question just propounded by the gentleman from Illinois, if the plucking board be abolished and these officers be not retired from the Navy, there is not any question in the mind of the gentleman from Mississippi that an appropriation would be made to pay their salaries, is there?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Pay the salaries of those officers whom they want to retire?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; those officers if they were not taken out at all, if the plucking board is abolished, and the additional number of officers to those now in the Navy were retained, there would be no question of appropriating to pay their salaries?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is no question now, because those officers we want to restore will receive their salaries. They are on the retired list and they are receiving pay out of the Treasury without rendering any service, and they do not want to do that. They want to earn the money they are getting from the people, and I say they ought to be allowed to do it.

Now, that is another woeful condition about the lack of officers. We are told by the highest experts in the Navy that if we were to have a war it would take five years for us to put the 12 battleships which we have abandoned into a position where they could be used, and that grows out of the fact that we have not sufficient officers to train them. I will tell you, according to what I have learned from these naval experts, that if we were to put a lot of green men and green officers on a battleship without any target practice and maneuvers or training of any kind and send it out to fight it would just be like putting a blind man up to fight a duel with an expert pistol shot. It would be barbarous. These 12 battleships now might just as well be at the bottom of the ocean, so far as any good they could do in war, on account of the lack of officers. That is the condition of our Navy, according to the testimony of the only men who know about it, the naval officers; and yet we are in two ways making that condition worse every day. Every time you authorize a new battleship you make it worse, because you require more officers; and every time the plucking board kicks 15 of them out you make it that much worse. So much for the reasons why I think section 9 should be repealed.

Now, the next paragraph provides that the President shall be authorized, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to restore such officers as have been removed by this plucking board wherever the cases of their removal have been examined into and testimony taken and printed by a committee of this House or the Senate and where a committee of either House has reported favorably a bill to restore them. Now, it has been objected here that that means that you would restore the officers upon the action of a committee and not on the action of the House. That is not true. The expression in the second paragraph about the officers having had their cases examined and reported on by a committee is merely descriptive of the officers to be restored, and this House is not asked to vote to restore them because the committee has so recommended, but we ask you to restore them because the testimony which has been printed which we have before you shows that they are competent, efficient, and some of them the most brilliant officers in the Navy. You have got in the records here the evidence to show that, and we ask you to vote to restore them, not because the committee has recommended them, but because the facts justify and require it.

And I want to call your attention to those facts. First, I want to call your attention to the facts that apply to all of these officers, and there are seven of them. The testimony shows that they are highly educated, well-trained, competent, efficient, talented officers, and that there is no dispute about that proposition. The members of the plucking board whom we examined testified that these officers could not be dismissed from the service on account of objections to them, on account

of their inefficiency, on account of their incompetency. One of them said that not one of these officers deserved the stigma that had been placed upon him, but they were simply retired because the law forced the board to do it; that you had a law that made it necessary for them to do it, and not because they ought to be retired. That is the testimony of the members of the plucking board themselves.

Now, I want to submit to you the proposition that they were illegally dismissed and they were denied their legal rights. This section 9 provides that this board shall have, when they come to consider these officers, the records of all the officers they are considering, and the records of these officers are the only evidence that the law submits to that board. And manifestly it meant that the board should take these records and compare them and determine from the records which were the least efficient. That is what the law requires. The statute further requires that the members of this plucking board shall take an oath that they will not be governed by any bias or partiality and that they will consider nothing except the fitness of the officer and the efficiency of the Navy.

If the board selected and retired the 15 most efficient officers in the Navy, it would thereby decrease the efficiency in violation of the statute. So construing it altogether, I submit to this committee that the meaning of the law is that they should take the records of these officers and compare them, and determine, as they could from the records, which are the least efficient and then retire the 15 least efficient. And all the testimony in this case shows that they did not do that. This is a fact: That in the case of every one of these officers the board had only a small part of the records before them and never did pretend to examine the records or to make the comparison which the statute requires. Even in the case of the officers who have been retired the testimony shows that in several of the cases just a part of the record of those officers was examined by the board and not the entire record.

Now, we have examined the records of these other officers and had the members of the plucking board to testify with reference to them, and we have also had other witnesses, and that testimony proved this—that these officers had records much higher than those that were left in the service. And in many cases it was done in a most lamentable and inexcusable way. Here is an officer who was retired, and the testimony shows that there was not a thing against his record. It was not only high but absolutely flawless. Here is another man that was left in the service, whose record is just spotted with drunkenness, and to such an extent that his superiors reported—and it is in the hearings—that he was incompetent and unfit to discharge his duties. That is the kind of a man they would leave in the service and take out the most gifted, talented, brilliant officer, against whom there was not a flaw. Not only that, but here are a lot of officers who have been court-martialed and convicted of running ships aground, and in one case a ship was entirely lost by the negligence of an officer. Yet he is left in there, and men against whom there was nothing, from the beginning to the end of their records, are plucked. That is the kind of testimony that has convinced us that these officers ought to be restored.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What reason is assigned for selecting these men whose records are flawless and neglecting those with blemished records?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. In the course of my remarks right now the gentleman from New York will have a complete answer to his question.

Now, I want to call your attention to some facts with reference to each one of these officers individually. Take the first case—the Perkins case: Perkins served some 30 years in the Marine Corps, and most of his life was spent in the Tropics, and it finally had the same effect on him as it does on other officers who stay there a long time. It temporarily ruined his health. For about a year and a half he was unable to discharge his duties; but finally he recovered, and the medical examiner certified that he was able to discharge his duties, and he was sent back—to a recruiting station, I believe. Now, it was not long after that before the time came for him to be promoted. He was then a lieutenant colonel, and it was time for him to stand an examination for promotion to the next higher rank, and he was ordered, as all these officers are in such cases, before a board to stand his examination. Up to this time there had never been one unfavorable report against Perkins. But just about the time he was ordered before this board he received a letter offering him, I believe, $1,000 for his number; that is, to resign, get out of the way, so that somebody else could be promoted in his place.

He declined to do it. At the same time the major general commandant notified him that if he stood that examination and was promoted he intended to send him back to the Tropics, which had ruined his health before—trying to deter him and bulldoze him and prevent him from standing the examination.

At that time the commandant, his superior, made an unfavorable report on him, which was the first that had ever been made. He did not give the officer notice of it. The regulations require that whenever an unfavorable report is made upon an officer notice of that fact must be given to the officer. This officer went to Boston to appear before this board, and when he got there he was confronted with this unfavorable report, and the board asked him why he had not replied to it, as the regulations require. He said, "I never heard of it before. I was not notified of it," although it had been made six months before. The board threw it out, because he had not been notified of it. They gave him a very rigid examination, and he stood it and passed and was congratulated by every member of the board on his splendid examination.

That is the way Perkins got to be a colonel. Soon after that he was sent out to California in the discharge of his duties out there, and very soon afterwards he got a telegram to come to Washington. He came here and appeared at the proper office, and they told him that he must appear before a board that was already organized. He went in before that board, and they tried him for being insane. He never had any notice of the charge until he got here. He had a very poor chance to defend himself, and the board found that he was crazy. He appealed to the Secretary of the Navy from that decision, and the next day he and his lawyer went before the Secretary of the Navy, and there he was confronted by some telegrams from some friends in California and by a telegram from his own wife, urging the Secretary of the Navy to put him out of the Navy.

Well, of course, he did not know why his own wife had turned against him, and so he just had to resign, and did resign. When they found out the facts about it, it developed that somebody had been working on those parties out in California and deceiving them and making them believe that unless he resigned he would be disgraced as a lunatic; and that is the reason why his wife was induced to send him that telegram.

Mr. PADGETT. You used the word "resign." You mean voluntarily retire.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is what I mean by resigning. You can not resign involuntarily.

Mr. PADGETT. That is retiring.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The fact about this is that they practiced a fraud on Perkins to get him out. That is the point of the matter. After that the action of the plucking board that found he was crazy was reviewed by the Judge Advocate and disapproved and reversed, and it was afterwards submitted to two other Judge Advocates, and they also disapproved it. Then your committee had the members of that plucking board that found Perkins to be crazy go before it, and examined them; and I tell you, gentlemen, I never examined a man on the subject of insanity in my life who knew as little about it as the members of that board.

Now, so much for Perkins. Take the next case, that of Rust. What I say as to these officers applies to Rust. But there are two or three things in this case that I want to call to your especial attention. Capt. Rust is the author of two books. One of them is a system of tables for the identification of stars, so that the mariner can on a cloudy night, if he sees a star in any part of the heavens, determine what star that is. The other book is also a system of tables by which they can take any star that they can identify anywhere and determine the latitude that the boat is in. Those were considered so valuable to the Navy that both of those books were printed and every ship in the Navy is supplied with both of them. That is one of the things that Rust did.

But, in my opinion, the greatest thing he did was to invent a range finder. A range finder is an instrument by which you determine the distance to a battleship or any other object that you want to shoot at. The whole question and problem of accurate shooting in naval warfare depends on the ascertainment of the distance to the ship. They never shoot to the right or the left. They always shoot over or under the opposing ship, and the reason they do that is because they do not know the exact distance to it.

Now, I have here a map by which I can explain the value of this. The difference between the Rust range finder and the one now in use is that the one now in use has a very small base, of about 20 feet. He has invented one with a base of almost the length of the ship. This diagram here would represent the present range finder. That little narrow strip would be the base of it. His range finder would have this broad base. Now, the difference between them is just this: The way they

determine the distance to a ship with the range finder is that they find this angle and that angle, and with those two angles and a known base they determine the distance to the ship. In getting those angles it is very difficult not to make some mistakes. And any mistake that is made in getting these angles will result in a mistake in finding the distance to the ship. Here is the advantage of the Rust range finder: If you find these two angles correctly, then the point T where those two lines cross is the correct distance to the ship. In the same way if you find these two angles accurately with the small range finder with the narrow base, the point where the lines cross is the distance to the ship. But now suppose you make an error, we will say, of one degree. That is a large error, and they would not make it, but I use it for illustration. If, in getting these two angles here, you make a mistake of a degree, the result of that mistake is that you lack this much in getting the accurate distance of the ship; but if you make the same mistake on the small range finder, a difference of one degree in these angles here would cause these two lines to cross right here, and you would have a very much greater error in the distance. See what an immense difference it makes. In other words, to make it plain, any error in getting the angle would be as much less in the Rust range finder than in the other one as this line here is longer than that line. Now, in my judgment, if the Rust range finder becomes a success and enables our officers to ascertain the distance to the ship of the enemy 5 or 10 minutes before they can ascertain the distance to our ships, it will have the same effect on the battle as it would to double the power of our Navy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 9 of the naval personnel act of March 3, 1899, entitled, "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, strike out the paragraph included between lines 12 and 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Navy all officers who may have been transferred from the active to the retired list of the Navy under the provisions of section 9 of said personnel act and from the active to the retired list of the Navy or the Marine Corps by the action of any board: *Provided*, That the action in these cases has been examined by the naval committee of the Sixty-third Congress of the House or of the Senate and either or both of said committees have reported or ordered to be reported favorably to the House or the Senate a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of the service: *Provided further*, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have held if he had not been retired, or to which he had passed a satisfactory examination for promotion, and shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or at any time thereafter promoted: *And provided further*, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion, as now provided by law, in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee, and I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I move to strike out the paragraph just read, beginning with line 17, on page 28, and ending with line 13, on page 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment is preferential.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28: Strike out the paragraph beginning with line 17, on page 28, and ending with line 13, on page 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia desires to offer an amendment to perfect the paragraph.

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HOWARD:

Page 28, line 23, after the words "of any board," insert the following:

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer from the retired to the active list of the Marine Corps, in the grade and with the rank and seniority to which he would have been entitled had he not been so retired, in his original place as an additional number, any officer now on the retired list of the Marine Corps: *Provided*, That the circumstances concerning his retirement have been examined by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress, and that both of said committees have reported favorably to the Senate or to the House a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of said Marine Corps.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOWARD. I should like to address myself to the amendment, if I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I have introduced will affect only two men in the service. One of these men is Lieut. Col. Perkins, who was retired from the service, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], under circumstances that, I do not think, in the words of the Secretary of the Navy, were exactly what they should have been in the administration of justice as we should all like to see it administered. I do not think I can express myself more forcibly about the case than to say to you that at the time of Col. Perkins's retirement he had had 32 long years in the service of his country. That service was an honorable service. He never shirked a duty, nor did he have one black mark registered against him within those 32 years of service. Ex-Secretary Long of the Navy devotes nearly one page of his history of the American Navy to the work done by that most efficient officer in the suppression of the Samoan rebellion. There he was actually under fire; there he placed his life in jeopardy for his country, as he had been trained to do, and he willingly did it.

Before he was called before the retiring board in Washington he had not put his foot in Washington in 26 years. He had been a real soldier, not a swivel-chair "warmer" officer or a social "katydid."

After he went to Panama, less than 90 days before he was retired, the then Secretary of War Taft paid a visit to that zone. He called Col. Perkins into a conference and asked him about certain recommendations that had been made. Col. Perkins submitted in writing to him certain recommendations that did not dovetail with the recommendations of high officials in Washington. Mr. Taft brought those recommendations of Col. Perkins to Washington and he adopted every single recommendation that Col. Perkins made in every instance as better for the efficiency of the service than those upon which he was called upon to act that were furnished by officers at headquarters.

And yet within less than 90 days after that he received a telegram from the then brigadier general commandant detaching him from the service in Panama and ordering him to Washington. He came in response to the order, not knowing what he was to be charged with or why he had been detached.

When he walked into the headquarters of the Marine Corps and reported in response to the order detaching him he was notified for the first time that he was to go before a retiring board to be retired for a thing that I never heard of before expressed as a medical term—"mental instability."

I know of no such term applicable to insanity, but they tried to force Col. Perkins then and there to go before the retiring board without counsel or even reading the specifications. He rebelled, and they gave him four days in which to prepare for trial.

When we had these medical officers before the Committee on Naval Affairs let us see what they said.

The first man brought in was a man named Dr. Ury, and I never shall forget him as long as I live. He said Col. Perkins was a paranoiac. I said, "Doctor, paranoia is a progressive disease?" "Yes." "Ever hear of one getting well?" "Oh, yes; I cured one." I said, "Is he living now?" He said "Yes." I said, "Well, Doctor, you take the friendly advice of a plain country lawyer; you go and find that man and take him over to Europe and exhibit him to the great medical colleges of the world as a man who had a well-defined case of paranoia and that you are the one that cured him and give them the secret

of your remedy and your millions are made, because you are the first man that ever lived who has cured paranoia."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to show you how thoroughly the case was gone into. Oh, I must not forget Dr. Ury. I said, "Dr. Ury, are you on the active or the retired list?" He said, "I am on the retired list." I said, "What is your age?" He said, "Fifty-two." I said, "What are you doing on the retired list?" "Well," he said, "they retired me because I was sick." I said, "What is the matter with you?" "Well," he said, "they said I was mentally 'instable.'" [Laughter.] I said, "My Lord, Doctor, they would not put you on the board to pass upon the mental condition of the men in the service, would they?" He said, "I was put on and I don't know why I was put on." I told this to a gentleman in the cloakroom and he said that he certainly was tried by a jury of his peers. [Laughter.]

The next and only other medical gentleman was Dr. McClerg, of the retiring board, and in a sort of pleasant way I examined him. I said, "Doctor, are you on the active or the retired list?" He said, "I am on the retired list." I said, "How old are you?"—he was a youthful-looking man. He said, "I am 54." I said, "What are you on the retired list for?" "Well," he said, "I suffered from neurasthenia, too, and it affected my mind and they retired me." [Laughter.] Now, gentlemen, that sounds ridiculous, but it is in the record, and the gentleman from Massachusetts will remember that he asked some questions about it.

Now, what is the truth? The truth is that these men testified that they diagnosed this case and made a mistake. One of them said in his testimony:

> Gentlemen of the committee, I admit that I made a grievous error in the diagnosis of Col. Perkins's case, and his subsequent life has demonstrated to me that it was an erroneous diagnosis, and all one honorable gentleman can ask other honorable gentlemen to do is to correct this wrong.

He had the nerve and the fairness to do that, and it was the truth and the whole truth. But let us see what they did. Nobody every suspected this man of having a weak mentality. I say right now that he is capable of making a good Secretary of the Navy. He knows more about the intimate history of the American Navy than any man that I know of in this city. Yet they say, "Oh, he was crazy." Let us see who determined that. These two gentlemen I have just mentioned; and the funny part about it was this: Here is the examination they made to discover something being wrong with a man's head. I never heard of it before. I said, "What sort of an examination did you make?" He said, "Well, I felt his pulse." "Was that normal or not?" "Normal." Then he said further that he took his temperature, and I asked him what about that, whether it was normal or not, and he said that it was normal. Then I asked what other examination he had made. He then replied that he had taken notice of his respiration. I asked him how that was and my recollection is that he said it was normal. I then asked him if he had ever seen this man before, and he said that he had never laid eyes on him in his life. Then I asked how long the examination had been in progress, and he said between 15 and 20 minutes. I asked him if he talked to him, and he said, "Very little." Then I said, "What in the name of heaven made you come to the conclusion that the man was crazy?"

Mr. Chairman, that question has never been answered. The record shows that. But I suppose he came to that conclusion on the same principle that if people see a policeman walking down the street with a man with handcuffs on him, 70 per cent of the people believe the man is guilty, just because he is arrested. In the like manner I can take my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], or myself—well, I better leave myself out of the matter for very likely the conclusion would be right there—or I can take my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], or my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], and say that any one of them is crazy, and every one who would look at them would say, "Doggone if he doesn't look like it." [Laughter.] Why? Because somebody has been fool enough to say that he is crazy, because some one has him under surveillance. That is the way Perkins was kicked out of the service. Crazy about what? What was Secretary Taft doing accepting his recommendations if he was crazy? Where was there a blot on his record during the whole of the time that he was in the service? You will not find even a reprimand from a superior. Why take this man in the prime of his life when he has rendered honorable service and was ambitious to serve his country further and put him on the retired list, at the expense of the Government, when he is more capable to do service to his country than many of those who are now on the active list? [Applause.]

I conclude with this terse statement from as just a man as ever presided over the destinies of the American Navy—Secretary Daniels. After thoroughly going into every detail of this case he says:

> When Col. Perkins requested permission to withdraw his resignation, the Judge Advocate General reviewed the case and declared that "the finding is not supported by the evidence submitted." In this conclusion reached by the Judge Advocate General a careful reading of the record forces me to concur. Indeed, I can not understand how the finding of "mental instability" could have been reached from the evidence at the hearing. The Judge Advocate General rendered a righteous judgment when he said officially that "the finding is not supported by the evidence submitted to the board." This righteous judgment received the unanimous approval of the House Naval Affairs Committee, after the fullest investigation. I feel that for the Navy Department to live up to the principle of "for justice, all season's summer, and every place a temple," it is my duty to recommend the passage of a bill to restore Col. Perkins to the service and thereby right the wrong which was done him.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, in order that the committee may see the force of what I said about the Rust range finder I want to state this, that the Navy Department has tested that range finder, and it is so highly impressed with its value that they have constructed all of its parts, and they are now at the navy yard at Norfolk, and as soon as the battleship *Delaware* comes to that port it is going to be placed on that battleship permanently in order to give it a thorough test. I wanted to call the attention of the committee to one piece of evidence that looks to me conclusive with reference to Capts. Hill and Gibbons, and I want to read it from the record. These gentlemen have a record that is just as high as a human being could get, and in order that you may appreciate that I want to state that the regulations in the Navy require the superior officer to make written reports upon his subordinates every six months, and that every one of these officers had from 70 to 75 reports made upon him by their superiors. It is the statement in those written reports in answer to questions which elicit the judgment of the superior officer upon every conceivable qualification and characteristic of the officer. They are framed so as to bring out the full judgment of the reporting officer. These two officers have just as high report as a human being could get, and I want to read to you a piece of evidence as to what sort of officers they are. Just as we closed the testimony of Admiral Knight this letter was handed to your committee:

ANNAPOLIS, MD., *July 21, 1914.*

The Hon. LEMUEL P. PADGETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Capt. F. K. Hill, who has recently been retired by the plucking board, served under me as chief of staff during my command of the Atlantic Fleet. He performed his duties most efficiently in every particular.

From my intimate acquaintance and official association with Capt. Hill during the past 20 years I am convinced that he has no superior professionally among officers of command rank, and I believe this to be the judgment of a large majority of the officers of the Navy. From his early years in the Navy he has displayed marked aptitude and efficiency. He has been a close and intelligent student of naval progress and development, and is a thoroughly equipped, all-round officer.

His retirement is a distinct loss to the service. I would, therefore, invite your careful attention to his record and career in the Navy, feeling sure that it will convince you that a great injustice has been done to this efficient and capable officer. It can not be to the best interest of the service to retire two officers of the capacity and efficiency of Capts. Hill and Gibbons.

Very respectfully,

H. OSTERHAUS,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy.

Now, that came in there and was read, and this is the testimony of Admiral Knight, trying to justify his action in retiring these two officers. Then this occurred. I asked him this question:

> Do you agree to the statements contained in that letter?
>
> Admiral KNIGHT. No; not to all of them.
>
> Mr. WITHERSPOON. You differ with Admiral Osterhaus about that, do you?
>
> Admiral KNIGHT. I differ with much diffidence, because I have the highest respect for Admiral Osterhaus, and I know that Capt. Hill's service with him was of a very high order of excellence. If I agreed with that letter, it goes without saying that I should never have had anything to do with the retirement of Capt. Hill.
>
> Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, give us your judgment now as to whether or not the opinion of a man like Admiral Osterhaus, whom you esteem very highly, ought to have more weight, or ought the judgments of other admirals that may be as well capacitated as himself, who have not had the intimate association and personal contact with an officer which he says he has had with Capt. Hill, to have more weight; whose judgment ought to have more weight?
>
> Admiral KNIGHT. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the judgment of Admiral Osterhaus as to Capt. Hill is of far greater value than my judgment as to Capt. Hill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. What is the question before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GARDNER. Another parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Is not debate on the amendment exhausted at the end of 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; debate has been exhausted.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask, not to be taken out of my time to accommodate the gentleman from Wisconsin, that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no opposition to including the case of Col. Perkins among those on which the committees of Congress are to give power to the President. I have been all through the Perkins case for a number of years and am heartily in favor of a bill to restore him to the service. [Applause.] But I do not believe that his bill or any other should be included in an omnibus proposition such as we have before us where the mere action of committees confer power on the President of the United States. I think, from what has been said by my friend from Georgia on the Perkins case, that this committee will understand that it is a long case to present properly to this committee. There is argument on the other side, as my friend will also admit, but that argument does not weigh with me. The fact is, however, that this committee has not had a full statement of any one of these cases that would come under the provisions of this act. There has been no analysis of them; there has been nothing said in opposition to any of them. The side of the department, which has recommended against every one of them, has not been put before this committee.

The committee as a committee is not in a position to judge intelligently as to the merits of any one of the cases. I have some views on some of these cases, because I have been all through them; others I have not. What I object to is not the consideration of each and every one of these cases on its merits. I believe that should be, but I do object to this House putting itself in the position it will be in if this passes—of making the judgment of a committee superior and paramount to the judgment of the House. If the House should take up each case and have it thrashed out and then pass on it, my objection would be gone, but that is not the proposition before us. The proposition is that any case retired by the plucking board or the operations of any other board in the Army or Navy where a committee of Congress is willing to pass on the case can be acted on by the President. Now, let me say that if this should become legislation before the Sixty-third Congress expires there might be a shoal of those cases coming in, because if you read the language you will find that the committee does not have to report a bill to the House, even. If the committee orders a report on a bill, then the President of the United States is clothed with power to act. You would not even have to get a bill into the House in the ordinary way. In other words, the judgment of a committee overweighs the legislative function of this body or the body at the other end of the Capitol, and, as suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, it need not be a unanimous opinion of the committee, but a mere majority of that committee conferring this power on the President, and I submit, gentlemen of this committee, that is bad legislation. It is a bad precedent to establish. It might be carried further, and if carried to its conclusion there is no necessity for any sessions of Congress to pass on legislation that comes up. This can be accomplished by conferring on each committee of the House power to report the bills, and, when reported, the President can then act.

You can see how ridiculously absurd such a proposition would be if this were done in all committees, and it is just as ridiculous and absurd to permit it to be done in the case of one committee. And so I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment to strike out the whole paragaraph will prevail.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LENROOT, and Mr. WITHERSPOON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this plucking board was originally based on a false theory. I think it is very fortunate that the House has already agreed that it shall be stricken out of the law this year. Men should be promoted by selection for their ability and their aptitude to perform service, and not merely because of their age or length of service. The necessity should never arise where we should drive good men out of the service in order to promote others to the commanding rank. [Applause.] But that is passed, and I hope the House will stand by what it has acted on to-day or let this bill die. I believe in the action of the House to that extent. But now, as to these men who have been removed by the plucking board: Mr. Chairman, I know but little about naval affairs. I have never given them a close study; but there is no Member of this House that could have listened to the debate and the testimony that has been given to us to-day in reference to the way in which these men have been turned out of the service, the country deprived of their needed services, and they carried on a retirement list, drawing their salaries at the expense of the people, that can not come to the conclusion that there has been something rotten in these conditions. [Applause.] And I say the time has come when this House should do justice to the men that this law has treated in an infamous way. I have listened to the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. For many years there has been a close corporation in this House and in the Navy Department that ran the United States Navy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The day has come when the American people have a right to see that the American Navy is run in their interests; and the first thing that you should do in the interests of the American people is to return these officers to the service of their country.

The gentleman says you propose to put these men back in service by the action of these committees. Why, read the paragraph, and what does it mean? It means but one thing, that you are designating a list of men, to wit, the men who have been turned out by this plucking board, and whose cases have been examined and passed on favorably by the Naval Committee of the House, as a list from which the President can select the men whom he will return to the service. It would be the same thing if you wrote in the pages of the bill the names of these men and said that from this list of names the President in his discretion and in accordance with this law can return these men to the service.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes, in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman stated that you might as well write in the names of the people who would be affected. Can the gentleman tell this House how many cases are pending in the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs for restoration, how many the committee have reported to the Senate, and how many they have ordered to be reported, and, furthermore, how many more they may report and order to be reported?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not. I would be willing to give the President of the United States a blank commission to return any of these officers to the service that he thinks it just and right to return.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why would he not have that power under the next paragraph, rather than leaving it to the committee to determine who shall be returned?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is nothing that leaves it to the committee to determine anything. Whatever the committees have determined has already been determined, and it is a mere designation of a certain list of officers, and nothing else. And if you read the bill, you can not come to any other conclusion. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso in the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] and ask to have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LENROOT moves to strike out the proviso in the amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD, which is as follows: "*Provided*, That the circumstances surrounding his retirement have been examined by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress, and that both of said committees have reported favorably to the Senate or to the House a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of said Marine Corps."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has just said, that he would be willing to give a blanket commission to the President of the United States to restore to the active list any of these officers who have been retired; and the purpose of the amendment that I have offered is to effect that object—to give the President of the United States that blanket commission, which he does not have under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. It limits the action of the President of the United States—certainly in his amendment—to only restoring those officers whom the Naval Committee of either House may have favorably reported on.

Now, I want to ask you on this side of the House if it is fair to give a preference to an officer who may have had influence enough and "pull" enough to come here and get a favorable report from a committee, while some other officer, without money, without means, without influence, but just as much entitled to consideration by the President of the United States as are these men—is it fair, is it right, to debar the President from the right of doing justice to these men who have not been here and confine him to appointing those men only who have been?

Now, Mr. Chairman, another proposition: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] says, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] agrees with him, that upon the main proposition contained in the bill it is only a request to the President of the United States to place these men upon the active list. I want to ask you, Are you willing to vote to request the President of the United States to place men upon the active list that may have been reported by a Senate committee—that may have been reported by a Senate committee between now and the 4th of March?

We all know something about senatorial courtesy. The moment that that goes into the bill and becomes a law any Senator or member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate that desires to make a request to the President of the United States, by the President to place a man upon the active list, will as a matter of course, will as a matter of senatorial courtesy, get a bill either favorably reported or ordered to be reported by the committee.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would not the purpose be served by inserting, on page 29, line 16, after the word "Navy," the words "and Marine Corps"?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly it would be taken care of. But if you strike out the proviso it gives the President of the United States absolute authority to appoint any man to the active list that the President may find entitled to be placed there.

I am willing to trust the President of the United States upon that proposition. Why should not you? But I want him to have the opportunity to put upon the list an officer who has not had the influence to command a favorable report from the committee here as well as one who does have that influence.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. Is it the gentleman's idea that influence was required on the part of those officers to have a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. LENROOT. No. But it does require money, it does require means, to come here and present a case before a committee of Congress; and the man who has not done that ought to have an opportunity to present his case before the President of the United States if he chooses, and be appointed if he is found to be entitled to an appointment.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to say that there has not been a single case where anyone has asked for a hearing and has not had it.

Mr. LENROOT. I did not intend to make the slightest reflection on the committee; none in the least. But the man has to come here and present his case; and there are many officers, no doubt, upon the retired list who have not had that opportunity, but who ought to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought the next paragraph covered that amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. No. The next paragraph does not cover that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. LENROOT. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 50.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 28, line 19, after the word "Navy," I move to insert the words "or Marine Corps."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 19, after the word "Navy" insert the words "or Marine Corps."

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I presume the same words ought to be inserted after the word "Navy," in line 16.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. CULLOP. The active list of the Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. That is a different matter. Unless the amendment which I propose is adopted, this would authorize an officer of the Marine Corps to be transferred to the active list of the Navy. We can not do that. This is to perfect the language, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first proviso of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANN moves to strike out on page 28 the proviso beginning in line 23, which reads as follows:

"*Provided*, That the action in these cases has been examined by the Naval Committee of the Sixty-third Congress of the House or of the Senate and either or both of said committees have reported or ordered to be reported favorably to the House or the Senate a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of the service."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this subject so far has related mainly to those officers who were retired by the so-called plucking board under the personnel act; but this provision in the bill does not, in fact, apply to them at all, though I doubt not that that was the intention of the author of the proposition. This paragraph in the bill authorizes the President to restore officers who have been plucked and who have been recommended for restoration by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House or the Senate, and the next paragraph in the bill authorizes the President to restore all other officers who have been plucked under the personnel act. So that this proviso about committees reporting upon officers who have been retired under the personnel act would have no effect at all. Under the next paragraph of the bill the President can restore any officer who has been retired by the plucking board. This provision, therefore, about committee recommendations has no effect upon officers who have been retired under the personnel act, but it does give a tremendous power as to officers who have been court-martialed or who have been retired by any other board, because this paragraph provides not only for officers who have been retired under the personnel act, but also anyone who has been retired from the active to the retired list of the Navy or the Marine Corps by the action of any board.

The next paragraph, giving the President carte blanche in the restoration of officers on the retired list, applies only to those who have been retired under the personnel act and does not apply to officers who have been retired by any other board. If this provision remains in the bill as it stands, it does no good to officers who have been retired under the personnel act. That is covered by the next paragraph; but it authorizes the Naval Committee of the House or the Naval Committee of the Senate to recommend to the active list any officer who has been retired at any time by any other board than the plucking board, and the Naval Committee does not even have to make a report to the House or to the Senate. It does not apply merely to those who have bills already introduced. Any officer on the retired list who has been retired for any purpose by any board,

court-martial or otherwise, who can secure the ordering of a report by the Naval Committee of either House between now and 12 o'clock noon on the 4th of March, is eligible for reinstatement to the rank which he would have held if he had not been retired.

That means that a great many of them will be put upon the active list as rear admirals if they have sufficient influence to affect the judgment of the President. It seems to me that it does no good and ought to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 41, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 17, after the word "authorized," insert the words "within two years of the date of the approval of this act."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes that the authority granted to the President must be exercised within two years of the approval of the act. The applicants under this provision should be examined promptly and their applications definitely determined. The matter should not be held open year after year or administration after administration, so that the cases may keep coming up and be thrashed out and renewed and renewed and rerenewed until some one is found who will act favorably.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment applies to what might be called paragraph 2?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is to page 28, line 17, after the word "authorized," to insert the words "within two years after the date of the approval of this act."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. How does the gentleman propose to treat the next paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I propose to offer the same amendment there. I believe two years is ample time and one might be enough.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be better to add it as a separate paragraph at the end of the next paragraph?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe it is better right at this point, as it is so simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 29, lines 12 and 13, the language "in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, lines 12 and 13, strike out the following language: "In all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now provides—

That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion, as now provided by law, in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination.

I take it that the purpose of this bill is to restore men to the Navy who may be of some value to the Navy. Suppose a man had passed a physical examination six years ago for promotion; then he had been plucked, how idle it would be to say that he ought to go back into the Navy now without a further physical examination. He may have entirely lost his health within six years. That might not be true of his professional examination.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I did not quite understand the gentleman. Would he strike out the provision requiring him to stand an examination?

Mr. MANN. I want to leave the provision so that he must stand a medical and professional examination before he can be reappointed.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Some of these officers are captains and they were captains when retired. They have stood an examination for promotion to the grade of captain and does the gentleman want them reexamined?

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to be reexamined.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. They would then be required to stand two examinations for that promotion?

Mr. MANN. They are out of the service now and they want to get back in. If they can not pass a physical and professional examination now, they ought not to go back as captains. If they are not qualified to be captains, they ought not to be appointed. I apprehend that as to the professional examination there might be no difficulty, but there might be great reason for not putting a man back without giving him a physical examination. A physical examination taken six years ago is no criterion to determine whether he is fit to be an officer in the Navy now.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will not the gentleman admit this? We will take one of these cases where he was promoted from the rank of commander to that of captain, we will say, five years ago. He stood an examination, both medical and professional, at that time. If he never had been retired he would not have to stand any further examination until the time came for him to be promoted to the grade of rear admiral. That examination—both medical and professional—would stand under the regulations until the time came for him to be promoted again.

Mr. MANN. But that time would not last five years.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. This is exactly the same thing.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. A man who has been examined in the Navy for promotion to a captaincy, say, would stand a professional and medical examination. If they find that he is entitled to be promoted, and he remains in the service, he is not losing anything, though he does not get the physical examination, as I understand it, until the time when they are ready to make the appointment in the way of promotion. But to say that an old examination years ago shall qualify a man now for appointment in charge of one of the war vessels of the United States seems to me liable to bring upon us men who are not qualified to perform the duties. I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] desires to put into the active service anyone unless he is able to show qualities, both professional and physical, for performing the duties of the office which he seeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 44, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 4, page 29, after the word "*Provided*," the word "*further*."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 4, after the word "*Provided*," strike out the word "*further*."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the President be, and he is hereby, also authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Navy any other officer who may have been retired under the said section 9 whom he may consider physically and professionally qualified to discharge his duties on the active list: *Provided*, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have held if he had not been retired and shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or at any time thereafter promoted: *Provided further*, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination as now prescribed by law: *And provided further*, That any officer transferred to the active list shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay or allowances of any kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the word "authorized," insert the words "within two years of the date of the approval of this act."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment adopted on the other paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he make it read "two years of the passage of this act."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the "two years of the date of the approval" is the same thing. It means the same thing.

Mr. MANN. It does not, but I do not care.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 17, after the word "said," strike out the words "section 9" and insert in lieu thereof the words "personnel act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, these three paragraphs under consideration relate entirely to section 9 of the personnel act. They do not relate to the other provisions of the personnel act. For instance, section 8 provides for retirement for disability and on other conditions. The gentleman's amendment is opening up all the various paragraphs of the personnel act where may be grounds for removal. All that is in order under the rule are these three separate paragraphs and germane amendments thereto. If under the other sections of the personnel act officers may be removed, amendments relative thereto would not come within the scope of the rule. It has been held many times that when an amendment relates merely to one thing, another amendment embodying a general class as this amendment does is not germane. I assume that the Chair appreciates the real purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the Chair overruled the point of order which I made a while ago to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] on the preceding paragraph, without discussion, but I have no complaint to make about that. I thought the amendment introduced entirely new matter.

This section provides for the restoration to the active list of men retired in a certain way under section 9 of the personnel act. Now, there are many other ways in which an officer can be retired entirely apart from section 9, and the question is whether on a provision to restore officers who have been retired under section 9 it is germane to offer an amendment affecting officers who have been retired in some other way.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will indulge me just a moment further. Section 8 provides for the retirement of officers by reason of voluntary retirement and by reason of disability. The purpose of the amendment is to give authority to the President to consider the retirements of officers who have been retired for other reasons than under section 9, relating to the plucking board. It opens up the general subject, and therefore it is not germane, because provisions here only relate to one certain class, namely, those who have been retired under section 9 of the personnel act, while the amendment relates to a different class.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the subject of this legislation, it is the transfer of officers from the retired list to the active list in the Navy and Marine Corps. The preceding paragraph relates to those who are retired by any board, so it clearly is outside the provisions of section 9 of the personnel act; and the present paragraph goes into another subject—the transfer from the retired list to the active list—and the purpose of this amendment is simply to open up section 8. There are only two paragraphs in the personnel act under which an officer can be retired—one is section 8, the other is section 9. Section 9 is the section that provides for the plucking board and gives power to that body. Section 8 provides for voluntary retirements. Now, the thought that brought this amendment to my attention was, having in mind a young officer who was recently transferred from the active list to active duty on the retired list, it seemed to me the power ought to be vested in somebody somewhere along the line, in a proper case, to transfer that young man back to the active list in the Navy, and that is the purpose of this proposed amendment. It seems to me that it is germane to the subject matter of this legislation and eminently appropriate to the rule under which we are considering this legislation to-day. The rule itself provides that this legislation shall be subject to all amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FITZHENRY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I listened attentively as possible in an endeavor to hear what the gentleman was saying, but I could not hear all he said. What is the real reason for changing that language? Now, the purpose of this act, as I understand it, is to transfer to the active list of the Navy certain officers who have been eliminated by the operation of this board of elimination, and the power of that board is found under section 9.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Why not use the same language? Does the gentleman desire to enlarge the list of officers who possibly may be restored?

Mr. FITZHENRY. Because under the preceding paragraph of this bill express provision has been made for specific officers whose particular cases brought this subject matter to the attention of the committee. The next paragraph, as I understand it, was to be a paragraph to grant to the President of the United States power to treat any particular case within the law and to make proper transfers. The language used is that of "section 9," and in order to broaden it out so it will take in section 8 I have offered this amendment to strike out the words "section 9" and insert the words "personnel act."

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman for answering my question, and now let me ask him another one. Is it the gentleman's intention to enlarge the list of officers to be restored? Does the gentleman intend to have included in this new act other officers than those who have been selected by this elimination board?

Mr. FITZHENRY. I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania, frankly, that is the intention.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman for his candid answer.

Mr. FITZHENRY. I want this law to be broad enough to cover a man who may have voluntarily for a few weeks gone on the retired list doing active duty, as the one I have in mind, and in a proper case have him transferred back to the active list. That power ought to reside somewhere in the management of the Navy, either in the President of the United States or in the Secretary of the Navy. I think the most remarkable thing about sections 8 and 9 is that the Congress ever gave any board to be automatically created power that could not even be reviewed by the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentlemen to confine themselves to the point of order. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FITZHENRY. If the Chair will permit me, I would like to call attention to the closing paragraph under the rule under which this paragraph is being considered, to the effect that it shall be in order to offer amendments to the paragraph while the same is being considered under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is as to a germane amendment. The Chair thinks under the rule we are dealing entirely with section 9 of the personnel act of March 3, 1899, and to undertake now to go further, as the gentleman says is the object of the amendment he has offered, is to open up a broader field from which to take persons who are on the retired list and put them on the active list, and is not germane to section 9. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] for a moment. I believe he is the author of this provision. I would like to understand the meaning of this proviso:

Provided, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have held if he had not been retired.

Now, what does that mean? For instance, every officer who is promoted is required to take an examination, is he not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How can anybody tell whether he has passed an examination which he has not taken, and, if they can not tell, how can they restore him to any place he has not already held? What is the intention of it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The answer to that is that they have all taken the required examination except one. There was one officer that was ordered to take an examination for promotion to the next higher rank.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman does not quite get my question.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir; I get it, and, if you will bear with me, I think I will make you understand it. There was one officer who was about to be examined, and just before he stood the examination he was retired by the plucking board. Now, if he was restored to the same place that he would have had, he would have to stand an examination, and that was the object of that provision that you had struck out, that they should stand examination except where they had already stood it. That was struck out, and I think we made a mistake when we struck it out, because it was intended to cover one case.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to argue that over again.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. When it says that he shall be restored to the same place he would have held, it means this: That each officer has a certain number. You take, for instance, the admiral——

Mr. MANN. Let me ask my question, then, a little more intelligently than I did before. Suppose a man was lieutenant commander in the Navy, holding a certain number, and that number is now in the position of captain in the Navy, having passed through the position of commander. Even assuming that the man had taken examination for promotion from lieutenant commander to commander, he would not have taken examination for promotion to captain. If he had remained in

the service and taken examination he would now be a captain. Does this restore him to the position?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir. I was going to tell you there was a certain number he would have had if he had remained in the service.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but how could you tell he would have passed the examination for captain?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The bill as we had it drawn would provide for identically that case.

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. If you will let me explain, I will show you it did provide for precisely that kind of a case until you struck it out.

Mr. MANN. But he had not taken examination for promotion as captain.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. He could not have done so. A lieutenant commander could not be appointed captain.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is true; and if he could not stand that examination now, he could not be restored.

Mr. MANN. He could not have been appointed captain from the position of lieutenant commander. He first would have to be appointed commander and be promoted from commander to captain.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Under that bill he would have the place he would have had.

Mr. MANN. But it is not a correct supposition that within the time that has elapsed there has been a promotion of his class through two ranks.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think there have been some of them promoted through two ranks.

Mr. MANN. I do not agree with you about that.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I know in the previous paragraphs some have been promoted through three ranks.

Mr. MANN. Not since he was retired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Since he was retired by the operation of some other board. There is not a single one of these cases that has been retired long enough to have passed through two ranks.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. The previous paragraph does not apply merely to the personnel board. The personnel board has been in operation for 12 or 15 years. There have been men passed through more than two ranks, and I guess more than three ranks in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, before we leave the paragraph, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, before we leave this subject we have been considering, let me bear a word of testimony to the valuable services which have heretofore been performed by this board which is now obnoxiously spoken of as the "plucking board." I agree with the action of the committee. I have felt for three or four years that this board should be abolished; that the good work which it had performed, the good work which it was designated to perform by a law passed 16 years ago, has been performed, and the mission of the board was done.

Perhaps if you will allow me to refer to myself, I am the only one here who actively participated in the construction of this law 16 years ago. At that time I had some fear as to the effect of the absolute authority conferred upon this board. I had great doubt whether it was advisable to place such absolute and unreviewable authority—such undisputed authority—in the hands of any man or set of men. I appealed at the time to those who knew better than I did to inform me of the probable consequences following the execution of the law, and became satisfied of its necessity. You may yet think well of the services of this board as it is now extinguished forever.

As I have said, I was satisfied that there was need for this board and the power given it; and I say now, as one who knows of what he is speaking, that it is largely because of the work of this autocratic board that we have now the finest personnel that any military body can boast of. The officers were held to a strict accountability. They knew what the result would be if they did not come to the mark prescribed for them.

But all the old timber has been cut out. The authority being absolute, there being no opportunity whatever given to this board to avoid the duties devolving upon it, it has been forced, my friends, to take from the line of the Navy men who, in my judgment, should not have been selected. Perhaps at times this board acted unwisely. But in most instances it acted wisely and with a view to add to the efficiency of the service. I believe, except within the last two or three years, the acts of this board could be approved by anyone who would examine the duties which it performed and the manner in which it performed them.

I am glad, however, that the day of its departure is about to come. But let me suggest to you that you may find it necessary within a very short time to direct by law another body of men to perform duties of some kind that will take from the Navy of the United States men who ought not to hold high commissions in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The title of paymaster's clerk in the United States Navy is hereby changed to pay clerk, and hereafter all pay clerks shall be warranted from acting pay clerks who shall be appointed from enlisted men in the Navy holding acting or permanent appointments as chief petty officers who have served at least three years as enlisted men, at least two years of which service must have been on board a cruising vessel of the Navy. All appointments as acting pay clerk shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy, and all such appointees, in addition to the qualifications above set forth, must be citizens of the United States. All acting appointments herein provided for shall be made permanent under regulations established by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That paymasters' clerks now in the Navy whose total service as such is less than one year and who are citizens of the United States may, upon the passage of this act, be given appointments as acting pay clerks without previous service as enlisted men: *Provided further*, That paymasters' clerks now in the service and former paymasters' clerks whose appointments have been revoked within six months next preceding the passage of this act, who have had not less than one year's actual service as such, and who are citizens of the United States, may, upon the passage of this act, be warranted as pay clerks without previous service as enlisted men or as acting pay clerks: *And provided further*, That pay clerks and acting pay clerks shall have the same pay, allowances, and other benefits as are now or may hereafter be allowed other warrant officers and acting warrant officers, respectively.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. The point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That all pay clerks shall, after six years' service as such, be commissioned chief pay clerks and shall on promotion have the rank, pay, and allowances of chief boatswain: *Provided*, That in computing the six years' service herein provided for credit shall be given for all service in the Navy as pay clerk, acting pay clerk, and paymaster's clerk: *Provided further*, That paymasters' clerks now in the Navy and former paymasters' clerks whose appointments have been revoked within six months next preceding the passage of this act, who have had not less than six years' actual service as such, and who are citizens of the United States, may, upon the passage of this act, be commissioned as chief pay clerks without previous service as enlisted men, acting pay clerks, or pay clerks.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has made a point of order against the first paragraph of the provision relating to pay clerks, and in order to save the time of reading I ask that we consider as read all down to and including line 11 of page 33. It all relates to this same matter. And inasmuch as the gentleman from Illinois has made a point of order as to the other, I ask that the point of order be sustained on the later provisions down to line 11 of page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to consider as read the provisions down to line 11 of page 33, and that the same shall be considered as subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Was there a request made for unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. It all relates to this same matter. With the first paragraph out the other is useless.

Mr. MOORE. If it comes out, the opportunity to ask this question goes by. I reserve the right to object for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee why the expression "who are citizens of the United States" is used? Have we paymasters who are not citizens of the United States? In each one of these paragraphs that expression is used.

Mr. PADGETT. Paymasters' clerks are limited to citizens of the United States, coming up from the enlisted men.

Mr. MOORE. Why is that expression used?

Mr. PADGETT. Just to limit it to that class. They are warrant officers.

Mr. MOORE. To put the question bluntly, are there any paymasters' clerks who are not citizens of the United States?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand not; and we do not want any.

Mr. STAFFORD. To make the RECORD clear, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against each of these paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order to the paragraphs, beginning with line 23, on page 31, line 21, on page 32, and line 7, on page 33. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter officers of the Navy and Marine Corps appointed student naval aviators, while lawfully detailed for duty involving actual flying in air craft, including balloons, dirigibles, and aeroplanes, shall receive the pay and allowances of their rank and service plus 35 per cent increase thereof; and those officers who have heretofore qualified, or may

hereafter qualify, as naval aviators, under such rules and regulations as have been or may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, shall, while lawfully detailed for duty involving actual flying in air craft, receive the pay and allowances of their rank and service plus 50 per cent increase thereof. Hereafter enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps, while detailed for duty involving actual flying in air craft, shall receive the pay, and the permanent additions thereto, including allowances, of their rating and service, or rank and service, as the case may be, plus 50 per cent increase thereof: *Provided*, That not more than a yearly average of 48 officers and 96 enlisted men of the Navy and 12 officers and 24 enlisted men of the Marine Corps, detailed for duty involving actual flying in air craft, shall receive any increase in pay while on duty involving actual flying in air craft, nor shall any officer in the Navy senior in rank to lieutenant commander, nor any officer in the Marine Corps senior in rank to major, receive any increase in pay or allowances by reason of such detail or duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman if he is going to make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to inquire whether these provisions, as recommended by the committee, differ at all from the provisions in the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs for the Army aviators?

Mr. PADGETT. They differ in this, that there is a better provision made for the men in the Army aviation corps than is provided in this bill for the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe there was no difficulty whatever in the Committee on Military Affairs obtaining consideration for the bill providing for the permanent establishment of the aviation service connected with the Army, and I think there will be no difficulty in getting consideration of a similar bill reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs for the Navy, and so I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the point of order include and embrace all down to and including line 9, on page 35, for it all relates to this matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order to those respective paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the point of order shall relate to paragraphs indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order to each of the paragraphs indicated. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George W. Littlehales a professor in the corps of professors of mathematics of the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, as additional number in that grade and in any grade to which he may be thereafter promoted: *Provided*, That for pay and other purposes his service as a civilian employee in the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department previous to being commissioned shall count as service in the Navy.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. The point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

There is hereby established a United States naval reserve, which shall consist of citizens of the United States who have been or may be entitled to be honorably discharged from the Navy after not less than one four-year term of enlistment or after a term of enlistment during minority. The naval reserve shall be organized under the Bureau of Navigation and shall be governed by the Articles for the Government of the Navy and by the Naval Regulations and Instructions. Whenever actively employed with the Navy, or whenever employed in authorized travel to and from prescribed active duty with the Navy, its members shall be employed as members of the naval reserve and shall while so employed be held and considered to be in all respects in the same status as enlisted men of the Navy on active duty, except that they shall not be advanced in rating in time of peace. When not actively employed with the Navy, members of the naval reserve shall not be entitled to any pay, bounty, gratuity, or pension except the pay expressly provided for members of the naval reserve by the provisions of this act, nor shall they be entitled to retirement by reason of such service in the naval reserve.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph. This is too important a matter to be considered on an appropriation bill. I will ask to reserve the point of order for a moment, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. While this is clearly subject to the point of order, it is perhaps the most desirable feature of this whole bill, as the Naval Militia is, in my judgment, one of the most important features of the Navy, and I shall ask the Naval Affairs Committee at an early date to report this in a special bill, so that we may consider it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, but I think he will agree with me that this is no place to consider such an important measure—on an appropriation bill. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. They put the other in by a special rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. That shows the favoritism that characterizes your Committee on Rules.

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all. It is not a question of favoritism; it is a question of judgment. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, as this provision continues down to and including line 8, on page 40, that it all be considered as read, and the point of order made to it down to line 8, on page 40.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the part of the bill indicated by him be considered as read.

Mr. MANN. Down to where?

Mr. PADGETT. To line 8, on page 40.

The CHAIRMAN. To line 8, on page 40, as it all relates to the same subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. To have the RECORD straight, I will make the point of order to the respective paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the paragraphs beginning with line 21, on page 36——

Mr. STAFFORD. Line 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been sustained already to that paragraph; to the paragraphs beginning with line 8, on page 37; line 15, page 37; line 1, page 38; line 7, page 38; line 16, page 38; line 22, page 38; line 11, page 39; line 24, page 39; and line 7, on page 40.

Mr. BUTLER. Including lines 7 and 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order to the paragraphs beginning with the lines indicated by him. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the commander in chief of the United States Atlantic Fleet, the commander in chief of the United States Pacific Fleet, and the commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet, respectively, shall each, after being designated as such commander in chief by the President, and from the date of assuming command of such fleet until his relinquishment of such command, have the rank and pay of an admiral; and in each of the above-named fleets the officer serving as second in command thereof shall each, after being designated as such second in command by the President, and from the date of assuming duty as such second in command until his relinquishment of such duty, have the rank and pay of a vice admiral; and the grades of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy are hereby reestablished and authorized for the purposes of this section. The annual pay of an admiral shall be $12,000, and of a vice admiral $10,000: *Provided*, That in time of peace officers to serve as commander in chief and as second in command of the three said fleets shall be designated from among the rear admirals on the active list of the Navy: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall create any vacancy in any grade in the Navy nor increase the total number of officers allowed by existing law, and that when an officer is detached from duty as such commander in chief or as such second in command, as above provided, he shall return to his regular rank in the list of rear admirals and shall thereafter receive only the pay and allowances of such regular rank.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that.

Mr. CULLOP. I also make a point of order to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: Coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, including expenses of transportation, storage, and handling the same; maintenance and general operation of machinery of naval coaling depots and coaling plants; water for all purposes on board naval vessels; and fee for the cooling of water, including the expense of transportation and storage of both, $4,500,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee inform us whether any efforts have been made by the Navy Department to obtain cheaper coal or to release it from what is said to be a coal combination that sets the price of Navy coal?

Mr. PADGETT. There have been appropriations to develop the Alaska coal, and we received a report of the Matanuska field which is very encouraging. The report of the Bering River field the year before was not satisfactory. The one received this present winter as to the Matanuska field was very encouraging. It was said to be equal to the best eastern coal.

Mr. MOORE. The hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee have some reference to a combination which it is said the Secretary of the Navy undertook to break up during the past year.

Mr. PADGETT. Identical bids were submitted in a number of cases.

Mr. MOORE. The bids were identical; and there was a move on the part of the Secretary of the Navy to break up the combination by acquiring coal elsewhere than from West Virginia fields.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary declined to accept any bids, and readvertised, and then in the readvertisements there was

a change in the conditions and terms. Then there was in the next submission of bids variations in the prices.

Mr. MOORE. Were there any allegations before the committee of a combination which would seem to have warranted any investigation on the part of the committee?

Mr. PADGETT. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy said that the management of the coal was under his jurisdiction in the department; and when these identical bids came in he was satisfied from them that there must be a mental telepathy that brought them all together, and for that reason he had refused to accept the bids and readvertised.

Mr. MOORE. He has been purchasing some Pennsylvania coal, has he not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. In competition with the West Virginia coal?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell approximately how many tons of coal are used for steamer use in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. It is quite a large amount.

Mr. MOORE. The appropriation is $4,500,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and I think they use between 700,000 and 800,000 tons for steamer purposes. There is some bought otherwise for factory purposes, but that is a different class of coal.

Mr. MOORE. Has all the coal heretofore been obtained from one source?

Mr. PADGETT. Not from one source, but from one general locality. There is over here in West Virginia three different grades—Pocahontas, Georges Creek, and New River—and they were all three the principal supplies of coal, but under the present administration during the last year it has broadened out, and two or three supplies from Pennsylvania have come into competition.

Mr. MOORE. The department has certain standards and is guided by those standards in regard to the quality of steamer coal?

Mr. PADGETT. It has the mines classified, and they must come up to the standard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Pennsylvania coal was examined during the past year, and it came up to the standard fixed by the department?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of it did, and some did not come up to it.

Mr. MOORE. Was there any test on any one of the naval vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand there were several.

Mr. MOORE. Was there a test on the battleship *New York*?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember the name of the ship. I believe that some coal was tested on the *New York*. I am not sure that it was Pennsylvania coal, but the test was made on the *New York*.

Mr. MOORE. I think I am correct in saying that the hearings show that a test of Pennsylvania coal was made on the *New York*, and that it was eminently satisfactory.

Mr. PADGETT. If it was the Pennsylvania coal, the report found that it was satisfactory.

Mr. MOORE. At any rate, that Pennsylvania coal is now being secured to a limited extent by the department. I wanted to find out if the gentleman could tell us why the tests established by the Navy Department, which accepted the Pennsylvania coal, are not acceptable to the War Department, which, up to the present time, has insisted upon taking the Pocahontas coal and other coal from the West Virginia fields?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no information on that. I did not know there was that distinction.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us how coal is stored at the Isthmus, so far as the Navy coal is concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has no separate storage there. That is under the War Department and under the Panama Canal administration. They store there and supply the Navy and commerce also. The Government has a monopoly on the supply at Panama with reference to all purposes.

Mr. MOORE. Has the Navy a storage plant at Panama?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not. We get it from the Isthmian Canal administration.

Mr. MOORE. What is the nearest coal supply station to Panama?

Mr. PADGETT. We have one at Guantanamo, and then on the Pacific coast we have one at San Diego, at Los Angeles, and up the coast to Bremerton.

Mr. MOORE. At the present time all of the coal goes to the Pacific coast from the Atlantic coast, from the port of Norfolk, or latterly from the port of Philadelphia?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know anything about the freight rates?

Mr. PADGETT. They have been very high of late.

Mr. MOORE. As high as $6 a ton?

Mr. PADGETT. Higher than that in some cases.

Mr. MOORE. On coal costing no more than $2.60 a ton?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of the freight rates run up above $8 a ton.

Mr. MOORE. There is no coal on the Pacific coast—the Matanuska, Alaska, field—that is, up to date, satisfactory for naval use?

Mr. PADGETT. The Matanuska coal is reported to be; but that is away inland 100 miles, and they have to bring it out at great cost in sleds and dredges over the snow. There is no communication there yet.

Mr. MOORE. What is the prospect, so far as the Navy Department's necessities are concerned, of obtaining that western coal for Pacific coast use?

Mr. PADGETT. From Alaska?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. None at all until the railroad is completed; but I may add that there is a very large supply of oil on the Pacific coast, and oil is very cheap, and we are using a large quantity of oil in ships, and we are providing oil storage on the Pacific.

Mr. MOORE. That was the purpose of the inquiry I made of the gentleman early in the day. Provision is made in this bill for additional storage tanks?

Mr. PADGETT. All up and down the coast.

Mr. MOORE. It appears, from the testimony of Assistant Secretary Roosevelt before the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the coal combination of which Secretary Daniels complained resulted in a test of Pennsylvania bituminous coal on the trial trip of the battleship *New York*, "when she exceeded her contract speed by about 1 knot," and the award of a contract for substantially 200,000 tons of that coal. What the Assistant Secretary told the committee about the coal combination included the following:

> I am speaking now of Hampton Roads coal. Every bidder—and there were 17 of them—bid $2.90 a ton, a flat price. Two bidders bid $2.85 a ton, the White Oak Coal Co. and the B. Nichols Co. Those two bids of $2.85 were subject, however, to an increase of 5 cents in case the Interstate Commerce Commission granted the rate increase.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. How about the other $2.90 bids, were they subject to the increase?
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. The bids were the same, only the other people were willing to take the chance?
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, sir. Seventeen of them bid $2.90, irrespective of any change in the rate, and two firms bid $2.85 with a qualification.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. But if the rate increase was granted, they would go up to $2.90, while the other people bid $2.90 and they could not get any more, and so it is fair to assume that they considered the increase of rates at the time that they put in the bid of $2.90.
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not know what they considered.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. On that assumption, they were all on the basis of $2.85?
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. The 17 firms did not make any bid on the $2.85 at all.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. I assume that they had in mind the increase of rates.
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. I doubt if the 17 firms contemplated that, in view of the fact that the previous year's contract had been at $2.90, before the rate question was brought up at all.
>
> These tests as above outlined made sure that a widening of the fields would be secured without a lowering of the quality. Dealers of excellent reputation in the trade, of large financial resources, and of undoubted ability to carry out any contracts they undertook, were found who expressed their willingness to compete for coal and who, in addition, were willing to furnish coal which was then on the accepted list of the Navy, and about which, of course, there could be no dispute as to its quality. First, however, the department being exceedingly loath to make any changes unless absolutely necessary, coal was advertised for under practically the old conditions, the only difference being that public advertising instead of the personal letter was the method used. It was hoped that the attitude of this administration in regard to noncompetitive bids had been made so clear in the matter of armor plate that the dealers supplying coal would read the handwriting on the wall and would engage in real competition. Much to the disappointment of the department, however, these bidders, apparently secure in what they considered their exclusive privilege, bid a uniform price of $2.90 per ton for delivery at Hampton Roads, which was the main item, and contemplated the acceptance of 600,000 tons. Two bidders named a price of $2.85, but modified it by a reservation that this price would be increased by the amount of any increase granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the coal-carrying roads of that section. At the time this reservation was made it was generally hoped by the coal men that an increase of at least 5 cents per ton, and possibly more, would be granted within a very short time, which made the actual cost of the coal under this bid somewhat difficult to determine. A list of these bids is herewith filed, marked "A."

This effort to secure competition having failed, it was directed that all bids be rejected and new specifications made out. In this connection the attention of the committee is called to the Revised Statute 3728, which gives the Secretary of the Navy absolute discretion as to how and by what method he shall purchase coal and leaves him absolutely unhampered by the usual restrictions as to bidding or acceptance of bids.

Mr. ROBERTS. The Secretary of the Navy has a free hand, absolutely, in purchasing coal?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. He does not have to advertise for bids?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. He can make a contract with a dozen people or with one person?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. As he sees fit?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Several important modifications were made in the new specifications. The amount to be purchased was to be divided between deliveries at Hampton Roads and Philadelphia, thus bringing the Pennsylvania fields into the competition. This, however, was only optional with the department, and was intended simply to give the Pennsylvania field people a chance to come in for the Navy business, on the sole condition that they had an acceptable coal at an acceptable price. Furthermore, the department also removed the restriction compelling a bidder to be either an owner or the sole selling agent of a mine or of a sufficient amount of the output of the mine to cover the amount on which he bid. This threw it open to all reputable dealers of coal who were financially able to put up the bond and whose moral reputation insured that they would carry out the contract. Another change was made by the insertion of a paragraph, that there might be no misunderstanding, that it was the intention of the department to permit bidders in emergency to substitute for one kind of coal any other kind of coal, provided that it was on the old acceptable list of the Navy. So long as the coal was a coal which had been in the past an approved and acceptable one, under the extremely rigorous rules of the department, it was obviously immaterial to the department from which particular mine the coal came. The point was to secure coal which had been tried, tested, and found to be good coal. In other words, the department had distinctly in mind the possibility of a reputable coal dealer bidding on coal which he was then handling from a particular mine, and then, if he found himself refused that coal by those who had control of the mine, he could go out and get any other coal that was on the Navy acceptable list. The bids under these new proposals, which were opened June 18, show great improvement. As against the $2.90 price at Hampton Roads bids as low as $2.57 were received.

Mr. ROBERTS. For Hampton Roads?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. For Hampton Roads. Philadelphia coal was as low as $2.40. A summary of these prices is shown on the inclosed exhibit, which I will file with the committee. In going over the bids the first and absolute determination of the department was to make sure that no inferior coal was purchased. At the same time we wished to give every bidder an opportunity to have his coal tested, so that if he had discovered a mine or found somebody who owned a mine which had good coal in it, but which was not on the Navy acceptable list, he would have a fair chance to put it on the list if it was good enough.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Secretary, before we get away from your statement of the price bid for Hampton Roads on June 18, in which you say they offered coal as low as $2.57—do you not want to revise that? If you will pardon me, that was at Philadelphia. The lowest bid you got, according to the official report we have, on page 344 of Admiral Griffin's hearing, at Hampton Roads was $2.80, with an alternative bid of $1.40 a ton at the mine, the Government to pay the freight from the mine to Hampton Roads. Now, we do not know what that would figure out. The bidders guarantee that the freight would not be in excess of $1.40, which would make $2.80. The $2.57 bid, you will find, was for Philadelphia delivery.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think you are quite correct on that. Two dollars and eighty cents was the lowest at Hampton Roads. Two dollars and fifty-seven cents was the Philadelphia bid.

Mr. ROBERTS. The lowest at Hampton Roads was $2.80?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I desire to ask the chairman if the experiments have reached such a stage with the vessels on the Pacific side of the country, where they are using oil as fuel instead of coal, as to demonstrate an advantage in cost, and thereby saving the transportation from the east coast across the continent to the western slope?

Mr. PADGETT. I may state that all of the recent battleships burn oil exclusively.

Mr. CULLOP. On both sides?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Either Atlantic or Pacific?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; wherever they are they would burn oil. They are constructed only for oil.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to ask the gentleman if they do not find that oil is much cheaper fuel than coal, and also that it saves space in the transportation of the fuel?

Mr. PADGETT. It saves space, and also cost in the labor in feeding it into the boiler. As to the cheapness of it, it depends upon whether it is on the Pacific or on the Atlantic. On the Pacific coal is very high and oil is very cheap, while on the Atlantic coal is much cheaper and oil is somewhat higher than on the Pacific, so that there is a difference as to whether the oil and the coal are burned upon one or the other ocean.

Mr. CULLOP. Has there ever been any test made as to how much oil it will take to supply in fuel the equal of a bushel of coal?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; there have been a number of such tests——

Mr. CULLOP. Can the gentleman give us such particulars?

Mr. PADGETT (continuing). As to their steaming qualities I do not recall, but if the gentleman will look over the hearings of last year he will find, either last year or the year before, we went into it very extensively, and comparative statements were made as to the steaming qualities of coal and oil, one related to the other.

Mr. CULLOP. Well, now, the gentleman spoke of the difference in the cost of coal and oil on the Atlantic Fleet, coal being much cheaper than oil——

Mr. PADGETT. I said that oil on the Pacific coast was cheaper than oil on the Atlantic, and that coal on the Atlantic was much cheaper than coal on the Pacific, and then the ratio of difference between the two is not so great, between oil on the Pacific and the Atlantic and between coal on the Pacific and on the Atlantic.

Mr. CULLOP. What is the difference between the cost of the two with reference to the Atlantic Fleet?

Mr. PADGETT. The difference is not so much because when you take coal on the Atlantic you get coal at about, I believe, $2.80 or $2.85 a ton on salt water, at tidewater, and on the Pacific coast coal costs anywhere from five to eight and a half or nine dollars, which is freight added, depending upon whether it is carried on a sailing vessel or a steam vessel, or the particular conditions that may exist at the time of the shipment.

Mr. CULLOP. What I wanted to know, if I can find out from the gentleman, is, what is the difference, say, between the two with regard to the Atlantic Fleet?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give that to the gentleman, but there is not a great deal of difference on the Atlantic.

Mr. CULLOP. Coal, however, is cheaper.

Mr. PADGETT. No; oil.

Mr. CULLOP. On the Atlantic?

Mr. PADGETT. On the Atlantic; I am not sure, but coal may be a little bit cheaper on the Atlantic.

Mr. CULLOP. I understood the gentleman to say at the beginning that coal was cheaper on the Atlantic and oil was cheaper on the Pacific.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said it depends upon where you consider it in making comparisons.

Mr. CULLOP. I should think oil would be the cheaper.

Mr. PADGETT. It may possibly be, but the difference is very close on the Atlantic; I am not prepared to state the exact difference, but we went into that very fully last year or the year before, and the difference between coal and oil on the Atlantic is not very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULLOP. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

Construction and repair of vessels: For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary; purchase of materials and stores of all kinds; steam steerers, pneumatic steerers, steam capstans, steam windlasses, and all other auxiliaries; labor in navy yards and on foreign stations; purchase of machinery and tools for use in shops; carrying on work of experimental model tank; designing naval vessels; construction and repair of yard craft lighters, and barges; wear, tear, and repair of vessels afloat; general care, increase, and protection of the Navy in the line of construction and repair; incidental expenses for vessels and navy yards, inspectors' offices, such as photographing, books, professional magazines, plans, stationery, and instruments for drafting room, and for pay of classified force under the bureau; for hemp, wire, iron, and other materials for the manufacture of cordage, anchors, cables, galleys, and chains; specifications for purchase thereof shall be so prepared as shall give fair and free competition; canvas for the manufacture of sails, awnings, hammocks, and other work; interior appliances and tools for manufacturing purposes in navy yards and naval stations; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipage at home and abroad; and for the payment in labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; naval signals and apparatus, other than electric, namely, signals, lights, lanterns, rockets, running lights, lanterns and lamps and their appendages for general use on board ship for illuminating purposes, and oil and candles used in connection therewith; bunting and other materials for making and repairing of flags of all kinds; for all permanent galley fittings and equipage; rugs, carpets, curtains, and hangings on board naval vessels, $9,106,127: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be applied to the repair of any wooden ship when the estimated cost of such repairs, to be appraised by a competent board of naval officers, shall exceed 10 per cent of the estimated cost, appraised in like manner, of a new ship of the same size and like material: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be applied to the repair of any other ship when the estimated cost of such repairs, to be appraised by a competent board of naval officers, shall exceed 20 per cent of the estimated cost, appraised in like manner, of a new ship of the same size and like material: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive the Secretary of the Navy of the authority to order repairs of ships damaged in foreign waters or on the high seas, so far as may be necessary to bring them home. And the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to make expenditures from appropriate funds under the various bureaus for repairs and changes on a submarine torpedo boat of the "E" type in a sum not to exceed $100,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen (ship keepers), and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of superintending naval constructors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $958,100.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 45, line 11, before the proviso, insert the following as an additional proviso:

"*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended for bunting or other materials for making and repairing flags of any kind not manufactured in the United States."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not care to argue it if it is not well taken.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I submit it is a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this proposed amendment at any length. It seems to me, however—even admitting that it may be proper, in order to get the benefit of the lowest possible prices upon certain commodities, that the Secretary of the Navy should in rare cases have the power to go to the markets of foreign nations for supplies and equipment—that this possibility should not be open in the case of the material for the American flag which flies over our warships or which flies over our navy yards throughout the United States. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be repugnant to the sensibilities of every Member of this House, repugnant to the sensibilities of every citizen of this country, to think that any such result should be entailed with the law as it stands to-day. I therefore have suggested this amendment, which will require the Secretary of the Navy, in purchasing material for the flags of our vessels and for use anywhere in connection with the Navy Department, to purchase the material therefor in our home markets. In short, the Secretary ought not to have the power to purchase our flags of European manufacturers.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the department and the Secretary of the Navy will use all proper prudence in the purchase of home-manufactured goods. It is poor policy to prohibit competition and permit the home fellow to hold him up and make him pay any price he sees proper.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman think that material of this sort ought, as a matter of patriotism, to be an exception? And, more than that, does he not think that on a commodity like bunting, that the competition which necessarily will be abundant in the United States will be amply sufficient to avoid any possibility of the holdup to which he refers?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we ought to have restrictive legislation to compel us to buy from anybody. I think we ought to have an open market. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ROGERS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. I will offer an amendment to which I think the gentleman will agree. I move to strike out the word "further," in line 11, page 45.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs and improvement of machinery and implements at plant at navy yard, Mare Island, Cal., $15,000.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 2, after the figures "$15,000," insert:

"For the purchase of a floating crane, $450,000.

"For the purchase of a boring mill, lathes, and planers, $125,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that. That has been universally held subject to a point of order. We have had the question up a number of times.

Mr. CURRY. I have no doubt it is subject to a point of order, but I would like to have the gentleman reserve it for half a minute.

Mr. PADGETT. I will reserve it for five minutes.

Mr. CURRY. I recognize that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I had hoped, however, it would not be raised. The Mare Island Navy Yard is the only one, public or private, on the Pacific coast that is prepared to construct a dreadnaught, and as a matter of efficiency, economy, and national defense it ought to be equipped with a floating crane and machinery, as specified in my amendment.

Mare Island does better work, at less cost, than any other yard in the country. All construction work assigned to her is on her lower estimates, submitted in competition with other yards, public and private. The work done at Mare Island is always done within the estimate, and the yard never asks for a deficiency.

Mare Island was recently awarded a contract to construct one of the torpedo-boat destroyers provided for in the last naval appropriation bill. This destroyer will be the first constructed in a Government yard. Contracts for building six new destroyers authorized in the last naval appropriation bill, to cost $4,436,000 in all, were recently let by Secretary of the Navy Daniels. The Fore River Shipbuilding Co., of Fore River, Mass., received two contracts at $795,000 each. The Bath Iron Works, of Bath, Me., two at $800,000 each; the Cramp Shipbuilding Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., one at $820,000; and the Mare Island Navy Yard, one at $626,000. The cost limit fixed by Congress was $925,000. Mare Island's estimate was $139,000 lower than the next lowest bid.

If Congress will adopt my amendment and equip Mare Island with a floating crane and the machinery specified in that amendment, Mare Island will be able to save all they cost out of the appropriation to construct one battleship, if such a ship should be assigned to her to build; and if she were so equipped, there would no longer be any excuse for not permitting the yard to submit estimates for the construction of a dreadnaught.

As a point of order has been raised against the amendment, and the point is well taken, I do not wish to detain the committee further at this late hour. I shall not further discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order against the amendment, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewal of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; maintenance of coast signal service, including the purchase of land as necessary for sites for radio shore stations; equipage, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations; pay of classified force under the bureau; incidental expenses for naval vessels, navy yards and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books, and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; instruments and apparatus, supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work in radiotelegraphy at the naval radio laboratory: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and other United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed $650,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for sites for radio shore stations shall not exceed $50,000: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures under this appropriation at the naval radio laboratory shall not exceed $5,000; in all, engineering, $7,727,975.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the act providing for the radio stations authorized the purchase of land; and if so, what is the limit of cost?

Mr. PADGETT. The limit of cost is fixed at $1,000,000. Is the gentleman speaking of high-power stations?

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the expenditure of $50,000 for the purchase of land for sites for radio shore stations.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; there is no limit of cost fixed.

Mr. MANN. There is no authority granted, then. What need is there to spend $50,000 now for these sites? How long have we carried this $50,000 appropriation for the purchase of land, and how much of it has been expended?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it has been in there for several years.

Mr. MANN. They have had no occasion for it, have they?

Mr. PADGETT. I know of none. I know of no purpose to purchase any; but it has been in there so that if any emergency arose, and they needed it, they would have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the language on page 47, lines 16 and 17, as follows:

Including the purchase of land as necessary for sites for radio shore stations.

And also the language on page 48, commencing in line 10:

Provided further, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for sites for radio shore stations shall not exceed $50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know whether there was any authorization other than that which has been carried in the appropriation bills or not.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is not, the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

High-power radio stations: Toward the purchase and preparation of necessary sites, purchase and erection of towers and buildings, and the purchase and installation of machinery and apparatus of high-power radio stations (cost not to exceed $1,500,000), to be located as follows: One in the Isthmian Canal Zone, one on the California coast, one in the Hawaiian Islands, one in American Samoa, one on the island of Guam, and one in the Philippine Islands, $400,000, to be available until expended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. How many of these stations have been provided out of the $400,000 that was appropriated? Is that the amount?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. There has been $800,000 appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Four hundred thousand dollars last year and $400,000 the year before?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There has been $800,000 appropriated altogether, and this appropriation here of $400,000——

Mr. MANN. How far have they progressed?

Mr. PADGETT. The one at Panama is about complete, and they have made progress with the others with reference to towers. They have procured land in California for the one to be located there. There was a question of title. I understand that has been cleared up, and they now have the land.

Mr. MANN. When we passed the bill authorizing the construction of these high-power radio stations the Navy Department stated, and so did the Committee on Naval Affairs, that with a million dollars they could erect one on the Canal Zone, another on the California coast, another on the Hawaiian Islands, another on the Samoan Islands, another on the Island of Guam, and another on the Philippine Islands. Now, how far have they got toward erecting these stations with the $800,000 which has been appropriated?

Mr. PADGETT. As I said, the one at Panama is about complete.

Mr. MANN. It was a long ways from being complete in November. I saw it.

Mr. PADGETT. I stated just what I understood to be the fact.

Mr. MANN. It was a long ways from being completed at that time.

Mr. PADGETT. The others are in course of construction, but I do not know what percentage of completion has been attained. It is true that when this matter was taken up several years ago, under the administration of Mr. Meyer, it was estimated or represented that $1,000,000 would be sufficient to do the work, and we fixed the limit of cost at $1,000,000. But it was a matter that was largely experimental. We had never undertaken anything of that kind before, and we find that the cost is much greater than was estimated at that time.

Mr. MANN. I remember when the bill was before the House. I stated then, not knowing much about the subject, but evidently knowing more than the Navy Department did, that they could not construct all these high-power radio stations for a million dollars, and I was chided by the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who frankly and kindly informed me that I knew nothing about it and that the Navy Department was thoroughly qualified to pass upon it.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember that.

Mr. MANN. I do. The gentleman was not attacked as I was.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman will remember that I was not the guilty party.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure of that. I have not the RECORD. But I know that if the gentleman did, he did it most graciously.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman will bear me witness that I never chided him at all.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman frequently does, but I do not criticize that. I may have needed it. What is the estimate now?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand they say a million and a half dollars.

Mr. MANN. They had $800,000, and the gentleman says they have nearly finished the Canal Zone. That was far from being the case in November. It may be nearly finished, but I do not know. That is one out of six or seven.

Mr. PADGETT. There has been considerable work on this, and yet not all the money has been expended on the others. But they need this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. How far have they progressed with the one on the California coast?

Mr. PADGETT. As I stated, they have secured the land and given orders for the construction of the steel.

Mr. MANN. That is a long way toward the construction of three wireless towers, 600 feet high each. How far have they gone with the one on the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. PADGETT. I believe they have given orders, but how far it is completed I do not know.

Mr. MANN. How far have they gotten with the one on the American Samoan Islands?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think they have done anything with that.

Mr. MANN. And how far have they gotten with the one on the Island of Guam?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know how far they have gone with the one on the Philippine Islands?

Mr. PADGETT. They have given orders for a number of these. I do not know whether they have given the order for the one on the Philippine Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, they have had $800,000 appropriated up to date, and they have commenced the work on the one on the Canal Zone, and have obtained land at San Diego, Cal., and have thought about giving orders for some of the others. Now, if they can do only that much with $800,000, how near will they come to completing six of them with a million and a half dollars?

Mr. PADGETT. I said they had given orders for some of the others. I did not say they thought about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact, as disclosed by the hearings on page 328, in the testimony of Admiral Griffin, that the reason why they have not expended any money or gone ahead contracting for these additional stations is to let them all at one time, so as to get a better contract?

Mr. PADGETT. I said that they had not expended the money.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have not even let the contracts.

Mr. PADGETT. Not all of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will read to the gentleman to refresh his memory:

We wanted to let contracts at the same time for towers at three stations, in order to get the benefit of the reduced price of getting a large contract.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And a close reading of the hearing shows that they have not let the contract, and have only proceeded with the obtaining of the title at San Diego, and that only recently, because there was some difficulty about obtaining the title to that site.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the appropriation is authorized by law.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Authorized by law to the extent of $1,000,000, but this changes the authorization to $1,500,000, and hence is legislation, and subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. It will tie this up.

Mr. MANN. I know that "hope springs eternal in the human breast." [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. This is a matter that is very important.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to have some knowledge of what they are going to cost.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. No; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: Text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures and entertainments not exceeding $1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, $28,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking a question. What is the purpose of inserting the words:

Expenses of lectures and entertainments not exceeding $1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer.

Mr. PADGETT. On this subject the superintendent made the following statement:

The CHAIRMAN. But what do you estimate the entertainments would cost?

Capt. FULLAM. Probably not more than $1,000 a year at the outside. I, as superintendent, would not myself, under any circumstances, permit the expenditure to be very large. I think we have two lecturers now provided for, and I believe we want to get one college glee club down there. I do not want to try to make the wording of the appropriation cover things which are not specifically provided for.

Mr. ROBERTS. You can get the college glee club by merely paying their expenses?

Capt. FULLAM. Yes sir; that is all.

This is to provide entertainment of the kind indicated for the young men.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase, binding, and repair of books for the library (to be purchased in the open market on the written order of the superintendent), $2,500: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and domestic periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso. I wish to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the legislative bill has a provision that applies to all such things, and this will not be necessary here.

Mr. PADGETT. Is it taken care of in the legislative bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS.

Pay, Marine Corps: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on the active list, including clerks for assistant paymasters, six; and for the following additional officers hereby authorized, the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the senior colonel of the line on the active list of the Marine Corps to be a brigadier general; one colonel, one lieutenant colonel, one major, five captains, one captain assistant quartermaster, one captain assistant paymaster, five first lieutenants, and five second lieutenants: *Provided*, That the increased compensation as now fixed by law for the Marine Corps for foreign shore service shall hereafter be paid to the officers and enlisted men of that corps while on sea duty, in the same manner and under the same conditions as is provided by the act approved May 13, 1908, for officers of the Navy; in all, $1,060,604.50: *Provided further*, That hereafter appointments to the Marine Corps which may be made from civil life shall be made only after such prospective appointees shall have served a probationary period of two years, as nearly as may be practicable, as acting second lieutenants, which grade is hereby authorized and established. Candidates for appointment from civil life to such grade shall be between the ages of 18 and 22 years at the time of appointment, which appointment shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy upon the recommendation of a marine examining board to be constituted as now provided by law, and shall further be revokable at any time during the probationary period at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That the rank, pay, and allowances of acting second lieutenants shall be the same as for second lieutenants, and said acting second lieutenants shall be subject to all laws governing pensions and other gratuities in the Marine Corps, but shall not be entitled to retirement or retirement pay unless the cause thereof is the result of or incident to active duty other than at the school at which they may be stationed to receive their instructions as officers of the corps. Said probationary period shall end two years from July 1 of the calendar year of original entry, and the number of appointments to said corps to be made in said grade in any calendar year shall be the number required to fill existing vacancies and prospective vacancies by operation of law in the authorized strength of the commissioned personnel of said corps in the same calendar year.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the bill a provision was stricken out which contemplated the expenditure of $200,000 at Norfolk and $200,000 at Mare Island, which was reappropriated out of an appropriation of $400,000 found not to be necessary for the erection of barracks at the Isthmus of Panama. It seems to me this is the proper place to make an inquiry——

Mr. PADGETT. That went out on a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to inquire whether there is any intent on the part of the department to change its bases for the Marine Corps? There have been frequent reports as to where the central base of the Marine Corps was to be. The provision stricken out on the point of order would seem to indicate an intent to centralize the Marine Corps at two points—Norfolk and Mare Island.

Mr. PADGETT. No; as I remember, the principal base is to be at Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. That is my understanding, and that is the common report. It has been so announced.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no intention to interfere with that.

Mr. MOORE. Why was it necessary to take the $400,000 from Panama and put it at Norfolk and Mare Island?

Mr. PADGETT. Because they must have marines at both those places in addition to those kept at Philadelphia, and they needed barracks at those places to accommodate the men who must be kept there.

Mr. MOORE. Would the expenditure of the money in the erection of barracks at these two places mean a drawing upon any other of the bases of the Marine Corps—as, for instance, at Philadelphia?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not Philadelphia. It means that the department is determined to withdraw them from Boston and from smaller places.

Mr. MOORE. Is that due to strategic or climatic conditions?

Mr. PADGETT. We maintain so many and can concentrate them at the most desirable places where they can be used.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the department consider Philadelphia a desirable place?

Mr. MOORE. It is the most desirable place for marines, according to the testimony of those who go to Philadelphia in the marine service. When a man gets an opportunity to leave New York and go to Philadelphia he throws up his hands with delight and satisfaction. [Laughter.] I would not like to see Philadelphia drawn on to build up any other yard.

Mr. GOULDEN. I will agree with the gentleman's assertion if he goes there when he wants to sleep. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I know we have aroused New York, but I was trying to get information from the chairman of the committee whether or not there was any intent to build up this yard at the expense of other places?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman can realize that the marines on the Pacific coast——

Mr. MOORE. Are they using tents or buildings?

Mr. PADGETT. Tents and improvised wooden shanties that are but temporary.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman knows that we have some cheap wooden structures at the Philadelphia yard?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but a few years ago we made an appropriation to build some handsome barracks there.

Mr. MOORE. And it is not the intent to reduce the work already done, to deplete the force?

Mr. PADGETT. I never heard of any such intention.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. What is the meaning of the provision about future appointments to the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. In the Marine Corps when a man is appointed a lieutenant he gets his commission at once and becomes a commissioned officer. If after he is tried he is found to be lacking in military adaptability or efficiency there is no way to get him out except to prefer charges and have him court-martialed. This establishes a probationary period during which time the man is tested and tried. If he is found all right he gets his commission; if he is not found all right he does not go into the Navy. It is a probationary period.

Mr. BORLAND. It says appointments made hereafter from civil life. Are they not all made from civil life?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so; they come up from the ranks and from outsiders. Examinations are held.

Mr. BORLAND. None of them are appointed from the academy directly?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. BORLAND. But some who have been in the academy seek employment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Last year or the year before there was a provision that they could be assigned to the Staff Corps or the Marine Corps and they can be assigned, but the great bulk of them come up from civil life.

Mr. BORLAND. This speaks of going to school while in the probationary period.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we have a school now—the school of application, I think it is called. They go there and are trained.

Mr. BORLAND. How long is the course?

Mr. PADGETT. One year.
Mr. BORLAND. It is a graduate school, an officers' school?
Mr. PADGETT. Yes.
Mr. BORLAND. Where is it located?
Mr. PADGETT. Near the city, I think.
Mr. BORLAND. Is there more than one of these schools?
Mr. PADGETT. Only one that I know of. I am informed that I am mistaken, that the school has been removed to Port Royal, N. C., to the station we used to have there.
Mr. BORLAND. Why to Port Royal, when we are arranging barracks at Norfolk and Mare Island as the place for marines?
Mr. PADGETT. We had Port Royal and we wanted some use for it, and we used it for that purpose. They had the building. It is only a school for officers.
Mr. BORLAND. Would not it be better to have the service school at a point where the marines have their base?
Mr. PADGETT. These young fellows have no command and have nothing to do with the enlisted personnel of the marines; they are going to school to receive instruction.
Mr. BORLAND. The final result of this is that if a young man is appointed from civil life, after he has passed an examination physical and mental, if he does not turn out to be fit he may be dismissed by the Secretary of the Navy and on the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy?
Mr. PADGETT. Or of a board.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state how many officers this adds to the Marine Corps?
Mr. PADGETT. Twenty-one, I believe.
Mr. FITZGERALD. It creates a new rank on the active list?
Mr. PADGETT. It creates a new rank of brigadier general.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Why?
Mr. PADGETT. Because it was thought that the Marine Corps service has become of that importance and size that there should be a brigadier general in command.
Mr. FITZGERALD. How many men are there in the Marine Corps?
Mr. PADGETT. About 10,000.
Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a proviso which gives to the officers and enlisted men while on sea duty an extra compensation.
Mr. PADGETT. That is the 10 per cent increase for sea pay.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Do enlisted men of the Navy get 10 per cent increase while at sea?
Mr. PADGETT. The officers do.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Do the enlisted men?
Mr. PADGETT. I understand not.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Why do you give the enlisted men in the Marine Corps 10 per cent increase while on sea duty?
Mr. PADGETT. They are paid so much less than the men in the Navy.
Mr. FITZGERALD. But they need the money more on land than at sea. That has been my experience with these chaps in the Navy. They can not spend the money while at sea.
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.
Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought I had the floor in my own right.
Mr. BORLAND. I had surrendered the floor, Mr. Chairman.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, if we give the enlisted men in the Marine Corps 10 per cent increase of pay when they serve at sea, will not the argument be made that we ought to give the enlisted men in the Navy 10 per cent increase when they serve at sea?
Mr. PADGETT. The enlisted men in the Navy get more pay.
Mr. MANN. But they really serve.
Mr. PADGETT. And these men serve, too. The marines on the ships do the regular duties that the bluejackets do.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Why do you not fix their pay the same?
Mr. PADGETT. Because the law fixes the pay of marines the same as in the Army and not the Navy. They have the same pay as the Army. I want to call attention to a condition. I can give you an illustration. In the Mexican situation the marines were ordered down there, and went on two ships. The marines from one of the ships landed, and under existing law they received 10 per cent additional pay. That is the existing law. The marines from the other ship did not land, but stayed anchored out in sight of the land. Those men did not get the additional pay, although they were in the expedition and serving and were there for the same purpose as the men who went ashore.
Mr. FITZGERALD. That might be an isolated example. But how about the members of the Marines Corps who are put on ships and go out to sea for maneuvers?
Mr. PADGETT. This is service. While they are serving on the ship they give them the per cent increase for sea pay.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like to cite to the gentleman from New York a still more glaring instance of the inequality of pay now existing in the Marine Corps. Take the same instance, the occupation of Vera Cruz. The marines who were sent down by transports and landed at Vera Cruz received foreign-service pay. The marines who were stationed on ships that were sent to Vera Cruz, and who were taken from the ships and who fought side by side with the marines who came down on the transports, did not get the 10 per cent increase, because they were held under the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury not to be on foreign service.
Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not much excuse to give anybody increased compensation because of foreign service, because they spend less on that service than when at home.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Whether it is an excuse or not, there is an instance of where two men in the Marine Corps were killed at Vera Cruz. One of them went down on a transport and the other on a battleship. They were both fighting in the same battle. Both were killed, and the one who went on the transport was entitled to 10 per cent extra pay, and those dependent on him to get a gratuity, and the other one, who went on the battleship, but who was killed there fighting with his comrade in the same battle, did not get the 10 per cent, and those dependent upon him did not get the gratuity.
Mr. FITZGERALD. That can easily be taken care of.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This places the men in the Marine Corps on the same footing in regard to pay——
Mr. FITZGERALD. If I understand correctly, the compensation of the enlisted men of the Marine Corps is fixed the same as the compensation of the enlisted men in the Army.
Mr. PADGETT. The Infantry in the Army.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and this is a step to give them the pay of enlisted men in the Navy.
Mr. PADGETT. No; it does not equal the pay of the enlisted men, but it gives 10 per cent additional for foreign-service pay.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It gives them foreign-service pay when they are on board ship, that is the purpose of it.
Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman where is the school now for officers in the service in the Marine Corps?
Mr. PADGETT. I just stated it is at Port Royal.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is at Norfolk.
Mr. MANN. I am willing to deal with either fair charmer. Is there a school?
Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there is a school, and young men go there. I was personally under the impression that it was near Washington here, but the Clerk stated that it had been removed to Port Royal.
Mr. MANN. Then I understand we send a boy to Annapolis or West Point and train him before he goes, and also he is allowed $50 a month or something of that sort in addition for his keep, possibly, and——
Mr. PADGETT. These are boys who have never attended either of those places.
Mr. MANN. I understand that, although that might not be the case; but under this provision and under existing circumstances you pay a man a second lieutenant's salary—full pay—and then allow fogey pay based upon it and propose to give him an education that otherwise you give to the boys at these other schools. Is that correct?
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No.
Mr. PADGETT. No.
Mr. MANN. That is correct; I do not care which one says no. They commission a man a second lieutenant, as is proposed, and give some instructions as to the duties he performs——
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is a different statement.
Mr. MANN. That is the same statement I made before.
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, no.
Mr. MANN. If I did not know any more about this I would not interrupt——
Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not seem to. The two statements do not jibe.
Mr. MANN. My statements not only jibe but they are true; and if some of the other gentlemen would be careful and

accurate with their statements they would vastly improve the information of the House. [Laughter.] Why do not they give an examination to these men so that they can go to work in the Marine Corps—take the boys out of the military schools of the country like they do in the Army?

Mr. PADGETT. Young men have to be trained, and if they were trained at the beginning they would not have to go to school; and a great many come in who do not have that training.

Mr. MANN. There is no necessity for a great many coming in who do not have any training. There are a lot of military schools in the country that are very good, indeed, and turn out boys well equipped to act as commissioned officers either in the Marine Corps or in the Army, and sometimes just as well if not better qualified than they are when they come out of West Point. Why do not they appoint those instead of starting a new school?

Mr. PADGETT. This school has been running for years.

Mr. MANN. Well, making the point of order will not affect it, and that will relieve my conscience; so I make the point of order on all of the paragraph commencing with the word "*Provided*," on page 54. I do not make the point of order against the increase in the officers, and I except the language of line 7, "in all, $1,060,604.50."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order commencing with the word "six," line 19, page 53.

Mr. MANN. The two points of order would cover everything contained in the paragraph except the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation can be put in.

Mr. MANN. Except the language in line 7, page 54, "in all, $1,060,604.50."

Mr. PADGETT. Where does the gentleman make the point of order to?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order on all the language of the paragraph, the Chair understands, after the word "six," line 19, page 53, down to and including the word "Navy."

Mr. MANN. "Lieutenants," in line 1. I am perfectly willing to make a point of order on all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the balance of the paragraph, except the appropriation, "in all, $1,060,604.50."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains both points of order.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to strike out the word "six" and insert "five." There is no necessity for that extra one if this one goes out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 19, strike out the word "six" and insert "five."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, I offer another amendment. After the word "five" insert the words "in all, $980,799.50." The appropriation in the bill was for this increased amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, has the other amendment been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 19, after the word "five" insert the figures "$980,799.50."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning this amendment. Where is there any need of an increase of this amount which for this year was $951,640? With the same number of men in the service why do you increase the amount from that to $985,000, which is an increase of about $34,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Twenty-nine thousand dollars. This is an increase of $29,000, and it is made up of four different items, three of them involving increases and one of them involving a decrease as compared with the corresponding items of last year. Then there is an increase of $50,070 for longevity of officers now in the service. As the officers of the corps grow older in the service, they become entitled to this longevity increase and it must be provided for.

Mr. MANN. It is all right if that is the reason.

Mr. PADGETT. And it goes on to explain the items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. I understood the point of order took out all of the paragraph after the word "six," and did not leave in this amount of $1,000,000 and more?

The CHAIRMAN. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee desired to change the amount.

Mr. PADGETT. I did. I wanted to be sure that was done.

The CHAIRMAN. Strike out the amount where it now is and insert the provision the gentleman has just sent up?

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers prescribed by law, on the retired list: For 3 major generals, 4 brigadier generals, 6 colonels, 5 lieutenant colonels, 10 majors, 19 captains, 12 first lieutenants, 4 second lieutenants, and 1 paymaster's clerk, and for officers who may be placed thereon during the year, including such increased pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for retired officers regularly assigned to active duty, $189,702.50.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from Massachusetts, or some other place, how many men there are on the active list of the Marine Corps who are brigadier generals.

Mr. PADGETT. We have no brigadier generals in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANN. How many are there on the active list who are major generals?

Mr. PADGETT. There is one who has that rank while serving as commandant.

Mr. MANN. Here is a peculiar situation, especially in view of the action of the committee to-day authorizing the President to restore Tom, Dick, Harry, and all the other names to the active list in the Navy long enough to be promoted and then put on the retired list at high pay. They have no brigadier general in the Marine Corps. One major general in the Marine Corps, but one major general while he is commandant. And we have three major generals on the retired corps and four brigadier generals on the retired corps, making several officers on the retired list by passing through one place. That is "going some" for you.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. For information.

Mr. PADGETT. These men were put on by special act of Congress for special war service.

Mr. MANN. That does not help the matter any.

Mr. PADGETT. But it relieves the appropriation committee.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation committee ought not to put these men on the retired list, although they brought in a proposition to-day to put a whole lot more on the retired list under similar circumstances, and the number of men who will be on the retired list as rear admirals and captains will drive you crazy unless the President is able to withstand the temptation presented to him by the pressure brought to bear upon him by this body and other bodies in the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to dispute any of those statements.

Mr. MANN. Seven retired officers on the retired list, at three-fourths pay, all passing through the same conduit, which, when it is full, blocks up any entrance or outlet. It is a great scheme, a fine thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How about trying it on Members of Congress?

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from New York must be modest about that, because if we would put anybody up as major general it would be the gentleman from New York, and I hope he would not be retired in that place soon. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men, active list: Pay of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, as prescribed by law, and the number of enlisted men shall be exclusive of those undergoing imprisonment with sentence of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, and including additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun captains, gun pointers, mess sergeants, cooks, messmen, shipmen, or holding good-conduct medals, pins, or bars, including interest on deposits by enlisted men, post-exchange debts of deserters, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and the authorized travel allowance of discharged enlisted men and for prizes for excellence in gunnery exercise and target practice, both afloat and ashore: *Provided*, That the number of gunnery sergeants heretofore authorized is increased by 20; that the number of sergeants heretofore authorized is increased by 20; that the number of corporals heretofore authorized is increased by 70; and that the number of privates heretofore authorized is decreased by 110; in all, $3,062,764.05.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the proviso, or reserve it, at least.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intend to insist upon his point of order?

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Then, if the gentleman intends to insist, there is no object in explaining why it is essential to have this increase among the noncommissioned officers. It is essential and necessary in the military operations of the Marine Corps.

Mr. CULLOP. I am going to insist on the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. CULLOP. I think it would make it top-heavy to increase the number of officers and decrease the number of men.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not subject to a point of order, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. The law provides that the Marine Corps shall be one-fifth of the Navy, as Congress may provide. It is not up to the limit of one-fifth. These are enlisted men. They are not commissioned. They are simply warrant officers, and they are part of the enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps. The law fixes the size of the Marine Corps at one-fifth of the Navy, as Congress may authorize, so that it is in order for Congress to authorize it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the Marine Corps is all one corps, or whether it is divided up into battalions, and how it is organized?

Mr. PADGETT. It is all one corps.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the law creating that corps how many sergeants does the law provide? Does this provision in the bill increase the number of sergeants authorized by law?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It so says on the face of it.

Mr. PADGETT. It says that hereafter the number of enlisted men in the United States Marine Corps shall be such as the Congress may from time to time authorize.

The CHAIRMAN. That authorizes Congress to fix the number of enlisted men.

Mr. PADGETT. These are enlisted men.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true; but you are providing for sergeants and noncommissioned officers. They are enlisted men, it is true, but the Chair is arguing from what he knows of the Army, where each organization in the Army has so many sergeants and so many corporals, and the Chair assumes that it must be true with respect to the Marine Corps.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, Mr. Chairman, in each of these it increases the number over that now authorized. It must be authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair takes it that there must be some law that authorizes the number of gunnery sergeants in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. I was looking to see if this act provided a limitation upon those specific ones. It provides for the number of sergeants.

The CHAIRMAN. It provides how many sergeants there shall be?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this an increase over what is provided?

Mr. PADGETT. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment first, to correct a total.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer this amendment first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is in line 9, page 56, after the word "ashore," to insert the following: "*Provided*, that the number of privates heretofore authorized is increased by 110, of whom 20 may be promoted to gunnery sergeants, and 20 may be promoted to sergeants, and 70 may be promoted to be corporals."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the number of privates heretofore authorized is increased by 110, of whom 20 may be promoted to gunnery sergeants, 20 may be promoted to sergeants, and 70 may be promoted to be corporals.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 15, strike out "$3,062,764.05" and insert "$3,046,648.05."

Mr. FITZGERALD. The estimate was $2,916,684.

Mr. MANN. The present appropriation is $2,807,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation was $2,807,000, and the estimate was $2,916,684. I think there is a mistake about that total, and I ask unanimous consent that it be passed for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to pass the paragraph for the present. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law of enlisted men on the retired list: For 6 sergeants major, 1 drum major, 26 gunnery sergeants, 29 quartermaster sergeants, 36 first sergeants, 71 sergeants, 20 corporals, 20 first-class musicians, 1 drummer, 1 trumpeter, 1 fifer, and 26 privates, and for those who may be retired during the fiscal year, $160,857.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman if that amount ought not to be corrected, since it doubtless provides for the increase that was intended under the proviso in the preceding paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the increase was provided for in the preceding figures.

Mr. CULLOP. So it is not included in this?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of civil force: In the office of the major general commandant: One chief clerk, at $2,000; one clerk, at $1,400; one messenger, at $971.28.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to know why they did not give this messenger the odd 2 cents and make the amount 30 cents instead of $971.28? It seems rather high pay for a messenger, but even at that I think we ought to pay him at least the even 30 cents in an annual salary.

Mr. PADGETT. He is on a per diem, and that is what it figures out.

Mr. MANN. Why is he on a per diem? Why is he not paid a monthly rate?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. That is the law under which he is appointed.

Mr. MANN. They could put this man on a messenger's pay of $50 a month without any difficulty at all.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He is getting more than that now.

Mr. MANN. Of course he is getting more than $50 a month now, and I dare say he gets pay for every day he is absent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter field clerks of the quartermaster's department of the Marine Corps shall receive the same pay and allowances and other benefits provided by law for Navy paymaster's clerks on sea or shore duty, and to be entitled to the same right of retirement with the same retired pay as allowed Navy paymasters' clerks: *Provided*, That in computing the pay and allowances of these clerks credit shall be allowed for all previous honorable civil or military service in the Navy, Army, or Marine Corps.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to return to the provision that was passed over, for the purpose of correcting the total. I withdraw the other amendment and offer this one. I had only deducted for the pay of these particular officers in the last provision that was stricken out, and had overlooked the fact that further back we had stricken out the sea pay on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 15, strike out "$3,062,764.05" and insert "$2,916,684.05."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. While I think of it, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be given authority to correct the totals in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the Clerk will be authorized to correct the totals. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commutation of quarters, Marine Corps: Commutation of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them; commutation of quarters for enlisted men employed as clerks and messengers in the offices of the commandant, adjutant and inspector, paymaster, and quartermaster, and the offices of the assistant adjutant and inspectors, assistant paymasters, assistant quartermasters, at $21 each per month, and for enlisted men employed as messengers in said offices, at $10 each per month, $79,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Might I ask the chairman of the committee as to this division? This is a paragraph for commutation for enlisted men serving as messengers or clerks. Is not there a provision of law that enlisted men should take the place of civilian clerks?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. What is the provision of law as to supplying the place of civilian clerks with enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard of any change.

Mr. BORLAND. No change has been made? How many civilian clerks are there in the service?

Mr. PADGETT. That is carried in the legislative bill and is under the control of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BORLAND. What, then, is the item on page 57?

Mr. PADGETT. Military clerks are carried in this bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I refer to the clerks that are found provided for on page 57.

Mr. PADGETT. They are in this bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Was not there a provision of law reported by the gentleman's committee by which enlisted men were to take the place of the civilian clerks?

Mr. PADGETT. There was a provision to make these clerks enlisted men, but it went out on a point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Was not that the sense of the committee, that the enlisted men ought to be given an opportunity for filling these places?

Mr. PADGETT. If they took the position now they would cease to be enlisted men and become civilians.

Mr. BORLAND. Is it not possible to have a provision of law whereby enlisted men could take the place of these civilian clerks and thereby get some training in business life?

Mr. PADGETT. That is a provision we had in, but it has gone out on a point of order.

Mr. MANN. They would cease to be enlisted men and would become civilians.

Mr. BORLAND. They might be detailed to serve as clerks in the place of the civilian clerks, and that would have the effect of giving them some training in business life that they would not otherwise get.

Mr. PADGETT. That would be confusing and they would not get the pay; they would only get the enlisted pay.

Mr. BORLAND. But that could be adjusted.

Mr. PADGETT. It could by legislation.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me that the gentleman's committee ought to take care of it.

Mr. PADGETT. We tried to take care of it and did take care of it until we got into the House and we met the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Marine Corps: For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing of bed sacks, mattress covers, pillowcases, towels and sheets, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps, including the transportation of bodies and their arms and wearing apparel from the place of demise to the homes of the deceased in the United States; stationery and other paper, printing and binding; telegraphing, rent of telephones; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters; apprehension of stragglers and deserters; per diem of enlisted men employed on constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; employment of civilian labor; purchase, repair, and installation and maintenance of gas, electric, sewer, and water pipes and fixtures; office and barracks furniture, camp and garrison equipage and implements; mess utensils for enlisted men; packing boxes, wrapping paper, oilcloth, crash, rope, twine, quarantine fees, camphor and carbolized paper, carpenters' tools, tools for police purposes, safes; purchase, repair, and maintenance of such harness, wagons, motor wagons, carts, drays, motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes, and other vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official military and garrison purposes; purchase of public horses and mules; services of veterinary surgeons, and medicines for public animals, and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase of mounts and horse equipment for all officers below the grade of major required to be mounted; shoeing for public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase and repair of hose, fire extinguishers, hand grenades, carts, wheelbarrows, and lawn mowers; purchase, installation, and repair of cooking and heating stoves and furnaces; purchase of towels, soap, combs, and brushes for officers; postage stamps for foreign and registered postage; books, newspapers, and periodicals; improving parade grounds; repair of pumps and wharves; water; straw for bedding, mattresses; mattress covers, pillows, sheets; furniture for Government quarters and repair of same; packing and crating officers' allowance of baggage on change of station; deodorizers, lubricants, disinfectants; and for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising at home and abroad, but impossible to anticipate or classify, $460,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Why is it proposed to pay the civil expenses of men on the retired list? Is that something new?

Mr. PADGETT. I will read to the gentleman on that point from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Under the next item, "Contingent, Marine Corps," you have stricken out the old language, "funeral expenses of officers and marine," and inserted new language, "funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps."

Col. MCCAWLEY. I will explain that change. Prior to May, 1913, the quartermaster's department paid the funeral expenses of deceased retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps. The auditor did not question the accounts under the law existing at that time, considering the word "marines" to cover men on both the active and retired lists, but on May 7, 1913, the Comptroller of the Treasury decided that the funeral expenses of retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps could not be paid in the absence of a specific law on the subject, and the object of the new wording is specifically to provide for the funeral expenses of retired men, which it is believed the Government should pay as heretofore. No additional funds will be required to cover the change. It is not a very usual thing that these retired men are buried at Government expense, but sometimes they go to a naval hospital, where they die, and they have no money and there is no way of burying them. The Government always did bury them under these circumstances.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This has been the practice heretofore?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill, and read to the bottom of page 63.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. VARE, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday to-morrow and that this bill may be considered and finished up. If that is agreed to, I shall ask that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock. I now ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, of course on the increase of the Navy there will undoubtedly be a large attendance in the House. I think most Members understood that the bill would not come up to-morrow and some who want to be here are out of town. Does not the gentleman think it will be in ample time if we pass the bill on Friday?

Mr. PADGETT. Some gentlemen on this side as well as some on the other side have requested and urged me to take it up to-morrow, and insisting that if we take it up they would be glad to join in an effort to have it disposed of to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that is hardly fair to Members who did not know such a move was in contemplation. As far as I am concerned, if the Democratic side of the House thinks we are behind—I do not think we are in that position, necessarily—after to-morrow I would be very glad to agree to dispense with all Calendar Wednesdays. I do not know how many there are, but the last two Wednesdays are not Calendar Wednesdays. I do not think we ought to do it to-morrow. Let it go over until to-morrow, anyway.

Mr. PADGETT. Shall we meet at 11 o'clock?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; we would not need to meet at 11 o'clock, anyway.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to both propositions.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday. I wish to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] expects to take up the immigration bill on that day, and that there is a Democratic caucus on Thursday night. I make this request in order that we may get through with the business so as not to interfere with the caucus.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, of course this side of the House would be perfectly willing to accommodate that side of the House about the caucus in the evening in any way gentlemen desire. As I understand it, Thursday will be devoted to the immigration bill, and there will be nothing else called up in the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m., Thursday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the House adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And I suggest that the gentleman ask that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. PADGETT. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Friday, and that when it adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Saturday next. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, of course the naval bill will come up on Friday?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it is expected that will probably take the day?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know how much time it will take, but a good part of the day. I do not know that it will take all of it.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from New York if he knows whether the pension bill from his committee or the sundry civil appropriation bill is likely to come up soon?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the sundry civil appropriation bill will be reported on Thursday, and it is the expectation of the committee to follow the naval bill with the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, because if that bill is gotten out of the way, there is less likelihood of a blockade on appropriation bills at the end of the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to meeting at 11 o'clock on Friday and Saturday? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for additional remodeling and repair work in connection with the auditor's building (old Bureau of Engraving and Printing) to adapt it to the needs of the department (H. Doc. No. 1553), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HOBSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21257) to create the office of chief of naval operations, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1344), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19061) for the relief of homestead entrymen under the reclamation projects of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1345), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5092) for the relief of Charles A. Spotts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1343), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3771) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10929) granting a pension to Alonzo Sidman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13690) for the relief of the Woman's Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church in America; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 21290) providing for the holding of terms of the district court for the southern division of the western district of the State of Washington at Aberdeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 21291) to provide for the protection of subcontractors and material men engaged in doing work or furnishing material for the erection of Government buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 21292) prohibiting the use of the name of any Member of either House of Congress or of any officer of the Government by any person, firm, or corporation practicing before the Patent Office in advertising his business; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 21293) to authorize the use of the revenues in the Mesa Verde National Park in the management of the same, and the construction, repair, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in the park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 414) directing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of American citizens for damages suffered within American territory and growing out of the insurrection in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 415) requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 718) relating to the expenses of the fur-seal investigation in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Memorial of the Legislature of Virginia, protesting against the rulings of the War Department in re fisheries in the waters of Virginia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting change of navigation laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of the Legislature of Oklahoma, urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, exportation, and importation of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing Congress to so amend the navigation laws that the lumber industry of the Pacific coast may transact its business with its natural customers on the Atlantic coast on terms at least as favorable as are now held by competitors operating in British Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 21293) granting an increase of pension to George D. Henning; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 21294) granting a pension to Sophie Bacon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 21295) for the relief of Mary S. Ming; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 21296) granting a pension to Pellvenia Emmert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 21297) granting a pension to Ida E. Thorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 21298) for the relief of Richard Henry Greene and Walter F. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 21299) granting an increase of pension to George C. Jackman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 21300) granting a pension to George M. Laquey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 21301) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. G. Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 21302) for the issuance of a patent for certain Government land to Benjamin F. Robinson and John Dows; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), petition of citizens' meeting held at Cooper Union, New York, favoring certain restrictions on immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of Society of Friends at Swarthmore, Pa., favoring international arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Protests of Henry Haefner and sundry other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, against shipments abroad of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Newark (Ohio) Branch of American Brewery Workers, favoring bill forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Newark (Ohio) Branch of the American Glass Blowers' Association; Cigarmakers' Union, Branch 86, Mansfield, Ohio; Coshocton (Ohio) Branch of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, evidence to accompany H. R. 21274, for the relief of John W. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of German Beneficial Union, District 97, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George W. Lentz, of Spangler, Pa., protesting against the sending of the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petition of George C. Burger and 21 citizens of Adrian, Mich., in support of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the shipment of munitions of war to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Branch 818 of Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, of Wyandotte, Mich., protesting against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of Gustave Krutz and 40 other citizens of Corning, Mo., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions signed by 75 merchants of the city of Sheboygan; 53 merchants of the city of Port Washington and Ozaukee County; 29 merchants of West Bend; 27 merchants of Plymouth; and 32 merchants of Elkhart Lake and other places in the second congressional district of Wisconsin, asking for the passage of H. R. 5308, to provide for a tax upon all persons, firms, or corporations engaged in interstate mail-order business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Allie J. O'Conor and other members of the Minneiska Club, of Whitewater, Wis., urging the passage of H. R. 12292, the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, etc., of America, and the New York State Federation of Labor, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of German-American Central Alliance of Norwalk, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Germania Club, Reedsburg, Wis., urging support of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the president of Ripon (Wis.) College and 56 members of men's class, urging passage of Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of Charles O'Boyle, Anthony Finnerty, Joseph McNulty, M. F. McAndrew, Edward C. Maloney, John J. Cox, P. J. Tallen, Michael Carney, Thomas Carney, M. J. Sullivan, John F. Gillespie, Frank Shanley, John M. McHale, and Anthony F. Murphy, all of Olyphant, Pa., against the circulation of certain anti-Catholic publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of St. Stanslaw Society, No. 656, and St. Peter and Paul Society, of Old Forge; Polish National Alliance, of Dickson City; and St. Francis Branch, Roman Catholic Union, Priceburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of the People's Bank of Chester, S. C., against bill prohibiting manufacture by the Government of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of C. E. Holmes and other citizens of Takoma Park, Md., against H. R. 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petitions of citizens of Altamont, Bible Grove, Centralia German National Alliance, of Centralia, and Centralia Turn Verein, all of Illinois, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of Democratic State committee of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and other organizations of workers in the United States, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Outlook Association of California, favoring passage of House joint resolution 344, for national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Adolph Woehr, of first congressional district of Vermont, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petitions of 35 citizens of Omaha and 40 citizens of Kearney, Nebr., protesting against the passage of H. R. 20644, the Fitzgerald bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of 65 citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring legislation to prevent circulation of publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of G. F. Hurty, Sound Beach, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 344, for national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of German-American National Bund of Otoe County, Nebr., favoring bill prohibiting export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., protesting against prohibition in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of German Evangelical Lutheran Church of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of C. H. McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa., against seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of Helpenstall Forge & Knife Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., against ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of Allegheny Lumber Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., against discontinuance in manufacture of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of delegates of the Evangelical Protestant Churches of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) district, against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of B. C. Ketcham, Canaseraga, N. Y., favoring Senate bill 392, providing for a volunteer officers' retired list of the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Prof. A. J. Todd, University of Pittsburgh, and J. H. Macalpine, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of I. G. Williams, Philadelphia, Pa., against House bill 15401, to prohibit use of name of any church for purposes of commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Women's Missionary Society of the Oakland Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Duquesne Council, 387, United Commercial Travelers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring bill changing day of election of Representatives to the first Monday in November; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union against prohibition in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), petition of G. W. Lautzy, Spangler, Pa., favoring prohibiting the Menace from use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Central Trades and Labor Union, Pawtucket, R. I., favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mrs. W. S. Sims, of Newport, R. I., favoring Owen-Palmer child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of F. E. Chadwick, of Newport, R. I., favoring a bill to incorporate the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of W. L. Medhurst, of Providence, R. I., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Edward Cogan, of Providence, R. I., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: Petition of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Harry W. Walsh and 7 other citizens of Jamestown; R. A. Agostini and 3 other citizens of San Andreas; D. S. Mason and 9 other citizens of Sonora; E. L. Rehm & Co., J. B. Lester, and 12 other citizens of Sonora; Paul Holtz, of Bagby; G. E. Parker and 8 other citizens of Angels; the Amador Mercantile Co. and 9 other citizens of Amador City and Plymouth; the Brignoli Estate Co. and 10 others, of Sutter Creek; C. C. Carven & Co. and 11 other citizens of Jackson; Chichijola Co. and 2 other citizens of Jackson, all of California, favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Shipowners' Association of Pacific Coast, protesting against the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Shipowners' Association of Pacific Coast, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mrs. Sophie M. Hodges, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., urging Congress to invite all nations to join us in a world federation for the adjudication of international disputes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of California, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of citizens of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 185 American citizens, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in favor of the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Switchmen's Union, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the International Typographical Union, representing 65,000 members, urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Tobacco Workers' International Union, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the United Mine Workers of America, urging the Congress to pass the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Illinois State Federation of Labor; Cigar Makers' International Union; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance; Bartenders' International League of America; Minnesota State Federation of Labor; New York State Federation of Labor, representing 700,000 workers; and International Seamen's Union of America, favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 3, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we call upon Thee after the manner of our fathers in the spirit in which our Nation has grown to its greatness and its influence in the world. If it is true that to serve Thee we must serve our fellow men, it is also true that our service to our fellow men will be in vain unless it is in the spirit of God's great purpose and God's plan in life. So we seek Thee for guidance and for blessing. We pray that every thought may be brought into subjection to Thy will, that our service may be rendered in accord with God's great plan, that it may be permanent and abide, for the achievement of greatness and power will not satisfy the longings of the immortal spirit. Help us in our quest for God, lest we forget that highest interest to our immortal souls. So may we plan to live and work and achieve God's plan. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Borah	Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Goff	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brandegee	Gore	Oliver	Stephenson
Bristow	Gronna	Overman	Sterling
Bryan	Hardwick	Page	Stone
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Hollis	Pittman	Swanson
Camden	James	Poindexter	Thomas
Catron	Johnson	Pomerene	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Ransdell	Thornton
Chilton	Kern	Reed	Tillman
Clapp	La Follette	Root	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Shafroth	Walsh
Colt	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Crawford	McCumber	Sherman	White
Culberson	McLean	Shields	Williams
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Shively	Works
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
du Pont	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. LANE. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Journal been approved?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not yet. The Chair was about to announce that if there were no objections or exceptions the Journal would stand approved as read.

ATTENDANCE OF ABSENT SENATORS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. On Friday night an order was made that the Sergeant at Arms request or, if necessary, compel the attendance of absent Senators. That power, of course, is given to the Senate, as it is to the House, in order that the body may maintain itself and not be rendered helpless by absenteeism. Both in the Constitution and the rules the order to be given to the officer of the Senate contemplates a reference to the absence of a quorum.

I am not going to enter into a discussion this morning of the precise time for the expiration of the order, but there is one thing very clear, Mr. President, there can be no possible authority found either in the Constitution or the rules for having that order permanently in existence. Here we have been adjourning regularly for two days, doing business regularly, with a full and ample quorum apparent on every call, and yet the Sergeant at Arms has the order of the Senate to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And he ought to be executing it.

Mr. LODGE. And he ought to be executing at this moment that order to compel their attendance. It seems to me manifestly absurd, and I believe it is in violation of the power given by the Constitution, certainly of the power given by the rules, to have a permanent order to the Sergeant at Arms to hunt down Senators at any time during the transaction of the ordinary business of the Senate.

I think the order ought to be rescinded, and I move that it be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It seems to be the fate of the Chair to ask the Senator from Massachusetts for permission to insert something in the RECORD.

I do not know whether it is the fault of the Chair or not; the Chair was not here when that order was made, but the Chair found on his desk here a report from the Sergeant at Arms which the Chair has never handed down to the Senate. The Chair does not know whether he should now hand it down or not.

Mr. LODGE. It is a pleasure to be interrupted by the Chair, and I shall be extremely obliged if the Chair would have that report read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hand down the report now and we will see "where we are at." The Secretary will read the report of the Sergeant at Arms.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
January 29, 1915.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In obedience to the following order received by me at 8.30 p. m. January 29, 1915, "*Ordered*, That the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators; that warrants for the arrest of all Senators not sick nor excused be issued under the signature of the Presiding Officer, and attested by the Secretary, and that such warrants be executed without delay," I have the honor to make the following report:

The following Senators, who were absent, appeared in the Senate Chamber without being served: Messrs. CLARK of Wyoming, LIPPITT, LODGE, NELSON, SMITH of Michigan, STEPHENSON, SUTHERLAND, and VARDAMAN.

The following Senators were served by my deputies, responded, and appeared in the Senate Chamber: Messrs. BORAH, BRADY, COLT, CRAWFORD, DU PONT, GRONNA, JONES, MCLEAN, NORRIS, and STERLING.

Senator BURTON was served, but has not appeared in the Senate Chamber.

Senators BURLEIGH, CULBERSON, DILLINGHAM, and PERKINS are reported sick.

Senators CAMDEN, FALL, GOFF, LEA of Tennessee, NEWLANDS, PENROSE, SHERMAN, and WEEKS are reported to be out of Washington, and with the exception of Senator PENROSE, who is reported sick, they have been telegraphed.

No responses could be obtained at the residences of Senators BANKHEAD and POINDEXTER.

This accounts for all absent Senators who were not excused.

CHARLES P. HIGGINS,
Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment, Senators, if you please.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I think I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is now first in possession of further reports from the Sergeant at Arms, which the Chair will order read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
January 30, 1915.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

In reference to motion this day by Senator OWEN, to wit:

"Mr. OWEN. There are a number of Senators whose absence has not been permitted by the Senate and who have not responded to the roll call, and I demand that they appear before the Senate.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Sergeant at Arms will enforce the writs that are in his hands."

Since the above order the following have reported without having been served: Senators BANKHEAD, BORAH, BRANDEGEE, BRYAN, CATRON, CLARKE of Arkansas, CRAWFORD, CULBERSON, CUMMINS, DU PONT, GALLINGER, GORE, HARDWICK, HITCHCOCK, KENYON, LIPPITT, MCLEAN, NORRIS, OLIVER, PAGE, POINDEXTER, POMERENE, ROOT, SHIVELY, SMITH of Arizona, SMITH of Georgia, SMITH of Michigan, STEPHENSON, STERLING, STONE, TILLMAN, TOWNSEND, WARREN, and WEEKS.

Senators BURLEIGH and PENROSE are reported sick.

Senators FALL, GOFF, HUGHES, LEA of Tennessee, LEWIS, NEWLANDS, SHERMAN, SMITH of South Carolina, reported out of the city, have been telegraphed, Senators FALL and LEA responding they will come. Senator GOFF responded that though ill, he hoped to return Monday. Senator CAMDEN'S office having reported the Senator in New York City, I telephoned the Waldorf-Astoria, but he was not there. I then endeavored to reach him by telegraph. Telegraph company reported being unable to locate him at any of the leading hotels. Am informed, however, this evening that the Senator is in Washington, but his residence, University Club, reported by telephone that he had gone out some time before.

Respectfully,

CHARLES P. HIGGINS,
Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also directs that the following daily report from the Sergeant at Arms be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
February 1, 1915.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In obedience to an order received by me at 10.15 a. m. this day, when a roll call disclosed no quorum, directing the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the standing order of the Senate compelling the attendance of absent Senators, I have the honor to report that all Senators not answering to that roll call appeared in the Senate Chamber this day excepting Senators FALL, GOFF, LEA of Tennessee, LEWIS, NEWLANDS, PENROSE, and SMITH of South Carolina, who are out of Washington.

Respectfully,

CHARLES P. HIGGINS,
Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it illustrated what I am saying. Under this order the Sergeant at Arms has a perpetual supervision over all of us, to arrest us at any moment, no matter what the character of business is, and to report every morning upon us. I have not been subjected to arrest personally; I responded without being notified, but there are Senators here who have been arrested three or four times lately. It is reduced to a mere absurdity to keep a permanent order like that in operation. Of course, if this order is to be permanent and the Sergeant at Arms is to be charged with seeing that we are all in our seats every morning and to make a morning report on the conditions of the military company assembled in this Chamber, he ought to have with him an ample force of detectives to follow us about and see where we are.

Such a thing never before was done in the history of any legislative body. The weapon is put by the Constitution in the rules, and properly put in the hands of the body, if it finds itself without a quorum, to compel the attendance of absent Senators. That has been fulfilled; the warrant issued to the Sergeant at Arms has been fulfilled; and I think it worse than absurd to have this a permanent standing order and to have the Sergeant at Arms exercise this strange authority, suddenly thrown upon him, although he may do so with great discretion and good sense, and compelled every morning to make a report as to where we are. Nothing like it ever was heard of before. That is the reason I move that the order be rescinded.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am unable to determine from the reading of the reports whether I am present or whether I am not; but I desire to say that on the night of the 29th of January I had the pleasure of attending a farewell dinner—that is, there was no pleasure in the farewell, but it was in the dinner—given to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. While there I was notified that my presence here was desired, and I came as soon as I could conveniently leave. I have been in close attendance since, either in the Chamber or committee rooms. I have no complaint as to the order or as to the manner in which I was notified. I simply desire to have the RECORD speak the facts.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want simply to say that when the warrant was served on me I was getting ready to start for the Senate Chamber, having been advised that my presence here was needed, and so should have been here whether the warrant had been served or not.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I simply desire to say in regard to the service of the warrant upon myself that I ap-

peared in response to the service, but my name appears among the absentees in the second day's report of the Sergeant at Arms. I wish to say that no warrant was formally served upon me on the second day, but that the Sergeant at Arms, or his deputy, appeared in the committee room where I was, the committee at that time being in session, and suggested that within a certain time—half an hour, I think—or that in about half an hour I appear in the Senate Chamber; yet from the return of the Sergeant at Arms it would appear that the warrant was served upon me. I was in the committee room on the business of the Senate attending a regular meeting of the Committee on Public Lands at the time. I think it very apparent that the order should be rescinded.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I only want to say one word on this subject, which seems to me to be a rather serious one. I have been subjected to no personal inconvenience; I am about to leave the Senate; and I shall not be troubled by this as a precedent in the future; but I am inclined to resent, and I do resent, the attempt to reduce the Members of the Senate to a condition of involuntary servitude to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. President, the public business of a great free country can not be conducted in that spirit with success. Sir, I was present in the Chamber when this order was made; I had answered to my name on the roll call; I was not one of the absent Senators to whom the order could be held to apply; I was not one of the absent Senators to whom the constitutional authority could be held to apply, which is to compel the attendance of absent Senators; yet that order having been made, the next time I walked out of the Senate I became subject to arrest by the Sergeant at Arms. Warrants were issued under the order for the arrest of Senators; and as to many the first notice that they received that their attendance in the Senate in the early hours of the morning or the late hours of the night—between midnight and dawn—was an arrest by the Sergeant at Arms. They appeared.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator from New York yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Would it not be well to have the over of the writ of the Sergeant at Arms, so as to see what its text is, to see what it authorizes him to do, and to see whether or not it is not at this time functus officio, and if this whole discussion is not based on something which does not exist?

Mr. ROOT. I accept readily the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas, and will say but one word before I take my seat, and then yield to his suggestion.

When those Senators made their appearance in the Senate and were recorded as being here the power of the Sergeant at Arms under that order and in the execution of that writ was spent; it was executed; and there could be no new or extended authority given to him except by another act of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair was not in the Chamber when the proceedings referred to took place; but the Chair has just consulted with the Sergeant at Arms as to whether any writ was regularly issued and signed by the then Presiding Officer. The Chair is informed by the Sergeant at Arms that no writ was issued and signed by the Presiding Officer; that all that the Sergeant at Arms did was to serve a copy of the order of the Senate signed by the Presiding Officer and the Secretary, but that no formal writ was ever issued.

Mr. ROOT. Then, Mr. President, there appears to have been a false pretense here. The order of the Senate was in express terms that writs issue. The Sergeant at Arms has been going about under that order arresting Senators without the authority required by the order itself and without the warrant which was required by the order of the Senate and by the law.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, it seems that the order issued has had a most salutary effect upon the attendance of Senators upon this body. I think it has served its purpose, and served its purpose well. It is regrettable if unpleasant incidents have grown out of the execution of the order. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] has criticized this method of conducting the business of a great country, but the business of a great country can not be conducted at all unless Members of this great body attend upon its sessions.

This rule, adopted long ago, was put in force to the end that Senators who were derelict in their duties might be compelled to do their duty in the way of attendance. The proceedings had were in strict conformity with the rule, and the rule will be invoked again whenever the necessity for it arises. However, as the necessity no longer exists, I see no objection to the rescinding of the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that the Sergeant at Arms is entitled to have in the RECORD the document that came to his hands, and the Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 26 (calendar day, January 29), 1915.

The undersigned, Secretary of the Senate, hereby certifies that the following order has been agreed to by the Senate and is now in force:

"*Ordered*, That the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators; that warrants for the arrest of all Senators not sick or excused be issued under the signature of the Presiding Officer and attested by the Secretary, and that such warrants be executed without delay."

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, *Secretary.*

The Sergeant at Arms is hereby directed to execute the above order.

CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
Presiding Officer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise rather to a parliamentary inquiry. Am I still under arrest? I desire to add to that inquiry—and I ask it in all seriousness—this statement: I have been here almost continuously; I am not conscious of having missed a roll call. I was arrested in the cloakroom just as I was entering the Senate—or the warrant was served upon me—having been detained for a moment somewhere. As I stood in the cloakroom, just prior to opening the door into the Senate Chamber, the warrant was served upon me, or the order, or whatever it might have been; and I immediately entered the Senate. Of course I was on my way to the Senate when it was served, and I took no steps to liberate myself.

I do not want the RECORD to show that I am perpetually under the ban, at any rate, and therefore I ask whether, having done nothing more than enter the Chamber and participate in the proceedings of the Senate, I am still under arrest?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator was not arrested, was he?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know what you would call it.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator never was arrested; he was merely served with the order of the Senate, I suppose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly the Deputy Sergeant at Arms was very polite and did not threaten to interfere with my person in any way.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand; but the Senator does not think that he was arrested, does he?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, now, was the Senator——

Mr. CUMMINS. I was told that I had to come in here and report to the President of the Senate, or to somebody, in order to be liberated from the order, whether you call it a warrant of arrest or call it something else. I did not do that; I simply entered the Chamber and continued to perform my duty as best I could.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator, like other Members of this body, I presume, was notified of this order. There was no warrant of arrest issued for anybody; there was merely an order of the Senate. Instead of the Sergeant at Arms getting a warrant to bring Senators in here, as he had a right to do, he merely served this notice and requested their attendance. What else could he do? There were no warrants issued.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from North Carolina say that no warrants were issued?

Mr. OVERMAN. No warrants were issued. There was an order of the Senate made, and the Sergeant at Arms, instead of having warrants issued, arresting Senators, and bringing them in here—which seems to be what they are complaining about—simply went to them politely and notified them of the order of the Senate. The place for Senators is here in this Chamber and not to be absent breaking up a quorum, and all the Sergeant at Arms did was to serve this notice upon them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I really did not pay enough attention to it to observe accurately what the order was. I had assumed from the report of the Sergeant at Arms that he took me in charge under the order to arrest, but I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was going to ask the Senator a question, but I can state it in another form.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I call for the regular order.

Mr. LODGE. The regular order is the question of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the regular order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand there is a motion pending to rescind the order, and I am discussing that motion. The motion is debatable, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is in order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I heard correctly the order which the Senate adopted and which was within a few moments read by

the Secretary from the desk, it was an order of the Senate that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and in the enforcement of that order the Senator from Iowa was directed to come into this Chamber. The order provided that it was the duty of the Chair to issue warrants to enforce the order, and if the order and the compulsion which the order provided were enforced without a warrant, it was no less an arrest. When the Senator was told by the Sergeant at Arms that he had an order of the Senate to compel his attendance, and asked him to please come along in order that he might not be compelled by force or by arrest to come here, that was an arrest to all intents and purposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I simply want to state, by way of answer to the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], that the Sergeant at Arms was courteous to me, and I have no complaint at all to make, but I simply want to say that he told me he had a warrant for me, and he handed me a paper. I handed it back to him without looking at it, telling him that I was just getting ready to start for the Senate. He said to me, however, that he had a warrant for me.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not blame the Sergeant at Arms, unless he is an attorney at law, for not understanding the technical distinction between a legally issued and signed warrant and a certified copy of an order of the Senate ordering him to compel the attendance of Senators. I think that is entirely immaterial.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I do not like to take the valuable time of the Senate, but inasmuch as my name is amongst those of the Senators alleged to have been arrested and brought into the Senate Chamber I feel that I should like to have the RECORD show the facts in regard to my own case.

I came into the Senate Chamber last Friday morning at 11 o'clock, the time we convened, and, barring stepping out for a moment into one of the anterooms, I was here all night long and until 9 o'clock the next morning, when I did go out to take a little rest. The only appearance of the Sergeant at Arms in my case was this: I went to one of the deputies of the Sergeant at Arms and told him that I wished to step out for a few moments, but that if I were wanted all that would be necessary would be to call me and that I would respond at once. The Sergeant at Arms called me at the place where I had informed the deputy I would be and told me that he had been instructed to compel my attendance in the Senate. I said "I will be there in one minute."

I say now that I do not like to have my record for attendance here impeached, for I have been very careful, indeed, to be here almost all the time; it is very rare that I absent myself from the Senate or from the Senate Office Building, and I should like to have——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like, as one Democratic Senator, to testify to the fact that no Senator, as a rule, attends more closely upon the sessions of the Senate than does the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. PAGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I am very glad to add my testimony to that of the Senator from Missouri on that subject.

Mr. PAGE. I think I am all right, Mr. President. I was simply asking that the RECORD be made right.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SAULSBURY. For the consolation of my friends on the Republican side of this Chamber, I desire to relate a historical incident which occurred in this country in one of the great States when somewhat similar tactics were resorted to by those who were not willing to attend a great body and were compelled to be present. I think it was in 1797. A constitutional convention was being held in the State of Pennsylvania. Among those who, by force, compelled the presence in that convention of certain of its members to perform their duties was Commodore John Barry. The consolation, I wish to state to our friends on the other side, is that the names of the members of that constitutional convention who failed to perform their duties in that convention have been forgotten, while recently we unveiled in this city a monument to the memory of John Barry, and the most prominent officials of this country attended its unveiling.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. My name appears among the list of Senators for whom warrants were issued, but who appeared upon the floor of the Senate before they could be served. The RECORD will disclose the fact that I answered to nearly every roll call that was made during the session of the night of the 29th of January. The balance of the evening I spent in a committee engaged in the work of the Senate. I was on the conference committee on the seamen's bill.

I do not care anything about the warrant being issued or the notice being given that I was not present in the Chamber, but I do not want the country to understand that I was neglecting my duty, and I shall not quietly submit to the odium which the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana seemed inclined to put upon those of us whom he happened to mention as among the derelict. I have endeavored since I have been a Member of this body to attend upon its deliberations; and during all this fight against a measure which I think indefensible in many respects I have aided in making a quorum in order that the business of the Senate might be conducted, though I expected to vote against the measure and was exceedingly desirous that it be defeated.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was among the absentees mentioned in one of the several communications which have been read at the desk; but I do not rise to explain about that, because it recites nothing that is not true. I was excused by the junior Senator from Indiana, the Democratic leader, for what seemed to him to be sufficient cause; but I am a friend of the Sergeant at Arms, and I want to give him a little professional advice.

The business of arresting people in any country having institutions derived from the Anglo-Saxon race contemplates that there shall be a writ, in which the name of the person whom it is proposed to arrest is mentioned and the offense to which he is to respond is set out. Without that the officer is a trespasser and subject to be dealt with in a very summary way. The Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives was dealt with in a very summary way, and a judgment for $100,000 rendered against him and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States; and I commend the Sergeant at Arms here and elsewhere to a perusal of that case, under the title of Thompson against Kilbourn, reported somewhere near One Hundredth United States.

I want to say for the present Sergeant at Arms, however, that he is always courteous and considerate of the rights of Senators; and I am sure that if he had felt it to be his duty, under the particular paper that was delivered to him, to bring to the notice of a Senator the fact that his presence in the Senate was wanted, it would be done in a very polite and proper way. What I want to advise him about, and what I want to assert as one of the rights of a Senator, is that the Sergeant at Arms has no right to arrest a Senator unless he has a warrant naming that particular Senator, and announcing that the Senate has directed him to arrest him for his failure to attend a daily session of the Senate which has not come to an end by an adjournment after that time.

Our rules effectuate the provision of the Constitution which permits less than a majority of the Senate to compel the attendance of absent Senators. The whole thing is what would be called in a court of justice a statutory proceeding, and you can not go outside of it for the authority to enforce it. The rule says:

> If at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

That is the foundation for any proceedings—a roll call directed by the Chair upon a suggestion of a Senator that a quorum is not present.

Next the rule says:

> Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request—

Before anything further can be done a request must be addressed to each Senator. Before he can be proceeded against for contumacy he must have an opportunity to attend voluntarily. That is due to his station, the dignity of the body of which he is a Member, and the presumption that he will do his duty when his attention is called to the fact that his presence at a certain place is required to do it. He is not treated as a criminal in the first instance and arrested simply because he happens to find it necessary to absent himself for a short time from the session of the Senate. It is habitually done. Ninety per cent of the business of the Senate is conducted when there are not 25 Senators present, and if any such thing were possible as to give a continuing authority to the Sergeant at Arms and his deputies he might make service here absolutely unendurable. If he could pick up a Senator on the

street and say, "You are needed in the Senate, and you must go there with me now," it would not be long until service here would be less desirable than it is at the present time.

After having notified absent Senators, and after that has failed to produce the necessary quorum, then there is an additional power conferred upon the Senators present, no matter how small the number may be, for the rule proceeds:

And, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate.

At that stage, after having notified Senators that their presence in the Chamber is required, those Senators present bring into execution the power delegated by the Constitution of the United States, which is to issue a writ for the individual Senators who are absent—not a blanket proposition to bring in any Senator the Sergeant at Arms may come up with at any time during that session of the Senate or during that Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would it not be a correct proceeding, and one that ought to be followed, if the Sergeant at Arms fails to secure the attendance of the absent Senators by the first order, that he should so report to the Senate before the second order is made?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Evidently; because his report is the foundation upon which to proceed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. But I object to the use of the words "The Sergeant at Arms shall procure the attendance of absent Senators" in the first instance. He is not required to procure the attendance of anybody until he has a writ directing that the Senator shall be brought there, and that the particular Senator shall be brought there, and that he shall be brought to that particular session. He can not be furnished with a blanket writ to go out and arrest any Senator that he finds outside of the walls of this Chamber.

I think the explanation made by the Senator from North Carolina has cleared up this entire transaction. The Sergeant at Arms did not pretend to arrest anybody, and he did not deem himself to be authorized to arrest anybody. He treated the action of the Senate as a request for the attendance of Senators, and politely brought that to their notice, and that proved to be sufficient. The more drastic remedy of a writ was never resorted to, because no writ has ever been issued.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me there?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Simply in justice to the Sergeant at Arms and his deputies, I think it is only fair to them that I should say that there was not a suggestion, when his assistant came to my apartment, that he came there to arrest me, that he had any written order, or that there was any coercion about it. I had gone to my apartment with the impression that the Senate would adjourn that evening, as usual, and along pretty late in the evening this assistant came there and said that they were having quite a contest down in the Senate and that it was desired that the absentees should be present. I, of course, immediately accompanied him down here, but I did not understand that I was under arrest.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am sure the Sergeant at Arms did not invade the rights of the Senator. I am sure the Sergeant at Arms acted discreetly and in accordance with what the paper in his hands authorized him to do. The power of picking out Senators for arrest can not be delegated to a ministerial officer. That designation and that authority must proceed from the Senate itself. That is the point I want to make, and that is the information I want to communicate to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I wish to say just a word about the Sergeant at Arms. He did not attempt to use force in compelling the attendance of any Senator under the order he held in his hands. The Senate did order him to secure the attendance of Senators in the terms of the order which has been read. I hope no criticism is to be implied, much less expressed, of the action of the Sergeant at Arms. He had this order, made by the Senate in accordance with its rules and in accordance with the Constitution; and it was certified to him by the Presiding Officer, with instructions to carry it out. What could he do other than he did?

Nothing has been developed here to lay the basis of any complaint against the Sergeant at Arms, unless possibly it is the statement made by the Senator from Washington, who says that when the paper was handed to him the officer remarked that he had a warrant for him. He did not read the paper which was in his hands. If he had done that, he would of course have seen that the officer had mistaken the nature of the paper, or did not understand what it was; and, as the Senator from Connecticut said, he could easily understand, as anyone can, how an officer might use a term which was not fairly or properly descriptive.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. As I said a moment ago, I do not want to reflect on the Sergeant at Arms at all. His deputy was very courteous and very kind, and I would not have made the remark except for the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina. I simply stated it as a fact, and that was all. The Deputy Sergeant at Arms was very kind, and there is no reflection at all upon him in what I said.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a word or two, and I am through with this subject.

I can hardly agree with one view expressed by the Senator from Arkansas—that the Senate must first direct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, and that no further action can be taken by the Senate until the Sergeant at Arms has exhausted his ability to carry out that direction, and that the Senate must wait until he makes final return in that direction.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. JAMES. The very thing was done that the Senator from Arkansas says should be done in this instance before the order was issued to the Sergeant at Arms to compel the attendance of absent Senators by arrest, because the RECORD shows the following:

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. The rule requires that the names of absentees shall be called before that motion is made.

Mr. KERN. I do not understand that the rule so requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know of any rule that requires it. It has only recently been adopted as a custom. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

After that the order was issued to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and to issue warrants for their arrest.

Mr. STONE. I do not recall the exact successive steps taken. What I was about to say was that the Constitution provides that less than a majority can secure a quorum by requesting the presence of Senators who are absent, and, when necessary, by compelling their attendance.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri permit me to call to his attention the precedent of the Senate which I relied on in making the statement I did? It is reported in the last edition of Gilfry's Precedents, page 15, at the top of subdivision 7 on that page, where it says:

On motion by Mr. Harris that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel attendance of absent Senators,

Mr. Merrimon raised a question of order, viz, that under the third rule of the Senate the motion should be preceded by a motion to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The Presiding Officer submitted the question to the Senate, Should the motion to compel be preceded by a motion to request the attendance of absent Senators? and it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 24, nays 12.

Mr. STONE. That does not at all conflict with what I was trying to say. The Constitution authorizes less than a majority of the Senate to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and the rule authorizes the Senate to do the same thing. The rule provides that we shall request their attendance, and, when that is necessary, compel the attendance of absent Senators.

Now, Mr. President, while we are not settling anything this morning about it, I wish to say that it rests in the discretion and judgment of the Senate itself under the highest law in this Nation, and it alone can determine when it is necessary to issue compulsory process in the premises.

Mr. President, I do not think the course we have been pursuing heretofore for many sessions past is exactly the course that ought to be pursued. I agree with what the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators have said, that before a physical arrest can be made the Senator arrested should be named in a warrant authorizing and directing the arrest to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was not that done?

Mr. STONE. I do not know whether it was done in this case or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In every case.

Mr. STONE. I have more than once endeavored to have a more complete and, as I think, legal procedure adopted. The other night while we were here I prepared an order which I supposed we might want to use in the future during this session. It is very brief, and I propose to read it:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Whereas under the rules of the Senate a call of the Senate was ordered; and

Whereas the following-named Senators are absent without leave of the Senate, to wit—

There naming them—

Therefore it is ordered that the Sergeant at Arms be, and hereby is, directed to compel the attendance on the Senate of said named absent Senators; and it is further ordered that warrants for the arrest of said Senators be issued under the signature of the presiding officer, attested by the Secretary, and that the Sergeant at Arms be, and hereby is, directed to execute such warrants forthwith by arresting each of said named Senators and bringing him before the bar of the Senate, and that he make due return to the Senate of the execution of said warrants, and that this order shall be continuing until fully executed unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Then this form of warrant ought to be issued, or something in its similitude:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., ———, 191—.

To CHARLES P. HIGGINS,
Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate:

The undersigned presiding officer of the Senate, by virtue of the power vested in me, hereby command you, in pursuance of the order of the Senate this day made, to forthwith arrest and take into custody and bring to the bar of the Senate the following-named Senators who are absent without leave, to wit—

Naming them—

Herein fail not and make due return of this warrant.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the seal of the United States Senate, this — day of ———, 1915.

Signed by the Presiding Officer and attested by the Secretary with the seal of the Senate.

If that sort of an order were made and that sort of warrant issued, the Sergeant at Arms would be acting as a sheriff with a capias under an authority and direction to lay hands, if need be, upon those who were contumacious and bring them to the bar of the Senate. I hope that some such more accurate proceeding like that I have indicated will be followed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Missouri will not offer such a resolution as that which he has just read without more reflection than I think he has yet given the subject, because if he does he will involve the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, very likely, in somewhat expensive lawsuits. Because a man happens to be a Member of the Senate of the United States he has not forfeited his right to his personal liberty, and because he happens to be a Senator of the United States the right to bring an action for false imprisonment has not been suspended in his case.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] is entirely correct, in my judgment, in his construction of the powers of the Senate. The Constitution provides not that the minority may compel the attendance of absent Senators, but it provides that they may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Senators. The provision of the Constitution is not self-executing in its nature. It requires the action of the Senate laying down a rule according to which the constitutional power must be exercised before the minority may resort to that power at all.

Now, that the Senate has undertaken to do in the rule which has already been quoted:

Whenever upon such roll call—

That is, a roll call to ascertain whether or not a quorum is actually present, whenever upon that roll call—

it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and when necessary to compel, the attendance of the absent Senators.

Very clearly, under the rule itself, the motion must first be to request the attendance of absent Senators, and very clearly before the more drastic power can be resorted to that request must be made, and it must be made of the individual Senator. If it is not made, if he has not been requested first to attend the session, then a warrant for his arrest and his arrest upon that warrant would be absolutely beyond the authority of the arresting officer to execute, because beyond the authority of the minority of the Senate to authorize.

It required a rule to carry that provision of the Constitution into operation in order to give it any vitality whatever, because, as I have said, it is not self-executing. Prior to the adoption of the rule which has been quoted here it was held by the Senate itself that the Senate had no power to compel the attendance of absent Senators. I call attention to the precedent to that effect at page 14 of Precedents of the Senate:

The Senate, in the absence of a quorum, can not compel, but can only request, the attendance of absent Senators.

That was on April 20, 1872.

On a motion to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 174, "repealing the duty on tea and coffee," the yeas were 22, nays 7, no quorum voting; and the Sergeant at Arms, by a vote of 16 yeas to 8 nays, was directed to request the attendance of absent Senators. After debate, the Presiding Officer (Mr. Ferry of Michigan in the chair) announced that the Sergeant at Arms had reported that he had executed the order of the Senate, to request the attendance of the absent Senators; but that it still appeared, by the vote just taken, that a quorum of the Senate was not present.

Whereupon Mr. Howe submitted a motion that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of such number of absent Senators as would make a quorum of the Senate; and

* * * * * * * *

Mr. Pomeroy made a point of order, viz, that the Senate having made no provision in its rules for compelling the attendance of absent Senators, which could be made only by a quorum of the body, it was not in the power of a minority of the Senate, by adopting the proposed order, to change the existing rule on the subject, and that the motion of Mr. Howe was therefore not in order.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Ferry of Michigan in the chair) sustained the point of order, and ruled the motion of Mr. Howe not in order.

So, following that, the rule was made by the Senate which has been read, and since that rule has been in operation I think it has never been doubted that the request must precede the order to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and that request must be made upon the individual Senator before that individual Senator can be compelled to attend.

The Senator from Arkansas called attention to the case of Kilbourn against Thompson, which is an authority directly in point, although it had to do with the case of a witness and not with a case of a Member of Congress. The case is to be found in One hundred and third United States.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, as my name was announced among the absentees, I merely wish to state that the Sergeant at Arms met me on the street and told me that the attendance of absent Senators was required. Before I met him I had no idea the Senate was in session. I told him I would at once proceed to the Senate Chamber, which I did, and I remained there until half past 8 the following morning.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the RECORD, of course, discloses that I was absent when the order was made. I wish to say, however, that I was here all day and a part of the night, but I understood, or, at least, I was informed by those whom I thought ought to know, that the Senate would not be in session all night, and I did go to my home for the purpose of getting rest. I was not arrested by the Sergeant at Arms. I was simply notified that the Senate requested me to be present; and just as soon as I received that notice I immediately came to the Senate, and I was here all night and attended the session.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not quite agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] or the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] in the statement that the individual Senator must be notified to attend before a warrant of arrest can be issued for him; that is, that he must first be requested to come here by the Sergeant at Arms. If that is true, then it is within the power of a Senator, after he has evaded arrest, to put it beyond the power of the Sergeant at Arms to ever arrest him to attend.

I have known a somewhat striking situation, but one which presents this view of the question. Once my State became the refuge for numerous members of the legislature of an adjoining State, who left their State with a view of preventing a quorum in their legislature. They placed it beyond the power of the sergeant at arms to cause them to attend, and even beyond the power of the sergeant at arms to arrest them. Some of us were somewhat in sympathy with these fleeing representatives, and we tried to make matters as comfortable for them as we could. We provided them religious worship on Sunday and asked the hotels to be as liberal and as kind as they could be for the benefit of these gentlemen. However, that simply illustrates the idea I intend to express, that it is not essential before a Senator can be compelled to attend that he be personally requested to attend. If it were, then he could never be made to attend, because he could put it beyond the power of the Sergeant at Arms to make a request by concealing himself or fleeing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I notice that in the report of January 30 the Sergeant at Arms mentioned the fact that after the roll call, but before having been served, certain Senators reported in the Senate Chamber. I find my name among the number. I find that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and a number of other Democratic Senators so appeared. It is at least gratifying to us that the Sergeant at Arms has been entirely nonpolitical in the performance of his duties.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that on Saturday morning the roll call was had about 8 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. About 10.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a little difficult to remember what the hour of the morning was, as we had spent the entire Friday night in session, and many of us had remained here all night. Some time during that morning, at an appropriate hour, I left the Chamber for a few minutes to obtain my breakfast and returned. I am sure that was the full extent of my offense.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Constitution, Article I, section 5, provides as follows:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner and under such penalties as each House may provide.

Under that authority the Senate provided a method by which the minority of the Members could require the presence of a quorum in Rule V, paragraph 3, as follows:

Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

The Constitution therefore provides that a minority of this body, however small, may under this rule compel the attendance of Senators necessary to make a quorum. That is the language of the Constitution and the rule is that a minority of Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request and when necessary to compel the attendance of the absent Senators. The Constitution, however, does not stop there. It goes on to say that—

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Under the authority that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings the House is authorized to pass the rules which are necessary to make effective the work of the House and the Senate to make effective the rules of the Senate. Rule V, section 1, declares:

No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

To do so is a violation of the rule established under the Constitution and each Senator takes the oath of office to this effect: That he will support and defend the Constitution of the United States; that he takes this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that he will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which he is about to enter.

So he is bound by the oath of his office to obey these rules and observe them, and while it might be contended, as some Senators have, that a minority might not under the order or rule to compel the attendance of absent Senators issue a warrant of arrest, undoubtedly when a quorum is established by the call of the minority present in the Chamber under Rule V, then a quorum being present the Senate would under the Constitution have the right to pass the rule necessary to compel attendance by a physical arrest if necessary.

Mr. President, we have witnessed in the Chamber the fact that one or two Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber would take the floor and speak from 3 hours, 4 hours, 5 hours, 6 hours, 9 hours up to 12 hours of continuous so-called debate. It is not really debate. Nobody pretends it is debate. Some things were said which are essential, some things which are not very pertinent, and some things which are grossly impertinent and do not at all relate to the subject matter. Under that color of debate the time of this body has been consumed day after day during the last two years.

A prolonged filibuster was carried on when the question of changing our policy with regard to the tariff was before the Senate. A similar filibuster was engineered over the question of a water supply for San Francisco. There was a similar filibuster over the question of passing the Federal reserve act. It comes down to this: A single Senator on the other side may take the floor and may occupy the floor for 10 or 12 hours, and the Democrats on this side, representing the majority, the Democrats representing the people of the United States, are not permitted to govern, as they are authorized to do under the charter of the national election giving them the authority nominally and under the law. They are compelled to stay here day and night in order to respond at any instant to the call for a quorum by some one of the conspirators against the time of the Senate on the other side who may make a point of no quorum. The Democrats are compelled, therefore, to stay and make a quorum, while Senators on the other side go off to their several homes, go off to dinner parties, entertain themselves as they please, enjoy themselves, take their rest, and come in by relays to make these 9, 10, and 12 hour speeches, so called, for the purpose of carrying on a filibuster in this Chamber.

Therefore the majority has been fully justified in the very mild and moderate means which were taken to require those who were absent to come into the Chamber, perform their duty, and fulfill their oath of office.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I had not intended to contribute to this filibuster, but every other Senator, I believe, who was arrested has undertaken to purge himself of contempt, and I will follow that example.

At about 9.30 o'clock on Saturday morning the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] completed his all-night speech. Before he completed it, he suggested the absence of a quorum. The Presiding Officer declined to have the roll called, on the ground that no business had intervened. Then the colleague of the Senator from Utah, the junior Senator [Mr. SUTHERLAND], addressed the Chair. Those of us who had remained here all night understood that the junior Senator from Utah would undertake to equal, if not to excel, the record of his colleague. I had a very kind invitation from the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to go with him to breakfast, of which I very gladly availed myself after an all-night session. Upon my way back to the Chamber I stopped at my office in the Senate Office Building. I had been there about five minutes, when I was arrested and brought here or was told to come into the Senate Chamber. Altogether I was gone about an hour.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that all this debate illustrates another proposition that has not been immediately under consideration; that is, that the Senate under its rules is absolutely powerless to do business. It will not do for one Senator to say that when Republicans are in a minority they are filibustering, and try to place the odium of a filibuster on any political party, any more than it will do for the pot to call the kettle black. If you go back over the history of the Senate, you will find that these filibusters have always been conducted by Democrats when they were in the minority and by Republicans when they were in the minority. It is the method the Senate has to get a cloture; it is a cloture rule of the Senate. We have the fiction, all men proclaim, that in the Senate unlimited debate is allowed, and that this is the forum where everything can be debated to a finality; yet we have a cloture rule—the cruelest, the most hard-hearted, the most inhuman rule of cloture that has been adopted by any civilized legislative body in the world.

I am not finding fault with any minority when they resort to any means that the rules of the body give them to accomplish what they want to accomplish. They take the responsibility for it. I have myself been engaged in filibusters, although I have had no part in or sympathy with what has been termed the present filibuster. I am not complaining, either, of Democrats or Republicans, whenever they are in the minority in the Senate, to use the methods that the rules give them. It seems to me they have an honorable right to do it.

My complaint is—and I believe this illustrates it—that the Senate of the United States ought to adopt in its rules some method of orderly debate by which, under the rules themselves, every question must of itself naturally come to a vote without first resorting to a physical-endurance test to see who can stand the contest the longest.

Then, Mr. President, what a fiction this matter of a quorum is! It is illustrated by what happened to me. I am one of the Senators whose name has been read amongst those who were brought into the Senate by the Sergeant at Arms. The Senate had been in session all night, and the day before that practically all night, and along in the evening I went home. I was just going to bed—I had undressed—when the Sergeant at Arms called and said I was wanted in the Senate. I dressed again and came up here with him. We got here about 12 o'clock at night. There was no quorum here, but the records of the Senate showed there was a quorum. A Senator was addressing the Senate. I remained here until 4 o'clock in the morning. No vote was taken; no quorum call was made; at no time were there to exceed a dozen Senators in the Chamber, and during a great deal of the time there were only four or five Senators in the Chamber; yet the records of the Senate, if now examined, would show that there was a quorum present. There being no vote, there being no roll call, my name did not get into the RECORD. So the RECORD shows I was absent while I was really present. The RECORD also shows dozens of other Senators as being present when, as a matter of fact, they were absent. That

is one of the fictions of our rules. If this will bring about the adoption of a rule by the Senate that will close debate within a reasonable time, the time we are spending here, it seems to me, will be well spent.

I was here practically all night, but I was absent when the Sergeant at Arms sent for me. So the roll call—the only one that happened—shows I was absent, and, although I sat here from midnight until 4 o'clock in the morning, the RECORD shows, if that is to cast any odium, that I was disregarding my duty.

Mr. President, at 4 o'clock in the morning, after hearing—and it developed later that it was true—that the Senator then speaking was going to talk until morning—and he did talk until 9.30—I went home, as other Senators had done who were on record as present, and I got the odium of being absent, while those who were absent got the honor, if such it was, of being present. Waiting in the inclement weather—and I had to wait quite a while for a car and for a transfer at that hour of the night—I caught a cold, which I have not been able to get rid of, and at the present rate I do not know when I shall get rid of it.

It seems to me that it brings us to an outrageous conclusion, to an illogical conclusion, that Senators must stay here all night, knowing that there will be no vote, knowing that there will be nothing done, simply to help carry out the ancient rule of Senate cloture, that may be called by another name—unlimited debate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] spoke of several other bills in connection with which filibusters have taken place, as to some of which I think he was mistaken; for instance, in the case of the Hetch-Hetchy bill. I was one of those who favored the bill, but I do not have any recollection of its opponents opposing it in any way except legitimately, and I do not believe I would have a right to object if they had resorted to a filibuster, because the rules provide for it. I am inclined to think it would be a good thing if some Senator would filibuster against every bill to which he is opposed in order that we may be brought, as I believe we eventually will be brought, to have a cloture rule that of itself, under proper and guarded circumstances, would close debate.

It is not right to expect a man to stay here all day and all night when everybody knows he can do nothing, and if he goes out to get a meal make him liable to arrest by the Sergeant at Arms. It seems to me that the Senate ought to be above that; it seems to me that we ought to learn the lesson that we are doing something illogically, something hard-hearted, something cruel, that we could just as well accomplish in an orderly way, and yet not prohibit any debate that is fair or necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to rescind the order directing the Sergeant at Arms to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, has morning business closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not opened yet.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood that the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to rescind the order of the Senate was agreed to in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the very first thing done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then we are still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is just about to start in on morning business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, which had heretofore been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 15869. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining-experiment and mine-safety stations for making investigations and disseminating information among employees in mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 16637. An act to provide divisions of mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

H. R. 17330. An act to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 18783. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 21037. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 21089. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 21218. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

NOTING OF RECOGNITION OF SENATORS IN RECORD.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute of the time of the Senate during the morning hour to call the attention of the Senate to what I think is an error in the RECORD. I do not think the error pertains peculiarly to the particular case that I am about to cite, but I think it is in the method of reporting the proceedings of the Senate. For the purpose of illustrating it—and it presents a question of privilege, Mr. President—I call attention to the fact that on page 2585 of the RECORD under the date of January 29 this procedure is alleged to have taken place:

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Evidently a sufficient number. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. JAMES. What is the question?

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ASHURST, and he voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question to be voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan to take up Senate bill 392. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the Chair has ordered the Secretary to call the roll, and the Secretary has begun to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Connecticut was on his feet——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (continuing). Demanding recognition before the Chair ordered the Secretary to call the roll; and this is equivalent to denying to a Senator his rights under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, it does not appear there that the Chair recognized me at any point of the proceedings which I have read, and yet the Chair did recognize me, and I took an appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The occupant of the chair at that time, as I understand, justifies his conduct on the ground that the RECORD does not disclose that he had recognized me. If the Chair will examine the RECORD in any place, he will see that the RECORD never shows that the Chair recognizes any Senator, so that it is impossible for a Senator, if the Chair wants to be arbitrary, to sustain his contention that he was recognized by the Chair, if the Chair forgets that he did recognize him. For instance, in order to show the deficiency of the RECORD in this respect I read from the first page of the RECORD of yesterday:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to oppose or delay the approval of the Journal—

Then he proceeds for the rest of that column and a part of the next, and it does not appear that he was ever recognized by the Chair at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, he was.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, I know he was; but why should not the RECORD show what the Chair says as well as what Senators say? It ought to appear. In my opinion every time a Senator stands up and says "Mr. President," the Official Reporter ought to read into the RECORD and into his notes that the Presiding Officer said, "The Senator from Massachusetts" or "The Senator from Connecticut," as the case may be, so that it may be of record whether the Senator had the floor, and, therefore, whether he was ignored by the Chair in a motion that he made when he had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair has authority, the Chair will instruct the reporters from now on to note the fact of recognition in the RECORD.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is the very point I was coming to as the conclusion of my remarks. The very night of these proceedings, when I found the Chair was claiming that he had not recognized Senators after Senators had thought that they had heard him give them recognition, I went to the Official Reporters and requested them to take down what the Chair said, so that a Senator would not be helpless and could not be denied the floor; but it was not done. Of course, I have no authority to direct the Official Reporters, and I do not know whether the Chair has. I am simply bringing this matter up for the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It seems to the Chair that the Chair has authority to so instruct the Official Reporters, because the rule provides that a Senator shall rise in his seat and address the Presiding Officer—the Chair does not quote the rule accurately, but quotes the substance of the rule—and that a Senator shall not proceed until recognized by the Presiding Officer. The Chair believes he has the power to do so, and he will instruct the Official Reporters hereafter to show recognition by the Chair whenever the Chair recognizes a Senator.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. THORNTON. I present the following petitions, which I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD: First, a petition of certain citizens of Louisiana, asking that an embargo be placed on the shipment of all munitions of war from the United States to any country now engaged in the European war; second, a petition of the State Farmers' Union of Louisiana, protesting against the passage of any law that would interfere with the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to set aside rulings of any State railroad commission regulating freight rates in a State; and, third, a petition of State Farmers' Union of Louisiana, protesting against any restrictions being placed by England on exportation of cotton.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, most earnestly request the President of the United States, the Senators of our State, and the Representative of our District to pass the necessary laws that will enable the President of the United States to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies only, and thereby withdraw from all contending powers all aid and assistance of this Republic.

We especially request our Senators and the Representative of our district to vote for Senate resolution 6688, or any similar measure of the House of Representatives.

Rev. Wm. Wedig, H. B. Hesse, R. E. Meisner, Jas. P. Allcoate, Chas. Hainebach, Thos. Kahn, Chas. S. Miller, J. B. Zobalio, N. L. Miller, Valentin Huber, W. S. Young, G. U. Wilder, H. F. Hart, W. C. Peters, F. E. Morse, A. La Bowe, John Hoffhaus, John Taylor, P. H. Hosea, C. B. Banknight, J. Cecil Hazel, T. Turpillo, J. A. McCorkle, Jas. H. Wagnon, F. Huber, jr., F. Huber, Nick Keller, H. C. Banknight, J. O. Modisette, W. H. Adams, Alonzo Early, Peter Parker, C. O. Woyles, Henry Fossbender, William M. Williams, J. H. Heineu, V. E. Richard, G. O. Browning, Frank Schmitt, J. W. Alfords, Will Brown, N. A. Carr, J. Geo. Christian.

Whereas if farmers get the results to which they are entitled in the sale of their products we must take into our own hands the matters of traffic, financing, and distribution and sales of our farm products; and

Whereas of recent years we have succeeded in being greatly benefited by cooperating with transportation and other business interests, and which interests have shown a willingness to cooperate with us, and we have secured advantageous rates to points outside of Louisiana, which has resulted in us getting increased prices for some of our farm products; and

Whereas we notice in the press reports that at a recent meeting of the State Railroad Commissioners' Association in Washington, D. C., a resolution was adopted asking Congress to pass a law which would forbid the Interstate Commerce Commission from interfering with any rate which might be fixed by a State railroad commission within a State; and

Whereas if Congress should pass such a law it would prove against the interests of the farmer, as we want to be free to ship our products to any point outside of the State, where we can get better prices, and also to purchase our supplies either from points within the State or from points outside the State and be in position to buy where it might be cheaper and to our interests: So be it

Resolved by the Louisiana State Farmers' Union, That we oppose Congress passing any law that will interfere with the rights of the Interstate Commerce Comaission and gave them full authority to act as they did in the Shreveport Rate case, and which action has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, and which was in favor of the farmers, and that the secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Brother O. W. Taylor, president Oklahoma Farmers' Union, at Roff, Okla., and to Brother W. D. Lewis, president Texas Farmers' Union, Fort Worth, Tex., with the request that they take similar action, and a copy to each of our worthy Senators, Hon. J. E. RANSDELL and Hon. JOHN R. THORNTON, with the request that they see that our rights are protected.

J. M. DAVIS, *Chairman.*

Whereas the cotton farmers of the Nation are suffering from the worst depression that has overtaken this country since 1860, and the business interests are correspondingly affected in common with the farmer; and

Whereas, taking the European war as an excuse, England placed such restrictions on the exporting of cotton from the United States that it caused a ruinous decline in the price of cotton, owing to our inability to ship it to our customers in foreign countries, and England did not relax her interference with the shipment of cotton until her subjects had practically bought a year's supply of cotton at about 6 cents per pound from our farmers, who are forced to sell in order to exist; and

Whereas the waters of the seas are the only means of carrying the commodities interchanged between the various nations of this earth; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States of all classes, who are at peace with the world and neutral, should be permitted to use the high seas and ship our products in ships bearing the Stars and Stripes to any part of the world, irrespective of other nations who may be at war with each other; and

Whereas great injustice resulted from the efforts of some nations to interfere with the untrammeled and free use of the interchange of commodities of all kinds and interchange of intelligence; and

Whereas the interference referred to is causing unbearable losses and suffering to the great majority of farmers and other citizens of Louisiana and other States in the United States: So be it

Resolved by the Louisiana State Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, That we hereby pledge ourselves to do all in our power to obtain for ourselves and our fellow citizens, and mankind generally, the freedom and unhindered use of the seas and of the air, and we hereby respectfully petition our Federal Government to give due notice to all nations that in view of the losses sustained by the people of these United States, that in future that we henceforth shall ship all of our products at all times and to our customers in any nation just as in the past; that this Nation, being neutral, will not favor one over the other, but will treat all alike, as it ought to do, but that our Government proposes to send its own ships, under its own flag, with the products of its own citizens, to its customers in any nation on earth, and will brook interference from no one in protecting the right and the property and trade relations of its own people; and be it further

Resolved, That our secretary be instructed to mail a copy of this resolution to our national president, Brother C. S. Barrett, Atlanta, Ga., and request that he submit this to our national executive committee for action; and also to Brother O. W. Taylor, president Oklahoma Farmers' Union, Roff, Okla.; and also to Brother W. D. Lewis, president Texas Farmers' Union, of Fort Worth, Tex., and request that they take similar action in their State meetings, which we notice in the Farmers' Fireside Bulletin, that will be in January and February next; and also to give a copy to the press, with the request that the fullest publicity be given this resolution all over the United States; and also a copy to our worthy United States Senators, at Washington, D. C., Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL and JOHN R. THORNTON, and request that they have this read in the Journal of the United States Senate; and also that they furnish a copy for us to every Representative of the State of Louisiana, with the request that it be read in the House of Representatives; and that a copy be also mailed to the President of the United States, Hon. Woodrow Wilson.

I. N. MCCOLLISTER,
President.
J. M. DAVIS,
Vice President.
Miss MINNIE CARRON,
Secretary Treasurer.
R. LEE MILLS,
Chairman Executive Committee.
S. B. DAVID,
Secretary Committee.
J. H. CRAIG,
H. A. MORGAN,
Of the Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition signed by Rev. John Knox Tibbitts and 16 other members of St. Timothy's Church, of Concord, N. H., advocating and urging the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill, being House bill 12292. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Otto Granz, of Bedford, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. I have three or four short resolutions, adopted by the Washington State Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We favor the enactment of a mutual savings bank law, for the purpose of securing the great benefits which such institutions have produced in other States during the past 100 years.

Four and one-fourth billion dollars of assets are now held by the mutual savings banks of the United States, including 61 per cent of the entire reported savings deposits of the United States. Their investments are confined to the highest class of rigidly prescribed securities, including real estate mortgages at moderate rates of interest, thereby greatly advancing the upbuilding of the communities where located.

Whereas the present industrial crisis in the State of Washington demands remedy, and it is apparent that the Immigration Service is seriously handicapped for the lack of funds to properly enforce the present existing laws; and

Whereas statistics show that 1,400,000 immigrants entered the United States during the last fiscal year; and

Whereas the Immigration Service is the only department of our Government that is self-supporting, a head tax of $4 per head being required from every immigrant entering this country, and, as Government figures show, during the last fiscal year $6,700,000 was expended in the administration of existing immigration laws, and it appears that immigrants in large numbers are crossing the boundary line into Washington, with but little inspection, because of the parsimonious attitude of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our representatives in Congress to demand that the money acquired for the purpose of administration of existing immigration laws be expended for that purpose.

Whereas in many States it is customary for the labor of convicts in the State penitentiaries to be leased to private contractors, with no return to the prisoners, making of them virtual slaves; and

Whereas this system of contract prison labor has been the means of increasing the hold of the sweatshop system of free labor and undermining the conditions of the wage laborers in the industries coming into competition with convict labor, particularly in the case of the garment workers engaged in making shirts, overalls, etc.; and

Whereas in the Sixty-third Congress a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative BOOHER, of Missouri, and in the Senate by Senator HUGHES, of New Jersey, having for its object the prohibition of interstate commerce in prison contract-made goods produced in competition with free labor; and

Whereas this bill has already passed the House and is pending in the Senate, every effort being made to prevent final consideration until too late for action this session: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor demand immediate and favorable action in the Senate on this most important measure and notify the Senators from this State to that effect, requesting their cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That central bodies and local unions be requested to immediately take like action.

Whereas the policy of the State of Washington is and always has been to refrain from employing penal labor in pursuits which would place the products of that labor in competition with that of free labor; and

Whereas the penal labor of Kentucky is sold to contractors at from 35 to 40 cents per day; of Maryland, at from 35 to 50 cents per day; of Missouri, at from 50 to 75 cents per day; of Virginia, at from 60 to 85 cents per day; of Nebraska, at 62½ cents per day; of South Dakota, at 58½ cents per day; of West Virginia, at from 70 to 75 cents per day; and of Rhode Island, at 50 cents per day; and

Whereas fully 3,000 men and women are thus employed at wages between one-third and one-half of that of free labor; and

Whereas the produce of this labor is engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes, furniture, leather goods, hollow ware, farm implements, brooms, wire goods, pearl buttons, umbrellas, hosiery, underwear, men's and women's clothing, and other merchandise, which goods are sold in open competition with the products of free labor; and

Whereas all efforts heretofore made to prevent the shipping of such convict-made goods into States that recognize the injustice of such competition have failed because of the courts' interpretation of all such legislation as unconstitutional because of its interference with interstate-commerce rights, etc.; and

Whereas in an effort to overcome such court interpretation there has been introduced into Congress what is known as the Booher-Hughes bill, which bill specifically proposes to invest each State with authority to regulate the sale of convict-made goods within its borders; and

Whereas the Booher-Hughes bill has passed the House of Representatives by the overwhelming vote of 302 to 3 and is now pending in the United States Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor urge our United States Senators not only to vote but to work unceasingly for its passage during this session of Congress, and that the secretary of the State federation of labor be instructed to urge other State federations of labor through their executive officers to bring all possible pressure to bear upon their Senators, to the end that this bill be passed, so that States that so desire can protect free labor against such unfair conditions.

Whereas it appears that because of the cheaper timber procurable by the manufacturers in British Columbia the shingle manufacturers in the United States are placed at a decided disadvantage in their home markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the thirteenth annual convention of the International Union of Timberworkers instruct its international officers to cooperate with the manufacturers in a movement to establish a tariff sufficient to offset the advantages the British Columbia manufacturers now have; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegates of the International Union of Timberworkers in attendance at the fourteenth annual convention of the Washington State Federation of Labor be instructed to work toward securing the aid of the State Federation of Labor in this movement.

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor favors a tariff on shingles and indorses the above resolutions, and pledges its support to the timberworkers

---

Whereas organized labor has always advocated the caring for aged workers, who after years of toil are left dependent, because of not receiving sufficient competence to put away funds to care for themselves in their declining years; and

Whereas we believe the question is of national importance, it should be the function of the National Government to provide ways and means to put into effect an adequate system for the pensioning of aged and disabled workers; and

Whereas House record No. 5139, known as the Hamill bill, an act to provide for the retirement of employees in the Government civil service, is a step in the direction of providing a system of pensioning the aged workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor in convention assembled indorses the proposed measure, and instructs its executive officers to communicate the action of this convention on this matter to the Washington congressional delegation.

Resolved, That the State Federation of Labor, through our representatives, Senators and Congressmen, in Washington, asks for a deficiency appropriation to protect the said borders from the influx of foreigners.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have a letter from the secretary of the States Permanent Exposition Society relative to Senate bill 3971, providing for an investigation and report upon the feasibility of the establishment of a permanent exposition of the resources of the States of the Union in or near Washington, D. C. The letter is short and of interest, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1915.

Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor, on behalf of the States Permanent Exposition Society, to present for the consideration of the Senate of the United States the following facts relative to Senate bill 3971, providing for an investigation and report upon the feasibility of the establishment of a permanent exhibit of the resources of the States of the Union in or near Washington, D. C.

At the request of the States Permanent Exposition Society, there was introduced in the Senate on January 12, 1914, by the Hon. HENRY L. MYERS, the measure now before your honorable body for consideration. A similar bill was previously presented to the House of Representatives.

Immediately after the introduction of the bill in the House, governors of the various States manifested their keen interest and their approval of the measure. In fact, so strongly did the purpose of the bill commend itself that a number of the governors have selected State committees to cooperate in the establishment of permanent exhibits at the Nation's Capital. The purposes of the measure have not only received the approval of the States' executives, but also has the favorable indorsement of hundreds of commercial associations, trades bodies, and civic organizations in every part of the United States.

All preliminary work incident to the preparation of the bills, including all exploitation work, correspondence, etc., has been accomplished through the earnest, patriotic, and gratuitous services of two members of our society, Mr. Mark A. Woodell and Mr. R. Gordon Finney, both of said gentlemen having had long experience in exposition matters, and who fully appreciate the great industrial and commercial advantages which will result through the establishment of such permanent exhibits.

Aside from the great commercial advantages to be gained by such permanent exhibits at Washington, such an exposition will tend to inspire a wholesome and friendly competition among the States of the Union. The project will also prove a means of the saving of millions of dollars which have heretofore been expended by the States through their participation in great expositions of a temporary character. This great economy can be more readily appreciated when we pause to consider the vast sums of money which have in the past and which is at the present time being expended in the construction and maintenance of handsome and imposing State buildings on the sites of our great expositions in the West, and which buildings, after having served their purpose for but a few months, are dismantled and demolished.

It is for the above and numerous other good reasons that our States are anxious for a permanent exposition at their National Capital, and we earnestly ask that the initial steps may be taken at the present session of Congress for the accomplishment of this great enterprise of world-wide importance.

Assuring you of our high esteem and of our hearty cooperation in your efforts, we have the honor to remain,

Faithfully, yours,

STATES PERMANENT EXPOSITION SOCIETY,
M. A. WOODELL, *Secretary*,
Room 8, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[From report of House committee.]

For many years past the various States of the Union have been expending large sums of money for the purpose of advertising to the outside world the advantages possessed by each State over other sections of the country, and these expenditures and these efforts have been largely supplemented by appropriations made by railroads, commercial organizations, and individuals. This advertising takes many shapes, but in probably no other form of advertising does a State—through appropriations made from the treasury—expend such large sums as in exhibits made of its resources at the various State, national, and international expositions which are constantly being held in this country and abroad.

There are two great objections to exhibits of this character, however, so serious that it can well be doubted whether a State receives from such sources an adequate return for the moneys invested. The first of these objections is, that an exposition is temporary in character, and the displays made there must be viewed, if at all, within three, four, or six months. The second objection is that visitors to expositions are there in a holiday mood and are not disposed to make a study of exhibits illustrating the resources of any particular community. But the practice has so grown that it is doubtful whether a State can refuse to make an exhibit at any national or international exposition, because to refuse to do so would be to make that State conspicuous by its absence.

The erection at the city of Washington in the District of Columbia of State buildings within which to house a complete display of the national wealth and resources of the several States and Territories in education, manufacturing, agriculture, and in the arts is worthy of consideration. The erection of these buildings upon an appropriate site would add much to the beauty of the National Capital; it would stimulate a greater feeling of patriotism in the Federal Government, and would have a tendency to cement in closer bonds the people of the various States. It would furnish a most complete advertisement of the resources of a State, located at a strategic point where it could be viewed by thousands of visitors every year. What more appropriate exposition idea than to display here, in permanent manner, exhibits illustrative of the wealth of the States in agriculture, forestry, mining, manufacturing, and the arts? Such an exhibit would be of great educational value to the people of our country, and it would

prove an important factor in increasing trade, not alone with the several States of the Union but with foreign nations.

The establishing of the various State exhibits would furnish to foreign nations a most convincing argument for peace, in that the representatives of such foreign Governments could see at a glance the tremendous resources and wonderful possibilities of the United States. All that would be required of the National Government would be to furnish to the different States a proper and convenient site, on lands now owned by the Government, upon which to erect these buildings. Further than this the committee thinks the National Government should not go. The cost of the erection of the buildings, the expense of the installation of the various exhibits and the maintenance thereof, and all or any expenses incident thereto should be borne solely, wholly, and alone by the respective States which may establish their exhibits.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have divers petitions from citizens of the State of Illinois favoring the passage of Senate bill 6688, to prohibit individuals, partnerships, or corporations in the United States from selling arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives of any kind for exportation during the existence of war except upon proof that said arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives are not to be used in war against a country with which the United States is at peace. I ask that one of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD and that the remainder be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the body of one of the petitions was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY, 1915.

Senator LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As an American I respectfully ask you to vote for and lend your active support to Senate resolution 6688, so that it may pass the Senate at this session of Congress, and I also ask you to impress upon the Committee on Foreign Relations the fact that the majority of the people of your senatorial district are in favor of such a law.

Respectfully,
JULIUS VOSS,
4464 Fifth Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. CATRON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico relative to an appropriation of $300,000 for suppressing carnivorous wild animals destructive to livestock in the public-land States of the West. I ask that the joint memorial may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 1, introduced by Mr. Secundino Romero.]

Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America petitioning the United States Government to appropriate $300,000 for suppressing carnivorous wild animals destructive to livestock in the public-land States of the West.

Your memorialists, the governor and Legislature of the State of New Mexico, respectfully represent that—

Whereas in the Western States, known as the public-land States, the losses of livestock and poultry due to the attacks of coyotes, wolves, wildcats, cougars, and bears amount to not less than $15,000,000 annually; and

Whereas in these western public-land States the State, county, and stockmen do now and have for years paid large bounties and used other means to bring about the eradication of these carnivorous wild animals; and

Whereas in these western public-land States there is now withdrawn from settlement in some form or other approximately 225,000,000 acres of Federal land, which constitutes the principal breeding ground and refuge of these carnivorous wild animals and enables them to increase their numbers in spite of the efforts made by State, county, and stockmen to exterminate them: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby most respectfully urge and request that Congress immediately appropriate the sum of $300,000 to be used by the United States Department of Agriculture for the destruction of coyotes, wolves, wildcats, cougars, and bears in these western public-land States in order that the meat supply of the Nation may be increased and the proper development of the West encouraged.

I, Blas Sanchez, chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 1.

BLAS SANCHEZ, *Chief Clerk.*

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a petition signed by 70 merchants and business men of the city of Iron Mountain, Mich., stating that they believe in equal taxation, establishing of home industries, and protection of local trade, and are heartily in favor of House bill 5308, to provide for a tax upon the persons, firms, or corporations engaged in interstate mail-order business, and for other purposes, and indorsing the sentiments expressed in a letter dated January 14, 1915, from the Retail Furniture Dealers' Association of the State of Tennessee, and petitioning every effort to be made to secure the passage of such legislation. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. I present a petition signed by members of St. Timothy's Church, of Concord, N. H., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., *January 27, 1915.*

To the Hon. HENRY F. HOLLIS,
Senator from New Hampshire, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, members of St. Timothy's Church, of Concord, N. H., request that you advocate and urge the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill, H. R. 12292:

John Knox Tibbits, William Casno Silver, George Evans, George Angwin, Lillian B. Angwin, R. Waldo Wilson, Agnes E. Dexter, John Stanley, Mrs. J. Coleman, Ruth W. Abbott, Alice A. Abbott, Mrs. J. Baxter, Isabel Baxter, Mrs. G. Angwin, Rhoda J. Angwin, Mrs. John Angwin, John Angwin.

Mr. HOLLIS. I present a letter from E. M. Slayton, of Manchester, N. H., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANCHESTER, N. H., *February 1, 1915.*

DEAR SIR: Although general business through New Hampshire for January was the poorest for the corresponding month for many years, I can see a large business coming for the balance of 1915.

The basic conditions are such as to force it onto us. The passage of the steamship bill now before Congress will remove the last large deterrent. There are tens of millions of tons of our coal, iron products, food, and miscellaneous manufactured products wanted by neutral nations, but the English owners of 80 per cent of the present ocean carriers are charging four to eight times the usual freight rates, at the same time there are idle steamships to carry these goods, but because a Democrat proposes the bill the old-line Republicans oppose.

This war was brought on for business reasons. Russia wants free passage of the Dardanelles for its food crops, England was jealous of Germany's continuous advancement in getting a share of its overseas trade, Germany wanted Belgium for its seaports; it was, and is, a war for control of world's trade, and it is the height of folly for our people to let slip by the opportunity to step in and get a large share of the same. Don't think for a second England would, "if in our situation," neglect to buy ships wherever it could. Their game is to keep ocean freights so high that we have to sell underpriced in order to sell the merchandise. If ocean freights were at only double one year ago prices, we would be moving two and three million tons coal per month. Just think what that would bring in wages to the coal miners and railroads that bring the coal to seaboard. There would be an enormous demand for iron products, and consequently full employment for labor in that line; it would increase railroad earnings; in fact, bring full employment to all and prosperous times to all.

Most respectfully, yours,
E. M. SLAYTON.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the German-American Alliance of Middletown; of the German-American Alliance of Seymour; and of sundry citizens of Broad Brook and Bridgeport, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wallingford, Conn., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Unity League of Norwalk, of South Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 282, of Bridgeport, Conn., and a petition of Local Union No. 481, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Hobart, Indianapolis, Porter, McCool, Evansville, Hammond, Kokomo, Waymansville, Mishawaka, Huntington, and Brazil, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ockley, Delphe, Colburn, Mulberry, Frankford, Hammond, La Porta, and Dayton, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Elkhorn, Ind., praying for the extension of the Federal migratory bird law, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, Brotherhood of Railway Car Men of America, of New Albany, Ind., remonstrating against a change in the locomotive boiler-inspection law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the Ministerial Association of Richmond, Ind., remonstrating against a change in the

compensatory time service of post-office employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 565, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kokomo, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide Federal censorship of motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Arizona, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

House concurrent resolution for the construction of a bridge across the Gila River near the Pima Indian Agency.

To the Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH and HENRY F. ASHURST, United States Senators, and the Hon. CARL HAYDEN, Member of Congress:

Whereas a bridge across the Gila River near the Pima Indian Agency will be of a great benefit and convenience to the Pima Indians in crossing the river in times of flood; and

Whereas a diversion dam is contemplated by the Federal Government at the intake of a large canal near the Pima Indian Agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Arizona (the Senate concurring), That it is the desire of the legislature that the Arizona representatives in the Federal Congress use their best efforts to procure by the Congress now in session an appropriation for the construction of a combined bridge and diversion dam, to be located in the Gila River, Pinal County, Ariz., at a point about 2½ miles above the Pima Indian Agency and within the Gila River Indian Reservation.

Passed the house January 28, 1915, by a vote of: Ayes 35, noes 0.
WM. E. BROOKS,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 28, 1915, by a vote of: Ayes 19, noes 0.
W. P. SIMS, *President.*
OSCAR COLE, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4320. A bill for the relief of certain homestead entrymen for lands within the limits of the Glacier National Park (Rept. No. 951); and

S. 3200. A bill relating to desert-land entries (Rept. No. 952).

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16029) to authorize the Secretary having jurisdiction of the same to set aside certain public lands to be used as national sanitariums by fraternal or benevolent organizations, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 953) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4495) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the district of Kansas at Salina, Kans., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 955) thereon.

LANDS IN NEVADA.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President ——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have here a bill from the Committee on Public Lands, respecting the State of Nevada, to encourage the development of water on arid lands. It has been ordered favorably reported by the committee, with amendments, which has had two hearings upon it, and has also been favorably reported upon by the Department of the Interior. It is Senate bill 7109 to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 954) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 7545) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Worth, Tex., and for the remodeling, altering, etc., of the present post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7546) granting a pension to Myrtle J. Hayes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 7547) granting a pension to Walter K. Neal (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7548) granting a pension to Lucy A. Palmer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7549) granting an increase of pension to John E. Graham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7550) to correct the military record of Almond S. Root (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 7551) to provide for the establishment, operation, and supervision of a cooperative national farm-land bank system in the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7553) granting an increase of pension to John Hawksley; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GORE. I introduce a bill and ask that it be read the first time by its title.

The bill (S. 7552) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I introduce a joint resolution relative to an investigation of a system of rural personal credit. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 232) to authorize the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate a system of rural personal credit was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 232) to authorize the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate a system of rural personal credit.

Whereas none of the several rural credit investigating bodies appointed by Congress within the past few years has drafted a personal rural credit bill; and

Whereas personal rural credit is more necessary than a land-mortgage system, although such system is good so far as it goes; and

Whereas nearly every highly civilized country has in successful operation a personal rural credit system through which the farmers of those countries obtain credit for productive purposes at low rates of interest and in sufficient amounts to enable them to produce agricultural products more economically than is done in this country, even though our farmers possess many natural advantages not enjoyed by them; and

Whereas the great European war now being waged is wasting capital at a rate never before approached, which condition is bound to result in materially affecting the world's capital and credit markets; and the American farmers having no organized credit machinery it naturally follows that their interests will suffer more than any other interests in the country and make it more difficult for them to obtain credit in the future than it has been in the past: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House of Representatives are hereby authorized, through a subcommittee, to investigate and hold hearings on such personal rural credit bills as may be presented to them, in the manner hereinafter more specifically set forth, and make a report thereof not later than the 10th day of December next.

SEC. 2. That such subcommittee or investigating body, which is hereinafter referred to as the commission, shall hold its hearings and investigations in such manner that will permit persons who, in the commission's opinion, have sufficient authoritative backing, to present bills for a personal rural-credit system in the United States to the commission and appear before them by experts of their own selection to establish the merits of their respective bills and to disprove any provisions contained in bills not presented by themselves. The commission shall notify at least one leading representative of every interest affected by such bills, including the president of the American Bankers' Association, of his privilege to appear before the commission by an expert of his own selection and to advocate or oppose any bill presented, who shall enjoy

the same rights and privileges before the commission as the experts of the proponents.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the further duty of the commission to send for persons and papers; to administer oaths; to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and have the same examined by themselves or by the representatives of the parties at interest appearing before them, or both; to adopt rules of procedure and the same to amend; and to employ such secretaries, experts, stenographers, and other assistants as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the commission was created.

SEC. 4. That the members of the commission shall receive no compensation for their services on the commission, except traveling expenses incurred outside of the District of Columbia while attending to the duties imposed under this act.

SEC. 5. That the sum of $9,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and to defray the expense of the commission, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Such appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said commission, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of said commission.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I introduce a joint resolution providing for world organization to secure permanent international peace. I ask that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 233) providing for world organization to secure permanent international peace was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 233) providing for world organization to secure permanent international peace.

Whereas it is the duty of all men to aid in ameliorating harsh conditions suffered by others; and

Whereas multitudes of men in all lands are now burdened by the cost of armaments due to an ever-present fear of international war; and

Whereas means of communication now exist which give to the people of different nations a larger understanding of their common interest than they could have had heretofore; and

Whereas that common understanding, if supplied with an organ of expression and of action, may bear proper fruit in preventing the desolations of war and in promoting human happiness through peaceful cooperation of States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That this Congress hereby declares its acceptance of the principle that international disputes threatening war should be submitted for final determination to an international court having armed power to enforce its decrees; the constitution of said court to be substantially as set forth in the tentative draft of articles of agreement hereinbelow set forth.

Resolved further, That this Congress does hereby request the President to initiate negotiations, through the usual diplomatic channels, looking to the establishment of a system of international control based upon the principles appearing in the said tentative draft.

TENTATIVE DRAFT OF ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT CONSTITUTING AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF DECREE AND ENFORCEMENT.

ARTICLE 1.

The object of this agreement is declared to be the abolition of international war and the furtherance of peaceful cooperation between the Governments assenting to these articles.

ARTICLE 2.

In the pursuit of this object the signatories hereto undertake to create a sovereign body to be called the International Court of Decree and Enforcement, hereinafter designated the court. And they bind themselves to perform the things required of each for the establishment and maintenance of the court.

ARTICLE 3.

SECTION 1. The court shall be composed of representatives of the signatories hereto, hereinafter referred to as member States.

SEC. 2. The number of such representatives, plus those determined by the provisions of section 4 of this article, shall be as follows: Two members from each of the following States and groups of States, namely: Austria-Hungary, China (including Thibet), France, German Empire, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain and Portugal, Turkey, United States of America.

SEC. 3. One member from each of the following States and group of States, namely: Afghanistan and Persia; Argentine Republic and Uruguay; Belgium and Luxemburg; Bolivia, Chile, and Peru; Brazil and Paraguay; Bulgaria, Greece, Roumania, and Servia; Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, and Venezuela; Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Salvador; Denmark, Sweden, Norway; Holland; Siam; Switzerland.

SEC. 4. From each State or group of States (except China) named in section 2 of this article one additional member for every 20,000,000 inhabitants in excess of 30,000,000; from each State or group of States in section 3 of this article, one additional member for every 20,000,000 inhabitants in excess of 20,000,000. For China (including Thibet) one member for every 100,000,000 inhabitants in excess of 200,000,000: *Provided*, That in the enumeration of inhabitants for the purpose of representation no count shall be taken of any persons held in slavery. Inhabitants of colonies, protectorates, or possessions not self-governed shall entitle their controlling power to representation on the following basis, namely: For the first 30,000,000, one member; for each 100,000,000 in excess of the first 30,000,000, one member.

SEC. 5. The membership of States affected now by the provisions of section 4 of this article shall, during the first 10 years of the exercise of this constitution, be taken as follows: Austria-Hungary, 2; France, 3; German Empire, 3; Great Britain, 6; Holland, 2; Japan, 3; Russia, 6; United States of America, 7.

At the end of said period of 10 years, and thereafter every tenth year, the court shall inquire into and fix for the purpose of representation in this union the population of member States and groups of States.

ARTICLE 4.

SECTION 1. The pay of members of the court shall be $20,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. The manner of selection, the personal qualifications, and the term of office of members shall be such as may be determined by their respective Governments.

ARTICLE 5.

SECTION 1. The first place of meeting of the court shall be at The Hague, in Holland. This meeting shall take place and the conditions of this agreement shall become operative one year from the date when any six of the following-named States may have adopted and signed these articles, namely: The United States of America, Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Japan, and Italy.

SEC. 2. During a period of five years after the first year of the exercise of this agreement the court may sit in such capitals of member States as it may select. During the same period of five years the court shall endeavor to obtain sole sovereignty of an area not exceeding 10 miles square, and there fix its seat of government; and if it should not succeed in obtaining such sole sovereignty, the court shall thereafter have its sittings wherever it may determine: *Provided, however*, That the persons of members of the court shall always be inviolable when journeying to and from, or in attendance upon, the court.

ARTICLE 6.

SECTION 1. The rules of procedure of the court shall be such as from time to time may be fixed by it: *Provided, however*, That a majority vote of the members shall always be required for the following purposes, namely:

First. For adopting or altering rules of procedure.

Second. For rendering final decision in any dispute between member States.

Third. For authorizing the use of violence by the armed forces of the court.

Fourth. For determining the sums required for meeting the expenses of the operations of the court.

Fifth. For electing a president and vice president (from among their number) and for defining the powers and terms of office of said officers.

Sixth. For passing upon the credentials of members whose right to recognition as such may be in dispute.

SEC. 2. Communication between the court and the member States shall be carried on by their respective executives, unless other officials be specially appointed thereto by the court or the member States.

SEC. 3. The court shall cause to be printed in French, with reasonable promptness, and to be furnished to the member States, full reports of its decisions, whether judicial or executive, but its deliberations may be made public or not as the court may decide.

ARTICLE 7.

The powers of the court shall be as follows:

SECTION 1. To decide by decree all disputes submitted to it by any State (whether a member or not) and arising between a member State or any other State (whether a member or not). Such decision may be made upon the evidence presented by the State submitting the dispute if, within such period as may be fixed by the court, the other State or States concerned, having been admonished thereto by the court, shall have failed to present other evidence.

SEC. 2. To enforce by arms the execution of its decrees, the fulfillment of demands made in accordance with this constitution, and the exercise of all powers granted herein.

SEC. 3. To repel any attack, or to repress preparations therefor, by any State against any member State.

SEC. 4. To intervene in the affairs of any State disordered by violence and to pacify such disorder by advice, decree, or force: *Provided, however*, That no such intervention shall take place unless the court be requested thereto by two or more States, other than the State or States directly concerned, and that two-thirds of the members of the court shall consent to such intervention.

SEC. 5. To establish, maintain, and control such civil organization and such armed force on land and sea as the court may deem necessary. Conscription of the armed personnel shall be effected, when necessary, through demand made upon the member States, for numbers of men fixed in the ratio of the relative populations of the States. And for this purpose the population shall be determined in the manner specified in section 4 of article 3.

SEC. 6. To determine annually the sums required for meeting the expenses of the government hereby constituted; to demand of each member State payment of its due proportion of said sums, the apportionment among the States and groups of States to be made in the ratio which the number of representatives of each State or group of States may bear to the total number of members of the court on the 1st day of July of the year for which the apportionment is made. If in any of the groups of States mentioned in article 3 there should be failure at any time to agree upon and report in due time to the court the proportion which each is to bear in paying the group apportionment for the expenses of the court, then those States of the group or any one of them which shall assume and pay the group apportionment shall be entitled to the group representation.

SEC. 7. To acquire and hold such lands, buildings, docks, anchorages, and rights of way as may be necessary for the efficient maintenance of its civil and military establishment. Such acquirement may be effected through purchase, gift, or demand made upon any member State for the exercise by it of its right of eminent domain in respect to property desired and which can not otherwise be had on conditions satisfactory to the court.

SEC. 8. To demand of member States that, within three months from the date when these articles of agreement shall become effective, they shall surrender to the control of the court all armed vessels of war and all material appurtenant thereto; to select from such surrendered vessels and material whatever the court may desire to retain in its naval establishment; to disarm the remaining vessels, and to return them, with material not desired, within six months from the date of their surrender; to demand of member States that they shall not build armed vessels of war; to demand that, within one year from the date when this constitution shall become effective, the standing armies of all member States shall be reduced to a footing of one soldier for each thousand inhabitants, determined according to the provisions of section 4 of article 3, and provided that land forces maintained solely for services in colonies not self-governing shall not be subject to the restrictions of this article; to demand of each member State such portion of its material for land forces as the court may require; to value all vessels and material retained by the court under the provisions of this article, and to pay for the same within 10 years from

the date of its acquirement; to demand the disarmament of fortifications fronting the land frontier between member States; to occupy, maintain, alter, or disarm seacoast fortifications of member States and fortifications fronting the frontiers between member States and other States.

SEC. 9. To make terms of peace which shall be binding upon all member States affected, in order to conclude any war waged between the forces of the court and those of any State.

SEC. 10. To propose to States for their consideration methods of promoting the common good of mankind in literature, science, art, and commerce.

SEC. 11. To recognize any sovereign State that may hereafter come into existence, and to fix the number of representatives in the court to which such State shall be entitled as a signer of these articles of agreement.

ARTICLE 8.

An amendment to these articles of agreement shall have full force and effect as a part of it when it shall have received the assent of three-fourths of the members of the court and two-thirds of the member States: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this article each group of States named in article 3 shall be taken as one State.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WORKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment providing that hereafter the President of the United States be authorized to designate a list of areas of any lands purchased by the United States under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911, as should, in his opinion, be set aside for the protection of game animals, birds, or fish, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agriculture appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRONNA submitted an amendment providing for the creation of a national farm-loan association and State and local associations, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agriculture appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that the pay of electrical expert aids and electrical experts in the classified service of the Navy of the first class be $3,600 per annum; the second class, $3,000; the third class, $2,400 per annum; and the fourth class, $1,800 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975), which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. About 10 minutes are left before the morning hour closes. The Committee on Public Lands of the Senate yesterday favorably reported House bill 15799, to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

Mr. POMERENE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 533), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to subpœna witnesses, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and the expense thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does a Senate resolution submitted to-day have precedence over resolutions coming over from yesterday?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A resolution coming over from yesterday will come up in its regular order, which will be the next order of business.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Just a word in explanation of this resolution. The Committee on Interstate Commerce some days ago appointed a subcommittee to hold hearings with respect to a bill on the subject of boiler inspection. Before this reference was made there were a number of applications for hearings, and the subcommittee is now conducting those hearings; but I am informed by the clerk of the committee that there is no formal resolution authorizing the committee to hold hearings. I simply suggest this so that there may be early action on the resolution by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

SHIPS OF BELLIGERENT NATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 527, submitted by Mr. BURTON, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Senate certain information relative to interned merchant ships of belligerent nations.

Mr. KERN. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the pending ship-purchase bill, being S. 6856, contemplates by certain of its provisions the purchase of shipping tonnage already constructed, and therefore suggests the possible acquisition of ships belonging to belligerents, some of which are interned in American and other ports as the result of the war; and

Whereas the purchase of such vessels would raise questions of vital importance to the interests of the United States, a knowledge of which is of supreme importance in order that the Senate may reach an intelligent conclusion as to the advisability of enacting said bill and as to the propriety of incorporating in its provisions certain amendments: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested, and is hereby directed, to transmit, at his earliest convenience, to the Senate of the United States information responsive to the following queries:

First. Has the Secretary of the Treasury knowledge that any officer of the Government has made overtures or addressed inquiries to the owners of ships under the flags of belligerent nations, including those ships now interned in ports of the United States or other neutral ports, for the purchase of such ships on the part of the Government of the United States or any of its authorized agencies?

Second. Have tenders of sale of any interned merchant ships or other merchant ships carrying the flag of any of the belligerent nations been made to the United States or any of its officers or agencies?

Third. Have there been any tenders for the sale of vessels at present carrying the flag of any neutral nation to the United States or any responsible officer or agent thereof?

Fourth. Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that any person, firm, or corporation, acting either in private capacity or that of agent for the Government, holds any option upon any vessels of a belligerent nation interned in ports of the United States or elsewhere contemplating their transfer either to private citizens of the United States or the Government of the United States or an agency thereof?

Fifth. Is it within the knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Government of the United States, or any official thereof, has in his employ or under his direction any person or agent who is making inquiry as to the possibility of purchasing any ship or ships of any description whatsoever contemplating their eventual transfer to the United States or an agency thereof?

In each of the above instances the names of the persons, ships, and terms involved in each contemplated sale or purchase is requested.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution, so far as I am concerned. Still, it contains some matters which seem to me unimportant and possibly irrelevant. For instance, the third paragraph reads:

Have there been any tenders for the sale of vessels at present carrying the flag of any neutral nation?

Whether there has been or has not been any such tender I do not see that it amounts to anything in connection with the arguments made with reference to this measure. For instance—I have no information on that subject, but I am supposing a case—suppose some ship broker in New York writes to the Secretary of the Treasury and says: "I can get you Norwegian, Danish, and Italian ships of such and such description," could there be any possible fault found with anybody on that account?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly not; but this is a part of the general inquiry. The resolution seeks to ascertain, I may say, two things. In the first place, the possibility of acquiring ships, so that we may know how many boats the Government might acquire if this bill should pass. In the second place, it seeks to know whether there is any danger of complications arising out of purchases from belligerents. The resolution is intended to be comprehensive, and to include that general subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. The fifth paragraph also covers an inquiry as to the possibility of purchasing any ship or ships of any description.

Mr. BURTON. The third is distinguished from the fifth in this particular: The third is with regard to tenders for the sale of vessels or offers from the owners of neutral ships. The fifth is in regard to inquiries made by officials of our own Government. I do not see how it can do any harm to include both.

Mr. STONE. I see how it can do harm.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection so far as I am concerned. I will say that my information is that Danish, Norwegian, and Italian ships have been offered. Of course, if this bill passes, there could be no objection on the part of anybody to transactions of that kind, I should think.

Mr. BURTON. I repeat what I said; no, but I think it very desirable that the Senate should know to what extent those boats are offered to this Government, so that we may know whether or not any shipping property may be readily available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. It would likewise be very desirable for the Shipping Trust, the shipping combine between the shipping interests of the United States and Great Britain, to know what ships were offered to or might be purchased by the Government or by the corporation it is proposed to create in the event the bill becomes a law.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has submitted two resolutions—one addressed to the Secretary of State and the other one, which has just been reported, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury. The one addressed to the Secretary of State requests the Secretary to transmit to the Senate, at his earliest convenience, information responsive to this inquiry:

Has the Secretary of State, through private or official channels, received any information from any responsible foreign source as to the attitude the Governments of the belligerent nations, or any of them, might be expected to assume in relation to the transfer to the American flag and American register of merchant ships which have heretofore carried the flag of a belligerent State?

I see absolutely no objection to the passage of that resolution. If any foreign State, or anyone pretending to represent a foreign State, has made any representations to our State Department in the nature of a protest or for any other purpose intended to be expressive of the attitude of such foreign State, I think the Senate ought to be advised of that fact, not alone because of any possible effect it might have on the pending legislation but for even more important reasons than that.

Speaking for myself, I have no objection to the passage of the resolution; but as to the other resolution, the one addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, which is now pending, it seems to me it would be the effect of the resolution to give to every nation in the world and every corporation or interest in the world opposing this legislation and seeking to defeat it an opportunity in advance to know what it might be possible for the Government of the United States or the corporation to accomplish.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a question?

Mr. STONE. In just a moment, Mr. President, I do not believe that any person or corporation that was about to enter upon a business enterprise would care in advance to lay all the information it had respecting that business before its competitors. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, in a document transmitted here and laid before the Senate, have made public a long list of some 22 boats they said were available? Possibly they were imposed upon. It seems to have come from a man who is not a shipping broker, but a real estate agent, on whose door there was printed "shipping broker" about 10 days ago.

Mr. STONE. What is the pertinency of the suggestion?

Mr. BURTON. That this resolution is exactly in line with what the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce have already been doing. What we want is accurate information on the subject.

Mr. STONE. If that is all the information there is about it, then the Senator has it. If that is all the information the Secretary of the Treasury may have on the subject——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived——

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 6856.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BURTON. I ask——

Mr. JAMES. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BURTON. I think I had the floor, did I not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the rule which has just been entered, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky to suggest the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gore	Norris	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sterling
Brandegee	Hardwick	Oliver	Stone
Bryan	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Burleigh	Hollis	Page	Swanson
Burton	James	Perkins	Thomas
Camden	Jones	Pittman	Thompson
Catron	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thornton
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Chilton	La Follette	Reed	Townsend
Clapp	Lane	Root	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Warren
Crawford	Lippitt	Sheppard	Weeks
Culberson	Lodge	Sherman	White
Cummins	McCumber	Shields	Williams
Dillingham	McLean	Shively	Works
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. LANE. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is engaged on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to state that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on yesterday or the day before the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] in calling attention to what he asserted to be an irregularity in some proceeding of the Senate, as shown in the RECORD, stated in substance that a failure to observe the rules and the proper methods of procedure might involve the constitutionality or validity of legislation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know the Senator does not wish to draw wrong inferences from any remark I made. I did not intend to make the remark the Senator attributes to me. I do remember having said yesterday that the accuracy of the Journal might involve constitutional questions, but I did not refer to the legality of any legislation. That was not in my mind at all. It was the constitutional privileges of Senators that I had in mind.

Mr. STONE. After that there is perhaps nothing more for me to say on that subject.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I had no idea what the Senator was about to say. I simply wanted his premise to be correct if he was about to say anything.

Mr. STONE. Since the premise is incorrect, I will forego predicating any remarks thereon further than to say that I have no doubt the great interests combined to defeat this legislation will seek, through judicial procedure, to prevent the enforcement of the law if it be enacted. I would not be surprised if the constitutionality or the validity of the statute which we are seeking to make would be called in question and such process utilized as might tend, in the first instance, to delay the execution of the law and ultimately to defeat it. And now, Mr. President, I will pass by any further observations on that subject, which after all I intended to give only a passing notice, and come to that I have risen to talk about.

Mr. President, in northern France there are to-day, and for months have been, two great armies confronting each other in a titanic struggle and in enacting one of the most stupendous tragedies of history. Suppose a fraction of some company of

French soldiers or German soldiers should secretly withdraw from among their fellows to some secluded spot and there plot together to aid the enemy and betray their comrades; suppose prearranged signals should be agreed upon through which the plotters might inform the enemy just when, where, and how to strike a deadly blow, what would the comrades of such betrayers think of them? What would France think of them? What would Germany think of them?

Suppose, again, that during the closing days of that long struggle carried on in the British Parliament to establish home rule for Ireland some Irish members of the House of Commons who had been allied with Redmond and the Irish National Party, working with them to accomplish reforms of tremendous import to Ireland, had slipped away into secret places and plotted, upon signals to the enemy, to rush in at a crucial moment to surprise their old associates, in whose confidence they knew they held a secure place, and help the Tories to strike down that great measure in the interest of human rights, what would the people of Ireland and the world have thought of that?

Mr. President, do not the cases I have supposed make their own application here? Is there any need to be more specific? This we know, that on Monday last the Democrats of this body were subjected to one of the greatest surprises which has ever occurred in American politics. What are the facts? Seven Democrats, Members of the Senate—I did not believe there were seven such Democrats in the world, and certainly not in the Senate—who had been holding secret conclaves, whispering and conspiring together, came in here, without a word of warning to their associates on this side, but after Republican Senators on that side had been duly notified of what was coming, and notified sufficiently long in advance for every Republican to be in his seat—which, by the way, is a rare sight nowadays—and then these seven conspirators——

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. STONE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I rise to a point of order—that the Senator from Missouri is violating paragraph 2 of Rule XIX, imputing conduct or motives unworthy and unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think I am amenable to the rule, for the conduct I refer to was unbecoming and unworthy of a Senator.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I press the point of order, and I ask that the Senator from Missouri be requested to take his seat until he purges himself of his contemptuous conduct in this body.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has not the floor until the point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has not the floor. Will the Official Reporter please read the language complained of?

Mr. STONE. I will apologize without having it read to the Senate, Mr. President.

Mr. O'GORMAN. On the apology of the Senator from Missouri, I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York withdraws the point of order. The Senator from Missouri will proceed. Does he yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STONE. I think I should not have designated these seven Senators as conspirators. I withdraw that expression as objectionable under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STONE. He is not now asking me to yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator has withdrawn his unwarranted——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has not yielded yet. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STONE. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I rose, Mr. President, to protest against the statement made by the Senator from Missouri, because I am one of the Senators who voted against and have done all I could to defeat this bill. His reference to Democratic Senators who participated in that was offensive to me, and I rose to characterize it as I felt. The Senator has withdrawn it, and I have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think I will be in order if I say that there was an innocent meeting, highly patriotic in its purposes and very democratic in every way, attended by seven Senators, who still by courtesy, if not by right, are occupying seats on this side of the Chamber, at which meeting they conferred, of course always with the good of the country and the Democratic Party uppermost in thought and heart, with no extraneous influence operating upon any of them, for these Senators would spurn such a thing as that, all being like Brutus—most honorable men. I think I am within my rights when I say that these most honorable Senators, after maturing their plans, marched in here and sprang a complete and cruel surprise on their colleagues on this side of the Chamber. I think I am within my rights when I say that these seven and the Republicans of this body collaborated to make the surprise as complete as possible, and throughout acted in concert. I congratulate our friends the enemy on their coup. It was well done. You did upset us. You did get us in a hole, and I do not know now whether we are going to get out of it. It was indeed a fine, a most artistic performance, and I again extend my compliments to Senators on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, what was the situation up to the hour when this unexpected blow was struck? The shipping bill was before the Senate as the unfinished business, and had been for two weeks. The majority Members of this body in conference had determined to make it the unfinished business and keep it the unfinished business until every possible expedient had been exhausted to enact it into law. To that end we made it a party measure. Let me read from the record of the Democratic caucus or conference to show why it was a party measure and how we made it so. On December 15, 1903, the Senate Democrats held a party conference, at which certain proceedings were had and entered upon the caucus record. From that record I read:

Resolved, That hereafter all members of the Senate Democratic caucus shall be bound to vote in accordance with its decisions made by a two-thirds vote of all its members on all questions, except those involving a construction of the Constitution, or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents, or received instructions from the legislature of the State which he represents.

That was adopted by the conference with only two dissenting votes, and has been the rule of our party here from that day forth. It means—of course it can mean nothing else—that when a proposition is submitted to the party conference and two-thirds, not of those present but of all its members, determine to support a given measure a party obligation attaches to every Democrat to support the proposition, with the exceptions named.

I was a member of the conference at that time, and I approved the rule. It was the first year of my service here. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is leading this revolt, was also a member of that conference. He and I came to the Senate at the same Congress. This is the first time in these 12 years, so far as I recall, that Senators have disregarded this party obligation. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] prompts me to say that this is the first time that we have had occasion to invoke it. This is the first time it has ever been called in question.

Now, Mr. President, let me read from the caucus record made on January 23 of this year:

The Democratic conference of the United States Senate, January 23, 1915, having under consideration the shipping bill, and the bill having been perfected, Senator FLETCHER offered this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That in the judgment of this Democratic conference the bill S. 6856, as amended and agreed upon by this conference, should be enacted, and that it is the judgment of the conference that said bill should be continued as the unfinished business of the Senate and that it should be supported as a party measure."

That is the resolution we adopted. Let us understand it. There were three parts to it. First, that it was the judgment of the conference that it should be agreed upon in the final form then presented; second, that it was the judgment of the conference that it should be continued as the unfinished business of the Senate; and, third, that it should be supported as a party measure. Then the record continues:

The question was, on demand, divided, and the first two paragraphs were adopted by a viva voce vote. A roll call was asked on No. 3, which was then adopted by a vote of 35 yeas and 3 nays, one of which was then changed to "yea," making the vote 36 yeas and 2 nays. All agreed to support the measure.

There were 36 yeas—two-thirds of all the Democratic Members of the Senate. After that vote was cast—36 to 2—on the motion of a Senator the vote adopting the resolution as an entirety was made unanimous. It was to be a party measure, then, as well as a public measure. So great was the public import of the bill and so high the public considerations involved that the majority Members of the Senate, in view of the circumstances then surrounding us—I refer to the stubborn, organized opposition on the other side—determined to make it a party question under the rules of our caucus, and thus try to hasten its passage. We left the caucus and came back to the Senate with the bill backed up by the unanimous vote of

38 Democratic Senators, all who were present, and with more than half of those absent known to favor the measure. The fight went on day after day and night after night, and when we were pressing them the hardest this most lamentable event of which I am speaking occurred. The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, the President pro tempore of this body, elected to that high office by this identical Democratic caucus, rose suddenly and moved to recommit the bill, intending thereby to kill it. This unexpected blow was struck by the man upon whom we had conferred the highest honor within the gift of the Democrats of the Senate. The lamented Bacon, that old Roman from Georgia who never faltered, wanted that great honor at our hands, but we turned him down, almost breaking his heart, to elevate the Senator from Arkansas to this conspicuous and most honorable position. I myself voted for him, not that I loved Bacon less, but because of my personal relations to the Senator from Arkansas. He is in consequence of this office in a sense the official head of our party in the Senate, and yet he comes——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. STONE. In a moment—he comes, before the Congress has expired in which he was elected to preside over the Senate, and performs with exceeding grace an act intended to unhorse the Democracy.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not heard the Senator from Missouri indicate to the Chair whether he yields or not.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not care to interrupt the Senator if he objects.

Mr. STONE. I do not object.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I simply wanted to state that I am satisfied that the Senator from Missouri is attempting to perform some useful public service, and not particularly to say offensive things about Senators. It is true that I was elected President of the Senate pro tempore by the action of the Democratic caucus. There has never been a Democratic caucus, of which I have been notified, held since I have been here that I did not attend, and there has never been one whose proper act I have not obeyed, and there never will be one.

When the resolution to which the Senator from Missouri makes reference as having been passed in 1903 was adopted, that was then directed at me because I maintained that the ratification of the Panama treaty was not a party question and could not be made one; that the Democratic Party had always advocated the construction of an Isthmian canal and did not thereby intend to bind anybody down to any particular point of location for having that construction made, either at Nicaragua or at Panama. I conceived that I owed some obligation to the opinion I held and to the position I had assumed. Seventeen out of the thirty-five Democrats in the Senate at that time, notwithstanding the adoption of that rule, agreed with me about it, and the RECORD will show that they voted that way. I did not then concede to any number of Senators to determine for me, against my own convictions and preferences, that the construction of a canal at Panama was contrary to Democratic principles and purposes, and that the construction of a canal somewhere else would be, just as I refuse now to permit any such directions to be given to me about the Democratic character of this measure simply because more Democratic Senators are in favor of the motion than appear to be against it.

The other day, when this particular matter first came up, I attended the first meeting of Senators, under a warning, not to attend a Democratic caucus, but to attend a meeting of the Democratic Senators. There was no intimation in the notice sent me that there was to be a caucus held, as is provided in the resolution read by the Senator from Missouri from the records of the Democratic caucus. I said then that this particular question never had been an accepted tenet of the Democratic Party; that no Democratic convention had ever lent itself to support anything like it; but, on the contrary, every declaration that had ever been made by the Democratic Party had been against maintaining ship lines at the public expense; that no Democratic patron saint ever had promulgated it as a matter of positive doctrine which that party was ever likely to assume; that the party, at intervals, had administered the affairs of this Government for nearly half a century, and that such a thing was never by any organ of the party thought to be a party duty.

It was originally projected to meet a supposed emergency in the agricultural and manufacturing interests of our country growing out of the deplorable war in Europe, an emergency that, so far as my people are concerned, has now passed away. I am now confronted with the naked problem of advocating and supporting something, as a permanent policy, that no Democrat had ever before dreamed of presenting as Democratic doctrine. I then felt constrained to state to that assembly of Democratic Senators that I was then ill and would not therefore be able to attend its sessions, but I wanted there and then to put them on notice that I should not by act or omission be put in any situation where I should be deprived of my right to vote against this measure if I saw proper to do so.

As relative to the question that we had no notice of a caucus going to be held—but I would not have made a point on that now, but I believe that if the Democratic Senators who are now opposing this bill, which is being used to obstruct the enactment of wholesome and more important legislation that the interests of the country demand, had been there, no such resolution as the Senator from Missouri read declaring this measure to be a matter of Democratic doctrine imperatively entitled to the support of all professed Democrats, even if to do so they must surrender their own well-matured convictions.

Ever since 1903 that resolution, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] says, never was invoked; but every meeting of the Democratic Senators that has taken place in 12 years has been of such a character that whenever the party and political side of a question had been developed and recognized, that that obligation has been sufficient to get a unanimous vote, and it always will be, as I firmly believe, without coercive directions from a caucus.

Another word and I am through. I did not suppose that when a meeting of Democratic Senators—without indicating then that it was to be a conference or a caucus—was held that any action could be taken that would put me in the attitude of having some Senators agree for me that I should do something, and that I had failed to recognize the binding force of what had been done by my consent. No such charge has ever been truthfully laid at my door anywhere nor at any time.

When I went back to Arkansas at the close of the last session of Congress and this general matter was talked about pending my election, I did not hesitate to say that I would not vote for it; that it would be of no service to the cotton-growing people of my section; that the time had passed when they could get any benefit from it or any similar measure; that we had appealed to this Congress to help out the cotton situation and were bluntly informed that nothing could be done. I knew that a war tax had been levied on the people to raise revenue to pay current expenses, and that I could not conceive that the time would ever come when the Democratic Party in that situation would enter upon so new, so broad, and so questionable a proposition as this. If I had been specifically notified to come to a Democratic caucus, I think I should have attended and said something along this line.

The Senator from Missouri voted for me for President of the Senate; our relations have always been cordial; and I should regret to see the day come when they would ever be of any other character; but I must not be deprived, under any fear of being criticized or abused, from doing what I think to be right. I have always done this since I have been here, and I would not want to serve one day longer than that right was left to me; and whenever it is taken away from me the hour is struck when my longer service here will not be worth while to me.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the caucus rule, which I read, has not been heretofore invoked because there has been no occasion to invoke it. Everyone has accepted it without question.

The Senator from Arkansas said he did not know we were having a caucus——

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. REED. I call for order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. There is some audible conversation in the galleries, which must cease.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Arkansas said he did not know we were going to hold a conference.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. A caucus.

Mr. STONE. Or a caucus. I got the usual notice sent out——

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator let me put into the RECORD the notice sent to me, if it does not disturb him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. STONE. Let it go in.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let me read it, so that you may have the effect of it. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1915.

There will be a meeting of the Democratic Senators in the Finance Committee room, Senate Office Building, room No. 312, on Saturday, January 23, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

THOMAS W. KELLER,
Assistant Doorkeeper.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that is a printed notice, except as to the date, which is inserted in a blank left for that purpose. This is the same notice in words and terms that has been sent out assembling Democrats ever since I have been a Member of this body. What do Democrats assemble for? What do we assemble for under these notices? Not merely to sit around in social converse, discussing anything that may happen to be suggested by talkative Senators. We assemble for a purpose; and if the Senator from Arkansas did not know for what purpose we were called together when he got that notice, he is the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who did not. We met there to confer about this bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I knew that.

Mr. STONE. The Senator was present at one of the meetings—there were several of them—and made some observations which I suppose I am not permitted to advert to.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If it is with me, I relieve the Senator of any restraint.

Mr. STONE. I will only say that while the Senator was deeply impressed with the notion that this sort of legislation was not desired by the American people, that they were opposed to it, and that if it resulted in an extra session it would bring disaster to the party, I never heard a declaration by the Senator hostile to the measure itself until he uttered it here the other day.

Of course, like any other man, he has the right to think he knows just what the people want or do not want, and just what the political effect of legislation will be. Mr. President, I am not one of those who pretends to know exactly what the people want or do not want with respect to legislation. I have found out that whenever a man is opposed to a measure he becomes very sure that the people are against it, or, if he is for it, he is bold to assert that the people are for it; but I do not think that men who assume so much know anything more about the wishes of the people than I do. The only way I have of knowing what the people want is to make up my mind as to what is best for the country, feeling confident the people will approve if I am not mistaken. It is said that the people do not want this legislation, and that if we should stay here for an extra session in order to pass it our action would result in party disaster. One thing is sure beyond dispute, that the commercial interests of the country have been and are desperately embarrassed for want of shipping facilities. The cotton growers of Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Carolina, for example, have suffered enormously; is not that so? The amount of their losses can not be accurately estimated, but we know that they have been enormous. Likewise, thousands engaged in other industrial activities and productions have suffered and are suffering from the same cause. We know that; and, in view of that, if we should stay here a little beyond the 4th of March for the purpose of trying to aid and help the people who are in distress by striving to create better facilities to relieve them and thus lessen measurably, at least, their accumulating losses, would they say, "Anathema! Cursed be ye"? Do men anathematize those who are striving to render them an honest, useful, and much-needed service? And do they most praise those who would run away without trying to help when help is sorely needed? Would you expect the people to desert us for suffering great personal discomfort by staying at our posts in their service, and go over to those who would do nothing, saying, "Blessed be the men who obstruct great measures of relief intended for their Benefit"? I have no fear of that. I have too great faith in the intelligence and honesty of my countrymen to believe that.

Mr. President, I want to make an appeal, if I may, to these Democrats who have deserted the party to come back to us. Consort no longer with the enemy, but return to the shelter of your mother's wing and dwell within the old party fold. I see sitting right before me the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN]. It is well known that this distinguished Senator is regarded as perhaps the most opulent and in many ways the most fortunate man in Kentucky. When he came here there were some doubting Thomases who whispered now and then a fear that if a sharply drawn issue should come between great vested interests and the people, the Senator from Kentucky would not be overactive against the interests.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. CAMDEN. I should like to ask where the Senator heard those whispers.

Mr. STONE. Oh, in the cloakroom and elsewhere.

Mr. CAMDEN. I should like to know who said it.

Mr. STONE. Well, I will not tell the Senator that. I denied what I heard, for I could not believe it.

Mr. CAMDEN. I am very much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I said that it was not possible that a man of his pedigree and environment——

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri further yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. CAMDEN. I never attended any of these conferences, and——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Kentucky is out of order until he secures recognition. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CAMDEN. I beg the pardon of the Chair, but he granted it.

Mr. STONE. Oh, that is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wants to know.

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky for a question.

Mr. CAMDEN. I will reply now that I never attended a conference, and if the Senator from Missouri was there he might have known it.

Mr. STONE. Never attended a conference? What is the significance of that? Does the Senator contend that because he did not meet in conference with his party associates—that because he was absent from a meeting—he is absolved from the obligations that rest upon a loyal party man? A distinguished Senator, speaking of the matter to which I referred a moment ago, when I was combating the fears some gentlemen had, asked me this question, "Did you ever see the effect of casting a stone into a covey of English sparrows?" I had not. He said, "Well, try it, wound one, let him cry out, and see how the whole tribe of pugnacious, feathered gamin will come fluttering to the rescue." Still I stood out against his apprehension and sought to reassure him. I want the Senator to prove me right. He lives in old Kentucky, the State of my birth; and he lives in one of the most beautiful of the blue-grass counties, surrounded by as fine people as can be found on earth. No better men and women ever felt the rays of heaven's softest sun fall upon them than those who inhabit old Woodford County. I did not believe it possible that this great Kentuckian, so highly honored by this splendid Commonwealth, bearing a commission signed by that old veteran, Gov. James B. McCreary, would come here and help Republicans break his party in two. I want the Senator to justify me and show that he is not of that kind.

Mr. President, I had not seen a real smile on the Republican side for two years until this thing occurred, and then, on every face over there I saw not only a smile but a broad grin of grim satisfaction. For heaven's sake, I appeal to the Senator from Kentucky and to all of them to quit this bad association and get back into line with his and their own party friends. I want my Kentucky friend to go home and say to his great constituency, "I did not forget. Nothing could drive me from the straight path. I have kept the faith and stood by all the pledges, express or implied, I made when you honored me with your commission."

I might, and I do, make the same appeal to all of you. It may fall on dull ears, but I make the appeal from the bottom of my heart. I would be willing not only to forgive and forget, but to pour upon your heads blessed waters, drawn from the very altar of Democracy, to rebaptize you in the faith.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal on that side of late about what the President said about teamwork. The President was right. Without teamwork we can accomplish nothing. And I want to say right here that I prefer the leadership of Woodrow Wilson to that of ELIHU ROOT, HENRY CABOT LODGE, THEODORE BURTON, WILLIAM EDGAR BORAH, JACOB H. GALLINGER, or that of any recreant alleged Democrat who goes about with a murderous dagger in his sleeve. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will kindly suspend. Under the rules of the Senate manifestations of approval or disapproval in the galleries are not permitted. The occupants of the galleries will please refrain from making any expression.

Mr. STONE. And I prefer honest association with the Democratic Party to any illicit association with Republicans. Of course every man can take his choice, but I indicate my preference, and I am not meaning to be offensive to you gentlemen on the Republican side. I just do not think you know any better. Possibly you do the best you can, but your best is very poor.

Why, how are we going to accomplish anything, Democrats, if we do not have teamwork? Remember we represent the majority. The people of the United States have imposed upon us the great responsibility and duty of government, of designing and enacting laws, and of establishing and enforcing public policies. I heard the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] say some time ago, I thought inaptly at that moment, what I may be about to say inaptly now—that it has been charged, as I think without good reason, but charged over and again, that the Democratic Party, after all, and at its best, is little more than a mob; that it is incapable of governing wisely. Of course I do not believe that; but this performance here, beginning on Monday and still going on, furnishes you gentlemen over there with an argument at least, even if not a convincing one, to support your contention. Senators, we can not do anything without teamwork.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that Republicans should assail the President. I am only surprised that Democrats should contribute to these assaults, directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, nothing so stirs the gall or upsets the nerve equilibrium of the average Republican politician as the name of Woodrow Wilson. It is not surprising that this should be so, for the burnt child dreads the fire, and the galled jade winces. Their backs are still raw from the well-deserved drubbing Wilson gave them in 1912, and they still smart from the salt rubbed on the old sores last November.

I once heard an anecdote which aptly illustrates the mental attitude or state of mind of the average heavy-weight Republican who bears about with him the burden of a great ambition, covertly contriving some sort of apparatus designed to attract electrical currents at the next Republican convention. It is told that upon one occasion a party of Americans visiting England were taken to a graveyard and there shown a rudely carved image of George Washington. Asked why this cartoon in stone had been erected in such a place, the guide answered that it was put there to frighten grave robbers and trespassers. Quick as a shot came this answer: "It is a most excellent conceit, for nothing could be imagined better calculated to scare the stuffing out of a Britisher than the sight of George Washington." So, Mr. President, for like reasons, if there be anything that can surely fetch a biting frost to nip the rose of expectancy blushing on the cheeks of Republican Senators, if there be anything more than another that harrows up their souls, freezes their blood, and makes their "knotted and combined locks to part, and each particular hair to stand on end like quills upon the fretful porcupine," it is the name of Woodrow Wilson.

Why be surprised, therefore, that Wilson should be hated, feared, and execrated? Why be surprised, whenever the President fires a shot, to hear an answering cry of rage, a chorus of snarls and deep-mouthed baying?

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] informed the Senate, pretendedly as from personal knowledge, that the next House would not pass this bill, and because of that the Democrats of the Senate are now solicitous and urgent to hasten its passage at this session. I wonder if this lithe young Senator from Utah is really in cahoots with gentlemen who are to occupy seats in the House during the next Congress, as he seems to be in cahoots with Senators who now occupy seats in this Chamber? Is he a leader or in the confidence of bolters in futuri as well as of bolters in præsenti? He must be a marvelous man to run not only two parties, but both Houses.

The Senator from Arkansas said that the people of his State are not interested in this bill. Not interested in facilities for the conveyance of their products to the waiting markets of the world? Not interested in making provision to meet the immediate emergency upon the country? Not interested in making a provision for the future that would render a repetition of existing conditions impossible? I have a better opinion of the people of Arkansas, of their intelligence and patriotism, than their senior Senator seems to have.

Mr. President, let us look for a moment a little closely at the conditions, old and new, out of which this proposed legislation has grown. For half a century the American merchant marine has been decaying until now there are practically no American ships engaged in over-seas transportation. At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 the merchant marine of the United States was second only to that of Great Britain, and substantially equal to that. This great achievement in maritime development was due in chief to wise constructive governmental policies inaugurated under Democratic auspices. The growth of our sea power became one of the marvels of that period of history. Naturally the war not only retarded development, but the whole industry was stagnated and depressed. But the people expected that this important business would revive after hostilities had closed—an expectation doomed to disappointment. There was no revival; instead the mildew of decay gathered ever thicker and faster. No matter the cause. I will not consume the precious time of the Senate in discussing the cause or causes. That would do no good. For explanation it is sufficient to say that the Republican Party was in power. Republicans saw this great industry, so important to our people and to our national life, withering year by year. Primarily responsible for it, they have not known how to stop it. Their very environment made them helpless. It was during the period of Republican rule that the power of monopoly and special interests rose to its height and dominated the legislative and administrative policies of the Government. In promoting various special interests, the merchant marine as a whole was sacrificed. For several decades the Republican Party, although for the most part ascendant, has been lamenting the destruction of our maritime business, vainly groping in darkness, and awaiting, as it were, a miraculous revelation of some means of rehabilitation. The revelation did not materialize, and in consequence the Republican Party stands convicted of utter incapacity through its own agencies of dealing with the subject. They are to be pitied as well as blamed for this impotency. They could not move out on bold, intelligent, practical lines without crossing beyond the boundary which pampered and arrogant special interests, long fostered, forbade them to cross. I will not trace the pages that make up this sad chapter in our history. Year after year we have stood more and more in need of ships, and year after year our commerce has suffered more and more for the lack of them. Because of incapacity or hampering environment, the Republican Party has not been able to afford any substantial measure of relief. And so conditions grew worse and worse down to this day. Then came this great war in Europe to accentuate the fatal folly of the old Republican policy of doing nothing. At last the country is aroused. The embarrassments and tremendous losses which our people are suffering because of a woeful shortage in transportation facilities, have made the national need of an American merchant fleet a burning question before the people. A great Democratic President and a great Democratic Congress, responding to the public need, have undertaken the task of doing something sure enough. We have begun work to relieve the immediate distress that has fallen upon us, and at the same time to lay the foundation for a permanent restoration of the merchant marine. This is the first time in nearly two generations that any definite plan has been attempted on a large scale to rehabilitate our maritime interests. The Democratic Party is striving to accomplish a great constructive work in this direction. What are you Republicans doing? And what are your allies doing? Are you or they coming forward in a spirit of enlightened patriotism to help accomplish this work? Pitiful to say, you are not. Scarcely a word of counsel or encouragement comes from that side of the Chamber. Instead we find you banding together confessedly for the sole purpose of blocking all progress in the work we have undertaken.

The sinister monopolistic interests to which their party is chained forbid Republicans to extend a helping hand in any legislative work which might by any possibility interfere with valuable privileges and monopolies long enjoyed. These monopolies are quick to scent danger from afar and quick to take alarm. The Shipping Trust and its allied interests are not confined alone to this country or to any country. No pent-up Utica contracts their power. It is world-wide. To-day they see, or think they see, a storm rising which threatens the unchecked supremacy of their monopoly, and, forgetting foreign wars and rumors of war, they fix their alert eyes on our horizon to watch for the gathering of a cloud. They have launched a propaganda which has few parallels in cold, calculating cupidity and mendacity to thwart any effort made by the Government to restore our merchant marine on a scale of sufficient magnitude to endanger their grip on the commerce of the world. They are invoking every energy at their command to influence public opinion and to put obstacles in the way of any relief to transportation. There are parliamentary reasons why I should not say that Republican Senators are encouraging and aiding this propaganda. But I can say that what they are doing is just as effective in that direction as if it were intended for that purpose. Take the speech made on Saturday by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as an example. He warned the country that the purchase of belligerent ships would precipitate grave

international complications and "start this Nation on the highway to war." He assumes that the sole purpose of this bill is to open a way for the purchase of such ships—as if we would be obliged to buy them. After conjuring this ghost to 'fright the souls of his adversaries, he proceeded to project a broad intimation that German shipping interests were behind the bill. He based that statement on an assertion that some agent of the Hamburg-American Line had been in Washington last week. He does not vouchsafe the name or official position of this agent, nor does he tell us what business he had in Washington or whom he saw, but leaves it to be vaguely inferred that the object of this visitation had to do with this shipping bill. I observe that this lugubrious prophecy of possible war and this insinuating reference to some agent of a German shipping company are about the only parts of the Senator's speech which a certain class of newspapers deemed of sufficient importance to exploit. Of course the sole object of this insinuation was to offset, if possible, the known fact that the American-British shipping combine is moving heaven and earth to defeat this measure. Is it not amazing to what expedients even big men may resort to fool and cheat the people?

Mr. President, we are trying to do something. Our opponents are trying to obstruct progress and prevent us from accomplishing anything. As I close I wish to ask this question: Do Republican Senators imagine that the people can be fooled about the purpose of this ridiculous performance we have been witnessing here from day to day? Do they imagine the people do not understand the purpose it is intended to serve? You have battled against the bill from every standpoint, economic and international. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], who is always overcast with a somber radiance which many impressionable and credulous people mistake for a heavenly halo, was put forward as one ordained to speak with authority, to warn the people of the dangers we are about to encounter by violating the laws of nations. He was later demolished by the rude blast the junior Senator from Montana blew—only I still fear that his untimely proforeign utterances may hurt our people when they come to deal with foreign Governments.

Mr. President, at this point I will refer briefly in passing to a report widely circulated a few days since to the effect that Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, had informed our State Department that the purchase of German ships for any purpose by this Government would be regarded as an unneutral act. On Sunday morning the Washington Post had this to say:

> It was stated positively at the State Department, as well as at the British Embassy, that no communication, official or otherwise, on the subject had been received from Sir Edward.

It must be that this denial is true, although some publications still avouch the story. The shipping trusts of the United States and Great Britain, so clearly associated in interest and ownership, are tremendously aroused by this bill, and, being whipped from point to point, it is natural that they should seek to excite among the people a vague fear of some dread consequence; but it is inconceivable that the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs would permit himself to be so overreached by commercial interests, however urgent or powerful, as to make such a diplomatic representation to this Government as that reported, which could have no other immediate purpose than to influence legislation pending before the Senate of the United States. After this bill becomes a law we will have reached a point where diplomatic exchanges may be had, provided the corporation it is proposed to create should desire to purchase a belligerent ship; but for a foreign power to intimate an objection, much less to register a protest, at this time would be both premature and offensive. For one, I would resent such an impertinent interference with all my strength. Mr. President, I had as well declare now as later, that so far as I am concerned I would not permit Germany to dictate what we may sell nor permit England to dictate what we may buy, so long as we ourselves remain within the pale of international law and right. In our domestic policies we should receive no suggestion from abroad. Upon these questions we should be governed alone by our own judgment.

I do not like speeches that would sound better in the British Parliament or the German Reichstag than in the American Congress. I prefer to believe that we are big enough to uphold our rights without asking leave of anybody whose interests might be subserved by unduly circumscribing rights and privileges we are undoubtedly entitled to.

Mr. President, there are other things I desired to say, but I see I am trespassing too long on the good nature of the Senate. I must close with much unsaid. In this emergency confronting us, what is the duty of Democrats? What should we do? For myself, I repeat what I have said at another time—fight on, carrying trench by trench until we can storm the citadel. This is a fight, clean-cut and unmistakable, between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, between what these parties respectively represent, between long-fostered special interests and the great industrial masses of the people. I shall stand steadfast and resolute by the Democracy. How can any Democratic Senator hesitate or halt? Reflect that in this supreme test of party principle, prowess, and strength, weakness of faith or heart may destroy us. Whatever others may do, I shall stand by my flag. I shall stand by my flag because it is the flag of the old Democratic Party and represents what is best in the economic and political life of the Nation. If the party falls and dies by the hands of men it has trusted and honored, I can stand by the shrouded corpse with a clean conscience. No man can say accusingly to me, "Through this rent was thrust the dagger of an envious Casca." No man shall lift the shroud and point accusingly to some deadly wound and say to me, "And thou, too, Senator." I will stand on the outer rim among the silent mourners, comforted by the reflection that my hands are unstained by a single drop of Democratic blood. In this spirit I am in this fight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, no concealment either of the facts or the object of the pending filibuster has been made or attempted. When this bill was introduced and an effort was made to give it a leading place upon the calendar for immediate consideration, objections to it upon the other side were so voiced as to carry the conviction that it would be opposed to any extent which parliamentary procedure under the Senate rules would justify. As a result, Mr. President, the past two weeks and more have been devoted, for the most part, not to a logical and bona fide discussion of the merits or demerits of the measure, but to a contest of verbosity between Senators on the other side of the Chamber intent upon consuming the precious hours yet remaining to the Sixty-third Congress, and thus forcing the failure of the bill.

In view, Mr. President, of these developments, it may be that this purpose will have been accomplished and make the present passage of this measure impossible or extend its so-called consideration to so late an hour in the session as to make an extra session absolutely necessary; but the measure will sooner or later become a law.

Mr. President, in one respect, much as I shall personally and as a Democrat deplore the temporary defeat of this measure, if defeated it is to be, I am constrained to believe that this filibuster may in some respects be useful as an object lesson to the country. Perhaps an object lesson may not at the present time be amiss, because, Mr. President, it has been assumed by some that recent radical changes in the method of selecting Members of this great body had done away with the bases of those abuses for which the Senate of the United States has long been notorious. The election of its Members by the people as a substitute for their choice by legislatures was a great advance and reformation. Many have thought that it was so great and so radical that all had been done which was necessary to enable the Senate to become a representative body in the true sense of the word instead of an asylum for privilege, which it has long been; but we have merely captured an outpost.

Mr. President, this body, long known as the citadel of the vested interests of the country, is now demonstrating that the change of method of selection of its Members is but one of many steps to be taken before the desired end shall have been accomplished. I am therefore of the opinion that the prominence of this measure, thus making prominent the methods which have been resorted to for its defeat, will focus public attention upon our methods of procedure which make filibustering possible, upon those so-called rules of practice which enable half a dozen men in the enjoyment of fairly good health to become an insurmountable obstacle between the governmental machinery of the Nation upon the one hand and the people upon the other, thus defeating its policy and making needed reforms impossible.

The new method, therefore, of choosing Members of this body, important as the change has been, necessary as it was, and accomplished only after years of persistent opposition by those who believed in the essential necessity of the ancient plan, leaves us, notwithstanding our independence of legislative bodies for our commissions, almost as helpless before the compact organizations of vested interests, entrenched in places of advantage, as we were before. Without a change of our rules, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States will continue to be bound and shackled, the business of the country will continue to be dependent upon the will of a small minority, the

voice of the majority will be as silent and its efforts as ineffectual as though no selective reformation had been accomplished. We are still an army without weapons, exposed to fire from entrenchments.

We perceive, Mr. President, therefore, that, beyond and above a change in the old method of choosing Members of this body and underlying its foundations, is a system of procedure based upon precedents defining, enlarging, contracting, and contradicting rules which were originally designed to promote the transaction and facilitation of business, but practically construed for its prevention, for strangling beneficial but undesirable measures for restricting or defeating legislation which, in the evolutionary processes of a people's growth, are wholly essential to their well-being and prosperity, but which, being hostile to existing and prevailing conditions and inimical to privilege in some or all of its manifold aspects and which have been the offspring to previous legislation, is undesirable to it.

Now, Mr. President, could anything, in addition to the spectacle to which the country has been treated by the recent declamatory performances of certain Members of this body be necessary to demonstrate the proposition that until a radical change in the rules of the Senate can be effected, until the time shall come when some restriction be placed upon the time to be consumed in the consideration of any measure however important, until a decent limitation can be placed upon present methods of discussion and upon the time to be devoted to the consideration of any proposition, we shall continue to be at the mercy of the minority, whether that minority be Republican or Democratic; that the will of the people as expressed in majorities can be thwarted by a handful of Senators and representative government, now on the defensive, shall become a subject of popular contempt?

I have been a Member of this body, Mr. President, for but two years—not long enough, perhaps, to have formed mature, correct judgment on many things which have meanwhile taken place here. All of them may need revision—perhaps all of them are erroneous—but one of the impressions which I have received is that some very good men in this body are far more concerned about the sanctity of our rules than about desirable measures which are sacrificed by their machinery; that some good men are more concerned about precedents, however illogical they may be, than they are about the purposes for which this body was organized and which it should carry into effect with as little ceremony as possible. This is not the only body, Mr. President, of which this criticism can be made; this is not the only body, either, which has designed a machinery of action so complicated in its character, so evidently designed to prevent instead of to promote action as to require radical and immediate reformation. And it is not the only one to be relegated to the dust heap of the past if it fails to heed the demands of an aroused public opinion.

For my part, Mr. President, I am old-fashioned enough to have very little respect for any system of procedure apparently designed to defeat the will and evade the commands of the people. I have only contempt for any rules of procedure or decisions construing them which, either separately or collectively, are apparently designed to prevent the enactment of the public will into legislation as that will has been declared at the polls. [A pause.]

Oh, Mr. President, if Senators want to hold a caucus, I will suspend. Everybody seems to be caucusing now, notwithstanding that the name seems to be so offensive to some of my associates across the aisle. I have seen and have attended caucuses and conferences and combinations—I will not say conspiracies, for that would be unparliamentary—consisting sometimes of three—and it is said, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"—and sometimes 30, and sometimes more, busily engaged in something—I know not what—both inside and outside of the Chamber, during the past fortnight, but for the most part, Mr. President, designed to block or defeat the vastly important legislation now pending before this body.

I know, Mr. President, that age is always pleaded in defense of the existence of every abuse. Anything which can command antiquity as an excuse for its existence appeals most solemnly to the reverential mind, which needs nothing beyond it in justification for its existence or as a defense against its destruction; but the world must move on; the standpatter is an impossibility. Even he is carried along, reluctantly, unconsciously, perhaps, but he is nevertheless carried along by the tides of time and the march of progress. Age may, but need not, be the cogent reason for any established custom. Taken alone, however, the thing dependent upon it should be placed upon the defensive and made, by assuming the burden of proof, to vindicate its continuance.

Mr. President, how do we proceed here? A bill comes up upon which the great parties of the country are divided, either fundamentally or because some partisan advantage may be gained by successful opposition. A measure may be introduced and reported from a committee which aims at the destruction of some interest or some evil too apparent in its existence and its operation to justify open defense, but which, nevertheless, finds its advocates in opposition. All that is necessary, all at least that seems to be necessary here, is to secure either the opposition or the advocacy of half a dozen stalwart Senators, men of endurance, men possessed of a vocabulary full of sound and fury, but meaningless, which can be utilized to consume time and exhaust patience. We enter upon a contest, then, of physical endurance, of which the pending filibuster is a graphic illustration.

Day hath succeeded unto day and night after night has passed in a test of endurance, each side watching the other and alert to take advantage of any parliamentary situation, with the filibusterers always having the advantage. Their course is known; it is planned, and as each oracular Senator completes his exhaustive and exhausting discourse upon everything in general and nothing in particular and files out of the Chamber, his place is taken by an associate, inspired with the double ambition of defeating the measure under consideration and talking longer and saying less than his associates. We have, therefore, a contest of physical endurance and vocal competition, as just exemplified by the speeches of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Utah, Mr. President, took the floor about half past 10 o'clock last Friday night, and after a discourse with the unoffending furniture of the Chamber and the Presiding Officer as his auditors yielded the floor to his colleague. He exhausted about 11 hours and 30 minutes of time. The Senator from Michigan took the floor about half past 3 o'clock on Saturday, and after holding it up to the hour of 11 o'clock and 15 minutes yielded for an executive session. He came into the Senate Chamber on Monday morning and resumed his discourse—I presume I may be justified in so naming it—yielding the floor at the hour of 4 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of a motion.

It has been impossible for me, Mr. President, as one of the timekeepers of this sonorous contest, to determine up to this good hour which of these Senators is entitled to the palm for verbosity; but in view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan yielded the floor apparently with the determination of again resuming it, I presume that as an impartial judge I should postpone a decision until the contest is over. But the Senator from Utah is ahead as a continuous performer.

We are told, Mr. President—the truth of which I do not know—that 10 other Senators upon the other side of this Chamber are loaded to the guards with books, newspaper clippings, quotations from the Bible, Shakespeare, last year's almanac, the principles of aviation, of submarines, of culture, and other subjects equally pertinent to the measure under discussion, to the end that they, or some of them, may establish the records for long-distance talking and at the same time use up the remainder of this session of Congress, thus preventing the accomplishment of anything whatever.

Mr. President, if I have overstated the occurrences of the past few days, or if I have erroneously foretold the intentions of the next few days, I hope I may be at this time corrected. If my assertion that the purpose of this so-called discussion is not bona fide, but to consume time, and thus wear out the majority, I am open to correction; but if, on the other hand, what I have asserted is true, I ask what sort of a spectacle this Senate, which claims to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, the most advanced and dignified legislative chamber anywhere, presents to the American people? Are we here, Mr. President—were we sent here to consume time in idle and vapid talk miscalled discussion, to the end that the session may miscarry and its time exhausted, or is it expected that we shall attend to the business of the country and reach conclusions, even though unfavorable, upon all measures, or upon as many of them as possible, which are now on the calendar?

The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], in opening his recent speech, complained about the lack of discussion of the merits of this measure. He complained of the absence of Senators from the floor, and particularly upon the Democratic side. He criticized the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] for his assertion that the Democrats had the votes with which to carry this measure, and drew from that statement the conclusion that we did not care to argue it; that we were not interested in its bona fide and earnest discussion, but that by brute strength we proposed to put the bill through.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to be present during as much of this discussion as possible; and, without being at all invidious, without mentioning specific instances, I want to say that, in my opinion, but three real speeches directed to the subject matter of this bill, considering its real aspects and examining its real purposes, have been delivered on the other side. If more than that number of arguments against this measure or some of its provisions have been made in this discussion, they have been made at a time when, unfortunately, I was not able to be present in the Chamber.

How, Mr. President, shall I describe the others? Is it any wonder that even Senators occupying seats on the other side refrained, except occasionally, from appearing upon the floor to listen even for a few moments to so-called debate? They disappeared either in the cloakroom or elsewhere, until reluctantly summoned back to their seats by a roll call. Why, Mr. President, Senators have not even tried to be entertaining in their discussions. If we are to be criticized for failure to remain upon the floor and listen to their speeches, the Senators delivering them should at least instruct or interest or amuse us; but up to date I have been unable to discover either of these characteristics in any of the filibustering speeches, pure and unadulterated, which have been delivered upon this floor.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], whose intellectual genius measures up to that of any of his colleagues, when delivering orations, we will say, at Arlington on Decoration Day, lays all the gorgeous fruits and flowers of his tropical imagination before a rapt and attentive audience. He lifts them to empyrean heights, rapt with emotion and patriotism, by eloquent and rounded periods flowing freely from his eloquent lips. Here he simply sits upon the ground and beats the unoffending air with his wings.

He spreads before other audiences the rich and abundant harvest of his many experiences, clothed in all the beauty and attraction of oratory and of metaphor, leaving for us only the chaff and the husks that are sifted from the wholesome grain. Can we be expected to retain our seats under these circumstances, even under the soporific influence of a long and tedious discourse reaching after midnight and delivered in a sing-song monotone that reminds one of a cross between the style of Billy Sunday and that of Macaulay's "Praise God Barebones." We want something interesting, Mr. President, from the filibusterer if he expects us to listen to him.

Besides we know the purpose. I care not how great an argument a man may make, if the purpose behind is known to be insincere, to be something other than that which it pretends to be; if, instead of speaking to a measure, a Senator is talking against time; if, instead of sincerely desiring to enlighten his associates, he is merely indulging in what is miscalled a duty, to the end that legislation he does not desire may thus be gotten rid of, why should we sit and listen to him? I am surprised, Mr. President, that even the Presiding Officer, the officials of the Senate, and the doorkeepers did not in self-defense, during these long and tedious outpourings, also take refuge in the marble room or elsewhere, anywhere to escape the suffering thus inflicted.

Mr. President, possibly the result for which we have been given this sorry spectacle has been obtained. The hurry and scurry of day before yesterday afternoon indicated that such was the fact. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was speaking; he had been listening to himself for a long time. Suddenly he yielded. He had yielded many times before, but only that a question might be asked, expressing the tragic fear that to yield for anything else would be to yield the floor, but he yielded readily to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], when the Democrats on this side of the Chamber discovered the proceedings to be finally of sufficient interest to give due heed and attention to their duties upon the floor.

I remarked, as was said by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], instantly I entered the Chamber that for the first time during these sessions practically every Republican Senator was in his seat. One or two were absent from the city, and one was brought, as I have been informed, from a sick room, as rapidly as a machine could bring him from his quarters, and appeared for the first time during the consideration of this measure. Was that accident or the result, Mr. President, of a purpose previously arrived at through conference with Democratic Senators?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of caucus.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I will not say "caucus," because my friends upon the other side are extremely sensitive about caucuses, while "conferences" are perfectly respectable in polite Republican circles. No; I will not say, Mr. President, that the events which began with the motion of the Senator from Arkansas were the result of a caucus, but of many hours of conference, of negotiation, which Democrats would properly call a caucus. Why the entire force of the minority upon the floor? Why the lack of notice to Democratic Senators, many of whom were away from the Capitol and who hurried hitherward as rapidly as they could? There was no coincidence here, Mr. President.

Now we know what is behind it all; we think we do. Ostensibly it is to postpone this measure for the present session. The reasons actuating the insurgents upon this side I know not; I do not feel qualified to pass judgment upon them; I have my own opinion. But I know, if I can judge from what has fallen from the lips of Senators on the other side, that they feel that if this bill can be recommitted, it will be killed, and that it will be impossible to pass it through both Houses of the next Congress; that if the bill can be temporarily shunted into committee, it will not reappear upon this floor prior to the 4th of March, and that the narrower Democratic majority in the other House in the next Congress will make it easier to permanently defeat it than would be the case if it were sent there by the Senate at this time. Whether my Democratic friends were cajoled or deceived into the arrangement or not, I warn them that if they persist, Mr. President, they are contributing to the possible success of a well-matured plan to deprive the people of the benefit of this much-needed legislation.

A small majority, Mr. President, is easier to overcome by the many influences which are always active in defeating important legislation than a very large one; and so our friends are intent on keeping this bill here at this session, because they feel that the victory will be theirs at the other end of the Capitol at the next session. I do not believe it, but I do not think it wise to make such an experiment. That is the coming event, Mr. President, which seems to be casting its shadows before.

I presume that if I were a member of the Republican Party I would be as aggressive, as active, and as filibustering as any Senator on that side of the Chamber. If I were a member of that party, my views would be the views of its membership, and therefore I would see in this measure many things which are repulsive to Republicanism, but which are attractive to the party of the people. And I shall now call attention to some of them.

Now, my friends of the Republican side, heart to heart, what is the real objection of the most of you to this bill? It is its Government-ownership feature. Some of you so say; some of you indicate it, and all of you know it. You see in this measure the extension of Government agency to a great avenue of transportation, and you know, morally, or at least you fear, that the experiment will be successful; and that being successful, it will be successively applied to all the lines of transportation and of communication, on the land as well as on the sea. That is your prime objection to it, and you know it. You realize that it will also be the entering wedge for the overthrow of that terrific and far-reaching monopoly known as the Coastwise Shipping Trust, which has levied its toll upon the millions of producers and consumers of this country ever since we had a Government, and which, with its twin interest upon the ocean, is strong enough to come here and defeat the passage of a measure which the condition of the country instantly and imperiously demands, because it will end the hugely profitable robbery now going on in the way of ocean freight rates; and it grieves me to think that seven distinguished Senators upon this side of the Chamber seem to be willing to aid you in your strangle hold upon the Nation's throat that this trust may continue to pick the pockets of the people.

Mr. President, Government ownership with me has been a plant of slow growth. I am not fully committed to it, but I am getting nearer and nearer to it every day; and I am driven in that direction by just such spectacles as have been presented to the country in the opposition to this bill. Public ownership has no terrors for me; for, whether perfect or not, if we must have monopoly, which seems unpreventable, let it be the monopoly of the Government instead of the monopoly of a comparatively few.

Transportation is a matter of public concern. Our lines of transportation are the arteries of commerce and communication; without them a nation like ours could not exist; but it is all in private hands, manipulated in private interests, with the result of almost inconceivable fortunes in the hands of its managers and financiers; while the railroad systems are clamoring at the doors of the Interstate Commerce Commission for leave to charge higher rates to the end that they may not go into bankruptcy; and on the ocean, where the laws of no one nation can be made effective, a far-reaching combination, international in its scope and character, from which no relief can ever come except it come through a measure of this sort. Come it will, not now, perhaps, not next year, perhaps; but come it will, for there will be an end to this condition, and the end

will, I trust, come more quickly by reason of conduct such as has characterized this Chamber for three long weeks. The present emergency is a great one, but does not appeal to the judgment or the wisdom of the opponents of this measure. No other relief is in sight. Defeat this and you mark another milestone upon the highway to Government ownership.

Mr. President, another objection Republicans have to this bill is that it will forever lay the ghost of subsidies, so near and so dear to our hearts. Our friends would like to see this Government put its hands into the Treasury and hand over millions annually to private companies as a reward for building vessels and operating them. This is in line with their darling doctrine of protection. I know of no easier way of making money and no surer way of making the restoration of our merchant marine absolutely impossible, but there is no question that one of the great controlling influences operating to defeat this measure is the certain doom which it carries to the subsidy plans of the Republican Party.

It was recently intimated to me by a Senator that if this measure could be amended so that the Government would not operate any of these vessels, but lease them to different shipping companies, the filibuster would end.

In other words, if we would cut the heart out of the measure and build ships for the Shipping Trust to lease under corporations that it would create and operate for that purpose, we might be permitted to pass it. Of course this was not stated by authority, but was simply as an opinion; but I believe to-day that if such an amendment were offered upon the floor of this body and accepted by the majority it would result in the speedy enactment of the measure. And what sort of a measure would we then have? One which would bring no relief; one which would simply expand the opportunities and facilities of the existing Shipping Trust and make relief to the producers of the land more remote than ever.

Mr. President, I am not mistaken about the real objections to this measure. I come from an inland State, which has no shore line and no ships, but which is interested, as all the people of this country are, in the common weal. I have a right to speak upon things maritime. Yet I was struck a few days ago by an argument used in the case of Gibbons against Ogden, by one of the great lawyers of that day, to support the contention that his clients were entitled to the exclusive use of the waters of the State of New York in the operation of their steamships. They used this argument then in support of the same view entertained, and of which our present conditions are the outgrowth:

> Mr. Thomas Addis Emmett, in behalf of Mr. Robert Fulton, in his argument in 1824 in the case of Gibbons v. Ogden made this prophecy: "The 13 original States were a band of brothers, who suffered, fought, bled, and triumphed together. They might, perhaps, have safely confided each his separate interest to the general weal; but if ever the day should come when representatives from beyond the Rocky Mountains shall sit in the Capitol, if ever a numerous inland delegation shall wield the exclusive power of making regulations for our foreign commerce, without community of interest or knowledge of our local circumstances, the Union will not stand. It can not stand. It can not be the ordinance of God or nature that it should stand."

We were then warned in those days by the defenders of privilege that if the Union extended its boundaries so far to the westward as to include the Rocky Mountains, resulting in an inland delegation to Congress, which had the presumption to legislate concerning matters of marine or of navigation, it was in the ordinance of God that the Union itself should not stand. Fortunately the argument did not prevail with the Supreme Court of the United States, but it was quite as forcible for privilege then as the arguments against this measure are to-day. An inland delegation from the Rocky Mountains is here; it has been here for many years; it is divided upon this momentous question. But no ordinance of God has dissolved the Union, and no catastrophe save that which loosens maritime privilege from its foundations will disturb the Nation when Uncle Sam takes the helm and navigates a commerce which private capital disdains.

Mr. President, I heard a great deal upon the subject of international law during this discussion. I have attempted to inform myself to some extent upon some of its principles. The most cogent argument made against this bill from the standpoint of international law was that of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]; yet, when submitted to the pitiless logic of the Senator from the Rocky Mountain inland State of Montana [Mr. WALSH], its indefensible premises disappeared, and the argument resting upon it collapsed. I am not surprised that there is so much fear—and I use the word deliberately—in the breasts of my colleagues upon the other side of this Chamber that the enactment of this measure will result in international complications, and that the Government will be involved in war, because it so easily conceals the real motives demanding its defeat.

Why, Mr. President, the same Senators, or many of them, entertaining such views, have been loudly clamorous against the administration, and bitter in their criticisms, because the President has avoided taking any step, as far as he could, that might lead to war with Mexico. Do Senators feel that they can defy Mexico, and are they at the same time afraid of countries which are engaged to-day in the deadly grapple of conflict?

Mr. President, if this measure passes, as pass it will in time, and if it is administered in accordance with its provisions, as it will be, and it thereby brings to the transportation interests and needs of this country the relief that is so sorely needed, and war results or difficulties arise with other nations, it will be simply because, regardless of the principles of international law and of right, they provoked it. If we are to be deterred from taking the essential step which the needs of the people of this country demand lest Great Britain and her allies shall place some new construction upon the principles of international law, or assume to make captures upon the high seas without reference to precedents which she herself has established, the fault will not be ours.

We know that such a thing, while it may occur, is most improbable. The nations of the Old World whose fates are trembling in the balance may be pardoned if, in the exercise of the great law of national self-preservation, they should make mistakes or take chances here and there, as men do in similar emergencies; but to contend that either of them will, as a settled policy, interfere with or offend this Government simply because it is a shareholder in a private corporation created for the purpose of relieving an unnatural and unprecedented situation, is to create men of straw and then to demolish them.

Mr. President, a few months ago I referred to the obstacles this bill has thus far encountered in this Chamber—the obstacles of obstruction. I also said that in my view of the situation the pending filibuster would be beneficial; that it will serve to focus public sentiment upon the ancient rules of this body, the construction of which has made them a bulwark in the defense of existing unwise and injurious legislation, as well as against the passage of bills which, like this, are so sorely demanded. I do not know, but I do not believe the people of this country will regard us with patience or due consideration much longer if this method of procedure is continued. I know it is old, and whenever anyone criticizes the system—for system it is—it is always defended in part by reference to its uses in the past in great national exigencies, and that is advanced as a reason why it should not be disturbed.

Republican Senators never fail to remind Democratic Senators that the force bill, a bill originating on that side of the Chamber, and commanding the almost unbroken support of every member of the Republican Party, was sought to be placed upon the statute books in opposition to the Democratic minority, and they now say that they rejoice that their effort was defeated. So do I; but, Mr. President, I firmly believe that if that measure had been successful and had been crystallized into national legislation, the public opinion of the country not only would have made it ineffectual but it would have disappeared from the statute books at the next session of Congress. I do not care how great the national emergency may be; if public sentiment demands a given policy overwhelmingly the people ought to have it, and they will get it, under our institutions, sooner or later. If, on the other hand, legislation which offends the public conscience, which assails public opinion, as the force bill undoubtedly did, should have been successful, the party behind it and the legislation itself would alike have disappeared under the storm of indignation and obloquy that they would have provoked. But, Mr. President, because in one or two instances the right of unlimited debate in this body has produced good consequences, that it should be permitted to continue at this late day, and to persist for the future, in the face of so much accumulating public business, is to my mind inconceivable.

Why, Mr. President, the proposed legislation which has come to the Congress of the United States during the last 25 years, and which is constantly increasing, represented as it is by thousands of bills in both Houses, needs the prompt attention of the Congress of the United States under rules which will permit its swift and intelligent consideration. Take the present instance: Here are 14 great supply bills which must be passed between now and March 4; in any case before the 1st day of July. The rural credits bill, the possible reconsideration of the immigration bill, the land bills, and scores of other proposed and needed laws are all held up and blocked by the highwayman proceedings of the filibuster. If we could put every work-

ing day of every year to the transaction of the public business at this and the other end of the Capitol, it would be impossible for us to get rid of it all. If Congress were in perpetual session, the vast extent of its jurisdiction consequent upon extended governmental activities makes the present system of rules not only incongruous but impossible. Day after day is wasted in what is called discussion, at a cost to the people of over a thousand dollars an hour for a working day of six hours, while all these important measures are held up and die of strangulation; yet it is declared that this method of proceeding must be continued, because forsooth, our Republican friends may again come into power, and may again try to pass a force bill, in which event it will be necessary to invoke the system, to the end that such an effort may not be accomplished.

Mr. President, one of the greatest men this country ever produced was Thomas B. Reed, of Maine. He was great in many ways and in many things, but the greatest of all his accomplishments was his complete revolution of the rules of procedure of the House of Representatives. He there found a condition that could be well termed one of legislative anarchy, and had had much experience with its attempted operation through many years of previous service. He had the courage and the genius to confront that situation, and, despite bitter opposition and personal abuse proceeding from every quarter, he established a system of rules which makes it possible to do business in that body, and which its bitterest opponents were obliged to adopt; and I believe I can say with perfect truth that unless some such dominant character appears here very soon and performs for this body a similar service the people will take the subject in hand and attend to the case themselves. In other words, a revolution in our methods of procedure must come, or perhaps the Senate will go; and if it is to be merely an obstructive institution it ought to go, for progress can not lag behind a cumbrous chariot drawn by legislative oxen old and blind and halt and feeble going in all directions except the right one, or not going at all. The multitude of interests demanding our attention, the intelligent consideration of public affairs, the insistent demand of great emergencies such as necessarily arise from the present war conditions are all clamoring against this antediluvian system whose only merit is that it is the last remaining shelter of privilege in America.

The House of Lords, Mr. President, and we are sometimes called the American House of Lords, the Millionaire Club, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] suggests, meaning, of course, millionaires like him and myself—the House of Lords for many years was a similar obstruction in Great Britain. It utilized the mere power of inertia to prevent legislation demanded by the voters of England to protect privilege in all its hideous intricacies against the needs and demands of the workmen and workwomen of the country. It became an anachronism in the nineteenth century, but nevertheless an obstructive deadweight on the neck of British legislation and progress. It took a good while to overcome it. The mills of the gods ground slowly, but they ground exceedingly fine. Where is the House of Lords to-day, which failing to heed the public demand remained deaf to the signs of progress and evolution everywhere? It can now place its veto twice upon legislation, and that is all. Enacted once more it becomes law through the mandate of the House of Commons fresh from the people.

Mr. President, it is a noticeable fact that the two-House method of legislation survives very largely in the United States, and survives in form merely almost everywhere else. So we had, in my judgment, better conform to modern requirements, do away with the present system, and place a limitation upon debate, to the end that we may get somewhere, to the end that while what is perfunctorily called debate is going on combinations can not be made behind our backs for the defeat of legislation, to the end that the necessity may blow over and those enjoying the benefits of monopoly may not be disturbed in their continuance.

Now, Mr. President, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I venture the prediction that only three or four more filibusters, characterized by long periods of physical endurance and vapid vocal offerings of hours' duration at great expense to the people, will produce a reaction, is producing reaction that will sweep our rules away if we do not do it ourselves.

Many Senators upon both sides of this Chamber opposed the popular election of Senators for a good many years. They called it revolutionary. They declared that the ancient method of procedure was essential to the recognition of the States and of their rights. But a great party harried the opposition a little too long, and they went out of power at the time the change became effectual.

I know, Mr. President, a good many men upon this side of the Chamber, as there are many men upon the other side of the Chamber, do not agree with me regarding the rules. I am aware of the fact that the present system has its earnest and sincere advocates here, as it has its earnest and sincere advocates over there, but I am also aware that many Senators occupying seats on the other side of the Chamber agree with me and are ready to join with those of us here who so believe in making the Senate of the United States a modern, up-to-date legislative body, free from the barnacles that so cumber its hull as to impede its legislative progress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will allow me, I would like to relate a historical fact.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt the Senator refers to the defeat of the force bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No, sir; not to the defeat of the force bill. I was the only Democrat who cast a vote for the vital measure to which the Senator refers at the time when and in the only form in which it could be passed. I stood alone then in nominal defiance of every Democratic Senator on this side of the Chamber, and I thus had the historic opportunity of writing into the Constitution of the United States the provision the Senator is now so justly eulogizing, and I did so in defiance of the clamor and criticism of those who sat with me on this side. I shall always insist that my independence of dictation on that occasion added that vital measure of national legislative freedom to our system of modern reforms 20 years earlier than it could have been secured by the plan I resisted and the larger number who supported it.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to know this, Mr. President. I want to say to the Senator, when I said there were Senators upon this side of the Chamber who believe as I do concerning the rules of the Senate, I had no particular Senator in view. I know that there is a strong division of sentiment here upon the subject just as there is a strong division of sentiment over there; but the very fact that opinions upon this subject do not arise along party lines is the most hopeful feature of the situation, and encourages me to believe that the time is soon coming when opponents of changes will be forced to consider it in earnest whether they would or not.

As at present constituted the Senate has assumed all the proportions of a vocal nuisance—I was about to say a vocal machine of national dimensions. Who reads our profuse offerings to the literature of the day? If some revivalist were to tell me unless I joined the church my future punishment would consist in being condemned to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout eternity, I would join the church before night. It contains some things, some speeches, some documents that are of inestimable value and greatly instructive; but take it page after page, and 50 per cent of it is devoted to the discussion of precedents, rules, constructions, and other matters of detail, and all is published at an enormous expense. It is too much for human patience.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended. I did not intend to take up any time upon this subject or upon the pending measure, preferring to listen as best I could and get to a vote as soon as our friends upon the other side would graciously permit us to do so. But in view of what seems to me to be one of the logical consequences of the filibuster—and there is no other word in the English vocabulary that expresses the idea so directly and clearly—I felt impelled to take the occasion to express some views with regard to our methods of procedure.

Mr. President, no man deplores existing Democratic differences more greatly than I. No man has, perhaps, in a limited way had more experience with party dissensions and with their consequences. We all know, because our experiences teach us, that the surest of all ways to destroy a great political organization is to introduce dissension in its ranks or in the ranks of its leaders to destroy or weaken that unity of purpose which is at once the cause and the object of party organization. We can meet the enemy with united front; if we go down then, we can go down with a cheer and reorganize and come back again. However, if our own is the hand that strikes the blow there may be recovery, but the probabilities are against it. A family difference is the most serious of all differences because of the difficulty of future reconciliation. A political family difference is more serious than that, since it necessarily breeds misunderstandings, suspicions, and resentments, followed frequently by charges and countercharges, by criminations and recriminations, which result in making the rift so great and so far-reaching as to be fatal.

Mr. President, it is because of the fact that this is a party measure, made so under our rules of procedure, made so because it was necessary to secure its passage, that the refusal of

seven members of the party to recognize our party action becomes so serious, for the loss of seven members, we having charge of the government of this country until this administration shall have ended, reduces us to a minority and delivers us, metaphorically speaking, into the hands of the Philistines, who may do with us as they see fit.

Keen are our pangs, but keener far to feel,
We nurs'd the pinion that impell'd the steel.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party was never exiled except through the acts of its own members. The Democratic Party was never retired from power except at the hands and by the conduct of those following its flag and wearing its uniform. In all the history of this Nation, and the Democratic Party was born with the Nation, its defeats have been due to the conduct, the lack of cohesion, the differences and quarrels of members of its own organization. This is a historic fact. I can not recall a single exception.

The Democratic Party has been called back to power. It will stay there, Mr. President, so long as its leaders and its followers are united. It will be exiled when that union ends; and the smile of satisfaction which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] observed upon the genial faces of Senators upon the other side had for its inspiration the belief that this difference forecast the beginning of the end. They know, Mr. President—for the leaders of the Republican Party are the best politicians in the world—they know that if the phalanx on this side of the Chamber can be broken they can, perhaps, make a drive that will reach to Paris. They also know if they can submarine us, no matter how great our battleship, it will be sunk to the bottom by the wound that is inflicted.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has alluded to the so-called filibuster of 24 years ago on the force bill, and the Senator is making some prophesies as to what may happen to parties. Does the Senator remember that that filibuster was broken precisely by similar occurrences as have taken place so far in this so-called filibuster? Then, as now, seven Members of the ruling party finally voted with the other side and displaced the force bill, and following that the Republican Party, that had been in the majority and had undertaken to force complete party solidarity and support of an unpopular measure, went to the wall and the Democrats elected a President and a majority in Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Then the Senator agrees with me in my conclusion.

Mr. President, I do recall that one of my predecessors from Colorado led the revolt, or a revolt, but I do not recall whether he was alone, against the force bill; but I am glad the Senator reminded me of the fact, because the Republican Senators can now use that incident as a precedent not only for filibustering but to justify their capture of seven votes from this side.

Mr. WARREN. I was about to finish. The idea is this, that when party solidarity is carried so far that men can no longer endure it and vote with the other party, do they vote right if according to their conscience, or do they vote wrong? If right, then they did right in the force bill. The country, I think, as the Senator stated, has accepted that conclusion as a proper one, and both parties in the country have thought it was better it was settled that way.

I will ask the Senator if he recalls any other so-called filibuster since that time——

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. WARREN. Which, when finished, whatever way finished, by the failure of the dominant party or by the passage of the bill, the country has not afterwards indorsed the action which had taken place through the filibuster, or rather its results?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the country has indorsed the results of filibusters at all times. I recall the last great filibuster, to which my memory goes, which was the filibuster against the passage of the bill for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. The filibuster in that case was carried on by members of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties, a sectional rather than a party filibuster.

Mr. WARREN. What about the later filibuster against the river and harbor bill of last session? What has the country done about that?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, so far as that filibuster is concerned, I will get to it in a moment. I do not believe that the country as a whole indorsed although they accepted the result of the filibuster in 1893. I know that in our section of the country the results of the filibuster were, and still are, thought to have been disappointing and disastrous.

Now, I will come to the last filibuster, to which the Senator from Wyoming has referred—the recent filibuster against the river and harbor bill, which resulted in its defeat. I concede, so far as my acquaintance with the bill goes, that its defeat was a good thing, but, in my judgment, the enactment into legislation of such measures, where they are as outrageous as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] declared that one to be, should be defeated in some other way, or else they be allowed to become laws, and the people will judge. I also fully concede that a filibuster, like everything else, has its uses. It may be used, and is sometimes used, for good as well as for pernicious purposes; for desirable as well as for undesirable ends. But it is a survival and a detriment.

Mr. WARREN. And the Senator recalls that it is seldom used, except in extreme cases?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, its use in a modified way is very frequent. It can be used against every measure, as the Senator well knows; but I am obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to the fact, if I understood him correctly, that his party went out of power shortly after their failure to pass the force bill and because of their attempt to do so. I commend that statement to the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who are about to repeat the performance to which he has referred.

Mr. WARREN. But, Mr. President, I did not state that that result was the cause of our defeat. I was simply reciting history.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, I do not want to misquote the Senator from Wyoming. He knows that. And if I made the statement too broad, of course I will gladly stand corrected; but whether it was the cause or not of his party's defeat, an after event of that legislative situation was the defeat of the Republican Party. We are now confronted with a parallel condition, Senators—a filibuster against a great party measure to become successful by the vote of seven recalcitrant Democratic United States Senators. If coming events, then, cast their shadows before, then may not impending events cast the same shadow now? With that warning before you, with that example fresh in your memories, let me implore you, before taking the last final step, to reflect that the results of your action to ourselves may be the same as were the results to the Republican Party 24 years ago.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The effect will doubtless be now as then. It was not the outcome, but it was the fact of the Republican Party undertaking to force upon an unwilling Nation legislation not acceptable that caused its defeat. It is now the same thing. The Democratic Party is undertaking to force legislation that the country is not willing to accept, and the result may be the same.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming rather drifts to that conclusion by reason of the analogy which I have drawn between that incident and the present situation. There is about as much resemblance between the force bill and its purposes and the shipping bill and its purposes as there is physically between the Senator from Wyoming and myself.

Mr. WARREN. But the mode of party-caucus procedure here at the Senate was almost identical.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, it is the mode of filibustering procedure, Mr. President, that I am criticizing. I am not going into the history of the force bill; it is fresh in all our minds; we know what its purpose was. It was virtually to enslave a free people through the political power of national legislation, and to impose upon them a social and political condition so utterly unnatural and intolerable as to excite the horror of most of the people then and of all the people now living.

But here, Mr. President, what is the situation? A great war has produced the very condition prophesied by the Republican Party in 1900 when, in their platform declaring for a merchant marine, they charged that the occurrence of a great European war would demonstrate the extremity of our condition for the lack of it. Of course I do not use the exact language of the declaration, but I think I express the idea. That war has come. It has found us without a merchant marine; it has produced the identical conditions which that platform declaration outlined 15 years ago.

The owners of the few bottoms remaining for our commerce have raised their rates—and that is human nature—they have raised their rates of transportation to the clouds. Millions of

dollars worth of goods are awaiting transportation and clamoring for it in vain. The great exigency, the great emergency, the great necessity consequent upon those conditions are here. Private capital will not come to the rescue; private capital declares it can not come to the rescue. The Government is insuring their cargoes and their vessels; the Government has taken off the restrictions of the navigation laws, to the end that foreign vessels may register here and do business; but capital, instead of investing, is waiting for subsidies. In the meantime, however, the commerce of the world, and ours in particular, is suffering. The people themselves—of the sufferings of whom we hear so much, and which are so greatly exaggerated by politicians, are largely due to this intolerable condition; yet the filibuster is invoked at this hour of the public extremity, and when the governing party of the Nation, having upon its shoulders the duty of relieving the situation, is endeavoring to do so, parallels are sought to be drawn in justification of the present filibuster with the filibuster against the force bill of a few years ago.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I have concluded, from the comments which the Senator from Colorado has been making, that he does not approve of a filibuster.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not, unless the time limited by the rules that ought to govern a legislative body of modern times be used for filibustering to the extent to which the limitation goes.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, there is now a motion before the Senate, and I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he give us a chance to vote on that motion now.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; the Senator has the votes to defeat the bill if he can poll them soon, and the conclusion is, Mr. President, that I am filibustering. [Laughter.] I acknowledge the imputation, but I do not defend the practice. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, Tom Johnson, some years ago in the House of Representatives, was making a speech in behalf of the Wilson bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What?

Mr. THOMAS. The Wilson bill; yes, the Wilson bill. And I am reminded that nearly every speech made by the Senator from Michigan in this Chamber that I have heard gives an account of Wilson riding on Bryan's shoulders in the House after the passage of that bill. It is a sad, sad fact, because the Senator always metaphorically sheds tears over the picture which he draws for the delectation of a suffering Senate. But I was going to say that in the course of his discussion of that measure Tom Johnson was taunted with the fact that he had made a fortune under the provisions of the tariff law, and he said he had; and he said further, "I propose, if I can, to make another, but I will not defend its infamies."

Yes, Mr. President, unlike some Senators upon the other side, I acknowledge that I am filibustering, and I am doing so because you have done it so long that it becomes necessary to do a little filibustering on this side. [Laughter.] I shall not make any pretense, Mr. President, to the contrary. I am not going to talk as long as the Senator from Michigan for the reason that I am not able, physically or mentally, to do so. The Senator's capacity for repeating the same thing a dozen times in order to consume the hours is beyond mine.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield; certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator has been kind enough to tell us how long he was not going to talk. Would he be willing to take the other side of the dilemma and tell us how long he is going to filibuster, so that we may arrange our plans accordingly? A number of Senators would be very grateful if they knew exactly what was going on.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall not gratify the Senator. If he had come to me three or four days ago and made that proposition, so that we might have acquired some knowledge of his party affairs, I should have been the last to refuse to reciprocate now; but under the circumstances I do not think I am under any moral, physical, or mental obligation to comply.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, if I may be allowed again——

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. I thought it was very distinctly understood on this side how long we were going to talk; that we were going to talk as long as was necessary by legitimate means to defeat this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes, Mr. President.

Mr. LIPPITT. Do I understand the Senator is going to adopt a similar course?

Mr. THOMAS. But you did not tell me what was going on behind our backs nor just how soon we might expect a vote. I knew last Monday, when the Senator came rushing in from the cloakroom with his smiling countenance all ablaze with expectation, that, to use the language of the street, there had been "something doing"; but, Mr. President, I am not going to talk much longer. If that is any consolation to my friends upon the other side, they are welcome to it; indeed, I do not know but that I have got to the end of my string, anyhow.

To be perfectly frank, Mr. President, when I was interrupted by the Senator from Wyoming I had about concluded; but I thank him very much for having called my attention to some historical facts which I had forgotten, and which I have endeavored to use to the best of my ability on this occasion.

Mr. President, I have not, in the filibustering spirit, at least, offered to the Senate the comments that I have made upon its present methods of procedure. I have felt, and still feel, that the next great reform which is essential to the welfare of the country and the good of the Senate is the reformation of its rules and the placing of substantial limitation upon indiscriminate discussion.

I believe that while filibusters have been used for good purposes and have been used for bad purposes, they should not be used at all, except in so far as limitations upon debate may justify. I have believed, and still believe, that the temptation to use the power is too great to be resisted in many instances when it should not be resorted to at all. I believe that such is the general impression of the outside world, and I believe that the impression is well justified; that it is growing; and that it will express itself in no uncertain way in the near future, if we ourselves do not heed the handwriting upon the wall and introduce some system less antiquated in its character and more adaptable to the needs of the country.

Mr. CAMDEN and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. CAMDEN. I beg pardon. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Kentucky has been recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no question to ask.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, I intend to express my views on this measure at a later date, but, since the Senator from Missouri did me the honor of selecting me as the special target of attack, I feel that a brief reply is in order.

The Senator made two accusations against me, one that I am opulent; the other that I do not bestir myself when the vested interests are opposed by the great mass of the people. Touching the first charge, I am glad to be able to say that the great law of compensation works between the Senator and me, for he is opulent in tact, in successful leadership, in winning ways, and in magnificence of private character. I mention compensation at this time, along with mention of the vested interests, because both terms are well understood by the Senator and with him, some whisper, have been interrelated.

As regards my being sluggish in the public interest, I contentedly leave that to my neighbors and friends.

The Senator said much about the secrecy of alleged negotiations here leading up to the vote of Monday last. Surely a denunciation of secrecy comes with peculiar grace from him, who is known the world over as "Gumshoe Bill," a name testifying to frank and bold work in the public interest at Jefferson City, Mo., and Washington, D. C.

Not having the Senator's opulence of ready speech, I have taken the pains to prepare these few remarks.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. STONE. For a moment.

Mr. WHITE. I only wish to present a telegram, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. WHITE. This is a telegram containing a joint resolution from the Legislature of the State of Alabama, now in session.

It is dated Montgomery, Ala., February 3, 1915, and reads as follows:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. FRANK S. WHITE, *Washington, D. C.:*

I am directed by the senate to transmit to you the following joint resolution this day adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives, to wit, senate joint resolution 57, by Mr. Lusk:

"*Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring),* That the Senators and Representatives of Alabama in the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to do all within their power to secure the immediate passage of the administration bill to secure ships for transportation of American products to the markets of the world. Our cotton is the greatest sufferer from want of transportation. We urge prompt action by our Senators and Representatives."

J. A. KYLE, *Secretary.*

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. LIPPITT. With the permission of the Senator from Missouri, I simply wish to ask the Senator from Alabama what is the description of that bill? What was the bill to which he referred?

Mr. WHITE. It is the bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. LIPPITT. I mean the bill referred to in the telegram.

Mr. WHITE. It is the administration bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, the administration bill?

Mr. WHITE. The Democratic administration bill, backed by the President, Hon. Woodrow Wilson. I do not suppose the Senator has any doubt about the bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. No; I only wanted not to have any doubt about the description of it

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Why, of course not. I thought——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is not yielding.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold that motion for just a moment. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, following the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the pending motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion one moment?

Mr. STONE. I will.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent from C. H. Huston, chairman, dated Chattanooga, Tenn., to the Secretary of the Treasury; also a short letter referring to the bill and containing a very short article from the Motor Age of January 28 with reference to shipments to South America; also an editorial from the Washington Post of February 1.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the request?

Mr. FLETCHER. The last request was as to an editorial in the Washington Post of February 1.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; what did the Senator ask?

Mr. FLETCHER. To have it inserted in the RECORD; that is all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why, Mr. President, I have a basketful of letters and communications of various kinds in my committee room, and I have not thought of lumbering up the RECORD with them; but I never object to anything the Senator from Florida asks. If other Senators do not object, I will not; but we will have a pretty bulky RECORD to-morrow if we are going to put in all the communications that come to us.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that this is very brief; and in connection with the editorial in the Washington Post I might mention that the office boy of the Washington Post seems to be very active and undoubtedly very capable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Telegram.]

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *January 28, 1915.*

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO, *Washington, D. C.:*

Presidents of business men's club, manufacturers' association, jobbers' association, clearing house, and chamber of commerce direct me to express our appreciation of your efforts in behalf of the shipping bill. It is vital to all business interests of the South, and extremely so to our numerous manufacturers doing an export business. Your Chicago speech and appeal to Congress sounds the keynote.

C. H. HUSTON, *Chairman.*

—

FLORALA, ALA., *February 1, 1915.*

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Anent the arguments set forth by certain Republican Senators, saying that we have all the shipping facilities needed to South America, as well as elsewhere, I beg to hand you page from Motor Age dated January 28, in which you will note the article marked, showing that automobile purchased by Mr. Frederic J. Stimpson, newly appointed ambassador to the Argentine Republic, was shipped to South America "via London."

Would think this was sufficient argument to show that space, regular lines, etc., to South America are noticeable by their absence?

Very truly,

R. A. FRENCH

—

[From the Motor Age of January 28, 1915.]

AMERICAN FLAGS PROTECT CAR.

Manager Albion L. Danforth, of the Boston Cadillac agency, had his troubles last week when he began plans to ship to South America an eight-cylinder car ordered by Frederic J. Stimpson, newly appointed ambassador to the Argentine Republic. The car had to go by way of London, and Mr. Danforth was forced to get United States Government seals from Secretary of State William J. Bryan to paste on the crate. On all four sides of the crate a reproduction of the American flag has been pasted, together with other indications that it is the property of an American official, and so not subject to seizure.

—

[From the Washington Post of February 1, 1915.]

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS ITS OWN MERCHANT MARINE.

The delay in providing this country with its own merchant marine is a serious injury to the people of the United States.

If the pending measure can be improved by amendments, the leaders of the Democratic Party should be willing to accept the same.

The Republican Party is entitled to the thanks of the country for constructive work upon many matters in the past, but it has a record as to merchant-marine negligence, if not worse, that brings it neither honor nor credit.

It is only earning condemnation if it adheres to a policy of legislative obstruction to the providing of a national merchant marine now.

The agriculturists need the service of such a marine; the manufacturers and the merchants require it; the transportation land lines will be benefited by it; the industrial workers of the country are now being embarrassed by the lack of these additional vessels.

The voters of the United States are asking now why did not the Republican Party establish such marine during the years of its full political power.

Can the Republican leaders of the Senate tell the people the reason?

Will the Progressive Senators tell the people of the United States why the Republican Party failed to carry out its repeated promises and pledges?

The people of the United States, regardless of party affiliations, desire the establishment of this merchant marine.

The business interests of all the people demand it.

No party that stands against it as obstructionists but stands as an active ally of foreign and domestic shipping combines, and by such obstruction is injuring the people of the United States.

The people in every State of the Union are asking why the Republican Party is refusing to aid in the establishing of this national necessity, indignant at being kept as vassals to foreign shipping combines.

The business men of the Nation see foreign markets captured by a foreign commercial competitor while the Republican Party stands as the obstacle to providing the means for our own merchants and manufacturers to place their products in those markets.

The Post knows it voices public sentiment when it advocates the placing of the United States commercial, industrial, agricultural, and financial interests above those of any other nation.

Obstructionists to this merchant-marine creation are standing in the way of the interests of our people.

The Republican Party will face a revolt by the patriotic members of its own organization if its representatives in Congress persist in doing the work that aids our commercial competitors or allied shipping combines, either at home or abroad.

Every day makes it clearer that this country can not be secure in its foreign trade while dependent on foreign vessels for ocean transportation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I have the advance sheets of an article 8 pages in length, entitled "The transfer of merchant vessels during war, including comments upon Senator ROOT's recent speech in the Senate," by Hon. Archibald R. Watson, corporation counsel of the city of New York from 1910 to 1914, and bearing directly upon the international subject of the Senator's discourse. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that it contains criticisms or comments on the speech of a Senator delivered in this Chamber?

Mr. THOMAS. I said so, but they are of a very proper kind. There is nothing at all in it that is of a personal nature. It is a very high-class article.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that is a very extraordinary request—to put in the RECORD comments of outside parties on speeches delivered in this Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, Mr. President, it is practically a reply to a very important speech here.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to it.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt the Senator from New York has had a copy of it.

Mr. ROOT. I have not had a copy of it, but I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. If there were the slightest thing of a personal character in it, I would not think of presenting it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if he will not have the article referred to the Committee on Printing, so that if it contains anything objectionable that fact may be ascertained?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly; if the Senator does not want to take my word about it, I am perfectly willing to take that course, but I assure him——

Mr. SMOOT. Upon the word of the Senator, I shall make no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. I assure the Senator that there is nothing objectionable in it. I am perfectly willing to submit it to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. GALLINGER. In view of the fact that the Senator from New York makes the suggestion, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, perhaps I should not have used the word "criticism" when asking the privilege of inserting the document in the RECORD. I did not intend to use it in any offensive sense whatever.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE TRANSFER OF MERCHANT VESSELS DURING WAR, INCLUDING COMMENTS UPON SENATOR ROOT'S RECENT SPEECH IN THE SENATE.

[By Hon. Archibald R. Watson, corporation counsel of the city of New York, 1910–1914.]

The Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York's senior Senator, eminent lawyer and publicist, late Secretary of War and Secretary of State, is undoubtedly one of the most able, brilliant, and forceful men which the public life of this generation has seen. But when our distinguished friend undertakes to maintain the view which he has recently expressed concerning the purchase of a merchant vessel owned by a citizen or subject of a nation at war by a citizen of the United States, he is brought into conflict with so formidable an array of authorities that even Senator ROOT will have to give ground and ask for quarter. We might, if we wished, go back to Chief Justice Marshall's time, when, in the year 1800, the schooner *Charming Betsy* was seized by Capt. Murray, commander of the U. S. frigate *Constellation*, and carried into Martinique as prize for alleged violation of the nonintercourse law between the United States and France and her dependencies. It was in the course of his opinion in this case that the learned Chief Justice first enunciated the views with respect to the rights of neutrals to engage in commerce, referred to in Prof. Moore's Digest of International Law, volume 7, page 415.

But more recently—though still nearly half a century ago—we may turn to another case, decided by the United States Supreme Court, involving the capture of the steamship *Georgia*, which had been a ship of war in the service of the Southern Confederacy, and as such had preyed extensively upon the commerce of the United States. Finding herself in English waters, and to escape the U. S. steam frigates *Kearsage*, *Niagara*, and *Sacramento*, cruising off the coast of France and in the English Channel, the *Georgia* suddenly entered the port of Liverpool, with her armament and complement of officers and crew. She was there dismantled, refitted as a merchantman, and sold to one Edward Bates, a citizen of Liverpool and subject of Great Britain. Bates, after refitting the vessel, chartered her to the Portuguese Government for a voyage to Lisbon and thence to the Portuguese ports on the coast of Africa, and it was while on her voyage to Lisbon, "in a peaceable manner," that the vessel was captured by the *Niagara*, Commodore Craven commanding. (The Georgia *v.* United States, 7 Wall. 32.) This case is important, significant, and even conclusive of what was the rule at that time, because calling attention in the clearest manner to the distinction between the sale of a war vessel or a vessel which had previously been armed and the sale of a merchant ship. And it was here declared by Mr. Justice Samuel Nelson, for the unanimous court, that while the *Georgia* was liable to capture as having been previously a ship of war a different rule was recognized by the highest authorities everywhere as applying to the sale of merchant ships.

"Such has been the understanding of the profession and of text writers both in England and in this country," said Mr. Justice Nelson, "and as still higher evidence of the rule in England, it has since been recognized as settled law by the judicial committee of Her Majesty's privy council. In the recent learned and most valuable commentaries of Mr. Phillimore, now Sir Robert Phillimore, judge of the high court of admiralty of England, on international law, he observes, after stating the principles that govern the sale of enemies' ships during war to neutrals: 'But the right of purchase by neutrals extends only to merchant ships of enemies for the purchase of ships of war belonging to enemies is held invalid.' And Mr. T. Pemberton Leigh, in delivering judgment of the judicial committee and lords of the privy council, in the case of the *Baltica*, observes: 'A neutral, while war is imminent, or after it has commenced, is at liberty to purchase either goods or ships (not being ships of war) from either belligerent, and the purchase is valid, whether the subject of it be lying in a neutral port or in an enemy's port.' Mr. Justice Story lays down the same distinction in his Notes on the Principles and Practice of Prize Courts, page 63, Pratt's London edition—a work that has been selected by the British Government for the use of its naval officers as the best code of instruction in the prize law. (11 Moore, P. C., 185.) The same principle is found in Wildman on International Rights in Time of War, a valuable English work, published in 1850, and in a more recent work, Hosack on the Rights of British and Neutral Commerce, published in London in 1854."

Every Attorney General of the United States and every Secretary of State for more than half a century past, before whom the question has come, has appeared to agree upon the proposition as stated by Attorney General Cushing in 1854, when it was said:

"A citizen of the United States may purchase a ship of a belligerent power at home or abroad in a belligerent port or on the high seas, provided the purchase be made bona fide and the property be passed absolutely and without reserve, and the ship so purchased becomes entitled to bear the flag and receive the protection of the United States." (Vol. 6, Opinions Attorney General, 638.)

Two years later the Hon. William M. Evarts, who was Attorney General before he became Secretary of State, in a letter to Mr. Christiancy, minister to Peru, stated, amongst other things, that:

"The right of Americans to buy foreign-built vessels and to carry on commerce with them is clear and undoubted * * *. As a consequence an adjunct of this right, that of flying the American flag, can not be prohibited. If circumstances justify on the part of the consular officers an opinion that the sale is honest, and that the vessel has really become the property of a citizen of the United States, she may properly fly the flag of the owner's country as an indication of such ownership and as an emblem of the owner's nationality."

Still later, in the case of the *Benito Estenger* (177 U. S., 568), Chief Justice Fuller said:

"Transfer of vessels flagrante bello was originally held invalid, but the rule has been modified and is thus given by Mr. Hall, who, stating that in France their sale is forbidden and they are declared to be prize in all cases in which they have been transferred by neutrals after the buyers could have knowledge of the outbreak of war, says: 'In England and the United States the right to purchase vessels is in principle admitted, they being in themselves legitimate objects of trade as fully as any other kind of merchandise, but the practice of fraud being great the circumstances attending a sale are severely scrutinized and the transfer is not held to be good if it is subjected to any condition or tacit understanding by which the vendor keeps an interest in the vessel or its profits, control over it, and power of revocation or a right to its restoration at the conclusion of war.'"

To the same effect are the observations of Sir William Scott in the *Seeh Geschwistern* (4 C. Rob., 100); the *Jenny* (4 C. Rob., 31); the *Omnibus* (6 C. Rob., 71); also observations of Judge Cadwalader, of the eastern district of Pennsylvania, in the *Island Belle*, Federal cases No. 7, 107. Other authorities to the same purport are Oppenheim's "International law" and Halleck's "International law," volume 2, page 93.

Of course it is required that the sale of a belligerent ship to a neutral shall, to be valid, be in good faith; that the title of the former owner shall be absolutely divested; that the vessel shall not remain in any respect subject to the control or management of the enemy; that there shall be no reversionary interest in the ship, and nothing which continues the interest of the former owner in or to the vessel. All of these considerations go to the validity of the transfer. In some instances, no doubt, the amount of the purchase price would be weighed as bearing upon the regularity of the sale. But given a valid transfer and passing for the moment the international naval conference of 1908–9 it seems that there should be no question, especially so far as Great Britain is concerned, upon which any international complication could reasonably be expected to arise.

It has been said that France has never recognized the validity of the transfer of a merchant vessel flagrante bello. It is true that in 1778 France promulgated a regulation to the effect that "enemy-built vessels can not be made neutral by a sale to a neutral after hostilities break out." (See 2 De Pistoye et Duverdy, Prises Maritime 1, 503.) But again, as far back as 1856, Mr. Marcy, then Secretary of State, in a letter to Mr. Mason, then minister to France, wrote:

"However long may be the period during which this doctrine has formed part of the municipal code of France it is manifestly not in harmony with her maritime policy, and it is confidently believed by this Government that France will not assert it, not only against the practice of other nations, but against the authority of her most enlightened writers on public law.

"The principle, therefore, that the neutral has a perfect right to purchase the merchant vessels of the belligerents has been maintained by England, by Russia, and by the United States, and it is inconsistent with these historical facts to say that the contrary doctrine avowed by France has had the sanction of the chief maritime nations or that 'it forms a part of the whole doctrine of maritime law.'"

Opposed to the French view, continued Mr. Marcy, "is the doctrine of the European publicists, and it is especially sustained by Hautefeuille, whose authority will, I doubt not, be recognized by the Emperor's Government. He (Hautefeuille) says: 'It is impossible to recognize such a right as that claimed by the regulation of France.'"

The Russian prize regulations, prior to the international naval conference, as given by Prof. Moore (vol. 7, p. 424), are as follows:

"Merchant vessels acquired from a hostile power or its subjects by persons of neutral nationality are acknowledged to be hostile vessels unless it is proven that the acquisition must be considered, according to the laws of the nation to whom the purchasers belong, as having actually taken place before the purchasers received news of the declaration of war or that the vessels acquired in the manner mentioned, although after the receipt of such news were acquired quite conscientiously and not for the purpose of covering hostile property."

That is to say, the Russian view has been in full accord with that of Great Britain and the United States, that the validity of such transactions as referred to depends upon good faith and "conscientiousness."

We come now to the international naval conference held at London from December 4, 1908, to January 6, 1909, participated in by representatives of Germany, Austria, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Spain, the Netherlands, Russia, and the United States. Senator ROOT, in his recent speech in the Senate, had much to say about this London conference, but little or nothing to say concerning the long-established and recognized position of the United States, Great Britain, and, apparently, Russia previous to this conference, which never, as a convention or treaty, became binding or in any way obligatory upon any of the nations participating in it. In fact, it is very doubtful if the terms themselves of the tentative "declarations" clearly sustain Senator ROOT'S view. But of this more later.

"The reason why the declaration of London is subject to consideration, although we are not bound by it"—

Said Senator ROOT recently in the Senate—

"is that England, France, and Russia have adopted it, with some modifications not touching this subject, as their law for the present conflict."

That is to say, though the London conference was held some six or seven years ago, and though nothing was done in approval of it until the breaking out of the present European war, with such alignment of forces as to give Great Britain, France, and Russia control of the sea, these powers now, no doubt, wish to extend their right in respect of the capture of merchant ships; while the United States, consistent in one view for a century, has, alike with Great Britain, during all of this time maintained the right of neutrals to engage in commerce with belligerents, subject to certain clearly defined restrictions, and

has included in that right the right of our citizens in good faith to purchase merchant vessels for neutral use from the citizens or subjects of nations at war. Having declared this principle just and reasonable in itself, having affirmed and reaffirmed it through generations, there seems to be much in favor of the view that the United States should not now recede from this position, but should stoutly maintain it should occasion arise.

But what were the conclusions arrived at by the delegates to the London conference concerning "transfer to a neutral flag"?

"First. It was resolved that the transfer of a belligerent vessel to a neutral flag before the beginning of hostilities was valid, unless proved to have been made to evade the consequences to which an enemy ship, as such, is exposed (art. 55).

"Second. If the transfer was effected more than 30 days before the opening of hostilities, it would be deemed valid, if unconditional and complete, even though made in order to evade the consequences of war (art. 55).

"Third. Where the transfer was after the outbreak of hostilities it would be deemed void unless shown not to have been made 'in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed.'"

Article 56 continues the same subject:

"There, however, is an absolute presumption that the transfer is void: (1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port; (2) if the right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor; (3) if the requirements of the municipal law covering the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled."

Now, in the case of an enemy vessel safe in the haven of a neutral port, what are "the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed"? Can it reasonably be said, taking a concrete example, that a German steamer now lying at her dock in Hoboken, is "exposed" to capture by the British? Undoubtedly such a vessel would be "exposed" to capture if, "as such,"—that is, if as "an enemy vessel"—she attempted to navigate the high seas. But as a neutral vessel, flying the Stars and Stripes, she is not an enemy vessel, and consequently not liable to capture as such, nor does the declaration of London, as we understand it, so provide. Nor, if this be true, can it be said that a valid, unconditional, and complete sale of such a vessel, then proceeding to engage in neutral commerce, was made to "evade" the consequences to which an "enemy vessel, as such, is exposed."

In assuming a position which would bind the honor and retard the prosperity of our Nation by the merely tentative discussions between the delegates to the London conference, Senator ROOT seeks to interpret the provision in question as meaning that any transfer of a belligerent ship to a neutral flag would be deemed invalid if it could be shown that in all probability no transfer would have been made but for the outbreak of war. It would have been very simple and easy to state the proposition this way, had such been the intention of the delegates. And the fact that this idea would have been so easy to express, and that it was not expressed, certainly detracts from the weight of Senator ROOT's conclusion that such was the unexpressed intention. Instead, what the delegates did say, as we have seen, was only that there was an absolute presumption of invalidity if the transfer was made in transitu, or in a blockaded port, or if the right to repurchase was reserved, or if the requirements of the municipal law governing the transaction had not been fulfilled. Nothing is here said about a conclusive presumption of invalidity where the vessel is in a neutral port, there quite as safe from capture by the enemy as if there was no such thing as war in the world.

Furthermore, the concurrence by our delegates in the declaration of London was not understood at the time, nor has it been regarded since, until Senator ROOT spoke, as involving a surrender of the century-old position of the United States upon this important subject. In this connection we may point to the article "War" in the Cyclopedia of Law and Procedure (vol. 40, p. 296), by George Grafton Wilson, author of a Handbook on International Law, professor of international law in Harvard University, lecturer on international law in Brown University and in the United States Naval War College. Under the heading "Transfer of vessels by belligerents in anticipation of or during war" (p. 355), Prof. Wilson states:

"The continental practice has been in the direction of regarding sales of belligerent merchant vessels to neutrals in anticipation of or during war as invalid; but in England and the United States, while the presumption has been against the validity of such transfers, they have been upheld where a bona fide sale for a valuable consideration has been shown. Where, after the alleged transfer, the former owner retains an interest in the ship or it remains under the same management and in the same course of trade as before, the presumption against the bona fide character of the transfer is conclusive. Nor can a valid transfer be made of an enemy vessel in an enemy jurisdiction, nor of an enemy vessel or goods in transitu, nor of a public vessel belonging to a belligerent nation. An attempt has now been made to regulate the whole subject by the incorporation into the declaration of London of a set of rules substantially similar to those stated above."

That is to say, Prof. Wilson, who quotes and considers the provisions of the declaration of London, regards such declarations "as substantially similar" to the preexisting rule long maintained by the United States.

And finally, even though the terms of the declaration of London be regarded as in conflict with the previous rule so long recognized and adhered to by the United States and Great Britain, the status of the conclusions of this conference, so far as this Government is concerned, was very clearly stated in the recent letter of the Secretary of State to Senator STONE, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. "This Government," wrote the Secretary of State, "is not now interested in the adoption of the declaration of London by the belligerents"; and, further, that the United States would insist that, without regard to the declaration of London, "the rights of the United States and its citizens during the war shall be governed by existing international rules."

In conclusion, the matter narrows down to this. Shall this Nation—its commerce paralyzed by a European war, for which it is in no wise to blame, its citizens suffering prodigious losses annually by reason of the disturbed conditions abroad—deny to its citizens the long-existing right to purchase in good faith ships of former belligerent registry, to carry American goods, now congesting our warehouses and accumulating on our wharves, to the empty marts of Europe, where our products are so sorely needed and can be so advantageously sold? May not our citizens be permitted to recoup or avoid a little of the enormous aggregate of their inevitable loss in this peaceable and proper way? Many must at this time hold the view that such a sacrifice of its rights and interests on the part of the Government of the United States would be unreasonable and unjust, and should not now be expected or required.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a great deal has been said about the southern people not being interested in this bill and the farmers not being interested, I wish to read and have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following cut out of to-day's Washington Evening Star:

FAVOR SHIP-PURCHASE AND RURAL-CREDIT BILLS—REPRESENTATIVES OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS VOICE INDORSEMENT DURING CALL ON PRESIDENT WILSON.

Indorsement of the ship-purchase bill and the rural-credits legislation was given to President Wilson to-day by representatives of the National Grange, the National Dairy Association—

These are both northern associations—

the Farmers' Alliance—

This is a southern farmers' association—

and the National Rural Credits League, who called at the White House with Representative SMALL, of North Carolina.

Claiming to represent all of the farmers of the country, Oliver Wilson, of Illinois; William T. Creasy, of Pennsylvania; and S. H. Hobbs, of North Carolina, told the President that they favored his plans for a shipping bill and that they believed rural-credits legislation should be passed during the present session of Congress. They said that action on both questions was vital to the farmers.

The National Rural Credits League was formed here yesterday to urge action on the subject by Congress. The directors elected were J. A. McSparren, of Pennsylvania; D. M. Blankenship, of Virginia; Western Starr, of Maryland; William T. Creasy, of Pennsylvania; and S. H. Hobbs, of North Carolina.

This shows that the farmers are waking up to the vital importance of this bill. They have been slow to see it, but they are awake now.

In view of the fact that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and one or two other Senators upon that side have said that this bill was standing like a cloud over the shipbuilding interests of the country and was discouraging the building of ships, I wish to insert as a part of my remarks from the same evening paper, just cut out from the news columns of it, an article entitled:

Boom in shipbuilding at the American yards. Contracts at big prices largely the result of the European war.

The article shows that 70,000 tons of ship construction are now going on at Newport News, and tells what is going on at the Maryland yard and at various other yards in the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BOOM IN SHIPBUILDING AT THE AMERICAN YARDS—CONTRACTS AT BIG PRICES LARGELY THE RESULT OF THE EUROPEAN WAR.

There is an unprecedented boom in shipbuilding in the shipyards of the United States. The shipyards of the Atlantic seaboard for many months had so little to do that they scrambled and cut prices to get the smallest order, but to-day every one of the big plants is so busy that the smaller plants are getting the overflow and are also crowded with work.

Bargain prices in new ships prevailed during the slack period; now a new craft to sail the deep is costing big money. The American shipyards lost out in competition with foreign shipyards in other days; to-day the American yards are getting work at their own prices because of the lack of foreign facilities.

This story of prosperity in the shipyards of the United States is brought from Newport News by Capt. C. A. McAllister, chief engineer of the Coast Guard, who was recently there to inspect the two Coast Guard cutters building at the Newport News Dry Dock and Shipbuilding plant. That plant has enough work on hand to keep 4,500 men busy for two years, and is likely to refuse additional construction work as beyond the capacity of the plant.

TOTAL OF 70,000 TONS.

Prior to December 1 the shipyard at Newport News did not take a single construction order. To-day, including two battleships and two Coast Guard cutters, it is building 70,000 tons dead-weight of new ships.

Cramps' shipyard is signing up contracts to crowd it with work. The Maryland Steel Co. yard at Sparrows Point, the New York Shipbuilding Co. at Camden, and the Fall River plant are all doing capacity work. Although orders for repairs are necessary to keep busy certain facilities of the plant, a great part of repair work is being abandoned to smaller plants; the bigger plants were taking every bit of it they could get only a brief time ago.

Among ships building at Newport News are two big oil tankers for the Standard Oil Co., each 15,000 tons dead-weight. These steel vessels were to have been constructed in German yards, but the German concern, unable to construct them, abandoned the contract to American competitors. This is only one of many foreign contracts for construction that have been abandoned, with American yards profiting.

OTHER VESSELS UNDER CONSTRUCTION.

Two other big vessels being constructed at the Newport News yards are a 10,000-ton dead-weight steel freighter for the Luckenbach Co., and a 10,000-ton dead-weight freighter for the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co.

All foreign yards have been turned over to war-construction work. In Great Britain every yard is busy building warships, and the workmen wear buttons on which are inscribed the legend "I am serving the Empire in the building of ships." The same conditions prevail in Germany and France where the larger yards are situated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That does not look much like a "cloud." No "discouragement" because of "anticipated Government competition."

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] were both "appalled," to use the language of the senior Senator from New York, with the idea of the war that might await us with Great Britain if we purchased German ships, I have cut out of the Star this evening this article, headed:

Justifies Wilson's stand on ship-purchase bill—British paper—

It is the London News, which is a celebrated Liberal paper, in sympathy with the administration there—

British paper declares United States merchant marine might prove valuable to England.

And it goes on to tell why, reenforcing just what I said the other day, to the effect that in my opinion there will not be any opposition from the British Government or the French Government to the purchase of German ships. I ask that that article may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JUSTIFIES WILSON'S STAND ON SHIP-PURCHASE BILL—BRITISH PAPER DECLARES UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE MIGHT PROVE VALUABLE TO ENGLAND.

LONDON, *February 3.*

Raids by German submarines on British commerce might make a United States merchant marine valuable to Great Britain as a means of supplying food, in the opinion of the Daily News, which prints an editorial this morning justifying President Wilson's attitude on the ship-purchase bill now before Congress.

The paper says this "unprecedented development of state socialism" is the only means whereby the United States can recover its place in the world of shipping. The editorial sets forth that in the present war the submarine has become a serious menace to England's food supply, and in any future war will dominate her position, unless in the meantime science should discover some effective means of defense.

"Should it then threaten our shipping with destruction and ourselves with starvation," says the Daily News, "it will not be an unimportant fact that a great neutral country, possessing a mercantile marine of its own, can send its ships into our ports unmolested and unafraid."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 4, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1915.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William H. Hornibrook, of Albany, Oreg., to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Siam, vice Fred W. Carpenter, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Matthias N. Fegtly, of Jordan Valley, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Vale, Oreg., vice Henry G. Guild. Term expired and resigned. This nomination is in lieu of the one sent to the Senate January 18, 1915, and confirmed January 22, in which Mr. Fegtly's first name was stated as Martin.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

M. W. Camper to be postmaster at Florence, Ala., in place of Charles W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1915.

OKLAHOMA.

James G. Lyons to be postmaster at Okmulgee, Okla., in place of W. S. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Walter J. Stevens to be postmaster at Lexington, Okla., in place of A. M. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

OREGON.

W. R. Hamer to be postmaster at Newport, Oreg., in place of Oliver P. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

John T. McGuire to be postmaster at North Bend, Oreg., in place of Elmer F. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William T. Benner to be postmaster at Saxton, Pa., in place of Luther P. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1915.

E. R. Benson to be postmatser at Mount Jewett, Pa., in place of O. S. Gagahan. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1915.

Daniel R. Dunkel to be postmaster at Hamburg, Pa., in place of Abel M. Byers. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

John J. Durkin to be postmaster at Scranton, Pa., in place of John E. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Allen S. Garman to be postmaster at Tyrone, Pa., in place of H. B. Calderwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1915.

Jerome A. Hartman to be postmaster at Phoenixville, Pa., in place of J. Wersler Thomson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

William A. Irwin to be postmaster at Downingtown, Pa., in place of Joseph B. Means. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

George E. Hipps to be postmaster at Carrolltown, Pa., in place of Frank N. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Harry K. McCulloch to be postmaster at Freeport, Pa., in place of Robert B. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Norman D. Matson to be postmaster at Brookville, Pa., in place of Joseph B. Means. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

David M. Means to be postmaster at New Wilmington, Pa., in place of S. W. Price. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1914.

George D. Schoenly to be postmaster at Boyertown, Pa., in place of William W. Wren. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

Irwin Simpson to be postmaster at Punxsutawney, Pa., in place of Harry G. Teagarden. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Clardy to be postmaster at Laurens, S. C., in place of Charles H. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1915.

John W. Geraty to be postmaster at Yonges Island, S. C., in place of John W. Geraty. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1915.

Bernard B. James to be postmaster at Union, S. C., in place of Laurens G. Young. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

TENNESSEE.

Fred P. Darwin to be postmaster at Dayton, Tenn., in place of Noah J. Tallent. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1915.

Joseph W. Nichols to be postmaster at Trenton, Tenn., in place of John T. Hale. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1915.

George W. Phebus, jr., to be postmaster at Union City, Tenn., in place of Allen D. Keller. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1914.

VIRGINIA.

George W. Sheppard to be postmaster at Glenallen, Va., in place of Franklin Stearns. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1915.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1915.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Robert Emmett Jeffery to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Uruguay.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Robert C. Baird, Coulterville.
Thomas E. Davis, Mulberry Grove.
William F. Filbert, Watertown.
George B. Gray, Sesser.
J. E. Herman, Mounds.
James K. Hopkins, Princeton.
Ludwig A. Karcher, Dahlgren.
J. J. Lloyd, Fairfield.
John T. Scott, Saybrook.
Louis A. Slykas, Westville.
Charles L. Stephenson, St. Francisville.
Samuel M. Stewart, Metropolis.
Mahala E. Trainer, Blue Mound.
B. L. Washburn, Carterville.

IOWA.

John O'Rourke, Red Oak.

KANSAS.

Henry Block, Syracuse.
G. S. Hoss, jr., Cherryvale.

MICHIGAN.

James Fraser, Webberville.
William H. Vau Consant, St. Johns.

MINNESOTA.

J. E. Bauvette, Hallock.
J. J. Daly, Frazee.
M. W. Jensen, McIntosh.
Sophus A. Nebel, Braham.
William H. Nevin, Ivanhoe.
Alvin A. Ogren, New London.
O. P. Oseth, Oslo.
C. J. Schendel, Campbell.
Nels J. Thysell, Hawley.
Frank E. Wilder, Spring Valley.

NEW YORK.

James R. Mapes, Canaseraga.
James R. Mayne, Heuvelton.

OHIO.

Samuel R. Coates, Maynard.
Grover C. Naragon, Amsterdam.
Nelson C. Petrie, Rock Creek.
Robert T. Spratt, Malvern.

RHODE ISLAND.

Francis Fagan, Pascoag.
J. Elmer Thewlis, Wakefield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 3, 1915.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, to whom our hearts are as an open book, cleanse us, we beseech Thee, from all sinful and selfish desires, that the pages written in the transactions of this day may be free from blots and stains of which we should be ashamed; that with a conscience void of offense toward Thee, our Father, and our fellow men, we may ask Thy blessing upon all we have done, assured of Thy favor, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Cabinet officers coming before the Congress.

The SPEAKER. On the subject of what?

Mr. MURRAY. On the subject of Cabinet officers coming before Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD about Cabinet officers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] on the subject of American neutrality.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his own remarks a speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] on the subject of neutrality. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on last Calendar Wednesday, the bill H. R. 2496 had been called up, and I now inquire if it is not the unfinished business for to-day, this being Calendar Wednesday? The matter for decision was pending at the time the House adjourned. I will read the RECORD to the Chair, showing the status at adjournment.

The SPEAKER. What page is the gentleman going to read from?

Mr. CULLOP. Page 2431, on January 27, the following proceedings took place:

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I call up, by authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill H. R. 2496, House Calendar No. 194.

Mr. MANN. What bill is that?

Mr. CULLOP. For uniform classification of freights.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves the right to object to what?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. To object on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman raises the point of no quorum, and so does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, the bill having been called up, will it have the right of way on next Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. It would.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker had better think about that before ruling on it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not know whether any other brother has anything to offer, and I will move to adjourn.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. MCKELLAR. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this matter.

Mr. MANN. Impossible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do it after the point of no quorum is raised until that point is settled.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Chair has ruled this bill will be in order next Wednesday as unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe that suggestion to the Chair is correct. The bill has not been reported. The gentleman has to call up the bill affirmatively——

The rest of the proceedings are not so material. The Speaker declined to make a ruling at that time, and I now call it up under the conditions of the RECORD—H. R. 2496, a bill for the uniform classification of freights.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the gentleman can not call up the bill from the committee, as that committee has been called two days in succession. I would like to remind the Speaker that the RECORD is not the Journal. The Journal's proceedings of last Wednesday have been approved. The Journal does not show that the gentleman called up the bill and the Journal is conclusive upon the House, having been approved. The Journal shows that as soon as the bill which had been under consideration had passed I made the point of no quorum, and thereupon the House, on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, adjourned. That is the Journal, and that is conclusive upon the House.

Mr. CULLOP. Well, I think every one present will remember if that is the showing of the Journal it is not correct, but the RECORD here is correct, and that the proceedings took place then as found here in the RECORD on page 2431, so I ask now that the bill be considered because of the fact that the bill had been called up, but had not been reported; but it was before the House for report by the Clerk when the point of no quorum was made, and hence has the right of way as the first thing to-day.

The SPEAKER. The history of the transaction is very brief. The gentleman from Indiana rose and said he called the bill up, and the Chair directed the Clerk to report it; but before the Clerk could get started or even find the bill two gentlemen raised the point of no quorum, one raising the point and the other reserving it. The bill never was before the House. At first the Chair, not having paid exact attention to what was done about it, said he thought it would be in order to-day. The Chair having stated that the bill in question would be in order to-day as unfinished business, on the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the Chair held the decision under advisement, and upon reflection came to this conclusion about it: That the bill never was before the House; that if the Clerk had read the title or got started, then it would have come up to-day, but inasmuch as it never got started that committee has had two days and is not entitled to any more under the circumstances, and the Clerk will call the next committee.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. CULLOP. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CULLOP. If I understand the ruling of the Chair correctly, it was that as the bill had not been reported by the Chair it was not now the unfinished business of to-day.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to make a further inquiry. Does the Chair further hold that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce having had two Calendar Wednesdays under the rule for Calendar Wednesday it can not have business before the House to-day?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Then this bill could not be called up?

The SPEAKER. No. It has been ruled, both by Speaker Cannon and the present occupant of the chair, that to start on a bill at the close of the second day, if it gets started, then it

comes up as the unfinished business on the next Calendar Wednesday; but this never got started.

Mr. MANN. If it will be any consolation to my friend from Indiana, I will state that I got caught the same way once.

Mr. CULLOP. Well, I am not responsible for being caught; the gentleman was responsible——

Mr. MANN. I was not responsible then; somebody else was.

Mr. CULLOP (continuing). Because the gentleman raised the point of no quorum; and this act on his part prevents its consideration to-day, which I very much regret.

POSTPONEMENT OF SALE OF FUR-SEAL SKINS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER (when the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was called). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House joint resolution 391 by instruction of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he hereby is, authorized to postpone the sale of all skins now in possession of the Government, taken from seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes, under section 11 of the act of August 24, 1912, until such time as, in his discretion, he shall deem advisable; and the proceeds of such sale shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, section 11 of an act to give effect to the convention between the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia for the preservation and protection of the fur seals and sea otter which frequent the waters of the north Pacific Ocean, concluded at Washington July 7, 1911, and which was passed August 24, 1912, provides in section 11:

That from and after the approval of this act all killing of fur seals on the Pribilof Islands, or anywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States in Alaska, shall be suspended for a period of five years, and shall be, and is hereby, declared to be unlawful; and all punishments and penalties heretofore enacted for the illegal killing of fur seals shall be applicable and inflicted upon offenders under this section: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not apply to the annual killing on the Pribilof Islands of such male seals as are needed to supply food, clothing, and boatskins for the natives on the islands, as is provided for in article 11 of said convention; the skins of all seals so used for food shall be preserved and annually sold by the Government, and proceeds of such annual sales shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Heretofore the sales have taken place annually.

In the fur trade it has long been the custom to sell at auction. This has always been the practice of the Government. Until last year all of the sealskins of the United States Government have been sold in London, England. On December 16, 1913, the first sale of Government sealskins was held at St. Louis, Mo. Many foreign buyers were present as bidders at this sale. The prices obtained were about 5 per cent higher than for similar skins at the London sales a short time before. The compensation for storage, handling, advertising, and selling the sealskins last year was 1 per cent lower than had previously been paid to the English dealers.

The foreign buyers who attended the sale of 1913 were nearly all from European countries now at war. At the present time there is no prospect of securing the attendance of such foreign buyers, and if the sale were to take place now or in the near future, competition would be materially reduced and prices would be affected to such an extent as to materially injure the interests of the Government.

The number of sealskins sold last year was 1,896; they brought $54,579. It was subsequently found that the number of seals authorized to be killed for food for the natives on the Pribilof Islands was insufficient, hence the number has been increased for the present year. The total number of skins now in possession of the Government is 3,284.

This department is advised that these skins can, with the proper care, be retained for many months without deterioration and with very little expense. At the present time it is quite impossible to determine when the interests of the Government will require the sale to be held. Under these unusual conditions it is deemed advisable to give authority to the Secretary of Commerce to use his discretion in fixing the date of the sale. It is very important that action should be taken as soon as possible.

This simply involves a business proposition. The department has been advised by the solicitor that under the law these sales must take place annually unless this discretion is vested in the Secretary of Commerce. I may say that a similar resolution, or one in identically the same terms, passed the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce brought the pending joint resolution to me. I introduced it in the House, and it was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. When I learned that Senate joint resolution 214, covering the same subject matter, passed the Senate, I traced it and found it had been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have conferred with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, the chairman of that committee, and he is quite willing that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be discharged from the consideration of the Senate resolution and that the Senate resolution may be substituted for the House resolution and passed, which would dispose of this question.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask him what is the estimated value of the skins which would be affected by the passage of this resolution for 1914? I notice the year previous it was $54,579. I notice that the department report 3,284 skins are held now by the Government.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There were 1,896 skins sold, and they brought $54,579.

Mr. GOULDEN. I take it that that was for 1913?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. And this is the resolution that covers those for 1914?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Do you have any idea whether the value is greater or less than it was in 1913?

Mr. ALEXANDER. If they were sold now, they would not bring as much money. Those sold in 1913 in St. Louis brought more money and the sale was more advantageous to the Government than previous sales made in London.

Mr. GOULDEN. Under existing conditions I think it is an excellent proposition to postpone the sale, and will support the resolution.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. These skins will eventually go into the hands of the consumers in the United States, and why should not those consumers have the advantage of the price? Why should we wait for foreign buyers?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The wish of the department is to get a fair price for these skins, because we are at a large expense in the administration of the seal industry on the Pribilof Islands, and we would prefer that those who wear sealskin coats would pay a higher price for them.

Mr. MOORE. As a matter of fact, would not the purchaser of the skins in the United States have to pay more for them by reason of the postponement of this sale?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is to be hoped that he will, because we want more money for them.

Mr. MOORE. Then the resolution would not be in the interest of the American consumer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I have no plea to make for those who wear sealskin coats.

Mr. MOORE. I have not been able to buy a sealskin yet. I think the price ought to be brought down so that men who merely earn congressional salaries may have a chance to wear one once in a while.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no such ambition myself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understand these skins always had been sold in London until 1913, when for the first time they were sold in St. Louis, and that the sale at St. Louis was very satisfactory?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It was; and it is our purpose, if possible, to transfer these sales permanently from London to this country; and not only the sales but the dressing of the skins.

Mr. MANN. What are the reasons now for the Government speculating in these skins? On the supposition that they would sell here at some future time at a higher price than they would sell now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The only reason I know is that given by the Department of Commerce. It is regarded purely as a business proposition, because if they were sold at this time they would be sold at a much reduced price. Of course the cost of administration and care of the fur-seal herd and of the people of the Pribilof Islands involves this Government in a very large expense. I presume the intent is to reimburse the Government as far as possible for those expenses.

Mr. MANN. That applies, of course, to any sale. Why does the department believe they can get a better price by not selling now than by selling now? The people who buy these skins know just as much about it as the department does. Why would they not be just as willing to pay for the sealskins now what

they are worth as they would be if the Government waited for 2 or 5 or 10 years? That would be a matter of speculation on the part of the Government.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This vests discretion in the department. The department may conclude that it can best sell them now.

Mr. MANN. It is a declaration on the part of Congress that the Government ought to speculate in sealskins and hold them until it gets a better price instead of selling now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This is a matter of business. The Government ought to get as good a price as it can.

Mr. MANN. I know; but what are the reasons for the supposition that they will sell better in a year or two years from now, when they will have a larger quantity to sell, than they would sell now, when there is some demand for them?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, this is one of the conditions growing out of the war in Europe. A great many of those who have been bidders for seal skins heretofore were Europeans, are not here, and would not be here to bid at this time. Of course, if this war in Europe should continue for any considerable length of time and the conditions should not change, I do not know of any reason why the sales should not be made.

Mr. MANN. Of course, until the sale is advertised the people will not be here to bid. How does the department know they will not be here to bid?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The firm in St. Louis that has been acting as the agent of the Government, I expect, is the best informed on the conditions of the fur trade of any firm in the United States; and Mr. Sweet, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, visited St. Louis and conferred with that firm, and his opinion, no doubt, was made up largely from the opinion obtained from them.

Mr. MANN. I apprehend that that firm is not locking its doors and putting all its furs away for a year or two before it will sell any of them. I imagine they might want the Government to speculate upon holding sealskins, but I dare say they will not speculate with what they have. The market price is fixed, of course, by the supply and demand. People outside are just as apt to bid what they are worth now as if we should let the Government hold them and gave them an opportunity to bid a year from now. I can not see the point in the Government speculating upon what the value of sealskins or other property will be a year from now, when there will be a larger quantity to be sold.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the principal market for these sealskins has been in Europe, and has not that been true for a number of years past? And is it not true that the market for fur-seal skins in Europe is now very greatly interfered with, and the demand for sealskins is not what it was before the beginning of this European war?

Mr. MANN. Well, I think the gentleman is slightly mistaken as to the ultimate market. More sealskins are purchased in the United States by Americans than are purchased in any place in the world. Of course, they are taken over to Europe to be dyed; I understand that.

Mr. LLOYD. More fur-seal skins from the Pribilof Islands have been sold in Europe than in the United States.

Mr. MANN. They are taken to Europe to be dyed.

Mr. LLOYD. The fur-seal skins used in the United States, as a rule, are not the ones taken from the Pribilof Islands. They are from an inferior species of seal.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. I remember I bought one some years ago, but they went out of fashion, and I held it for a time, until I could see if it would get in fashion, and I am waiting until I get money enough to buy another. Of course, if they go out of fashion, they will not bring as high a price, unless you get them in fashion again. I notice the number of seals killed is nearly 75 per cent more this year than before. The excuse is given that they need to kill more for food. Are they getting around the law forbidding the killing of seals for skins in that manner?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think not. I do not think they killed any more than were necessary for food purposes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. As I have had occasion to notice in the press, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] very freely predicts that we shall have a Republican President and administration two years from now [applause on the Republican side], and with them a return to full prosperity and the full ability of the people of the country to buy anything at any price they want. Now, if he believes what he says about that, is not that a good reason, from his standpoint, for putting off the sale of these skins until the expected good times arrive?

Mr. MANN. Well, that would be the only sensible reason for holding them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, if that is a prophecy, I believe we had better sell them now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me five minutes in opposition to this bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on first consideration certainly this proposition does not strike one with entire favor. As far as the record discloses, the only sales held in the United States of these sealskins resulted in better prices than the department had been obtaining for what they had been sending to Europe. It strikes me as rather an un-American idea that in this important seal industry, which the Government is protecting and preserving, the only product we have to sell should be shipped over to London to find an entirely foreign market.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. GORDON. Do you think there was any good and sufficient reason for the cotton growers to hold their cotton last fall, when it was selling for only 6 cents a pound?

Mr. MARTIN. I apprehend so; but I think that is quite foreign to this inquiry.

Mr. GORDON. I was not in favor of the Government buying it. The gentleman from Illinois was; but I was not.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was not in favor of it, and I am glad the gentleman was not.

Mr. GORDON. Did you not say that if the Republicans were in power they would give relief to the cotton growers?

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I did not say the Government would buy the cotton and hold it.

Mr. GORDON. That was the only relief they were asking for.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to answer this suggestion. In the first place, even if what was suggested by the gentleman from Ohio were true, that would have been no excuse for the Government's going into the cotton business and speculating on cotton futures.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. So that it is not apropos to this inquiry. I say it strikes me as quite un-American that it has been the policy of this department heretofore to take the product of the American seal fisheries abroad to seek a market there; and the fact that it was a mistake has been demonstrated in the only sale they ever have had in this country, the last sale, which was held at St. Louis, at which the sealskins brought a higher price and at a smaller expense than ever before.

Mr. GORDON. Would you favor the Government selling them abroad if they could get a better price there than they could here at home?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not say that. I say that an American product of this character had better be put up for sale in the usual way at public auction; and unless there is a very good reason shown to the contrary, I believe they could be sold here just as advantageously as abroad. It is just as easy for foreign buyers to come to America for this product as it is for Americans to go abroad and compete in London at a foreign sale of American products.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Does the gentleman understand that this bill proposes to require these sealskins to be sold abroad?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not; but I do understand that the suggestion is made not to sell them at the present time because of conditions abroad.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The fact is that under the present administration they have changed the place of sale from London to St. Louis, and the only object of this bill is to postpone the sale so that foreign buyers may come to St. Louis and buy these sealskins.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Ohio referred to the cotton question. Is not the real difference on that question this: That whereas there were 15,000,000 bales of cotton, sufficient to clothe the entire world, there are only 3,284 sealskins, or not nearly sufficient to give sealskin coats to all the ladies in Washington?

Mr. MARTIN. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is very pertinent—that we have nothing before us to indicate an improved market by holding these skins. There is no suggestion in the report of an appreciating market. Indeed, it would appear that the department has not made any sufficient examination of this question to know whether the market is liable to go down or to go up in the

future. The comment on this subject by the Assistant Secretary is—

At the present time it is quite impossible to determine when the interests of the Government will require the sale to be held.

Now, considering the general conditions in Europe, which are having a tendency to impoverish the people who have heretofore been purchasers of these sealskins in foreign markets, it is quite possible that to hold these skins for a longer continuation of this war, with the supply increasing in our own hands and with the next year's product coming in—to hold these sealskins for a year—may logically be expected to reduce the price the Government will probably receive for them when the sale does take place. I think it would be much better and much more American to proceed as the statute directs with this sale. Certainly no great loss will come to the Government thereby.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield me a couple of minutes?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois two minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the committee to pass this resolution brings before us a very curious situation. Over at the other end of the Capitol we have a filibuster in progress on account of the attempt of the administration to buy ships, to reduce the earning power of the ships that are already owned by American citizens. A little while ago the Congress passed the Clayton bill, to prevent the people of the United States engaged in industrial enterprises from charging prices that would yield them a profit. This is beautiful in its inconsistency. I do not believe there is any justification for the enactment of such a resolution as this under the circumstances which have gone before. Everything that Congress has done within the last two years has tended to reduce the possibility of any American citizen making a living. The majority of this Congress have particularly placed the stamp of their disapproval on any attempt on the part of any man in America having anything for sale to get such a price as would yield him a profit; and now it is proposed that the Government shall become a storage house for 3,280 sealskins until the time comes when the American people will be compelled to pay a higher price, and thereby the Government reap more profit, because it wants to enter into the field of speculation in the sale of sealskins. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of the Government speculating in sealskins or trying to obtain a high profit from sealskins. It is a question of the Government trying to obtain a fair and reasonable price for the sealskins that it owns which come from the Pribilof Islands. There are no speculative features about it. There ought not to be any politics in it. What is the situation? Prior to 1912 the seals in the Pribilof Islands were killed in any way without respect to their sex or the seasons. Consequently the herd diminished to a very large extent and there was a great amount of sealskins that were put upon the market. At that time and up until last year there had been but one sealskin market in the world, and that was London. It was said in the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee that there were two firms, I believe, that knew the process of preparing these sealskins so that they could be utilized into fur coats and otherwise; but since the enactment of the law in 1912 that the killing of any seals in the Pribilof Islands, except for necessary use of the natives, they have obtained very few sealskins, and these now proposed to be taken off the market are the ones they have, which is a small amount. It is true that at St. Louis last year they obtained a fair price for the sealskins, 5 per cent increase over what they had received in London the year before; but the report shows that the foreign buyers were there, that the London firms had representatives there, and that those firms who knew how to prepare the sealskins paid the price for them. I submit that under the present condition of affairs in this country brought on by the European war, when the people are unable to pay a reasonable price for these luxuries, that they ought not to be placed on the market to be sacrificed. They have been in the habit in England and in foreign countries of using sealskin coats more than in this country, and it looks to me as though it would be in the interest of economy and would show on our part good common sense if the Government would withhold from the market the sale of these sealskins at this time in order that at some future time we can sell them for a reasonable and fair price and not for the purpose, as the gentlemen on that side say, to speculate and to get from the American people some fictitious and high price.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of Senate joint resolution 214, a resolution identical in language with the one now pending, and that the same be considered now in lieu of the House joint resolution 391.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of Senate joint resolution 214 and substitute the same for House joint resolution 391, the two being identical. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman from Missouri to state whether the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs is also a fur-seal resolution?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is identical with the one that we are now considering.

Mr. MOORE. Then there is something of conflict in the matter of the reference of the resolution?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senate resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I introduced the resolution now pending, and it was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MOORE. There is now a fur-seal resolution before the Committee on Ways and Means. I was wondering how we are going to keep track of these different resolutions.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to have jurisdiction of all of this legislation, because it grows out of treaties between this country, England, and Japan. Most of the legislation has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. All important legislation recently has been reported by that committee. This resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but when it came from the Senate a similar resolution, identical in language, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MOORE. I should be very glad to see the question settled. I am giving the House information that the Ways and Means Committee is considering fur-seal legislation at the present time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But that is a different bill.

Mr. MOORE. Presumably upon the ground that it is a revenue measure. Here are three fur-seal bills or resolutions coming from three different committees.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. As I understand it, the bill before the Committee on Ways and Means has reference to transferring some sealskins from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice, and the reference was a mistake.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs surrendered its jurisdiction over this resolution, as I understand it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; but not to affect its jurisdiction in the future. This is a good opportunity to get this resolution through, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs is very glad to see the gentleman from Missouri get it through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on House joint resolution 391.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passing the House joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALEXANDER) there were—ayes 46, noes 23.

So the joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATES OF REGISTRY OF VESSELS ABROAD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 18686.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18686) to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That consular officers of the United States and the collector of customs of Manila, P. I., are hereby authorized to issue

provisional certificates of registry to vessels abroad which have been purchased by citizens of the United States, including corporations, as defined in section 4132, Revised Statutes, as amended by the Panama Canal act and the act of August 18, 1914.

(a) Such a provisional certificate shall entitle the vessel to the privileges of a vessel of the United States in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila until the expiration of 6 months from its date or until 10 days after the vessel's arrival at a port of the United States, whichever first happens, and no longer. On arrival at a port of the United States the vessel shall become subject to the laws relating to officers, inspection, and measurement, as amended by the act of August 18, 1914.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe the conditions in accordance with which such provisional certificates shall be issued and the manner in which they shall be surrendered in exchange for certificates of registry at ports of the United States.

(c) The form of such certificate shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Navigation and shall include the name of the ship and of the master, time and place of purchase and names of purchasers, and the best particulars respecting her tonnage, build, description, and inspection or survey which the consular officer is able to obtain.

(d) Copies of such provisional certificates shall be forwarded as soon as practicable by the issuing officer to the Commissioner of Navigation.

SEC. 2. That section 4165 of the Revised Statutes and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1897, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation," are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its passage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may wish to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill requires really but very little explanation. The purpose of the bill is stated in the title, which proclaims it to be a bill to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for certain other necessary features that attach to and concern the issue of those certificates. The precise situation which requires this legislation is this: Should an American citizen purchase a ship abroad to-day and desire to bring that ship into a port of the United States, where alone he can secure complete registry under our act of August, 1914, he would be confronted with the following situation: As soon as his vessel arrived at a port in this country, not having received theretofore and not having been able to receive theretofore, any complete registry, he would be compelled to pay certain penalties under our existing laws. These penalties once paid he would enter the port, apply for registry, secure the same, and then make application to have the penalties refunded.

As a matter of course, there is no reason why penalties should be imposed that thereafter as a matter of course would be remitted. The purpose of this bill is to allow certain consular officers abroad, upon such a state of facts as are predicated in this bill, to issue provisional certificate of registry. The American purchaser could then bring his ship home and be entitled to enter an American port. Once in this port, he could secure a complete registry. This is the entire situation, and I take it there will be no opposition whatever to the passage of this legislation. There is one amendment, however, that will be proposed on the part of the committee.

Mr. MANN. I did not hear what the gentleman said about an amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I said that an amendment would be proposed on the part of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Now, the act of August last—how long does that remain in force as to the registration of vessels?

Mr. SAUNDERS. How long does the act of August remain in force with respect to the registration of vessels?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understand that there is no limitation in that respect.

Mr. MANN. I was under the impression that a vessel had to be registered under that act within a certain length of time.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not recall such a provision.

Mr. MANN. I may be incorrect about that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There is no limitation, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The limitation was merely upon the power of the President to suspend certain provisions of the navigation laws.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The President was authorized to suspend the provisions of the law in reference to captains and watch officers.

Mr. MANN. I take it that paragraph (c), where it says "the form of such certificate," that that refers to the provisional certificate and not to the certificate of registration?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; that relates to the provisional certificate.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman insert the word "provisional," because just before that it refers to the certificate of registration.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There is no reason whatever why the word "provisional" should not be inserted

Mr. MANN. So it will show it is the provisional certificate and not the regular certificate.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There is no reason why that should not be done.

Mr. MANN. And the preceding paragraph just above it refers to certificates of registration at ports of the United States.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If the gentleman from Illinois will offer his amendment there will be no objection on this side.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will suggest that amendment, if it is agreeable to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can offer it.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. What method is pursued now in case an American citizen buys a ship in a foreign port?

Mr. SAUNDERS. He is given certain papers, which, in effect, allow the very thing to be done that is contemplated by this statute, but the papers given are not styled a provisional certificate. This act provides for such a certificate, and makes our practice in this respect conform to the practices of other nationalities with relation to ships that seek to come in under their flags.

Mr. MARTIN. As I take it from the report, some certificates are now given by our consular officers under those circumstances?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; and this certificate is intended to supersede the papers now issued, and furnish an authoritative and uniform method of procedure for the future.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] that from the foundation of the Government if an American citizen bought a ship abroad he could go before the American consul and have a bill of sale made out and executed, and the consul would issue him a certificate to the effect that that vessel was a vessel belonging to an American citizen and it was entitled to fly the American flag, and with that certificate on board that vessel would be entitled to the protection of this Government wherever it might go. That, however, was not a certificate of registration or a provisional certificate of registration. That vessel was not permitted to come into the home port with passengers or cargo under heavy penalties; and we have another bill following this, to repeal certain other provisions of law which are a limitation upon the entry of an American-owned ship when brought into ports of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. In case this bill in its present form should pass, would the Government here in Washington have advisory power over the certificate of the consular agent that would enable the Government to correct any mistakes or misapprehensions upon the part of the consular agent in issuing that preliminary certificate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, yes; if this bill becomes a law, of course there will be furnished specific directions and forms to be followed in every case, and he would report to the Department of Commerce and his acts would be subject to supervisory control by the department.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is carried in paragraph (c), on page 2.

Mr. MANN. That is carried in paragraph (a), lines 5 to 8, on page 2. If it comes to the United States it becomes subject to the laws of the United States.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Paragraph (a) carries what will be the effect of the certificate. I was referring to the form in which it would be carried.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it would be covered by lines 5 to 8, on page 2, but it occurs to me that it ought to be settled without any question that the work of a consular agent is only preliminary in such a matter, inasmuch as the whole matter might be undone in a particular case by the authorities here.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is the purpose of the bill, and I have no doubt it sufficiently carries that thought.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will my friend explain the purpose of section 2 in providing for the repeal of section 4165 of the Revised Statutes, and also section 10 of the act of March 3, 1897? I notice in the Revised Statutes before me that section 4165 provides for reregistry of an American vessel with American registry which has been captured or condemned as a result of war.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The answer to that will be found in a document which is referred to in the report, and which the chairman of the committee happens to have in his hand and will read from.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, section 2 of the bill provides that section 4165 of the Revised Statutes and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1897, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation" are hereby repealed.

I will read:

SEC. 10. That section 4165 of the Revised Statutes be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4165. A vessel registered pursuant to law, which by sale has become the property of a foreigner, shall be entitled to a new register upon afterwards becoming American property, unless it has been enlarged or undergone change in build outside of the United States."

This provision was made obsolete by the act of August 18, 1914, the ship-registry act.

Now, section 2 repeals that section, because the act of August 18, 1914, known as the ship-registry act, provides that foreign-built ships may be admitted to American registry. There is no reason why an American-built ship, if it should be sold to a foreigner and should again seek admission to American registry, should be precluded by the fact that she had undergone some alterations or changes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield further? This bill provides that the provisional certificate shall act so as to give an American status to a vessel for six months unless it sooner comes into a port of the United States. Suppose it does not come into a port of the United States at all, and a provisional certificate runs, but at the end of six months when the vessel is engaged in foreign trade under the American flag, what is there to prevent the vessel owner going to another consul and getting a new provisional certificate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I assume that our consular agents are informed from time to time of the issuance of these provisional certificates and registries.

Mr. MANN. I think it is a violent presumption to suppose that a consular officer at some place would know all the provisional certificates that might have been issued at some other place, even if he had been informed. But suppose he knew it? The bill specifically provides that he shall grant a provisional certificate. Ought there not to be something in here that will limit the matter so that one vessel can only get one provisional certificate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The question in the committee was whether or not if the vessel failed to enter a home port within a year the consul should have power to issue a second provisional certificate, but the committee were of the opinion that if the vessel did not return to the home port within the time the second certificate should not be issued. And reports must be made by our consuls of the issuance of these certificates immediately after they are issued, and if another consul, without knowledge of the fact that a certificate had been issued and the time had expired, should improvidently issue a second certificate, I presume the department would revoke it as soon as it had knowledge of that fact.

Mr. MANN. The bill authorizes the issuance of such a certificate. Ought not the bill to limit it to one provisional certificate to any one vessel?

Mr. ALEXANDER. My judgment is that the bill does that. The question was raised in the committee that it did, and I recall that a member of the committee suggested that express authority for the issuance of a second certificate should be provided, but that did not seem to be the judgment of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The committee did not want to give the authority to issue a second certificate, but I think the bill does give that authority.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The committee did not think so, and his notion was that it should. The committee did not concur in that view.

Mr. MARTIN. I think, if the gentleman will permit, that there can be no reasonable doubt but that the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is correct. Here is general authority given to issue these consular certificates, and there is no suggestion made that but one certificate shall be issued to any one vessel; and I believe the gentleman would find on general interpretation and practice that this registration could go on indefinitely and the vessel do business under the American flag without having a complete American registry, but just having a provisional certificate. It seems to me it would be wise to make it clear in paragraph 1 of the bill that but one provisional certificate of registry can be issued to one vessel.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No such case as that has ever arisen. The law of Great Britain provides for the issuance of a provisional certificate, good for six months. Other European Governments, although I do not recall which ones, but I think France and Germany are among them, may issue provisional certificates for a period of 12 months; but no such case has ever arisen, so far as I know, where a second certificate was issued, and I do not think in the administration of the act that it could be done. And, as I said, if a consul should improvidently issue the second certificate, it would be revoked as soon as the department received notice to that effect; and it is his duty to notify the department immediately of the issuance of a certificate.

Mr. MANN. Can I ask another question? Is Manila considered a port of the United States? Suppose a foreign vessel engaged in trade in the Philippine Islands gets a provisional certificate. Does it have to come to a port of continental United States, or can it get a permanent certificate while it is remaining in trade in the Philippine Islands or in trading between the Philippine Islands and China and Japan?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course I would not be able to answer the question intelligently as to just what our relations with the Philippine Islands are in that regard. Guam and Tutuila have been regarded as foreign—that is, not included in our coastwise laws—but I think, generally speaking, they are ports of the United States, and the Philippine Islands are in the same relation, inasmuch as they are under the control and jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman can readily see that a vessel engaged in the Philippine Islands or in trade between the Philippine Islands and China or Japan—a vessel of small size—might be purchased by American citizens, and they might desire to remain in that trade.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And it would result in very great inconvenience.

Mr. MANN. And they could not do so unless you issued additional certificates, unless the vessel came to a port of the United States, or unless Manila is considered as a port of the United States.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And it would result in very great inconvenience?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend lines 3 and 4 of page 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALEXANDER:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "the collector of customs, Manila, P. I." and insert in lieu thereof the words "such other persons as may from time to time be designated by the President for the purpose."

Mr. ALEXANDER. The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is this: The attention of the Commissioner of Navigation was called to the fact that we might not have a consular agent in these different ports to whom application might be made for the issuance of this provisional certificate, and hence a broader power should be given; and hence the amendment that would provide that a "consular officer of the United States and such other persons as may from time to time be designated by the President for that purpose are hereby authorized to issue the certificate of registry." I think on the island of Guam we do not have a consular agent, but we have an executive officer there—a naval officer in charge—and it is intended to give the President the power to designate an officer where we have no consular officer.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE. I would like to have three or four minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman four minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Make it five minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. It is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not without elements of danger, giving to the consular officer, as it does, a great deal of discretion in the matter of determining the ownership of the vessel. There is much interest just now in the matter of American ownership of foreign bottoms because of the European war. The State Department has before it two or three cases at the present time. The *Dacia* case is very well known to the gentleman from Missouri.

A new case has arisen in the last two or three days which develops a possible risk in what might result from the issue by consular officers of certificates that would practically settle the question of American ownership of vessels built in foreign countries. The case that has arisen in the last few days concerns a foreign-built vessel purchased by an American oil company, and this bill contemplates the purchase of foreign vessels by "corporations" as well as by individuals.

I read from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of this morning:

Though the vessel flew the Roumanian flag, she has never engaged in the Roumanian trade, and was formerly owned by a German company, capitalized for $30,000,000 by German, Austrian, and Roumanian

financiers. She was sold to the Union Petroleum Steamship Co. for $600,000.

I quote that statement for the purpose of suggesting that if that vessel had been purchased at Manila, and the collector of the port, to whom the power is delegated here, had given a provisional certificate, he would have taken on himself a very great deal of authority with regard to the possible consequences of purchasing a ship that might involve this Nation's neutrality. The reference to this case of the ship flying the Roumanian flag, purchased by Americans, continues in this wise:

The name of the German corporation which built and owned the *Steaua Romana* is the Steaua Romana Aktien-Gesellschaft fuer Petroleum-Industrie (Steaua Romana Joint Stock Co. for the Petroleum Industry). The president is Arthur von Gwinner, a leading German financier, a member of the upper house of the Prussian Diet and a personal friend of the Kaiser.

That is the origin of the ship. I read further:

The president of the Union Petroleum Steamship Co. is A. C. Woodman, of Philadelphia, who is also vice president and treasurer of the Union Petroleum Co. Mr. Woodman said to-night that the vessel was purchased with American capital by himself and two other Americans at Bremen.

The presumption is that if Mr. Woodman's statement is correct he had a right to purchase this foreign ship, and would have had a right to receive a provisional certificate if it had been purchased at some such port as Manila or any other port where the consular officer would act. The report in regard to this matter concludes:

It has been suggested that if this steamship is to continue in trade with Germany she not only raises the question whether a former German-owned ship may transfer her flag and continue in the same trade, as in the *Dacia* case—

With which the gentleman from Missouri is familiar—

but also the question as to whether the real money interests involved in the transaction are to be considered.

Now, the gentleman may be assured that no question of neutrality is involved in the consideration of this bill, and yet it would seem that if a ship, like the one just referred to, had been purchased abroad by an individual or corporation, a petroleum company or a cotton concern, or the United States Steel Corporation, it might have obtained a certificate from a consular officer who, without being in very immediate contact with his superiors in Washington, would determine the question of the validity of the purchase or the sale.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUTLER rose.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] first. I wish to call attention to the fact that from the foundation of the Government certificates have been issued by our consular agents to the owners of vessels purchased by citizens of the United States; that is, foreign-built vessels.

Now, the earliest and clearest expression of this right, and of the distinction between vessels built at home and those built abroad when owned by American citizens, is found in an opinion of Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, May 3, 1793:

The persons and property of our citizens are entitled to the protection of our Government in all places where they may lawfully go. No laws forbid a merchant to buy, own, and use a foreign-built vessel. She is, then, his lawful property and entitled to the protection of his Nation whenever he is lawfully using her.

The laws, indeed, for the encouragement of shipbuilding, have given to home-built vessels the exclusive privilege of being registered and paying lighter duties. To this privilege, therefore, the foreign-built vessel, though owned at home, does not pretend. But the laws have not said that they withdraw their protection from the foreign-built vessel. To this protection, then, she retains her title, notwithstanding the preference given to the home-built vessel as to duties. It would be hard indeed, because the law has given one valuable right to home-built vessels, to infer that it has taken away all rights from those foreign built.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell us at what time that statement was made?

Mr. ALEXANDER. While Mr. Jefferson was Secretary of State.

Mr. MOORE. This is a statement of Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Of course the gentleman knows that there was a very wide difference of opinion as to foreign and domestic commerce between Mr. Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton and the Federalists.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We are talking about conditions as they existed, not theories.

Mr. MOORE. But foreign-built ships coming in to compete with American-built ships is a very serious condition.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let me answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania first. The consular regulations affecting a foreign vessel transferred abroad to a citizen of the United States provide:

341. Right to acquire property in foreign ships: The right of citizens of the United States to acquire property in foreign ships has been held to be a natural right, independent of statutory law, and such property is as much entitled to protection by the United States as any other property of a citizen of the United States.

* * * * * * *

343. Record of bill of sale, certificate, etc.: In view of existing regulations, and to enable the owners of a vessel so situated to protect their rights, if molested or questioned by a consular officer, though forbidden by law to grant any marine document or certificate of ownership, may lawfully make record of the bill of sale in his office, authenticate its execution, and deliver to the purchaser a certificate to that effect certifying, also, that the owner is a citizen of the United States. Before granting such a certificate the consular officer will require tonnage of the vessel to be duly ascertained in pursuance of law and insert the same in the description of the vessel in his certificate. (Form No. 35.) These facts thus authenticated, if the transfer is in good faith, entitle the vessel to protection as the lawful property of a citizen of the United States; and the authentication of the bill of sale and of citizenship will be prima facie proof of such good faith.

344. Consul's responsibility: The authority of a consular officer to authenticate the transfer of a foreign vessel is wide in its effects and imposes great responsibility in making him, in the first instance at least, the sole judge of the good faith of the transaction. The question of the honesty and good faith of such a sale rises into the gravest importance in the event of a war between two or more powers in which the Government of the United States is a neutral. In such a war experience justifies the expectation that the citizens or subjects of one or more of the belligerents will seek to protect their shipping by transfer to a neutral flag. In some instances this may honestly be done, but the sales of the vessels of belligerents in appreciation of or in time of war are always and properly liable to suspicion, and they justify the strictest inquiry on the part of the belligerent, who may thereby have been defrauded of his right to capture the enemy's property. The acceptance of the pretended ownership of a vessel under these circumstances may be very profitable, and the temptation to abuse his trust in such a case to which a consular officer is subjected may be too great for persons of ordinary integrity, discernment, and firmness to withstand. Instances are not wanting in which citizens of the United States who were wholly incapable from their previous well-known condition and pursuits of making such a purchase have appeared as owners under sales of this character and have sought for them the protection of the Government.

345. Careful investigation enjoined: It is the duty of a consular officer to use all available means, especially during the existence of a war to which this Government is not a party, to satisfy himself that this sale of a vessel is made in good faith, and without a fraudulent intent. A considerable discretion and responsibility rests upon him in the determination of the good faith of such transactions. It is not to be concluded that all such sales, even in time of peace, are honest and free from collusion or fraud. It is the duty of the consular officer to notice all circumstances that throw doubt on the good faith of the transaction or point to its fictitious character, and, if he is satisfied in this respect, to refuse to grant his certificate. On the other hand, he is not permitted to regard the mere fact of the sale of a vessel to a citizen of the United States as any evidence of fraud. The presumption must be otherwise, and, in the absence of any indication of dishonesty, a sale in the regular way, with the usual business formalities, is to be regarded as made in good faith.

346. Certificate, when to be issued: When a consular officer shall have satisfied himself, after the investigation with which he is charged, that the sale of a vessel is not fictitious, and is made in good faith, and that the purchaser is a citizen of the United States, it is his duty, when requested, to record the bill of sale in the consulate, and to deliver the original to the purchaser, with his certificate annexed thereto, according to Form No. 35. A copy of the bill of sale, together with any other papers belonging to the transfer, and of the consular certificate should be sent without delay to the Department of State, with a report of the facts and circumstances of the transaction.

347. Right to fly the flag: The privilege of carrying the flag of the United States is under the regulation of Congress, and it may have been the intention of that body that it should be used only by a regularly documented vessel. No such intention, however, is found in any statute. * * *

348. Disabilities of foreign-built vessels: It should be understood that foreign-built vessels not registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, although wholly owned by citizens thereof, can not legally import goods, wares, or merchandise from foreign ports and are not allowed in the coasting trade. (R. S., sec. 2497, 4311.)

349. Forfeiture and tonnage dues: On arrival from a foreign port undocumented foreign-built vessels, if laden with goods, wares, or merchandise, may, with their cargoes, be subject to forfeiture. (R. S., sec. 2497. See tariff act of 1894, sec. 15.) If in ballast only, or with passengers without cargo, they will be subject to a discriminating tonnage duty. (R. S., sec. 4219; 19 Stat. L., 250.) When in foreign ports they are also subject to tonnage and other consular fees, from which regularly documented vessels are exempt. For instructions respecting the shipment and discharge and relief of seamen on vessels of this character, and the collection of extra wages, consular officers are referred to the several articles on these subjects.

Now, these consular regulations have been in force, you might say, from the beginning, but since we now admit foreign-built ships to American registry this act is intended to do no more than to issue the provisional certificate of registry until the vessel can come into the home port.

Mr. KENT. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KENT. Does this bring up the question of the purchase of ships that may belong to belligerents?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not at all. It does not affect that question at all.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the gentleman's question? I did not hear it.

Mr. KENT. I asked the question whether this proposition brings up the right of an American to buy a belligerent's ship and thereupon hanging the American flag on it. The gentleman said it did not.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will permit me, I had it in my mind to ask just such a question as the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] has asked. I understand that when this certificate is issued the vessel will have all the privileges and security given it that an American vessel could have. Do we not run some risk in permitting all these different consular agents to issue these provisional certificates and put these ships under the American flag? Do we not run an additional risk that we should not now run? And let me ask the gentleman, why should we at this time pass a provision of this kind which adds to the dangers with which, it seems to me, we are already surrounded? Am I too apprehensive?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so. We are simply making the law harmonize with the act of August 18, 1914, the ship-registry act.

Mr. BUTLER. I voted against the act of last August because I was afraid it would lead us into trouble, such as we are liable to now have with the *Dacia*. This is a continuation of the effect of the law of August 18.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This is simply to make the existing law harmonize with the act of August 18, 1914. We have a companion bill to this that I will call up next. At present, even although an American citizen buys a foreign-built ship, he can not bring it into an American port except under penalties, and the companion bill to this one will remove those penalties. A request came to us from the Department of Commerce to make the law harmonize with the provisions of that act.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe the conditions governing the purchase of these ships, and that the consuls will be expected to recognize the conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, but I doubt very much whether it is wise, in view of the dangers that confront us and are round about us, to pass this bill at present. I do not intend to minimize the worthiness of our consuls, but we do not always know what their abilities are, and this gives them the privilige of putting a foreign-built ship under the protection of the American flag, thereby increasing the risks that we already have.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman they have had that privilege for more than a hundred years, and they could do it whether this bill is passed or not.

Mr. BUTLER. Then there is no reason why we should pass the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It does not enlarge our liability in that respect at all.

Mr. KENT. Is it not a further recognition of the right to fly the American flag on a ship that may possibly cover belligerent origin?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is; but I think we are putting this under greater safeguards.

Mr. BUTLER. If I could see it, I would cheerfully vote for the gentleman's bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to make this statement of fact to him? There are certain German vessels now interned in the Delaware River. They have been lying there at anchor since the outbreak of hostilities. They could not be purchased by American citizens without a question of neutrality arising in this country. Are we not taking a very great risk in permitting consuls to determine the right of Americans in foreign countries to purchase under the circumstances?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think not. These provisional certificates are not conclusive evidence of the good faith of the transfer.

Mr. MOORE. Are we not conferring upon the consul a privilege and a discretion which we do not accord to our own officers in the United States at the present time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think not. I think we throw further safeguards about it, in my judgment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to vote against the bill, if I can get my mind clear. I am not inquiring to get into the RECORD or to be factious. I want my mind to be at ease, because I am one of the few Members of this House, perhaps, who proposes not to vote for anything that will complicate us with a belligerent. I would rather this Government would purchase the material we are now sending abroad and store it, if by purchasing it we could save ourselves from foreign complications. The gentleman has stated in his report that our policy with reference to foreign-built ships has radically changed. Does this increase in any way the authority heretofore given to these consular agents?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It does authorize them to issue a provisional certificate of registry.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman says that the consul had the authority to do that heretofore?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; he could not issue a certificate of registry heretofore.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought not, from the report; but I must have misunderstood the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The radical change in our navigation laws is this: Until the Panama Canal act was passed providing that foreign-built ships not more than 5 years old could be admitted to American registry no foreign-built ship could be admitted to American registry. The act of August 18, 1914, does no more than to remove the limitation of 5 years in the Panama Canal act, and permits foreign-built ships without reference to age to be admitted to American registry, and gives the President of the United States power to suspend the provisions of law with reference to the masters and watch officers of the vessels for certain stated periods. That is the whole of that act. But we are confronted with this condition: An American citizen may buy a foreign-built ship abroad and put it under the American flag. There is no provision made by law for the issuance of a provisional certificate of registry until he can get that vessel home, and when he gets home he is confronted by tonnage and light dues and tariff taxes, if the vessel contains a cargo, thus penalizing him if he brings that vessel into an American port. These two bills are intended to bring existing statutes in harmony with the act of August 18 in those regards.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit a little further. If, then, an American citizen or an American corporation should purchase a ship in Germany or in France or in England, an American consul in one of those countries will be authorized to issue a provisional certificate which will put that ship immediately under the control and protection and safeguard of the American Nation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Very well; and now an American citizen can buy one of those ships and go before an American consul, produce his certificate of sale, and if on investigation the consul is of opinion that the purchase is in good faith, the consul will certify to that fact and issue him a certificate, and the owner of that vessel can float the American flag, and will be under the protection of our Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Therefore it does not give the consul any greater authority than he already has had.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It does, because it goes further and authorizes him to issue a provisional certificate of registry.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the ship would have to-day, before this law is passed, just as much protection from the American Government as it would have after this bill is passed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Simply because it belongs to a citizen of the United States, and affords that protection our Government undertakes to give to every citizen of the United States or to the property of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish I could see the reason for the passage of this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In no essential particular does it increase the protection of the individual or give him an opportunity to imperil the Government beyond the present practice.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 2, line 14, by inserting between the words "such" and "certificate" the word "provisional."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "such," insert the word "provisional."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE) there were—ayes 35, noes 6.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL PENALTIES ON FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS OWNED BY AMERICANS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 18685) to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18685, with Mr. BORLAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18685, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 18685. A bill to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SIMS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The messafe also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7212. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 6981. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments" for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments" for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments" for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 25, 1915:

S. 4012. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States public building at Great Junction, Colo.; and

S. 6309. An act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

On January 28, 1915:

S. 2337. An act to create the Coast Guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service.

TO REPEAL PENALTIES ON FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS OWNED BY AMERICANS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of sections 4219 and 4225 of the Revised Statutes as imposes tonnage duties of 50 cents per ton and light money of 50 cents per ton on a vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States; so much of section 4J, subsection 1, of the act of October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," as imposes a discriminating duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on all goods, wares, or merchandise imported in a vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States; and so much of section 4J, subsection 2, of the act aforesaid as provides for the forfeiture of any vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States, together with her cargo, tackle, apparel, and furniture, are hereby repealed. Any such tonnage duties, light money, or discriminating duties collected since the passage of the act of August 18, 1914, shall be refunded, and any such forfeitures incurred are hereby remitted.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I can state the purpose of this bill very briefly, indeed in even less time than was required for the bill just passed. This bill is a companion measure to that bill, and is a corollary to the act of August, 1914.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Does this repeal a provision of the so-called Underwood tariff law?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It simply repeals the imposition of certain duties that were heretofore laid on ships bought abroad, and sought to be introduced into the foreign trade under the American flag.

Mr. MOORE. But the bill proposes to repeal a section of the tariff act known as the Underwood tariff law.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What section does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. MOORE. That is the reason I objected to dispensing with the first reading, as I wanted to see what this is.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman refer to line 10?

Mr. MOORE. Well, there is a repealer here of a section of the act—I read it hurriedly—of subsection of the act of October 3, 1913, which I understand to be the Underwood tariff law.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The imposition of a discriminating duty of 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; that is what I refer to.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries brings in a bill to repeal the tariff law we passed, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, which is now known as the Underwood tariff law. Is not that an unusual procedure?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why, no. This act is a penalty-repealing act. Hence the inclusion of the repeal of the cognate penalties in the Underwood bill is perfectly proper.

Mr. MOORE. The act having come from the Committee on Ways and Means, would it not have been proper, under the procedure of the House, to have had the repealing clause referred to that committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I do not think that would be necessary. This particular repeal is cognate to the other penalty repeals.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I will be very glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I said this act is really a corollary to the act of August, 1914. Our laws for many years have contained a provision imposing a 50-cent tonnage tax, and what is known as a light duty, amounting to another 50 cents a ton, the aggregate being $1 a ton. The purpose of these penalties was to make it impossible for an American ship bought abroad by American capital, to enter an American port, and participate in our foreign trade under the flag of the United States. It was hoped that the imposition of these penalties, would deter American capital from buying ships abroad and promote shipbuilding in American yards.

However the act was utterly impotent to accomplish the end contemplated, and the prohibitive cost of ships built in American yards, has made it impossible for American capital using American ships to enter the field of foreign trade. The House will recall that in August last we passed the statute under which American capitalists buying ships abroad can register the same under the American flag, and enter American ports so as to participate in the foreign trade of this country.

Since that law was enacted a great many ships heretofore flying foreign flags but owned by American capital, have registered under the same, and now fly the American flag. Hence our policy which imposed these penalties has been changed, it is altogether proper that the law imposing penalties should be repealed. It is no longer intended that these penalties should be collected. Hence the propriety of the repeal of the statute that imposes them.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have not had much time to look into this matter. Personally I believe in protecting all men who build ships in this country and in giving to them the preference over foreign labor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I say to my friend in that connection that all that is gone now when we passed the act of August, 1914. This does not do anything more than to remove the penalties which are no longer imposed, but they hang over the vessels while on the law books and they ought to be formally put out of the way, as they are no longer operative.

Mr. MOORE. I understood that from the gentleman's statement, but I also understood that in this indirect way the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in pursuance of its policy of rehabilitating the American merchant marine, is taking a step which is in the nature of a repealer of part of a tariff act passed by the Democratic Party in this House. Here is a tariff-law provision which our friends upon the other side propose to amend by way of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—the 10 per cent discriminating-duty clause of the Underwood tariff law. Evidently it is to be taken down in order that the policy set up by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be followed out.

I said in the beginning I believe in encouraging industries in the United States. That includes the employment of American labor. Here is a provision to encourage shipbuilding in foreign countries, and to give an opportunity for the employment of labor in foreign lands to work off their surplus energy upon the people of the United States.

Now, I understand that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I believe the gentleman voted against the immigration bill?

Mr. MOORE. I did.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I voted for it.

Mr. MOORE. And I think I was right in voting against the immigration bill. That was a question of literacy. In voting for American ships I am voting to keep out foreign conditions that would prejudice the labor that enters the United States. There is a vast difference between admitting the blood and bone and sinew that comes from a foreign country and seeks American wage conditions and admitting the product of that foreign bone and sinew that works at home under foreign conditions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then, if I understand the gentleman, it is not possible by a large immigration of foreigners to this country to create a congestion in the labor market and lower the price of labor, but it is possible by bringing in foreign-made goods to cheapen the price of goods at home? I think the same rule will apply in both cases.

Mr. MOORE. We will have that question up for full discussion to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether or not the regulation requiring ships registered under the American flag should be applied in America and also the regulation that they must employ Americans on those vessels have had anything to do with driving the American merchant marine from the sea? What is the cause of the decline?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's question may be answered by a reference to the shipyards on the Delaware River. During Republican times they have 5,000 men employed in one yard, supporting 25,000 people, and 5,000 employed in another yard, supporting another 25,000 people. Then the tariff and the Democratic merchant-marine policy proposes that we shall buy ships abroad, ships made by labor under foreign conditions and which receives one-quarter or one-half the price paid to the wage earners on the Delaware. The result is evident. I am for maintaining workmen in America at the American standard of wages, and while I have an interest in the general welfare of mankind, I do not believe that the United States is yet capable of alleviating all the distress that prevails in every country.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], who a moment or two ago questioned me upon the matter of immigration, has just pressed through the House a bill which proposes to enlarge the opportunity of speculative Americans and owners of yachts to buy the product of cheap labor, without special conditions and without regard to the welfare of the labor of the United States. Large corporations—not the individual American citizens referred to in the bill, but large corporations mentioned in the bill, and men some of whom are now organizing companies for the purpose of profiting upon the wretchedness and necessities of the people abroad, may buy foreign ships cheap and at the foreign labor price. The bill allows that, and at the instance of the consular officers the American flag may be placed over them, irrespective of American workmen or the risk of violating our neutrality with foreign nations. They can engage in trade between other countries and with us at the expense of the working people of the United States and American citizens in general.

While some of our own Members are in doubt upon this question, I plead for a restoration of the American merchant marine upon the basis of the employment of American talent and skill in drafting the plans and the employment of American mechanics and laborers in fabricating and constructing the materials. At the present time it would aid in obtaining a happy and free circulation of money in the United States for the benefit of our own people, who, being involved in no war, are being afflicted by a Democratic tariff law, which it is now proposed by this subterfuge to in part repeal. Due to this law, there is now a lack of employment that leads to distress and poverty, wretchedness and suicide, in all the large cities of this land. Go upon the banks of the Delaware, go into all the large cities to-day, and witness the results of the Democratic tariff law put into effect October 3, 1913. Time and again we have suggested the repeal of certain sections of this law, knowing the wretchedness it would bring upon the great masses of the working people. Time and again it has been suggested that there might be some remedy; but our friends upon the other side have stood like adamant—greater "standpatters" than any former Republicans whom they denounced—insistent upon the maintenance of their policies and blinded to the consequences.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was the author of the provision in the Panama Canal act permitting foreign-built ships with American registry to enter into foreign trade. That bill was passed under a former administration and signed by President Taft, then President of the United States. The act of August, 1914, was passed in this House under suspension of the rules, and this legislation was proposed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and a few Representatives from the State of New York. On the 5th of January I was in Boston and discussed the ship-purchase bill before the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and my distinguished friend and former colleague in this House, Mr. J. Sloat Fassett, was present. I believe he is regarded as a high priest of protection, and has been in favor of ship subsidy. And in his address there he gave his express approval to the purchase of foreign-built ships and their admission to American registry for the foreign trade. So that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I am afraid, is in a class by himself on this question.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Missouri is an excellent lawyer. We all recognize his ability in the determination of intricate legal questions that come before him, but the gentleman from Missouri has not yet learned the lesson of the factory, the mill, and the workshop.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have been told by representatives of Cramps, and of the New York Shipbuilding Co., and the Newport News Co. that they have more work on hand at this juncture than they have had for a number of years past—not only battleships but commercial ships. The yards are full.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know that I have a protest from Cramps in my possession now against the passage of much of this legislation that the gentleman is bringing into the House? And I have many others.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, I think the gentleman may have a protest against a certain bill, but not——

Mr. MOORE. I have many protests——

Mr. ALEXANDER. But not against this.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to say that I am somewhat surprised at the statements made by the gentleman from Missouri about the Newport News shipbuilding yard. I happened to be down there last week, and I did not find——

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was not down there, but I had a statement last week concerning the company.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was also down there last week.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I asked the gentleman who gave me information about that company if the ship-purchase bill should pass and the Government should want to contract with the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. to build ships for the foreign trade what would be the probable cost per ton. I reminded him of the fact that the cost abroad had increased from 30 to 35 per cent since the war began in Europe, according to my information, and I wanted to know if they could build ships at 860 per ton. That would be $25 per ton in excess of the normal price of a tramp ship in Europe. He said, "We could not now, because we have plenty of work."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, if the gentleman will yield just a moment——

Mr. MOORE. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know. The gentleman is always contending for calamity.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman always has reason for fearing calamity when there is a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; the gentleman is a calamity howler. I have been an optimist all my life, and I hope I shall never become a calamity howler.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Missouri is a calamity producer. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no. People who indulge in calamity howling always get the worst of it. But that is apart from the merits of this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I know how earnest the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] is, and I think I am not mistaken in paying him this tribute: That no committee chairman of his party has done more, since the blight of Democracy overcame this country, to formulate plans to help his party establish something in the nature of a policy. He has been able and alert, but he has been mistaken. He has traveled over this country and he has gone to Europe; he has informed himself widely and largely on questions that pertain to this committee. But he does not have behind him the sentiments of the men, either in business or in the workshops, who work for a living in the United States when he encourages American citizens whose money originates in the United States to send it out of the United States into foreign countries to buy the products of foreign labor, to come back and compete with the labor of the United States. That is the vital mistake the gentleman is making.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right at that point?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not care to prolong this discussion, but I want to puncture an error right there. Prior to the enactment of the Panama Canal law providing for the admission of foreign-built ships to American registry, and the amended act of August, 1914, we were not building any ships for the foreign trade. This is a fact. We were not building ships for the foreign trade, and hence by the admission of foreign-built ships to American registry we have not prejudiced American trade. I have not committed myself to the admission of foreign-built ships to the coastwise trade. We are talking about the foreign trade.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and the gentleman a moment ago referred to the Panama Canal, and referred to one or two acts of Congress that bore upon this with a view to answering what I said as to the protection of our labor. The Panama Canal was opened as the result of Republican activity. It was to be free to the people of the United States who were struggling under the burden of heavy transportation rates. It was to have been an entering wedge from the East to the West for the commerce of the people of the United States. It was also to have been our medium of encouraging the trade of the world. The Democratic platform at Baltimore, the platform on which the present President of the United States was elected, provided that this understanding of the Republican Party should be lived up to and fulfilled, and that there should be no tolls charged to the vessels of the United States of the coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal. It was not the gentleman's committee that brought in the bill to put on the tolls that we proposed to keep off, but it was the gentleman's party that brought in the bill, and the gentleman supported that bill, which prevented the people of the United States on the east coast from passing freely through their own canal to do business with the people of the west coast. Likewise it prevented the people of the western coast from passing freely through their own canal to do business with the people on the eastern coast and the interior. It was the Democratic Party, in violation of its own platform, that raised the barriers and erected a tariff wall against the people; barriers not against a foreign power, not against the other countries of the world, but barriers against American citizens who had built the canal and paid for it with their own money. The expenses incident to the construction of that canal were a draft upon the pockets of our business men and taxpayers generally throughout the United States. They were also a charge upon the wages of men who worked in the shops. They had to pay that bill, and they expected to obtain more labor and more business in consequence of the expenditure. This you denied them. They expected, moreover, a reduction of freight rates and in the cost of living. But they were deceived. The boon was denied to them by the gentleman's own party. The gentleman's citation of the Panama Canal act in this connection is therefore unfortunate.

But what I was referring to in relation to this bill was the tendency, by virtue of the activity of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to encourage everybody on the other side of the water to do business for us, to labor for us, and to discourage us from doing anything for them or for ourselves. To-day we are seeking foreign materials to go into the very ships that are built in our shipyards. To-day even our Government itself, under the new policy of Government ownership that has been entered upon during this Democratic administration, proposes to utilize this cheap labor of Europe, not here, where it may attain the American standard, but at its home in Europe. It would beat down the prices and the wages of the men who produce in this country. Here mills are closed and workmen are upon the streets. Only yesterday up in Phoenixville a man, brought to the verge of starvation, carrying the few shirts that he and his wife were undertaking to make to obtain bread for their children, fell dead because he had not the sustenance of life. Over yonder in the Kensington mill district in my own city, right close by these shipyards which you would depopulate by this foreign-ship policy, and for which you are apologizing by the repeal of a part of this 10 per cent discriminating clause of the Underwood tariff law, one poor woman, who has dedicated her life to the welfare of the unfortunate, has taken to her bed because of scenes of poverty and distress which she and her companions have not the power to alleviate. There is no work in many of the American workshops and no work in some of the American shipyards, except for the manufacture of Government vessels or the manufacture of munitions of war for unfortunate people to slaughter each other in other lands. Oh, the temporary prosperity of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] speaks, whether it be in the shipyards or elsewhere, is the prosperity that arises from the misfortunes of the conflicting nations of Europe. A man says, "Yes; my mill is running full; running day and night."

"What are you making in your mill?"

"I am making bandages for the wounded in the armies of Europe."

Great Scott! are we boasting of this kind of prosperity? Are we proud of the fact that a mill is running somewhere to make bandages for the men who are shooting bullets into one another?

Another man says, "Over yonder at Baltimore I am running full, and the lights are burning until the early hours of the morning."

"What are you doing?"

"I am making canvas tents for Mexico or the armies on the other side of the water."

A glorious prospect this is for America. Up in Massachusetts some one tells us, "Yes; we are busy. Over in Haverhill we have a mill running all the time, three shifts a day."

"What are you making?"

"Shoes for the armies."

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman. I knew I would get a rise from the gentleman on this subject.

Mr. GARDNER. Haverhill is in my district, and I have not heard of any such thing there.

Mr. MOORE. Of course not; I transfer the illustration to Lowell or some other shoe town.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I received a letter yesterday from a gentleman who had been investigating the conditions of the various industries in Massachusetts, and he told me there were 500,000 idle men in that State now.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] rise to that statement?

Mr. GARDNER. I have about 1,000 letters from constituents wanting me to help them to get jobs.

Mr. MOORE. Do you think you can get your constituents jobs in the foreign shipyards that are building the ships that American speculators are purchasing for the purpose of carrying munitions of war? Of course not. If the gentleman answers, he would answer in the negative.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does it appear that this prosperity in Massachusetts is shown by the fact that special bills have been put through our legislature at the request of the Democratic governor within the last few days, whereby money can be appropriated out of the public treasury in order to put the unemployed at work?

Mr. MOORE. I understand that to be the fact. It is greatly to the credit of Gov. Walsh, the Democratic governor of Massachusetts, that he has taken this timely step; and I think it is very creditable to that former Member of this House, who is now mayor of Boston, Mr. Curley, that for six months before the outbreak of European hostilities he was formulating societies, he was applying to the municipal body, he was urging the citizens to raise funds to help the men who were knocking at factory doors for work, and who are actually threatened with starvation in the patriotic old town of Boston. These efforts have not been confined to Republicans. Democrats in authority have some heart, and the Democrats in national authority to-day apparently have just enough heart to yield a little bit from the standpatism that has held them in leash on their Underwood tariff bill, which the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee comes in to adjust with respect to the 10 per cent discriminating clause.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There are a number of other bills reported from the committee, in which Members of the House, including the Members from Massachusetts, are interested. Can we not reach a limit to the general debate, in order that we may then consider this bill under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MOORE. I will be very frank with the gentleman. I entered upon this discourse because of the evident desire of the chairman to press these bills through to-day. If the gentleman will recall, the gentleman from Virginia started to debate this bill before it was read. I do not know whether he intended it or not. There was no opportunity on this side of the House to read the bill. And there was very little discussion of the other bill relating to consular certificates. The time was yielded only by the courtesy of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yielded all the time that anybody wanted.

Mr. MOORE. I say it was yielded wholly by the courtesy of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Another gentleman has indicated a wish to speak 10 or 15 minutes. I think this discussion ought to be limited to a reasonable length.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and facilitate his business if I yield now 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be concluded in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the next bill the gentleman proposes to call up?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is the appointment of additional inspectors, H. R. 20282. The next bill after that will be the one providing for the appointment of assistant steamboat inspectors.

Mr. GARDNER. Which one is the gentleman going to call up first?

Mr. ALEXANDER. H. R. 20282. We have one supervising inspector on the Pacific coast now, and they claim they ought to have more. Of course, we have some fish-hatchery bills, but I do not know whether we will get to them or not. The longer this debate continues the less the hope.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Missouri that I regard this as a very important bill, as I regarded the bill just passed. It seemed to me something ought to be said upon it. Some gentlemen are now ready to discuss it, and while I desire to retain my time——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill close in 30 minutes, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. How much time has the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And of course 20 minutes of that time, if he cares to, he can yield now to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire some time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like to have six or seven minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman could get that very easily under the five-minute rule.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I shall occupy the 20 minutes, but inasmuch as this is the first attempt that has been made to amend the Underwood tariff law, so far as I know, I think that it is an opportune time to submit a few remarks in regard to the effect of that tariff law as it affects my country locally. It so happens that I have here in my hand a dispatch received this morning from the president of the largest lime manufactory in my State. Several weeks ago, perhaps something like three months ago, the Department of Commerce sent a man to Washington to investigate the condition of the lime industry. That report has been on file here in Washington City for several weeks. No one knows what the report was or what action the department is going to take upon it. Mr. McMillan says in this dispatch:

What hope on lime? Conditions serious here.

When I was home at the last election Mr. McMillan and other gentlemen who were interested in the lime industry came to see me and pointed out conditions that exist there to-day. In order to send a barrel of lime over into British Columbia the American manufacturer must pay 19 cents per barrel. The British Columbia manufacturer in order to send his lime into the United States pays 3 cents per barrel. The natural conditions in the two countries are practically the same. All of the labor employed in British Columbia in the lime industry is Chinese, every bit of it. All of the labor employed in the United States in the lime industry is American.

As I stated upon the floor of this House a short time ago, a large lime plant was started over on Vancouver Island. The representatives of that industry came to the American manufacturers and said, "Unless you pay us a tribute of so much a barrel, we will go into the American market and destroy it and drive you out of business." The American manufacturer refused to be blackmailed. The British Columbia manufacturers have kept their word. The American manufacturers are here now appealing to Congress and to the department, asking for relief. You can come in here with a bill to give relief to foreign ships or any other American industry, but you must not attempt to relieve the lime industry. Another rather striking coincidence. Not over two hours ago one of the leading Democrats in the State of Washington—Mr. E. F. Blaine—called me up over the telephone and wanted to know if it were possible to get the Underwood tariff law amended in regard to fish—I hope I may have for a moment the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whom I see in the Chamber. This leading Democrat from Seattle, Mr. E. F. Blaine, stated to me that unless they could get the tariff changed in regard to fish, the fish industry of the Pacific coast was threatened with destruction, and he asked me what I thought the chances were. I said, "None." I said, "You may just as well ask a Democrat to turn over the Capitol Building as to ask him to amend the Underwood tariff law."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Blaine said that the Canadian Government pays one-third of the express rates upon fresh fish caught by their fishermen and sent into the markets of the United States. I said that I was aware of that fact, and he said also that the Government of Canada had established great cold-storge plants at Prince Rupert, costing many millions of dollars, where are stored the catch of the fishermen of Canada until it can be shipped. I said I knew that that was true. I presented all of those facts to the Ways and Means Committee. I told them that free fish meant the destruction of the fishing industry.

The only reply I received was that our people would get cheaper fish, a fact that is not true. The price of fish has not been reduced, the Government is losing revenue, and the fishing industry of the Pacific coast is upon the verge of destruction. Will the Democratic Party do anything to relieve it? Certainly not. They will repeal the provision of that law that relates to duties on goods carried in American bottoms, at the request of foreign shipping interests, but they will not do anything to relieve the tariff situation of the people of that country. The same condition exists with regard to shingles as to lime and fish.

I want just for a moment to pay some attention to this particular provision in the bill. I understand that the argument is made that they want to repeal this provision because it is in conflict with the treaties that we have with the various nations of the world. That argument was made when it was offered upon the floor of the House, but what effect did it have? Gentlemen on that side of the House were absolutely certain they knew all about it, and they would not even listen to arguments. The real reason why they want to repeal this law is not because it is in conflict with the treaties, but because it is an absolute absurdity. There never was a more ridiculous, absurd proposition argued before the American people than this one written into the tariff law.

When it was under consideration I called the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that it was ridiculous, that it was absurd, that it would not produce revenue enough to run canoes between here and South America. But what was the use of arguing? It is no use to argue with the Democratic Party upon any proposition in regard to this merchant-marine legislation as long as they are wrong, and they have always been wrong upon it. And here, now, we have the admission of it when they come in and ask that this last proposition of theirs be repealed.

Now, my distinguished friend from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, has referred to the provisions of the Panama Canal act admitting foreign vessels to register. I voted for that. I did it, and I said so at the time, because it would demonstrate it was of no value whatever. It passed, and not a single, solitary vessel has ever come under the American flag as a result of it. That was the end of our free-ship argument.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman's statement is too broad. Under the amended act, which removed the five-year limitation, a hundred and forty-odd vessels have been admitted to American register, which represents a tonnage of 450,000 tons, so it has not been a failure.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes, it has been a failure, a complete failure. I was just going to refer to what the gentleman mentions. Then the next act that we passed was this act to which the gentleman from Missouri referred, admitting foreign ships to American register as an emergency matter. I think I have a list of those ships in my possession, and if the gentleman desires I will put them in the RECORD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But practically every one of those vessels belongs to the Steel Trust, the Standard Oil Co., or the United Fruit Co.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the Government insurance company that was to take care of the cargoes of those vessels?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not know.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know whose cargoes have been insured up to date?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; but you take these vessels that our Democratic friends boast of, the 140 ships that came in under the flag as a result of emergency legislation, not a single additional ton of American freight has been carried on that account; not one. Not a single additional voyage has been made from any American port to a foreign port; not one. These vessels are simply running in the same trade they ran before. You take the United Fruit Co.'s vessels. They run from the same ports, and they are carrying the same cargo. It has not in any way benefited our commerce. It has benefited the United Fruit Co., because they were afraid that if they went upon the high seas under the British flag they might run across a German war vessel. It has benefited these great companies and trusts that the Democratic Party has denounced so vigorously, but it has not benefited anyone else. Then, I want to ask my distinguished friend from Missouri—for he is my friend, and I know I am his—if he wants to repeal this law because it is in violation of treaties, what is he going to do with the seamen's bill? That law went through here, and it was pointed out that that bill violated every treaty upon our statute books; but you could not then get it really discussed. It went through with only half a dozen votes against it.

Now, we not only violated every treaty, but we told every other nation of the world how they shall run their merchant marine. Having made a dismal failure of our own, we now set ourselves up as a teacher of all the other nations of the world and tell them what to do. I am glad of one thing, that after having been denounced and attacked by distinguished gentlemen upon that side of the House because I opposed the so-called seamen's bill, which would not benefit any American seaman, that having been denounced by them for several years because of my attitude upon that bill, at last I have had a very distinguished recruit to join me. It is my understanding now, if you can believe the statements in the newspapers, that the President of the United States has placed himself on record as against the seamen's bill. Now, if you are coming in here and asking us to repeal laws because they are in violation of the treaties, what are you going to do with the seamen's bill when it comes back from conference, which not only violates all of our treaties but imposes conditions upon all other nations, to which I have called the attention of this House before. It tells the foreign nations that send their ships into our ports how they shall pay their crews, how old their sailors shall be, what their qualifications must be, what language they must speak, and it holds out a specific inducement for them to desert, and it compels the foreign ship to pay them half their wages in order that they may desert. Under the conditions imposed by that bill, that if there is ever an attempt to enforce them, then I make this prediction now, and I say it measuring my words as I go, that if we enact that seamen's bill and attempt to enforce it that we will have war on the Pacific in less than 90 days after we attempt it. Yet with all these facts before us, no man on that side of the House stood up and talked about violation of treaties. What is the reason? You become greatly excited now over the violation of a provision in statutes that amount to nothing; you come in here and ask that it be repealed; and yet when a bill goes through this House that no one denies violates every treaty upon our statute books and is filled with danger to the country, I failed to hear a single voice on that side of the Chamber raised in protest, and I doubt if any protest will be made when it returns to us again, if it ever does.

I do not care to consume any more of my time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of sections 4219 and 4225 of the Revised Statutes as imposes tonnage duties of 50 cents per ton and light money of 50 cents per ton on a vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States; so much of section 4 J, subsection 1, of the act of October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," as imposes a discriminating duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on all goods, wares, or merchandise imported in a vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States; and so much of section 4 J, subsection 2, of the act aforesaid as provides for the forfeiture of any vessel owned by citizens of the United States but not a vessel of the United States, together with her cargo, tackle, apparel, and furniture, are hereby repealed. Any such tonnage duties, light money, or discriminating duties collected since the passage of the act of August 18, 1914, shall be refunded, and any such forfeitures incurred are hereby remitted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to make an explanation. I had a copy of the hearings here, but some one has carried it off——

Mr. MANN. I have a copy of the hearings if the gentleman desires it.

Mr. ALEXANDER (continuing). Which would be of service to me in making the explanation, which I handed to Mr. UNDERWOOD, and I think he carried it off.

Mr. MANN. I will loan the gentleman my copy.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The provisions of existing law which this bill undertakes to repeal have been on the statute books for a great many years—I would not undertake to say how long. Part of them have been a part of each tariff bill and are in the Underwood tariff law; that is, not all, but in part, so far as the duties are concerned.

It should be understood that foreign-built vessels not registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, although wholly owned by citizens thereof, can not legally import goods, wares, or merchandise from foreign ports, and are not allowed in the coasting trade.

That is a provision of the Revised Statutes, sections 2497 and 4311.

Another provision is to this effect:

On arrival from a foreign port undocumented foreign-built vessels, if laden with goods, wares, or merchandise, may, with their cargoes, be subject to a forfeiture.

That is section 2497 of the Revised Statutes, to which I have referred.

If in ballast only, or with passengers without cargo, they will be subject to a discriminating tonnage duty.

That is section 4219 of the Revised Statutes (19 Stat. L., 250).

When in foreign ports they are also subject to tonnage and other consular fees, from which regularly documented vessels are exempt.

Now, the tariff law, Schedule J, subsection 2, provides:

That no goods, wares, or merchandise, unless in cases provided for by treaty, shall be imported into the United States from any foreign port or place, except in vessels of the United States, or in such foreign vessels as truly and wholly belong to the citizens or subjects of that country of which the goods are the growth, production, or manufacture, or from which such goods, wares, or merchandise can only be, or most usually are, first shipped for transportation. All goods, wares, or merchandise imported contrary to this section, and the vessel wherein the same shall be imported, together with her cargo, tackle, apparel, and furniture, shall be forfeited to the United States; and such goods, wares, or merchandise, ship or vessel, and cargo shall be liable to be seized, prosecuted, and condemned in like manner, and under the same regulations, restrictions, and provisions as have been heretofore established for the recovery, collection, distribution, and remission of forfeitures to the United States by the several revenue laws.

Now, after the passage of the Panama Canal act and the act of August 18, 1914, we had this anomalous condition. While the law provides that an American citizen may purchase a foreign-built ship, he may not bring it into an American port except under the penalties provided by the laws which we seek to repeal here and to which I have called attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, the law gives the Secretary of Commerce power to remit these penalties; and, of course, we seek simply to repeal the provisions of law which impose them rather than put him to the duty of remitting the penalties. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman a question, if I might, in reference to section 4219 of the Revised Statutes. I notice that that is quoted in the hearings before the committee. Does the gentleman know whether that section has been amended in recent years?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will tell the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. MANN. Because it is not correctly quoted in the hearings as it appears in the Revised Statutes. It leaves out a very material part of the section. I do not know whether that has been stricken out by an amendment of that section of the Revised Statutes or not, although with some examination I was not able to find that there had been an amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is not correctly quoted in the hearings. I have the section before me here.

Mr. MANN. Do you say it is not correctly quoted?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is my impression it is not.

Mr. MANN. This provision as printed in the Revised Statutes is not in the section as quoted in the hearings:

In addition to the tonnage duty above imposed there shall be paid a tax at the rate of 30 cents a ton on vessels which shall be entered at any customhouse within the United States from any foreign port or place.

I do not know whether that provision is still in force or whether, if it be still in force, this act would affect it; and I am afraid the committee does not.

Now, one of the provisions of this bill also is to repeal so much of section 4225 of the Revised Statutes as imposes 50 cents a ton light money on vessels owned by citizens of the United States, but not a vessel of the United States. Section 4225, which it is proposed to repeal in that respect, provides:

A duty of 50 cents per ton, to be denominated "light money," shall be levied and collected on all vessels not of the United States, which may enter the ports of the United States—

And so forth. And the next section of the Revised Statutes provides:

The preceding section shall not be deemed to operate upon unregistered vessels, owned by citizens of the United States, and carrying a sea letter, or other regular document, issued from a customhouse of the United States, proving the vessel to be American property. Upon the entry of every such vessel from any foreign port, if the same shall be at the port at which the owner or any of the part owners reside, such owner or part owners shall make oath that the sea letter or other regular document possessed by such vessel contains the name or names of all the persons who are then the owners of the vessel; or if any part of such vessel has been sold or transferred since the date of such sea letter or document, that such is the case, and that no foreign subject or citizen has, to the best of his knowledge and belief, any share, by way of trust, confidence, or otherwise, in such vessel.

Now, that clearly excludes from the payment of light money the vessel built in a foreign country which has been purchased by American citizens and which has obtained one of these consular certificates, or provisional certificates. I can not see the necessity of repealing that provision, because it is inoperative, notwithstanding the statement made by Mr. Chamberlain to your committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The bill provides that only so much of the statutes shall be repealed as shall impose a light duty on these foreign-built ships. But it may be that the gentleman's construction is right; but that is the view the department takes of it, and that is the view Mr. Chamberlain expressed to the committee.

Mr. MANN. Well, if this section of the Revised Statutes is incorrectly furnished to the committee—and I do not say that it is, although it is different from the print of it in the Revised Statutes and in the hearings—no insinuation was made by Mr. Chamberlain that it had been amended, what I wanted to inquire was whether we would have to pay the 30 cents a ton on the foreign vessels built or whether they would escape that, while American vessels coming from a foreign port would still have to pay it. I am not sure that Mr. Chamberlain knew.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think an American vessel would have to pay. A foreign vessel might, belonging to a nation that we had no treaty with, but we have treaties with the maritime nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BORLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18685) to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL SUPERVISING INSPECTORS, STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 20282.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20282) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Yes; this bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. I will object to that. The House automatically goes into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The House automatically goes into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20282, with Mr. LLOYD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20282, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4404, Revised Statutes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4404. There shall be 11 supervising inspectors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each of them shall be selected for his knowledge, skill, and practical experience in the uses of steam for navigation, and shall be a competent judge of the character and qualities of steam vessels and of all parts of the machinery employed in steaming. Each supervising inspector shall be entitled to a salary of $3,000 a year, and his actual and reasonable traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, together with his actual and reasonable expenses for transportation of instruments, which shall be certified and sworn to under such instructions as shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce."

SEC. 2. That section 4405, Revised Statutes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following words: "The supervising inspector of the district embracing the Pacific coast shall not be under obligation to attend the meetings of the board oftener than once in two years; but when he does not attend such meeting he shall make his communications thereto, in the way of a report, in such manner as the board shall prescribe."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the employment of an additional supervising inspector in the Steamboat-Inspection Service. We now have 10. We now have a Supervising Inspector General, 10 supervising inspectors, boards of supervising inspectors, boards of local inspectors, and then assistant inspectors.

Mr. Hoover, of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, who appeared before the committee, stated that the reason they asked for this legislation is that they do not now believe that one supervising inspector can properly supervise a district as large as the first district. That is the district on the Pacific coast. The first district consists of the local inspection districts of San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, Juneau, St. Michael, and Honolulu.

Now, the approximate coast line from California to Nome is about 3,000 miles, and, in addition, there is the Yukon River, of 800 miles, or a total of 3,800 miles. It is the first district. Honolulu is approximately 2,000 miles from San Francisco. For that one district, which had in the last fiscal year a total of 1,166 steamers inspected, with a tonnage of 1,896,000 tons, they had one supervising inspector.

As compared with that, of course, the other districts are more amply provided for. On the Atlantic side they have four supervising-inspection districts—the third, the fifth, the eighth, and the tenth. On the Pacific they have one supervising-inspection district. It simply means, so Mr. Hoover said, that one supervising inspector can not give his attention to all that territory as it should be covered, and it was to meet this condition that the committee has reported this bill favorably to the House. A district comprising in extent 3,800 miles, and including southern California, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands, contains too much territory to be supervised by one inspector.

The second section of the bill simply repeals that provision of the law which provides that the supervising inspector shall not be under obligation to attend the meetings of the board oftener than once in two years. The Board of Supervising Inspectors is now in session in Washington. Of course it was because of the distance to be traveled and the expense involved that this provision was inserted. The second section of the bill repeals that provision and makes it necessary for the supervising inspector to attend the meetings of the board as all other supervising inspectors are required to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] yield?

Mr. MANN. He reserved the balance of his time, I take it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield such time as the gentleman from Illinois desires.

Mr. MANN. I would rather take the floor in my own right.

Mr. ALEXANDER. All right. I have made the only explanation I care to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the other two bills we have just passed from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries gave us the satisfaction, in the report accompanying them, of receiving the advice to get the hearings and read them, and the only way to get the hearings or the report was by sending a special messenger over to the committee room with a request to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for those hearings and report; and now, in order that the House may be fully enlightened on the subject of this bill, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask the Clerk to read in my own time the full report of the committee on this bill. I ask the attention of the committee while this report is being read, because it will not detain them long.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 20282) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, having considered the bill, report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. MANN. That is a very enlightening report; and in order that we may obtain real enlightenment now I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and further time if he desires.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman permit this explanation? As far as the two preceding bills are concerned, I think the gentleman will agree that the reports were quite full. I admit that this report and the one on the succeeding bill are very brief.

Mr. MANN. The other reports were not very full, and in both cases, instead of giving the information contained in the hearings, referred us to the hearings to read them, a very unsatisfactory way of examining reports.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not apologizing for them.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANN. Thirty minutes, to begin with.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the immigration bill is coming up to-morrow and the question of passing it over the President's veto will be decided. I expect to have control of a certain amount of the time allotted for debate; but I do not wish to take up more than my share. Therefore I am going to say to-day what I should prefer to say to-morrow.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say that this is the first time in this Congress that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries have had the floor, and I think the gentleman will have some regard for the rights of the committee and not occupy too much time.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield, this is not the first time the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been called in this Congress by a long shot.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The first time it was called was at the beginning of the Congress.

Mr. MANN. This is the first time it has been ready.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And it has never been called since that first time until to-day.

Mr. MANN. The committee calls have gone around two or three times, if not more, as the record will show.

Mr. GARDNER. As a matter of fact, how many bills have you got?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have quite a number of them, including one for a fish hatchery in Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, you can not tempt me with that. It is not in my district. [Laughter.] I am willing to be reasonable about it if the gentleman is.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have more bills than we can get through to-day, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. A good many more than ought to pass.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We can keep the House busy, all right, to-day and next Wednesday.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL VETO—THE ISSUE SQUARELY PRESENTED.

Mr. GARDNER. The President is entirely correct when he says in his veto message that the object of the literacy test in the immigration bill is restriction, not selection. The President believes that every able-bodied person not of questionable character ought to be admitted to this country. Now, without doubt, that is our historic policy. I am sorry the issue has been evaded for so many years. The question is whether or not we are going to abandon that historic policy. I believe that we ought to abandon it. I squarely differ with the President on a square issue, so far as his message permits the framing of an issue.

We restrictionists believe that altogether too many able-bodied persons are coming into this country, whether their characters are good, bad, or indifferent. We believe that immigrants are coming too fast to be assimilated, and we believe that the low wages which they are willing to accept are a menace to our high standard of living. Therefore we declare that the time has come for Congress to abandon the historic policy of letting in every able-bodied person whose character is not questionable, and in lieu of that policy we believe that we ought to adopt the policy of substantially cutting down the number of immigrants, even if in so doing we are forced to exclude many persons who might prove to be desirable citizens.

The efforts of those who desire this reduction in immigration have for the most part been centered on the attempt to enact a law which provides that every immigrant must at least know how to read in some language or other, probably, of course, in his own tongue. That requirement is commonly called the "literacy test," and a bill embodying that test has five times passed the Senate of the United States and has four times passed the House of Representatives of the United States, and three times it has encountered a veto. We are now face to face with President Wilson's veto, and I do not want to befog the issue by a discussion of details. I want to meet the issue

squarely from the point of view of whether or not we are going to restrict immigration for the sake of reducing the number of immigrants. If you believe that the country needs and ought to receive every able-bodied man or woman who comes here, provided they do not come here under contract, and provided they are of unquestioned moral character, then you will be doing your duty if you support the President's veto. If, on the other hand, you believe, as we restrictionists do, that too many immigrants are coming here every year, then I shall have no difficulty in persuading you to vote to pass the bill over the President's veto, even though you may not think that the literacy test is the best way to accomplish the restriction which you seek, and even though you think that some better test might well be devised.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman and I have an honest difference of opinion upon this question, but in view of his statement of the attitude of the restrictionists may I inquire whether he has given thought to the advisability of introducing a bill that would fix a numerical restriction rather than a mental restriction?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I have given some thought to every scheme which has been proposed. I am coming in a little while to the general question of other plans of restriction.

THE LITERACY TEST.

Now, it is estimated that the literacy test will reduce the number of immigrants by about 300,000 every year.

The test, I am afraid, will bear heavily on the Sicilians and on the Lithuanians. It will be hard on those people, I admit, for it will exclude 40 to 45 per cent of those who come here from Lithuania, from Sicily, and from southern Italy. It will hardly touch the Scandinavian or the German or the Canadian or the Englishman or the Scotchman or the Irishman. Practically every adult in those nations can read and write. It might touch a few of the old folks from those countries, but we have provided a clause by which elderly people can enter whether they themselves can read or not, so long as a single member of their family is able to do so. No man in his senses would claim that the literacy test is an ideal contrivance for restricting immigration. Everyone knows that such a provision of law will admit many bad men, and will exclude many honest men. The question is whether the literacy test will exclude more undesirables and admit more desirables than other restrictive methods which have been proposed.

WHY THE LITERACY TEST WAS SELECTED.

A dozen years ago about every restrictionist, so far as I could observe, favored a different plan for restricting immigration. A great many people who said that they were restrictionists, but who at heart were not restrictionists, always seemed to favor some method of restriction which was not before the country for consideration. Over and over again Members declared on the floor of this House that they were in favor of restriction, but that the literacy test was not the way to restrict; that the head tax was not the way to restrict; that the money-in-the-pocket test was not the way to restrict; that this, that, and the other was not the way to restrict.

The consequence was that the restrictionists were obliged to get together to see which form of restriction appealed most strongly to the greatest number. Soon it became apparent that of all the plans proposed the literacy test could command the most support. Along in 1907 Congress provided for the appointment of a commission to travel abroad and look into this question and report on the best method of restriction, if it should be found that restriction was desirable. That commission was composed of nine men—three Senators, three Members of the House, and three distinguished outsiders. Of these three outsiders Prof. Jenks, of Cornell, was one, and Dr. Neill, of the United States Bureau of Labor, was another. Both Prof. Jenks and Dr. Neill have said that when they became members of that commission they did not believe that the literacy test was the proper one by which to restrict immigration. Both of them, after they had investigated the whole question, entirely changed their opinions. When that commission of nine men reported, they reported unanimously that immigration ought to be restricted, and eight out of the nine gave it as their opinion that the best and most immediate way to restrict would be by means of the literacy test. In face of that report no man who really is in favor of restriction ought to hesitate a moment about voting for the literacy test, because evidently that test commands the greatest amount of confidence and the greatest amount of support. Suggestions as to other tests—and it is seldom that a month passes without some new proposal for restriction being brought to our attention—are apt to be merely ingenious contrivances invented by our foes for the purpose of diverting our energy from its object, which ought primarily to be the enactment of this literacy test which the Immigration Commission has decided is the best form for restriction to take.

That the literacy test is an ideal method of restriction nobody contends, but surely we must admit that if it excludes 300,000 aliens who can not read, it is better than if it excluded 300,000 aliens who can read. To argue that 300,000 individuals who are able to read are not better material for citizenship than 300,000 illiterates is to impeach our whole public-school system. However, the commission recommended the literacy test not as a selective measure, but rather as a means of curtailing the congested oversupply of unskilled labor. The superiority, if any, of the individual immigrant under this system was regarded as a fortunate incidental advantage. For many years I have listened in this House to the argument that the anarchist and the gunman and the procurer can read, while many an honest, horny-handed laborer does not possess that accomplishment. I freely admit the fact. It is true. It is also true that many a straight man can be found in a gambling house and many a crook can be found at church. Yet, for all that I should not recommend the passage of any legislation based on the supposition that the frequenters of gambling houses are more desirable citizens than are the churchgoers.

DISTRIBUTION.

Every year at certain seasons when we hear of the demand for farm labor, gentlemen on this floor pull long faces and solemnly express the opinion that a proper distribution of immigration would solve the whole problem. I venture to predict that until the employing farmer can offer the farm laborer a steady job, we never shall be free from this cry as to the shortage of farm labor. There are just two seasons of the year when the farmer is short of farm labor. One of these seasons comes at seeding time and the other when the harvest is gathered.

For nearly eight years we have had on the statute books a law providing for a bureau intended to facilitate the distribution of immigrants, but the bureau has not amounted to much. South Carolina has actually tried the experiment of importing and distributing immigrants, but the State found that the immigrants would not stay distributed.

The commissioner of labor and agriculture of the State of South Carolina, in compliance with the law of that State, chartered a vessel known as the *Wittekind*, and in her he imported some 700 or 800 people, largely Belgians, to work in South Carolina. I asked the Belgian minister three or four years later how many of the *Wittekind* immigrants he thought were still in South Carolina. He said, so far as he knew, not one. I asked him how many of them were still in the United States. He said that he had no means of knowing, but that they had been applying to him in great numbers to get them back to Belgium. I have asked many a South Carolinian as to the result of that experiment, and invariably the answer is that of those seven hundred and odd men brought out and deliberately distributed in South Carolina, practically none remained in the State.

TWO MEN LOOKING FOR ONE JOB.

If I were to tell my manufacturing friends in Massachusetts that competition does not lower prices, they would think I had gone crazy, and they would probably judge that the time had come to get another Congressman. Yet those very same men will turn around and tell me that unrestricted immigration has no effect on wages in the textile industries. Perhaps they may be right; but if so, labor is the only commodity in the wide, wide world whose price is not reduced by competition. To be sure, in flush times the effect of immigration may only be to keep wages from rising as fast as they otherwise might. When two jobs are looking for one man, no amount of immigration will lower wages; but times are no longer flush now, and it is no longer true that two jobs are looking for one man, as used to be the case. The fact is nowadays that two men are looking for one job, and they are not finding it, either. Now, do not pretend to me that our colossal immigration has nothing to do with this surplus of labor and the number of unemployed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. How does the gentleman explain that in the face of the existing industrial depression resulting in the unemployment of large numbers in our industrial centers, that there is no decrease in the wages of labor?

Mr. GARDNER. Well, that may be true, as yet, of skilled labor; but I doubt whether unskilled wages are holding up.

Mr. STAFFORD. How does the gentleman explain the conflict with the economic theory of supply and demand that, even without the demand for labor, the price of labor has not gone down, but it has been maintained in these times of depression?

Mr. GARDNER. The amount of employment has gone down.
Mr. STAFFORD. But wages have not gone down. The gentleman's statement is inconsistent.
Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I think not.
Mr. STAFFORD. Wages have not gone down in a single employment in my city.
Mr. GARDNER. Of course I can not say as to that.

THE STEAMSHIPS PAID THE BILL.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not very often go into the muckraking business, but I think that the evidence published last Saturday by the American Federation of Labor is pretty conclusive of the fact that the steamship companies for years have financed the fight against the restriction of immigration. I admit that the evidence presented might not be sufficient to convict anybody in court; but, after reading the documents, if there were any way of deciding the question, I should be ready to bet two to one that the steamship companies supplied the funds with which the National Liberal Immigration League carried on its work. There are certain points which stick up like sore thumbs in the evidence which was published last Saturday by the American Federation of Labor. In the first place, one of the exhibits was a rough draft of a letter to Andrew Carnegie, which had come into the hands of the Federation. In that letter this passage appears:

Up till recently we were receiving from a steamship line (name) $15,000 per annum, which, however, scarcely covered our running expenses—

And so forth.

Consider this letter in connection with the financial statements of the National Liberal Immigration League which were included in the exhibits. For instance, here is the league's balance sheet for November 20, 1911, and likewise its balance sheet for April 10, 1907. In the balance sheet of April 10, 1907, I notice this item:

By cash received, $15,000.

Where did that cash come from? I wonder why its source was not specified. It seems a singularly round amount to receive from enthusiastic supporters of the league's policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. MANN. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

THE GERMAN AND THE FRENCH LETTERS.

Mr. GARDNER. In the league's balance sheet of November 20, 1911, statement of income and liabilities July 1, 1910, to November 20, 1911, I find under the heading "Receipts" the following entry: "Paris, $15,000," and I notice in this same account that the league had far exceeded its income and was in debt to the tune of $6,167.14. Observe the date of this financial statement, November 20, 1911. On December 15, 1911, less than a month later, the secretary of the Liberal Immigration League sent a cablegram to Director Storm, Hamburg-Amerika Line, Hamburg, Germany. This cablegram or a copy of it came into the hands of the American Federation of Labor. It is signed "Behar," and that is the name of the secretary of the National Liberal Immigration League. Remember that the financial statement of November 20, 1911, showed that the league had received $15,000 from "Paris," and that the deficit was something over $6,000. Now, mark this cablegram sent December 15, 1911, some four weeks later:

Director STORM,
Hamburg-Amerika Line, Hamburg, Germany:

We owe over $7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy with disagreeable consequences for all concerned.

BEHAR.

That message is confirmed by a letter from Mr. Behar to Mr. Storm, director of the Hamburg-Amerika Line, in which Mr. Behar quotes the cablegram and says that he has been talking to Emil L. Boas, the resident director and general manager of the Hamburg-Amerika Line, and that the cablegram was sent at Mr. Boas's suggestion. Furthermore, among the exhibits appears some correspondence between Mr. Behar and Messrs. Japhot & Saget, Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Rue Auber, Paris, France. I admit that there is nothing in the letter from Mr. Behar or in the answer from the Paris firm which shows that any money was actually given by the French steamship company to Mr. Behar. Yet in the latter's letter appears this significant sentence:

I shall be very glad to receive your contribution as soon as possible—

And so forth.

I assert that the correspondence of the secretary of the National Liberal Immigration League with the French line and the Hamburg line shows a friendly understanding between those various parties—I will take back that word "understanding"—a friendly acquaintance between those companies and Mr. Behar, the secretary of the league which has been fighting immigration restriction. Unless such a friendly acquaintance did as a matter of fact exist I can imagine Mr. Adolph Storm's puzzled surprise when the cablegram signed "Behar" was placed on his desk in far-off Hamburg.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I trust in the general debate which has been indulged in that the committee will not lose sight of the bill now pending before the committee. This bill is of particular importance to the shipping interests of the Pacific coast.

It provides for an additional supervising inspector for the Steamboat-Inspection Service, this inspector to be located on the Pacific coast. At the present time, as the chairman has stated, we have but one supervising inspector for that entire territory. On the Atlantic coast they have four supervising inspectors, so that the necessity for this additional inspector on the Pacific coast, covering territory from San Diego to Alaska and including Hawaii, is apparent and should appeal to every Member of the House.

Section 2 of the bill seeks to repeal that section of the present law which provides that—

The supervising inspector of the district embracing the Pacific coast shall not be under obligation to attend the meetings of the board oftener than once in two years; but when he does not attend such meeting he shall make his communications thereto, in the way of a report, in such manner as the board shall prescribe.

The two inspectors from the Pacific coast provided for in this bill will be entitled to attend the annual meetings held in Washington. With the many problems likely to arise following the opening of the Panama Canal and with the large increase of shipping on the Pacific coast, it is indeed important that the inspectors from that section attend these annual meetings.

In view of the fact that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries occupies the floor to-day it would seem appropriate for me to quote certain extracts from a speech delivered before this House on April 25, 1906, by a former distinguished chairman of that committee. I refer to the Hon. Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, for many years a Member of this body. His speech was a plea for an American merchant marine. The paragraph I shall quote now seems prophetic. Comment is unnecessary. This is the paragraph:

Suppose we had a war to-day, or suppose we had no war to-day, but that England and France had, or that France and Germany had, or that Germany and England had; or suppose even the minor nations of Europe had war with each other; what would become of the commerce of the United States? Ninety per cent of it is being carried in foreign ships, not alone in English ships, not alone in French ships, but in German and Italian and directly in Japanese as well as in Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish. Suppose any of these nations now were involved in war, what would become of our commerce? If we had ships of our own, we could carry our commerce under our own flag and defy the nations that were at war to interfere with us. How long would it be, Mr. Chairman, until these contending forces would enforce the laws of war and seize the merchant ships that were carrying our commerce and drive that enormous commerce that we are so proud of off of the face of the seas? So no great commercial nation can maintain her supremacy in commerce if she does not carry her commerce under her own flag and protect it by her own power and in her own ships.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Illinois was criticizing the brevity of this report, I was surprised that he had overlooked, as I think the chairman of the committee has, one of the main purposes to be attained by the bill under consideration. I recall that when the prior bills were under consideration he had access to the sections of the Revised Statutes which those bills sought to change, and here we have this bill without any reference whatsoever in the report to such change; but the bare reading of the statute shows that one great abuse that has been indulged in in times gone is to be obviated by the elimination of the provision of 10 cents a mile to these inspectors for travel allowance when engaged in their official business. I wish the same committee, or the Committee on the Judiciary, would go still further and repeal this archaic piece of legislation, which gives to every official a fixed stipend of so much a mile, far in excess of their traveling expenses, and adopt it generally for all such cases, so that they would be limited, as we have limited it in the Postal Service, and as it has been limited in this service, to the actual traveling expenses incurred by the officials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4404, Revised Statutes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4404. There shall be 11 supervising inspectors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each of them shall be selected for his knowledge, skill, and

practical experience in the uses of steam for navigation, and shall be a competent judge of the character and qualities of steam vessels and of all parts of the machinery employed in steaming. Each supervising inspector shall be entitled to a salary of $3,000 a year, and his actual and reasonable traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, together with his actual and reasonable expenses for transportation of instruments, which shall be certified and sworn to under such instructions as shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri whether there has been any calculation as to how much this will increase the expenses of the Government?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The salary of this inspector is $3,000 a year—that is, the additional inspector—and his reasonable traveling expenses in attending the meeting of the board here in Washington.

Mr. MANN. I take it that is not the only increase. He maintains an office and has an office force.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am unable to say just what the additional expense will be.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me it is a very good time and a very wise time to make a calculation in every case where we propose to increase the expenses of the Government.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is always true, I think.

Mr. MANN. Well, but the gentleman has not followed it in this case.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We felt that the emergency was great enough to justify the expense.

Mr. MANN. Well, the people have gotten along very well for years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move to strike out the last two words in order to ask a question.

Mr. MANN. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman had yielded the floor. I beg his pardon.

Mr. MANN. Usually, every proposition we have looks meritorious when it is a little one. This looks meritorious to me. A few days ago the free money in the Treasury was $60,000,000. That was a decrease in the course of a few months of $125,000,000. This morning the free money in the Treasury was $54,000,000, a decrease in the last few days of $6,000,000; and the decrease yesterday, I believe, was over $1,000,000. But surely here is a new office—and the gentlemen seem to pay no attention to the fact that the money in the Treasury is getting low, and, as far as I have been informed, and I have some information on the subject, the President has not yet been able to get anybody in this body to propose an increase in taxes, though he appreciates the fact, if my information is correct, and I think it is, that we will be very much in need of increased taxes if we keep on making these expenditures.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion that the committee do now rise.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill has not been read for amendment yet. The second section has not been read.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Let the second section be read.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am willing to have the next section read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 4405, Revised Statutes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following words:

"The supervising inspector of the district embracing the Pacific coast shall not be under obligation to attend the meetings of the board oftener than once in two years; but when he does not attend such meeting he shall make his communications thereto, in the way of a report, in such manner as the board shall prescribe."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I regard this measure as one where real economy can be obtained. I think that the saving that will result in cutting off the "graft," if I may use that word, of 10 cents a mile for traveling expenses and limiting them to their actual expenses, when we all know that it does not cost these days for any person to travel, no matter in what State, 10 cents a mile, will result in a decided saving of expense to the Government.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. PETERSON. Would it not be better economy to cut down the mileage of one and leave only that one? That would be true economy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which one?

Mr. PETERSON. The new one.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are 10 inspectors. The gentleman will realize the necessity of having them assemble here once a year and holding conferences as to the needs of navigation. At least they should assemble at some time to hold conferences with their superiors.

Mr. PETERSON. Would it not be better to leave the number you have now and reduce the mileage instead of increasing the number? Would not that be true economy?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not my position. I rose to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether the department had been asked what economy would be obtained by reducing the amount of mileage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The committee has not asked that question, but if those people on the coast are properly located there will be a saving in the cost of travel. The coast line is 3,800 miles long.

Mr. STAFFORD. That saving will extend to all the inspectors if they come here, because the 10 cents allowance would be eliminated entirely.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The bill provides for the actual expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment and move to strike out the word "of," in line 14, and substitute the word "for."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "of," in line 14, and substitute the word "for."

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know whether the attention of the chairman has been called to the fact that in the original draft of the statute the word was "for" instead of "of." While "of" is the more grammatical term, I suppose if we are going to revise it we should carry the same language.

Mr. MARTIN. In the original draft it is "for"?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course it all goes out in this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If we are describing it at all, we should describe it in the phraseology of the statute, not the phraseology as it should read.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the section which provides for actual and reasonable expenses, traveling expenses, and so forth, is the preceding section, and is not involved in this section. The law provides that these inspectors shall meet in Washington once a year. That is not necessary at all. Half the time it is entirely superfluous. Then it contains the provision that the inspector for the Pacific coast shall not be under obligation to come to Washington but once in two years, although if he does not come he shall make a report in such manner as the board shall prescribe.

Now, the bill adds to the number of the inspectors on the Pacific coast, or is intended to. It provides two instead of one. There is no reason on earth why these two gentlemen should come to Washington every year and have a nice little junketing trip at the expense of the Government. Under the terms of the law one of them could be here every year anyhow. When there are two there, the law need only provide that either one would be under obligation to come more than once in two years, although if the department had any reason for it the department could order him to come. Now, why should we provide an additional inspector for the Pacific coast and at the same time make it obligatory upon those two men to neglect their duties at home and take a nice little junketing trip across the continent to Washington?

There is no new information laid before these inspectors every year. We all know it. Occasionally something comes up. If the whole board did not meet but once in five years, it would probably be an advantage to the Government and to the shipping interests. But certainly there is no reason for requiring each of two inspectors to travel from the Pacific coast across the continent to Washington. The other inspectors do not have very far to come, and there is no very considerable expense incurred in bringing them here. But those two inspectors have a long way to come, and there is a good deal of expense incurred in bringing them here. If one of them comes one year, he can tell the conditions on the Pacific coast, and the other can come the next year, and he can tell the conditions on the Pacific coast; and if the department wants both of them to come at the same time, let both of them come at the same time any year that the department needs them.

There is no occasion for repealing the law which now leaves it at the option of the department to let one of these men stay there one year out of two and attend to his work out there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, with reference to the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that the Board of Supervising Inspectors is in session now. They continue in session for one month to six weeks and sometimes longer. They have many duties, and the regulations that are formulated by the Board of Supervising Inspectors are of vast importance to the shipping interests, and in the course of the year many matters come up for consideration to which it is necessary for them to give most careful attention.

If the seamen's bill should become a law, there are many provisions of it that would require regulations by the Department of Commerce, and they will be formulated by the Board of Supervising Inspectors. I do not think the board comes to Washington for a junket, and in view of the fact that the shipping interests on the Pacific coast are becoming larger and more important every year, I do not know any reason why the inspectors from the Pacific coast should not be here if it is important for the inspectors from the Atlantic and the Gulf coasts and the Great Lakes to be here. The Pacific coast should be represented.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. As it now stands, four inspectors come to Washington from the Atlantic coast and will continue to come. Ought the Pacific coast to be discriminated against because we happen to be a long distance away? The same argument, carried to its logical conclusion, would say that because of the large mileage there should not be as many Members of Congress from California.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think the question of expense should be the controlling question. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, to see whether anybody is in favor of economy.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, noes 32.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. That is not a very large number.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LLOYD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20282) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, and with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 21, noes 8.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays. Those favoring the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Six in the affirmative.

Mr. MANN. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Forty-seven in the negative.

Mr. MANN. That makes 53 altogether.

The SPEAKER. Fifty-three.

Mr. MANN. A large number.

The SPEAKER. Six Members, not a sufficient number, second the demand. The yeas and nays are refused, and the bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT INSPECTORS, STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20281) to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. I think I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the House automatically——

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill in Committee of the Whole be limited to 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I renew the request to make it 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to limit the debate to 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the eighth paragraph of section 4414, Revised Statutes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"And, in addition, the Secretary of Commerce may appoint, in districts or ports where the exigencies of the service require, assistant inspectors at a salary, for the port of New York, of $2,000 a year each; for the port of New Orleans, La.; the districts of Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; the port of Boston, Mass.; and the district of San Francisco, Cal., at $1,800 per year each, and for all other districts and ports at a salary not exceeding $1,600 a year each; and he may appoint a clerk to any such board at a compensation not exceeding $1,500 a year to each person so appointed. Every inspector provided for in this or the preceding sections of this title shall be paid his actual and reasonable traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, together with his actual and reasonable expenses for transportation of instruments, which shall be certified and sworn to under such instructions as shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors. The purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to enable the department to appoint assistant inspectors at ports where their services are needed. Under the existing law these inspectors can only be appointed at ports where 225 or more vessels are inspected in a year. The department is thus compelled to appoint the assistants at the ports where more than 225 vessels are inspected, although their services may be needed at another port. For instance, under existing law the assistant inspectors may be appointed at Milwaukee and detailed to serve at Chicago. This bill does not provide for any increased expenditure, but under it, if additional assistant inspectors are needed at the port of Chicago or elsewhere, they may be appointed at the port of Chicago. I say it does not involve any additional expense. It simply vests in the department the power to appoint the inspectors at the port where their services may be needed, although less than 225 vessels a year are inspected at that port. The provision for their pay, of course, must be made under existing law, and authorized by the Committee on Appropriations, and if the department in its estimate would include one or more assistant inspectors, it would be compelled to go before the committee and make a showing that the services of these inspectors are necessary. I think I have given the gist of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the salaries of these assistant inspectors at the present time are those stated in the bill under consideration?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. We do not affect the salaries or compensation in any way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that in the section of the statute that this seeks to amend the salary is $1,600 for all places other than the district of New York. Perhaps that has been changed since. I am inquiring for information.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Hoover, from the Steamboat-Inspection Service, who appeared before the committee, gave their present compensation. That has been fixed in the appropriation bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here you prescribe a salary of $1,800 for numerous places and $1,600 for others.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We do not change the existing law, but the appropriation bills have from time to time limited the amount, and he stated that the pay is $1,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Fifteen hundred dollars for the clerks, or for the assistant inspectors?

Mr. ALEXANDER. For the clerks. I inadvertently said assistant inspectors.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the existing law the salaries of assistant inspectors outside of New York, according to the sec-

tion of the statute I have before me, are $1,600, whereas here you prescribe salaries of $1,800 for numerous districts. Perhaps it may have been changed in the legislative bill by appropriation law; but, as far as the statute is concerned, there are the salaries.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I may be in error about that. I will read what he says:

Mr. HARDY. However, I see you leave out of this bill, as it is proposed here, one city that was named in the former section, and that is Chicago.

Mr. HOOVER. I can explain that in this way: There had been in Chicago assistant inspectors receiving $1,800 who were appointed at that place. When the number of steamers fell below 225, Chicago lost its assistant inspectors, and they could only be detailed there. They were appointed at Milwaukee, where there were 225 steamers inspected, and detailed to Chicago. Those men got $1,600, and the present inspectors at Chicago get $1,600. If you should say the assistant inspector at Chicago should get $1,800, you would have two men there getting $1,800, and two who do the same work that these men at Cleveland and Buffalo do who get $1,600.

Mr. HARDY. Then you suggest to leave that as it is?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes. Take, for instance, the matter of pay of assistant inspectors, to show how unbusinesslike we are now, in the spring we detail two Cleveland, Ohio, men, who are getting $2,000 a year, to work side by side with two men getting $1,600 a year. Those $1,600 men are just as competent and do just as much work. I have not raised that question with regard to standardizing salaries except to show the condition as to the pay of assistant inspectors.

Mr. HARDY. "And he (the Secretary of Commerce) may appoint a clerk to any such board." That is the first time a board has been mentioned in this bill.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes; and the question, I judge, that you have in mind, Judge Hardy, is, Why is this particular question of clerks to boards, or that particular feature, covered by this section that speaks of assistant inspectors?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; and why is it not necessary in this bill, to make it intelligible, to explain what board you mean?

Mr. GREENE. You say, "such board." That would cover a board already provided for.

Mr. HARDY. You are referring here to a board. You do not say anything about a board until you get to the expression "such board."

Mr. STAFFORD. But I understand from the reading of that testimony that it is the purpose to raise the salaries so as to equalize them, so that officials from other districts detailed outside of their districts shall receive the same pay as inspectors detailed from another place. The whole argument is for equalization of salaries.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is desirable to make the pay of assistant inspectors uniform for the same service.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not uniform even by this bill. By this bill you provide different salaries. For instance, at New York it remains at $2,000, while at New Orleans, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and San Francisco, it is increased from $1,600 to $1,800. The case instanced by the gentleman who testified would still exist, because if a man at Cleveland, receiving $2,000, were detailed to Chicago, where they are receiving only $1,800, the inequality would still prevail. Then, again, I would like to inquire what the salaries of the clerks to these respective inspectors are at the present time. According to the statute law they are receiving $1,200, and under this bill $1,500.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Here is what Mr. Hoover has to say about that:

Mr. HOOVER. Yes. That has all been changed from time to time by the appropriation bills. For many years it was $1,600. About four years ago the Appropriations Committee changed that and made it $1,400, and the effect of that was that we had to reduce the pay of several men and to rearrange our salaries. Then it was gotten back to $1,500, but Congress did not allow for that increase of a couple of hundred dollars extra to keep from reducing several men, and it has remained at $1,500 ever since.

Mr. STAFFORD. So by this bill we are merely reenacting appropriation law, so far as the salary of the clerks is concerned?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We are not interfering with existing law. If the department asked for additional inspectors, the Appropriations Committee would control the number by the appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not the salary.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The number.

Mr. STAFFORD. We will fix the salary here.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; as now provided by law.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Committee on the Merchant Marine have adopted for much of the business we are called upon to consider to-day a very unsatisfactory method. The report in this case contains absolutely no information. It contains simply a recommendation that the bill be passed. It proposes to amend the statutes of the United States, and no Member of this House can tell anything about what the changes will be in the statute if the bill is passed without getting a copy of the Revised Statutes and checking up what changes would be made. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] in his effort to do that is now told by the chairman of the committee that so far as the salaries are concerned the salaries enumerated in the statute are not the ones that are being allowed now. It all illustrates how unsatisfactory it is to endeavor to get any real light on the question before the committee by examination of the data that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has placed at the disposal of the House. I would like to ask the chairman what the real purpose of this proposed legislation is?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The chairman did not write the report. The bill is to authorize the appointment of additional inspectors at the ports where they are needed, without reference to whether those ports inspect 225 vessels each year.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the real purpose of the bill is to increase the number of inspectors and give a larger authorization in that particular than the existing law now allows?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The way it is done now is: They are appointed at ports, for instance, like Milwaukee, where more than 225 vessels are inspected in a year, and then detailed to those other ports. The department wants authorization to appoint them where they are needed, although there might not be 225 vessels inspected at those ports in the course of a year. For instance, as I understand it, the assistant inspectors are detailed from Milwaukee and Cleveland to other ports along the Great Lakes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The law as it now stands, so far as the Revised Statutes are concerned, which it is proposed to amend, does not do what the gentleman from Missouri says, as will be apparent from reading it. This is the language of the Revised Statutes:

And, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury may appoint in such districts where their services are actually required assistant inspectors at a salary—

And so forth.

We authorize the appointment of assistant inspectors now under existing law just as much as this language in the bill does, which reads:

And, in addition, the Secretary of Commerce may appoint in districts or ports where the exigencies of the service require assistant inspectors at a salary—

And so forth.

Both the law and the bill simply authorize the appointment of assistant inspectors where the Secretary thinks they are required. There is no change.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the statute, and, of course, I appreciate the force of the interpretation the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] gives, but I think it is susceptible of another interpretation. The statute says, after enumerating in section 4414 various ports at which these inspectors may be appointed, in the eighth paragraph:

And, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury may appoint in such district.

There is a comma right after the word "districts," which perhaps would indicate from the punctuation that the use of the language "such districts" refers to the districts immediately enumerated previously, and I presume that has been the interpretation of the department if they have asked for a change, because the chairman has just now very frankly stated that in order to appoint these inspectors to serve in other districts from the ones enumerated in the statute, section 4414, the custom apparently has been to appoint them to one of these specified districts named in the statute, and then detail them for service somewhere else. And I think probably the interpretation of the statute in that respect, considering the punctuation, may be a correct one.

But, at all events, the purpose is to facilitate the appointment of these inspectors. Can the chairman of the committee inform us how many additional inspectors or assistant inspectors this would place into the service beyond those who are now considered to be authorized by law?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It authorized the appointment of additional assistant inspectors as they are needed, but, as I say, before they could be appointed the appointment would have to go to the Committee on Appropriations and the necessity of the appointment would have to be made clear.

Mr. MARTIN. Then if we pass this bill in its present form there would be no limitation as to the number of these assistant inspectors who could be appointed other than in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. ALEXANDER. There is none in the existing law if they are appointed a certain way.

Mr. MARTIN. To serve at a certain place. Here they may be appointed to serve indefinitely at any port.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It was brought to the attention of the committee that while their services are not needed at a certain port with less than 225 vessels to be inspected, they are needed

at some other point, and they are allowed for that port, and the understanding is that they can be utilized at other ports. I will read what the supervisor has to say. I wish to say that until I saw the report made by a member of the committee, who had this in charge, I did not know he had not given the information to which the House is entitled.

Mr. MARTIN. I take it for granted, the chairman will agree that the House ought to have in the report of the committee sufficient data to know what changes would be made in the Revised Statutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was very much disappointed to find it was not in the report. Here is what the supervisor says:

Mr. HOOVER. The reasons are these: First, I should say that after July 1, 1905, boards of local inspectors were paid fixed salaries. Up to that time they had been paid according to the number of steamers inspected, and we believed that that placed a premium upon defective and inefficient inspection by limiting the man's salary to the number of steamers that he inspected. Hence, their salaries were fixed. Now, at the time that was done—and that law was effective July 1, 1905—these words in section 4414 in regard to appointing the assistant inspectors at districts where there were 225 steamers or upward to be inspected annually were not also mentioned, but it was the understanding of the department from that time on that the number of steamers that were inspected in a district did not have any effect whatsoever upon the salaries. Therefore there remained from that time to the present day these assistant inspectors who were appointed at certain of these ports and detailed to certain other ports. Now, the effect is that to-day some of these ports where assistant inspectors have been appointed have fallen below the 225 steamer limit, where assistant inspectors are to be appointed, you understand, and appreciating that it is not a fair basis, simply the number of steamers that are inspected in the district, to base the number of men who shall be employed there, we want to get away from that and have this amendment made which should have been made back in 1905. It has been our understanding from that time on that we proceeded correctly in having these assistant inspectors at the place where they were appointed, even though that number of steamers had fallen below 225. I may say that in the last year we have gone over these statutes trying to bring them up to date wherever we found them defective, and in our efforts to do that we found this place here. We first discovered it—or we did not discover it, but thought of it carefully—when we were getting up the last estimates, and it occurred to me we ought to have that corrected and do directly that which we have been doing indirectly; that is to say, if there happen to be ports where the exigencies of the service require assistant inspectors of course we can actually appoint them, but we can not actually appoint them until you gentlemen appropriate so we will have money to pay them.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, so far as we have information now upon the subject, it would appear that this bill would amount to an increase in the compensation for some inspectors. We have no information that shows what changes, if any, have been made in the Revised Statutes since this originally was passed; and of course this bill proposes to amend the original section in the statutes. If no further changes have been made, the result of the bill, if passed, would be to leave the salaries of the assistant inspectors in the port of New York at $2,000, where the statute places it. Then, at New Orleans, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and San Francisco, to increase their salaries from $1,600 to $1,800 a year, and it would have the effect, so far as the clerkship is concerned, of increasing the clerk's compensation from $1,200 to $1,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may enlighten the gentleman and the committee somewhat by calling attention to the item providing the appropriation for this branch of the service in the last legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act. There we find the salaries carried in that bill are the same as are carried in the bill under consideration. For instance, we find the following:

Steamboat inspectors: * * * Assistant inspectors, as authorized by act of April 9, 1906, for the following ports: New York, 27, at $2,000 each; New Orleans, 4, at $1,800 each; Baltimore, 6, at $1,800 each; Boston, 6, at $1,800 each; Philadelphia, 8, at $1,800 each; San Francisco, 8, at $1,800 each; Buffalo, 4, at $1,600 each; Milwaukee, 8, at $1,600 each; Norfolk, 4, at $1,600 each; Seattle, 8, at $1,600 each.

So the gentleman will see that the salaries stated in the bill under consideration at the places named are as stated in the appropriation bill, and that at all other places, some of which are enumerated here, no higher than $1,600 is carried in the legislative bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the gentleman found the items for appropriations for these clerks in the legislative bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; that is also included right here, and is as follows:

Clerk hire, service at large: For compensation, not exceeding $1,500 a year to each person, of clerks to boards of steamboat inspectors, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the provisions of section 4414, Revised Statutes, the act of April 9, 1906.

Mr. MARTIN. Apparently, then, these salaries have been already increased above the provisions of section 4414 by appropriations?

Mr. STAFFORD. By appropriation law.

Mr. MARTIN. The only changes, then, made in the statutes so far as it would appear would be to make it clear that these assistant inspectors may be appointed to other ports than the ones enumerated by the section, and furthermore the additional change that instead of being compensated for traveling expenses by mileage at 10 cents per mile by this bill they will be compensated their actual traveling expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and there is——

Mr. MANN. The law was changed some time ago, and they do not get 10 cents a mile now. They get their actual expenses. That is all they get under the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; a change recently made, which we have just discovered.

Mr. MANN. A change which I discovered some time ago and which the gentleman from Wisconsin has finally discovered after he made a very eloquent speech on the subject without knowing what the facts were.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am surprised the gentleman from Illinois did not correct me until now, when he discovered it himself.

Mr. MANN. I do not attempt to correct all the errors of the gentleman from Wisconsin at the time, because it would not give him time on the floor to discuss matters himself.

Mr. STAFFORD. I never knew the gentleman to fail to do so when I was in error.

Mr. MANN. I have followed the discussion of this bill, and I can not yet understand what the purpose is. The law now provides fully for the appointment at Chicago and elsewhere of these assistant inspectors that the gentleman has enumerated. I understood the gentleman to say that they appointed assistant inspectors at New York and then sent them to Chicago. May I ask whether that was a correct understanding on my part?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Did the gentleman ask me?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman or anyone else who knows.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not recall having made any such statement myself, and I thought the gentleman referred to some one else.

Mr. MANN. I thought in the conversation between the two gentlemen that statement was made; it may not have been the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. I think no reference was made to Chicago beyond it was stated by the chairman, if I understand it, that under the present law they would appoint a certain man to a particular port named and then assign him to duty elsewhere.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me to state, Chicago was not able to qualify to have an assistant inspector, because they are required to inspect 225 vessels at a place, and Chicago did not have that number, and so they had to come to Milwaukee to get an assistant inspector who would be detailed to Chicago for temporary duty.

Mr. MANN. I do not even take the trouble to correct another erroneous statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], because it is safe to say that it is erroneous.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The provision of the existing law is this: Section 4414 of the Revised Statutes provides:

There shall be in each of the following collection districts, namely, the districts of Philadelphia, Pa.; San Francisco, Cal.—

And naming other ports—

One inspector of hulls and one inspector of boilers.

And in addition the Secretary of Commerce and Labor may appoint, in districts and ports where there are 225 steamers and upward to be inspected annually, assistant inspectors.

Mr. MANN. Where does that law come from?

Mr. ALEXANDER. In section 4414 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MANN. That is not in section 4414 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is. The section was amended on March 3, 1905, on April 9, 1906, and May 28, 1908—section 9. And that is the limitation that is undertaken to be removed—the limitation that assistant inspectors shall not be appointed except in ports where they inspect 225 vessels and upward annually.

Mr. MANN. Why should they be appointed?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They shall be appointed where they are needed. Mr. Hoover says there are not 225 vessels inspected annually at Chicago, but yet there is a great need for assistant inspectors there.

Mr. MANN. There is not if there are no more vessels. In Chicago they collect taxes on vessels coming to Chicago. Chicago-owned vessels go to Milwaukee as their own city——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interrogation?

Mr. MANN. No. The gentleman will make another erroneous statement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I presume they do not all go to Milwaukee. They go to other ports as well. As Mr. Hoover said, when the act was amended in 1905 they overlooked that limitation, and it has resulted in inconvenience.

Mr. MANN. They have two or three inspectors at Chicago and have had for a long time who reported for the Chicago district. They are quite competent, so far as I have heard, to attend to the work in Chicago. May I ask the gentleman what is the provision of the statute putting that limitation in? Where is that to be found?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have the navigation laws of 1911, section 4414 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the subsequent acts, as I said before, and it is in the second clause of that section. That is the existing law.

Mr. MANN. I assume that that may be correct, although I am not at all sure that that edition is correct. It is not an official copy. Why do they not tell where the amendment is, where the Revised Statute is amended? You propose to amend a section of the Revised Statutes which you say has been amended four or five or six times by referring to the original statute.

Mr. ALEXANDER. They have simply collected the navigation laws for convenience.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing that, but far from it. It is a matter of convenience.

Now, I understood some one to say awhile ago that they appointed an inspector at New York and transferred him to Chicago or some of these other places. They are appointed at New York at a salary of $2,000 a year, are they not? If they were appointed for Chicago, they would be appointed at a salary of $1,600; and I guess that is the reason they are so appointed and transferred. That is the only reason I have seen yet for the passage of this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I gave the explanation made by Mr. Hoover. It is very clear to my mind.

Mr. MANN. May I ask, with all due deference, who Mr. Hoover is?

Mr. ALEXANDER. He is the chief clerk in the office of the inspector general, and a very competent man. He has been there for many years.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The bill was read in full.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The bill provides that every inspector shall be paid his actual and reasonable traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, and so forth. The law now in force provides that these employees shall be allowed—

Only their actual necessary traveling expenses while traveling on official business assigned them by competent authority.

The language of the existing law reads very good to me. It was only inserted in the law a short time ago, after deliberate judgment by Congress. May I ask my friend from Missouri why the department seeks to change the language of the law in reference to traveling expenses, and apparently make it a little more liberal? Is that designedly done?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I did not understand there was any change made at all in the existing law. In fact, Mr. Hoover assured us that no change had been made in the salaries or the compensation of the inspectors.

Mr. MANN. Of course it is very difficult to tell. I have no criticisms to make of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] or anybody else. The gentleman from Missouri is one of the most efficient Members of this House, and unfortunately he has to take charge of a bill, which he brings up this afternoon, probably without having expected that he would have charge of it. The report contains no information.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say that my colleague from Texas [Mr. HARDY] was detained at home by illness.

Mr. MANN. He is away for a good reason undoubtedly. The report contains no information, and the gentleman in charge of the bill does the best that he can, but there is a good deal of information that he does not have and that the rest of us do not have. I suggested to somebody over here awhile ago that probably the best way to pass a bill in the House was to have as complete ignorance concerning it as possible, so that you would have nothing on which to base opposition.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOLDFOGLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20281) to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATES OF INSPECTION OF STEAM VESSELS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20107) to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4421 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4421. When the inspection of a steam vessel is completed and the inspectors approve the vessel and her equipment throughout, they shall make and subscribe a certificate, which certificate shall be verified by the oaths of the inspectors signing it, before the chief officer of the customs of the district or any other person competent by law to administer oaths. Such certificate shall be delivered to the master or owner of the vessel to which it relates, and one copy thereof shall be kept on file in the inspectors' office and one copy shall be delivered to the collector or other chief officer of the customs of the district in which such inspection has been made, who shall keep the same on file in his office. If the inspectors refuse to grant a certificate of approval, they shall make a statement in writing and sign the same, giving the reasons for their disapproval. Upon such inspection and approval the inspectors shall also make and subscribe a temporary certificate, which shall set forth substantially the fact of such inspection and approval, and shall deliver the same to the master or owner of the vessel and shall keep a copy thereof on file in their office. The said temporary certificate shall be carried and exposed by vessels in the same manner as is provided in section 4423 for the regular certificate, and the form thereof and the period during which it is to be in force shall be as prescribed by the board of supervising inspectors, or the executive committee thereof, as provided in section 4405. And such temporary certificate, during such period and prior to the delivery to the master or owner of the regular certificate, shall take the place of and be a substitute for the regular certificate of inspection, as required by this section and by section 4426, and for the purposes of said sections. Such temporary certificate shall also be subject to revocation in the manner and under the conditions provided in section 4453. No vessel required to be inspected under the provisions of this title shall be navigated without having on board an unexpired regular certificate of inspection or such temporary certificate: *Provided, however,* That any such vessel operated upon a regularly established line from a port of the United States to a port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States whose certificate of inspection expires at sea or while said vessel is in a foreign port or a port of the Philippine Islands or Hawaii may lawfully complete her voyage without the regular certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section, and no liability for penalties imposed by this title for want of such certificate shall be incurred until her voyage shall have been completed: *Provided,* That said voyage shall be so completed within 30 days after the expiration of said certificate or temporary certificate: *Provided further,* That no such vessel whose certificate of inspection shall expire within 15 days of the date of her sailing shall proceed upon her voyage to such port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States without first having procured a new certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section."

SEC. 2. That section 4422 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4422. Upon the application of any master or owner of any steam vessel employed in the carriage of passengers, for a license to carry gunpowder, the local inspectors shall examine such vessel, and if they find that she is provided with a chest or safe composed of metal, or entirely lined and sheathed therewith, or if the vessel has one or more compartments thoroughly lined and sheathed with metal, at a secure distance from any fire, they may grant a certificate to that effect, authorizing such vessel to carry as freight within such chest, safes, or compartments, the article of gunpowder, which certificate shall be kept conspicuously posted on board such vessel."

SEC. 3. That section 4423 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4423. The original certificate of inspection delivered to the master or owner of a steam vessel shall be placed by such master or owner in a conspicuous place in the vessel where it will be most likely to be observed by passengers and others, and there kept at all times, framed under glass, as evidence of the authority thereby conferred: *Provided, however,* That where it is not practicable to so expose said certificate, it shall be carried in the vessel in such manner as shall be prescribed by the regulations established by the board of supervising inspectors with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce."

SEC. 4. That section 4424 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4424. Whenever any passenger is received on board any steam vessel not having an unexpired certificate of approval or an unexpired temporary certificate of approval placed and kept as required by this title, or whenever any passenger steam vessel receives or carries any gunpowder on board, not having a certificate authorizing the same, placed and kept as required, or shall carry any gunpowder at a place or in a manner not authorized by such certificate, such steam vessel shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each offense."

SEC. 5. That section 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4498. A register, enrollment, or license shall not be granted, or other papers be issued by any collector or other chief officer of customs to any vessel subject by law to inspection under this title until all the provisions of this title applicable to such vessel have been fully complied with and until the copy of the certificate of inspection required by this title for such vessel has been filed with said collector or other chief officer of customs."

SEC. 6. That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1908, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That a register, enrollment, or license shall not be issued or renewed by any collector or other officer of customs to any such barge unless at the time of issue or renewal such barge has in force the certificate of inspection prescribed by section 10 and on board the equipment prescribed by section 11."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF PREDACEOUS FISHES AND AQUATIC ANIMALS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 16477) to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman give the calendar number?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is Union Calendar No. 245. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. I will say that this is the last bill I expect to call up this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16477) to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is on the Union Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Fisheries be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to conduct investigations and experiments for the purpose of ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by dogfish and other predaceous fishes and aquatic animals.

SEC. 2. That the said investigations and experiments shall be such as to develop the best and cheapest means of taking such fishes and aquatic animals, of utilizing them for economic purposes, especially for food, and to establish fisheries and markets for them; and for these purposes the Commissioner of Fisheries is authorized to employ such persons as may be necessary, and to catch, buy, or otherwise obtain, and to sell at cost or less or distribute gratuitously such quantities of the said aquatic products as may be necessary for tests or demonstrations of their qualities or the establishment of a demand among prospective consumers: *Provided*, That the proceeds of any such sales shall be accounted for and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Fisheries, through the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit in his annual estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of Fisheries an estimate of the sum of money necessary to give effect to this act.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the said investigations and experiments shall be such as to develop the best and cheapest means of taking such fishes and aquatic animals, of utilizing them for economic purposes, especially for food, and to establish fisheries and markets for them; and for these purposes the Commissioner of Fisheries is authorized to employ such persons as may be necessary, and to catch, buy, or otherwise obtain, and to sell at cost or less or distribute gratuitously such quantities of the said aquatic products as may be necessary for tests or demonstrations of their qualities or the establishment of a demand among prospective consumers: *Provided*, That the proceeds of any such sales shall be accounted for and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 2. This bill is being read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is so. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out section 2.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the first part of this bill provides for an investigation of dogfish and other predaceous fishes and aquatic animals. That is all right. This section, which I think has not met with very much approval, even from the committee which reported it, authorizes the Department of Commerce to go into the business of buying, selling, or giving away fish. I think the gentleman will realize that whether it ought to be in the law or not there is no possibility of the bill being enacted into law at this session of Congress with that section in it—"to catch, buy, or otherwise obtain, and to sell at cost or less or distribute gratuitously such quantities of the said aquatic products as may be necessary for tests," and so forth. We can not undertake that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], the author of the bill.

Mr. HINDS. I do not object to that going out, if that will save the bill.

Mr. MANN. There would be no chance for the bill with that in it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, to strike out section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Fisheries, through the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit in his annual estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of Fisheries an estimate of the sum of money necessary to give effect to this act.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "act," on page 2, line 16, the words "*Provided*, That the said sum shall not exceed $15,000 in any fiscal year."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$15,000" and inserting "$5,000."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$15,000" and inserting "$5,000." The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. MANN. I will withhold it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say that I shall move to adjourn soon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 655. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments to two omnibus pension bills, H. R. 19545 and H. R. 20562, and to ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments——

Mr. MANN. To take these bills from the Speaker's table.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 19545 and H. R. 20562, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. LANGHAM.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, February 4, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army, submitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the rivers and harbors act, June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., 676), certain claims against the United States, which have been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War (H. Doc. No. 1557), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18086) to amend section 71 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 4, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1346), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20814) to place Candler and Evans Counties, Ga., in the eastern division of the southern district of Georgia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1347), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19907) to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1362), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17122) for the relief of John Burrows, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1348), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 691) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1360), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PRICE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18197) for the relief of Arthur W. Fowler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1355), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19325) for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1349), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15666) for the relief of John A. Ryan, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1350), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17174) to pay the claim of the American Towing & Lightering Co. for damages to its tug *Buccaneer*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1352), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill H. R. 19399, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 720) referring to the Court of Claims the papers for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith, accompanied by a report (No. 1351), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13709) for the relief of Joe Davis, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1357), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2589) for the relief of Peter McKay, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1359), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20800) for the relief of Charlotte M. Johnston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1356), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3925) for the relief of Teresa Girolami, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1361), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16896) for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1353), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21077) for the relief of W. F. Crawford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1354), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PRICE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18756) for the relief of Mollie H. Pumphrey, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1358), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR (by request): A bill (H. R. 21304) to create an executive department of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 21305) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 719) directing the Postmaster General to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, favoring a national highway fund; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 21306) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21307) granting an increase of pension to John K. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 21308) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21309) granting an increase of pension to William R. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 21310) granting an increase of pension to John Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 21311) granting a pension to Bridget Kenney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21312) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Ludwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 21313) granting a pension to Otto Day; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 21314) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Resolution (H. Res. 720) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 721) authorizing the payment of $600 to Norman E. Ives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 722) to pay $600 to Lillie M. Reesch for extra services rendered in connection with statements filed by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of various labor organizations of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), memorial of the executive council of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of the New York State Federation of Labor; the Minnesota State Federation of Labor; the International Seamen's Union of America; the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor; the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America; the International Protective Association of Retail Clerks; and the Railway Employees' Department, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, protest by the Upson Nut Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, against the Alexander bill (H. R. 18666), relating to Government ownership and operation of merchant vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the German-American Alliance and the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Newark, Ohio, with a membership of 1,200, praying for legislation to prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war to the belligerent countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jerry Loewendick and 123 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, praying for an embargo upon all contraband of war exportations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Leonard Yeager, J. J. Hauser, Christian Benz, jr., F. W. Boldt, John Yeager, jr., Michael Nole, R. Reufbacher, Martin G. Archelman, and Martin Archelman, all of Altoona, Pa., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, forbidding exportation of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of president Chicago Branch National Association, A. C. P., protesting against jim-crow cars in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of David P. Roberts, Saxman, Cambria County, Pa., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of New Jersey Federation of Patriotic Fraternities, Camden Branch, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of International Seamen's Union of America and sundry organizations of workers of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Nicholas Winter, of Union, N. J., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Max Krapp and Henry Hagen, of Union Hill, N. J., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Fairfield quarterly meeting of the Society of Friends, representing 1,682 people, urging passage of the bill for the advancement of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of J. J. Dues and other citizens of Minster, and T. J. Lankenan and others, of Ohio, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petitions of sundry citizens of Taylorville, Carlinville, Brighton, Nokomis, Mount Olive, and Bunker Hill, Ill., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of New York State Federation of Labor, Utica, and International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of mass meeting of citizens of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of New York nonpartisan citizenship committee, relative to sustaining President Wilson in his action on the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Goethe Lodge, D. O. H., of the first congressional district of Vermont, favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of H. Engel Kern and others, of Columbia, Pa., and vicinity, favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of F. E. Goehring and others, of Frohna, Mo., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of U. S. Ring Traveler Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against preventing sale of stamped envelopes by United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of Rev. G. D. Gurley, August Pepmiller, J. W. Fugeray, Charles Mathews, G. W. Williams, Charles E. Merrill, Otto J. Rettek, Peter Retter, Otto J. Kuebler, H. J. Katenhauser, Edward G. Folz, O. V. Knapp, F. C. Raber, Otto A. Britzins, William Koch, Theo. Britzins, Charles Munn, V. Kriekbram, O. M. Medcalf, J. C. De Forest, W. M. Walden, M. D., John W. Barrett, Gus Keller, E. G. Harris, Arthur Seybold, all of Newburg, Ind., and Charles H. Meier, of Evansville, Ind., favoring Senate bill 6683 and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of R. I. Brockett, Henry D. Stahlschmidt, Frank Miller, Walter Becker, H. F. Berg, Farmer Ruston, Freeman Moss, John G. Wimberg, P. H. Kiely, W. A. Bosse, G. W. Pfender, all of Evansville, Ind., favoring Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Central Labor Union, International Molders' Union, firemen's organization of Omaha, and Central Labor Union of Lincoln, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Plattdeutscher Verein and 54 citizens of Millard, Nebr.; also 23 citizens of second Nebraska congressional district, favoring legislation to prevent export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Memorial of members of the Polish National Alliance, Nos. 99 and 107, of Calumet, and of the Tow Siv Piotra Polish Society, of Ironwood, Mich., protesting against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of William C. Kauth, F. C. Seideman, and others, of Hancock, and Henry Wachter and others, of Bagley, Daggett, Stephenson, and Ingalls, Mich., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of German-American Alliance, of Middletown, Conn., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Resolutions and letters from the Stockton (Cal.) Merchants' Association; Salida (Colo.) Commercial Club; Fort Scott (Kans.) Industrial Association; Merchants' Association of Snohomish County, Wash.; Osakis (Minn.) Commercial Club; Commercial Club of Benson, Minn.; Curtis (Nebr.) Commercial Club; Ardmore (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce; and Baraboo (Wis.) Commercial Association, all urging the passage of House bill 5308, providing for a tax on all persons, corporations, etc., engaged in the mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Indianapolis, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of B'rith Sholem Verein of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting that the President's veto of the immigration bill be sustained; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of a conference of American citizens representing church, benevolent, educational, and other civil organizations, held at Washington, D. C., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of H. Penner and five other citizens of Whitewater, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 5308, compelling concerns selling goods to customers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds toward the development of the local community, the county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Messrs. Stanley and Krebbiel, of Elyria, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of R. G. Barnes, of Galva, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Haldeman Mercantile Co. and four others of Inman, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Messrs. Riesen and Dysk and three others of Halstead, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mr. Armoner and three others, of Bentley, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of F. A. Rice and six others of Potwin, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Gouring Krehbul Mercantile Co. and 10 others, of Moundridge, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Hanlin Sheep Mercantile Co. and 21 others, of Newton, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ira G. Wilson and 7 others, of Canton, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of R. C. Strahm and 17 others, of McPherson, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Communications from the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs of America, the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, the International Seamen's Union of America, and the New York State Federation of Labor, all favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, telegram from the San Francisco Labor Council, and communications from the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of A. Lenteneker, of Chicago Park, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Star of Hope and other Polish societies of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of Mrs. J. R. Fletcher and others, of Hill City, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of 53 citizens of Hawley, 72 citizens of Lewisville, 17 citizens of Kratka, citizens of Ottertail, Richville, and Thief River Falls, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 790 American citizens, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of the Shawnee (Okla.) Trades and Labor Assembly, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, urging the Congress to pass the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, urging the passage by Congress of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Pattern Makers' League of North America, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 4, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy name is above every name. Thy authority alone is supreme in all the universe. Thou art the Supreme Judge of men. There is no revoking Thy order; no appeal from Thy decree. Thou dost rule us by Thy power and Thy love. We bless Thee that Thou hast revealed unto us the infinite tenderness of Thy love; that Thou dost refine our spirits more and more; that by the gentle influence of Thy grace we are enabled more and more to know the infinite tenderness of the love of God.

Grant us this day to return love for Thy love and obedience to Thy will, that we may be in subjection to the great God of heaven to do the will of our Father which is in heaven. For Christ's sake. Amen.

ALBERT B. FALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not want it to be supposed that I am going to make a habit of discussing the Journal. I have always felt that the reading of the Journal was a ceremony to be disposed of rapidly and dispensed with as far as possible. But "absence makes the heart grow fonder," and I am beginning to feel some attachment to a Journal which we do not get except at intervals, perhaps, of 10 days or more, when it is presented to us in a large and more or less inaccurate mass.

I do not wish to speak about this Journal of yesterday which has just been read, but in connection with the Journal of Tuesday which, by unanimous consent, went over for revision. I wish to correct an error into which I think I may have fallen myself in what I said about the Journal of Tuesday. On last Friday—I think it was last Friday, but since we have abandoned the Gregorian calendar, which is in general use among mankind, and devised a new calendar of our own, I may not be perfectly accurate—but last Friday, I think, was the occasion when we had some great movements here in the field of parliamentary law; it was my misfortune—and I regard it as a very great misfortune—that I was not present to listen during that period, for it is very interesting to see parliamentary law in the making, and that evening we not only revised a good many rules of the Senate, but we made some wholly new parliamentary law never conceived or thought of before.

I was reminded in that connection of an old story which everybody has heard. When some one said in the House of Commons to Henry Labouchere that the story he had just told was neither true nor new, he said he did not in the least object to being told that his story was not true, but he did object to being told that it was not new; he was sure it was new because he made all his stories himself. Whatever may be said of the rulings that evening, they were certainly new; and that is why I was anxious for a better revision of the Tuesday Journal.

I now refer to the most important ruling made that night—I think it was the most important—in regard to the use of the ordering of the yeas and nays as a previous question. I said on Tuesday that it was a decision of the Chair. I had taken the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I had noted that on page 2587 at the bottom it said:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair).

I read it along to page 2590, where the rulings occurred in the first and second columns, and I assumed that they were made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], for there was no statement that the Senator from Kentucky had left the chair. When the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] said that he thought I was mistaken in saying it was a decision, I felt sure it must be a decision, because the Senator from Kentucky never doubts or hesitates; and I was certain that he could not be accused of having made a tentative decision, which was to me a new and ingenious phrase.

I have heard it stated, though it does not appear in the RECORD, that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] made the ruling in question, and the Senator from Georgia, with the natural feeling we all have when we see a friend floundering in the water or trying to escape from a fire, naturally came to the defense of the Senator from Virginia, and said his decision was a "tentative" ruling.

Mr. President, this one fact illustrates the need of a revision of this Tuesday Journal. According to the RECORD, the Senator from Kentucky was in the chair; but the Senator from Georgia, who was an eyewitness, evidently considered that the Senator from Virginia was in the chair. This illustrates the confusion and certainly shows the need of a careful revision of the Journal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I will yield in a moment.

Now, Mr. President, I think I was not mistaken in the impression conveyed to the Senate by these rulings. The Presiding Officer, according to the RECORD, was the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]; according to eyewitnesses, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]; and I, of course, do not wish to take any sides in the contest as to who made those now celebrated rulings. I have heard that both the distinguished Senators to whom I have referred claimed the honor of making those rulings, and since then that, in a spirit of generous rivalry, they are each trying to yield to the other the honor of having made the brilliant discovery of the order of the yeas and nays

as a kind of mongrel previous question. But here is what was said:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is mistaken, he would be very glad to hear any Senator who dissents from the decision of the Chair; but the Chair is satisfied that no amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is in order until the yea-and-nay vote has been taken.

Now, that has every appearance of a decision.

However, the Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is to perfect the original text, which would be voted on prior to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida, under Rule XVIII, and it being the general parliamentary law that the original text must be perfected before a substitute is voted on. The ordering of the yeas and nays will prevent any amendment being offered to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida.

Of course, that may be called a tentative decision, but it reads to me very much like a plain decision. Then he said further:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to hear any decision to the contrary, but the Chair is of opinion that if the yeas and nays have been ordered on a proposition if it is modified the yeas and nays would have been ordered on a different proposition if an amendment were made.

There is the ingenious reason for a decision which is not a decision clearly given.

If the mover of a resolution, under the rules of the Senate, can not modify it after the yeas and nays are ordered, it would seem to the Chair that any proposition upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered would be of equal dignity.

I am not going to enter into the obvious proposition that the admission of an amendment to the original bill would change the situation just as much as a perfecting amendment to the substitute. This goes to the merits of the question, and with the merits of the question I am not now concerned. Such, then, are the "tentative" rulings.

The Senate on both sides, I think, understood that the question had been determined when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] on Monday—I believe I am again right in reference to the calendar day—moved to recommit the bill. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], in charge of the bill, who is a Senator of long service and an experienced parliamentarian, following, of course, closely the decisions that had been so recently and brilliantly made, said:

Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has decided to take a vote on the pending question and the yeas and nays have been ordered. No other motion is in order until that is decided. The Senate has determined that, and I make that point of order.

So the impression on the mind of the senior Senator from Florida as to the tentative decision was the same as the impression upon my mind and, I think, upon those of all the Senators around me that the question had been determined by the Senator from Virginia.

Thereupon, as we all know, the question came to the Senate and the Senate decided that the new ruling was not correct and returned the body by their decision to the old, and, as I believe, only sound, ground, which is that ordering the yeas and nays; that is, determining the method of taking a vote when a vote is reached, is not in the nature of ordering the previous question on amendments, although not on debate, and that decision of the Senate, of course, stands until the Senate reverses it or until some one occupies the chair who has forgotten it. This Friday ruling was a very important one. It had a brief life from Friday night until Monday afternoon, but it was beautiful and pleasant in its life, and while it existed we all wondered and obeyed. Now, it has been ruthlessly disposed of by a Senate vote.

Mr. President, I call attention to these facts in order to correct my own error, if I was wrong in my opinion as to the Friday night ruling. I also call attention to it so that those who have the Journal in charge may make certain who was the Senator in the chair who made that ruling. I think we ought to know, and I wished to call attention to it before the Friday Journal is finally approved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts called attention—the Senator from Massachusetts yields?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I have yielded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When the Senator from Massachusetts called attention to the action of the Senate on Friday night last, by his consent I sought to correct him at the time and to suggest that he was in error when he supposed that the Presiding Officer on Friday last ruled that an amendment could not be entertained to a pending proposition after a call for the yeas and nays. The Senator from Massachusetts referred to the manner in which the Senator from Virginia when in the chair handled this question, and I called to his attention the fact that the Senator from Virginia in the chair did not rule on it, that he expressed a tentative opinion and refrained from ruling.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Then I understand the Senator thinks that those two rulings—rulings as they seem to me—were made by the Senator from Virginia and not by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No rulings were made by either on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. We will not dispute about terms.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The language referred to was by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. The two statements that I read were made by the Senator from Virginia, not by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The statements were by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly; and then the RECORD is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The RECORD is wrong.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I do not yield for the present, if the Senator from Kentucky will allow me to finish answering the Senator from Massachusetts. The RECORD fails to show the place at which the Senator from Kentucky ceased to preside. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows the Senator from Kentucky in the chair and later on shows the Senator from Kentucky on the floor raising a point of order without showing at any place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the Senator from Kentucky ceased to be in the chair and when the Senator from Virginia took the chair.

What I rose for was to emphasize the suggestion that I made to the Senator from Massachusetts when he brought this subject to the attention of the Senate before. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] did not rule that the amendment to the substitute was out of order upon the ground that the yeas and nays had been called for. He could not have ruled it out of order, for no amendment to the substitute was at that time presented.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one moment, please.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment offered was to the original text; and the Senator from Virginia held that, as it was to the original text, it was in order. He went on, however, and expressed tentatively his views. There was no opportunity for an appeal from the decision of the Chair, because there was no decision, there was no amendment offered on which an appeal could be based. So it in no sense takes the form of a ruling of the Chair affecting the procedure of the Senate, but is merely an expression of an opinion by the Presiding Officer upon a subject that was not before him.

Just one moment further now. A little prior to that time when the subject was up, the Senator will find, on page 2589, that the Presiding Officer said:

It is not now in order—

That is to say, to offer an amendment—

because a motion to lay on the table has been made by the Senator from Utah. It is not in order until that motion is disposed of.

That was after the call for the yeas and nays. So upon that same Friday afternoon we hear the Chair indicating clearly that after the disposition of the motion to lay on the table an amendment might be offered to the substitute, although a call for yeas and nays had been made.

Mr. President, my view was very pronounced upon this subject. I believed that an amendment could still be made; I believed that the rules specifically permitted the amendment; I believed, and I still believe, that Rule XV expressly authorized a motion to recommit until final action upon the bill; I have no doubt about that myself. Of course, as I claim the privilege of my own opinion, I concede most heartily to others their opinion. I only wish to prevent the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] from strengthening the authority against the right to offer an amendment after the yeas and nays were called. I wish to remove the suggestion that any ruling on Friday last was authority against the right to move to recommit after the yeas and nays were called, for there had been no formal ruling on the subject in the Senate on Friday from which an appeal was taken.

I do not desire to occupy the attention of the Senate just now, but at a little later time I may present to the Senate a short statement with reference to Rule XV and with reference to the constitutional provision and the history of the constitu-

tional provision on the yeas and nays, which to me conclusively sustains the opinion that the yeas and nays are only intended as a means of recording the vote, to furnish the status of each Senator to the public, and not to give a minority the privilege of segregating a question and preventing the majority from shaping it as they wish to shape it before they finally vote on it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I wish to suggest that it is hardly necessary for me to say that I agree with him absolutely in his view as to the yeas and nays and their uses, and my vote shows that. What I want to ask him is—for I am trying to learn as we go on here developing our parliamentary law——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Massachusetts the benefit of any information I have.

Mr. LODGE. I want to ask the Senator this: Does the Senator hold that the Chair can not make the ruling unless he rules and opens the opportunity for appeal? Over and over again, both in the Senate and in the other House, I have seen Senators and Members of the House rise and ask the Chair if an amendment or a motion would be in order, and the Chair would say "the motion is not in order," and the motion would never be offered; there would never be an opportunity for an appeal; but the Chair would rule on the right of the Member or his request to offer the amendment. It has always been taken as a ruling.

The Senator from Georgia says that this was a tentative statement. It seems to me, on reading it pretty carefully, to be about as explicit, with the reasons, as a ruling can be made.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Massachusetts asked me a question, and I suppose he wished me to answer it?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know that it is customary for Senators and Members of the other House and of other parliamentary bodies to rise and inquire of the Chair what the Chair's view would be on a subject, but I do not consider answers to such questions by the Chair as rulings in any way binding upon the body. I do not think the Chair could make a ruling that would be binding upon the body unless a question was submitted to him from which the right of appeal would exist. I do not think that from a tentative expression of an opinion of that kind an appeal could properly be made. I would regard it rather as the expression of an opinion by a judge on a subject that was not before him.

Mr. LODGE. My point is that the opportunity for an appeal is not necessary to constitute what the Chair declares a ruling. It can be a ruling without it. I am not saying that the Senator asked, "Would it be in order?" He asked, "Is this amendment in order?" And the Chair said, "No; it would not be in order at this time," or, "It would not be in order." I have seen that done again and again. That, in my judgment, is a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should look upon that rather as advice by the Chair to the one making the inquiry; and if I were interested in the matter, it seems to me I would rather tender my motion or tender my amendment and go through the various parliamentary stages of insisting upon my rights, unless I wanted simply to act upon the advice of the presiding officer.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. Referring also to the expression of the Senator from Virginia, when he was in the chair, he expressly stated before he finished his remarks, as I recall them, that he did not intend to rule upon the subject; that it was not then before him; and he did not say that he would not entertain an amendment if it was offered. The Senator from Virginia, however, is now in his seat, and is better capable than am I of discussing what he said.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the merits of the ruling. I am afraid I am beyond change on that. But I want to ask the Senator from Georgia one other question. Is it not true, as is shown by the statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] which I read, that he regarded the question as determined by the Senate—he used that phrase—and that is what I regard it, as determined? I mean that was the idea certainly in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was present in the Senate at the time when the expressions by the Presiding Officer were made; I knew that I differed from some of my colleagues in my opinion about the subject, and I was watching it pretty constantly, intending myself to insist upon my own view of the rule if the occasion required. With all deference to the views of my colleagues, I had such a pronounced view upon the subject that I could not yield it, and if the ruling had been made it had been my own purpose, most courteously and, of course, deferentially, to appeal from the ruling, because I regarded it as a matter of the utmost importance to preserve the permanent right of Senators to perfect measures before them and to prevent a ruling which would allow one-fifth of the Senate the opportunity to segregate a question and force it to a vote to the exclusion of the desire of four-fifths to put it in the shape in which they desired finally to vote upon it before they did vote. My views were so strong upon that subject that it was well known that I intended if necessary to appeal from any ruling to the contrary and to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, there seems to be some dispute as to when I took the chair and just at what point in the proceedings I left it. I was in the chair when the yeas and nays were being called on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to adjourn, as shown on page 2587. I remained in the chair until the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] was read. Then the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] took the chair, and was in the chair when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] addressed the Chair, on page 2589.

I make this announcement not for the purpose of seeking to avoid any responsibility that may attach to the ruling which is now criticized. I voted to sustain the ruling of the Vice President. I think that vote was right, and I have no apology to make for it. I should gladly cast the same vote again.

Of course I recognize that as the situation has somewhat changed and the leadership has passed from this side of this body to the other side, we are in some degree now at the mercy of the alliance, but nevertheless I merely wanted to make this statement to show that if I had been in the chair I should have ruled as the Vice President of the United States did.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I rise not for the purpose of taking part in any discussion as to the ruling, or as to whether there was a ruling, but because other days will come, other sessions, other bills will be before the Senate, and many and many a time the best, sometimes the vital, interests of the country will depend upon the protection of due and orderly parliamentary procedure in this body.

Now, sir, we have the Journal which covers the proceedings of last Friday night before us, its approval suspended for further consideration. We have heard different Senators, whose opinions are unquestionably sincere, differing as to whether rulings were made or were not made, and we have the ascertained fact that the RECORD contains at least one serious error in carrying the impression, an erroneous impression, upon the very important fact as to who occupied the chair.

In making up the Journal it is the duty of the Journal Clerk to translate the voluminous record into a statement of his own as to what in fact was the effect of what was done, and, inasmuch as the Journal Clerk has to translate and state the effect of what was done while the Senate itself is in doubt, in dispute as to what was done, and inasmuch as the RECORD, upon which the Journal Clerk has to proceed, has in it at least one manifest error, it seems to me that if there is ever an occasion for the approval of the Journal by the Senate there is now occasion that the Senate shall know what it is doing when it passes upon the Journal. It is plain that the Senate can not pass upon the Journal upon the rapid reading which we have already had, for none of us can remember what was contained in that paper as it was read, nor can any rapid reading from the desk carry a correct idea.

I ask, sir, therefore, that that part of the Journal which relates to the proceedings of last Friday evening be printed before approval and placed in the hands of Senators, in order that they may consider the correctness of the Journal Clerk's statement of the effect of what was done. I do that, sir, in the hope, in the expectation, that when we have that paper before us Senators, all of whom desire that there shall be an accurate record and that the future proceedings of the Senate shall not be embarrassed, will be able to agree upon the correct statement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion in relation to that matter before the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] proceeds?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator has asked that that portion of the Journal referred to by him be printed. Would it not be well to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. ROOT. That is immaterial, Mr. President. My idea was that it should be printed before approval, so that it would practically be equivalent to circulating a proof, that we may go over it, and undoubtedly we can agree upon what it ought to be. I do not care, however, where it is printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well; I do not care to insist if the Senator does not want it that way.

Mr. ROOT. I think it would be better, sir, that it should not be printed in the RECORD until after there has been an agreement. It might be very misleading in the future.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only mistake I see in the RECORD during the time when I was presiding is that the reporter failed to note when I returned to the chair. I had that omission corrected the next day, so far as it could be corrected, to indicate when I returned to the chair. I have not had time to read the minutes, nor did I make any correction of the record as furnished by the reporter. I desire the record to stand as it is, absolutely without change. I am willing to abide by any decision I made and by every interpretation given. The record speaks for itself, and I see no occasion for anyone on this side—and certainly not the Presiding Officer at that time—to have any agreement as to what the Journal shall indicate. Let the Journal speak for itself; let the decisions speak for themselves. There is no decision that I rendered, no ruling that I made, that I am ashamed of, that I desire to apologize for, or that I would not make again. If any decision I made was not agreeable to this body, it had the authority to appeal. It is a majority of the Senate that determines what its rules are and their just interpretation.

When the yeas and nays were ordered they were ordered in pursuance of the policies adopted by the other side. The question was propounded to me—I have not had time to read the Journal or the record as made up by the reporters—but the Senator from Michigan asked me, inasmuch as the yeas and nays were ordered, whether I considered that an amendment could be offered to the substitute. It was a parliamentary inquiry. It was not in order at the time, and I said in answer to the parliamentary inquiry that I could tell him what were the views of the Chair; that I thought that it could not be amended for the simple reason that there are two rules which provide that a mover of a resolution can not withdraw it or modify it after the yeas and nays are ordered. He can modify it before then. Why? Because of the constitutional right to vote on a question which is pending. It is the same way in connection with the preamble of a bill. My idea was that under the Constitution one-fifth of the Members had a right to be recorded on a specific proposition. If that can be withdrawn and denied, then a majority can deprive one-fifth of that right by changing it. If the yeas and nays are ordered on a specific question, and it is amended and changed, when the time comes to vote it might be an entirely different proposition from that on which the yeas and nays were ordered, and they might not desire to order them. Still they would have to vote.

That was the view I entertained. I stated specifically that it was no time to pass upon it then, but that, as a parliamentary inquiry was made by the Senator from Michigan, I felt inclined to rule that way, but would be very glad, if I should be in the chair, to hear the question discussed pro and con, as I had not reached a definite conclusion. I voted to sustain the Vice President. I am satisfied that the Vice President's decision was correct and that to change it simply means to nullify the Constitution, which gives a man the right to vote on any question that is pending. It is a specific question, and if it can be changed entirely a man can be deprived of a vote on that question.

In a decision before this body it has been decided otherwise. The Senate has decided that an amendment is in order. That is the only decision I know of that has been rendered. I should have been very glad to have rendered that decision, if it had come to me as a specific question, unless authorities could have been produced otherwise. I find a decision in the House of Representatives, by Mr. Reed, where an effort was made to withdraw an amendment, which was permissible under the rules of the House, on the ground that the mover had a right to do so. Mr. Reed said it could not be done; that a man had a constitutional right to vote on the question, the yeas and nays having been ordered.

I was not in the Chamber when any other criticisms were made of the rulings Friday night. It seems to me the entire trouble with those rulings is with the Senators on the other side. I am willing to have the country understand the proceedings that were had here that night—an effort to thwart the will of a majority in this assembly, an effort to prevent a vote, a filibuster—and, as far as I am concerned, I do not desire any change from the notes made by the Official Reporters. I am willing to let those be inserted in the Journal, which is the right thing to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have taken no part in the discussion pertaining to this matter and will say only a word.

I confess that I was greatly astonished at some of the rulings that were made on Friday evening. I had supposed that I knew something about the rules of the Senate, having given special attention to them some time ago, and when certain rulings, or suggested rulings, were made I wondered exactly what was happening in the Senate of the United States.

On the bottom of page 2576 it will be observed that I took an appeal from the decision of the Chair on a matter different from that now under discussion. That was alluded to at least half a dozen times—perhaps oftener—in the next hour, but that appeal was never submitted to the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. What appeal was that?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will find it at the bottom of page 2576.

Mr. SWANSON. Who made the appeal?

Mr. GALLINGER. I made the appeal.

Mr. SWANSON. What was it on?

Mr. GALLINGER. It was on the point of order made by me against the ruling that the Presiding Officer could recognize any Senator, whether he had first addressed the Chair or not. I called attention to the rule that requires that the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator first addressing the Chair. Now, I am not criticizing——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator had moved to lay a motion on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. SWANSON. I ruled, which is proper, that under the rules recognition belongs to the Chair, and that no appeal could be made from a decision of the Chair with reference to recognition. That is included in Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. GALLINGER. Jefferson's Manual says that in the Senate the decision of the Presiding Officer is without appeal, which is a wrong statement. I am not familiar with the rule to which the Senator from Virginia alludes.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator hold that an appeal can be made from recognition?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not the point I am discussing. I took an appeal, which was recognized by the Chair, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] moved to lay the appeal on the table. The question was never submitted to the Senate on the motion to lay the appeal on the table; but I am not finding fault with the Chair. There was a great deal of confusion, and I simply call attention to that fact to justify something that occurred afterwards.

I offered certain amendments to the original text. I do not say that I would have offered them to the substitute had not a tentative ruling been made that they would not be in order; but I understood that the Chair held that no amendments could be offered to the substitute, from which view I very widely differed in opinion. I did not take an appeal from that tentative ruling, if we may call it such, but I did say this at a subsequent time:

> I think I have a right to ask that the rule be read, which I now do. The rule has been understood and never departed from in 24 years, to my knowledge. If we are to have the rules revolutionized, we ought to know what they are.

I did not take an appeal, because the former appeal I had taken had not been disposed of.

I read that for the purpose of showing that I regarded some of the rulings as most extraordinary.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator what rulings they were.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can look them up for himself.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to know. If they were so extraordinary, it ought to be very easy to point them out.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to engage in any controversy with the Senator from Virginia, who says that he stands by the rulings he made. He knows what they were. The most important one having been reversed by the Senate, I do not think it need be discussed.

I wish simply to say, and it is all I care to say, that I looked upon the rulings as being not only extraordinary but absolutely revolutionary, and I agree with those who hold that the matter ought to be looked into very carefully, and that the Journal ought to be corrected in many particulars. I hope, Mr. President, that hereafter we will be very careful in the observance of the rules of this body, which to my knowledge have been very scrupulously observed in the past.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to say that as far as I am concerned I shall oppose any change of the Journal except as it is disclosed by the record of the Official Reporters.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. The purpose of the Journal, of course, is to record accurately what was done by the Senate, including the Presiding Officer. It can make no difference in making up the Journal whether it is satisfactory or unsatisfactory to the Senator from Virginia or any other Member of this body; and certainly the Senate would not undertake to change or modify what is said in the Journal, except to make it speak the truth. Any effort to modify the Journal in order to change any ruling that might have been made by the Senator from Virginia certainly would not be justified. My position with respect to it is that we should be careful always to see that the Journal does accurately set forth just what was done by the Senate at any and all times.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For several days, ever since Monday, I have desired to present the reasons which controlled me in my vote sustaining the right of a motion to recommit the shipping bill, and I have been waiting for a suitable time. Since the discussion has gone as far as it has this morning, I believe perhaps this is the best time I can find.

Before proceeding to call attention to the rule of the Senate which I think controlled this matter and the constitutional provision on the subject, I ask the attention of the Senate to the status the shipping bill would have occupied if we had adhered to the ruling that the call for the yeas and nays precluded amendment. It is known that if the Fletcher substitute must go to a vote just as it is written, it will be defeated. It is understood that if it is amended a majority of the Senate will vote for it. Now, should that one-fifth have had the right to segregate this substitute just in the language which it used, and thus preclude the majority from the privilege of perfecting the substitute and adopting it?

I go one step further. It is claimed that they had the power, not the privilege, to segregate that substitute just as it was printed, and deny to the majority of the Senate the privilege of amending it, and thereby force the Senate to vote upon a proposition when a majority of the Senate would vote against it, and yet when it is understood that with some not very important amendments a majority of the Senate will vote for it.

Why, the friends of this measure who insisted upon the proposition that the call for the yeas and nays eliminated amendment, if they had been sustained, would have been left in a position where the substitute would have been beaten; and it is the defeat of the ruling which precluded the privilege of amending the substitute after the call for the yeas and nays that still makes it possible to perfect and pass this measure.

On Friday, January 29, the Senate had under consideration the shipping bill, to which an amendment in the nature of a substitute had been offered by the Senator from Florida. On this amendment a call was made for the yeas and nays and the presiding officer announced that "evidently a sufficient number have seconded the demand."

On Monday following, while the same subject was before the Senate, a motion was made that the "pending bill and all amendments be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce."

When the motion to recommit was made the senior Senator from Florida made the following point of order:

> Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has decided to take a vote on the pending question and the yeas and nays have been ordered. No other motion is in order until that motion is decided. The Senate has determined that, and I make that point of order.

The Chair sustained the point of order and an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and the Senate by a vote of 46 to 37 refused to sustain the ruling of the Chair.

Rule XV, paragraph 2, of the rules of the Senate provides that "it shall be in order at any time before the passage of any bill to move a commitment."

This rule is clear. It does not state that a motion to commit can be made at any time before a call for the yeas and nays, but it declares that "at any time before the passage of a bill" the motion shall be in order. To exclude a motion to recommit at any time before the passage of the bill is to override this express rule of the Senate.

There is nothing in the language of Rule XV that permits a construction preventing a motion to commit after the yeas and nays are called for. There is nothing in any other rule of the Senate which, taken in connection with Rule XV, would justify such a construction.

On the contrary, where the rules of the Senate contemplate that the ordering of the yeas and nays shall prevent action otherwise allowed by the rules it is so expressly declared, and this is done in only two instances. Under Rule XXI it is expressly declared that a motion or resolution may not be withdrawn or modified by the mover after the ordering of the yeas and nays without leave, and Rule XXIII provides that the mover can not of his own authority withdraw a preamble to a resolution when the yeas and nays are ordered.

These are the only two instances in which, under the rules, a call for the yeas and nays interferes with what otherwise would be the procedure of the Senate, and in these two instances the effect given to the yeas and nays is expressly declared by the rule. So that we have Rule XVI authorizing the motion to recommit at any time before the final passage of the bill, and thereby declaring that it can be made and will be in order after a call for the yeas and nays.

But it is contended that paragraph 3 of section 5 of the Constitution gives the right to call for the yeas and nays and to permit the motion to recommit after the call is made would interfere with a constitutional right. The language of the Constitution reads:

> Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, except such parts as may, in their judgment, require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

It will be observed that this paragraph of the Constitution does not say that one-fifth of those present may single out a question and force a vote upon that question without amendment and without change, but it gives to one-fifth the power to require the vote entered on the Journal.

This provision of the Constitution was not intended to give one-fifth of the Senate the power to prevent a majority from perfecting a measure by amendment or by recommitment. Such a power would enable one-fifth to defeat legislation by keeping it in an objectionable shape if originally presented in an objectionable shape, and thereby preventing the measure from being put in shape where the Senate would be willing to vote for it. It was intended solely as a guaranty that a minority might force publicity when a vote was had.

To give one-fifth the power to segregate a proposition and deprive the other four-fifths of the privilege of amending and perfecting it would be destructive of the rights of the majority of the Senate.

The practice of calling for the yeas and nays is an American practice. For the history and reason of the rule see Cushing's Law and Practices of Legislative Assemblies, sections 405 to 414, inclusive. See also Story on the Constitution, sections 840 to 842, giving the history and reason for that section of the Constitution.

Substantially this provision was a rule of the Continental Congress. That Congress held its sessions in secret. The rule, however, of the Continental Congress permitted any one Member to call for the yeas and the nays that a record vote might be had, and require the vote to be entered on the Journal and given to the public. It was not in the power of the one Member of that Congress to segregate a proposition and force a vote on it, excluding from the balance of the Congress the power of amending or of recommitting, or any other power that might be required to perfect the subject matter before a vote was actually had. It was solely intended to place within the power of any one Member the opportunity to cause publicity of a vote actually had.

The records of the Constitutional Convention show that this provision of the Constitution was first submitted in the following language:

> The House of Representatives and the Senate, when it shall be acting in a legislative capacity (each House) shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and shall, from time to time, publish them, except such parts as, in their judgment, require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of each House, on any question, shall be entered on the Journal, at the desire of any Member. (Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention, vol. 1, p. 156. Also, see p. 166, same volume; also, p. 180, sec. 7; also, p. 568, sec. 7; also, p. 592, sec. 5, subsec. b; also, p. 653, sec. 5, par. 3.)

The records of the convention show that the object of adopting this provision was to make it possible to cause publicity of a vote, and nowhere was it suggested that one-fifth were to have the power of forcing the four-fifths to act upon a measure before that measure was perfected. The language of the Constitution, the history of the provision, and all facts connected with it negative the suggestion that it was intended to do more than that which the language shows, to require placed upon the Journal a vote, that the position of each Senator might be made public, and neither the language nor its history places this provision of the Constitution in conflict with Rule XV of the Senate.

Returning to Rule XV of the Senate, it expressly authorizes the right of recommitment at any time before the passage of a bill. It therefore authorizes the motion to recommit after the call for the yeas and the nays.

Those entertaining this view of the situation could not refrain from voting to overrule the decision of the Presiding Officer. They saved the Senate from a ruling which would permit one-fifth of the Senate who opposed a pending measure from killing it by stopping any effort to perfect——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has requested——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Just one second before the question is put on the request of the Senator from New York. I do not want at this time to discuss at all the proceedings that occurred on Friday evening, but I do want to say to the Senate that in addition to the question which has been brought up and discussed here this morning there was also a controversy in which I was somewhat engaged and which, I think, also goes to a very vital point in regard to the interpretation of the rules. I did not at that time, as some Senators may remember, find any enthusiastic desire on the part of the Senate for me to explain my position, and I am not going to do so now; but when this matter finally comes up for consideration I shall want to say a word or two on this other point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has asked that the portion of the Journal which has to do with the proceedings of last Friday night be printed for the use of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIPPITT. What was the description of the matter the Senator from New York wishes to have printed? I think it should cover all of Friday night.

Mr. ROOT. It does cover Friday night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar day of Friday night.

Mr. GALLINGER. The evening session.

Mr. ROOT. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That portion of the Journal which embraces the proceedings of the Senate on Friday, the 29th of January, will be printed and laid on the desks of Senators for their examination to ascertain whether the Journal shall or shall not be approved. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no objection, the Journal of yesterday's proceedings as read will be approved, subject to future corrections.

The foregoing order was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary be, and hereby is, directed to have printed 200 copies of that portion of the Journal which embraces the proceedings of the Senate on Friday, the 29th of January, which shall be laid on the desks of Senators for their examination, to ascertain whether the Journal shall or shall not be approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, for the payment of claims for personal injuries sustained by certain persons and for damages done to other property through being run down in the streets of San Antonio, Tex., by a section of Battery B, United States Artillery, from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., on April 25, 1913, $8,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, stating that the balance sheet for the year ended December 31, 1914, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction which have been received prior to this date have been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The communication will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, February 3, 1915.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 14 of section 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, which reads as follows:

"That the accounts shall be closed annually on the 31st day of December and a balance sheet of that date promptly taken therefrom. On or before the 1st day of February following such balance sheet, together with such other information as the commission shall prescribe, verified by an owner or officer of the public utility, shall be filed with the commission and a copy thereof transmitted to Congress."

I have the honor to inform you that the balance sheets for the year ended December 31, 1914, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction which have been received prior to this date have been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatves.

Very respectfully, C. W. KUTZ, *Chairman.*

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. OWEN. I present the credentials of Hon. THOMAS PRYOR GORE, chosen as his own successor by the electors of the State of Oklahoma for the term beginning March 4, 1915.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19545) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. LANGHAM managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. LANGHAM managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 16477. An act to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals;

H. R. 18685. An act to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans;

H. R. 18686. An act to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20107. An act to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels;

H. R. 20281. An act to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed;

H. R. 20282. An act to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here three short statements from prominent members of the National Grange and the National Farmers' Union indorsing the joint resolution introduced by me to investigate certain personal rural-credit bills. I ask to have them inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1915.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Grange, I wish to thank you for introducing your resolution for an investigation of a bill or bills for the establishment of a sound system of personal rural credit. It should appeal to the judgment of every thoughtful person in this country.

I am inclosing herewith copy of a resolution adopted by the legislative committee of the National Grange, of which I am ex officio chairman, indorsing your resolution.

Believing you will do all you can to secure the passage of your resolution at this session of Congress, so as to enable the American farmers to reap the benefits of the proposed legislation in the near future, and thanking you for your efforts in this direction, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

OLIVER WILSON,
Master National Grange.

WASHINGTON, *February 3, 1915.*

The legislative committee of the National Grange, composed of Oliver Wilson, master National Grange and ex officio chairman legislative committee, Peoria, Ill.; T. C. Atkeson, master West Virginia State Grange; and H. J. Patterson, president Maryland Agricultural College and past master Maryland State Grange, adopted the following resolution indorsing the resolution introduced in the Senate to-day by Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, authorizing the Agricultural Committees to appoint a subcommittee to investigate such personal rural-credit bills which may be presented to it with sufficient authoritative backing. The resolution reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That we, the members of the legislative committee of the National Grange, hereby indorse the Sheppard joint resolution authorizing the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate, through a subcommittee, the subject of personal rural credit in a judicial manner."

OLIVER WILSON.
T. C. ATKESON.
H. J. PATTERSON.

—

NATIONAL HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1915.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your resolution for an investigation in a judicial manner of such bills for a personal rural-credit system as may be presented to a subcommittee of the Committees on Agriculture which may be presented by persons who, in the committee's opinion, have sufficient authoritative backing has my hearty approval and indorsement. My past experience as chairman of the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union convinces me that the method of investigation proposed by your resolution is a vast improvement over the old method for a purely scientific subject like credit.

The Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars within the past few years investigating monetary and credit institutions and subjects; yet not one of them ever drafted a bill on this subject. So it strikes me that a further investigation of the subject is a thing of the past, and Congress should authorize an investigation of bills on the subject.

I am inclosing herewith a resolution adopted at a conference held in this city, which organized the Rural Credit League of America. I was elected a member of the executive committee of that league at that conference, and I wish to thank you for introducing your resolution, and trust you will use your best efforts, as I know you will, to secure its enactment at this session of Congress.

Yours, sincerely,
S. H. HOBBS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Claims.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolution 13.]

Joint resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all reasonable effort to induce Congress to dispense with the requirement of an oath of loyalty to the Union during the late War between the States from those holding claims against the United States and wishing to prosecute them for payment.

Whereas there are now on file and pending before the Congress of the United States and before the United States Court of Claims many claims of citizens of North Carolina for supplies taken and used by the Army and Government of the United States during the late War between the States; and

Whereas these claims are just and meritorious, but our citizens can not present and prove them because they are required to make oath that they were loyal to the Union during the late War between the States: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to use all reasonable effort to induce Congress to dispense with the requirement of an oath of loyalty to the Union during the late War between the States from those who have claims to present for supplies taken and used by the Army or Government of the United States during the late War between the States, and to use all reasonable effort to assist our citizens in bringing such claims before the proper tribunal for a hearing upon their merits.

SEC. 2. That our secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this the 29th day of January, 1915.

E. L. DAUGHTRIDGE,
President of the Senate.
E. R. WOOTEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct. Inscoe, for committee.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Raleigh, February 2, 1915.

I, J. Bryan Grimes, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached two sheets to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh, this 2d day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.] J. BRYAN GRIMES,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Thomas O'Brien, of Berlin, N. H., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I file certain letters and telegrams and request that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Allow me, on behalf of this congregation, to express thanks and admiration for your courageous stand against iniquitous ship-purchase bill, which is unadulterated socialism and international folly.

E. T. HARGROVE,
Chapel of the Comforter, 10 Horatio Street.

—

BOSTON, MASS., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As lifelong Democrats who rejoice in the several great constructive measures enacted by the present Congress we commend every legitimate effort to defeat the Alexander shipping bill. Opposition to it deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation, in every section of which it is condemned by experienced business men, regardless of party, as well as by the people at large, who earnestly desire avoidance of all possible international friction. No more effective means could be devised for completely destroying private enterprise upon which successful development of a wisely encouraged American merchant marine depends.

ROBERT M. BURNETT.
JAMES M. CURLEY.
THOMAS B. FITZPATRICK.
JEROME JONES.
GEOFFREY B. LEHY.
EDWARD F. MCSWEENEY.
JAMES J. PHELAN.
BERNARD J. ROTHWELL.
JOSEPH B. RUSSELL.
JAMES J. STORROW.
JOHN A. SULLIVAN.

—

SOUTHAMPTON, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

As one of your constituents I respectfully urge you to vote against infamous ship-purchase bill. With our undermanned Navy sunk from second place to fourth, battle practice neglected, gunnery deteriorated, and our State Department a byword and laughingstock all over the world, this is no time to play party politics by a flagrant breach of neutrality, risking national humiliation or war with England, France, Japan, and Russia.

W. SCOTT CAMERON.

—

AUGUSTA, GA., *February 2, 1915.*

Senator O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I venture to send my hearty congratulations on what seems to me to be a patriotic and courageous stand. New York, I am convinced, is with you in opposing the present shipping bill. Regards and best wishes.

AUSTEN G. FOX.

—

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Almost unanimous opposition here to ship-purchase bill as wrong in principle and highly dangerous in practice. Urge you to maintain your courageous attitude of opposition.

JOHN F. B. MITCHELL,
33 Pine Street, New York City.

—

YONKERS, N. Y., *February 2, 1915.*

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Country owes you and Senators CLARKE of Arkansas, HARDWICK, BANKHEAD, VARDAMAN, HITCHCOCK, and CAMDEN debt of gratitude for statesmanship in opposing governmental ship-purchase bill. Gold is contraband. England rightly opposes exchange of Germany's interned and therefore useless ships for very sinews of war. Elusive hope of gaining few dollars by purchase and trade is nothing compared with becoming involved in war, or even losing friendly neutral relations with England, France, and Russia. Please show this to the others.

JAMES B. MURRAY.

—

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Through you we wish to express our strong disapproval of the so-called ship-purchase bill, and hope our views relative to this matter agree with your own and those of the majority of your constituents to permit of your voting against this measure.

Yours, respectfully,
WHITALL TATUM CO.,
H. V. BRUMLEY, *Secretary.*

—

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., *February 1, 1915.*

Senator O'GORMAN, *Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I wish to appeal to you as a citizen of your State to do all in your power to defeat this dangerous shipping bill, at present before the Senate.

I trust you realize that thoughtful opinion is distinctly against the placing upon our statute books of a bill which has been hastily thrown together, which is in nowise demanded by the people, and which may very conceivably bring us into controversy, with many friendly nations.

I am, sir,
Yours, very truly,
ALEXANDER PHILLIPS.

—

8 CLARK STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y., *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I can not refrain from thanking you and your six friends for the stand you have taken against the ship-purchasing bill. The entire nature of the bill is against neutrality as well as the best inter-

ests of the middling classes of this country. It is urged by a body of selfish men for personal gain, regardless of the trouble its passage would give us with other nations. Honest neutrality is our only safeguard. Should we get into trouble, what a nice opportunity for Mexico and Japan.

I am greatly surprised at the action of our President.

Again thanking you and your friends, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES S. S. LENNOX.

FEBRUARY 3, 1915.

Hon. J. O'GORMAN.

DEAR SIR: The stand you have taken against the shipping bill is so pleasing I can not refrain from expressing it. There is no good reason for passing such a measure.

The laws restricting the shipping companies should be changed so we can compete with foreigners. As they are to-day we can not hope ever to build a large mercantile marine. These laws have kept us for years from developing our shipping, and until corrected will continue to do so.

It does not seem as though we could take the position to which we are entitled by our people and resources without a large mercantile marine.

We also need an Army and Navy strong enough to protect us from the horrors which poor Belgium is enduring to-day.

Again expressing my satisfaction at your stand, I am, sir,

Yours, truly,

O. A. COOK,
108 West Eighty-fourth Street, New York City.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kingston, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a memorial from the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America upon the immigration bill. I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

JOURNEYMAN BARBERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Grand Rapids, Mich., February 2, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Local No. 8, Journeyman Barbers' International Union of America, of Grand Rapids, feeling that President Wilson has done all laboring men an injustice at the time he vetoed the immigration bill, H. R. 6060, we request you to use your best efforts to pass same over his veto.

Trusting you will give this your earnest consideration and awaiting a reply stating your position in this matter, we are,

Yours, respectfully,

LOCAL NO. 8,
Per A. J. KEECH, *Secretary.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the German-American Alliance of Middletown and Seymour, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented petitions of sundry citizens of Burns, Sheridan, and Leo, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NORRIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kearney, Nebr., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on the Upper White River, in that State, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the petition of Rev. E. W. Wilder and sundry other citizens of Granger, Wash., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Narcisse Grange, No. 301, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stevens County, Wash., praying for the Government ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Augustana Synod, Tacoma district of the Columbia Conference, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 8904. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg. (Rept. No. 961);

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois (Rept. No. 960); and

H. R. 20977. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal. (Rept. No. 962).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17330) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4876) to amend section 41 of the national-bank act, being renumbered as section 5144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 963) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 959) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19078) granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 957) thereon.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT MEMPHIS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 20933) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912, and I submit a report (No. 956) thereon. I direct the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the report.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I report back from the Committee on Commerce favorably without amendment the bill (S. 7535) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the report.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 7535 was passed this morning. It is the bill authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will disclose the noting of the motion.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. By direction of the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 20189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors,

and for other purposes, with a brief statement attached. I ask leave to make a fuller and more formal report later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar and leave will be granted.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Florida intend to call up in the near future the bill he has just reported?

Mr. FLETCHER. As soon as we can get to it. I do not know just when that will be, but the very moment we can get to it I desire to call it up.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to know that we may perhaps have it before the Senate in the near future.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sorry I can not be more definite.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 7554) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7555) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 7556) granting a pension to Delia May Prempert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7557) for the relief of Frank J. Manning (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7558) for the relief of Simon Caro; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7559) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Wells (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7560) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Mullins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 7561) granting an increase of pension to John McEathron (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 7562) granting a pension to Ellen Hammond Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7563) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Mildram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7564) granting an increase of pension to John Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Dichman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate for its second reading the bill introduced yesterday by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

The bill (S. 7552) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, upon such terms as he may deem proper, for periods of exceeding 20 years to permit responsible persons or associations to use and occupy suitable spaces or portions of ground in the national forest for the construction of summer homes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment proposing to amend the act of June 25, 1910, relating to the reissuance of Treasury drafts, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

THE TREASURY DEFICIT.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have an interesting article by United States Senator elect ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, of Louisiana, on the question, "How to wipe out the Treasury deficit." I ask, without reading, that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIPE OUT THE TREASURY DEFICIT—UNITED STATES SENATOR ELECT BROUSSARD ANALYZES THE SITUATION—A FALSE CRY REGARDING "PORK-BARREL" LEGISLATION HAS BEEN RAISED TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC—DEFICIT DUE TO MISCALCULATION BY THE FINANCIAL BRANCH OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND IS NO FAULT OF CONGRESS.

The resolution introduced by me contemplates the suspension of the free-sugar clause of the Underwood bill, which provides for free sugar after May 1, 1916. It is probable that, with the congested condition of the congressional calendars, it may not be possible to consider this resolution in this Congress.

It is fair to those upon whom rests the responsibility of reinstating a deficient Treasury, as well as to those who favor free sugar, that the efforts which I contemplate making in the next Congress should be made known to them; hence the introduction of the resolution at this time. It is my purpose to renew these efforts immediately upon the convening of the next Congress, whether in an extra or a regular session.

These efforts, if successful, will to a large extent obliterate the deficiency that confronts the United States Treasury.

We are informed that there is practically an $80,000,000 deficit, despite the enactment of a war tax in times of profound peace.

The defenders of our present financial policy have ascribed the pending $80,000,000 deficiency to what they are pleased to term "pork-barrel" appropriations by Congress.

No one cognizant of the existing situation is at all disturbed over that statement. The uninformed alone are misled by this false cry. When called upon to explain what is meant by "pork-barrel" appropriations one is referred to appropriations for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and the construction of post offices and other necessary buildings for the proper transaction of the public business.

DEFICIENCY NOT DUE TO THESE APPROPRIATIONS.

It is not true to say that this deficiency grows out of any such appropriations, because during this administration no public buildings have been provided for by Congress; and the appropriation for rivers and harbors was during the life of this Congress reduced from a normal appropriation of $50,000,000 to a $20,000,000 lump appropriation, to be used, in the discretion of the United States Engineers, in continuing projects already under way.

Even if this twenty million were charged to the legislative "pork barrel," it can not possibly account for a hole in the Treasury of eighty millions.

As a matter of fact, it can be demonstrated that this deficiency grows out of an entirely different situation, which situation precludes absolutely the use of the words "pork barrel" in connection with it.

It is not difficult to ascertain just how this deficiency occurred. In the first place, when the Underwood bill was under discussion in the House, Representative HULL, of Tennessee, was in charge of the income-tax section of that bill. I have every reason to believe that the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. HULL in particular, sought every avenue of information for the enactment of an equitable and just income tax.

Mr. HULL, in his opening address on the floor of the House, stated that the income-tax provision as written in the Underwood bill would produce $70,000,000. Such was the estimate furnished him.

INTERNAL TAXES FALL FAR BELOW ESTIMATES.

The returns, however, of the income tax show a total receipt of $28,253,534.85, a deficiency from the estimate of Mr. HULL of nearly $42,000,000, which miscalculation accounts for more than half the pending Treasury deficit.

When the war-tax measure was reported to the House out of conference Leader UNDERWOOD made the statement to the House that the information he had was to the effect that it would yield one hundred and five millions. When it passed the Senate it was estimated to yield one hundred and seven millions. When it came out of conference he said it was presumed to yield more than ninety millions. Collections thus far made indicate this estimate far too high; in fact, the Secretary of the Treasury himself now estimates that the war tax will approximately yield fifty-four millions for the fiscal year of 1915. From the collections already made this estimate seems reasonably accurate. Therefore, taking the lowest figure for the war tax given by Mr. UNDERWOOD, that of ninety millions, and subtracting the estimate now being made by the Secretary of the Treasury, there results a deficiency of thirty-six millions in that item alone.

The revenues from these two sources are in nowise affected by the European war. If the termination of the war causes any increase in our custom receipts, this increase can not entirely make up the deficit, but Congress will have to look elsewhere for the most part to recoup the Treasury.

By adding these two deficiencies—the one resulting from the income tax and the other from the war tax—we have almost the exact amount of deficiency reported in the Treasury of the United States.

In other words, if the estimates furnished Congress as to these two revenue acts had been correct, there would now be no deficiency, as the shortage in the results from the estimates precisely equals the Treasury shortage.

Why look to extraneous things when, through erroneous calculation, these two new methods of taxation account for practically every dollar in the present deficiency?

Now, this is a statement of facts, and the war-tax measure is soon to expire, so that the fifty-four millions yield for 1915 will shortly disappear and the eighty millions deficit must, consequently, be increased by that sum in the near future.

On the 1st of May, 1916, unless my resolution shall become law, practically $52,000,000 more now derived from the sugar duty must be also added to the present deficiency.

To summarize: Should the same deficiency occur in 1916 as is pending now, there will be added to the eighty million deficiency the further deficiencies due to the expiration of the war-tax law, yielding fifty-four millions, and a still further deficiency after May, 1916, of fifty-two more millions derived from the sugar duty.

AN APPALLING SITUATION THAT MUST BE MET.

This situation is appalling. It can not be shirked; it must be met. And the question is, How are we to meet it? There are several ways in which it can be done. The simplest, but probably the most obnoxious, would be to issue bonds. Another would be to reenact the war-tax act in times of profound peace, when possibly Europe itself will be at peace, and increase that tax. Another, still, would be to readjust the income tax by decreasing the exemption and increasing the rate; or, again, to revert back to the old practice of collecting money from a duty on sugar.

And why should not the last-named course be followed? The refiners told Congress, and Congress believed the refiners, that if the duty on sugar were reduced, the consumer would receive the advantage of the reduction. On March 1, 1914, Congress reduced the then existing duty by 25 per cent, and for not a single moment from that day to this has the consumer paid as little money for his sugar as he paid before the reduction. He is now paying practically twice as much as he did before the reduction.

The American consumer and the United States Treasury both have suffered from the reduction, and the only beneficiary has been the refiner, commonly known as the Sugar Trust, which has absorbed the entire reduction and multiplied the price of sugar to the consumer.

Under the old rate, which went out on the 1st of March by virtue of the Underwood bill, the Treasury of the United States would have collected to date more than fifty-eight millions in duty instead of forty-three millions, so that the Sugar Trust has absorbed in the 10 months since the reduction was made nearly $15,000,000. At this rate, by the end of 12 months, as the result of this 25 per cent reduction, fully eighteen millions will have been absorbed by the trust and will have been lost to the Treasury.

SUGAR TRUST IS AGAIN ATTEMPTING TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC.

All understand that the Sugar Trust is again engaged in its old practice of deceiving the public, and in this instance it asserts that the high price of sugar is due to the European war. That is not true. It is merely a subterfuge resorted to by the trust to deceive the American public while it is engaged in absorbing the tariff reduction, which it had promised the American consumer should receive.

I make this statement for the reason that at this very hour the refiners of the country are engaged on the American market in selling sugar to Europeans for consumption in Europe at a lower price than the same sugar is being sold by them on the same market to the American consumer.

The war could not lift the price of sugar in the United States, at peace with all the world, when sold to an American consumer, and not raise it equally to a European engaged in this same war. Yet this war, far from our shores, is invoked as a reason to lift sugar prices to the American consumers beyond the price charged Europeans.

To put the question squarely to Congress and the American people, I ask, Shall we indefinitely suspend all expenditures for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and the construction of necessary public buildings? And shall we reenact the war tax and increase its burdens? And shall we reduce the exemption clause of the income tax and increase the tax itself to meet this deficiency? Or shall we issue bonds in preference to all this? Or shall we, as I suggest, return to the time-honored system of collecting taxes on articles that can bear the duty, particularly when the remission of the duty does not cheapen their price to the consumer, as is the case with sugar?

Congress must soon answer these questions.

FEDERAL AID TO GOOD ROADS.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed for the use of the Senate document room 4,000 copies of the report of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. OVERMAN. I offer a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 535) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 250 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that designed to be published as a manual?

Mr. OVERMAN. There are only 15 copies of the Manual left. There will be a new Senate and a new Congress coming in, and a similar resolution has been passed every few years for 50 years past.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think, as we have the misfortune of spending two-thirds of the time of the Senate in the discussion of the precedents, and they are out of date, if we issue a new edition, and the same practice prevails here, we shall have no time to attend to the business of the people. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is not for the printing of the Book of Precedents but of the Rules and Manual brought down to date.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not the Book of Precedents?

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. If it is nothing but the rules, without the multitudinous instances of their construction, reconstruction, and destruction, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I think the continual reprinting of copies of this Manual is a hoary old abuse. My home in New York and my home here are cumbered with copies of the Manual. There has not been any change; it is the same old volume, and I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. Very well, let it go over until to-morrow, and I shall call it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over.

DIRECTORS OF REGIONAL RESERVE BANKS.

Mr. LEWIS. I submit a resolution and ask to have it read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution (S. Res. 536) was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board of the United States shall, if not incompatible with public service, report to the United States Senate the names of the directors of the regional reserve banks which were chosen as representatives of the United States Government; and the names and business of those recommending them, and what are the positions occupied by the said members of said regional banks, and in what banks and business and corporate institutions the said members are directors; also what are the names of the directors of the regional banks selected in any other manner than by the Government, and what position as directors either of these hold in any banks, business establishments or corporations.

PURCHASE OF VESSELS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 528, submitted by Mr. BURTON on the 2d instant.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution may go over for the day without prejudice, the Senator from Ohio being absent from the Chamber for a few moments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution goes over without prejudice.

Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio, who has now arrived, to the fact that Senate resolution 528 has gone over by unanimous consent and to ask him whether he cares to recur to it.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to bring it up, if it is in order to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has gone over by unanimous consent, but it can be taken up.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] wants to be present when it comes up.

Mr. BURTON. Very well; let it go over.

COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF THE LAWS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the notice of an amendment to the rules coming over from a preceding day.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 534) submitted by Mr. ROBINSON, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be a standing committee of the Senate known as the committee on revision of the laws, to be composed of five Senators elected in the same manner as the members of other standing committees, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and to which shall be referred all matters relating to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 20818, now lying on the table, be taken up and considered. A similar bill has already been reported from the Senate committee, is now on the calendar, and is ready for passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 20818) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Brunot Island Bridge Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, with approaches thereto, across the back channel of the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point on the southwesterly shore of Brunot Island, near the Duquesne Light Co.'s power plant, in the twenty-seventh ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., to a point between Telford Street and the Ohio connecting railroad bridge on the opposite side of said back channel of the Ohio River, in the twentieth ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 23, 1906."

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the bill (S. 7266) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River, being a like bill and now on the calendar, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19545) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCUMBER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCUMBER conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 18686. An act to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20107. An act to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels;

H. R. 20281. An act to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed; and

H. R. 20282. An act to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10.

H. R. 18685. An act to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The following bill and joint resolution were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Fisheries:

H. R. 16477. An act to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION—VETO MESSAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the first veto message of the President of the United States is that of the immigration bill. It ought to command the serious attention of Congress. I am wondering whether those Senators who have hitherto preached the doctrine of absolute fidelity to the President will now break away from their allegiance and loyal support upon a proposition which the President regards as so vital that he has interposed this his first veto. I am also wondering whether Democrats will at one and the same time vote to overthrow the President and the policies of the Democratic Party as expressed in its platforms on this subject from the days of Thomas Jefferson to this blessed hour. If Senators will give me their attention, I shall undertake to illustrate both of the propositions I have advanced.

The President in a very clear and powerful veto message states his objections to the immigration bill, which may be epitomized thus:

First. The bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of the country.

Second. It seeks to all but close the gates of asylum to political refugees.

Third. Literacy is not a test of character or personal fitness, but of opportunity.

I propose submitting some remarks in support of the veto of President Wilson.

I shall also undertake to reply to the arguments advanced by the proponents of the bill. I am confident that each argument can be answered and demonstration made, both of the falsity of its premise and the fallacy of its deduction.

I shall first give attention to certain of these arguments. During the course of my remarks I shall desire to submit various statistical tables, which I now ask leave to print as a part of my remarks without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I now desire to call attention to the following questions:

Is the immigrant patriotic?

Does he love liberty?

Is he attached to our institutions?

The foregoing questions are answered in the affirmative by every page of our country's history.

First. Nine signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in foreign lands.

Second. Alexander Hamilton and Albert Gallatin were born in the West Indies.

Third. Several of the most distinguished officers of the Revolution were foreigners, who out of pure love of liberty came here to assist us. Without their assistance the cause of the patriots might have failed. Among these are:

Lafayette, whose story is upon the tongue of every schoolboy.

Casimer Pulaski, Polish exile and patriot, could not had it been the law of 1776 have been admitted under the terms of this infamous measure, who would have been arrested at Castle Garden because he stood charged with the crime of fighting for his country.

Pulaski distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine; was made brigadier general by act of Congress; raised the Pulaski Legion; successfully defended Charlestown; and yielded his life in the cause of the young Republic at the Battle of Savannah.

Thaddeus Kosciusko rendered such valiant services at Yorktown and the siege of New York that he was promoted by Washington to chief of Artillery and was rewarded with the Order of the Cincinnati, made an American citizen, and was granted a pension and estates.

Paul Jones, whose naval victories gave luster to our arms upon the sea and whose genius and fortitude did much to win our national independence, was a foreigner.

He had taken up his residence in this country but a few months when he was called to the assistance of the Colonies. He was appointed a member of the naval committee. Not only was Paul Jones of foreign birth, but he secured aid in fitting out his vessels from foreigners.

His victories thrilled and heartened every patriot of the land.

He rose to the rank of rear admiral, and in 1792 was appointed United States consul to Algiers.

The list is long and need not be recited. The statues of these great foreigners, memorials in bronze of our inextinguishable debt of gratitude stand to-day in the Capital of the Nation they helped establish.

In yonder gallery is the bust of Pulaski in marble, and no man has ever gazed upon it who has not been impressed with the nobility of character expressed in the classic features.

Heitman gives a list, which he concedes is incomplete, of 437 French officers who served with the American Army, many of whom were promoted for gallantry on the battle fields of the Revolution.

The War of the Revolution was not fought by native-born sons alone. Standing elbow to elbow with them was the immigrant of that day. He crowded into the irregular column of Washington's army, he was with him in every battle, and from the days when our banner was first unfurled on Bunker Hill until it rose in glorious triumph at Yorktown. The immigrant stood in the trenches, walked in the snows, and died in the swamps as bravely and as valiantly as the native sons of that day.

In the War of 1812 again the immigrant responded to the call of duty. He was present when the first shot was fired and he was with Jackson back of the cotton bales when the last rifle spoke defiance to the veterans of the British Army.

The immigrant was with Scott and Taylor as they marched across the plains of Mexico. He followed them with glorious heroism to the heights of Chapultepec. He stood with them in the sieges and battles and bloody days of that great conflict.

In the War of the Rebellion the immigrant again responded to the call of his adopted country. He served under the battle flags of Lee and Jackson, and he marched beneath the standards of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan. He divided his allegiance as the people of this country divided theirs, being guided by the spirit of the State and the people among whom he lived.

I want to read just a word or two that I hope will sink into the hearts of some of our Republican brethren.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. REED. I read from a work by Mr. Higginson:

> Who that recalls the war for the Union does not remember how we all, from President Lincoln downward, played upon the string of "the open doors of this Nation," its being "a home for all oppressed mankind"? How fearlessly we then appealed to the Germans, the Irish, the Swedes, the Scotch within our borders, and how well they responded. Even the green flag of Ireland, now forbidden to be displayed from our city halls, * * * was then welcomed with cheers on battle fields when it was borne to front, amid decimated regiments, under shouts of "Faugh a Ballagh"—"Clear the way."

Mr. President, did these immigrants respond in the days of the Spanish War? I saw the Fifth Missouri Regiment mustered in; I saw our immigrant citizen standing in line waiting the privilege of signing the muster roll; I saw him frequently only poorly clad. He was leaving his wife and his children but scantily provided for. In his eyes there was the battle fire that is lighted only by love of country. In that war he served as bravely as did the native born.

A few days ago I read the names of the heroic dead who gave their lives at Vera Cruz, whose blood drops, yet damp upon the banner of our country, are its latest baptismal.

Among the dead were Jews, Polacks, Irish, Bohemians, and other nationalities.

Mr. President, whence does this spirit of proscription and hate come? Why has it suddenly arisen? What new danger is at our gates? What shadow of fear has fallen upon the native-born American? It was not so at first. The fathers knew how the immigrant had fought to establish our liberties; so in 1790 they passed a statute providing for naturalization after five years. This country was proclaimed to be the land of refuge and sanctuary for the oppressed of the earth. Foreigners flocked to our shores; population doubled; the frontiers of civilization were pushed westward; the strength of the country was made secure.

But the old Federalist Party was in power. Alexander Hamilton was its dominant spirit. He distrusted all of the common people, whether they were born in this land or beneath foreign skies. He did not regard them as fit for self-government. He was naturally of an aristocratic turn; he was a born proscriptionist. He ought to be here to-day, the author of this bill. There had been no discussion; there had been no agitation; there had been no issue made; but the Federalist Party, in the pride and arrogance of its power, passed the alien and sedition law. That law increased the naturalization period from 5 to 14 years. It authorized the arrest and deportation of turbulent and dangerous aliens without trial, at the discretion of the President. It was rushed through without being submitted to the people, as this bill is rushed through without having been submitted to the people. Hamilton felt strong enough and the Federalist Party felt strong enough to put the bill through Congress. They dared not submit it to the electorate. You who father this bill are trying similarly to force it through, although no political party now living has ever dared sanction its vicious principles in its platform.

What happened when the Federalist Party perpetrated that outrage? A protest arose in every part of the Nation. Its rumblings were heard in forest and in city. It found expression in the resolutions of State legislatures and of civic societies. The Democracy, headed by Thomas Jefferson, sprang into power upon this distinct issue. The Democratic Party was cradled in the national protest against proscriptive legislation. I shall come back to that. I shall quote you Jeffersonian Democrats the words of Thomas Jefferson; I shall compel you to admit that you are repudiating the traditions of your party and the long and illustrious record made by its great men.

I desire just now, however, to proceed to another question. The President has said "literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity." That sentence ought to go down in history as the tersest statement of a great fact that has been made in many years—"literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity."

In support of the proposition to which I have just referred, I want now to compare early and later immigration. I challenge attention to facts abundantly sustaining the proposition.

In point of literacy the new immigration surpasses the old at the time of the influx of the latter.

Twenty-six per cent of the German male immigrants above 16 years of age who came to Pennsylvania in the first half of the eighteenth century could not write their names. (Barnes, p. 45.)

EARLY POPULATION ILLITERATE.

In point of fact the present immigration is more literate than were the native inhabitants of this country at the period of the Revolution.

A painstaking investigation of the degree of illiteracy among the seventeenth century Virginians shows that 46 per cent of the jurors made their marks and that 40 per cent of the men making deeds and depositions could not write their names. Seventy-five per cent of the women were illiterate. (Barnes, p. 45.)

In Suffolk County, Mass., including Boston, two volumes of published deeds were examined for the years 1653–1656 and 1681–1697, in which it was found that in each period 11 per cent of the men made their marks. Of the women, 58 per cent in the first period and 38 per cent in the second period made their marks.

Mr. President, was literacy or illiteracy a standard of character? Why, sirs, I doubt not that the men in coonskin caps who rallied at Lexington, who later made their stand at Concord near the little bridge immortalized by the lines of Emerson:

> By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
> Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> Here once the embattl'd farmers stood,
> And fired the shot heard round the world.

I doubt not, sir, that many of the men whose eyes that day fearlessly glittered along rifle barrels could not have read the pages of a printed book. Yet, I repeat, these men knew how to die for liberty, for they had read the pages of a larger volume, the book of nature. In forest fastness, in mountain dells, in bending skies they learned the legend, "All men are born free and equal." So, in defense of that liberty they rallied, they fought and died, immigrant and native born, literate and illiterate, side by side, that you and I and all of us might have the blessings of liberty. Yet many of these early Virginians and men of Massachusetts were illiterates.

Literacy was not then a test of character. The best test in that hour of trial was how the man at the end of the gun behaved.

Again, I call attention to the fact that literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity.

Mr. President, in 1799 an Irish colony sought to establish itself in Massachusetts. Ninety-six per cent of the whole number could write their names. After this came bitter oppression and poverty to the Irish people. The opportunity to obtain education grew constantly less; they were robbed; they were driven from their homes; they were hunted like wild beasts; they were murdered. Under such disadvantages education waned. Accordingly, the later immigrant was denounced as ignorant, unlettered, bestial; yet his lamentable condition was only the result of a lack of opportunity. Opportunity is the test. Have men had opportunity? When you answer they have not you have destroyed the value of the literacy test.

The Jew! Let us think of him for a moment. The Jew of the Middle Ages was the most learned man in all Europe. He maintained many great institutions of learning in which the ancient lore and medieval philosophy were taught. A period of merciless persecution followed and the race was forced into a condition of illiteracy and ignorance. But when the hand of the oppressor was taken from his throat even for a moment he again began establishing seminaries of learning and educating his race, and he has continued that policy wherever permitted so to do. One of his bitterest complaints against the Russian Government is that he is denied the opportunity of education.

The Italian! The Italian immigrant, particularly from the southern Provinces, is frequently illiterate; but since the establishment of an improved system of education in Italy the people are crowding into the schools and illiteracy is decreasing to a marvelous degree. Again, education is shown to be merely a matter of opportunity.

Let me digress a moment to call the attention of those who denounce the Italian to the fact that that great race never sank into barbarism. When the light of learning had faded in all the other lands of Europe, Italy still kept the torch held high in her hand. Her wonderful works of art, her marvelous poetry, her great architecture exist to-day as evidence of the fact that the Italian people have within them still the old Roman blood, the old spirit of empire. Shall Americans turn against the Italians? Why, it was the genius of an Italian blazing amidst the darkness and ignorance of the fifteenth century that disclosed the path across the Atlantic which followed by a mariner would lead to the undiscovered shores of this continent. An Italian gave America to the Old World. Ah, Mr. President, whatever others may do, let us not denounce the Italian.

The Balkan! These people are illiterate to a considerable degree, but what is their story? For hundreds of years they have battled with the "unspeakable Turk" for their very existence. They have been crucified upon crosses; they have been impaled upon stakes; their cities have been burned; their wives have been outraged; their children have been stolen; their daughters have been dragged into slavery; and so they have not had much time or opportunity to attend school. They are, nevertheless, a great race. Ah, when their battle flag at last was raised the world looked on in astonishment that the little Balkan people should dare assail the great armies of Turkey; and yet what a spectacle the world was destined to behold. It saw a race that could muster its entire population upon the field of battle—boys of 11, grandsires of 80. It saw the women driving oxcarts that carried provisions and munitions of war to the men who were fighting the battles. It saw the untrained citizens upon bloody fields battling with deathless courage and unalterable resolve. It saw them standing in trenches half filled with water, bivouacking in drifts of snow, wading through swamps; fighting, always fighting, for that liberty which every oppressed son of God upon this earth hopes and prays may yet be his. The world saw them emerge in victory, and lovers of liberty all over the earth hope and pray that the sunlight of peace and prosperity may soon smile upon that valiant race of men. A race of men that can fight so well in war can live well in peace.

Mr. President, there is a conclusive proof that literacy is but a test of opportunity, not a test of character. Here is an answer that will appeal to every candid man, to every man who has not locked the door of his mind and thrown away the key of reason. It is that as soon as these immigrants come to our shores they embrace every opportunity of education with more avidity than our native born. This, sir, is the final answer, the opportunity having been given they have seized it. The demonstration is complete that the President spoke wisely when he said, "education is a test of opportunity and not a test of character."

But, Mr. President, the argument has been advanced here that while illiteracy in former days was not a test of character it is so now, because the doors of opportunity have been opened.

Mr. President, that is a very unfortunate argument for an American citizen to make. It is a very unfortunate argument for the people of the State represented in the Senate by the Senator who uttered it upon our floor, and why? The children of immigrant population in many States, including that of the Senator who is the author of the argument, possess a higher degree of literacy than the children of the native born. This is not only the case to-day, but it has been, I regret to say, the case for many years.

In 1870 the Bureau of Education was established upon a substantial basis. The commissioner, Edmund Lee, reviewed the educational conditions from 1840 to 1870, and said this:

> Besides, our illiterate are, most of them, native born. In 1860, according to the census, there were, of our illiterate adults, but 346,893 of foreign birth, while there were 871,418 native born. These figures, of course, exclude the negro population.
>
> Thus it appears that this immense evil, our weakness and our disgrace, extends among our native population as well as among those of foreign birth; in the North as well as in the South, both in the East and in the West; in the old States and in the new, from Maine to Georgia, as well as from Maine to California.
>
> It has been also a growing evil; it has grown with the growth of the population. Indeed, from 1840 to 1850 it grew faster than the population. Not only did the gross numbers increase from 550,000 to nearly a million, but the per cent of illiterate increased from 9 per cent in 1840 to 11 per cent in 1850. So far, the facts have been given simply as they stand in the census.

The author adds:

> But it is well known to those who have investigated the subject that these are far below the truth, because many who can not read would not like to be so set down in the census.

Mr. President, shall this race of ours, with all its opportunity for education for 100 years, finding itself still less literate than the children of the foreign-born population, dare to set up a literacy test? What becomes of the argument of the Senator who stated that literacy is a test of character when it is accompanied by opportunity? For if that be true, what a sad reflection it is upon our native-born population, before whose feet the door of opportunity stands open.

Mr. President, I am coming now to a theme to which I invite the attention of Democrats. I wish there were more of them present. I especially wish the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], whose patron saint is Thomas Jefferson, might be in the Chamber. I purpose showing that the Democratic Party was born of a protest against the restrictive legislation that had been enacted by the Federalist Party; that out of the protestants against the Federalist restrictive legislation Thomas Jefferson was able to construct a triumphant Democracy. The victory then won placed our party in power for nearly 60 years.

The theme I am now discussing is—

> Shall we depart from our traditional policy and close the gates of asylum which have hitherto been open?

A pregnant sentence from the message of the President. Is the President correct when he states that this has been our traditional policy?

I answer "yes," and offer the following observations in support of it:

First. Ninety per cent of our early immigrants were refugees from the tyranny of church and state.

Second. Ninety per cent of all of our immigrants, early or late, were forced to these shores either by intolerable Governments or the unbearable physical conditions of life.

Third. The doctrine which is written largest upon the page of our national policy is that "this country, created by the oppressed of earth, shall forever remain the harbor and place of refuge for those who suffer wrong." Especially has this been the creed of the Democratic Party; and now, Democrats, those of you who are not ready to recant the ancient creed I challenge your attention to what I am about to read.

Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, said:

> Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? * * * Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to everyone manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us? (Jefferson's Works, vol. 3, p. 338.)

Writing to Mr. Dumoulin, in 1816, after thanking him for a copy of a treatise on naturalization, Mr. Jefferson stated:

> We can not but think alike, and I permit myself to doubt whether there is a man in the world who thinks otherwise, provided he has thought at all on the subject, has turned inwardly on himself, and ascertained whether he has not there found the same innate feeling of right to live on the outside of an artificial geographical line as he has to live within it; whether he finds there any stronger sentiment of right to use his own faculties at all than of that to use them in whatever place he can do it to the greatest promotion of his own happiness; whether he feels any obligation to die by disease or famine in one country rather than to go to another where he can live. (Jefferson's Works, vol. 19, p. 336.)

Ah! That strikes the very kernel of it all. It is the human right, the right that every human being has to seek his happiness, upon which Jefferson bottomed his immortal doctrine.

I could quote much further from this great man, but I pass on.

Democrats, I come now to the consideration of the Democratic doctrine as expressed in your platforms. I seek to sustain the statement of the President that the granting of asylum is "our traditional policy," and his further statement that you are undertaking to set it aside without having submitted it to the people of the United States or suggested to a single voter that you intended so to do. On the contrary, like the old Federalist Party, you get into power and then employ your power against the people to whom you would not dare submit the issue. The Democratic platform of 1840 is the oldest one of

which I could find a copy; but I have read you Jefferson's words, and now I ask you to listen to the platform:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

The Democratic Party of 1840, paragraph 9, is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the present privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books." (Hopkins Political Parties, p. 260.)

That plank, Mr. President, was readopted in 1844; it was readopted in 1848; it was readopted in 1852; it was readopted in 1856, and the following added:

Whereas since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American democracy should clearly define its relation thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity, expansion, and preeminent example in free government built upon entire freedom in matters of religious concernment and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century and in the United States of America against Catholic and foreign born is neither justified by the past history nor the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

In 1860 the Douglas Democratic platform reaffirmed the platform of 1856.

Again in 1876 the Democratic Party, in its platform of that date, took up the immigration question, and after denouncing the policy of the Republican Congress for allowing the immigration of Mongolian people, and for stripping our fellow citizens of foreign birth and kindred race across the Atlantic of their rights to become citizens of the United States, stated as follows:

We denounce the policy which thus discards the liberty-loving German and tolerates the revival of the coolie trade in Mongolian women imported for immoral purposes, and Mongolian men held to perform servile labor contracts, and demand such modification of the treaty with the Chinese Empire and such legislation within constitutional limitations as shall prevent further importation or immigration of the Mongolian race. (Hopkins, p. 332.)

In accordance with this doctrine the United States has since adopted immigration regulations which practically excluded the Mongolian races from this country on the theory that they can not be assimilated by the Caucasian race and therefore are not desirable citizens.

In 1884 the Democrats were still of the Jeffersonian belief in regard to the rights of the foreigners in this country.

This will be shown by the following paragraph of the political platform of that date:

Asserting the equality of all men before the law, we hold that it is the duty of the Government in its dealings with the people to meet out equal and exact justice to all citizens of whatever race, color, nativity or persuasion, religious or political. (Hopkins, p. 365.)

The platform of 1884 expressly reaffirmed the entire platform of 1856, which in turn reaffirmed the platform of 1840, which in turn was but a crystallization of the declaration of Thomas Jefferson made in his first inaugural address, which in turn was but a condensation of the battle cry of the Democracy as it rallied for its first great contest.

In 1888 we reaffirmed the platform of 1884, and in 1892 we reaffirmed allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by the long and illustrious line of his successors in Democratic leadership from Madison to Cleveland. Later in the platform is this language:

We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

As late as 1896 we said this:

We reaffirm our allegiance to those great essential principles of justice and liberty upon which our institutions are founded, and which the Democratic Party has advocated from Jefferson's time to our own.

That, sir, was once more a declaration to the foreign-born citizens of this country that we did not propose to indulge in any restrictive legislation.

The platform then denounces the importation "of foreign pauper labor." The fair construction of the two clauses is that our liberal immigration policy was to be pursued, but that contract and imported labor were to be barred. (Hopkins, pp. 428–431.)

Upon the platform of 1892 Grover Cleveland was nominated and elected President. He vetoed, on March 3, 1897, an immigration act containing substantially the same literacy test found in the present bill.

He said:

A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigration is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands, except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the jealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.

A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy, which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and willingness and ability to work.

A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to arouse a sentiment in its defense; for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

So conclusive were the reasons given by Grover Cleveland, and so thoroughly was the question being settled, that it has not since been specifically referred to in Democratic platforms. The question of contract labor has, however, been dealt with. The doctrine expressio unis exclusio alterius applies.

No political party since Know Nothingism went to its dishonored grave has ever dared write the doctrine of proscription into its platform or go to the people upon that issue.

This bill was rushed through without its principles having been in any form submitted to the people, much as the alien and sedition laws were rushed through by the Federalist without previous notice or discussion.

The political party writing this miserable doctrine into its creed will never win an election in the United States. You can not carry a single one of the great doubtful States if you do it. It is an act of betrayal, because you have turned your backs upon your own party history from the days of Jefferson to this blessed hour, and because, having obtained office without notice, you now propose to reverse a century-old policy which you dare not submit on the hustings two years from now.

Mr. President, let me go back to the Know-Nothing Party a little bit. I am talking to some Members of the United States Senate who come nearer belonging to the Know-Nothing Party than they do to any other party, and I do not speak offensively. The term "Know-Nothing Party" was one which was applied to the so-called American Party, and I am employing it simply in that sense. What I mean to say is that, in my opinion, the doctrines of know-nothingism are so firmly graven upon the hearts and so fully exemplified in the prejudices of plenty of Senators here that the old Know-Nothing Party ought to be revived, and they ought to join it. It made its appearance in 1837 as an offshoot of the Federalist Party. I think the Republican Party was originally a kind of cross between the Know-Nothing Party and the Abolition Party, and I think the two parents were also closely related.

In 1837 some gentlemen got together and organized what they called the American Party. By the way, I never yet have seen a man about to do a mean, contemptible, and selfish thing but that he immediately grabbed the American flag and wrapped it around him and struck a patriotic attitude. When the Republican Party, in the days of its corruption and infamy, in the blackest hours of its history, was being brought to book and challenged upon the hustings, every speaker who rose to defend its infamous record came on the platform with an American flag in each hand and cried out, "Will you tear down Old Glory?" That and a bloody shirt which he kept concealed somewhere about his person, and which he frantically waved, constituted his sole stock in trade and his appeal to the people. So, of course, a party like the Know Nothing Party would seize the name "American," and here was one of their declarations. Listen! How much it sounds like the arguments of the proponents of this bill. It is a better statement of their case to-day than any one of them can make. They have not enough talent to reproduce it:

1. That Europe is industriously ridding herself of an excess population, now becoming burdensome to her; and whom does she send? Her paupers, her convicts, the ou'pouring of her almshouses and jails. Even lately has a would-be regicide been landed upon our shores by a national vessel. * * * These immigrants from Europe leave there filled with all the requisite materials to spread among our citizens immigrant radicalism and liberalism.

They have been shouting "anarchist" for mighty nigh a hundred years now.

2. That the foreigner had become the tool of the political wirepuller; that the naturalization laws had become a dead letter; that the foreign vote had become a decisive factor at election; that the foreigner, especially the Irish, was willing to obtain office and power by any means.

What was the matter with these fellows? What is the matter with some of you gentlemen? What is the matter with those

who push this bill? Are you, like the old Know Nothings, afraid that the Irish will beat you in the game of politics? Well, your fear is well founded, because the Irish, whom the old Know Nothing Party declared were the offscourings of the jails and almshouses, have, under God's free sky, blazed a path of glory and progress that but few races of men can follow. But how narrow that declaration was! It sounds like the snarl of a wild beast in the jungle of ignorance. It is selfishness indescribable when uttered by one who, having himself, or through his ancestors, escaped to a free country, now denies the same privilege to those who were left behind.

But the point I make is that this charge is as old as our country for it was made even before the days of the Know-Nothing Party. It was made when the Federalists passed the alien and sedition laws.

Now, I want to analyze these attacks upon immigrants. I want to compare the ancient attack with the present attack. Hearken to me as I try to do so.

Ancient and modern attacks upon immigration are identical. I have already nearly demonstrated that. But let me proceed.

First. The declarations of the Know Nothing Party, just quoted, are similar, only more extreme than any now proposed.

Second. The complaint that foreigners congregate in cities was made with even greater vehemence 100 years ago than at present. I have already produced the evidence of this in previous speeches, in which I quoted contemporaneous newspaper articles, the reports of civic societies, and so forth.

Third. The charge that the foreigner is overrunning this country and crowding out the native population was made over 100 years ago by Benjamin Franklin, who asserted in substance that the Germans would soon absolutely dominate the government of Pennsylvania and transform it into a German province. I have hitherto quoted from Franklin in extenso.

Fourth. The charge that the foreigner is illiterate has been made for more than 100 years.

Fifth. The charge that the foreigner pollutes our electorate is as old as the Nation.

Sixth. The charge that the foreigners herd together in great numbers in tenement districts was as true 100 years ago as it is at this hour.

Seventh. The claim that Europe is dumping her paupers and undesirables upon our shores was made by Franklin in 1753, who said of the Germans, "Those who come here are generally the most stupid of their own nation; unless the stream of importation can be turned from this to other colonies, even our Government will become precarious."

I said before, when I read this declaration of Franklin, it was the only great question upon which, to my knowledge, that wonderful philosopher was seriously mistaken. But no man is gifted with prophecy, no man is without his faults and shortcomings, and Franklin made this one great mistake. Witness the mighty Commonwealth the foreigners he denounced builded. Witness the fact that to-day no man dares stand to challenge the greatness of the race he said was pouring its undesirables into Pennsylvania and about to overthrown our civilization.

Similar charges were then, and ever since have been, brought against all other races of immigrants.

I want to challenge your thought to this.

Eighth. Prior to the Revolution various countries had established their colonies so that, to a large extent, the colonies were but an aggregation of different nationalities.

All of the foregoing complaints against foreigners were made with reference to what is now termed the early immigration, to wit: Germans, Irish, Norwegians, Welsh, Danes, and French, with the same fierceness they are now leveled against what is termed the present undesirable immigration.

The Senator from Colorado stated that in the mines of Colorado there were some 15 or 20 different languages spoken by the employees. Let me call his attention to the fact that if you had assembled in the early seventeenth century typical residents from each one of the American Colonies, you would have heard about 12 or 15 languages spoken by those representatives. This country from the first was not a country of one race but of many races.

Now, Mr. President, I take up the cry that immigrants are congested in cities. It seems to me it had some effect upon the minds of Senators. Let us stop a few moments and analyze it.

The cry has been raised since 1817.

Nearly 100 years ago the "Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in the city of New York met to devise ways and means for the transportation of able-bodied foreigners into the interior to labor upon the soil."

In 1857 the "Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, New York, declared that the Irish had an utter distaste for felling forests and turning up the prairies for themselves. They preferred to stay where another race would furnish them with food, clothing, and labor, and hence were mostly found loitering on the lines of public works, in villages, and in the worst portions of the large cities, where they competed with negroes for the most degrading employment." (Hourwich on Labor and Immigration, p. 67.)

If these alarmed gentlemen had had their way in 1819 New York City would yet have been a village. The charge brought against the Irish of that day was just as true as the charge that is being brought to-day against the present-day immigrant, and both of them are false. They said the Irish congregated in the cities and would not work on railroads, yet everyone knows that it was Irish picks and Irish shovels and Irish brawn and Irish courage that laid nearly every tie of the railroads that span this country. What we need is a committee to suppress public slanderers who get into high places.

But it is argued that the recent immigrant will not move to the farm. Now let us analyze that, not by vain mouthings and wild assertions, but in the light of the cold facts taken from the official statistics.

These gentlemen support their statements that the recent immigrant will not move to the country by an array of figures showing the rapid proportionate increase of the urban over the suburban population. From this fact the opponents of immigration deduce two conclusions:

(a) That the congested conditions of cities are due to the large influx of immigrants.

(b) That the immigrant is unwilling to live in the country.

Both of these arguments are unfounded and misleading.

First. As a country increases in age the proportion of its urban population invariably increases.

Second. This fact is especially manifested throughout our entire history, although it is admitted, notwithstanding the lamentations of the associations I have just quoted, that the so-called early immigrant went largely to the country.

I present a table showing increase of urban population in the United States since 1790:

Table showing percentage of total population living in cities from 1790 to 1910, inclusive.

[Taken from United States census of 1880, vol. 1, p. 29, and from the Census Abstract of 1910, p. 55.]

1790	3.3	1860	16.1
1800	3.9	1870	20.9
1810	4.9	1880	29.5
1820	4.9	1890	35.1
1830	6.7	1900	40.5
1840	8.5	1910	46.3
1850	12.5		

NOTE.—The urban population is in the above table to the year 1880 based upon cities of 8,000 or more inhabitants; from 1880 to 1910 they include all cities over 2,500. There should therefore be a slight increase in the earlier percentages.

But these figures do not at all demonstrate that the increase in the proportion of the urban population is due to immigration. On the contrary, an analysis of our immigration shows that from 1861 to 1870 only 17.6 per cent of the immigrant population engaged in agricultural pursuits, while from 1901 to 1910 the percentage had risen to 24.3 per cent. (Hourwich, p. 67.)

So it may truthfully be said that substantially one out of every five immigrants coming to this country settles upon the farm and tills the soil.

If the immigrants had all settled in the cities, it would necessarily have tended to decrease removal from the farms by increasing the demand for farm products. Its tendency, therefore, would have been to retain upon the farms those who were already there.

On the other hand, if there was, as there is, a large percentage of the immigrants who settle upon farms, the result would be an increase of the farm population to a greater extent than would have resulted merely from the natural increase of population.

Notwithstanding this fact, there has been an actual numerical decrease in the farm population of many of the best agricultural States in the Union.

These facts absolutely demonstrate that the reason more of the immigrants do not settle upon our farms must be identical with the reasons which sent our native population from the farms to the cities.

What are these reasons?

There are doubtless many, but two controlling facts stare us in the face.

First. Men will, invariably, go to the place where they can earn the greatest amount of money and procure the greatest advantages.

Second. Every labor-saving agricultural implement increases the ability of the farmer to dispense with employees. Accordingly, one man becomes able to cultivate a larger body of land.

In no branch of industry has the progress in labor-saving inventions been more rapid or revolutionary than agriculture.

Within the memories of men yet living, the farmer has progressed from the hand sickle to the cradle; from the cradle to the reaper; from the reaper to the self-binder. From the moleboard plow scratching the surface of the land to, in some places, traction engines drawing gang plows which turn 8 to 10 furrows at a time.

The sickle has given place to the mowing machine; the handrake to the horserake; the hoe to the cultivator; the flail to the steam thrashing machine; the saddlebag to the motor truck.

The weary tramp over dirt roads of great distances has become a memory.

The railroad now transports the farmers' goods to every part of the world. The packing house slaughters his hogs and cures his meat.

Clothing that were once woven by the tired fingers of the housewife are now created in the looms of great cities. Hence, the concentration of people in cities and a proportionate diminution of farm population.

By actual investigation it is shown that in many of the best States in the Union there has been not only a proportionate decrease, but an actual loss of farm population. I present a table showing the decrease in certain States from 1900 to 1910.

Table showing numerical and percentage decrease of rural population in certain States.

[Census Abstract, 1910, p. 57.]

	Number.	Per cent.
New Hampshire	10,108	5.4
Vermont	8,222	4.2
Ohio	28,105	1.3
Indiana	82,127	5.1
Iowa	119,869	7.2
Missouri	68,716	3.5

The above figures do not at all indicate that the States named are going backward.

I give, in simple illustration, the State of Missouri. Its rural population decreased 3.5 per cent, while its city population increased 22.3 per cent. This does not mean that the farmers of Missouri or the other States named are not prosperous. It does mean that improved farm machinery has enabled the farmers to cultivate larger bodies of land, and hence the farm population is emigrating to other States or going to the large cities.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the discussion of the relative growth of the cities and the losses which have come to the rural communities during the last 10 years. While this bill was before the Senate and during the discussion the Senator from Missouri and myself held some difference of opinion in relation to the matter, and afterwards I took pains to examine the census reports to see what is the fact.

What the Senator has stated is undoubtedly true about the trend of population from the rural communities to the cities. In New England, I think, the census of 1910 shows that during the 10 preceding years our cities had increased a million in population while the country districts had decreased something like 25,000. But that increase in the city population was not altogether from the country; the larger proportion of it was from immigration. I wanted to cite right here the official figures, if the Senator will permit me to do it.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator, when he states the increase is very largely from foreign immigration, do you not raise any children of your own in the cities of the East, and does not that tend to increase the population?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. A few; but I examined the census of 1910 and I found that the per cent of immigrants in the native white and foreign white population in the 10 largest cities in the country for the decennial period from 1900 to 1910 was as follows:

In New York native whites increased 30 per cent, foreign-born whites 52.9 per cent.

In Chicago, increase of native whites 25.5 per cent, of foreign-born whites 33.4 per cent.

In Philadelphia, increase of native whites 15.5 per cent, of foreign-born whites 30.3 per cent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thought the Senator rose to ask me a question, and I am willing to answer——

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I ask the Senator if he will not permit me to give the exact figures on that question, taken from the census? If the Senator objects, I will do it in my own time.

Mr. REED. Is it very long?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; I have taken the 10 principal cities of the United States.

Mr. REED. Very well; read it in.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In St. Louis the increase of native whites was 20.6 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.3 per cent.

In Boston, increase of native whites, 17.5 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 23.5 per cent.

In Cleveland, increase of native whites, 41.7 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 57.4 per cent.

In Baltimore, increase of native whites, 9.7 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.4 per cent.

In Pittsburgh, increase of native whites, 16.3 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 22.3 per cent.

In Detroit, increase of native whites, 63.5 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 63 per cent.

In Buffalo, increase of native whites, 23 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.9 per cent.

So it appears that the increase in population among the foreign born in the largest cities of the country has been very much greater than the increase of the native born. The three exceptions are St. Louis, Detroit, and Buffalo. In the case of Detroit the difference is not appreciable. I think that explains the true situation regarding the movement of population during the last 10 years.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. REED. I have called attention to the statistics compiled by the Government which show that for the decades preceding this the percentage of foreign born who went into the country was about 17, and that the percentage has risen in the last decade to 24. The truth is the same law that drives the boy born on the farm to the city keeps the foreigner from going to the farm. If conditions in the city are so much better than they are on the farm that the boy born on the farm will insist on going to the city, then, of course, the conditions do not permit the man who is born in the city or immigrates to this country to go to the farm. That is all there is to it.

Whenever labor becomes better paid upon the farm than in the city, whenever prices for farm products have risen so that farming is more profitable than other occupations, the immigrants will nearly all go to the farm, just as did your ancestors and mine.

I desire to put in these figures. I was calling attention to the increased use of farm machinery. The figures are startling.

In 1850 the total amount expended for farm machinery in the United States was $151,587,638. In 1910 we expended in farm machinery $1,265,149,783. That means that machines are doing the work human hands formerly performed. In this fact we ascertain the reason foreigners stay in cities. It is because they have to live, and they have to stay where work is.

But I pass on. I desire to discuss the question of low wages. I give way to no man in my desire that wages shall be kept at a high standard in this country. It is the best method of distributing wealth that there is. If we could have a high wage everywhere, we would begin distributing the wealth where we should—down at the bottom, to many men—instead of allowing it to be concentrated at the top in the hands of a few men. I am in favor of high wages.

But how are we to obtain them? In the great world of competition labor still has to meet its own members in the bitter strife for existence, and, upon the other hand, it must contend with the cupidity, the avarice, and the cruelty of the employer. It is true that foreigners coming to this country must get work, and that if they can not get work at $2 a day they will work for a dollar and a half. They will accept the smaller wage because they must take it. But, Mr. President, is there anything alarming in that situation? That, as I shall undertake to show, is the exact complaint that has been made at every stage of our country's history against every race of men who have ever come to these shores.

It was charged against the early German, Swede, Irishman, and Scotchman, as it is now charged against the more recent immigrant.

A moment's consideration of the facts daily confronting us, a slight knowledge of human nature, and the employment of a little common sense annihilates the argument.

No human being prefers hardship to ease, hunger to plenty, poverty to wealth. The desire to improve his condition and escape from the exactions of toil is an innate faculty of the human mind.

These men, therefore, work for low wages only until they can secure a higher wage.

The immigrant who has been here for a few years invariably refuses to work for less money than the native born secure. Who any longer brings the charge against the Irishman that he cuts wages? If you think the Irish are engaged in keeping down wages in this country, try to hire one of them to work on your farm or in your factory. Try to hire an Irish girl to work in your home. If you think the Swede is any longer cutting down wages, try the same experiment with the Swede man or the Swede woman. If you claim that any of these races are really cutting down wages so that they have materially affected the general wage level of this country, then I reply you are mistaken; you will learn the effect is confined to a few spots, and the remedy for those spots is not to be found in prohibiting men from entering our country, but in proper legislation, humane treatment, and sensible advice.

Rest assured that just as soon as a foreigner obtains a sufficient amount of capital so that he dare protest his rights he will protest them. Accordingly they sometimes strike, and when they do their action is discussed as though striking by immigrants were the worst of crimes. It is all right for the American citizen to strike, but very wicked for the foreigner to imitate his adopted brother. However, if the foreigner does not strike you heap maledictions upon him, because he is too truculent and continues to work for small wages.

The fact is that the circumstance of the foreigner striking is the very best evidence that he is unwilling to work for a low wage, and that as soon as possible he will insist upon and secure a higher and a better wage. If there is violence done sometimes, I reaffirm what I said a few days ago, it is not as likely to be committed by the foreigner as it is by the native-born son, because the foreigner more fears the law.

The chief argument in favor of the literacy test is that the large influx of unlettered foreigners increases the general average of ignorance and constitutes a menace to our country.

The force of the contention is greatly weakened by the following considerations:

First. A very considerable percentage of adult immigrants never become naturalized; hence their lack of education does not affect the intellectual average of the electorate.

Second. The period of life of adult immigrants is necessarily limited. Therefore their lack of education must soon cease to be a factor.

The vital question is, Are the children of immigrants the equals of our native population in education, intelligence, and patriotism?

If the foregoing question can be answered in the affirmative, then restrictive legislation is not only unnecessary, but a serious mistake.

I present herewith statistical tables which constitute a complete answer to all of the contentions raised by the advocates of this restrictive measure.

The tables referred to are as follows:

TABLE NO. 1.—*Per cent of children 6 to 14 years of age attending school compared with the per cent of foreign-born population in each State.*

[This table confined to the white race for the year 1910. (Census Abstract, pp. 86 and 228.)]

WHITE.

States.	Per cent of foreign-born whites in 1910.	Per cent of native parentage.	Per cent where one or both parents are foreign born.	Per cent of foreign-born children.
Alabama	0.9	70.0	78.1	70.2
Arizona	22.9	80.4	72.1	61.6
Arkansas	1.1	74.7	81.2	55.8
California	21.8	87.4	88.1	82.3
Colorado	15.9	86.4	88.4	81.7
Connecticut	29.5	92.6	92.6	89.2
Delaware	8.6	83.4	83.4	75.9
Florida	4.5	72.1	76.1	63.5
Georgia	.6	74.8	84.5	76.0
Idaho	12.4	82.0	84.1	76.2
Illinois	21.3	88.2	88.0	83.8
Indiana	5.9	88.4	87.6	80.6
Iowa	12.3	90.8	90.8	82.0
Kansas	8.0	88.3	89.1	76.7
Kentucky	1.7	76.3	87.1	83.8
Louisiana	3.1	68.4	69.7	50.7
Maine	14.8	90.3	88.4	81.0
Maryland	8.0	83.3	80.0	75.5
Massachusetts	31.2	93.9	93.1	88.1
Michigan	21.2	91.3	90.6	86.8
Minnesota	26.2	88.8	89.2	86.0
Mississippi	.5	84.2	82.9	44.0
Missouri	7.0	85.5	86.7	80.7
Montana	24.4	83.5	86.0	76.1
Nebraska	14.8	90.1	90.8	85.1
Nevada	22.0	86.3	88.8	76.7
New Hampshire	22.4	92.2	91.3	85.5
New Jersey	25.9	89.6	88.7	83.8
New Mexico	6.9	76.9	75.1	56.6
New York	29.9	89.9	90.6	88.3
North Carolina	.3	75.7	84.0	64.8
North Dakota	27.1	82.7	81.5	70.0
Ohio	12.5	90.3	89.2	84.0
Oklahoma	2.4	82.2	85.5	75.8
Oregon	15.3	85.1	87.3	82.7
Pennsylvania	18.8	88.1	84.8	79.6
Rhode Island	32.8	91.2	89.0	82.4
South Carolina	.4	72.1	81.4	72.2
South Dakota	17.2	84.1	84.6	72.9
Tennessee	.8	75.2	83.6	78.9
Texas	6.2	74.3	60.3	28.4
Utah	17.0	85.4	87.9	83.5
Vermont	14.0	93.1	93.3	89.3
Virginia	1.3	73.2	80.0	71.3
Washington	21.1	85.9	86.9	83.9
West Virginia	4.7	83.0	82.9	66.1
Wisconsin	22.0	90.8	89.7	84.1
Wyoming	18.6	84.9	85.9	76.4
United States (total)	14.5	83.5	88.0	82.3

TABLE NO. 1.—*Per cent of children 6 to 14 years of age, etc.*—Continued.

WHITE—continued.

School attendance of children 6 to 14 years of age in the United States of all classes, both native and foreign born parentage and foreign born, 81.4 per cent.

Per cent of foreign-born population compared with the per cent of illiterates 10 years of age and over and the per cent of prisoners serving sentence in each State of the United States.

[This table confined to the white race for the year 1910.]

WHITE.

States.	Foreign-born whites, population (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 86).	Illiterates 10 years of age and over (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 245).	Per cent prisoners in penal institutions Jan. 1, 1910, serving sentence (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 75).
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Alabama	0.9	22.9	0.17
Arizona	22.9	20.9	.31
Arkansas	1.1	12.6	.08
California	21.8	3.7	.18
Colorado	15.9	3.7	.15
Connecticut	29.5	6.0	.13
Delaware	8.6	8.1	.14
Florida	4.5	13.8	.24
Georgia	.6	20.7	.25
Idaho	12.4	2.2	.08
Illinois	21.3	3.7	.09
Indiana	5.9	3.1	.10
Iowa	12.3	1.7	.06
Kansas	8.0	2.2	.14
Kentucky	1.7	12.1	.12
Louisiana	3.1	29.0	.14
Maine	14.8	4.1	.09
Maryland	8.0	7.2	.16
Massachusetts	31.2	5.2	.19
Michigan	21.2	3.3	.09
Minnesota	26.2	3.0	.07
Mississippi	.5	22.4	.12
Missouri	7.0	4.3	.10
Montana	24.4	4.8	.25
Nebraska	14.8	1.9	.05
Nevada	22.0	6.7	.35
New Hampshire	22.4	4.6	.11
New Jersey	25.9	5.6	.11
New Mexico	6.9	20.2	.12
New York	29.9	5.5	.13
North Carolina	.3	18.5	.06
North Dakota	27.1	3.1	.06
Ohio	12.5	3.2	.08
Oklahoma	2.4	5.6	.10
Oregon	15.3	1.9	.09
Pennsylvania	18.8	5.9	.10
Rhode Island	32.8	7.7	.13
South Carolina	.4	25.7	.11
South Dakota	17.2	2.0	.04
Tennessee	.8	13.6	.12
Texas	6.2	9.9	.11
Utah	17.0	2.5	.10
Vermont	14.0	3.7	.11
Virginia	1.3	15.2	.15
Washington	21.1	2.0	.16
West Virginia	4.7	8.3	.12
Wisconsin	22.0	3.2	.07
Wyoming	18.6	3.3	.19
United States (total)	14.5	7.7	.12

Vote on Thomas amendment modifying literacy test. (Congressional Record, p. 767.)

States.	Yeas.	Nays.	Not voting.
Alabama		White	Bankhead.
Arizona		Ashurst, Smith	
Arkansas		Robinson	Clark.
California	Perkins	Works	
Colorado	Thomas, Shafroth		
Connecticut		Brandegee, McLean	
Delaware			du Pont, Saulsbury.
Florida		Fletcher, Bryan	
Georgia		Smith, Hardwick	
Idaho	Borah		Brady.
Illinois	Lewis		Sherman.
Indiana	Kern		Shively.
Iowa		Cummins	Kenyon.
Kansas		Bristow	Thompson.
Kentucky		James	Camden.
Louisiana	Thornton, Ransdell.		
Maine			Johnson, Burleigh.
Maryland	Smith, Lee		
Massachusetts		Lodge	Weeks.
Michigan	Townsend		Smith.
Minnesota	Clapp	Nelson	
Mississippi		Vardaman, Williams.	
Missouri	Reed		Stone.[1]
Montana	Walsh, Myers		
Nebraska	Hitchcock, Norris		
Nevada	Pittman		Newlands
New Hampshire		Gallinger	Hollis.
New Jersey	Martine, Hughes		
New Mexico			Catron, Fall.
New York	O'Gorman	Root	
North Carolina		Simmons, Overman	
North Dakota		McCumber, Gronna.	
Ohio	Pomerene	Burton	
Oklahoma		Gore	Owen.
Oregon	Chamberlain, Lane		
Pennsylvania		Oliver	Penrose.
Rhode Island		Lippitt	Colt.
South Carolina		Smith	Tillman.
South Dakota		Sterling	Crawford.
Tennessee			Lea, Shields.
Texas	Culberson	Sheppard	
Utah		Smoot, Sutherland	
Vermont		Dillingham, Page	
Virginia		Swanson	Martin.
Washington		Jones, Poindexter	
West Virginia			Chilton, Goff.
Wisconsin	La Follette		Stephenson.
Wyoming			Warren, Clark.

[1] Paired for the amendment.

Table 1 shows—and I challenge the attention of some southern Senators to what I am now about to say—Table 1 shows:

1. That those States which possess the smallest percentage of foreign-born people are the strongest advocates of the bill, while many of the States having a very high percentage of foreign-born populat. n are opposed to the bill.

2. That a majority of the States advocating the literacy test are:

(a) In point of literacy below the general average of the rest of the United States.

(b) In point of literacy below the foreign-born immigrant children.

(c) The percentage of literacy among the foreign-born immigrant children is higher than the general average of the United States.

(d) The percentage of literacy of children, one or both of whose parents are foreign born, is far above the general average of the United States.

Mr. President, if I can make good those propositions I shall have destroyed the last argument of those who voted for this restrictive, un-American, and undemocratic bill.

I. THE STATES WHICH POSSESS THE SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN PEOPLE ARE THE STRONGEST ADVOCATES OF THIS BILL, WHILE MANY OF THE STATES HAVING A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION ARE OPPOSED TO THE BILL.

The following States have less than 2 per cent of foreign-born people:

	Per cent.
Alabama	0.9
Arkansas	1.1
Georgia	.6
Kentucky	1.7
Mississippi	.5
North Carolina	.3
South Carolina	.4
Tennessee	.8
Virginia	1.3

The following States have more than 2 and less than 5 per cent of foreign-born population:

	Per cent.
Florida	4.5
Louisiana	3.1
Oklahoma	2.4
West Virginia	4.7

It is a significant fact that all of the Senators, with the exception of Louisiana, representing the above-named States, either voted against any modification of the literacy test or failed to vote on that question.

The author of the bill is a Member of the House from Alabama, which has a foreign population of but nine-tenths of 1 per cent. The chairman of the committee of the Senate, who has been most forcibly pushing the bill, comes from South Carolina, the foreign-born population of which is only four-tenths of 1 per cent.

The following States have a large foreign-born population:

	Per cent.
New York	29.9
Minnesota	26.2
New Jersey	25.9
Montana	24.4
Wisconsin	22.0
Illinois	21.3
Michigan	21.2
Colorado	15.9
Oregon	15.3
Nebraska	14.8
Idaho	12.4

The Senators representing the above-named States, by a large majority, supported an amendment in favor of modifying the literacy test.

It is a noticeable fact that the State of Illinois, which possesses a foreign population of 21.3 per cent, is represented here by Senators of opposite political faith. Yet both of these Senators oppose the literacy test. They do so because they are intimately acquainted with the immigration problem. The great State of Illinois contains a foreign population of approximately 1,201,019.

I pause now to ask why it is that Senators coming from States where substantially no immigrant population exists, which can not have suffered from it, which can not be well acquainted with it, are so keen in their insistence upon forcing their restrictive policy upon those States which are acquainted with the problem? If this question were left to those States which are acquainted with the problem this restrictive legislation never would have been passed.

Mr. President, I next call attention to this proposition:

II. THE LITERACY OF CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS IS HIGHER THAN THE GENERAL AVERAGE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Table No. 1, which I present, shows the following somewhat startling facts:

A. The total percentage of foreign-born population in the United States to be 14.5 per cent.

B. The percentage of children between the ages of 6 and 14 of native white parentage who attend school to be 83.5 per cent.

C. The percentage of children of all classes between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school to be 81.4 per cent.

D. The percentage of whites between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school, where one or both parents are foreign born, to be 88 per cent.

E. The percentage of foreign-born white children between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school to be 82.3 per cent.

It therefore appears that the percentage of school attendance by children, one or both of whose parents came here as an immigrant, exceeds that of the children of white natives by 4.5 per cent.

The table also shows that the school attendance among children of foreign birth exceeds the general average of school attendance for the whole country by nine-tenths of 1 per cent.

The figures just quoted demonstrate, therefore, that the degree of literacy of children of foreign birth is above the general average of the native born and also above the average of the population of the country taken as a whole.

The figures also prove beyond peradventure that the offspring of the immigrant does not remain illiterate, but that he pursues learning with an even greater avidity than our native-born children.

I advance this proposition:

III. THE STATES HAVING THE LOWEST PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANT POPULATION ARE LOWEST IN LITERACY.

The men who stand here to represent the States having the smallest foreign population also represent States having the lowest average of literacy of the country. The States that cry "Shut out the illiterate" are themselves the most illiterate.

I present herewith Table No. 2, which compares the degree of illiteracy among children of school age between five great States containing a very large percentage of foreign population with the degree of illiteracy among children of school age found in the five States containing the smallest percentage of foreign-born population.

The comparison is distinctly unfavorable to the States possessing the smallest percentage of foreign-born people.

The figures I now give embrace all of the white children between 6 and 14 years:

Rhode Island: Immigrant population, 32.8 per cent; school attendance, 91.2 per cent.

South Carolina: Immigrant population, four-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 72.1 per cent.

Massachusetts: Immigrant population, 31.2 per cent; school attendance, 93.9 per cent.

North Carolina: Immigrant population, three-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 75.7 per cent.

New York: Immigrant population, 29.9 per cent; school attendance, 89.9 per cent.

Mississippi: Immigrant population, five-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 84.2 per cent.

Connecticut: Immigrant population, 29.5 per cent; school attendance, 92.6 per cent.

Georgia: Immigrant population, six-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 74.8 per cent.

North Dakota: Immigrant population, 27.1 per cent; school attendance, 82.7 per cent.

Tennessee: Immigrant population, eight-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 75.2 per cent.

When we include the colored population the contrast is even more unfavorable to the States possessing a small foreign population.

Note also that States containing a very low percentage of foreign population are, in the point of literacy—

(a) Far below the general average of the United States taken as a whole.

(b) Far below the general average of children of foreign birth, taking the United States as a whole.

What an astounding thing it is to find the representatives of these States, whose population in literacy is far below the average of the children of foreign birth, whose States contain but few people of foreign birth, here clamoring that the foreigner shall be excluded from this country on the ground of illiteracy!

I next assert, Mr. President, that immigration is not inimical to education.

That immigrants favor education is shown by the fact that those States where they are most numerous and potential have uniformly dealt more generously with the public schools than have those States which are completely dominated by native-born people. In support of the foregoing statement I submit Table 2:

TABLE No. 2.—*Comparative statement showing the five States which have the largest percentage of foreign born compared with the five States which have the smallest percentage of foreign born.*

LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN BORN.

States.	Per cent of foreign-born whites in 1910 (Census Abstract, p. 86).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14 years, all classes (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, native white (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, of whites having one or both parents foreign born (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, of foreign-born whites (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of negroes 6 to 14, attending school (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Expenditures for public schools, 1879 (Statistical Abstract, 1880, p. 155).	Expenditures for public schools, 1911 (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 118).	Value of all property in 1904 (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 650).	Population in 1880 (Statistical Abstract, 1880, p. 149).	Population, 1910 (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 24).	Area in square miles (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 28).	Date when admitted to the Union (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 21)
Rhode Island	32.8	88.8	91.2	89.0	82.4	87.7	$597,000	$2,360,000	$799,000,000	276,000	542,000	1,000	1790
Massachusetts	31.2	92.9	93.9	93.1	88.1	92.0	4,994,000	22,502,000	4,956,000,000	1,783,000	3,366,000	8,000	1788
New York	29.9	90.0	89.9	90.6	88.3	87.1	10,464,000	52,328,000	14,769,000,000	5,083,000	9,113,000	47,000	1788
Connecticut	29.5	92.3	92.6	92.6	89.2	90.5	1,375,000	5,426,000	1,414,000,000	622,000	1,114,000	4,000	1788
North Dakota	27.1	80.7	82.7	81.5	70.0	.....	.....	5,184,000	735,000,000	.....	577,000	70,000	1889

SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN BORN.

South Carolina	0.4	62.6	72.1	81.4	72.2	56.1	$319,000	$2,168,000	$585,000,000	995,000	1,515,000	30,000	1788
North Carolina	.3	71.7	75.7	84.0	64.8	64.0	337,000	3,140,000	842,000,000	1,400,000	2,206,000	48,000	1789
Mississippi	.5	72.2	84.2	82.9	44.0	63.7	641,000	2,726,000	688,000,000	1,131,000	1,797,000	46,000	1817
Georgia	.6	65.6	74.8	84.5	76.0	55.4	465,000	4,390,000	1,167,000,000	1,539,000	2,609,000	58,000	1788
Tennessee	.8	72.1	75.2	83.6	78.9	60.1	710,000	5,083,000	1,104,000,000	1,542,000	2,184,000	41,000	1796

I also present Table 3, which compares the amounts of money expended for public schools in the five States containing the largest percentage of foreign population with the amounts expended in States containing the smallest percentage of foreign population.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE No. 3.—*Money expended for public schools.*

	Population.	Expended for public schools.	Per capita expended.	Per cent foreign born.
North Carolina	2,206,000	$3,140,000	$1.42	0.3
Rhode Island	542,000	2,360,000	4.35	32.8
South Carolina	1,515,000	2,168,000	1.43	.4
Massachusetts	3,666,000	22,502,000	6.13	31.2
Mississippi	1,797,000	2,726,000	1.51	.5
New York	9,113,000	52,328,000	5.74	29.9
Georgia	2,609,000	4,390,000	2.07	.6
Connecticut	1,114,000	5,426,000	4.87	29.5
Tennessee	2,184,000	5,083,000	2.32	.8
North Dakota	577,000	5,184,000	8.98	27.1

The average amount of money expended on public schools in five States showing highest percentage of immigration per capita—— $5.96

The average amount expended in the five States showing the lowest percentage of immigration per capita—— 1.54

The above figures prove that a great influx of foreigners has not led to a policy of stinting the public schools; also, that if it be true that foreigners exercise the potential influence in politics ascribed to them, then they have well manifested that interest by liberal taxation for educational purposes. If the figures I have quoted were reversed, what a frightful deduction these proscriptionists, who are the residuary legatees of the Know Nothing Party, would draw.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the deduction of the Senator, accordingly, that the real reasons for pressing forward this legislation are some that have not been disclosed?

Mr. REED. That is my opinion—reasons so unpleasant that I hesitate to mention them; but I shall perhaps touch closer upon that question a little later.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. O'GORMAN. No Member of this body has given more careful consideration to the questions involved in this legislation than the junior Senator from Missouri; and it does seem to me, if he has information which would inform his colleagues and the country as to the real motives underlying this proscriptive policy, that it is his duty to give that information here and now.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks I think I shall be able to satisfy all of the Members of the Senate that I have dealt with this question with considerable frankness; but lest it might be later forgotten, and lest it might be thought that I am avoiding an answer, I have to say that I believe the most potential, constant, and determined force back of this restrictive legislation is that spirit of religious proscription that is as old as our country; that organizations and societies have been pushing this legislation, and that these societies raise against one of the great branches of the Christian faith the hand of proscription, if not of absolute persecution.

I desire to proceed now. I was saying that I laid down further the proposition that the increase of population and wealth in those States having the largest foreign population has

been the greatest in this country, and I should like to challenge the attention of the Senators who are present to Table 3, which I have presented.

Now, a preliminary word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to call his attention at this point to one phase of modern immigration which had much to do with the vote which I cast in favor of the measure just vetoed. It is the importation—I think that is the proper word to use—of large bodies of men into this country by great corporate interests, such as the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. in my State, from the different nationalities of Europe, parceled out among these nationalities in somewhat regular lines of division, and employing them in their mines, so that on account of disparity of language and nationality there can be neither community of action nor concert in any social way, in consequence of which the places of American workmen are taken by that class of people, who afterwards, becoming dissatisfied with their condition, which to say the least is an undesirable one, break out into opposition and insurrection and strikes, and commit disorders for which American workmen, both native and naturalized, and who are entitled to the protection and the privileges of our laws and of our institutions, are blamed.

To give the Senator a cogent illustration of the situation which results from the possibilities of carrying out such a purpose, in 1904 there was a strike in southern Colorado. The governor of the State, at the instance of the mine owners, declared martial law; and the militia, at the behest of those in authority, loaded into box cars, without form of law or process of law, the men who were displeasing to the managers, whether they had been engaged in the strike or whether they had been merely suspected of wrongdoing or wrong purpose, and dumped them onto the plains of Kansas and New Mexico. Their places were filled by men imported directly from southeastern Europe, and the men who were imported in 1904 from that section were naturalized before they had been in the State three months and herded at the polls and voted like sheep. It was these men who in 1913 went on strike—a strike which has become historic on account of its gravity and the extent to which it reached.

I also want to emphasize the fact that when the President of the United States, responding to the call of the governor, exercised his constitutional power by taking possession of the disturbed area of the State with the troops of the United States Government, he issued a proclamation commanding all those who had arms in their hands and all who were otherwise unlawfully disposed toward the Government, to disperse and go to their homes within a certain time, and that proclamation had to be translated into 22 different languages in order that its contents might be properly understood and carried to the minds of something like five or six thousand of the men supposed to be upon strike.

I submit that that is a condition which is undesirable in any country, and one which no well-regulated immigration law would permit. It is one which has been the fruitful cause of much of the social, political, and industrial disturbance in my State, and one to which the real workingmen and citizenship of my State naturally desire to put an end, if possible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Colorado break completely in on the thread of my discourse.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very sorry I interrupted the Senator, if that is the case.

Mr. REED. That is all right, and I therefore will depart from the thread of my discourse for a moment to give them consideration.

The Senator himself introduced an amendment to this bill seeking to modify the literacy test, and I believe if that amendment had been placed upon the bill the President would not have found it necessary to interpose his veto. I supported that amendment. It was an amendment which exempted from the literacy test those who come here to escape race persecution and who come to escape political persecution; but the authors of this bill were so desirous of restricting immigration that they—I say it without meaning to be offensive—stubbornly refused to yield a single inch, and insisted upon excluding from this country those who flee here seeking refuge from the tyranny of other lands.

I make the further observation that if labor is being imported into the State of the Senator from Colorado by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., or any other corporation or any individual, the present Federal statutes are sufficient to punish drastically those guilty of the offense. But if the laws need strengthening in that respect I will go as far as the Senator from Colorado can go, or as any other man can go, to stop the importation of contract labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has not lost the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have repeatedly made the statement during the course of this debate which I have just made—the difficulty that in a bill which contains some good and wholesome propositions were thrust these propositions to which the President has expressly called attention, every one of which is unsound and all of which are a repudiation of the doctrines of the Democratic Party, of the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, of the principles of justice and of equity, of the very system under which civilization in this land was first established.

As for the statement of the Senator from Colorado that various languages are spoken in the Colorado mines, let me call his attention to the fact that only 20 years after the discovery of Manhattan Island it is recorded there were then 14 different languages spoken on its soil. There is nothing new about different people speaking different tongues or of the fact that people of different tongues come to this land and work at the same place.

Let me remark as I am passing, that if I know anything of the history of the strikes of Colorado, bad as was the conduct of the striker, the conduct of some of the officials, particularly the military officers, was probably a worse offense against the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights of this land than was the act of any one of the strikers who ventured to raise his arm against oppression.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully concede that one injustice was the offspring of the other. I merely wish to say that I make no point upon the disparity of language taken in itself. What I intended to emphasize was the fact that when men are brought here deliberately because they speak a different tongue and are separated lest they acquire either a common tongue or the English language, when, after they have been here for a period of 10 years, the only language which they know is the language which they brought here, and that that is the consequence of the method of oppression upon a large scale, it is a condition which to my mind is not only undesirable but appalling.

Mr. REED. Ah! But, Mr. President, I call the attention of my friend from Colorado to this, that the authors of that outrage of importation were American citizens, who thereby violated the laws of the land. I also call his attention to the fact that the cruel system of herding these people together in communities so arranged that various languages were spoken was born in the brain of some native-born corporation manager. If these people were so herded and so treated, is it any wonder they finally rose to strike? Was not that rather an evidence of their manhood and of their fitness for citizenship than proof to the contrary? And having been brought here and herded, as the Senator states, is that any excuse for the officers of a State trampling upon the Constitution and setting up a pretended condition of war, and arresting these people, confining them like cattle in prison pens without trial, and denying to them the writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. There certainly is no excuse whatever for the things which the Senator has just mentioned. My fundamental objection, and there are many, is that when these people were brought there each one of them took the bread out of the mouths of an American workman, his wife and his children, and they were turned adrift not only to seek employment elsewhere but to meet the drastic competition in lower wages consequent

upon the importation of this large body of men as their substitutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, importation is utterly abominable and importation is now criminal. If the authorities of Colorado, the native-born people, the educated and literate people, the learned people, permitted the laws of the United States to be trampled under foot they themselves have a responsibility for which they must answer.

As for the question of wages and driving out American workmen, I shall discuss that a little later, because it is in the course of my remarks. I propose now to go on with my demonstration.

The next point I make is that a comparison of the material progress and wealth of States having a large foreign population with States having a small foreign population shows that the former have far outrun the latter in every line of industry and attainment.

COMPARISON OF MATERIAL PROGRESS AND WEALTH.

Now, a preliminary word.

The wonderful progress of our country can be largely attributed to the liberal immigration policy hitherto pursued.

When the War of the Revolution ended, our civilization was confined to a narrow strip of land along the Atlantic coast. The population was in the neighborhood of 3,000,000.

In less than a single decade the population had doubled. It had begun pushing its way into the interior. It drove back the Indians; built cities, schoolhouses, churches, and homes.

In a few years the new Republic had more than doubled its strength, its wealth, and its power among the nations of the earth.

That policy has been pursued ever since, with the result that our land has outstripped all the nations of history.

That our progress is largely due to the generous influx of foreign blood is abundantly illustrated by the contrast existing between the progress and development of those States having the highest percentage of foreign population with the States having the lowest.

Again, I call attention to the 10 States I have just referred to:

RHODE ISLAND AND SOUTH CAROLINA.

Rhode Island and South Carolina came into the Union at substantially the same time.

South Carolina has thirty times the territory of Rhode Island and only three times the population, while the wealth of Rhode Island exceeds that of South Carolina by $214,000,000.

Rhode Island has 32.8 per cent foreign population; South Carolina has four-tenths of 1 per cent.

Contrast Rhode Island with South Carolina. You can put 30 States like Rhode Island within the territory of South Carolina, yet little Rhode Island has nearly one-third of the population of South Carolina; little Rhode Island has more wealth than South Carolina, and little Rhode Island has outrun her in progress, yet little Rhode Island has 32.8 per cent of foreign population while South Carolina has four-tenths of 1 per cent.

Mark you, I have not selected States that just suit my purpose. I have here the five States showing the highest percentage and I am contrasting them with the five States showing the lowest percentage of foreign population. The percentage of the other States intermediate will bear out the results I am now giving to a greater or less extent.

LET US CONTRAST MASSACHUSETTS AND NORTH CAROLINA.

Both States were admitted into the Union at substantially the same time.

North Carolina has six times the area of Massachusetts. Massachusetts exceeds North Carolina in population by 1,160,000, and has almost six times as much wealth, the figures being Massachusetts, $4,956,000,000; North Carolina, $842,000,000.

The foreign population of Massachusetts is 31.2 per cent; North Carolina, three-tenths of 1 per cent.

What a blessing it would have been to South Carolina if she could have had an infusion of the blood that helped build the great State of Massachusetts.

NEW YORK AND MISSISSIPPI.

The age and area of these States are substantially the same. New York has over five times the population of Mississippi and over twenty times its wealth, the exact figures being New York, $14,769,000,000; Mississippi, $688,000,000.

The foreign population of New York is 29.9 per cent; Mississippi, five-tenths of 1 per cent.

CONNECTICUT AND GEORGIA.

These two States were admitted into the Union in the same year.

Georgia has over fourteen times the area of Connecticut and nearly double the population, but falls below Connecticut in point of wealth, the exact figures being Connecticut, $1,414,000,000; Georgia, $1,167,000,000.

Connecticut has a foreign population of 29.5 per cent; Georgia, six-tenths of 1 per cent.

NORTH DAKOTA AND TENNESSEE.

North Dakota was admitted into the Union nearly 100 years after Tennessee.

North Dakota has made marvelous material advancement. Owing to her youth the population is comparatively sparse, yet with less than 25 per cent of the population of Tennessee she already has over 66 per cent of her wealth. In both population and wealth she is rapidly overtaking her elder sister.

The foreign population of North Dakota is 27.1 per cent; Tennessee, eight-tenths of 1 per cent.

The above figures absolutely demonstrate the following propositions that immigration has not:

(a) Increased the average of illiteracy.

(b) Has not injured the public schools.

(c) Has not withheld material advancement.

On the contrary, the States containing a heavy foreign population show a distinct superiority in the matter of literacy.

In material advancement they have far outstripped the States containing a small foreign population.

Under these circumstances it is a little astonishing that an attempt should be made by States with but a small percentage of foreign population to force their policy upon States with a large percentage, the representatives of many of which desire to continue a policy of liberality.

I now inquire if crime increases by immigration. This question is answered in the negative by both statistics and authority. I present Table 4.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE NO. 4.—*Comparing the percentage of persons confined in penal institutions in the 10 States having the largest percentage of foreign population with the percentage of persons confined in penal institutions in the 10 States having the smallest percentage of foreign population.*

States.	Percentage foreign-born white.	Percentage of prisoners under sentence in penal institutions.
Rhode Island	32.8	0.11
Massachusetts	31.2	.19
New York	29.9	.13
Connecticut	29.5	.13
North Dakota	27.1	.06
Minnesota	26.2	.07
New Jersey	25.9	.11
Montana	24.4	.25
New Hampshire	22.4	.11
Wisconsin	22	.07
Average		.125
North Carolina	0.3	.05
South Carolina	.4	.11
Mississippi	.5	.12
Georgia	.6	.26
Tennessee	.8	.11
Arkansas	1.1	.17
Virginia	1.3	.15
Kentucky	1.7	.12
Oklahoma	2.4	.10
Louisiana	3.1	.14
Average		.131

Mr. President, the table shows that the average criminality in 10 States having the largest percentage of foreign-born population is less than exists in the 10 States having the lowest percentage of foreign-born population.

Here are 20 great States placed in contrast; the 10 States that have not been polluted by foreigners at all with 10 States having a large population and also large cities, in which, it is charged, there is a congestion of population caused by immigration, and that thereby crime is bred. Yet the average criminality in the States having the highest percentage of foreign population is materially less than the average shown by the States having the lowest foreign-born population.

The Immigration Commission can not be charged, Mr. President, with a prejudice in favor of the immigrants, because it has seemed to me to appear as a special pleader against him throughout. The Immigration Commission nevertheless makes this statement:

As to whether or not immigration increases crime, there is not sufficient evidence to predicate a conclusion.

I have produced very substantial evidence from the official statistics by the comparison of the 20 States above named. The Immigration Commission has displayed animosity toward the immigrant. Its statement therefore is tantamount to an admission that the enemies of immigration have not been able to make a case.

POLITICAL REFUGEES.

The President has sharply challenged attention to the fact that this bill refuses asylum to political refugees.

In this respect the bill repudiates our national traditions as they have existed from the first. It was, as I have shown, the initial reason for much of the early immigration to our land. Our parent stock sought refuge in the forests of North America from the executioners of kings.

The doctrine was proclaimed by Jefferson that the War of 1812 was fought in the defense of the rights of immigrants.

Again, in 1853, Marin Koszta, a Hungarian refugee, was rescued from an Austrian warship by the captain of the United States sloop *St. Louis*, who backed his demands with the cannon of his vessel.

As I have said, the War of 1812 was fought in defense of the rights of our naturalized citizens. They were good enough in those days to go to war for, but in this day it is proposed to exclude them. The doctrine of protection of political refugees has been written in the creed of every political party entitled to live and that has lived.

Mr. President, we stand in the presence of the greatest war ever waged. Its termination may not be prophesied, but when it is over the map of Europe doubtless will be rewritten. Provinces, perhaps entire countries, will become the spoil of the victors. Bitter reprisals will inevitably follow.

It is humanely probable that thousands of men whose only offenses have been love of country, devotion to home and native land will be obliged to flee to escape the prison and the scaffold.

Shall we, in this hour of the world's history, reverse the policies of our Nation and deny sanctuary to those our fathers would have welcomed to their hearts and their homes? I present that question to the thoughtful and humane consideration of Senators.

Who are these immigrants who are coming with outstretched hands at the present day? Mr. President, they are our own kith and kin. Hart, in his American History, states (vol. 26, p. 42) that considerably more than one-half of the white people in the United States can not go back two generations without striking a foreigner.

It is safe to say that if they go back three generations 80 to 90 per cent of our people will strike an immigrant.

We are already a composite race. But few men born in America can truthfully say there does not mingle in their veins the blood of several European races. Yet we justly maintain that we have here developed a race superior to all of its forbearers.

DO THE IMMIGRANT RACES POSSESS THE QUALITIES OF GREATNESS?

No race produces superior men, unless the race itself contains the elements of greatness.

Measured by this standard, every European race has demonstrated not only its right to live but its capacity for the highest attainment. We are yet compelled to go to Europe for our ideals in architecture, painting, sculpture, poetry, and literature. What nation of Europe has failed to enrich the treasury of art and knowledge with the jewels of genius?

But European countries have unfortunately overburdened the great mass of their people. The common man, finding his opportunities at home too circumscribed, in answer to the longings of his soul seeks a country of freedom and equality. It is proposed by the authors of this bill to refuse him admission at our gates.

IS THE FOREIGNER CAPABLE OF CITIZENSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENT?

Shall we consider the Jew?

Seek the source of the century-old horrors he has endured and you will enter the caverns of ignorance where dwells the serpent of superstition and its pestilential offspring, persecution.

The Jew has been, and in some places still is, an outcast simply and only because he has steadfastly refused to abandon the God of his fathers.

For this, 3,000 years ago were his burdens in Egypt made greater than he could bear; for this were his cities burned, the walls of his capital razed, his temples destroyed, his altars desecrated, his people slaughtered; for this was he carried into captivity by Syrian and Babylonian despots, his land reduced to a desert sown with the bones of murdered millions. Yet, in spite of all, for fifteen hundred years the Jew clung to the horns of his altar, cherished his temple, and reverenced his God.

For fifteen centuries the world was enveloped in the night of bigotry, ignorance, and terror—a night illumined by a single torch of truth, held aloft by the hand of the Jew.

The Jew alone during all that period of terror, vice, tyranny, despair and loathsome idolatry taught the doctrine of one Supreme God. He alone followed a code of laws which embraced every principle essential to liberty, morality, and religion. His laws and his religion were to those of the other nations of the earth as a star of indescribable glory shining through the clouds of a storm-rent sky upon a sea of blood.

Then came the dawn of Christianity, but its glory fell first upon the land of the Jew. The God mother was a Jewess. The Twelve Disciples were Hebrew fishermen who spread their nets along the shores of the sea of Galilee.

From this race we get our religion, from its sacred writings our morals. It preserved the greater part of our knowledge of ancient history. The sublimest examples of sacred poetry and the tenderest expressions of exalted devotion fell from the pens of inspired Jews.

Obliterate the work of the Jew before the Christian era and you destroy the old Bible and the Ten Commandments. Strike out the work of the Jew of the Christian era and you obliterate the New Testament.

Your religion, the fundamentals of your laws, your ideas of virtue, your precepts of morality—all these you get from the Jew. From the lips of the son of a Jewess came the sublime command, "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you."

If you say some of the Jews crucified the Savior, I answer it was also Jews who followed Him to Calvary. It was a Jew who drew the nails from the cross. It was Jews who reverently bore the body to the sepulcher. It was Jews who awaited the glory of the resurrection. It was Jews to whom He appeared; with whom He walked and talked.

It was these same Jews who went into all the world teaching His word. They were beaten; they were imprisoned; they were fed to wild beasts by those they came to save. They gave their lives to the propagation of Christianity. The race has ever since been persecuted by those whom a part of the race converted.

But as civilization has progressed, as the light of reason has penetrated the night of ignorance, as man has emerged from the jungles of barbarism and approached the sun-lit plains of civilization, persecution of the Jew has lapsed or ceased. Only Russia and one or two others of the tardy nations continue the diabolic practice. Let us not become either assistants or parties to the infernal policy.

If you were to name the 10 greatest statesmen of the century, you would be compelled to include the elder Disraeli, an English Jew.

If you were to name the 10 greatest judges, you would include in the list a Jew, Rufus Daniel Isaacs, lord chief justice of England.

If you were to think of great lawyers of the century, your mind would call up the name Judah P. Benjamin, attorney general of the Confederacy, and remember him as a Jew.

If you were asked to name the foremost actress of the world, you would instantly think of Sarah Bernhardt, a French Jewess.

If you were asked to call the name of a master of music, you would remember Anton Rubenstein.

If you were to pursue your inquiry, you would find that in law, medicine, literature, science, philanthropy, art, and in business the Jew has held his own with competitors of every race.

Let me quote you the words of Joaquin Miller:

> Who taught you tender Bible tales
> Of honey lands, of milk and wine?
> Of happy, peaceful Palestine?
> Of Jordan's holy harvest vales?
> Who gave the patient Christ? I say,
> Who gave your Christian creed? Yes; yes;
> Who gave your very God to you?
> Your Jew! Your Jew! Your hated Jew!
> (Joaquin Miller in "Russia's Ingratitude.")

Shall we speak of the Polander? I have heard him referred to here in a derogatory way. Ah, before you do that, Americans, think of the two great Polacks who came here to serve in the War of the Revolution; gaze, if you will, upon the marble bust of Pulaski, to which I already have called attention, standing in yonder gallery, and remember that the blood poured from his veins to give you liberty. Is the Polack fit to hold his place in the world's progress? I have spoken of Pulaski and Kosciuszko. Let me mention Copernicus, that great astronomer who exposed the mistakes scientists had for a thousand years made,

who revolutionized the theory of the universe, whose genius blazes down the centuries as the sun at high noon upon the earth.

What lover of music has not stood entranced by the divine melodies of Chopin or sat enthralled by the Polac[illegible] Paderewski, master of the piano?

The soil that still can produce beautiful flowers will also bring forth useful grains. The sons of genius do not spring from an inferior race of men.

Shall we condemn the Italian? Ah, my friends, I have called attention to the fact that since schools have been established in his native land the Italian is rapidly gaining in education. But shall you condemn him? He alone successfully fought back the tidal wave of barbarism that engulfed Europe in the Dark Ages; he alone, although often overrun and often conquered, preserved his great libraries; he alone kept his temples of art and preserved the masterpieces of the ancients even though compelled to bury them to prevent their desecration by the barbarians. These people, sirs, still have in their veins the masterful blood of the Romans; they only lack opportunity.

If now you were to name the two foremost discoverers in the field of electricity, next to Edison you would speak of the Italian, Marconi.

Sir, at no period has Italy permitted her civilization to die. When all the world was dumb Italian poets were still singing their wondrous songs; her artists were preserving on canvas and in marble the marvelous visions of grace and beauty their souls conceived. The vulgar rich of this country seek to gain reputation for good taste by displaying in their homes the immortal works of the immortal geniuses who sprang from that race some of you would exclude from our shores.

Shall I speak of the German? Sir, he was denounced in his early immigration, but now criticism is silenced. The schoolhouse, I almost may say the schoolhouse of the world, is Germany; there music and art and culture make their homes. I pass on.

Do you denounce the Bohemian? Remember that in 1348 he established the university of Prague, at which there speedily gathered over 6,000 students. Remember that largely because of it learning was revived in Europe. Remember also that that race of men have suffered upon the battle field for liberty, and that it boasts a higher degree of literacy than the native sons of America.

Ah, shall we condemn the Greeks? Yes; they come here poor; they are shoemakers pounding at their benches, and bootblacks. I confess that as I used to look at them it seemed to me that possibly the poet was wrong when, in speaking of the Greek revolutionists many years back, he ascribed to them the spirit of Thermopylæ and Marathon. But, sir, when the Balkan War was on I stood upon the streets of my city and saw my bootblack friend transformed and transfigured. The blood mounted to his dark cheeks, the light of battle gleamed in his eyes; I saw him and his neighbors bid good-by to their wives and their children, and, almost to a man, leave their adopted homes and return to Greece to help break the chains their oppressors had riveted upon their native land. Then I knew that the spirit of Thermopylæ was alive, and then I knew a race so patriotic would make good citizens of this Republic.

So I followed the history of their war; it was a glorious story. The bootblack immigrant stood in the red line of battle and fought like the veteran of a hundred wars, and then when the war was over and Greece emerged victorious the immigrant returned to his humble occupation. But it will not be for long. Each year I see these people graduate into a better employment. Sometimes I wonder whether in genuine culture they do not surpass the average of our own people. From their homes come wonderful music. There is a song upon their lips we can not reproduce. The mystery of harmony is in their souls, and wherever you go in the humblest cottage, or the hovel, you will find, if not a marble, at least a plaster counterfeit of some great work of art. Why, sirs, they are but poor as were our ancestors, but this race must not be condemned and will not be save by the narrow or by the confused.

And now, Mr. President, a word about the immigrant. He always has looked the same. He never has been a pleasant spectacle when he arrives. His women wear no $50 bonnets; their faces are not adorned with cosmetics; their lips are not incarnadined out of a paint pot; their clothes are very cheap. Of course, they are poor and so were our ancestors. The rich do not come here; the wealthy do not crowd our shores, and those who come from the nobility we generally either have to send to jail or marry to a foolish American girl. [Laughter.]

But what of the character of these men who come? Why, sirs, I say without a single doubt or hesitation that the great common people of Europe are infinitely the superior portion of that country. If you wanted now to start an empire in the wilderness, would you rather have the immigrant as he arrives at the dock or would you choose a wife-hunting nobleman? I will take the immigrant, and I will tell you why. If you put the two men together, the noble and the immigrant, the man reared in the lap of luxury and the man who has toiled in the mill of hardship, and strip them both naked and turn them loose to fight the battle of life, the immigrant will live, while the other fellow will die. The immigrant is the better citizen, and let me tell you why. It is hardship, it is oppression, it is wrong, it is battle that develops a race of men, and nothing else can do it. Why, sirs, the knotted muscle of this immigrant contains the strength of a long line of ancestors who have also toiled. There is not a single drop of noble blood in his veins, as we use that term, yet he is the best raw material out of which to make a nation.

First, because the immigrant is always the bravest man in his community. A sponge never migrates: it is born and dies upon the same rock; but the game fish finds its way to the headwaters of every creek and river of earth.

Second. His generations-old contact with hardship and toil has given him the ability to surmount difficulties and withstand hardships.

Third. In the breast of such a man is a deathless ambition to better his state in life.

Fourth. He has that love of liberty which always glows hot in the heart of the man who has felt upon his neck the heel of the oppressor.

There is not an immigrant of the common people who comes to our shores who does not love liberty with a fervor we ourselves scarcely possess. He loves it and appreciates it because he has been denied it.

Mr. President, before we adopt this new national policy of proscription and of isolation let us consider a little the pages of history. The peoples who have prohibited or discouraged immigration have degenerated or disappeared from the face of the earth—China, Java, Hindustan, Turkey, and back of these Egypt, Persia, Media. And yet, I pause to remark, your literacy test would not keep out one Chinaman, for all can read and write, to the last one. But these races have degenerated or disappeared, and why? Because, just as no man can grow or even live without contact with his fellow men, so nations degenerate and die without the infusion of new blood and contact with other races.

The countries which have progressed most rapidly have generously opened their doors and invited foreign blood or have had it forced upon them by arms.

The invasion of the Franks awakened ancient Gaul from the lethargy of barbarism. The invasion of the Normans raised her to the first nation of Europe.

Ancient Brittany gained her early forward impulses from the example of the Roman Conqueror and the admixture of Roman blood. She took her place among the nations of the earth after Norman blood had been mixed with the Saxon.

Spain rose to the pinnacle of her greatness after the Moors conquered her cities and built the Alhambra.

Even the invasion of the Huns was, in the end, beneficial to Europe.

Germany is herself a conglomerate of many tribes and bloods.

It is the transfusion of blood, the inspiration of new ideas, the creation of higher ambitions which results from the contact and mingling of races which produce the superman.

Mr. President, our national progress illustrates this better than the history of any other nation. When I shall have called attention to it I shall yield the floor.

Our national progress has surpassed that of all the nations of history. To what shall we ascribe this wonderful achievement? Who seeks the truth will find its roots deep-seated in the fact that here is a race commingling the best bloods of all the world. Here gathered the oppressed of every land. The man whose back had felt the oppressor's blow; whose arms had borne the manacles of tyranny; who, in his heart, felt the hot flame of protest against centuries of wrong; whose soul aspired for liberty; whose eyes were strained to catch the glorious light of hope's bright star.

Beneath their ragged garments were thews of steel; within their brains the dreams of empire.

The Huguenot, the English Dissenter, the Jewish refugee, the Scotch Covenanter, the Irish Catholic, and, alike, the Irish Protestant, the Dutch and German Lutherans, the Polish patriot, the Bohemian revolutionist, the Italian peasant, flocked here by thousands to escape religious, race, or class persecution.

Some had insisted upon praying according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Some had lifted brave arms to assail the thrones of kings. They struck because they were more patriotic and courageous than were the common crowd.

They were the supermen of their countries. The bravest of the brave; the pioneers of progress; the champions of independence. They were the Bayards of civilization; the Cœur de Lions of enterprise.

When these refugees met here they mingled their ideas, traits, and blood. Each gained from the other in intellectual strength. Their offspring embraced the talents and genius of the mixed parentage.

Within one century of time the children of these oppressed and expatriated sires produced orators whose words of flame could fire a nation's blood with patriotic ardor that will last while liberty shall be a holy name; poets whose words will still be read as long as men shall love the music of our tongue; artists who could transform the dull and inexpressive canvas to a glorious harmony of color, light, and shade, and "paint the rainbow's wondrous hues and magic tints"; soldiers who could stand with Washington at Valley Forge and write the story of their patriotism in bloody footprints on the forests' winter snows; sailors who, following the intrepid Paul Jones, could lash their sinking vessel to the triumphant British man-of-war, and leaping like tigers on her bloody decks wrest victory from triumphant enemies; women who could stand within the cabin door, rifle in hand, and keep the home while the husbands served in the red line of battle at the front. We brought forth statesmen with the sublime courage to deny all the ancient tenets of government, to demolish all the idols of the past, to supplant the doctrine of the divine rights of kings with the divine doctrine of the rights of man; statesmen whose prophetic vision swept the horizon of the future, whose hands laid the foundations of the temple of liberty so broad and so secure that the countless millions to come after them could find within its ample walls a place to dwell.

In those good days the patriots still remembered their fathers were the oppressed of earth and held out arms in invitation of the brothers left behind. And they have come a mighty host and brought with them the hopes, the inspiration, the industry, the love of liberty our fathers had. Beneath their sturdy strokes the forests have been felled, the mountains tunneled, the rivers bridged, the iron bands of steel laid down that tie the Atlantic to the golden shores. Better than all natural advancement, higher than all commercial and industrial achievements, towers the great fact that we have created ideals for all the earth and made our flag the emblem of universal liberty and peace.

And now it is proposed that we shall selfishly deny to others the liberties for which our fathers longed and prayed, that we shall turn our backs upon the policy which has made of us the foremost Nation of the earth.

As well the eagle spurn the rock in which it makes its nest, the child deny its parents, or the lake refuse the offerings of the springs that keep its waters fresh and pure!

Fused in her candid light,
To one strong race all races here unite.
Tongues melt in hers; hereditary foemen
Forget their sword and slogan, kith, and clan.
'Twas glory, once, to be a Roman;
She makes it glory now to be a man.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. If I may have unanimous consent to do so without yielding the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, I would like to state my reasons for voting to recommit this bill. I consider it undigested, half baked, and full of fallacies, and thoroughly undemocratic in principle and theory. Already it has been amended six times by its framers.

OBJECT TO GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

To my mind there are several serious objections to the enactment into law of this bill, almost any one of which would be sufficient in itself to compel me to cast my vote against it. Viewed from the standpoint of time-honored Democratic doctrine and principle, it is most alarming, objectionable, and dangerous. I feel that I do not exaggerate when I say that the policy of true Democracy will be fundamentally changed by the passage of this bill. If it becomes a law, the Democratic Party will be irrevocably committed to the theory of a paternal form of government, which, freely translated, means state socialism. This is the entering wedge for Government control of other forms of trades and industries. Personally I am far from convinced that the Democratic Party of this Nation is prepared for this great leap into the dark. And I do not feel that this country should be committed to this new and radical policy without having it thoroughly discussed before and digested by the rank and file of the party and the people and have their seal of approval or, at least, their indorsement of the undertaking before they are irrevocably committed to this doubtful governmental ownership and operation of a merchant marine.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress on January 28 vetoing the immigration bill, recently passed by both Houses, and which passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7 and the House by a vote of 284 to 14, said:

> If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests, and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant, and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

This terse and facile language of the President expresses my views of the shipping bill so much clearer and more emphatic than I could that I take pleasure in adopting and applying it to this bill. If it be true that the literacy test of the immigration bill would "so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before," what reversal of policy do we find in this shipping bill, which commits the people unheard, consequently without an opportunity to make up their minds or render their verdict on an undertaking so revolutionary that the business world must stand aghast? "Has any political party ever avowed a policy on this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled offhand or in any other way." Mr. President, I am willing to be guided by the wish of the people when expressed on this great fundamental question and even surrender to the will of the majority my "clear conviction," but I am not willing to surrender that conviction and my sense of duty until the people have spoken. For these reasons I participated in none of the so-called conferences, afterwards denominated caucuses, by which it was sought to bind Democratic Senators to support this bill, which is in no sense a party-platform measure.

CONTRARY TO DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

I can find nothing in the platform utterances of the Democratic Party that in any way commits Democratic Senators to its support or even countenances this proposed measure, but, on the contrary, as I read the merchant-marine plank of the Democratic platform of 1912, it clearly condemns such a procedure as is here contemplated. That plank reads:

> We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the South, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

As I understand the purposes of this bill, it does not attempt to be in harmony with this platform declaration to regulate or to "foster by constitutional regulation of commerce the growth of a merchant marine," but, on the contrary, it proposes for the Government to jump full-fledged into the business itself and simultaneously create and conduct a merchant marine, and does it in open and flagrant violation of the platform declaration, because in doing so it is not regulation but operation; and, besides, it is manifestly imposing "additional burdens upon the people" by using forty millions of the people's money in a hazardous venture, and that, too, at a time of great public stress, when the Treasury needs every dollar to avoid further

taxation of the people. It is strikingly inconsistent that the President and certain Democratic Senators can repudiate a plank in the Baltimore platform—exemption of canal tolls—and yet when certain other Democratic Senators decline to support a measure that is not authorized by the Baltimore platform, and is un-Democratic on the face of it, they are denounced as bolters.

DOUBTFUL BUSINESS VENTURE.

This is no time for doubtful business ventures or experiments. Individuals, guided by experience, are cautious; why should the Government be otherwise? Are we true to our constituents' interests or to our oaths of office if we commit the Government to a business venture so fundamentally unsound and unwise, in which we as individuals would not embark, convinced in advance, as every business man must be, that it will be necessarily a losing investment? No country has tried Government ownership for a fundamental reason. They realize that it places the conduct of its foreign business in the realms of international affairs and complications. There is nothing in the experience of those countries which have tried, or are trying, Government ownership of railroads or other public utilities that would recommend it to us as a success. The wasteful and unbusinesslike manner in which the Government conducts its affairs, State and Nation, is of itself sufficient to discourage and to condemn such an experiment, especially at a time when our revenues have decreased to such an extent, owing to the foreign war and the shrinkage in imports. If I could, under ordinary or normal conditions of our country's existence, give my consent to try this most basic change of party principle and policy, I would certainly feel it a reckless tempting of fate if I agreed to an experiment in the world crisis that is in the balance now.

PEACE SENTIMENT—ITS POPULAR HOLD ON THE PEOPLE AND DANGER OF WORLD COMPLICATIONS.

Probably the one sentiment more than any other act of this administration that has gained the confidence and affection of the American people for the Democratic Party is the feeling that it has kept this country at peace.

Disregarding for the moment these serious objections of Government ownership, it looks to me like madness to jeopardize the peace and happiness of this Nation for an assumed and doubtful commercial advantage. I feel that if this Government engages now in the ocean carrying trade it is a certain invitation to disaster. To my mind we inevitably will be entangled in the world conflict now raging. During our Civil War we exercised the right of search of vessels of friendly nations consigned from one neutral port to another; but we confined that search only to merchant vessels of other nations and not to naval vessels. Would ships owned and operated by the United States Government in times of congested trade, but so designed in ordinary conditions to be used as auxiliaries in the Navy—would those be naval ships or not? What would be the status of a merchant marine owned and operated by the United States Government? As it stands now, according to international law merchant ships under convoy of a neutral warship are exempted from visit and search. Will the American people think it advantageous for our Government to go into trade at this time and forfeit the advantages now enjoyed by its naval vessels?

At present belligerents claim the right to search all vessels carrying the United States flag if contraband is suspected. The American people are willing to submit to seizure, search, and detention of vessels owned by private capital and to await the decision of international courts; but could or would they submit to apparent indignities offered to the United States Government in the form of one of its vessels? It is not only an unneutral act but practically a declaration of war for any Government to furnish a belligerent with supplies. Can this Government dissociate itself from that position in the eyes of the warring nations if it embarks in the carrying trade at this time? If this bill does not undertake to embark the United States Government, in its sovereign capacity, in the purchase, construction, and operation of vessels in ocean trade, then I must confess that I do not understand the English language

The analytical minds of distinguished lawyers may be able to split hairs or dissociate the Government from this undertaking by reason of the formation of the artificial person called a "corporation," but I can not. As far as the purchase or construction of the vessels is concerned, section 3 of the bill provides:

That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purpose of such corporation, with a view to transferring them to such corporation.

It is here unmistakably provided that the United States shall either purchase or construct suitable vessels for this corporation, and here is where our Government would take a bold chance of reversing its policy of strict neutrality to an entanglement and probable participation in this world war by the purchase of vessels owned by some one of the belligerent powers. If vessels are to be purchased, it necessarily must be vessels of this character—those which are unable to participate in commerce because interned at the outbreak of hostilities. All other vessels are too profitably engaged to be bought now at any reasonable price.

VIEWED WITH ALARM.

Is it possible that we are not to view with alarm or feel any concern if the United States, through this shipping board, purchases these vessels with the view of subsequently turning them over to this corporation, in which it must own 51 per cent of the stock, and, in fact, will own a hundred per cent? Is it an evidence of timidity to take this rational view? The very discussion of this bill and the possibility of its complications by learned lawyers on either side of this Chamber, and the opinion of eminent lawyers representing the Government, holding, as they do, so many divergent views on the right to purchase vessels of belligerents, and the presumption prevailing when they were purchased before the outbreak of hostilities and after the outbreak of hostilities, and whether or not they were purchased in good faith, whether the good faith of the vendor or the purchaser is to prevail, and whether a controversy arising between nations over such purchase is to be determined by the rules and laws of the captor country or whether the declaration of London, which has not been ratified and accepted, is to prevail.

I say if these gentlemen, so eminent and learned in their profession, disagree about these international questions, experience teaches us what we may expect, because when lawyers disagree the courts must decide. It will then not be a court of this country, but of the captor country that will have jurisdiction; then I, for one, become timid and view with deep concern the possibilities of serious complications, if not war. Why are we to take all of these chances and assume all of these risks, fraught with so much concern to the people of this country? Because we are told that there is a scarcity of vessels engaged in the ocean trade and the freight rates are high and it is believed that these conditions may be remedied in this way. I do not subscribe to this theory and do not believe for a moment that the suggested plan will prove efficacious; but, granting that it will, are we justified in taking such a hazardous step for a mere commercial advantage?

Mr. President, every day brings forth new angles, a stronger and clearer light with which to view this momentous question. New situations are revealed. The morning papers of this country are all quoting an editorial from the London Daily News of February 3, headed "President Wilson's problem." At first there was great hostility in the average British mind against this shipping bill. This editorial was written for the purpose of disabusing that idea, for what reason is here revealed. I quote the last paragraph of the article:

We do not here discuss the bearings of this matter on our interests, but there is one point we ought not to overlook, and that is that the submarine has become in this war a serious peril to our food supplies. It will dominate our position unless science discovers an effective weapon of defense. Should it threaten our shipping with destruction and ourselves with starvation it will not be an unimportant fact that a great neutral country possessing a mercantile marine of its own can send its ships into our ports unmolested and unafraid.

WARNED TO BE CAUTIOUS.

Democratic Senators, I solemnly warn you that it is madness to push this bill to embark our Government upon this perilous and uncharted business sea. Does not Britain well know that if one of this country's boats should be sunk by a floating mine—in an accidental way—we might say, then, we would be not only feeding Britain, but we would find ourselves fighting for her, which she well knows. We have seen how treaties are regarded by nations that are fighting for their existence. All international law and precedents are upset and made chaotic by this holocaust now raging. Any of the belligerents who felt that their adversaries were securing a genuine advantage and their success in the war injured or jeopardized by the entrance of this Government into the carrying trade might regard whatever understanding they may have had with us, as did the Germans the Belgian treaty—"merely a scrap of paper." They would brush aside as trivial this legal fiction of a "corporation" set up by the lawyers of this Government.

EMERGENCY MEASURE.

The promoters of this bill, which has been amended six times, tell us that it is an emergency measure, designed mainly, if not

solely, to relieve the congested condition of over-sea traffic at the present time, but they studiously avoid fixing a definite time for disposing of these purchased ships and of getting out of business.

How, then, is this emergency proposed to be met? Either interned boats owned by belligerents must be purchased with all the attendant complications or they must be built, because all other vessels are carrying their full capacity, and to purchase those already engaged in service would in nowise benefit or remedy conditions. If it is not the policy of the Government under this bill to purchase these interned vessels of the combatants, and if it be true that the rates are so excessively high, then necessarily the owners of all the vessels now engaged in the traffic must be reaping harvests so rich that none of them would care to sell at a fair valuation if the Government sought to purchase. The only course, then, left open to the Government, would be to have them built. I am informed that it would require at least 16 months for the shipbuilders to fill the order. The $40,000,000 to be invested under this plan would give our Government a merchant marine of about 80 ships ready for service, say, in about one year and a half. Under normal conditions it requires on an average of about 60 days for a ship to be loaded at the home port, make the voyage, be unloaded in the foreign port, to take on cargo, make the return voyage, to unload, to be reloaded, and ready for another voyage, one vessel thus making about six trips a year. Under present congested conditions, however, the number of trips would probably not exceed four or five, if vessels were available now. Then, if the purpose of the Government is actually to relieve this immediate congested business condition, is this not a pitiable, and, viewed solely from a practical standpoint, a futile effort? Any emergency which may now exist will have passed vessels provided either by purchase or construction.

The number of vessels which could be provided by the capital of this proposed Government corporation would furnish about 3 per cent of the total cargo tonnage of the vessels now in use. Nothing could better demonstrate the utter futility and short-sighted policy of this measure if its object is to reduce freight rates by competition. It would be like a little boy with his toy wagon attempting to unload a grain elevator.

ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND.

As a business proposition this measure can not be defended. It must be conceded—in fact, it is conceded—that as such it is a failure, and would be doomed to bankruptcy but for the backing of the Federal Treasury. So apparent is this that it is freely admitted that private capital can not be induced to take the 49 per cent of the stock, or, in fact, any part, for which it is permitted to subscribe, and the Government will be compelled to go it alone, take all the stock, furnish all the money.

If the Government corporation undertakes to purchase the vessels required by it at this time, when, owing to the war, freight rates have advanced so rapidly, the price paid must be correspondingly higher, and doubtless from 50 to 100 per cent in excess of what they could be purchased for under normal conditions, unless it is proposed to tempt fate and throw discretion to the winds and purchase interned ships owned by the warring nations. This Government-owned corporation would then begin business by investing its capital on a rising market in vessels at enhanced prices and be compelled to sell on a declining market. Having purchased these vessels at exorbitant prices, when the war is over and the law of supply and demand bring freight rates down to the ordinary level, then, if it be contemplated for this corporation to retire from business and turn its vessels over to private concerns, as the sponsors of this bill aver is the expectation, are we not sure to have a repetition in the disparity of the purchase price and selling price as was experienced with the vessels purchased by the Government during the Spanish War, with which we are all familiar, when many of such vessels sold for less than 5 per cent of the purchase price, and this deficit which this Government-owned corporation will sustain, and from which the shipper and exporter alone will benefit, will have to be supplied by the taxation of the whole people. This difference between the purchase and selling price which the Government will supply, is it anything more than a subsidy in disguise?

Am I, as a representative of the people of Kentucky, authorized to vote to tax my people to raise these millions which will only benefit the exporters? Nearly every bushel of grain and pound of cotton or farm produce is now out of the hands of the producer and in the hands of the exporter, or will be shortly. The freight is paid by the purchaser on the other side, not by the farmer.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT NEVER ECONOMICAL.

It is well known—and a practical demonstration of the fact is brought to our notice every day—that Government management and operation is vastly more expensive than private management. No sensible person will for a moment contend that a corporation managed by Cabinet officers, with no especial adaptation or technical skill or knowledge in shipping, can conduct its business in competition with a company or corporation managed by men who have given a lifetime study to its mastery and are familiar with every detail of the business. Besides, Government ownership always will have more or less politics and favoritism injected which of itself will largely detract from, if not practically destroy, its efficiency.

If, then, the expense of conducting this Government-owned corporation exceeds the expense under private ownership, one of two conditions must necessarily result: Either the freight rates must be higher than private-owned and managed vessels, thus defeating the object of the bill, or the vessels must be run at a loss, and the last is evidently contemplated. This loss will have to be supplied by the Government out of the Treasury, which means ultimately out of the pockets of the people by way of taxation. Wherein, I again ask, would this differ from a subsidy?

DOCKS NEEDED.

One essential point in these calculations seems to have been completely overlooked by the framers and advocates of this bill, who seem to think that ships were all that is needed to carry cargoes, and that is terminal facilities. Terminals are as necessary to ships as to railways. Steamships can not pull up at any landing and unload their cargoes on the bank. Deep harbors, especially constructed piers and docking facilities, and huge warehouses must all be provided beforehand. These abnormal world conditions have congested and overtaxed all the harbors of Europe almost beyond imagination. The war drain upon men has depleted the ranks of stevedores and dock hands. On account of these delays it is said that it requires 11 vessels now to do the work of 5 under normal conditions. The English ports are congested largely because of the scarcity of labor; and in France they have been compelled to use the German prisoners to unload the ships and clear the quays and docks. It is not clear, as a business proposition, how a few more Government-owned vessels can relieve this situation or emergency. The Government would first be compelled to purchase, construct, or lease more terminal facilities before it can relieve existing conditions, and thus divert a large part of the capital of this corporation from the purchase of ships.

A recent editorial in the New York Times very aptly illustrates this proposition. It says:

> It is especially fatuous to provide Government shipping or private shipping with Government aid when the necessity of the case is not so much shipping as facilities for loading and unloading. To the facts on this fact as given by carriers' spokesmen on this side of the ocean may now be added incontestable evidence from the other side. Twenty-one vessels arrived in Liverpool last Thursday and not one of them was able to get a berth to discharge its cargo.
>
> It would be idle to add to such congestion by providing more ships. The trouble is not one of trade, but of war. Some ports are closed, throwing more business upon others than they could do in favorable times. Many dock laborers have enlisted and others are earning such high wages that they are independent. Commerce is not running in accustomed lines. Strange boats are on unfamiliar routes and require more attention than liners running on routine. If any Government should intervene, it is not ours. We are shipping full volumes of goods at our own prices, and the freight is paid by the buyer. They should worry, not we. We should worry only if those who are more eager than wise should thrust us into an experiment which is not only unnecessary in a commercial sense, but is obnoxious politically.

The same objections for the same reasons existed at the other ports. The papers state that on the same day over 50 vessels arrived at London, and also at Genoa, Italy, and were unable to unload for lack of docking facilities.

Not only would this bill, in my judgment, fail to relieve the situation for which its promoters claim that it is designed, but it would have a tendency to paralyze personal initiative and prevent private capital from entering the field and investing in a merchant marine in competition with the Government-owned corporation, which is exempt from taxation and insurance and where all losses are recouped from the Public Treasury.

Investigation has shown that it costs 50 to 100 per cent more to build ships in this country than it does abroad, and that it costs about $17,236 more a year to operate a ship of 3,000 tons under the American than under the British flag. These disabilities under which our foreign trade now labors must be removed before one can hope to establish a merchant marine that will thrive and grow and hold its own with that of the other nations of the world. Mr. President, I shall vote to have this bill recommitted, because I hope and believe that there is enough patriotism and statesmanship in this august body to handle this vital question in the wise and right way and not from the viewpoint of petty and partisan politics. My suggestion to the Commerce Committee, which will have the redraft-

ing of this bill, if recommitted, is to so revise our foreign navigation laws as to place our merchant marine on an exact equality with the merchant marine of Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, and other countries. This will not be in the form of a protection or subsidy, but will appeal to the best efforts of American ability, which has never yet failed, and thus enable American shipowners to meet the competition of the other nations of the world and actually foster and encourage a real American merchant marine.

OTHER BILLS MORE IMPORTANT.

I am opposed to giving up all of the present session of Congress to the consideration of this shipping bill, which, in my judgment, is so unwise and will become so obnoxious to the people generally when fully understood, when we have other measures of real merit awaiting consideration, and in which the masses of the people are so vitally interested. The appropriation bills essential to the proper running of the Government must be passed. There is the rural-credits bill which might be discussed and passed at this session, and which affects the real interests of thousands of farmers and merchants of this country. I can not see wherein this bill is in the interest of the farmer or the producer, as is contended by some; his grain and cotton and other products have practically all been sold and are now in the hands of the exporter who purchased them, and if this bill would benefit anyone at this time it would be the exporter. These enormous freight rates will not be paid by the farmer, but by the purchaser across the ocean.

I am a farmer, and have recently sold my cattle and wheat at better prices than I have sold them for in years. The war is the immediate cause of these high prices—the high price of wheat as well as the high price of shipping. Wheat is to-day quoted at $1.65 per bushel. Would this fact justify the Government in investing the public funds in vast acreage in the West and to raise wheat in competition with the farmer in order to reduce the present enhanced price? While this may be far-fetched, what concerns us most is to determine where Government ownership and competition with the individual is to stop. Where is the line to be drawn if we once embark upon the project? I am opposed to establishing any such precedent.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to make plain my objections to this bill, and in a manner in keeping with the dignity of this body. I have not impugned the motives of anyone, realizing that it is a measure regarding the merits of which Senators may differ and are entitled to express their honest convictions. No Senator has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue that authorizes him to criticize and condemn another who differs with him as to what is for the best interests of the people of this country nor to read him out of the party because he will not violate his "clear convictions" at the behest of a conference, subsequently called a caucus, in which he did not participate. Ill-advised and ill-tempered remarks never won a cause, and I deprecate their use in this Chamber.

It is rather inconsistent for those who profess to be leaders here and to speak for the administration to criticize Democratic Senators for conferring with Republican Senators on this measure when President Wilson immediately calls into conference three Senators from that side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, in this connection and under the heading of "Rights of the States," I want to quote this plank from the Democratic platform of 1912:

> We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

I am convinced, and do not hesitate to state that, from my personal knowledge, quite a number of the Democratic Senators are at heart opposed to this bill, and but for the interference and pressure of the Chief Executive the measure would have been abandoned long ago.

It is highly inconsistent for the same leaders to criticize me because I will not violate my "clear convictions" and support a measure which I deem undemocratic and socialistic, and upon which the people have not passed, when the President vetoes a measure which passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7 because it is opposed to his "clear convictions." I honor and admire him for his courage; but is it possible that a Senator is not entitled to the same privilege? Must he surrender his "clear convictions" on a measure vastly more important, more revolutionary, and upon which the people have not rendered their verdict?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to a matter which will take but a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN], who has just addressed the Senate, called attention to an editorial recently appearing in the London News concerning which some editorial comment was submitted yesterday. The article being rather important as reflecting the prevailing sentiment upon the important question of the purchase of belligerent ships, I send to the desk a copy of the morning Washington Post, which gives the editorial, and I ask that the editorial be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the same matter was put in the RECORD last evening.

Mr. WALSH. I have examined the RECORD, and I find that all that was put in the RECORD was some brief editorial comment on the matter in the Washington Star. I send to the desk the editorial itself, which is copied in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Montana now refer to the editorial in the Washington Post or to the report from London?

Mr. WALSH. I refer to the London dispatch giving the editorial in the London News, which, as I have stated, is copied at length in the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it had been inserted in the RECORD on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

WANT SHIPPING BILL PASSED—LONDON PAPER DECLARES PURCHASE MEASURE IS INTENDED TO MEET PRESSING INTERNAL EMERGENCY—NOT AIMED AT GREAT BRITAIN—SUBMARINE ATTACKS ON ENGLISH OCEAN COMMERCE CITED AS PERIL.

LONDON, *February 3.*

The Daily News, in an editorial headed "President Wilson's problem," discusses the ship-purchase bill and says:

"So much misapprehension exists on the subject in this country that it may be useful to indicate the motives behind the President's action. That that action is intended to be inimical to our interests is a suggestion that may be dismissed as absurd. The whole purpose of the ship-purchase bill is to meet an internal situation of great seriousness. The United States, like this country, is suffering from a sudden and unparalleled lack of transport facilities. It has been chiefly dependent for its shipping on the mercantile marine of this country and Germany, and now the war has revealed the grave consequences of this dependence on foreign-owned shipping.

HAS EYE TO FUTURE ALSO.

"President Wilson's measure is not only an expedient to meet the present emergency, but a means for preventing a similar disaster in the future. Since it is clear that private enterprise can not meet the case and the method of subsidies is repudiated, he purposes to establish a State-owned merchant service and purchase ships for that purpose.

"There are obvious objections to the scheme, of course, especially in a country so individualistic in spirit and traditions as the United States. It is a development of State socialism that is without precedent, and could obviously not be conducted on lines which would make it directly profitable; but, as far as one can see, it is the only means by which the United States can recover its place in the world of shipping and protect its commerce against the consequences of dependence upon foreign shipping.

OPPOSITION NOT DISINTERESTED.

"The opposition which Mr. Wilson is encountering is, of course, not wholly disinterested. The Republicans are naturally attached to their own policy of subsidies, which fits in with the aims of very powerful interests, but the plain fact is that either State ownership must be adopted or the United States must remain without an effective shipping trade.

"We do not here discuss the bearings of this matter on our interests, but there is one point we ought not to overlook, and that is that the submarine has become in this war a serious peril to our food supplies. It will dominate our position unless science discovers an effective weapon of defense. Should it threaten our shipping with destruction and ourselves with starvation, it will not be an unimportant fact that a great neutral country, possessing a mercantile marine of its own, can send its ships into our ports unmolested and unafraid."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce, Mr. President, that immediately after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Georgia to-morrow I shall submit a few remarks on the unfinished business.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. JAMES. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia in yielding to me; and I desire to say that after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Georgia and the

speech of the Senator from Mississippi I shall try to make a few observations upon the pending measure.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that on yesterday the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States were treated to the most remarkable spectacle of incompetent leadership that has been exhibited on the floor of either House of the American Congress by any political party in many decades. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the author of the pending bill, or its original author—who is its author in its present form no mortal man can say, for we have had at least four different and distinct revelations of the pure and undefiled doctrine in this one bill since it began its course in this Chamber—the Senator from Missouri, the author of the original proposition, one of its most ardent champions on this floor and a reputed spokesman of the administration of the party in power in respect to this particular matter, finding himself confronted with a situation that threatened at least a temporary delay or defeat of the measure in its present form that may have meant at least its delay and possibly its substantial amendment, because certain of his party associates on this side of the Chamber had grave objections, constitutional and otherwise, to the measure in its present form, and at least some of them considered themselves under direct and specific pledges to the constituencies which sent them here, had evidenced by their conduct a purpose to support the motion made by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to recommit this bill to the Committee on Commerce—confronted, I say, by that situation, the Senator from Missouri, finding this division in sentiment and in thought upon his own side of the Chamber, engaged in the exceedingly diplomatic and conciliatory course of attempting to set himself up as a censor morum and to read out of the Democratic Party Senators who are just as good Democrats, to put it conservatively, as the Senator from Missouri ever was.

I do not know whether or not such methods as that can be adopted with success in Missouri, but, unless I mistake both the character and the temperament of my colleagues, I think I can assure this great leader of our party that no such methods as that will be successful in the Senate of the United States; that Senators of the United States, who act under a solemn oath of office and who represent on this floor States just as great and constituencies just as great as does the distinguished Senator from Missouri, are not to be browbeaten, bulldozed, or intimidated by any rough-hand methods in this matter. Sad will be the day for the people of the United States and sadder still the day for this illustrious body when Senators who sit on either side of this Chamber are to be browbeaten in any such manner as this, and certainly it seems to me that if the Senator from Missouri possessed the very first element of leadership he would have left most of his speech of yesterday unsaid.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to add to the already bitter feeling that has been engendered by this controversy and by this situation; it is far from my purpose to do so. I think those of my colleagues who know me best, who live closest to me, and who are best acquainted with me and with my life and character and career, understand full well that it is with extreme regret that I differ from any Democratic colleague in this body on any important matter. Certainly it is not my desire to add to the discord existing on this question; certainly it is not my desire to put the party in worse shape than that in which I found it when I came here, or by my speech to make the situation worse than it was before the speech was made. So that while I expect to answer with some frankness some observations of both the distinguished Senators from Missouri about this matter, I do not expect to go so far as these distinguished Senators have seen fit to go in their criticism of me and of certain other Senators on this side of the Chamber for the awful crime of having disagreed with them and certain others of our associates about a great question.

But the Senator insists that I and other Senators have been recreant in party fealty because of a so-called Democratic conference or caucus about this measure—which term ought to be applied to the meeting or meetings I am quite uncertain. In the beginning, being a new Member of the Senate, I was informed by certain of my colleagues that for many years Democratic conferences in this body had been held, without any precedent to the contrary, which did not seek to bind Senators, who were here as the ambassadors of sovereign States, to vote against their convictions on any of the great questions that might be pending. That was the information that I had originally on this subject; and I remember that at the first conference which I attended of Democratic Senators, in a spirit of harmony and good will, without the slightest jar or friction between any members of the conference, it was suggested and unanimously assented to, just after the President had made his opening address at the beginning of this session, that we should first of all, so far as the Democratic conference was concerned, make it our program to pass the great supply bills that were necessary for the maintenance and support of the various departments of this Government, and then, after that work was done, we would proceed, as far as we could, to try to carry out the program recommended to us by the President of the United States, so far as we might find ourselves able to agree and assent thereto. Unless my memory serves me incorrectly, that was the unanimous verdict of a Democratic conference, with not a voice raised in dissent.

Then this measure came on, offered originally, if I am correct, in another body, by a distinguished Representative from the State of Missouri, brought here by him, given—judging only by the fact that the language is identical—to the senior Senator from Missouri, and introduced by him and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce. A conference of Democratic Senators was called to consider this subject, and it soon developed that it was the purpose of at least some Senators to attempt to make this conference a thing that it had not been in 13 years, without a break—a binding caucus—and to commit us to that policy, without even reading the bill.

For certain reasons that I will explain to the Senate and to the country in a later portion of my address, I felt impelled to object to that form of procedure. We then undertook to take up the bill in detail and read it in sections. During the preliminary stages of the conference I was attending, hoping that the measure might be modified in conference to meet the views that I entertained and the pledges that I had made on this great question, so that I might be able to confer with the balance of my Democratic brethren about the matter and finally support some kind of a shipping bill.

Senators, and particularly Senators on this side of the Chamber, I appeal to you. Unless I am incorrectly informed about the happenings in this body, not since the year 1903 has an attempt been made to hold what might be technically and accurately termed a caucus of Democratic Senators, and to bind Democratic Senators to vote, whether against their convictions or not, for public measures. Yet even the very resolution which was invoked as the basis of this action, as the warrant for this authority, on its very face and in its very terms affords justification for the action that each one of the seven Senators who sit on this side of the Chamber and expect to support the motion to recommit has taken. I will read it.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. I desire to make a motion for an executive session.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 5, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1915.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Blair E. Hoar, of Orofino, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Lewiston, Idaho.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE.

Ed Ryan, of Goldfield, Nev., to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

William E. Stevens to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Anderson C. Dearing to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Ensign Ernest J. Blankenship to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

G. Lindley Gollands, Chandler.
E. F. Thompson, Kingman.

ARKANSAS.

Henry Clay Maples, Green Forest.
M. E. Sherland, McGehee.
John B. Thompson, Sulphur Springs.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles B. Fair, Lindsay.
Ralph P. Giddings, Turlock.
Luella Mann, Boulder Creek.
Johnnie L. Murphy, Madera.
C. D. Radcliffe, Merced.
E. W. Wilson, Fowler.

CONNECTICUT.

Charles F. Greene, Bridgeport.

FLORIDA.

F. Bartow Swearingen, Fort Meade.

GEORGIA.

Frank L. Asbury, Clarkesville.
Julien V. Frederick, Marshallville.
Josephine M. Gray, Adairsville.

IDAHO.

Patrick T. Sweeney, St. Maries.

ILLINOIS.

Emil J. Hess, Mendota.

INDIANA.

Frank Billings, Morocco.
Thomas C. Dowling, New Haven.
Eugene Kelley, Waterloo.
Charles K. Lewis, Russiaville.
William L. McMillen, Brook.
Winfield S. Sanders, Westport.

KANSAS.

J. A. Carson, Erie.
Michael A. Frey, Junction City.
Harlan W. Marmon, Barnes.

LOUISIANA.

Burnside Capers, Arcadia.
Ulysses J. Marcotte, Cottonport.
Joseph P. Trosclair, Opelousas.

MAINE.

Guy H. Hunt, Newport.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Josiah W. Earle, Cohasset.
George W. Jones, Falmouth.
George H. Olivier, New Bedford.
Sidney M. Towle, Duxbury.

MICHIGAN.

Julius C. Armbruster, Sebewaing.
Charles Davidson, Richmond.
John C. Downing, Vermontville.
William F. Hemmeter, Saginaw West Side.
Charles A. Johnson, Pinconning.
Edward G. Scott, Iron River.

MINNESOTA.

John Haas, Lamberton.
Andrew Rotegard, New Richland.

MISSISSIPPI.

Walter E. Dreaden, Lambert.
Susette E. McAlpin, Bolton.
Joseph E. Saucier, Bay St. Louis.

MISSOURI.

Harry B. Adkins, Weston.
Thomas C. Bassore, Rogersville.
Samuel T. Breckenridge, Bosworth.
John Gable, Browning.
George P. Hicks, Callao.
Samuel J. Jamison, Rich Hill.
Horrell Johnson, New Madrid.
Nesbert W. Lemasters, Oak Grove.
John H. Taylor, Chillicothe.
Francis M. Traughber, Centralia.
Robert K. Wilson, Jackson.

MONTANA.

William C. Bernard, Harlem.
Mary Bonham, Ismay.
Jefferson D. English, Big Sandy.
George C. Milburn, Darby.
Hans A. Nelson, Joplin.
Stephen J. Rigney, Cut Bank.

NEBRASKA.

Anton J. Glodowski, Platte Center.
Frank Howard, Ravenna.

NEW JERSEY.

Hunn Livingston, Allentown.
William T. Nash, New Egypt.
Marcellus Parker, Manasquan.
David A. Power, Metuchen.
Addison Robbins, jr., Hightstown.
Alexander H. Sibbald, Park Ridge.
Carl Shurts, Lebanon.

NEW YORK.

George F. Cornell, Rosebank.
H. Blake Stratton, Monticello.

NORTH CAROLINA.

W. M. Goodson, Marion.
C. F. Mitchell, Winton.
N. Henry Moore, Washington.
Thomas J. Orr, Matthews.
Christopher H. Peirce, Faison.
William J. Roberts, Shelby.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank Argersinger, Forman.
James F. Cannon, Tioga.
A. O. Dahl, Plaza.
Frank E. Ellickson, Regent.
T. J. McCully, Sheldon.
Henry W. O'Dell, Reeder.
Bernhard Ottis, Wyndmere.
Henrietta Rooks, Linton.
M. J. Gurnett, Balfour.

OHIO.

Louis N. Gerber, Middleport.
J. E. Halliday, Gallipolis.
Grover Cleveland H. Hipp, Grover Hill.

OKLAHOMA.

Dorothy L. Avant, Avant.
Lee B. Fitzhugh, Sand Springs.
C. D. Snider, Waurika.

OREGON.

John W. Hughes, Fossil.

PENNSYLVANIA.

B. Stiles Duncan, Duncannon.
Winifred Hughes, Tioga.
P. G. Katz, Verona.
Leslie C. Lockerman, Cheswick.
John B. Shea, Eldred.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Micheal P. Healy, Navy Yard.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

A. J. Johnson, Murdo.

TENNESSEE.

John L. Nowlin, Sparta.
J. T. Patten, Dickson.

TEXAS.

Andrew Barton, Kilgore.
B. G. Edwards, Forney.
Sam H. Little, Eagle Lake.
B. H. McKinnon, Canton.
C. C. Powell, Clarendon.
W. A. Smith, Gatesville.
W. B. Stradley, Paducah.

WASHINGTON.

Freeborn S. Lewis, Port Angeles.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Margaret McGugin, Ravenswood.
George H. Merchant, Cairo.
Hayes Sapp, Newburg.

WYOMING.

Thomas W. Keenan, Pinebluff.
W. H. Wolfard, Encampment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 4, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in response to the invitation revealed in the written word and in the law of our being, we come asking that we may receive, seeking that we may find, knocking that the chambers of Thy councils may be opened unto us, that righteousness, truth, and justice may prevail in all our hearts that Thy purposes may be fulfilled in us; and we will praise Thy name forever. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912; and

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (No. 1368) from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that it is not necessary to read the report.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to have the report read.

Mr. MANN. It will be read in the gentleman's time. The report is not privileged.

Mr. BURNETT. There has been, Mr. Speaker, a time agreed upon for debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to an hour's time on his report.

Mr. HEFLIN. What is the agreement as to time?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Alabama should have the agreement as to time settled in the House.

Mr. BURNETT. And then have the report read, but not taken out of the time agreed upon?

Mr. MANN. I do not care about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think the question is not before the House until a motion is made to accept the report. I think it is in order for the gentleman to have the report read in his time and then make the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 6060. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. FIELDS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. FIELDS. Considering the importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be a quorum present, and I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not do that; there will soon be a quorum here.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the report on the bill H. R. 6060, and move that the House pass the bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House, on reconsideration, pass the immigration bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have agreed upon 5 hours and 20 minutes for debate. One-half is to be given to the side of the proponents of the bill and one-half to those opposed to the bill; 1 hour and 20 minutes is to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. For those opposed to the bill, 1 hour and 20 minutes is to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and 1 hour and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. SABATH. One hour and twenty minutes is to be controlled by me and one hour and twenty minutes by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this bill shall be limited to 5 hours and 20 minutes—one-half on one side and one-half on the other; that one half of the time for those in favor of the passing of the bill over the President's veto be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and one half of the time in opposition to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MANN. And at the end of that time——

Mr. BURNETT. I shall ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. And at the end of 5 hours and 20 minutes the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask if out of that time I can have 10 minutes. I want to discuss this question, as it is a very important one, and I want at least 10 minutes of time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee desires most of the time, and I can not agree to the gentleman's request, but I will agree that he shall have 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Alabama would have any objection to fixing the time for a vote. I think the House is entitled to know when it will vote.

The SPEAKER. It will vote at the conclusion of 5 hours and 20 minutes plus such little time as may be lost in the usual process of debate.

Mr. MOORE Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE. I am a member of the Committee on Immigration, and I rise to reserve my right to object in order that I may ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that an arrangement has been made by which 5 hours and 20 minutes are to be accorded to debate. He proposes that the time shall be divided between himself and the gentleman from Masssachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who stands on all fours with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and that then a Democratic member of the committee shall divide the rest of the time. I would like to know whether the members of the committee on all sides of this question have been consulted with regard to the division of time?

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania totally misunderstands the question. The gentleman from Alabama very fairly asked me what I would agree to on the Republican side, being on the same side. I said that one-quarter of the time should be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, on the Republican side.

Mr. MOORE. Was "the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE," consulted?

Mr. GARDNER. No; he was not; he was not here——

Mr. MOORE. Oh, "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" has been here regularly.

Mr. GARDNER. We did it this morning, and we thought it was exceedingly liberal, inasmuch as the preponderance of the House is not only Democratic, but also in favor of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] gets exactly the same treatment that the chairman of the committee himself gets.

Mr. MOORE. Without consultation on the part of the gentleman who is presumed to represent the minority Republican side of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that representing the minority of the Republicans on this committee I will get an hour and 20 minutes in this debate?

Mr. BURNETT. That was so stated by Judge SABATH, the ranking member of the minority of the committee, who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. MOORE. And who is not a Republican.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Alabama is that there be 5 hours and 20 minutes of debate.

Mr. MOORE. My question is, Do I get an hour and 20 minutes of that time to divide among Republicans who are opposed to the bill?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. That was my statement.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for one-quarter of that time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of advocating the passage of this bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

I sincerely regret I am compelled to part company with the President on this important question. For almost two years I have followed him religiously, supporting by voice and vote each and every administration measure presented to this House. I recognize and appreciate his splendid ability, his unquestioned honesty, integrity, and sincerity, as well as his earnest desire to give to the country the best legislation possible.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe Woodrow Wilson is the greatest President this country has had since the pen dropped from the hand of Thomas Jefferson and the sword from the hand of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] Through his leadership Congress has given to the country more constructive legislation in the interest of the American people than had been given them during the past 50 years. Generations to come will be under everlasting obligation to Woodrow Wilson for the great service he has rendered in preserving peace, in protecting the rights of the individual, in bringing the day of special privilege to an end, and in fixing the doctrine of equal rights in national policies as well as in the hearts of mankind. [Applause.] But, sir, no man ever lived or ever will live who was absolutely infallible. Thomas Jefferson made his mistakes; Abraham Lincoln made his; and Woodrow Wilson will make his. The President in his veto message has expressed his honest convictions. I honor and respect him for so doing, but I know the President well enough to believe he will honor and respect me for voting my honest convictions, even though I disagree with him. In fact, in my judgment, no Member of Congress who either has no convictions or who does not have the courage to sustain his convictions will ever command the respect of any President of the United States or the confidence of the American people. I believe the safety of our Republic and the perpetuity of our institutions rest upon the combined judgment of all our people, and that any tendency toward the surrender of this individual, God-given right to think and act for ourselves will undermine the foundation upon which our Government rests. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the Committee on Immigration for eight years, having given a great deal of thought and time to the study of this question, having voted for this bill twice in the House, and having voted to pass it over the veto of President Taft, if I were now to reverse myself and vote to sustain the veto of President Wilson I would be ashamed to face my constituency. What reason could I assign or what excuse could I offer for voting to sustain a Democratic President when I refused to sustain a Republican President upon the same question? I can not, Mr. Speaker, even for party advantage, put myself in such a ridiculous position before the country.

Now, let us consider briefly the objections offered by the President in his veto message. First, he says:

> The bill embodies a radical departure from the long-established policy for this country, and would close the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of man.

So far as this objection is concerned, outside of the literacy test, the bill under consideration only emphasizes what is already existing law. In fact, the President says in his message—

> that this bill is in many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable.

He also says:

> I believe its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

Mr. Speaker, I see but little force in the first objection offered by the President, as that objection relates to the present law as well as this bill. His second and main objection goes to the literacy test, and I am aware of the fact that much can be said against this particular kind of a test. I am also aware of the fact that many men of foreign birth who were uneducated came to this country in an early day and have made good citizens and have contributed their part toward the development of our country. I do not contend that education is a test of morality or character, but I do say there is far less excuse the world over for being unable to read than there was many years ago. I have no objections to immigration that will not lower our standard of living, and I recognize the fact that much of our progress and many of our achievements are due to the ability, the capacity, and progressiveness of many citizens of foreign birth. I am proud of their achievements in both business and professional life. Their loyalty to our country and devotion to our flag have attracted the attention and won the admiration of all our people. But that is not the question. What we must decide upon is the best method of restriction. We all agree that immigration is coming faster than it can be assimilated; that we already have a surplus of unskilled labor; that American workmen of both native and foreign birth are being driven out of employment by the influx of thousands of illiterates from southern Europe, who are willing to live and do live in box cars or under the crudest kind of shelter, at an expense of 10 or 15 cents per day, and who, as a matter of course, eventually lower the standard of American wages and the standard of American living. You can not tell me that the dumping of 250,000 illiterates from southern Europe annually on our shores will not lower the standard of American citizenship. If this be not true, then our boasted system of schools is a failure and we are annually wasting millions of dollars of the people's money in their maintenance.

The test proposed does not require them to read the English language. It only requires them to read in the language or dialect of the country from which they come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is not only in the interest of all American citizens, both of native and foreign birth, but I also believe it is in the interest of illiterate foreigners who expect at some time in the future to make this country their home. It will have a tendency to stimulate and develop a better system of schools the world over, and will result in causing thousands of foreigners who desire to become American citizens to prepare themselves for admission.

Again, the President in his veto message says:

> Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction? Does this bill rest upon the conscience and universal assent and desire of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment no legislative matter has ever received so much attention and discussion at the hands of the American people as the question of restricting immigration. It has been a prominent issue before the people for 15 years. It has been discussed for years by 30,000 labor organizations scattered throughout the country, representing a membership of 2,500,000, and all of these organizations have passed resolutions favoring the passage of this bill. It has been discussed for years by thousands of farmers' organizations, representing a membership running into the millions, and all have passed resolutions favoring this legislation. The President asks if any political party ever made a declaration upon this subject. As far back as 1896 the Democratic national committee made a platform declaration as follows:

> We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

The Republican national committee platform of the same year contained a plank as follows:

> For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

And we all remember that President McKinley was elected on that platform. Let us go still further, and see whether this is a new question.

In 1896–97 the House and Senate passed a bill containing the literacy test, which bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto, but in the Senate it failed by a few votes.

In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill got no consideration in the House because of the Spanish-American War.

In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test.

In 1906 the Senate again passed a bill containing the literacy test. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission.

In 1913 the Senate and House both passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test recommended by the commission, which bill was vetoed by President Taft. The Senate passed the bill over the President's veto, but it failed in the House by a few votes.

In 1914–15 the House and Senate passed, by more than a two-thirds vote, the bill before us, which contains a literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the consideration given this question by both branches of Congress during the past 18 years, it can be truthfully said that the chosen representatives of the people knew the sentiment of the districts they represented when they passed by overwhelming majorities the numerous bills I have mentioned.

Again, the President says:

> I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them.

Yet, by this veto he overrides the judgment of the House and the Senate, both of which expressed their approval of this bill by overwhelming majorities.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the judgment of the President, and recognize the fact that he is within his rights under the Constitution when he exercises the veto power; but, so far as I am concerned, I would rather accept the judgment of 454 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate than to accept the judgment of any one man. The Federal Immigration Commission, appointed by Congress, spent four years studying this question both at home and abroad, and here is what that commission says about labor conditions:

> The investigation of the commission shows an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country, as a whole, a condition which demands legislation restricting the further admission of such unskilled labor.

Mr. Speaker, eight out of nine members of the commission recommended the literacy test as the most feasible single method of accomplishing the desired restriction. While this test may be regarded by some as a selective measure, the commission recommended it as a measure of restriction, the purpose, as indicated, being to relieve the harmful pressure of immigration on an already overcrowded unskilled-labor market. That the judgment of the Congress coincided with that of the commission is shown by the fact that in 1912–13 the House favored the literacy test by a vote of 178 to 52, and the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8, and on the bill now before us the vote in the House was 252 to 126, and in the Senate 50 to 7.

This overwhelming vote in both the House and Senate reflects not only the judgment of the representatives of the people, but it also reflects the judgment of the people themselves. We who occupy seats here come fresh from the people. We know the wishes of those we represent, and if we fail to carry them out we will not, and should not, represent them longer.

Even in districts where the population is largely foreign born, as it is in the district represented by Judge GOLDFOGLE, of New York, the sentiment against restriction is changing. No man on the floor has been more active against the literacy test than the gentleman from New York. He has never failed to manifest, during his entire congressional career, his intense interest and solicitude for foreign-born citizens, both in committee work and on the floor of the House, yet he was defeated for reelection, which indicates that the people he represents, who are 90 per cent foreign born, are beginning to realize that some restrictive measure is necessary.

This bill will not affect to but little extent, if any, the Scandinavian or the German or the Canadian or the Englishman or the Scotchman or the Irishman, as practically every adult in those nations can read and write. It might touch a few of the old folks from those countries, but we have provided a clause by which they can enter whether they themselves can read or not, so long as a single member of the family can do so. The bill also provides that all those who are fleeing from religious persecution, whether they can read or not, can be admitted. In fact, practically all who will be excluded under this bill are a few of the Sicilians and some of the Italians from southern Italy. It is not by any means a radical measure. While personally I am not wedded to the reading test, but no one has suggested a better one, and as it is the only method proposed which will protect our laboring men from being thrown out of employment, I feel it my duty to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is worthy of our support. I believe it is in the interest of America and American institutions. I believe it is in the interest of the illiterate foreigner who in the future desires to make this country his home. I believe it is in the interest of American workingmen, both native and foreign born, who are now being crowded out of employment by an oversupply of unskilled labor, and, believing this, I shall vote to override the veto of the President.

Let us be men. Let us not only show we have convictions of our own, but also show that we have the courage of our convictions. I appeal to you as the direct representatives of the American people to write this bill into law, and establish what Abraham Lincoln said should be, that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my approval of the message of our President on this bill, and I hope that this Congress will stand with him to-day. What I can not understand about the attitude of a majority of the Members of this House, who up to the present time have insisted upon the passage of this bill with the literacy test, is that they seem to make the fundamental blunder of forgetting that character, which is the only test that an immigrant ought to be obliged to meet, is not necessarily secured by education, but, as I have said in this Chamber on another occasion, if a man naturally bright has immoral tendencies the education which he has may, by the very fact, be used for the purpose of training these tendencies to the detriment of the community in which he is going to live.

We have a great public-school system in this country. America is called the melting pot, and our own Emerson has called it only another name for opportunity. If the inhabitant of a foreign land, prompted by the inspiration to improve his condition, turns his eyes longingly to America, are we going to deny him entrance simply on the ground that he is unable to read and write? If this is the test which you are about to impose to-day, how can you, in fond contemplation of the institutions that were builded so firmly by the fathers of this Republic, say that they builded better than they knew? [Applause.] And yet what were they? Men of character in most instances, but what kind of education did they have? I leave it, Mr. Speaker, to your own knowledge of the history of origins in this country to answer this question. What it is that makes foreign immigration a positive acquisition to our country is that no man wishing to come to this country does so except under the impulse of a disposition to improve his condition. He is dissatisfied with conditions in his own land. He is blessed with a wholesome discontent and this wholesome discontent is, so far as I know, the only measure of ambition. If an immigrant brings here a strong body, an acute mind, and fine moral sensibilities, we need have no fear of the influence of his presence upon our institutions. Nay, we may rather rejoice to think that he has those qualities which, found in the fathers of the Republic, enabled them to build a land which I verily believe is to endure as long as humanity has ambition to improve. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, let it never be said that within less than 150 years of the Declaration of Independence a Congress of the United States, so far forgetting the foundations of our own America, gave the lie to the hopes and to the aspirations of people struggling under the absolutism of Europe and other countries and who, yearning for opportunities for improvement for themselves and those that came after them, found closed upon them the doors of a country which in the providence of God had been reserved as a haven for the struggling aspiring manhood wherever found on earth. [Applause.] "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." All men are His creatures. Shall we dare to say that man, the image of the Creator, shall not have a share in the fruits of the largest land which the sun shines upon?

Why it was to these shores, Mr. Speaker, that Kossuth, the Hungarian liberator, came as a triumphal here on a vessel of the United States squadron offered by Congress to him and his fellow exiles who had surrendered to Turkey. They escaped their greatest danger, threatened extradition to Russia in accepting this offer of Congress—this same Congress which is now closing the doors to the oppressed and the unhappy of other lands. In gratitude Kossuth wrote, on March 27, 1851:

> May your example, noble Americans, be to other nations a source of social virtue; your power be the terror of all tyrants, the protector of the distressed, and your free country ever continue to be the asylum of the oppressed of all nations.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I beg the Members of this House to recall the story of other days and to consider again the history of this country. Ask yourselves whether this bill is not really a step backward. Surely, sir, this is no partisan measure. Two Presidents of the United States have already expressed their dissatisfaction with the literacy tests. Another, a great scholar himself, after most careful consideration, has followed their example. Our duty, as it seems to me, is absolutely clear in the premises, and I sincerely hope that the Members of this House, of whatever party, however much they may have hesitated up to the present moment, may consider the reasons assigned by the Chief Executive of this Nation compelling his veto of this bill, and that America, through its Congress, will declare to the aspiring immigrant, and through him to the world, that it is national character alone that makes a nation,

and that it is not intellect but morality that is a test of character. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I can see influences back of this proposed legislation other than those exercised and controlled by organized labor; I can see influences which dare not come out into the light of day, but which, under the cover of an inky, slimy darkness, masquerading in the guise and garb of so-called "patriotic" orders, are ceaselessly endeavoring to divide the great body of American citizenship along lines of racial and religious prejudice. I ask every fair-minded man in this body to listen to this extract from one of these so-called "patriotic" publications; and when you have heard it, ask yourselves whether there be even the shadow of truth in its base references to "Rome and its lobby."

This paper said in its last issue:

On January 14 the Senate agreed to the conference report on the Burnett immigration bill without a record vote. Senator REED, of Missouri, after four weeks of talk and filibuster in opposition against this meritorious measure, finally tired of talking and allowed the Senate to take the vote resulting in agreement.

Among other things inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his remarks on the subject were telegrams and letters from Cardinal Gibbons; Edward Cummins, S. J. (supreme Jesuit); John Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the Roman Catholic University at Notre Dame, Ind.; John J. Glennon, archbishop of St. Louis; and the like. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, pages 1606 and 1607.

From this it is apparent who pulled the string that kept Senator REED'S tongue in motion day after day under the endless-talk privilege by which a Senator may talk a measure to death.

Rome's spokesman in the House seems to have been RUFUS HARDY, of Texas. HARDY'S speech in the House (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1531) contains HARDY'S declaration that he is against this bill and against all kindred legislation. We are informed that his remarks on the floor were more severe and harsh than they appear as revised in the RECORD.

The 60-page bill, containing the reading test and 300 other additional amendments to existing immigration laws, went to the White House January 15. The President has 10 legislative days, excluding Sundays and the day he received it, in which to sign the bill or return it to the House without his signature. Failure to do either results in the bill automatically becoming a law.

It is expected that President Wilson will veto the measure; but it can be passed over the veto if all the supporting Senators and Congressmen are present and counted on the final vote. Rome's lobby is there in force, and friends of this bill should not delay in writing their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to do their duty at the critical moment.

Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of this House that it would be well worth the time of those who seek the light to read some extracts from an article from the pen of Rev. Washington Gladden, recently published in Harper's Weekly. It represents the viewpoint of a broad-minded, courageous, and well-known Congregational clergyman. Dr. Gladden writes:

THE ANTIPAPAL PANIC.

It is evident that we are in for another fierce anti-Catholic crusade. These visitations are periodic; the term has not perhaps been calculated, but we shall be able one of these days to give the formula. The period is probably a little longer than that of the 17-year locusts. Whether the pupa of the Cicada papaphobiana burrows in the earth during the time of its disappearance is not known; there are those who think that it goes deeper.

* * * * * * *

To those to whom the happiness and peace of their native land is dear these visitations of religious rancor and intolerance are most unwelcome. An epidemic of smallpox or yellow fever is a light affliction compared with these seasons of religious contention and suspicion and enmity. What we are going to see during the next few months is something like this: The great mass of the Protestant Christians of this country arrayed against the great mass of the Roman Catholic Christians, each party thinking and saying hard and bitter and violent things about the other; each party cherishing the worst suspicions about the motives and purposes of the other; each party believing that the other is plotting to take away its liberties, and perhaps to exterminate it by assassination or carnage. Not all the Protestants and not all the Roman Catholics will give room in their hearts to such dark thoughts and fears and enmities, but most of them will; and the mob mind, which always dominates these epidemics, will reduce to silence the majority of those who know that this is mainly insanity.

The first mutterings of this eruption of mud and slime are audible already. Those of us who have passed through this misery two or three times know what to expect. It is being whispered now in Protestant circles that the Catholics are meeting by stealth from night to night in the basements of their churches to drill for the impending insurrection. If the church has no basement, it matters not; the story is just as freely told and just as readily believed.

* * * * * * *

Here is the program of "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism" recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district in my own city:

"1. Why preach against the Roman Catholic Church? (A shotgun load.)

RIFLE BALLS.

"2. Popedom. This lecture will expose the most palpable fraud of human history.

"3. The priesthood. Testimony of history, ex-Catholics, and first-hand information.

"4. The auricular confession. An iniquity that ought to be prohibited by law.

"5. Rome's bloody hands. No man-eating tiger ever thirsted for blood as has the Roman Catholic Church.

"6. Romanism and American institutions. If red blood flows in your veins the Pope's ambition to rule our beloved country and reduce it to the level of Italy and Spain will set your nerves atingle and cause you to engage in the great fight that is on."

This is the sort of entertainment sheet which will soon be offered in many American cities.

Rumors will be heard of consignments of arms being delivered by night to Roman Catholics; they are apt to come in coffins.

Forged documents of various sorts will be printed and privately circulated—documents purporting to have been issued by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, giving instructions to the faithful, in which they are authorized and instigated to commit various crimes against their Protestant employers and neighbors, and intimating that mother church will absolve them from the guilt of all such offenses.

Old bulls and decretals of the dark ages will be dug up and exploited, and it will be insinuated, or perhaps boldly asserted, that the policy indicated in them is still ruling the Roman Catholic Church. In the last of these epidemics a forged papal encyclical, with all the formal phrases belonging to these documents, and signed by the name of Pope Leo XIII, was kept standing for weeks in the columns of many of the papers representing the anti-Catholic crusade and was published in leaflet form and circulated broadcast. In this stupid fabrication Pope Leo was represented as saying:

"We proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said Republic, and also all dominion, dignity, and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity, or obedience, on or about September 5, 1893, when the Roman Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Ill., as we shall exonerate them from all engagements; and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States."

* * * * * * *

It is an astounding fact that such a fiendish document could be forged and published by Protestant Christians in the United States of America; it is more astounding that they should believe that it would impose on any considerable number of Americans; it is most astounding that thousands and thousands of the members of our Protestant churches, including many ministers, should accept it as genuine and aid in its circulation. In Toledo, Ohio, the "councils" of the secret anti-Catholic orders united in ordering several hundred Remington rifles to protect themselves against this threatened slaughter; on the night named in the "encyclical" numbers of them were up all night in the engine houses, waiting to give the alarm by which the Protestant hosts were to be rallied to resist the massacre. In the meantime their Roman Catholic neighbors were sleeping soundly in their beds, all unaware of the carnage which was expected of them.

In how many other places such vigils were kept I do not know; but in Toledo there was a dispute about the payment of the bill for these Remington rifles, which brought the business into court, and the facts related above are a matter of court record.

Such hysterical fears will soon be agitating hundreds of thousands of breasts in this enlightened land. It is quite impossible for anybody to forge a tale of horror or treachery or villainy which will not be eagerly believed by millions of Christians in this country concerning their fellow Christians, when these religious lunacies begin to be epidemic.

* * * * * * *

The demand for instances of the enmity of our neighbors becomes in appeasable, and imagination is busy inventing them. Most of these harrowing tales will come from other communities; the dreadful things that are happening in your own community you will learn about through letters of inquiry from distant places. Intelligent persons from other towns in Ohio wrote me 20 years ago that the report was current among them that all the police in Columbus and all the school-teachers and all the county officers were Roman Catholics; the truth at that time was that 5 out of 20 county officials, and 45 out of 112 policemen, and 12 out of 349 school-teachers were of that faith. But Columbus at the same time was believing similar tales about many other towns and cities.

* * * * * * *

The fact is that we have got to learn to live together in this country—Protestants and Catholics. If either party should undertake to exterminate the other, the process would be somewhat difficult. The only question is whether we shall live together in peace or in enmity. If we are to have peace, we must study the things that make for peace; each party must be ready to see the good side of the other; must learn to put the best and not the worst construction on the words and deeds of the other; must avoid all bitter and uncharitable judgments; must put away all thoughts of domination. We must be friends, Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable. And there is no worse enemy of Christ or of his country than the man who seeks to inflame and poison the minds of either Protestants or Catholics with suspicions and fears and resentments and enmities toward the other.

* * * * * * *

This conflagration of hate is already well-started, and it will probably sweep over the land. No argument could extinguish it. There are millions of Protestants who are incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics. Traditional rancor colors all their vision wherever the name of the Pope is mentioned. But there are a good many other Protestants, I trust, who are capable of reason and justice, and to them I venture to make two or three suggestions:

1. Whenever you hear any of these harrowing tales about the sinister and sanguinary plots of the Roman Catholics never let one go unchallenged. Insist that the narrator give his authorities and furnish his evidence. See that the matter is thoroughly investigated, and publish the facts with the names of those who have reported the charges.

2. Take every opportunity you can get to talk with your Roman Catholic neighbors and friends about the relations of the churches. Don't shun them or cast suspicious glances on them when you meet them; don't treat them as if they were spies or emissaries of some malign power; shake hands with them; get acquainted with them and talk over the whole situation in a friendly way. We may have some difficult problems to settle in our relation with them, but let us meet them not as enemies, but as friends.

3. Instead of listening to horrible tales of what the Catholics are doing in distant places sit down and make out a list of all the Catholic men and women you know in business, in professional life, in the philanthropies, in society, in the shops and factories, in the kitchens; put down their names and think them over, and see whether you will be able to convince yourselves that these men and women are capable

of doing the kind of things which these tales attribute to them. How many of these people, do you think, are plotting to rob you of your liberties or to murder you in your beds? These are Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholics not of the dark ages of the sixteenth century, but the Roman Catholics of to-day. And whenever you talk about Roman Catholics in public or private remember that these are the people you are talking about.

* * * * * * *

4. It might be well for people who are capable of putting two and two together to remember that the danger of the clerical domination of this country, whether by Congregationalists or Catholics, is not imminent. The last Roman Catholic paper I opened alleged that there are 75,000,000 of non-Catholics in the United States. That would mean that there can be no more than 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 of Catholics. In any attempt to impose clerical rule the Protestant forces would find themselves strongly supported by the great majority of the secret orders and by the entire socialistic contingent of our population. There does not appear to be any adequate reason why 75,000,000 should be shuddering with fear that 20,000,000 are about to subjugate or exterminate them. The mood which yields to such a panic is the reverse of heroic.

* * * * * * *

Now, Mr Speaker, I want to read here the appreciation of an eminent Catholic layman, Prof. Condé B. Pallen, who recently carefully and honorably analyzed Dr. Gladden's article in the Columbiad. Prof. Pallen says, among other things:

We have but to read over the program of the "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism," quoted by Dr. Gladden, as recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district of his city (Columbus, Ohio), to appreciate the character of the people for whom they were intended and the turpitude of the expounder. Their folly, their falsehood, their viciousness would seem incredible, were not the damnable evidence vouched for by Dr. Gladden himself, and were not similar evidences scattered broadcast throughout the land in a number of periodicals through the United States mail, whose officials seem impotent to rectify so flagrant an abuse of a great national agency, whereby 15,000,000 American citizens are daily vilified and calumniated.

* * * * * * * *

That this anti-Catholic agitation is widespread and maliciously active is evident enough. Is its influence as a disturber and disrupter of the peaceful relations between Catholics and Protestants and of the amity, which sane and liberal men entertain toward each other as citizens of the same fatherland, as malign and weighty as Dr. Gladden predicts? Will it bring about that mutual suspicion and distrust, that hard, bitter, and violent feeling which Dr. Gladden depicts and deplores?

It is here that we take issue with Dr. Gladden. We believe that the vast majority of American citizens are above the sinister influences of a propaganda so vile in its methods, so base in its principles, so contrary to the basic character of our Constitution, so flagrantly stupid in its accusations, and so wanton in its purpose. Our faith in the integrity and intelligence of the American character is based upon the history of the past. The American people, as a whole, have triumphantly resisted such vicious agitation for the past 125 years, and this when they were much less better prepared to yield to the iniquitous influence than at the present day. In the decade between 1850 to 1860 it manifested itself in its most virulent form and crystalized in the Know Nothing Party, which went down to shame and a just oblivion under the sturdy repudiation of the American people. The noxious growth could not live in the open air. Under the form of APAism in the nineties, the scorched reptile again raised its venomous head to be crushed again under the heel of real Americanism. APAism was repudiated by the great political parties, and evoked strong denunciations from prominent leaders, such as Theodore Roosevelt; Speaker Henderson; United States Senators Hoar, Vest, Hill, and Vilas; Gov. Peck, of Wisconsin; Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois; and Gov. Stone, of Missouri. Its influence was limited to a few localities and that evanescent. By the year 1900 the A. P. A. agitation had practically ceased, and as a political factor disappeared from the horizon.

* * * * * * * *

Each successive manifestation of anti-Catholic bigotry in this country has shown itself weaker and weaker, and with good reason: Catholicity has constantly demonstrated itself as in perfect congruity with American principles and institutions. Non-Catholics have mingled with Catholics in every-day life, and learned that the latter have neither Government of the United States to a feeble old man in the Vatican, horns nor tails. There have been no Catholic conspiracies to seize the Government and place it under the domination of the Pope. The often-reiterated charges against them have proved silly bogies. They have never stored arms in the basements of churches with which to massacre their Protestant fellow citizens. The accusations against them have invariably evaporated in their own weltering silliness. There is even a certain sense of humor in the situation. To imagine that a small minority of citizens even contemplated turning over the who has neither army, navy, nor funds, is more bizarre than opera bouffe, and ought to move wild laughter in the throat of death. What must be the mental condition of the people who are prepared to swallow such a concoction of bedlam?

Beyond all this, Catholics have been living side by side with their non-Catholic fellow citizens for a century and a half, engaged in the same pursuits and enterprises, and have been clearly discerned to be ordinary, normal human beings. In the professions they have, just as others, left their mark and demonstrated their achievements; in business they have contributed their quota of success and failure as others around them have done. In the Army and the Navy, both in rank and file, they have served as others have served, and their record has been clear. They have rallied to the flag when occasion required it, and shed their blood as freely as others have done. In the fields of industry, invention, and enterprise they have not been laggards; in short, they have been citizens as others have been and just as human as others have been. The others have recognized all this, and with American sanity and honesty seen for themselves that Catholics are just as keen for their country's welfare and glory as they themselves are; just as ready to defend it, work for it, and shed their blood for it as any in the land. The others have realized all this by constant daily intercourse, and as they are not fools, they are not going to swallow the foul and silly accusations against Catholics by which fanatics and knaves would destroy the mutual trust and understanding between citizens of a common country and with a common cause.

* * * * * * *

We do not believe that there is any reason for alarm. Dr. Gladden's apprehension that the present anti-Catholic agitation is going to lead to bitterness, estrangement, and mutual misunderstanding has no justification on the Catholic side. We Catholics are not going to cherish the worst suspicion about the motives and purposes of our Protestant fellow citizens. We never did and we are not going to begin now, for we know that the vast majority of our Protestant fellow citizens are level-headed enough to see through a doughnut, especially when it is a political doughnut. There are, of course, the agitators and their deluded followers; these we pity or despise. But they are a constantly diminishing minority. They are fewer and count less and less in value year by year, and the American public has grown tired of bogus encyclicals and false oaths, which would strain the credulity of imbeciles. Our civic and social and business integrity has become too well established to be injured by a propaganda of lunacy. Dr. Gladden believes that "there are millions of Protestants incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics." We hesitate to estimate so many of our fellow citizens at so low a grade of intelligence and honesty. At any rate we believe that there are tens of millions of Protestants whose mentality is still sound and whose hearts are in the right place. We harbor no suspicion against them, and the bigots are not going to rouse us to recrimination, resentment, and enmity. We are not going to be made fools by the folly of some fools nor malicious by the malice of some knaves. We believe with Dr. Gladden "We must be friends, Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable."

* * * * * * *

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to charge any Member of this House with being under the thumb or under the heel of these "patriotic" organizations which are spreading the gospel of hatred and religious anarchy. But every man within the sound of my voice has been either petitioned or threatened by these very organizations or their agents or their publications that their action on this immigration bill will be watched and their political future has been dangled before their eyes should they dare to incur the wrath of the "antipapal" press—this press, Mr. Speaker, which has so wickedly, yes, so foully, within the recent past given wide circulation to a most heinous, ungodly, un-Christian, yes, a murderous and illegal oath as the one required by the Knights of Columbus from its members. It is an attack against the Catholic and his church, a creation of Know Nothings, A. P. A.'s, and their allies and successors.

Bigots have read this foul libel and gloated over its expected destruction of the Knights of Columbus; they have passed it to others, circulated it, approved it.

Some honest men have read it and been sorely troubled in consequence. It seemed unlike the Knights of Columbus they knew as honest men; yet would men dare publish such a thing if it were untrue? If untrue, would not the Knights of Columbus prosecute their defamers?

What, then, was the duty of the society to itself, to its members, to the host of men who were in doubt?

Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote from a recent publication issued by the commission on religious prejudice of that great, truly American order just what actions have been taken to expose these libels. May I ask the Members of this House to give these lines most careful consideration?

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Before giving the history of the various prosecutions and activities above referred to for criminal libel in printing or publishing or defaming by means of the alleged oath, we want to answer the foul charge intimating that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States is authority for its genuineness.

Much has been printed by those circulating the bogus "oath" tending to mislead the public into the belief that in some way Congress had found it to be true. So they have referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913, for proof of the genuineness of this "libel."

THE FACT.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913, pages 3215 et seq., appears a report of the Committee on Elections No. 1 on the contested-election case of Eugene C. Bonniwell *v.* Thomas S. Butler. The contestant had alleged that the circulation of the "oath" against him was libelous, and a use of means not to be recognized, etc.

A FALSE AND LIBELOUS OATH.

After reciting the "oath," which decency and respect for our order forbid reprinting, the committee in its report says:

"This committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper. It also condemns the publication of editorials to excite religious prejudice in a political campaign. No man should be persecuted for his religion, whether he be Catholic or Protestant."

PHILADELPHIA CASE.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST CHARLES MEGONEGAL AND CLARENCE H. STAGE.

Over a year ago (to be exact, February 20, 1913) two men were held in bail for appearance in court to answer charges made by local Knights of Columbus. Charles Megonegal, a printer of 4201 Brown Street, was charged with printing and causing to be printed libelous matter (the bogus Knights of Columbus oath) willfully and maliciously exposing the Knights of Columbus as a body; Charles B. Dowds, upon whose affidavit the arrests were made; James A. Flaherty, the supreme knight; and Philip A. Hart, master of the fourth degree, to public hatred, contempt, and ridicule, to their great damage, disgrace, scandal, and infamy.

Megonegal and Clarence H. Stage, a barber, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame and oppress the aforesaid members and others of the order by causing said matter to be circulated.

At the hearing it was elicited from Megonegal that he had bought copies of the bogus oath in bulk from the Menace before starting to print it on his own account.

A THREAT.

In its March 1, 1913, issue, the Menace, after reproducing a press dispatch reporting the result of the hearing before the magistrate, at which the accused were held for trial, said:

"Further than what is given here we do not know the particulars in this case, but we do know that these men are American citizens, and that they will be defended in their constitutional rights of free speech and free press. The press dispatch, as usual, lies when it says the Menace has printed the so-called Knights of Columbus oath, as the files of our paper will show. But if the Knights of Columbus want to start anything with the Menace for what it really has printed they have our permission to do their worst, as we are ready to defend every utterance we have ever made about the Knights. And if they don't want their complete ritual and secret work printed and distributed to a million men in this Republic they had better leave the Menace out of this controversy."

THE TRIAL.

On Friday, January 30, 1914, in the quarter sessions court, before Hon. Robert N. Willson, appeared Megonegal and Stage to answer the true bills of indictment found against them by the grand jury. Joseph Taulane, Esq., assistant district attorney, appeared for the Commonwealth; Owen J. Roberts, Esq., and Joseph P. Gaffney, for the private prosecutors; Peter F. MacLaren, Esq., for Megonegal; and Leroy N. King, Esq., for Stage.

The trial judge, the assistant district attorney, in charge of the prosecution, the senior counsel for the private prosecutors, and both attorneys for the defendants are non-Catholics.

James A. Flaherty, Esq., supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, having been sworn, testified as follows:

"This alleged oath is a tissue of falsehoods from the first word to the last—absolutely false. This prosecution was brought simply to vindicate the Knights of Columbus on account of the wide circulation given to this vile and scurrilous circular, the purpose of which was to breed strife and arouse religious bigotry. The alleged oath is absolutely baseless, and of such a flagrant character that it is indeed surprising that anyone would give it the slightest credence. It was so persistently circulated that the Knights of Columbus were compelled to take some steps to refute it, and we thought criminal prosecution would be the best way to do it."

GUILT ADMITTED, SENTENCE SUSPENDED.

Megonegal having pleaded guilty and Stage nolo contendere, which means that the truth of the charge is not contradicted, the district attorney stated that the prosecution was willing that sentence be suspended.

Attorneys MacLaren and King, counsel for the defense, joined in this request to the court, pleading good faith on the part of their clients, who, they said, had received the "oath" from the Menace, of Aurora, Mo.

As evidence that their clients had been deceived, they presented to the court a copy of a letter sent to the Menace by Mr. King, asking the paper's aid in the defense of Megonegal and Stage, and the original of the reply received from the Menace.

The text of Mr. King's letter follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *February 27, 1913.*

MENACE PUBLISHING CO., *Aurora, Mo.*

GENTLEMEN: Mr. Peter M. MacLaren and myself are associated in the case of libel and conspiracy brought by the Knights of Columbus against Clarence H. Stage and Charles Megonegal, of this city.

We notice in your issue of March 1 that you are prepared to print and distribute the complete ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, and we desire to obtain an authentic copy of said ritual and secret work for use in the trial of our clients, since the prosecution alleges that there is no oath taken by candidates for any of the Knights of Columbus degrees. Can you supply us with what we desire and need?

Our clients have no knowledge of the authenticity of the Knights of Columbus oath, having received them in the first instance from your company, and they naturally rely upon you to aid them in their present difficulty.

An early reply will be greatly appreciated.

Yours, very truly,

LEROY N. KING.

The answer of the Menace was as follows:

AURORA, MO., *March 5, 1913.*

Mr. LEROY N. KING,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of February 27, we wish to state that we are not in possession of the ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, but we believe we are in fair way to get it; and the statement in a recent issue of the Menace which led you to believe that we had it in our possession, while somewhat of a bluff on our part, was based on the fact that we know that it can be had. You will note that we printed in our No. 99 the ritual and secret work of the Hibernians, and we are positive that it is authentic. The alleged oath which your clients in Philadelphia were arrested for distributing was circulated in practically every State during the late campaign, and the demand upon us for this document was something great, and we had received copies of them from so many sources we simply printed and handled them as we would any other job of printing—to supply the demand—and while we have no apologies to make for so doing, we do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by members of the Knights of Columbus.

We feel sure that it would be folly for you to undertake to base your defense on the authenticity of this document.

We note that some of the officials are claiming that it is not an oath-bound order, which, of course, is a subterfuge and untrue. You can depend on them resorting to any method which they can contrive to bluff away their critics, and if they are so bent on vindicating themselves, why not ask that they present in court the obligations which they do take. This would be the quickest way to clear the matter up in the minds of the people.

We are filing your letter and will be on the lookout for anything which we think will aid in the defense of these men.

Trusting that this will be satisfactory, we beg to remain,

Yours, sincerely,

THE MENACE PUBLISHING CO.

STATEMENT FROM THE COURT.

Agreeing to the proposal that sentence be suspended, Judge Willson, who is one of the most prominent Presbyterian laymen in Philadelphia, said:

"I think that these cases have reached a very proper conclusion, and it is, in my judgment, quite suitable that, in accordance with the desire of all the parties concerned, sentence should be suspended in the cases.

"Great care ought to be taken that no injustice should be done by written or spoken words to either individuals or institutions. It is not at all strange that the prosecutors in these cases should not have been willing that the opprobrium which would naturally arise if the publications complained of had been founded in truth should be allowed to exist.

"I am personally glad to hear from the head of the order or society referred to what he has said in regard to the matter.

"Though not of the same faith, I realize fully and without reluctance that the church with which that society is affiliated accomplishes a vast deal of good. Its activities should be protected from misrepresentation.

"I may add that my personal acquaintance with Mr. Flaherty, the head of the order in question, leads me to accept his statement without hesitation."

ANOTHER CASE.

STATE OF MINNESOTA AGAINST A. M. MORRISON AND GARFIELD E. MORRISON, EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS OF THE MANKATO (MINN.) MORNING JOURNAL.

A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of this country and of Canada, as well as to non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the church—was held in Waterville, Minn., Wednesday, July 29, 1914. This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in this country and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the fourth-degree oath and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE.

The outcome of this trial is of more than local interest. It is of national and international importance. The Knights of Columbus have often been accused of taking an alleged oath which, if the charge were true, would forever condemn them to the merited execration of their fellow men. But this was the first time that an individual knight was directly charged with the offense. It furnished the order the first opportunity it has had to put the real obligation of the fourth degree in evidence and make it a matter of court record which any citizen may read for himself. Herein lies the importance of the case which establishes a precedent in the history of the order.

Knights of Columbus and Catholics generally have been astounded at the conditions which make possible the publication and circulation by millions of copies of this foul libel. Well-meaning non-Catholics have been shocked by these accusations against Catholic men and Knights of Columbus whom they knew to be high-minded citizens and ideal neighbors. The bigots working in the darkness, as of old, have pressed on the accusation and argued that if the "oath" was not true the Knights of Columbus would soon, by prosecution or otherwise, prevent its further circulation.

A SENSATIONAL TRIAL.

The fact is that the trial was a most sensational one from many points of view. It was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul. The small country court room was crowded to the very limits of its capacity, and the spectators filled every available inch of space, having come in from the surrounding country to hear the case tried. A jury was finally selected, and it is of more than passing importance and a matter of gratification to the order, as it is a compliment to him, that the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of the town, was chosen on the jury and was not challenged by the complainant, and, as the result showed, voted with the other 11 men to convict the two defendants.

The jury in this case were: William Callies, Emil Hehl, John W. Gish, Thomas McGovern, Vince Roessler, Rev. Thomas Billing, Joseph Miller, jr., H. J. Luther, V. R. Wood, Chris. Ruedy, Steve Hoban, Ed. Zinbrich.

The proceedings were taken down in shorthand by C. G. Bowdish, court reporter of the judicial district.

After each juror had been questioned in turn, the defendants waived any challenge.

The following witnesses were called by the State: P. J. Gutzler, Rev. H. E. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church; I. N. Griffith, deputy postmaster of Mankato; E. M. Lawless, Dr. E. W. Buckley, supreme physician of Knights of Columbus; William J. McGinley, supreme secretary of Knights of Columbus.

SUPREME OFFICERS PRESENT.

The surprise of the trial to the Knights of Columbus themselves and to all those whose curiosity had whetted their appetite to learn some of the secrets of that great order, was the calling of two of the supreme officers as witnesses. The first was the supreme physician, Dr. E. W. Buckley, of St. Paul, who testified in effect that Mr. Lawless had received initiation in the fourth degree under his direction as master. Upon cross-examination Dr. Buckley was asked as to the nature of the "oath" administered in the fourth degree, and most emphatically denied then, as he did in answering subsequent questions of the defendants' counsel, that the order had any oath in any part of its ceremonial or degree work. He freely admitted that the order had a pledge or obligation which is administered to candidates. To the great surprise of all present, however, when interrogated as to the nature of this obligation, Dr. Buckley very fully answered the question and gave the substance of the obligation as administered to candidates on being initiated in the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus.

William J. McGinley, of New Haven, Conn., supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus, also testified as to the nature of the obligation, as the official custodian of the original manuscripts and of all matters pertaining to the ceremonial of the society. He placed a copy of the obligation in evidence, and it was made part of the records of the trial. He emphasized the fact that the Knights of Columbus was not an oath-bound society, and that no member was asked to take more than an obligation which any gentleman might take. Both Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley testified in no uncertain words that

the bogus oath which was the subject matter of the prosecution, was, neither in letter nor in spirit, a part of any of the ceremonial of the Knights of Columbus in any of its degrees.

The following is a portion of the direct and cross examination of Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley:

"Direct examination by County Attorney Hanzel.

"Cross-examination by Attorney Morris.

"Q. Your name is Edward W. Buckley?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. You are a practicing physician and surgeon in St. Paul, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Now, you are also a Knight of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Member of the Knights of Columbus, and a member of the fourth degree?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. On January 27, 1907, did you hold any position in the order?—A. I was master of the fourth degree for Minnesota and North Dakota.

"Q. As such master did you have charge of the giving of that degree?—A. I did.

"Q. Did you have charge of the giving of that degree on January 29, 1907?—A. What date?

"Q. January 27, 1907.—A. I did.

"Q. That was the time that Mr. Lawless said he took that degree; do you remember of his taking it?—A. Well, he says he took it, and I think I remember his taking it, but I had 160 candidates in that class from Minnesota and North Dakota; I feel pretty certain Mr. Lawless took it at that time.

"Q. Did you hear me read and have you heard that purported oath credited to the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus read here in court?—A. I did.

"Q. Did any of those candidates, including Mr. Lawless, take such an oath as that?—A. Not that I know of.

"Q. Is there any such oath in the order?—A. There is not.

"Q. Is there any oath in the order?—A. There is not.

"Q. What do the members take in the order?—A. They take an obligation in the degrees—first, second, third, and fourth.

"Q. Do you know the obligation of the fourth degree?—A. Well, I know what it is in a general way. Now, the master doesn't give any part of the degree; he has charge of it and the degree team under him, and he is supposed to give to each one of the members of the degree team the special charge belonging to their office; and one of the officers of the degree—it is the duty of one of the officers of the degree to give the obligation; and, in a general way, of course, I remember what it is. I am not master now, and haven't been for some years.

"Q. You are the supreme physician of the order?—A. I am supreme physician, medical director, of the order.

"Q. Well, give us your general idea of that fourth-degree obligation.—A. The fourth degree is a patriotic degree; it exemplifies patriotism, and the candidate affirms that he will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of his own State; that he will protect the purity of the ballot; and that he will remain a good member of the Catholic church. He also agrees to remain a good, law-abiding citizen of the United States.

"Q. Is there any part of the degree work that resembles anything like that that appeared in that article that has been read here?

"(By Mr. Morris.) Objected to as calling for the opinion or conclusion of the witness. The proper way to do is to tell what they have and then put this beside it, and let the jury say whether there is any resemblance.

"Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial, calling for a conclusion.

"Q. Is there any such oath taken in any of the degrees?—A. No, sir.

"Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

"Q. Are there obligations taken in each of the degrees?—A. In each one; yes, sir.

"Q. Are each of the four obligations different one from the other?—A. Yes, sir. There are only two principal obligations, the one following at the third degree and the other in the fourth.

"Q. Is there anything in those oaths—— A. Which oaths?

"Q. Well, we are all wrong about calling them oaths; we all mean the same thing.—A. That is right, if you mean it, but I can't answer the question with the word oath in it.

"Q. Well, I'll try to call it obligation.—A. All right.

"Q. You stated that in some of those oaths there is a requirement—or in some of those obligations there is a requirement to remain members of the Catholic Church?—A. No; was that my wording?

"Q. That's the way I took it down.—A. That's the intent, but that's not the wording. Well, yes, I'll take it back; they do really insist they must remain members of the Catholic Church in order to retain membership in the fourth degree.

"Q. Yes; of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

"Q. That's true as to each one of the obligations?—A. Well, it isn't so specifically stated; but the constitution and by-laws of the order provide that.

"Q. Is there anything in those oaths—— A. Again.

"Q. Oh, those obligations—which has a denunciation of others of other denominations—which was—— A. Nothing.

"Q. Will not spare age, sex, or condition; anything of that kind in any of the oaths?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Is the word 'spare' in any of the oaths?—A. In what? Well, now, is that done purposely?

"Q. It is not.—A. Well, I take it as an insult, because you are trying to trap me into saying 'oath.'

"Q. Well, it isn't intentional; I inform the court and jury it isn't intentional at all. Is the word 'spare' in any of the obligations?—A. In the sense that you mean, spare somebody from injury?

"Q. Well, the word 'spare'?—A. Well, it might be; I don't recall, but in the sense of sparing anybody, or not sparing, no, sir.

"Q. Which has the sense of not sparing?—A. There is no such word nor no such sense in it.

"Q. Are the words 'these infamous heretics,' or words of that import, in any of the obligations?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Doctor, you say one officer gives the obligation. You yourself, now, couldn't give verbatim any one of the four obligations, could you?—A. No, sir; I wouldn't attempt to.

"Q. Is that oath written or unwritten?—A. I don't understand your question.

"Q. Oh, is that obligation written or unwritten?—A. It is printed.

"Q. And can you tell me where I may procure, where a copy of that obligation can be procured; give me the name and address of the person in whose custody one is?—A. Yes, sir. Now I understand; you ask two or three questions there together. I can tell the name of the person in whose custody the ritual of the order, the unwritten work and the written work of the order, is kept.

"Q. Well, you may do so.

"By Mr. HESSIAN. Well, I object to that as immaterial and incompetent. What has that got to do with this case?

"By Mr. MORRIS. Well, if we find the oath as printed, we can compare it with this.

"A. Compare with what?

"Q. The obligation.—A. You mean, I think, to use that word purposely. It isn't my first time on the witness stand. I know when an attorney is asking a witness questions fairly and when he isn't. Now, I object to the word 'oath,' because it would charge us inadvertently with having taken such an obligation.

"Q. We don't charge you with it.—A. You do by using the word 'oath,' and then comparing it with some other oath. We take no oath.

"Direct examination of William J. McGinley:

"Q. Your name is William J. McGinley?—A. Yes.

"Q. Where do you reside, Mr. McGinley?—A. New York.

"Q. In New York—in the State of New York?—A. City of New York.

"Q. You are a member of the Knights of Columbus?—A. I am.

"Q. Do you hold any position in the Knights of Columbus?—A. I do.

"Q. What is that position?—A. Supreme secretary.

"Q. Supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. As such secretary, are you custodian of the written and other work of the order?—A. I am.

"Q. The ritual. You know of the obligations that are taken in the four degrees of that order?—A. I do.

"Q. You have heard this purported oath read here in court, have you not?—A. I have.

"Q. Do they take any oath?—A. They do not take any oath. Our society is not an oath-bound society; in fact, can't hardly be called a secret society. It is a society of Catholic laymen, recognizing the authority of the Catholic Church in matters spiritual.

"By Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as not responsive to the question.

"By the COURT. I will sustain the objection to that part of it.

"A. I am leading up to it, your honor.

"Q. What is the purpose of the Order of the Knights of Columbus?

"Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial; the question here is whether Lawless took an oath as stated in that complaint. The purpose of the order will throw no light on whether he did or didn't.

"By the COURT. He testified there is no oath taken; objection sustained.

"Q. Have you a printed copy of that oath, of that obligation?—A. I have.

"Q. Will you produce it?

"(Marked 'State's Exhibit D.')

"Q. What is State's Exhibit D?—A. State's Exhibit D is an official copy duly attested under the seal of the Order of the Supreme Council of the obligation taken by all members initiated in the fourth degree of the order.

"Q. And you are the custodian of this?—A. I am official custodian of the ritual and ceremonies of the order and the laws of the order under seal of the order.

"Q. And let's see; have you stated that is the one taken by the fourth-degree members?

"Mr. HESSIAN. Yes.

"Mr. HANZEL. Now, we offer this in evidence.

"Mr. MORRIS. One question. I notice 'M., or F. N.' at the head of this Exhibit D; what does that represent?—A. 'Master, or faithful navigator,' title of one of the officers of the degree.

"Q. Is that the only obligation of the fourth degree?—A. The only obligation.

"Q. Contains the only obligation in anyway connected with the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

"(State's Exhibit D read to the jury by Mr. Hanzel.)

"State's Exhibit D is as follows:

"'M., OR F. N.

"'I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"'I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

[Supreme Council seal.]

"'A true copy.

"'Attest:

"'(Signed) WM. J. McGINLEY,
"'*Supreme Secretary.*'"

"Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

"Q. Mr. McGinley, references have been made here to the word 'oath' and the word 'obligation,' and apparently exception has been taken to the use of the word 'oath' as describing the thing we are thinking of. Will you tell us the difference between oath and obligation?—A. An oath, as I understand it, is a pledge or obligation or affirmation wherein or in connection with which God is called upon to witness, or the Deity; and an obligation is a pledge or undertaking of a kind in which the Deity is not called upon to witness. That is the distinction, I believe, between an oath and a pledge. I would suggest the word 'pledge' rather than 'obligation.' It is easier to say.

"Mr. HANZEL. Just a question. Ought there not to be inserted there also: Isn't an oath something that would be administered by proper legal authority? Ought not that to be a part of the explanation?

"Q. I notice that you have these printed on little slips. What is the object of having them printed in that way, loose?—A. For the convenience of the ceremony in the fourth degree of the order, whereby annually, at the first meeting of the fourth degree, assembled in January of each year, all the members of the fourth degree renew that obligation. That is what is known as the annual meeting, and for the purpose of supplying the officers with their parts, for convenience' sake it is arranged in that form.

"Q. Dr. Buckley, in his testimony, stated there was something in the obligation requiring members to remain members of the Catholic Church. Is that true?—A. That is a constitutional, fundamental law of the order. Well, toward the end there he promises to remain a member of the Catholic order, in there by implication, if not expressed.

"Q. I will ask you is this all the obligation of the fourth degree?—A. That is our obligation in the fourth degree.

"Q. Do any of the other obligations—first, second, or third degrees—have reference to non-Catholics in any way, directly or indirectly?—A. None whatever.

"Q. You have heard this purported oath in the criminal warrant read, have you?—A. Yes; I have.

"Q. Have you seen that elsewhere?—A. I have."

The defendants testified and also called Mr. Lawless, who had testified for the State. They were not cross-examined by the county attorney.

It is unnecessary to go into the recital of the other evidence in this case. Suffice it to say that the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

DEFENDANTS FOUND GUILTY.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days on each of the defendants, from which they took an appeal to the district court on the following day, each giving a bond of $500, with H. B. Oblinger and W. Knaack as sureties.

Referring to the foregoing trial, we set forth below the correspondence between the Rev. Mr. Billing and Hon. Fred Bierman, of Decorah, Iowa, who, we believe, is the publisher of the Decorah Journal:

DECORAH, IOWA, *August 14, 1914.*

Rev. THOMAS BILLING,
Pastor of Methodist Church, Waterville, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have noted with interest that you were a juror in the prosecution of A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of Waterville, for criminal libel by E. M. Lawless, of the Waterville Sentinel.

The reports are that the jury unanimously voted for the conviction of A. M. and G. E. Morrison. May I not ask you to write me a line or two, stating whether or not this report is a fact? And also give me any bit of information that may be of interest in the case.

This anti-Catholic agitation, in my judgment, is very discreditable to all the Protestant churches that do not seek in the spirit of Christian charity to quiet it. Furthermore, it is a menace to the best conduct of political affairs and breeds a very regrettable bitterness and suspicion among people who otherwise would be friends.

If you have no objections, I should thank you very much for the privilege of publishing your reply in the Journal.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED BIERMAN.

—

WATERVILLE, MINN., *August 15, 1914.*

Mr. FRED BIERMAN, *Decorah, Iowa.*

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 14th received. And while I do not care for publicity, must admit that either by the irony of fate or by the hand of Providence I found myself upon the jury empaneled to find a verdict in the E. M. Lawless criminal libel case against A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of the Mankota Journal. I did not know until I reached the court room of the case. Had I known what awaited me that day, I would probably have been absent when the sheriff came three-quarters of an hour before the trial to summon me. But when summoned did not inquire how or learn for what purpose. However, never having run away from anything that looked like duty, and not being challenged by either party, I stood my ground, and notwithstanding much adverse local criticism am glad to have had the privilege of helping to nail down so ugly and diabolical a lie as the pseudo oath so widely published and attributed to Ed. Lawless was proven to be.

Furthermore, my district superintendent and other of my ministerial brethren (all of whom I have hitherto met) have expressed themselves as being perfectly at one with me.

The case was very simple.

1. The publication of the so-called oath in the defendant's paper was proven.

2. Its diabolical character was proven.

3. Its circulation in Waterville was proven by Rev. H. P. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church of that city.

4. Its utter and complete falsity was proven by two witnesses of the highest standing in the order, viz, Dr. Buckley, of St. Paul, by whom or in whose presence the fourth degree was conferred on complainant Lawless; and also by William J. McGinley, of New York, supreme secretary of the order, and custodian of all the written and oral work.

The first ballot stood 9 to 3 for conviction. The second ballot stood 10 to 2 for conviction, and the third was unanimous for conviction. The verdict was followed by a sentence of 30 days for each of the defendants in the county jail. The case, however, is appealed to the district court in September.

The case was the result of an anti-Catholic spirit (which has had other deplorable results), stirred up by the advent of Annie Lowry, the pseudo nun, whose trail across the State is quite visible, and certainly not enviable. Such things exhibit the strange anomaly of a religion of love producing the keenest haters and a gospel of peace engendering strife and animosities more bitter than the disputes and rivalries of the most profane.

Yours, for the peace of Zion,

(Rev.) THOMAS BILLING,
Foreman of Jury.

THANKS FOR LETTER.

DECORAH, IOWA, *August 17, 1914.*

Rev. THOMAS BILLING,
Waterville, Minn.

MY DEAR SIR: I thank you very much for your letter of August 15 and for the promptness of your reply.

I want to compliment you on the position you take in the matter, and to say that, in my opinion, if the Protestant clergymen in general took this position they would be held in higher esteem by the general public.

If I can do you a favor at some future date, I hope that you will not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED BIERMAN.

ANOTHER PROSECUTION.

Another case was tried in St. Johns, Newfoundland, on February 18, 1913.

The defendant was Charles A. Swift.

This trial was held in the central district court, before Judge Knight.

The defendant was charged with criminal libel in publishing and circulating the same oath described in the foregoing pages.

The complainant was Charles O'Neill Conroy, for himself and the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. A. B. Morine, K. C., was counsel for the complainant and Mr. F. A. Mews for the defendant.

The witnesses for the Government were William Bowden, Kenneth Barnes, William F. Coaker, Charles O'Neill Conroy, John Fenelon.

The defendant testified, admitting the charge, and concluded his testimony as follows:

"I should now like to express my very deep regret to Mr. Conroy and Mr. Fenelon and the whole Council of Knights, in St. Johns and elsewhere, that I should have been led to believe through false representations that this was the oath of the Knights of Columbus, and I wish to make an apology to all concerned, saying I sincerely regret having caused any pain or ill feeling to the members, and I wish this apology to be as complete as possible. I may add that in January last I did not know any of the members of the Knights of Columbus as such."

Mr. Morine then made the following statement to the court:

"This proceeding was taken for the purpose of showing the bogus nature of this alleged oath. If the accused had justified his conduct or attempted in any way to set up the truth of the alleged oath, the prosecution would be pushed to the greatest possible extent. There was no desire to persecute or even to punish where punishment was deserved. Mr. Swift having explained and given proper information, the complainant is satisfied that Mr. Swift was a victim, that he had no actual malice, and that he sincerely regrets his part in the circulation of the defamatory matter. This being so, the prosecutor's object has been achieved, and he desires that these proceedings go no further against this particular accused. He will, however, prosecute for any further circulation of this same or similar matter, and reserves his ordinary denial, their clear and deliberate assertions being made on oath in a properly constituted court. In exercising clemency the Knights will have won respect and admiration; but after this ample vindication it should be a solemn duty on the part of members of the order and their friends, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, to take steps to assure the severest punishment the law provides to any who may make similar charges. It is an old story, this oath business, and the Knights of Columbus is not the only society that has suffered similarly in the past. What made the offense more atrocious was an evident desire on the part of some to revive those displays of sectarian hatred which were buried, it is hoped forever, a quarter of a century ago."

ACTION IN SEATTLE, WASH.

In Seattle, Wash., a public statement was made on September 1, 1912, in the course of which it was alleged that this same "oath" was the oath taken by fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus. As a result of this statement the knights in Seattle voluntarily decided to submit to a committee of Protestant gentlemen the printed ceremonial containing the actual obligation taken by fourth-degree members of the order. The following newspaper extract gives the result of the investigation:

"The gentlemen to whom this obligation was submitted are H. C. Henry, railroad contractor and president of the Metropolitan Bank; J. D. Lowman, president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; J. E. Chilberg, vice president of the Scandinavian-American Bank of Seattle. The signed statement of these gentlemen follows:

"COMMITTEE FINDINGS.

"Honorable Catholic gentlemen of this city have placed for examination in the hands of the undersigned two papers—one the actual fourth-degree obligation taken by each person upon becoming a member of the Catholic organization known as the Knights of Columbus, the other a printed circular purporting to be the above-mentioned obligation. This latter is a blasphemous and horrible travesty upon the real oath, and as fair-minded citizens of this city we can not allow an atrocious libel upon the large body of our public-spirited Catholic fellow citizens to stand undisputed. We declare, further, that the obligation taken by the fourth-degree Knights of Columbus is one of loyalty and patriotism to our flag and Nation, and that the said obligation binds those who assume it to the exercise of the highest type of American citizenship.

"Signed at Seattle, Wash., this 31st day of October, 1912.

"H. C. HENRY.
"J. D. LOWMAN.
"J. E. CHILBERG."

We beg to submit all of the above as evidence of the fact that we have been the objects of a malicious slander at the hands of a disturber of the public peace,

T. J. GORMAN,
Past Vice Supreme Master of the Fourth Degree.
JOHN D. CARMODY,
State Deputy of Washington.
J. C. FORD,
Past Grand Knight, Seattle Council.

RESOLUTION PASSED.

Mr. JOHN D. CARMODY, *Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by the Olympian Clericus, an organization composed of all Episcopal clergymen in the State of Washington west of the Cascades:

"Our attention has been called to a circular which has been rather widely distributed purporting to be a copy of the oath taken by the members of a certain religious order or society. We desire on behalf of ourselves to express our deep regret that such an attack should have been made on the members of a religious body. We disclaim any desire to judge others, but feel most deeply that the interests of true religion can never be served in such a way."

SIDNEY T. JAMES, *Secretary.*

ALL SAINTS' RECTORY, SEATTLE.

LOS ANGELES INVESTIGATION.

The following letters need no explanation:

Hon. PAUL J. MCCORMICK,
Courthouse, Los Angeles.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I take pleasure in handing you herewith the findings of the committee of Freemasons to whom you exhibited the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus.

I am very glad that I have been able in a measure to secure this refutation of a slanderous lie which has been widely circulated and which has been disseminated in many cases by well-meaning, credulous, and deluded persons.

I shall see to it that this report has wide circulation among Masons, and you may use it in any way you deem best to bring about an understanding of the truth among men who, above all controversies

and contentions, desire to know and to follow that which is right and true.

Yours, cordially, W. R. HERVEY.

OCTOBER 9, 1914.

We hereby certify that by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instructions from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed, and examined the same. We found that, while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great religion and every free State. Our examination of these ceremonials and obligations was made primarily for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a certain alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus which has been printed and widely circulated was in fact used by the order, and whether, if it was not used, any oath, obligation, or pledge was used which was or would be offensive to Protestants or Masons or those who are engaged in circulating a document of peculiar viciousness and wickedness. We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind. We find that the Order of Knights of Columbus, as shown by its rituals, is dedicated to the Catholic religion, charity, and patriotism. There is no propaganda proposed or taught against Protestants or Masons or persons not of Catholic faith. Indeed, Protestants and Masons are not referred to, directly or indirectly, in the ceremonials and pledges. The ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and holds up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a knight of the order. We can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that, to our minds, could be objected to by any person.

MOTLEY HEWES FLINT (33°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
DANA REID WELLER (32°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
WM. RHODES HERVEY (33°),
Past Master and Master of Scottish Rite Lodge.
SAMUEL E. BURKE (32°),
Past Master and Inspector of Masonic District.

RECENT PROSECUTION IN SANTA CRUZ, CAL.

The Santa Cruz News, of Santa Cruz, Cal., published the following under date of October 28, 1914:

SOCIALIST EDITOR BOUND OVER—NO TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY DEFENSE.

"H. S. Turner, editor of the World Issue and charged with libeling the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus through the publication of a false oath attributed to the organization, was bound over to the superior court by Justice of the Peace Bias this morning under $300 bonds, following a very interesting preliminary examination in which the most noticeable incident was the ingenuity of Attorney Ralph H. Smith in the defense of his client, the defendant.

"The little court room above the fire house was completely filled when the case opened this morning. Assisting District Attorney Knight was John H. Leonard, the local attorney and a prominent Catholic."

The complainant was Charles Gillen, who testified with Joseph J. Rosborough, of Oakland, and Eugene F. Conlon, San Francisco. No evidence was offered by the defendant, and after argument by his attorney, Mr. Smith, Judge Bias held that there was sufficient evidence to hold the defendant for the higher court.

BUSINESS MEN OF INDIANAPOLIS PROTEST AGAINST THE CIRCULATION OF THE FAKE OATH.

The business men whose signatures appear below are all Protestant; they can not comprehend how any Christian can lend himself to the further circulation of the monstrous lie.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS "FAKE OATH."

We the undersigned citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., beg to make public the following statement of facts, the truth of which is established by thorough investigation, regarding the circulation in Indianapolis and Indiana of a "fake oath" as being the true fourth-degree oath of the Knights of Columbus.

It will be unnecessary to reproduce the fake oath here on account of its vile character. Ordinarily charges of such vile nature should go unnoticed, but good citizens of all creeds owe it to themselves to pillory before the public those circulating this literature as un-American.

The true oath of the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus as hereinafter shown in the court proceedings is as follows:

"I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God."

Appended to the "fake oath," which is being circulated anonymously, is this notation:

"Copied from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, D. C., volume 49, part 4, February 15, 1913, page 3216."

By referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoted it will be found that this "fake oath" is filed as an exhibit by Eugene C. Bonniwell, of Pennsylvania, in his charge against THOMAS S. BUTLER, before the Committee on Elections No. 1, in Congress, growing out of an election contest. Mr. Bonniwell, the contestant, in his protest, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"Messengers in the employ of supporters of THOMAS S. BUTLER traveled the district, having in their possession and circulating a blasphemous and infamous libel, a copy of which is hereto attached, pretended to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, of which body the contestant is a member. So revolting are the terms of this document and so nauseating its pledges that the injury it did, not merely to the contestant but also to the Knights of Columbus and to Catholics in general, can hardly be measured in terms." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3216, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

Mr. BUTLER, in his defense, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"I apprehended with alarm the use of such a document in a political campaign or at any other time. I did not believe in its truthfulness, and so stated my judgment concerning it on November 4, 1912, as soon as complaint was made to me of its general circulation. Inasmuch as I did not wish to give this document, which I judged to be spurious, any notoriety whatsoever, I refrained from its public condemnation until the time when a general complaint was made to me, and I thought it my duty to publicly condemn it." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3219, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

The congressional committee to which the matter was referred reported in part as follows:

"The committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3221, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

This shows that the "fake oath" is a fake, and it explains how it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition to the reference made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing up this "fake oath," its false and malicious character was shown in two court proceedings, one in Waterville, Minn., tried on July 29, 1914, and one in Philadelphia, Pa., tried on January 30, 1914.

The Waterville case was a criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, the editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and C. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn.

The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the "fake" Knights of Columbus "oath," which is the same "fake oath" so largely circulated in Marion County.

The trial was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul.

A jury was selected, and the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of Waterville, was chosen on the jury.

At the trial reputable citizens gave evidence that the "fake oath" was a vile fake, and that the obligation above set out is the true obligation of the Knights of Columbus.

The defendants at the trial made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the "fake oath," but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days.

In the Philadelphia case two men, Megonegal and Stage, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame several members of the Knights of Columbus by causing the "fake oath" to be circulated.

At the hearing it appeared that the "fake oath" had been bought in bulk from the Menace in the beginning, but afterwards Megonegal had done the printing on his own account.

The Menace was called upon by counsel for these two men to give them some assistance, and it replied in a letter, dated March 5, 1913, and addressed to Leroy N. King, attorney for the defendants:

"We do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by the Knights of Columbus. We feel sure that it would be folly for you to base your defense on the authenticity of this document."

The case came on to trial at the quarter sessions court in Philadelphia on January 30, 1914, before Judge Robert W. Wilson. The district attorney was Joseph Taulane, who was assisted by Attorneys Owen J. Roberts and Joseph P. Gaffney. The defendants, in addition to Mr. King, had Peter F. MacLaren. Evidence was introduced that the "fake oath" was utterly false, and that no Knight of Columbus ever took it.

Megonegal pleaded guilty and Stage pleaded nolle. Whereupon, at the request of the plaintiffs, the sentence was suspended.

Knowing that the "fake oath" is false, we hold that all good citizens will join us in denouncing its circulation in Marion County and in Indiana, to the end that people of all creeds may dwell in peace and harmony as becomes the highest ideals of true and patriotic American citizenship.

Alex C. Ayres, attorney; H. C. Parker, physician; Aquilla Q. Jones, attorney; John G. Williams, attorney; Hugh McK. Landon, capitalist; Frederick M. Ayres, president L. S. Ayres & Co.; L. O. Hamilton, president Hamilton, Harris & Co.; Linneas C. Boyd, capitalist; Gustave A. Schnull, of Schnull & Co.; Albert P. Smith, attorney; J. M. McIntosh, president National City Bank; August M. Kuhn, treasurer Aetna Trust & Savings Co.; John Rauch, clerk Marion circuit court; G. A. Efroymson, president H. P. Wasson Co.; Chester P. Wilson, president Interstate Public Service Co.; Frank S. C. Wicks, minister; Henry M. Downing, attorney; Henry H. Hornbrook, attorney; Frank E. Gavin, attorney; Dick Miller, broker; Hugh Dougherty, vice president Fletcher Savings & Trust Co.; J. W. Stickney, general manager Central Union Telephone Co.; Thomas A. Wynne, vice president and treasurer Indianapolis Light & Heat Co.; Louis Newberger, attorney; Henry Lawrence, manager Claypool Hotel; Otto N. Frenzel, president Merchants' National Bank; Frank Wheeler, of Wheeler & Schebler; John J. Appel, real estate agent; C. G. Sander, of Sander & Recker; John W. Minor, secretary and treasurer Sentinel Printing Co.; Evans Woolen, vice president American National Bank; William Fortune, president Indianapolis Telephone Co.; J. D. Forrest, general manager Citizens' Gas Co.; Chalmers Brown, president Reserve Loan Life Insurance Co.; F. F. Hutchins, physician; Wilson S. Doan, attorney; Edward E. Gates, attorney; Oscar Schmidt, president Old Town Co.; Elmer E. Stevenson, attorney; Samuel O. Pickens, attorney; Sol Meyer, president Meyer-Kiser Bank; Linton A. Cox, attorney; Frank T. Edenharter, attorney; John F. Robbins, attorney; Thos. J. Owens, secretary Meridian Life Insurance Co.; George J. Marott, shoe merchant.

The above appeared in the Indianapolis News October 17 and in the Star October 18. All signatures are those of prominent non-Catholic men of the city.

Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of this House to the stenographic report of the hearing before President Wilson which was held in the East Room, White House, January 23? The hearing was given in response to the request of many gentlemen, both proponents and opponents of the bill now under consideration. I shall read here the arguments of those representative men and women who asked our President to veto this measure.

When the hour of 10 o'clock arrived, President Wilson, rising from his seat, spoke as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to devote two hours and a half to this discussion, and in order that it may be conducted in as satisfactory a manner as possible we have arranged to divide the time equally between the two sides, those for the signing of the bill and those against it. It has been arranged that the time of those in favor of the bill should be allotted under the supervision of Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, an hour being devoted to that side. The next hour and 15 minutes will be devoted to those who wish the bill vetoed, this time to be arranged by Representatives GALLIVAN, SABATH, and GOLDFOGLE; and then, at the conclusion of the 2 hours and 15 minutes which would be thus used up, the closing 15 minutes will be given to those who favor the bill, this time to be allotted as the other.

I am not informed as to who is to speak first in favor of the bill.

FOR THE OPPONENTS.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, Messrs. GOLDFOGLE, SABATH, and myself have agreed to divide our time equally. We have 1 hour and 25 minutes. The closing 15 minutes will be assigned to the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran. Because we have so many who have come from different sections of the country who will be unable to talk on account of lack of time, with your permission, Mr President, I am going to ask all those who are opposed to the pending legislation to rise.

The PRESIDENT. No; not now, please.

Representative GALLIVAN (to the audience). Never mind; do not do that. We do not desire to disappoint people here without letting them know that we have not the time to give them, and for that reason I thought that if they could show their numbers that would be an expression of opinion on their part. But we are profoundly grateful to you for this opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDENT. Whom shall we hear first?

Representative GALLIVAN. I am going to ask Representative J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Philadelphia, to speak for two minutes.

Representative MOORE. Mr. President, the German-American Alliance, which claims a membership of 2,000,000, protests against this bill and is directly opposed to the literacy test. The Federation of Italian Societies of Pennsylvania, numbering about 50,000, also protest against the bill. The Jewish societies unitedly protest against the bill, and Mr. Louis E. Levy, of Philadelphia, the head of these societies, I hope may be heard from for a moment or two a little later on. The United Polish Societies are also opposed to this bill, and they are a very numerous part of our citizenship in Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I shall ask to file some papers voicing the sentiments of these societies, and shall ask their consideration at your hands. It has been said by some of those who have already spoken, in scholarly fashion, that we must conserve the brain power of the Nation. I agree to the conservation of the brain power of the Nation, but I question whether the conservation of the brain power of the Nation should be conducted at the expense of the conservation of the brawn and the muscle of the Nation. We may be overdoing the conservation of the brain power and leading unconsciously to a race suicide that is entirely unlooked for. We must conserve the brawn and the muscle of the Nation. We must admit those who have committed no crime against the Nation save that of being unable to read to those same conditions which were granted to our forefathers from the beginning of our Nation's history.

It has been said that the insane are increasing in our institutions in this country. That may be true. Some startling statistics have been given with respect to the insane. But I question, Mr. President—I am on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, and have been dealing with this question for years in Congress—I question whether any more law upon the subject of naturalization and immigration will improve this condition. The law which we now have, the act of February, 1907, provides in the second paragraph for the exclusion of the insane. Section 2 reads that the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous.

Mr. President, there is ample law to-day for the exclusion of this class of citizens. Will more law help the situation? It is a matter of administration, as we have been told on former occasions. It is a matter of administration now.

May I have the privilege, Mr. GALLIVAN, of presenting Prof. M. D. Learned, of the University of Pennsylvania?

Representative GALLIVAN. You may. I will say that Prof. Learned has been given eight minutes.

Prof. LEARNED. Mr. President, gentlemen, while I have been requested by two organizations to speak on this occasion, what I have to say comes rather from a man who has studied it from an independent point of view. It has been my lot for the past 10 or 15 years to follow the history of immigration to this country with more or less care and with particular reference to the early immigration. I have also examined with great care the million-dollar output of the Immigration Commission—42 volumes, I think, in all. I will not swear that I have read them from cover to cover. Now, this report, to which reference has been made to-day, is presumably the basis upon which the committee and Congress have formulated the immigration bill before us. I wish to say one word about this report. It begins practically with 1819, at a time when our statistics begin to flow rapidly and freely. It was a convenient place to begin, because the good members of that commission did not have any difficulty in reconstructing the unwritten statistics back of that period. We all know that that is the great crux in the statistics of the United States—the period before the First Census, in particular.

Mr. President and gentlemen, it is precisely this neglected period in this report which vitiates the results of the report. The fact is that the period of the making of this Nation was the period before the First Census of the United States. It was the formative period, in which all these nationalities were grouped together in various parts of the country and the process of assimilation was going on. And what were the elements of that population? If we should see them moving down Pennsylvania Avenue to-day, with their packs on their backs, in many cases in their bare feet, and their tatters and rags, we should be ashamed to acknowledge that they were our ancestors. We can not judge from the immigrants what the output of this country is to be. We must remember that from these great stress periods, periods of religious persecution, periods of depletion by war, we have drawn the very best elements of our population. I need to cite only one example to show that—the example of the immigration of the Palatines in 1709 and 1710 and following years to this country, admittedly one of the best elements we have ever added to our population. And yet those Palatines were homeless, roofless, without clothes in many cases, foodless. They had to live upon the mercy of the English people when they were camped about London, and had to be actually shipped by others to this country. And hundreds and thousands of them could not read a word—had absolutely no ability to read.

This brings me now to this reading test and the present question. What is the class that will be affected by the reading test, that will be eliminated by the reading test? The class to be eliminated by the reading test will be largely the agricultural class and the artisan class of the lower grades in those countries and cities where popular education does not exist; a test that does in no wise signify or bear upon the character of the individuals; and we all know that. We all know that this particular form of test was selected—at least, we may suspect that this particular form of test has been selected—because the committee went on the plan, perhaps, of the fisherman, the happy fisherman. He takes his net and he says, "It won't catch them all, but it will catch a lot, and it is the best thing I have to fish with." And that was about the size of it with the committee that formulated this reading test.

Now, you have got to get a much larger net, and you have got to get a much smaller mesh before you can catch all of the ineligibles that were in the minds of this committee. We know that the tendencies and temptations in the Congress of the United States are all fraught with the interests of separate, distinct organizations, and separate economic and other interests of the country. We know that; and we know that Congress has to deal with all those conflicting interests; and we know that this legislation, like most of the legislation of Congress, is tied up with these special interests; and, Mr. President, I think, for me, one important fact to remember is that in this legislation we are not legislating for to-day or to-morrow. We are legislating with a view to the great future, with a view to those elements which are to come to us, and which are to give to us their brain and their brawn, because you need not tell me that in these peasant regions of the East, the uneducated regions of Russia and Bulgaria, and the other countries of the East, in Italy as well—you need not tell me that that brain which has been lying dormant for centuries, when it once catches the touch of education, will not, like a virgin power, rise up and give a new element to this civilization of ours. That is what the educational test is going to cut off—just that virgin brain that has not had the opportunity yet which our old ancestors had when they came to this country.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to present Mr. David A. Lourie, representing the New Century Club of Boston, an organization of professional men. Mr. Lourie will speak for three minutes.

Mr. LOURIE. Mr. President, as I heard some of the arguments here this morning it reminded me of the history of immigration as it has been discussed for the last 100 years. Away back in 1814, arguments were advanced for the restriction and exclusion of immigration, similar to those that have been advanced here to-day. Had those arguments been listened to, and those ideas translated into law, what would the development of this country have been to-day? The first speaker asked the question, Do we want to Russianize the people over here? I say, "No"; and the fact that we do not want to Russianize the people over here is the reason that we are opposed to the literacy test. What does Russianize mean? It means autocratic officialdom, tyranny, and everything that is bad in public life. Now, what does this principle of a literacy test, reduced to its lowest terms, mean? It means that a man subjects himself to examination by one official. Is there any standard by which this official can say whether the immigrant can read well or badly enough to admit him or to deport him? It is left entirely to his discretion, to his whim, to his caprice; and it is for this reason, among others, that we are opposed to this un-American principle of one-man power, to be able to decide whether a man is able to read well enough to come in here; we are absolutely opposed to this literacy test.

The gentleman tells you that the Farmers' Union is in favor of the literacy test. Why should they be? We know that it is for the interest of the United States of America to get as many of our immigrants out on the farms as is possible, to develop our agricultural resources. Secretary Nagel, in his letter to ex-President Taft, upon which ex-President Taft's veto was based, made a clear and careful study of the immigrant's relation toward the agricultural problem; and in that letter he says that it is these illiterate immigrants who have been coming here in the last 15 or 20 years who are greatly reclaiming the abandoned farm lands of the West and of New England.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I will give two minutes to Mr. Michael Leveen, grand master of the Independent Order of King Solomon, of Newark, N. J.

Mr. LEVEEN. Mr. President, I give way to Mr. Saul Cohn to represent us as spokesman.

Mr. COHN. Mr. President, it is very difficult for a youngster to add anything to what has been said by those opposed to the literacy test by such men as President Eliot and the President of the United States and a great many other gentlemen who have had the opportunity, and a part of whose duty it has been to study this brand of legislation. The words of the second gentleman who spoke in regard to the fact that the immigrant desired to be excluded catches almost as though a burning torch were applied to him, the ability to take advantage of our institutions, are absolutely true. It has been shown that there is a greater percentage of illiteracy in the children of native-born parents than there is in the children of foreign-born parents.

Mr. President, I do not desire to go into a detailed statement of the reasons for which we oppose the literacy test. I only desire to bring a homely illustration to the gentlemen present, in that those of us who lead professional lives know of our own knowledge that very frequently in our experience—I know it has been in mine—we find gentlemen who come to this country who can not read or write; who sign their notes and their deeds with a cross; who have brought up large families in decency; have given them every advantage that American institutions will permit; who have risen to stations of opulence in our communities; who have made excellent citizens, excellent fathers, and excellent busi-

ness men; and I am quite positive that from those experiences the proposed test has no foundation in truth and in justice.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I will ask Capt. Samuel H. Borofsky, representing the largest Jewish congregation in New England, to speak for two minutes.

Capt. BOROFSKY. Mr. President, I am personally foreign born. I came here when a boy of 14. I have lived amongst the foreign born of all classes—Jews, Italians, and others—in the city of Boston, and I want to say right here, Mr. President, that this country would have a great deal less trouble with the foreign-born element if all of them came here uneducated. The man who comes here and imbibes his education in the American schools imbibes something the value of which he realizes and which he appreciates more than those who have had the best education from the universities where revolution is rampant and where tyranny prevails, because our institutions are good. And, Mr. President, I want to say one more word with regard to many of us who come from those foreign countries. We have many ties there. A war is going on, devasting all of Europe, where fathers and brothers are being slaughtered on the field of battle. A man may bring his child of 14 years of age—I believe 16—a father may bring in his wife and his children up to that age; but if my father is killed there, and I have got a sister in the old country who can not read, who did not have the opportunity, no matter what my wealth in this country might be I would not under this bill be permitted to take my unfortunate sister from the old country and give her a shelter in my home. Just think, if I had a sister over there and she had a young girl of 14 or 16 or 18 years, with no parents after this war, absolutely destitute, with all my means I would be unable to bring her to this country and give her a shelter. Is this Americanism? Is this the true spirit of Americanism, Mr. President? I certainly submit, Mr. President, that the American people of this country, if they only realized how far this provision goes, would never for a minute consent to its enactment into law.

Representative GALLIVAN (addressing Mr. Sol B. Kantor, of Boston). How much time have we remaining, Mr. Kantor?

Mr. KANTOR. About eight minutes.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, we have here some representatives of Boston opinion on this bill; they have come from the city of Samuel Adams, of William Lloyd Garrison, of Wendell Phillips, and of thousands of many splendid immigrants of all races who could not have entered this country under a literacy test. They have come to protest with voice and mind and heart against this un-American measure that now threatens. They believe that such a test would not bar from our shores the arrogant, the brutal, the vicious, the selfish, the hateful, the uncharitable, the unwanted, but that it would close our doors against the unfortunate, the oppressed, the victims of brutalism and repression in Old World misgovernment.

Mr. President, I rise to speak chiefly against the literacy test in this bill, because I believe that, based on the experience and history of this and every other country, literacy is not a measure of character or a test of fitness for citizenship. It is a convenience, not a necessity, in the life of a people. It neither adds to nor diminishes the native nobility and virtue of any people, and it is the simplest commonplace to say that no nation was ever saved, no people ever freed, no government ever established by the pen of the writer and the book of the scholar; the vigor, courage, intelligence, and strong arms of men that accomplish these great ends were the endowment of those who were able to make history, even if they could neither write nor read it.

If there is one thing that stands out more imposingly in our national life—yes, far more than any other—it is that literacy has not been the source of American liberty or the cause of American greatness, and our lack of a commanding literature has sometimes been a cause of national reproach.

I believe it was Emerson who said that the farmer, laborer, artisan, fisherman, and chopper are the Commonwealth, not the lawyer, the scholar, and the penman. Too many of us make the mistake of confounding and confusing the terms of illiteracy and ignorance, and our great President hardly needs to be told that lack of letters and lack of knowledge are two entirely different things.

Mr. President, it is important to remember that this alleged stream of alien immigrants has been flowing into America since the early days of the seventeenth century. Its fanciful dangers have begun to dawn on us in the twentieth. Those who favor this bill seem to forget that only the other day their ancestors were alien, the sons of England, France, Ireland, Italy, Scotland, Poland, Germany, Russia, and other lands; and though that stream of fresh and revivifying blood has ceased to flow into some sections of our country, it still continues to renew the energies and courage of the North and the West as ever. Wherever the immigrant has come his energy, courage, fidelity, and brains have made the regions wherein he has cast his fortune blossom like the rose. Wherever he has gone schools have sprung up, industries have flourished, trade has increased, wealth has multiplied, prosperity has bloomed, and patriotism, peace, law, order, intelligence, and happiness follow in his footsteps.

Mr. President, we know that a literacy test will bar from our land its most vital necessity—strong, vigorous, simple, God-fearing peasants, who come here to find homes and to make the wilderness blossom into fertility. But will a literacy test keep out a single criminal whose record and antecedents we are ignorant of? You will find some illiterate criminals who have been guilty of crime of sudden passion, of violence, men who united ignorance with illiteracy; but it is everlastingly true that the crimes most injurious to society, most detrimental to business, commerce, finance, are never the work of illiterates.

The forger, the conspirator, the crooked promoter, the business defaulter, the blackmailer, the bank thief, the political grafter, and all that class of criminals, outside of and outnumbering the criminals of passion and violence, are literate. They read and write, for these vicious talents must be supplemented by literacy to make them profitable. Vicious talent sharpened and developed by letters is the most serious problem society has to deal with. Yet this absurd literacy test will admit the dangerous European criminal of the continental cities and bar out the honest and hard-working and badly needed peasant—farmer and laborer—whether he be English or Irish or French or German or Hebrew or Polish or Italian or Lithuanian.

In every crisis of the country's history these alien classes have stood loyally by the Republic that gave them asylum and home.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that literacy is not a test of character, manhood, or civic fitness. It is a trap to catch the unwary; it is contrary to American principles and practices. Give us honest men and women for our immigrants and the educational problem will not stagger us. Mr. President, hopefully and pronouncedly we ask for your veto.

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I regret that I will not be able to yield as much time as I should like to the many prominent and distinguished gentlemen that come from the city of New York. I present, Mr. President, Mr. Oswald Villard, of the New York Evening Post, to whom I yield four minutes.

Mr. VILLARD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Friends of Russian Freedom, our national society, and as the son of an immigrant who came to this country as a result of the revolution in the Palatinate in 1848, in which three members of his family earned the highest sentence for treason, I desire earnestly to protest against the exclusion by the bill under consideration of aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property, against the provision of section 19, that any who within five years after entry shall be found advertising or teaching the unlawful destruction of property shall be deported; and against the last paragraph of section 28, subjecting to fine and imprisonment, or both, as for a misdemeanor, anyone who knowingly aids or assists any such alien to enter the United States.

These prohibitions against those advertising or teaching the unlawful destruction of property, contained in the present law, mark a new and important departure in our national policy. Those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property are to be excluded; but advocate how? Through books? Through discussion among a small company of friends? This comes too near continuing the folly already in the immigration law of legislating against a state of mind, against those who believe in polygamy, or, like Prince Kuropotkin, possibly, in no organized government. Mr. President, I myself am never in favor of force to settle any difference of opinion between individuals or nations, and neither are the officers of this organization, which includes some of the most persistent workers in the cause of peace that we have in this country, such as Bishop Greer, George Kennan, Seth Low, Louis Marshall, Hamilton Holt, Paul Kennedy, and others; but in the opinion of the bulk of humanity force often must be applied to bring about reform in lands where no adequate provision is made for the peaceful declaration of the popular will. Before and since our Boston "tea party" the annals of history are full of cases where advertising and teaching the unlawful destruction of property have led men and women to come to freedom, to democracy, and to a better common life. As long as forcible revolution is regarded as legitimate the world over, it would be monstrous to say that we should deny an asylum to foreigners who might sit together on our territory and dream dreams of tyrants' yokes broken at home and foreign despots driven from their shores. Shall we set a premium upon the spy and the informer? Shall we brand the exiled patriot as one to be watched, because, sitting in his room with his family about him, he may talk over possible deeds of arms? Perish the thought. The shades of a thousand revolutionists—men like Blanqui, Sigel, and Carl Schurz—would rise to protest. Plotting for freedom is precisely what has always been done in this country and in England.

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield four minutes to the former lieutenant governor of the State of New York, the Hon. Robert F. Wagner, who represents, among other institutions, the Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, a society which was formed for patriotic purposes and has stood for liberty and freedom for over a hundred years.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, perhaps I can get through in less than four minutes; but I have the honor, as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by the executive committee of the Tammany Hall organization of the county of New York, to present this resolution for your consideration, in which we express our opposition to this measure, and also the hope that you will disapprove it. [Handing paper to the President.]

There was one thought that came to me, Mr. President, while this discussion was going on, and that is, What is the matter with our country now that this extraordinary literacy test should be imposed upon our immigrants? In the city of New York we have a population 80 per cent of which consists either of foreign born or the children of foreign born, and yet I submit that we have one of the greatest cities, if not the greatest city in the world, and our illiteracy rate is lower to-day than it ever was in the history of our country. We have there a free college—the College of the City of New York—with which your Excellency is no doubt well acquainted, and of which I have the honor to be a graduate. And, by the way, I am a foreigner—a foreigner in the sense that I was born in a foreign country and came here as a young boy. In the College of the City of New York we have at least 90 per cent children of foreign born, and of that 90 per cent, I take it, 40 per cent at least are the children of illiterate foreigners who have come to our country to seek freedom and an opportunity to work out an existence under happier conditions. Now, no one, it seems to me, can contend, in view of this experience within our own city, that this foreigner, illiterate though he may be, is a menace to our institutions. On the contrary, he is interested in them; he works in our industries to help build up our industries; and wants to give his children the best education possible, so that he may, if possible, become part of our institutions.

So we feel that this proposed law is un-American; it is undemocratic; it is in violation of the fundamental principles upon which our Government was built; and we feel that if this literacy test should be imposed at this time it is not a test of character, it is not a test of intellect, for illiteracy does not necessarily mean ignorance; nor does it mean that the individual will not be useful in the community where he may resides; and it will deprive our country in the future of men the like of whom in the past have helped to build us up and make us great.

In conclusion let me just say this: There are a number of refugees, no doubt, who will seek our shores just at this time, when their country is in turmoil and strife, where they are being oppressed, and they want to come to this country because we are enjoying peace and happiness and brotherly love, and largely due, entirely due, to your own efforts. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I present Mr. Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Committee, and yield to him seven minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, this is the third time that an immigration bill containing a literacy test has been presented to the President of the United States for consideration and action—first to President Cleveland, who vetoed it in a vigorous message; next to President Taft, who vetoed it; and now it is presented to your Excellency.

I feel that if this bill, as now prepared, should become a law it would be taking a step backward in our American civilization. It would make a decided change in the policy of our Government. Our Nation, which has been in the past the asylum of the oppressed of all countries, would no longer possess that proud distinction which has made it the home and cradle of liberty. The literacy test has been evolved after many years of labor on the part of the restrictionist as the touchstone which shall determine whether or not an immigrant shall be received into this country.

The arguments which have been presented hereby Prof. Fairchild and Prof. Ross are not arguments in favor of the literacy test, but in favor of the prohibition of immigration altogether. I have heard no argument presented by them which in any way indicates that the literacy test has any value whatsoever. Those who are opposed to its adoption and to restriction are not so unpatriotic as to say that our doors should be kept open to the immoral, to the defective, to the insane, to those who would be a menace to our country. As good citizens, we subscribe to the principle that our Government has the right to keep out those who by virtue of their bad character or other equally undesirable qualities should not be admitted. But before we adopt a test of exclusion it is important to understand whether that test means anything; whether it tests anything. After all, what do we want in this country? We want men and women—men and women of character, of principle; people who are industrious and who are willing to devote their energies to the upbuilding of the country.

The gentlemen who are in favor of this test seem to act on the theory that this is a country in which we have the right to be selective, to divide people into groups, and say, "You shall come, and you shall not come"; "you from eastern Europe must be excluded; we are perfectly willing to take you from western Europe." But that is un-American, and that would be injurious to the best interests of this country. This is a land of immigrants. Two hundred years ago there were very few people in this country, and all who were here were immigrants at that time. In 1790 there were about three and a half million people in the United States, and a very large percentage of these people were immigrants. We have now grown, in the last 125 years, from 3,500,000 to nearly 100,000,000, and a very large percentage of those are the children of immigrants or immigrants themselves. I also have the proud distinction of being the son of immigrants, and I feel, from my acquaintance with immigrants from my earliest days, which I have continued down to the present moment, that there is no better part of our population than that which has come to this country from foreign lands during the past 60 years, and who are coming day after day, when the spirit moves them to come, and to cast their lot with the welfare of this country.

Now, Mr. President, what is there in this literacy test which is of the slightest value. Does it indicate that because a man can read these cabalistic 30 or 40 lines which are to be presented to him under conditions of excitement and stress—that if the man can read them he is to be admitted, and if he can not read them he is to be rejected? Does that indicate that the man has character, ability, intelligence? I have known college graduates who have been able to speak six languages and who starved in each of those six languages. [Laughter.] They were unable to make a living. I have known graduates from the Sorbonne and from Heidelberg and from Cambridge and from Oxford who, in this country, lived on their wits and were a menace and an injury to this country. Those who believe that people who preach against American institutions are an injury to this country will find that among them those who are most able in their denunciation of constitutional government are those who are highly educated and who would not be excluded from this country because of their lack of the ability to read and to write. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield two minutes to Mr. Alexander I. O'Rourke, of New York.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. President, in the two minutes I have to be brief. I am going to assume, sir, that your mind as yet has not been made up, either to sign or veto this bill, because, if it were, you would not call this meeting to discuss it. I am going to assume, secondly, sir, that prior to your election as governor of the State of New Jersey you, by reason of your great association with the intellectual institutions of this country, had come to believe, as I, as a graduate, that the education of the people of this country is to be desired. But there is a literacy test imposed here, sir. Literacy does not make for the good of this Nation; and while we are discussing, Mr. President, the literacy of our people, we are forgetting the fundamental principles upon which this country was founded. The colonists said, when they founded this country, that a man was entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This Nation has stood as a beacon light to all the nations of the world, saying that here all peoples, of all classes, irrespective of education, should have the opportunity to pursue the happiness that they believed they were entitled to. They came from lands wherein they were persecuted. Religion, politics, and other things drove them here, and they came here thankful to this country for offering them an asylum; thankful to this country, whose foundation principles, upon which it was built, granted them this place as an asylum. Therefore they came here with hearts open to us; and we, the sons of these immigrants, realizing what this country has done for our parents, are prepared to sacrifice everything for this country because of its goodness to our parents and because of the advantages it has given to us. In the words of the psalmist, the immigrant and his son will say to you, sir, "If we forget thee, O Columbia, may our tongues cleave to the roofs of our mouths and our right hands forget their cunning." [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I present former Judge Leon Sanders, of New York City, president of the Hebrew Sheltering Immigrant Aid Society. I yield to him three minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as a Russian by birth, an immigrant by compulsion, and an American by choice, I am here to-day in the name of the Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, a fraternal organization that has 200,000 paying members, and as president of the Hebrew Sheltering Immigrant Aid Society, an organization which spends considerable sums of money for the Americanization of Jewish immigrants, and for the purpose of preventing congestion in the larger cities, to protest against this attempt that is being made in the passage of this immigration bill before you for consideration, to reverse the time-honored policy of this Nation. We believe that the greatness of this country has been produced in a large measure, and almost in every respect, by the immigrants who have sought opportunities here denied to them at home. Many have come here fleeing from religious persecution; others have come here fleeing from political persecution. Whatever their motives have been, they have come here and have assimilated with Americans; have taken part, in time of peace, in building up this Nation to what it is; and have been every ready to shed their blood whenever this Nation called them to the front.

Mr. President, not only is there an attempt to adopt the literacy test but there is something new injected into the law, of which even the lawmakers themselves who have passed it are unable to explain the meaning. "Persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority" are to be sent back. [Laughter.] I have been looking carefully over all the medical books; I have consulted men of science, men who have given this subject careful thought, and not one was able to give me a definition. How are we going to expect an inspector, getting perhaps $1,200 a year, to define this beautiful sentence, upon the strength of which people abandoning their homes abroad are to be sent back perhaps thousands of miles home? [Laughter and applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one minute to my colleague, Hon. GEORGE W. LOFT, Representative from the State of New York.

Representative LOFT. Mr. President, I come before you with 179,000 names [handing a petition to the president] of citizens of the State of New York, of men who are the heads of families. We give you this book that we show you now and ask you to veto this measure. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one minute to Mr. Marcus Braun, of New York.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, in order to avoid repetition I have taken the liberty to sign my statement [handing a paper to the President].

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to Mr. J. A. Shiplikoff, of New York City.

Mr. SHIPLIKOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of a quarter of a million organized Jewish working men and women I beg to present their opinion that it would be detrimental to the interests of this country to have this bill restricting immigration passed. I beg to call your attention to the fact that the standard of living has been raised within the last 35 years considerably, since the bulk of immigration from Europe has started, and if anything can lay claim to that it is organized labor, and organized labor in this country consists greatly of immigrant labor. Fully 65 per cent of the American Federation of Labor consists of immigrants, such as I am. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, through the kindness of my colleague [Mr. SABATH], I have been yielded just a few minutes, and I will take those for a few comments by myself.

I desire to say that while much has been expressed in Congress by those who favored restriction as to the desire to exclude the illiterate, the great city of New York, part of which I have the honor to represent, has never been afraid of the immigration problem over there. We realize in that great city, as I think the people throughout the whole country realize, that many of the illiterates who have come to this country have, as has been remarked this morning, made a desirable acquisition in the communities in which they settled, and through the means of our educational institutions and opportunities presented in this great land have been enabled to obtain an education, and in time become worthy and desirable citizens.

We realize, as I think you do, Mr. President, that there are many of the great resources of this country still to be developed. The hand of toil is still necessary. The American farm boy, as has been so frequently remarked, has left the farm, has been lured to cities and towns, and we still need the hand that will work in the tilling and the cultivation of the soil, the tunneling of the mountains, the building of the railroads, the doing of the thousand and one things that are required in the development of the great resources of the land.

Now, if you examine, as unquestionably the departments under you have examined, the records of the savings banks and the other institutions of this country, you will find that the immigrants have added to the welfare and contributed to the prosperity of the land. I wish to say on behalf of the great city of New York, and on behalf of the many institutions of which I am a member and a director, that we emphatically protest against the imposition of this literacy test. We believe it to be unjust; we believe it to be unfair; it is undemocratic; it is un-American. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, in behalf of the people of the great city of Chicago, with its many civic and social organizations, I have the great pleasure of presenting Miss Grace Abbott. [Applause.]

Miss ABBOTT. Mr. President, it seems to be necessary to present our forbears as a part of the introduction. I want to say that I come of Puritan and Quaker stock, and come here representing a very large group of old native Americans, who believe that the present test is a step backward in American idealism. I am aware that a great deal of the discussion in regard to this test is based on the narrow ground of race and religious prejudice. That, I take it, is unnecessary to discuss here; but that the advocates of the literacy test should believe in it because they think that a curtailment of the number of those who are coming will be of assistance in the solution of a great many of our difficult social and political and economic problems is the question that I want especially to speak on this morning in the few minutes that I have.

At the first conference of charities and corrections which I ever attended, a young sanitary engineer who had been making a study of typhoid fever in the city of Pittsburgh had made the discovery, he thought, that typhoid fever and similar epidemics usually began in our foreign neighborhoods, and spread from there to other parts of the city. His conclusion further was (and I do not want to vouch for anything excepting his line of reasoning) that this was due to the fact that the immigrant was accustomed to a purer water supply at home than the native American, who represented a sort of survival of the fittest, so far as the struggle against impure water was concerned. His further conclusion was that in the interests of public health in Pittsburgh and other cities with large foreign population we ought to be able to work out some kind of test by which we could exclude those who were liable to fall victims to impure water, and so protect the American public. [Laughter.]

Now, that is, of course, the general line of reasoning of those who are discouraged at the slow progress that we are making in the line of pure water, to the better industrial and social conditions, and a more healthful and normal life for us all. They find the discouragement in the way of pure water in Pittsburgh more than they can face, perhaps, and so they say, "Well, let us get rid of some of the group that are suffering from this situation." That is, of course, a kind of short cut which is not going to help us in those problems in which I am more interested than any other; those which mean better control of the conditions under which men and women work, better wages, and better living conditions all around. It is therefore perfectly futile to devote ourselves to this test in the expectation that we are going to change the large group of the people in the community who are opposed to better living conditions for the workingman and better wages for the workingman. The presence of the immigrant is not responsible for that attitude of mind. And so it seems to me that, throughout the discussion of the question of a literacy test brings us round to the question of where we should devote our strength and our efforts and our hopes; and it is not in this direction.

I want to say that I feel very strongly that the immigrants who are coming and who have come in the past have been very distinctly a democratic asset. We have pronounced to the world certain big fundamental propositions in regard to the equality of rights and opportunities. To those we are only struggling to live up, little by little. But the last arrival who comes in the expectation that we are going to make good in these directions has been a real democratic

asset that is going to help us to live up to the larger ideals that we have preached to the world, and which I, as one of the earlier ones, want to join with him in making a reality. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, in behalf of people that have demonstrated that they are good and law-abiding citizens, in behalf of people that have made good, I desire to present Father John Sobieszczy, representing the Polish-American Catholic Union.

Father SOBIESZCZY. Mr. President, I will not take much time, for all the arguments pro and con are known to all those who are interested. But still, with all those arguments, just because we appreciate and love this country and this Government, and everything that has made the name of the United States so glorious amongst the nations, voicing the sentiments of the organization that I represent, numbering 80,000, and at the same time voicing the sentiments of all the Polish people, who for the most part are a laboring class, I protest and protest strongly against this literacy test; for it is unjust, unfair, undemocratic; and we believe it aims at the foundations of American liberty and liberality. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, the Polish citizenship of this country is represented here by Mr. Adam S. Gregorowicz, representing the Polish National Alliance of America.

Mr. GREGOROWICZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Polish National Alliance, which aggregates about 125,000 members, I concur in everything that has been said against the literacy clause, and in addition, without taking up much time I would like to lay stress upon one argument that has appealed to me very forcibly and which I have not heard mentioned here by anyone present, and that is this: That while this literacy clause strikes the man who can not read and write, although he may be healthy and otherwise admissible, the same law bars out his children and the children's children, and thereby dooms them to suffer the conditions from which the parents sought to escape; and it is therefore legislation against one generation to the prejudice of the descendants of that generation, while the mentally weak and unfit aliens are barred out under other conditions of the law. Their descendants have in no way the same chance as the descendants of healthy immigrants who would be excluded.

I have also been asked by another Polish delegation which is here—and I suppose they will not have the opportunity to express themselves—the representatives of the Polish American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania, to register their protest against this proposed literacy test.

Representative SABATH. I have a petition here which I desire to present to you, Mr. President. [Handing a paper to the President.]

Now, Mr. President, permit me to present to you the representative of the Polish Women's Alliance of America, Miss Napieralski.

Miss NAPIERALSKI. Mr. President, this I deem will be the greatest honor of my life. As an American born, it is the first and perhaps the last privilege to come before the President of the United States and before a large body of learned men, and because my time is limited I will confine myself to just a few words.

Mr. President, the mother of one of the greatest Presidents in American history signed her name with the sign of the cross, and yet her son was the greatest emancipator of man, whose memory is sacred to all of us—Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] As the representative of the Polish women of America I have come here to protest against this unjust, un-American, and unconstitutional bill.

I thank you, Mr. President. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, my time has been taken away by others, therefore I am deprived of the pleasure of presenting to you other gentlemen who are here to address you. But permit me to say that in behalf of the Bohemian and other foreign-born people of Chicago and of Illinois and in behalf of the foreign-language newspapers of the United States I am asking that you should veto this bill. They have requested me to do so. I regret very much that I am deprived of the privilege of calling upon them, but I am doing the very best I can. My time is up, and I hope that you will take into consideration the plea of these millions of honest foreign-born citizens who are hoping that you will veto this unfair bill.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, as the closing speaker for the protestants against the pending legislation I desire to introduce, for the 15 minutes left to us, the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran, of New York. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. May it please your excellency: Listening here to everything that has been said since the opening of this discussion, I think I may assume there is one point on which we will all agree, and it is that the policy which this pending measure aims to abandon—nay, completely to reverse—is as old as this Nation itself. I do not think anybody will dispute that it has been the distinctive policy of this country, and if it is to be judged by the results that it has produced I do not think any in the history of mankind has ever been so triumphantly vindicated. Certainly nobody can dispute that during the period of its enforcement, now stretching over 125 years, this country has reached a measure of prosperity entirely without precedent in human experience. But at the same time the influence that it has exercised throughout the world has been simply incalculable. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the light of hope it has kindled among the oppressed and the suffering in every quarter of the globe has been a constellation in the firmament of civilization that has worked the chief influence in accomplishing the uplift in human conditions that has marked this last century beyond all the centuries that have preceded.

And yet, Mr. President, I quite agree with the gentlemen who have spoken here. Perhaps I would go even further and say that the merits of this measure should be considered entirely by the effect it will produce on this country. Your Excellency and the other officers of this Government are bound to defend the interests of this land. To that you have sworn. You are pledged to loyalty; you are not pledged to anything else. If the effect of this measure shall be beneficent to all the world we may rejoice at the universal good that it works. But though it should benefit every man in every other country throughout the world, if it should work injury to our own citizens its abandonment and its reversal, prompt and immediate, becomes a duty that is imperative and inescapable.

Now, that being so, Mr. President, I ask your attention for a moment to the character of the arguments that are being advanced here in favor of the bill, for I think you will agree with me that where a policy unbroken since the establishment of the country, whose benefits nobody here questions, is sought to be reversed the affirmative lies with the proponents of the measure. I have followed very carefully everything that has been said here, and I can find not a single evil that has actually occurred to this country which is charged against the immigration. The most vehement of the orators on the other side, and the most eloquent, anticipate dangers from it, but none has pointed to a single evil consequence yet. For I take it that the distinguished scientist in lunacy who told us about the spread of insanity throughout the world does not charge that to immigration. But even if he did, a literacy test would be no particular measure by which we could determine whether a man was either crazy or approaching lunacy. [Laughter.] I take it that may be considered negligible.

Now, I am repeating that we must consider the measure solely from the point of view of its influence upon this country. I want also to state that the proponents and the opponents of this bill have no issue as to the precautions which should be taken against the exclusion of the undesirable; that is to say, of the vicious, of the incapable, or of the diseased. There are no measures sufficiently drastic to suit us in that respect. But, on the other hand, we believe that men and women—laborious, meritorious, virtuous—seeking this soil for the chance to cultivate it loyally, anxious to establish homes under the protection of our flag and to rear their children in reverence for our Constitution and our laws, far from being a danger, actual or potential, to this country, are the most valuable contributions to its well-being that can pass through our seaports. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. President, let us test just what the effect of this measure will be. First, I assume that the literacy test can be disregarded as a serious test in itself. Its purpose is to shut out immigration. As one of the speakers said, it is the most effective method that can be employed. The gentleman who represents the Locomotive Brotherhood I do not think was particularly sensitive about the literary quality of these immigrants. He wants them shut out because 350,000 boys, as I think he described them, expected your Excellency to do it. [Laughter.] Now let us see what the effect of that would be. As far as the literacy test is concerned I will say this: That from what your Excellency has heard, I do not think that you would regard with particular favor a measure that distinguished against the laborious and in favor of the loquacious. [Laughter.] I do not think that the literacy test in itself proves any merit whatever except a certain glibness of utterance which might well be dispensed with in favor of expertness in labor. I believe that a calloused hand, a hand calloused by labor, should be a better passport through our customhouse than a tongue supple in several languages. I do not think this country needs linguists; I do think it greatly needs laborers.

Now, in addition, the labor of the country is, I suppose, really at the base of the opposition which comes from gentlemen who are associated with organized labor. I am perfectly willing that the consequences of continuing immigration shall be determined by its influence on the rate of wages to be paid to labor. I know of no test that can establish the prosperity of the country except wages of labor. Now, then, it is absolutely unbelievable that wages can be high unless production is abundant, and that production can be abundant unless prosperity is general. Now, how would this affect labor? These gentlemen seem to think that every man who comes to this country displaces somebody else. They forget the entire structure of our industrial system. No man can work except as somebody gives him an opportunity to work. The man who casts seed upon a western field would be perfectly senseless unless he employed another man to reap, another to transport his grain, another to mill it, and still another to distribute it among the consumers. Would there be any sense in mining ore from the earth if other laborers were not employed to transport it and transmute it into steel? Every man who works creates an opportunity for labor instead of depriving it of an opportunity, and that is especially true with reference to skilled labor. Now, I wonder if these gentlemen realize that skilled labor can not be employed upon the earth, but only on some product of it, and that product must be drawn from the earth by unskilled labor. Can the carpenter ply his trade before he is furnished with lumber, and can he be furnished with lumber until the tree is cut down by the hand of an unskilled workman? Can a bricklayer be paid $6 a day for laying brick if some unskilled workman is not found to carry his bricks? Does anybody suppose he could be paid at that rate if he had to carry his own bricks? Is there any skilled laborer in the world that can work until the raw material of his product is furnished to him as the theater in which his craft must be exercised? Yes; the immigrant does displace the native labor, for this basic labor must be employed before any industry is possible. The immigrant performs that basic labor which is the fountain of all industry. He does displace the native laborer there; but how? He takes the native laborer on his back and lifts him up to a higher plane, where he gets better wages. [Applause.] And as the immigrant straightens himself under the influence of the better conditions he is enjoying he is lifting the native skilled labor higher and ever higher, to better conditions and higher wages.

Mr. President, what other objection is made to this policy that would justify us now in abandoning it? Why, without this stream of immigrants coming in here the supply of commodities would be so diminished that not merely would skilled labor be deprived in a large degree of the materials on which it exercises its craft; but generally, throughout the whole world, there would be a diminution of the supply of commodities, so that the cost of living would go still higher, while the rate of wages would necessarily go lower. This work must be performed or all industry must end; and this laborer, this immigrant, is coming here in streams to perform it so that the native laborer may gain higher wages. He is, Mr. President, the Helot of this age. As the Helot of Sparta gained admission to citizenship by service on the battle field, he comes here to gain citizenship for his children and for himself by more meritorious service still upon the industrial field.

Now, is there any objection on the score of political expediency? If there be corruption in politics throughout this country—and very great corruption has been found in certain localities—they have not been those where naturalized citizens were in the great majority. But, Mr. President, this is not a question of citizenship; this is a question of admission to our population. You speak of tests that should be applied to a man coming into this country, and you say that he must be brought up to the test you exact from your own. Let me ask, Is any test exacted at the ballot box, where the supreme act of sovereignty is exercised by the citizen? Do you exclude men from that greatest of all functions that have ever yet devolved upon the common man because they can not read and write? You are here trying to apply a higher test to the man who comes here to work for you than you apply to the man who governs you. Mr. President, there may be some reasons for applying a literacy test to the exercise of the suffrage. That is not before us now. But the man who comes here to work with his hands must produce more than he consumes, otherwise there would be no profit in employing him. He is a contributor to this land, to its material prosperity, to its wealth, and, I believe, judged by all history, to its stability. He takes from it in return the admission to this life, the greatest boon that can come to a man upon this earth. There is not an unreserved grant on either side. There is service on both sides; and that mutual service has produced what? This people.

Will any of those professors who are so much afraid of the influence of these immigrants upon our labor tell us that there is a people in all the world can compare with us now? And what are we? Why, the product of a commingling of blood—those who live here and those who are constantly coming here. There has not been in the world a population like this, and this population is produced through that free access of all members of the Caucasian race and the commingling of their blood. They are always the best who come, for none but the best would be capable of the determination and the enterprise that would bring them away from home, sacrificing the associations of a lifetime and of the generations that preceded them, facing all the discomforts of an ocean voyage, landing upon this soil with nothing in the world but the capacity to labor. They are the men that we want. We can not have too many of them. We should not put the slightest barrier in their way, but we should ask them to come, that this stream of prosperity of which they have been in a large degree the source, of which they have been in the highest degree the tributaries, shall continue undiminished while this land remains peopled by us and by those who shall follow us.

Mr. President, I might almost say that it would be a very extraordinary thing that this measure should be proposed, if it were not, after all, but another appearance of a tendency old as human nature.

The spirit that is against this immigration under this bill is one form of a conflict that has been waging ever since civilization began. It is a blow against our civilization. Mr. President, there are but two forms of civilization. One might be called the civilization that trusts humanity, the other that distrusts it; one that builds institutions under the conception that if all men be given equal voice in the control of the Government its powers will be exercised for the protection of everyone, and the other which holds man so depraved that if he be trusted with power it will be abused; so that the majority—the poor, who are always a majority—would exercise their political functions to plunder the rich, who are always a minority. These two systems of civilization have been now on trial before the world. Ours is vindicated by the most glorious fruits that a political system ever bore, and it is now sought to change the policy of this country and enact this legislation, conceived in distrust and dislike of humanity. Substitute for that legislation a broad confidence in human kind that has blessed this land as no land ever was blessed before. It is, Mr. President—and I say it with all respect to these gentlemen, for I do not think they quite suspect themselves the real motives and forces that govern them—it is a revival of that savagery which finds a strong exemplification in the desperate war now ravaging foreign lands. This,too, springs from that distrust of humanity which made each nation arm, under the impression that all other nations coveted its territory, and could only be restrained from assailing it by the force that could be organized to resist it. This country conducted its Government on another plan, and now behold, all the countries that took armed precaution against war, based upon distrust of humanity, are being massacred by a dreadful machinery which already has cost the lives of the flower of their youth; and this country, which has trusted entirely in that spirit of humanity that will not assail unless it is assailed, and that will trust where it is trusted, is now in the enjoyment of perfect peace and of a prosperity, not equal to that which was its own when it traded freely with the countries whose industries were throttled, but still without a single building ruined, without a single city attacked, without a field ravaged, without a man killed. Now, the very same spirit that is back of this bill wants that policy abandoned, sir. Nay, they want to put your office in commission. They propose to create a commission of nine to give the Congress and the people information about our armed condition, because we are unprepared. But the Constitution makes you the authority who should furnish that information, and it creates that authority that the peace of the world may be preserved. And you have been faithful to that trust. You have stood against every storm of criticism that would be calculated to move even a man in your exalted place. The same spirit has checked that manifestation, and insists that this country shall remain unarmed, following out this old policy at least until it can be seen whether the result of this war will enable the world to come and adopt ours, before we should even consider being driven to adopt theirs. We earnestly hope that this spirit of distrust exemplified in this bill shall be defeated, and that those features of your policy which this and other measures propose to change, and which I think are the most valuable that this country has ever enjoyed in a great crisis of civilization, shall be upheld. The defeat of this measure will mark the triumph of our civilization, the security of this Government, the continued stream of immigration that will feed the springs of our production and continue our prosperity at least at the level that it has attained, and probably carry it higher than ever; whereas if this measure passes, it not only will impair our prosperity, not merely cloud our credit, but it will darken the prospects of humanity throughout the world.

Mr. President, I am glad that I can couple the prayer of humanity with the demands of this people. This people have a right to ask that a policy tried by 125 years of success shall not be lightly altered. The whole human family look with eyes of unuttered longing to the action that you shall take here, and which shall decide whether this light of hope shall be extinguished forever, an extinction which I believe would be a loss to humanity greater even than the war that is now ravaging a large part of Christendom. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWARD T. CAHILL. Mr. President, I desire to present, as a citizen of the United States, my plea for the nations of Europe and their children. [Handing a book to the President.] I feel that in presenting this as a citizen I am reechoing the sentiments that you reecho. Only those can speak who can feel. In this argument I tell the history of the alien laws; I tell the growth of our country as illustrated in your own acts and your own history; I connect that with our present acts down to date, and bring out a new theory, namely, the right of locomotion, etc.—the right of the people to move from one place to another; and I furthermore bring out all the treaties with reference to that and bring out the further ideal, as our friend from New York said, of you being the great peacemaker of the world. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. There is a gentleman present, a Mr. Russell, whom I would like to hear for a minute or two.

Mr. CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank you for kindly allowing me to be heard on this subject.

Some limitation and restriction of immigration is undoubtedly necessary and salutary. We are opposed to this measure because the provision of the literacy test would be unscientific, unsound, and extremely difficult to enforce. Consequently it would not reach the purposes aimed at in the bill. No provision, perhaps, could be more easily evaded than the literacy test.

Next, when there are at least two other tests, two other measures, that would reach the end sought, and that would not be open to the objection of the literacy test, is it not unfortunate that we should adopt this test, which is open to objection on so many grounds and which in all probability can not be enforced?

In behalf, therefore, of the Socialist Party, which I represent here, I offer this protest against the bill, and on one other ground, for I have sat here this morning and have been amazed to note that but one speaker has called attention to what is, in my judgment, the most deadly defect in the measure. Are we aware, Mr. President, of the fact that if this bill becomes a law we have abolished the right of political asylum in the United States? We have done it without a question. Take the provisions in section 12 and in section 28 and the only effect of them will be to utterly destroy the right of political asylum. Who are we, Mr. President, in this country that we should pass judgment upon the measures used by patriots in other countries to effect their liberty? We do that in advance in this provision in regard to the unlawful destruction of property. It is one thing, Mr. President, in a country that has universal suffrage, that has the right of free speech, free assembly, and a free press, it is one thing; but in a country that has none of these rights with respect to agitation for liberty it is a totally different thing. Only those who, like myself, have been engaged in the fight to preserve this right of political asylum in the United States can know how difficult it has been, and how increasingly difficult. This bill proposes finally to abolish that right. Are we ready to take that step? That is the greatest question of all involved in this bill—the right of political asylum. Bear in mind that if we had had this bill as a law in years gone by not one of the eminent refugees that have come here in the last century could have been admitted. Garibaldi, Sigel, John Mitchell, the grandfather of the present mayor of New York, Carl Schurz, every distinguished refugee from a foreign country who had agitated for political freedom would have been excluded if this act had been in force. If we put this law upon the statute books finally, we have abolished that right which has been so difficult to maintain.

In behalf, therefore, of the 1,000,000 Socialists of this country whom I represent I petition you, Mr. President, to veto this bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I hope the gentleman from Alabama will ask that all Members who speak on this veto message may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this veto message be allowed to extend their remarks for five legislative days in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like for the gentleman from Alabama to include other Members also.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make that request, that all gentlemen be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his request and asks that all gentlemen have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. If nobody wants to speak—— [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON]. Mr. Speaker, I will occupy the floor myself, to be taken out of my time, until Mr. NORTON is ready to proceed. It is only a matter of getting some papers.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, for more than three centuries the territory included to-day in these United States has been a haven toward which the downtrodden, oppressed, and persecuted of other lands have turned with wistful, longing eyes. Thousands of them have braved the most terrifying dangers of sea and land seeking a home and a better life on this new continent.

The Government which you men on that side and we on this side to-day enjoy was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the cardinal principles of equality and unrestricted opportunity to all men.

For more than a century our Constitution, our laws, and our people have invited and welcomed immigrants to our shores. The unceasing tide of immigration that has flowed from Europe into this Nation for a hundred years has never endangered or menaced its stability. On the contrary, it has enabled us to bring forth to the world out of a wilderness of forests, prairies, and mountains and firmly establish on this continent a Nation incomparably richer in material wealth and richer in the happiness, the contentment, and the political and religious freedom of its people than any nation the hand of God has ever blessed.

With this record of national development and achievement before us under a distinctly American immigration policy, a policy older on this continent than the Nation itself, the proponents of this bill aim to overturn this policy and adopt instead a policy of rigid restriction and exclusion which, in its operation, will debar from admission to this country a large number of poor and unfortunate, honest, healthy European immigrants and will not at all tend to keep out the educated gambler, society

crook, or common rascal who, as an immigrant, comes to us to live by his wiles and his wits and to become an addition to the already large number of parasites feeding off the toil and labor of our honest working class.

The thought impresses me that it would be a very great mistake to now place an embargo on willing hands and brawny muscles. Would it not be much better to increase the efficiency of our existing methods and machinery for distributing arriving aliens so that they might readily reach our vast and scattered demands?

Some of the gentlemen from the South, representing States where the good red blood of honest, healthy European immigration is strikingly conspicuous by its absence and where the greatest illiteracy among native white citizens in this country is to be found, who are most eager for and insistent upon the enactment of this legislation, recall to my mind two pictures I have seen. The first is that of a large lifeboat containing a few apparently well-cared-for and well-groomed professional men, business men, and officers struggling in the billowy waters of the sea. Surrounding the lifeboat are a few poor sailors, with tearful eyes uplifted, beseeching safety in the lifeboat. The occupants of the boat observe the unfortunates in the sea, but give no aid, because they have concluded that the admission of these men to the boat might crowd or inconvenience themselves in some way. The other picture shows the same large lifeboat, with the same occupants, dashed upon the rocks and being lost in the angry waves of the sea for lack of sufficient brawn and muscle to man her oars.

The proponents of the provisions of this bill in a narrowness of vision seem to have lost sight of the birth, the purposes, and the history of this Nation. They who to-day set up the cry that European immigration is the greatest menace to the welfare and well-being of the people of this Nation overlook the underlying principles of this Republic. This cry against honest, healthy, able-bodied immigrants with ready hands and willing hearts to work is not a new cry. It is the same old, narrow, self-centered, selfish complaint that was made by narrow-visioned Americans even in the days when the Nation was in its infancy. In the second annual report of the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in New York City, published in 1819, we read the following conclusions:

> As to the emigrants from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in language of astonishment and apprehension. Through this inlet pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences.

On page 21 of the same report we find this calamitous complaint:

> For years and generations will Europe continue to send forth her surplus population. The winds and the waves will bring needy thousands to our seaports and this city continue the general point of arrival. Over this subject we can no longer slumber. Shall we behold a moral contagion spreading and expanding with the most inveterate ravages amid the ranks of our growing population without endeavoring to arrest its progress? Shall this mass of immigrants be suddenly identified with ourselves and our children, inculcating their habits and their principles without an effort on our part to stay the impending calamity? Why attempt to exclude the ravages of sickness and disease and suffer the fatal ravages of moral desolation to stalk in triumph among us?

We read from an article published in 1835 entitled "Imminent Dangers to the Institutions of the United States of America Through Foreign Immigration":

> Then we were few, feeble, and scattered. Now we are numerous, strong, and concentrated. Then our accessions of immigration were real accessions of strength from the ranks of the learned and the good, from enlightened mechanic and artisan and intelligent husbandman. Now immigration is the accession of weakness, from the ignorant victims of the priest-ridden slaves of Ireland and Germany, or the outcast tenants of the poorhouses and prisons of Europe.

In the report of the meeting of the delegates of the Native American National Convention held in Philadelphia on July 4, 1845, the following is found in one of the addresses delivered at the meeting:

> It is an incontrovertible truth that the civil institutions of the United States of America have been seriously affected, and that they now stand in imminent peril from the rapid and enormous increase in the body of residents of foreign birth, imbued with foreign feelings, and of an ignorant and immoral character.
>
> The almshouses of Europe are emptied upon our coast, and this by our own invitation, not casually or to a trivial extent, but systematically and upon a constantly increasing scale.

And so this cry against immigration has been made since from almost the birth of this Nation to the present time by those blinded by a narrow selfishness and prejudice, refusing to read or recognize the pages of our country's history, that is so grandly emblazoned with the patriotic deeds and marvelous achievements of thousands of immigrants who reached our shores in deepest poverty and distress, but with the bright hope burning in their breasts that these United States would give the honest labor of their hands and their intellects opportunity to win and enjoy a quiet and peaceful home and a new and a better life.

At first the threatened menace of immigration was from England. Next it was the Irish; then the German immigrant, who was heralded as endangering American institutions. More recently the Swede and the Norwegian immigrant was the subject of attack as being an undesirable addition to our citizenship. To-day we are told the threatened danger lies in immigration from southern Europe and from Poland and Russia. While reading in the library a few days ago I came across a paragraph in an article in the National Geographic Magazine for November, 1914, which is interesting in this connection. The National Geographic Magazine is not, as you know, a political magazine. The paragraph I refer to appears on page 519 of the copy of the magazine I hold in my hand.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a few minutes' additional time.

Mr. MOORE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. On this page is a picture of an interesting group of men and women—Russian immigrants to Siberia. Under the picture is the following:

> Such people as these undoubtedly will prove to be the progenitors of a race that will compare with our own sturdy farmers in the Northwest. A group of Russian peasants emigrated to Siberia with nothing but the clothes on their backs, a little flour, some home-tanned leather, and a few tools for carpentry and blacksmithing. The first day they made two sets of ovens out of brick they prepared from a clay bed near by, and the men burned charcoal, while the women made bread. Within two days after their arrival they had six blacksmith's forges going, and inside of 10 days they had built themselves rude houses, made wagons, manufactured spades by the dozen, and reshod their horses, all the iron used being forged on the ground.

And the paragraph concludes with—

> Yet none of them could read or write.

Has the time arrived in this country when we should debar men and women of this kind and character from making homes in this country, which has an area so great that our population could be increased tenfold, and then it would not be as dense as the present population of Germany. I do not think it has. In 1910 we had in the United States but 30.9 people to the square mile of our area, while Germany has 312 and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland 374 to every square mile of area.

We should not allow our better selves and our better senses to be blinded by the blare of the supporters of this shocking measure to the debt we owe to past and present generations of splendid men and women, who came to us from foreign lands knowing nothing of education but knowing everything of honest toil, clean living, and loyal and lasting devotion to their adopted country. We should not forget our duty to open the door of hope to every sincere, honest man, whether he knows how to read or write. We should not pass this bill, for its enactment into law clearly places lettered scoundrelism above untutored industry and virtue.

The action of President Wilson in vetoing this bill and the action of President Cleveland and President Taft in vetoing immigration bills containing the same indefensible, un-American provisions included in this bill has been and will be commended and approved everywhere by those having a proper conception of American ideals and American aspirations. In returning the immigration bill without his approval President Cleveland, in his message to the House of Representatives on March 2, 1897, has well said in reference to the literacy test contained in the bill, the following which in every way applies to the bill we are now considering:

> A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigrants is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands, except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the zealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.
>
> A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and a willingness and ability to work.
>
> A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to rouse a sentiment in its defense, for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

The policy and purpose of this bill are indefensible. It is more afraid of illiterate fathers than it is gratified by their educated children. The last census reports clearly show that

the smallest proportion of illiterates is found in this country among the children of our immigrants. Among children of 10 to 14 years of age born of our native white stock 44 in 1,000 can not write. Among the children of our immigrants of the same age only 9 in 1,000 can not write. This bill looks in a nearsighted way, very narrowly at the present, and is blinded to the future. It means well, but it acts without foresight or reason.

Because the literacy test contained in this bill is neither a test of moral character nor a test of intelligence I shall vote against the bill. Because I am not blinded to the fact that the literate children of illiterate immigrants have done many million fold more good for this Nation than any harm that has come to it from immigrants who were unable to read or write I shall vote against this bill. Because the bill in several of its provisions is unreasonable, unfair, and un-American I am opposed to it, and I hope the action of this House will defeat its objectional provisions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in his message vetoing H. R. 6060, the bill to restrict immigration of aliens, the President of the United States says the bill—

seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men.

The President offers that objection in addition to his objection to the literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, I shall devote the time allotted to me to a discussion of sections 3 and 19, which are the paragraphs to which the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and other organizations most bitterly object and are the paragraphs to which one of the President's objections applies. Section 3 denies admission to various persons, including—

persons * * * who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized Government, because of his or their official character, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, that clause, with the exception of the words "who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property," is current law. (Sec. 38, act of 1907.)

Asylum for political refugees is clearly established in the words of the first proviso of section 3 of the present bill, as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of or legally charged with an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Now, then, a word as to section 19 of the Burnett bill. This section reads as follows:

That at any time within five years after entry any alien who at the time of entry was a member of one or more of the classes excluded by law; any alien who within five years after entry shall be found advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property, or advocating or teaching anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials * * * shall be deported.

Objection is made to this clause, although most of it is now current law, the new part being:

Any alien who within five years shall be found advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, these clauses, in my opinion, make the whole bill worth while and more than overcome any sentimental reasons or "on-first-thought" objections to the so-called literacy test.

"Shall we abolish asylum to those who seek political freedom?" shout those who want still more nostrums of the Old World taught to those who have come here as workers and toilers and who hope to rise through individual effort. And we answer, "Shall we have no redress against those who are flocking to this country to teach sabotage and to inflame and incite those who are here in the hope of bettering their conditions?"

I invite your attention while I read a few paragraphs from an article recently published in the International Socialist Review. This publication can be found, by the way, in nearly all of our public libraries. I have found it nearly always on the tables of libraries of towns of from 10,000 to 25,000 population, and I am informed it is sent to those libraries free of charge. High-school pupils, asked by their teachers to debate socialism, go to the libraries and find such statements as the one I am about to read, which, permit me to say, are not indorsed by all Socialists. The article in question is entitleld "How to make work for the unemployed." It declares that 5,000,000 persons in the United States are in need of work, and says:

Some writers propose to "organize with the unemployed"; that is, to feed and house them in order to keep them from taking the jobs away from the employed workers. Others, again, want to organize a gunmen defense fund to purchase machine guns and high-powered rifles for all union men, miners especially, that they may protect themselves from the murderous onslaughts of the private armies of the master class. Very well; these tactics may be perfectly good, but the question arises, Who is going to pay for all this?

What the working class needs to-day is an inexpensive method by which to fight the powerful capitalist class, and they have just such a weapon in their own hands.

This weapon is without expense to the working class, and if intelligently and systematically used it will not only reduce the profits of the exploiters, but also create more work for the wage earners. If thoroughly understood and used more extensively it may entirely eliminate the unemployed army.

To illustrate what he calls the "efficacy of this method of warfare"—which is sabotage, pure and simple—the writer cites an incident which occurred in the district I have the honor to represent. He says:

Some time ago the writer was working in a big lumberyard on the west coast, where nearly all the work around the water fronts and lumberyards is temporary.

The writer and three others got orders to load up five box cars with shingles. When we commenced the work we found, to our surprise, that every shingle bundle had been cut open—that is, the little strip of sheet iron that holds the shingles tightly together in a bundle had been cut with a knife or a pair of shears on every bundle in the pile—about 3,000 bundles in all.

When the boss came around we notified him about the accident, and, after exhausting his supply of profanity, he ordered us to get the shingle press and rebundle the whole batch. It took the four of us 10 whole days to put that shingle pile into shape again. And our wages for that time, at the rate of 32 cents per hour, amounted to $134. By adding the loss on account of delay in shipment, the "holding money" for the five box cars, etc., we found that the company's profit for that day had been reduced about $300.

So there you are. In less than half an hour's time somebody had created 10 days' work for four men who would have been otherwise unemployed, and at the same time cut a big chunk off the boss's profit. No lives were lost; no property was destroyed; there were no lawsuits; nothing that would drain the resources of the organized workers. But there were results. That's all.

This same method of fighting can be used in a thousand different ways by the skilled mechanic or machine hand as well as by the common laborer.

The article goes on to give further instructions as to how to practice sabotage in all lines. This is a new thing, comparatively, in this country, although it has been growing rapidly during the past three or four years. It has come from abroad, along with the teaching and preaching by clever agitators that individualism has played out in the United States—that opportunity is gone. These teachings are coming right along with the influx of more than a million aliens a year. The more illiterate of the aliens, once here, quickly absorb the teachings. Some of the worst of our recent strikes can be attributed, in part, to these things.

Gentlemen, I tell you frankly that that is why the American Federation of Labor is for the provisions of this bill. Their leaders know the disorder such preachings bring about. That organization has had to stand against such agitators. Sometimes I think that great employers of labor have been so busy fighting organized labor that they have not had time to see just how the newly arrived alien labor is organizing and what kind of riot it must produce in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that the article, "How to create more work for the unemployed," has been printed in a dozen languages in this country. I have seen similar and even worse printed in nearly all of the languages. Personally, I went over to Paterson, N. J., during the Industrial Workers of the World strike in the silk mills, and heard such stuff preached to the foreign workers, the majority of whom had not been in the United States two years. I heard it translated to them in their various languages. I heard the poor foreigners told that they had lost the strike, but if they would go back to the mills and secretly ruin as many bolts of silk as possible they would win the next strike. They were told to drop threads and let dyes run, and that the time would soon come when they would themselves run the mills and factories. And they believed it.

Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I would not only restrict immigration, but for the present would suspend it. [Applause.]

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Were not those statements made and those teachings given by men who could read and write; every one of whom could stand this literacy test?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course; and they were teaching them to aliens, many of whom could neither read nor write, and who had not found overnight the opportunities they had been misled to believe exist in the United States for all who come.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this clause in this bill does not stop those who are seeking political freedom, but it does say that those who shall be found, in five years after entry, advocating or teaching unlawful destruction of property shall be deported, and it is pretty generally agreed that they should be deported. I can point out to you to-day any number of foreign-born editors, editing publications of this class, who have not even sought naturalization, and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] says, of a highly educated class, teaching those newcomers the very things that will destroy this Government if not checked.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman evidently has not caught my question. He has not debated it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have answered the question, I think. Remember, I am not discussing the literacy provision of the bill. I have not time. I am addressing myself to what I think is far more important. In my opinion, the matter of the literacy test—that is, the ability to read, and not write, 30 to 40 words of one's native tongue or jargon—is a minor matter and will create no such heartbreaking or distress as some imagine. Neither will it restrict as heavily as I wish it would, but it will do something, and should be enacted into law. The best estimates show that about two or three hundred thousand of the poorest class of immigrants might be stopped.

The gates of the United States will be open to nearly all who want to come. Those in far-off lands who know of the free institutions of the United States, and who would like to come to us but who are detained through ignorance and inability to read the simplest words in their language, still will have the great hope that their children or their children's children may come here and be of us. [Applause.] Let us hope that they will not find a country brought down to the level of their own.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ACTION OF STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to add to my remarks a resolution recently adopted by the Washington State Federation of Labor, assembled in annual convention at Olympia, Wash., January 18 to January 22, 1915, as follows:

Whereas the present industrial crisis in the State of Washington demands remedy, and it is apparent that the Immigration Service is seriously handicapped for the lack of funds to properly enforce the present existing laws; and

Whereas statistics shows that 1,400,000 immigrants entered the United States during the last fiscal year; and

Whereas the Immigration Service is the only department of our Government that is self-supporting, a head tax of $4 per head being required from every immigrant entering this country, and, as Government figures show, during the last fiscal year $6,700,000 expended in the administration of existing immigration laws, and it appears that immigrants in large numbers are crossing the boundary line into Washington, with but little inspection because of the parsimonious attitude of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor call upon the State's Representatives in Congress to demand that the money acquired for the purpose of administration of existing immigration laws be expended for that purpose.

I desire to add also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 2.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that—

Whereas during the year ending January 30, 1910, Government statistics show that more than 1,000,000 aliens landed in the United States, of which number more than 600,000 came from southern and eastern Asia, the most undesirable immigrant known; and

Whereas the effect of this alien deluge is to depress the wages and destroy the employment of thousands of American workingmen: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House and Senate of the State of Washington, That the Congress of the United States be requested to pass such restricted legislation as will put a stop to this enormous influx of the most undesirable foreigners, whose presence tends to destroy American standards of living; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Washington for their use in endeavoring to secure the passage of such restricted legislation.

Passed the house January 19, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 24, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

The Washington State Legislature of 1915 is now in session, and to-day—just now—I received a telegram. Both house and senate urge the passage of this bill over the President's veto. The telegram follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 4, 1915.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill; and

Whereas the same is to be brought up for action on the President's veto Thursday, February 4, 1915: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington be, and he is hereby, directed to telegraph to each Member of the delegation in Congress from this State a request that he vote for the passage of the said Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill over the President's veto.

I. M. HOWELL, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the argument just made by the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] convinces me that he is on the wrong tack. It is not the illiterate immigrant who is a menace to this country, according to his argument, but it is the educated foreigner who comes to these shores. I, for one, would gladly vote for this bill or any other bill to keep that kind of immigrants out. I have as little use, as he has, for those foreigners who come here to preach the doctrines of anarchy and destruction of property. They are a menace to our institutions. But they are the products of their education, some of them, no doubt, hold university degrees. My objection to this bill is the so-called literacy test. The literacy test will keep out a class of men who have had no opportunity to become educated in their own countries and who want to come to this land of opportunity in order to better their condition in life. No question is raised as to their character, their manhood, their physical ability to perform that hard manual labor which the educated man will not perform. But this question of emigration into the United States is not a new one. In every stage of the country's history we have read and heard of the efforts to keep out foreign elements. Thomas Jefferson in his first annual message to Congress made this statement:

And shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?

I have not always been able to agree with the President of the United States in his policies, but in his veto message to this House on this bill he hit the nail squarely on the head when he said, in effect, that the literacy test tends to deprive a man who had not had opportunities in his own land from getting the benefit of the opportunities that this country would afford.

Away back in 1797, in the Fourth or Fifth Congress, the question of immigration and naturalization was up, and I was greatly pleased a few moments ago to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] express the liberal views he did on this floor on this question, for this is what a Massachusetts Representative said on the subject of immigration back in 1797. I read from McMaster's History of the People of the United States, volume 2, page 332:

The door for immigrants was open too wide. It would be wise to close it a little. Too many foreigners came to the States. Already they were out of all proportion to native citizens. When the country, said Otis, was new, it may have been good policy to admit all. But it is so no longer. A bar should be placed against the admittance of those restless people who can not be tranquil and happy at home. We do not want "a vast horde of wild Irishmen let loose upon us."

[Laughter.]

At that time it was the Irishman; a little later it was the German; then, still later, it was the Scandinavian; and now it is the immigrant from southern Europe. Mr. Chairman, it is a remarkable thing that opposition to illiterate immigrants comes from those sections of the Union to which the smallest percentage of the immigrants migrate and where illiteracy among native whites and children of native white parentage is greatest. [Applause.] "Physician, heal thyself." Teach your own children how to read and write; teach your own people how to read and write; and when you have done that, then begin to talk about literacy tests in an immigration bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, one plank of the labor section of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, July 2, 1912, reads as follows:

The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

In his speech of acceptance of the presidential nomination by the Democratic Party, Hon. Woodrow Wilson took occasion to make the following declaration:

The working people of America—if they must be distinguished from the minority that constitutes the rest of it—are, of course, the backbone of the Nation. No law that safeguards their life; that improves the physical and moral conditions under which they live; that makes their (the working people of America) hours of labor rational and tolerable; that gives them freedom to act in their own interest; and that protects them where they can not protect themselves can properly be regarded as class legislation or as anything but a measure taken in the interest of the whole people, whose partnership in right action we are trying to establish and make real and practical. It is in this spirit that we shall act if we are genuine spokesmen of the whole country.

The declarations of the Democratic platform and the language of Mr. Wilson's letter of acceptance of the Democratic nomination for President were an assurance to the labor world that in the Democratic Party and Mr. Wilson it would find its true friends and loyal advocates. Believing in the assurances of the Democratic Party and accepting it at its written word, the labor leaders and labor organizations and the laboring people generally throughout the country, some 2,000,000 in number, went pell-mell into the Democratic camp and became among the most loyal and enthusiastic supporters of the candidacy of Mr. Wilson. They went the length, at least in voice and vote, in putting their supposed friend and champion in the White House. After President Wilson had been inaugurated President of these United States and after the overwhelmingly Democratic House and Senate had settled down to business and undertaken the work, supposedly at least, of carrying out the Democratic pledges to the country, labor was anxious and soon expected to realize the fruition of its dreams in the fulfillment of the Democratic pledges and promises to it. Labor thought it had succeeded in less than 90 days in having the first one of its list of grievances carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill of June 23, 1913, and which reads as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including not exceeding $10,000 for salaries of necessary employees at the seat of government, $300,000: *Provided, however*, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

The sundry civil bill, with this proviso, passed both the House and the Senate and was sent to the President for his signature. After much hesitation he finally signed it, with the following statement attached thereto:

I have signed this bill because I can do so without in fact limiting the opportunity or the power of the Department of Justice to prosecute violations of the law, by whomsoever committed. If I could have separated from the rest of the bill the item which authorizes the expenditure by the Department of Justice of a special sum of $300,000 for the prosecution or violation of the antitrust law, I would have vetoed that item, because it places upon the expenditure a limitation which is, in my opinion, unjustifiable in character and principle. But I could not separate it. I do not understand that the limitation was intended as either an amendment or an interpretation of the antitrust law, but merely as an expression of the opinion of the Congress.

I can assure the country that this item will neither limit nor in any way embarrass the actions of the Department of Justice. Other appropriations supply the department with abundant funds to enforce the law. The law will be interpreted in the determination of what the department should do, by independent and, I hope, impartial judgments as to the true and just meaning of substantive statutes of the United States.

The President says, as forcefully as English can put it, that if he could have separated the item in the bill which provides that no part of the $300,000 therein appropriated should be used in the prosecution of any organization or individual from entering into any agreement or combination for the betterment of their conditions, he would have done so.

I would have vetoed that item—

He says—

because it places upon the expenditure a limitation which is, in my opinion, unjustifiable in character and principle.

The President continues:

I do not understand that the limitation was intended as either an amendment or interpretation of the antitrust law, but merely an expression of the opinion of Congress.

That is to say that Congress was not engaged in attempting to write a law or interpret one on this subject, but merely expressing its opinion as to what ought to be done in the premises. Congress! Congress! What a senseless and useless body, from the President's viewpoint. But the President further says:

I can assure the country that this item will neither limit nor in any way embarrass the actions of the Department of Justice—

in dealing with these labor fellows and their organizations. After the President had thus delivered himself labor had an awakening, but hoped for better things. So by and by the so-called Clayton antitrust bill came before Congress. Labor wanted Congress in this bill to do more than "merely express an opinion" on what it thought its rights under the law ought to be; so it insisted, and insisted strenuously, that there should be some real "labor exemptions" put in that bill and not mere empty words or expressions of opinion. The Judiciary Committee and the Democratic leaders refused to incorporate into the bill the provision desired by labor. A fight with the administration was imminent. It looked like there was going to be a regular knockdown and drag-out battle. The situation was interesting. A good deal of hotfooting went on from Capitol Hill to the White House. Numerous conferences were held in the hope of reaching an agreement. Finally there was incorporated in the so-called Clayton antitrust bill this provision:

Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations instituted for the purposes of mutual help and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws.

It will be remembered that the Supreme Court had held that the Sherman antitrust law did not exempt labor organizations from its operation. The court held in the Danbury hatters' case that such organizations were combinations in restraint of trade and therefore unlawful and liable for threefold damages. Labor wanted its organizations taken out from the operation of the Sherman antitrust law. Whether the provision as incorporated in the Clayton bill meets labor's grievance is a question for the courts to decide. The President says that it "grants no privilege not already enjoyed." One paper said, speaking of the provision:

It was frankly stated at the White House yesterday that the compromise provision was not an exemption provision; that, in other words, the labor unions would not be exempted from prosecution under the Sherman law.

When the President's views as to this provision in the Clayton bill became known to labor and the farmers, they wondered if they had not been handed a gold brick. That the President's position was hostile there seemed no further room to doubt.

THE EVILS OF UNDESIRABLE IMMIGRATION.

But this by no means tells the entire story. For many years organized labor, among others, has insisted that there was too much cheap labor being imported into this country; that the number ought to be greatly curtailed. Those favoring legislation to this end have practically agreed that what is known as the reading, or literacy, test is the best adapted for this purpose. There have been seven record votes in the House and five in the Senate on this question. On an average the House votes stood 192 to 73 favoring the reading test, while the average of the Senate vote was 52 to 19. As recent as January 15, of this year, this House sent this illiteracy-test bill to the President on the decisive vote of 227 to 94, although it was known by this House at the time that the President was opposed to the reading test for the admission of immigrants to this country.

The Senate has spoken in equally emphatic terms, having passed the bill after four weeks' fight by a vote of 50 to 7, notwithstanding the President's known opposition to it. The President has returned the bill to the House without his signature, accompanying it with a veto message. It is openly stated that the patronage whip has been suspended over the heads of Members in the hope of lashing them into line to support the President's veto. If the Clerk here should now begin to call the roll of this House, the A's on the Democratic side would not be passed before there would be found men with whom this matter had been talked over at the White House and their support of the President's veto earnestly insisted upon, notwithstanding the fact that they have committed themselves for it, voiced their convictions for it, and expressed the wish and will of their constituents by previously voting for it. And why the President should now disapprove the literacy test is, as I remarked at the outset, passing strange. As a private citizen, as an author and writer of books, aye, even as a presidential candidate, it seems that he entertained different views from the ones now absorbing his mind, and no doubt by his historical writing and campaign speeches induced confiding constituencies to entertain the expectation that this

needed legislation would meet a different fate at his hands. In his History of the American People, volume 5, page 212, we find this language, speaking of the character of immigrants that now come to this country:

The census of 1890 showed the population of the country increased to 62,622,250, an addition of 12,466,467 within the decade. Immigrants poured steadily in as before, but with an alteration of stock which students of affairs marked with uneasiness. Throughout the century men of the sturdy stocks of the north of Europe had made up the main strain of foreign blood which was every year added to the vital working force of this country or else men of the Latin-Gallic stocks of France and northern Italy, but now there came multitudes of men of the lower class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland—men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence—and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population, the men whose standards of life and of work were such as American workmen had never dreamed of hitherto.

The people of the Pacific coast had clamored these many years against the admission of immigrants out of China, and in May, 1892, got at last what they wanted—a Federal statute which practically excluded from the United States all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence; and yet the Chinese were more to be desired, as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.

He says, from the character of immigrants that have recently been coming to our shores, that it looks—

as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hopeless elements of their population—the men whose standards of life and of work were such as American workingmen had never dreamed of hitherto.

And the President, by his veto of the immigration bill, is refusing to close the door to the admission of the very class that he condemned. He says that they are a "coarse crew" that come "crowding in every year at our eastern ports." He had a chance to stop this "coarse crew" from crowding in each year at our eastern ports, but he has failed to avail himself of that opportunity. In its national platform, as far back as 1896, the Democratic Party said:

We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected declared unequivocally for the rights of labor and its protection.

Not only as a teacher, professor, and historian did Woodrow Wilson advocate and represent that he was a restrictionist, but as a candidate for the Presidency he gave the people of this country to understand that he stood for the very legislation contained in this bill. This identical measure passed the Senate April 19, 1912; was reported to the House by the House Committee on Immigration June 7, 1912; and therefore was pending before the House during the campaign, being an issue. Not only was it pending before the House, but the Democratic leaders of the House had announced that the bill would be put through the first thing in December, a special rule having even been agreed on. Candidate Wilson's immigration speech in New York City, September 4, 1912, contained among other things the following paragraph:

If we can hit upon a standard which admits every voluntary immigrant and excludes those who have not come of their own motion, with their own purpose of making a home and a career here for themselves, but have been induced by steamship companies or others in order to pay the passage money, then we will have what we will all agree upon as Americans. I am speaking to you as also Americans with myself, and just as much American as myself, and if we all take the American point of view, namely, that we want American life kept to its standards, and that only the standards of American life shall be standards of restriction, then we are all upon a common ground, not of those who criticize immigration, but those who declare themselves Americans. I am not saying that I am wise enough out of hand to frame the legislation that will meet this idea. I am only saying that it is the ideal, and that is what we ought to hold ourselves to. * * * Of course, if the immigrants are allowed to come in uninstructed hosts and to stop at the ports where they enter and there to compete in an oversupplied labor market, there is going to be unhappiness, there is going to be deterioration, there is going to be everything that will be detrimental to the immigrant.

That was his declaration on the stump and in New York City before the editors and sympathizers of the so-called American Association of Foreign Language Newspaper Editors, who were attacking him almost daily as a restrictionist. Brave words. Note his language, saying that the "Standards of American life *shall* be the standards of restriction." With this very bill passed the Senate and pending on the House calendar, and with our State compulsory school-attendance laws and public-school system as one of America's fundamental institutions and standards, there is only one thing such language could mean to the average voter, and that was that Candidate Wilson stood for requiring as much of foreigners as we compel of our own native-born in the way of an elementary education, in order to better fit them for earning a living, worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and intelligently participating in our public affairs.

What a shock this veto must be to the friends of this bill who were misled into thinking that Woodrow Wilson was a restrictionist! What a revelation it must be to them to read and hear that the President feels himself "pledged" to veto this splendid measure! And how roughly handled they must feel when they read accounts such as that in the Boston Evening Transcript of January 28 last, stating that "it is charged even by Democrats that the administration is 'picking off' men from the ranks of the friends of the bill, and the opponents of the literacy test declare that this 'teamwork' in the Cabinet * * * will be successful." But it is not a "long way to" the next presidential election, and the voters' hearts are "right there."

The Boston Transcript in a recent editorial had this to say:

The somersault of Mr. Woodrow Wilson on the immigration plank should surprise no one. It is only the latest illustration of the politician reversing the position of the historian. For 20 years as teacher and writer of history he wrote against "the alien invasion" and brought to bear the heaviest guns of his rhetoric against this "menace." After two years of silence in the White House, which no committee of Congress was able to break, the President has finally announced his opposition to the immigration bill, which has passed the House and is before the Senate, on the ground that it carries a literacy test. Before deciding to pass the enactment up to the President for his veto, we hope the Senate will sound the White House with a view to ascertaining what form of restriction the President would suggest, or whether his somersault on the subject is so complete that he to-day favors a continuance of unrestricted immigration.

The President by his veto says he favors the continuance of unrestricted immigration; for in his opposition to the literacy test, he opposes the most feasible method of restricting immigration.

It will be remembered that a few years ago Congress created an Immigration Commission to investigate this whole subject, and particularly the feasibility of the literacy test. This commission, after an extensive investigation both in this country and in Europe costing $1,000,000 and covering a period of four years, made a voluminous report covering 42 volumes, and in that report among other things said:

A majority of the commission (8 out of the 9) favored the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

This commission composed of both Republicans and Democrats, unanimously recommended to Congress that immigration be restricted. The commission unanimously agreed and reported that there was "an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries of this country." Congress and the country both agree that the influx of undesirable immigrants to this country ought to be stopped.

In the last 18 years, either the House or the Senate has 19 times emphatically declared for the reading test. In the years 1912–13 the House of Representatives favored the literacy test by a vote of 178 to 52, and the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8.

The bill that the President has just vetoed because of the literacy test was passed by the House by a vote of 252 to 126, and by the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7. We have heard a good deal said by the Democratic Party in recent years about letting "the people rule." They have gone before the country seeking its suffrage with that as a slogan. President Wilson has himself boasted much of that principle as one of his virtues, yet the fact remains that the principles embodied in no measure have been so long before the American people; have been so well understood by them; or have been indorsed by so many of them as the principles embodied in the immigration measure vetoed by the President. If this measure is not indorsed by the body of the American people and their Representatives in Congress, no important measure that ever became a law has ever been.

President Wilson in vetoing the immigration bill said:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so.

The American people have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants daily coming to our shores, but I deny that in so doing they are reversing "the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them."

Let us look first into the question as to whether or not the American people have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants that yearly crowd our shores, over 1,000,000 in number. Away back in 1896, nearly 20 years ago, when the evils of immigration were not so great and not so well understood as now, the Republican Party in its national platform of that year not only demanded a restriction of immigration but specifically indorsed the reading and writing test as a means to accomplish that end. In the Republican national platform of 1900 we find this language:

In the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands—

And so forth.

In his first message to Congress in 1901, ex-President Roosevelt said:

> The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test.

The Republican national platform of the year 1912, the latest expression of the party on the subject, reads as follows:

> We pledge the Republican Party to the enactment of appropriate laws to give relief from the constantly growing evil of induced or undesirable immigration, which is inimical to the progress and welfare of the people of the United States.

And I want to say that a Republican Congress promptly after the election of 1896 passed an illiteracy test bill, which was vetoed by a Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, and that such a bill would now be law if proportionately as many Democrats as Republicans would vote or had voted for the measure.

The Democratic Party—the party of the President—in its national Democratic platform in 1896, said:

> We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

The Democratic platforms of 1900 and 1904 both demand more stringent immigration laws of one sort or another, and yet after all this the President is not advised as to what the American people want, and asks in his short veto message of this long bill: "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction?"

After that part of the immigration bill to which the President objects has been favorably acted upon divers times by both branches of Congress, and by overwhelming majorities, still the President says he is not advised as to the desire of the American people upon this subject. If the representatives of the American people in this and previous Congresses have properly reflected the views of their constituents by their votes on this question, the President ought to be advised.

Now let me answer, if I can do it, the President's second proposition, namely, that in its insistence upon the literacy or other arbitrary tests Congress is "reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before." I take issue with that statement of the President. With due deference to him and his great learning, I say that he is wrong.

From the first settlement of this country down to about 1838 immigrants came here as a matter of course. This country had no policy upon the immigration question up to that time. In that year the House of Representatives agreed to a resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee of the House to consider the propriety of passing a law prohibiting the importation of vagabonds and paupers into this country. Then and there we took steps against admitting paupers and vagabonds.

If we had any policy of admitting them up to that time, it was then reversed. In the meantime a number of the States had begun to pass laws restricting immigration, notably, New York, Massachusetts, California, and Louisiana. These States saw most of immigrants and immigration and were the first to see and feel its evil effects. But their laws differed one from another. Each State had its own peculiar notion as to who ought to be debarred. It was soon apparent that the problem was too big for the individual States to handle; that it was national in its scope. The constitutionality of a number of the State laws reached the Supreme Court of the United States for final decision, and on March 20, 1876, that court, in a very unusual decision, said:

> We are of the opinion that this whole subject—
>
> Of immigration—
>
> has been confided to Congress by the Constitution; that Congress can more appropriately and with more acceptance exercise it than any other body known to our laws, State or National; that by providing a system of laws in these matters applicable to all ports and to all vessels a serious question which has long been a matter of contest and complaint may be effectively and satisfactorily settled.

Then came efforts of the States to restrict immigration until such was held unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court, since which day Congress has been passing one immigration bill after another, and each of them has been more stringent and more exclusive of immigration than the preceding ones.

The law of August 3, 1882, among other things, provided that each immigrant to this country should pay a head tax of 50 cents; that "lunatics, idiots, convicts except for political offense, and persons likely to become a public charge" should not be permitted to land. Another reversal of our traditional policy, Mr. President.

The law of February 26, 1885, forbade the importation of contract labor to this country. The law of February 23, 1887, gave the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to deport within one year from landing any alien who had come to this country contrary to the provisions of the contract-labor act.

The act of March 3, 1891, added to the list of aliens heretofore excluded the following: Those "suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease," "polygamist," and those "whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come," with certain exceptions. Steamship companies were forbidden by this act to solicit or encourage immigration. I wonder if the President would regard this as the reversal of a policy or the establishing of one?

In 1894 Congress passed an act raising the head tax of immigrants from 50 cents to $1 each.

On March 3, 1903, Congress passed another act raising the head tax to $2, and made it unlawful to assist in the entry or naturalization of alien anarchists.

On February 20, 1907, Congress passed another law further restricting undesirable immigrants. This is the last important law passed by Congress and signed by the President. It adds very materially to the classes of immigrants to be excluded. Not including those heretofore mentioned, it says the following, among others, shall be excluded: "Feeble-minded persons," "epileptics," "insane persons," "persons likely to become a public charge," "professional beggars," "prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or other immoral purposes." With but one single exception, every law passed by the Congress of the United States from the day and hour that it began to legislate upon the subject of immigration has been a law of restriction, and each law adding to the excluded classes of immigrants. The single exception, to which I have referred, was the law passed in 1864. It was a law passed to encourage the importation of contract labor; but it was repealed, however, in 1868, four years after its passage. In the face of this record and these facts, how can the President say that in adding the literacy or reading test we are reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before us? We are not reversing their policy, but sustaining their policy, in further excluding some 250,000 of the 1,000,000 or more immigrants that are annually coming to this country. Few there be, I think, who will contend that further restriction of immigrants is not desirable.

I will not go into the voluminous 41-volume report of the Congressional Immigration Commission further than to briefly answer the arguments of those who maintain that existing immigration law is sufficient by quoting what the commission, which employed trained experts, expended a million dollars in a searching inquiry, and spent four years gathering together indisputable proof of the following conclusion of the commission, says in its first partial report, namely, House Document 1489, under the heading, "The Immigration Law and Its Administration":

> It is generally admitted by those acquainted with the subject that, notwithstanding the fact that the present law proposes to provide for the exclusion of every undesirable immigrant, *many undeniably undesirable persons are admitted every year.* The commission's inquiries concerning defective and delinquent classes show this fact very clearly and in a way which, it is believed, will be thoroughly understood and appreciated. In theory the law debars criminals, but in fact many enter; the law debars persons likely to become public charges, but data secured by the commission show that too many immigrants become such within a short time after landing. The same is true of other classes nominally, at least, debarred by the law. In short, the law, in theory, so far as its exclusion provisions are concerned, is exceptionally strong, but in effect it is in some respects *weak and ineffectual.* The commission has discovered several sources of this weakness; it is its purpose to find the others and to recommend some effective remedies.

I have here the New York World of February 1, 1915, which contains a long editorial, entitled, "Over 8,000 alien insane," and which declares that these 8,000 alien insane "represent a burden from which" the taxpayers of the Empire State are "entitled to be relieved." The World estimates that these alien insane impose an annual financial burden on the taxpayers of New York State of about $2,000,000. New York State officials have testified before committees of Congress that it is about $4,000,000, or, in other words, that about one-sixth of all the taxes levied in New York for State purposes are levied for the care and keep of insane. This bill would lift millions of dollars of taxes from the shoulders of the taxpayers of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other Northeastern States, and tend to prevent the dumping of mental and physical degenerates upon this country, whose progeny will simply water the lifeblood of this country, as well as overburden our taxpayers.

The two dominant political parties in their national platforms have for years been pledging to the American people more stringent immigration laws. The Immigration Commission, after four years' investigation, both in this country and in Europe, unanimously reported in favor of further restricting immigration to this country, declaring: "The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of

the commission" (Vol. I, p. 48). Congress has frequently so declared itself, and more than one attempt has been made to pass such bills over Executive veto. And if it be admitted that further restriction is desirable, ought it not in all fairness be applied to the least desirable element of our immigration? In this immigration problem we have got to deal with classes and not individuals. To say that an illiterate class of citizens is more desirable than an educated class gives the lie to the favored boast of Americans that we are an educated and enlightened citizenry. If ignorance is better and more preferable in our citizens than enlightenment, we had better tear down our institutions of learning and abolish our boasted public-school system in America. If to fit our own American boys and girls for proper and efficient American citizenship we expend annually on them in tuition alone some $500,000,000, have we not a right to demand that immigrants coming to this country who are over 16 years of age shall at least be able to read some language or dialect? The American citizen who can not even read or write, but who has been reared in America, surrounded by Americans, and who has observed the workings of its Government, caught the spirit of its institutions, imbibed its lofty ideals, and inherited its progress and freedom is infinitely better prepared for wholesome American citizenship than any illiterate foreigner possibly could be.

The bill the President has vetoed makes 200 changes in the immigration laws, 50 of which are big changes. The President recognizes the force and value of these, for in his veto message he said:

> This bill is in so many respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

Why should the President destroy, so far as in his power lies, a bill which he concedes to be a good one. He admits that "the bill is in many respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable," and yet he vetoes it! He says he does it because it reverses a "policy of generations that have gone before." Instead of Congress "reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them," has not the President reversed their policy? Has not he also reversed the policy of his own party? The Democratic Party, in its national platform of 1896, said:

> We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

That declaration of principles of the Democratic Party has at no time been recalled or reversed. It is the policy of the Democratic Party to-day, if its declaration of principles in national convention assembled mean anything. A majority of the Democrats in both House and Senate voted to redeem their party's pledge, but the President, exercising his constitutional right, says, "No."

I believe it was Louis XIV of France who once said: "I am the State." The President expresses it differently when he says: "I am the captain of the team." And I agree that the President is "the captain of the team." When he tells the boys to "play ball," they usually "play ball."

BROKEN PLATFORM PLEDGES.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was nominated and elected said:

> We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

It is said that Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri, the present chairman of the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, wrote that plank of the Democratic platform. Mr. SHACKLEFORD was in earnest about it. He really thought that the Democratic Party intended to carry out that pledge to the country. He went ahead and passed a bill through the House many, many moons ago looking to that end. It would be embarrassing to ask the gentleman from Missouri what has become of his bill? He would hate to tell you that the President had put the cold hand of death upon it. Mr. SHACKLEFORD's good-roads bill has not been passed by the Senate. It will not be. Did not the President tell Senator SWANSON that they did not have the money for the roads legislation? Yet the Democratic Congress has at the President's suggestion passed a law whereby the United States Government is to spend $40,000,000 in railroad building in Alaska, and now he is trying to jam through a bill appropriating $50,000,000 with which to buy ships for the shipping interests; now, and in these times when the people are forced to pay war taxes when their country is at peace with the whole world.

The Democratic platform upon which the President was elected did not call for these expenditures, but it did call for Federal aid to State and local authorities in the construction of good roads. The lost Shackleford good-roads bill called for $25,000,000 for this purpose. The Democratic administration did not have $25,000,000 to spend on good dirt roads here in the several States, but did have $40,000,000 to spend on railroads in Alaska.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

But these are not the only broken promises of the Democratic Party to the American people. They said in their Baltimore platform:

> We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

This is what Democracy in its national platform declared for in 1912, and is what President Wilson stood for before he was elected President. I shall read the President's speech made to the 2,500 farmers at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912:

> One of the great objects in cutting that great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports, to allow all the farmers on what I may, standing here, call this part of the continent, to find an outlet at ports of the Gulf or the ports of the Atlantic seaboard, and then have coastwise steamers carry their products down around through the canal and up the Pacific coast or down the coast of South America.
>
> Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it has passed the House—provides for free toll for American ships through that canal and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company. You see the object of that, don't you? [Applause.] We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.

It will be remembered that the Democratic House of Representatives had passed the Panama Canal tolls bill before the Democrats met in national convention at Baltimore in July, 1912. The Democratic national convention indorsed what the House had done by inserting in its platform the Panama Canal tolls plank to which I have made reference. The day before the President made his speech to the 2,500 farmers at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912, indorsing what the Democratic House had done and what the Democratic national convention had declared for, the Senate also passed the bill, and the President indorsed that. But after the President was elected he came hat in hand up on Capitol Hill one day where the House and Senate was in session and said: "Boys, we've got to take her back. Acting under your oaths as legislators, you said that American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal should not pay any toll. The Democratic platform upon which I was nominated and elected declared for the same thing. I declared for the same thing in my speeches before election. I have not forgotten what I said to those New Jersey farmers and the country before election, but we've got to take it all back. I can not tell you why this is so, but I have reversed myself on the question of tolls of American ships passing through the canal, and you must reverse yourselves. You have already jumped through the hoop and passed the law. I shall have to ask you to jump back through the hoop again and undo what you have done. I shall have to ask you to pass a law to make American ships pay tolls." The law was passed. The "crow" was eaten, but few, if any, of the legislators have ever known why it was necessary.

RURAL CREDITS.

But this is only a part of the story. The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected said:

> Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits, or agricultural finance. We favor legislation permitting national banks to loan a reasonable portion of their funds on real estate security.

The Democratic Party promised the farmer that if elected and given power to legislate this law should be passed. The farmer, among others, did help to put the Democratic Party in power. They thought they were going to get some genuine rural-credits legislation, but they have not gotten it. The President says he favors such legislation. He said on December 2, 1913, in his message to Congress:

> I present to you, in addition, the urgent necessity that special provision be made also for facilitating the credits needed by the farmers of the country; what they need and should obtain is legislation which will make their own abundant and substantial credit resources available as a foundation for joint, concerted local action in their own behalf in getting the capital they must use. It is to this we should now address ourselves. We must add the means by which the farmer may make his credit constantly and easily available and command when he will the capital by which to support and expand his business. We lag behind many other great countries of the modern world in attempting to do this. Systems of rural credit have been studied and developed on the other side of the water while we left our farmers to shift for themselves in the ordinary money market. You have but to look about you in any rural district to see the result—the handicap and embarrassment which have been put upon those who produce our food.

And at the very time the Federal reserve bill was being perfected by the House Committee on Banking and Currency did not certain members of it—particularly Representatives NEELEY of Kansas, WINGO of Arkansas, and RAGSDALE of South Carolina—insist that a provision be inserted in the Federal reserve bill carrying out the pledge in the Democratic platform as to rural credits, and did not the President send the majority leader, the gentleman from Alabama, OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, to those men to assure them that if they would not insist in incorporating rural-credits legislation in the Federal reserve bill that he would help them and those interested in the question to pass it in a separate bill? So far it has not been passed, and I see no prospect of early action. Every one here says and knows that the President is now opposed to putting the Government back of rural credits and will not approve a bill that puts the Government back of freeing and making available the farmers' credit to the same extent that the Federal reserve act puts the Government back of the business man's and banker's credit.

The Democrats passed the currency law, and in their platform they said:

Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits, or agricultural finance.

But the farmers have to wait. They have waited for about two years, and how much longer they will have to wait no one knows.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The last national Democratic platform pledged the Democratic Party to reduce the "high cost of living" if intrusted with power. The Democratic platform said, and the Democratic orators said, that the high cost of living was due to the "robber protective tariff" that the Republicans had foisted upon the country to fatten the rich and rob the poor. The Democrats have taken that "robber protective-tariff law" from the statute books, and in its stead have substituted one of their own, and the cost of living has been getting higher day by day ever since.

The Washington Post, a Democratic newspaper, on yesterday said that May wheat is selling in Chicago at $1.65 per bushel, the highest price recorded in Chicago for years, and that "stale bread, known as the poor man's loaf, which has hitherto retailed at 5 cents for two loaves, to-day advanced to 3 cents a loaf."

REPUBLICAN EXTRAVAGANCE.

The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore said:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses.

And yet the appropriations made by the Democratic Party since it came into power have exceeded in amount anything that the Republicans had ever dreamed of. And notwithstanding the Democratic income-tax law and the so-called "war-tax" law—both direct-taxation money raisers—it is said that the Democratic Party will run this Government in the "hole" by the 1st of June of this year about $80,000,000, and the appropriations will exceed those of any previous Congress.

TERM OF PRESIDENT.

It is not necessary to proceed further with the broken pledges of the Democratic Party. But I can not refrain from speaking of at least one more.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected said:

We favor a single presidential term. * * * We pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

It is in the power of the President to keep inviolate at least one of the pledges of the Democratic platform upon which he was elected. He can refuse to be a candidate for reelection. But he is going to break that plank. "His hat is already in the ring," say his close friends and political advisors. He is now an avowed candidate for reelection. He will be nominated by his party and defeated at the polls. He can not survive the record made by himself and party. They have made and broken too many promises. In their Baltimore platform the Democrats said:

Our platform is one of principles. * * * Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign.

On August 15, 1912, during the campaign the President said:

Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. * * * It means business; it means what it says.

The American people will not soon again intrust with power the party and its candidate that have to their credit so many betrayed trusts and broken promises. [Applause.]

A traveling man down in my district not long ago looked over his half-filled order book at the end of a hard day's work and said:

The Democrats may be honest men, but I'll be d—d if they've got sense enough to run this Government.

[Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr SWITZER]. Call it two minutes, and he will yield back what he does not use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] is recognized.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I have always favored protection to American industry, in the belief that it resulted in protection to American labor. Holding such a view and keeping in mind the fact that one of the great objects sought in granting protection to American industry is to give indirect protection to American labor, I feel that as a protectionist I should support all legislation that will give reasonably direct protection to the laboring classes of this country.

I voted to pass a similar bill over the veto of ex-President Taft, and I intend to vote to pass this bill over the veto of President Wilson. [Applause.]

The need of diversified industries in order that we may be self-supporting and independent of other nations is now being accentuated because of the war raging in Europe.

The object of a protective tariff is to build up, diversify, and maintain American industries, and give to the American laborer an opportunity for employment at a wage sufficiently remunerative to enable him to maintain our standard of living and lay something by for a rainy day.

A protective tariff law has always increased the opportunity to obtain employment, resulting in increased wages, and has always brought thrift and prosperity to the people; and a free-trade tariff law has always produced the opposite result—closed factories and mines, depressed business, and created an army of the unemployed stretching across the country from ocean to ocean. At least such has been the actual working out of these two opposing policies during the past 25 years of our history.

I am therefore thoroughly convinced that the products of American factories, mines, forests, and the farm should be protected from free competition with like products of low-paid foreign labor by the imposition of reasonable tariff duties on the imported article, to the end that American labor may readily find employment and that such employment be fairly safeguarded.

The pending measure seeks to directly protect labor, and what is particularly denominated common labor, from the unrestricted influx of unskilled labor from Europe, and especially from the eastern and southern parts of Europe. While the bill carries many provisions increasing in innumerable ways our present protection against the insane, physically and mentally defective, the diseased, the pauper, contract labor, and against the degenerate, immoral, and criminal classes, its primary object is to afford some additional protection to the laboring classes of our country by providing the "literacy test," requiring all immigrants to pass an examination in reading before they shall be allowed to enter our gates. It is claimed by those who have given the subject careful study that the past enforcement of the "literacy test" would have barred from this country yearly at least 300,000 of the great horde of immigrants that have been landing on our shores during the past few years, a class which has come into direct competition with the common labor of this country.

While I dislike very much to discriminate against the man who can not read, as he frequently makes an excellent citizen, and is usually a hard-working and honest man, still the Immigration Commission after a long investigation and research have been unable to discover a better method for restricting this great stream of immigrants which has been pouring into our country year after year until their increased numbers have crowded out of employment the American laborer and augmented the army of our unemployed by the hundreds of thousands, contributing to the want and distress from which our laboring classes are now suffering.

Our country has been the asylum for the oppressed of all lands. We have been generous to the distressed of all countries, whether the result of religious persecution, war, famine, pestilence, or other calamities that have overtaken them, and we have given bountifully of our substance and have frequently extended over them the protective arm of our Government, and our enlightened sympathies and high sense of duty to humanity will cause us to quickly and amply respond to such demands in the future; but we must look to the safeguarding of our own household in order to insure our future ability to respond to such demands by adopting those policies which will promote thrift and prosperity and save American institutions from the slough of decay through an overassimilation of the uneducated and in many instances un-American notions of civil liberty.

The perpetuity of a representative government depends upon the intelligence of its citizenship, and we therefore spend millions of dollars for the cause of education and in building up our great public-school system, and it seems to me that so long as

we have thousands of laborers unemployed and who are clamoring for work at even a living wage we ought to attempt to check that stream of immigration which not only adds largely to this army of the unemployed, but which tends to offset the benefits derived from our public-school system, and which lowers the standard of intelligence of the American electorate.

The percentage of illiteracy in certain European countries is much higher than in the United States, while in some it is considerably lower. According to the census of the United States for 1910, of the entire population of 10 years of age and over, 7.7 per cent were illiterate; of the whites, 5 per cent were illiterate; and of the negroes, 30.4 per cent. Among the foreign-born whites 12.7 per cent were illiterate, as compared with 3 per cent among the native whites.

The report of the Immigration Commission published in 1911 discloses that in 1900 Austria's per cent of illiterate was 23.8; Belgium, 21.9 per cent; Hungary, 41 per cent; Portugal, 75.1 per cent; Servia, 83 per cent; Spain, 63.8 per cent; Italy, 48.5 per cent in 1905; Roumania, 61.4 per cent in 1899; and Russia, 72 per cent in 1897.

The "literacy test" is aimed at the streams of immigration coming from the large illiterate populations of the eastern and southern European countries.

By excluding "all aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish, with certain exceptions," we expect to check the avalanche of immigrants that has been pouring in upon us during the past few years.

Ex-President Taft based his veto of the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill on the reasons set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Mr. Nagel, which accompanied his veto message. Mr. Nagel contended that the "literacy test" would be difficult of enforcement and would entail a considerably increased expense on the part of the Government, and he further contended that—

> We need labor in this country, and the natives are unwilling to do the work which the aliens come over to do.

He evidently believed that we were in no danger of an oversupply of laborers, for in the conclusion of his letter he says in part, referring to the "literacy test," that—

> It is based upon a fallacy in undertaking to apply a test which is not calculated to reach the truth, and to find relief from a danger which does not really exist.

While industrial conditions under the administration of ex-President Taft were so prosperous as to lead him, as well as his Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to feel that we were in no danger from an oversupply of labor, no one will claim that these conditions obtain to-day. President Wilson, while vetoing the present bill because of the "literacy test," has been compelled to seek other reasons for his action than those set forth by ex-President Taft. He states that it is a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, and that—

> In this bill it is proposed to turn away from the tests of character and quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict.

The primary object in enacting the proposed legislation is to protect the American laborer from direct competition with the foreign laborer. I know of no way of doing this except by some method which will exclude or restrict the foreigner from coming into this country. All protective measures must be to some extent arbitrary in their application.

President Wilson states if this country desires to adopt an arbitrary policy of restriction that we have a perfect right to do so. But he seems to doubt that there is a universal sentiment throughout the Nation for such a policy. This proposition has been before the American people for the past 20 years, and has been the subject of thorough investigation by a commission appointed by Congress, whose work extended over a number of years, with the result that this test was recommended by a majority of the commissioners. It has been considered time and again by the thousands of farm, labor, and patriotic organizations throughout the country, and has been universally indorsed by these bodies. It carried by more than a two-thirds vote in the Senate of the last Congress over the veto of President Taft, and lacked but a few votes of receiving a two-thirds vote in the House. It received more than a two-thirds vote in the House at this session of Congress, and practically a unanimous vote in the Senate, the vote being 50 for and 7 against the proposition. I know of no better index of the sentiment of the people upon this question than the overwhelming majorities cast in its favor during this and the last Congresses. It does not seem to me to be possible that so large a number of the Senators and Representatives of these two Congresses could be mistaken as to the sentiment of their respective constituencies. I feel sure that there is an overwhelming sentiment in my district in favor of the passage of this bill, as I have had numerous letters of individuals and resolutions of patriotic and labor organizations urging its enactment, and not a single letter or remonstrance, verbal or written, to the contrary. I shall accordingly cast my vote to pass the bill over the veto of the President, believing that such a law will tend to bring some relief to the depressed labor conditions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back half a minute.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. RAKER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. To make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. SABATH. Will not the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I withdraw the point.

Mr. MOORE. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded by the suggestions just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] that labor organizations all over the country have petitioned this Congress to pass this bill over the President's veto. I am aware of the fact, however, that a large number of officials of labor organizations have worked up quite a sentiment in favor of the bill and in favor of overturning the President's veto. I presume that every Member of the House has had telegrams and letters from the officials of labor organizations to the effect that it was the duty of Congress to pass this legislation in the interest of labor.

But I beg to suggest, as every Member of the House knows, that it is very easy for one of the officials of the Federation of Labor here in Washington, by a few telegrams and letters on his part to subordinate officials over the country, to obtain this flood of telegrams and letters, which mean nothing so far as the sentiment of the rank and file of labor is concerned.

I do not hesitate to say, as one who has battled a long time for the cause of labor, that this illiteracy test does not reflect the judgment or the wishes of the rank and file of the toilers of this Nation deliberately formed. [Applause.] It does not reflect the cause of labor, which is more important. It does not reflect the best interests of labor, which is still more important.

How men in earnest, as I know men are, who have been leading the cause of union labor in this country can ever come to the unsound conclusion they have regarding this bill is beyond my comprehension. Their conclusion shows that they have not studied and do not understand the great underlying causes that have made the lot of the toiling man so hard to bear. They think, forsooth, that if they can pass some sort of legislation that will close the doors to competitors in labor that they thereby benefit the cause of labor. How foolish that idea is. Just as though the toiling man's wage is ever fixed by the number of toiling men willing to take the job. Do not men know that the wage of the laborer is not measured in such a way at all, but is measured by those fundamental laws that control the distribution of wealth and that divert the streams produced by labor and by land, those great laws regarding trusts, corporations, and transportation, and grain exchanges, all these great fundamental movements of commerce—those are the laws that congest into a few hands the wealth of the Nation and take unjustly from those who produce it; and the man is in the kindergarten class of politics and statesmanship who does not see and who does not understand that the cause of labor is measured, influenced, and controlled by the great laws of distribution of the products of labor, and reflect the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the laws controlling corporations and monopolies, laws measuring the tax imposed by transportation companies and marketing exchanges of the country, and not by the number of competitors.

Why, gentlemen, is it not clear to every thinking man that the welfare of labor is measured by how much of the products of labor the toiling men are able to hold as their reward for toiling? Is not that clear? Now, it is obvious that the wealth of the Nation is made by the toiling men altogether. Is it not equally clear that if you increase the number of toiling men by immigration you increase the aggregate wealth created for dis-

tribution? More men means more wealth produced; more toilers mean more necessities of life brought into existence to feed hungry men, to clothe shivering men.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that every man who creates wealth consumes the products produced by other toilers of the country, and thus is useful in two ways?

Mr. MANAHAN. An obvious thing; and yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that many men in this House are swayed by such an intolerant, narrow, and selfish point of view that they can not really comprehend that simple proposition of economics. Do not these intolerant men with prejudiced minds realize that if a million toiling men came in the next 10 years, this million toiling men will produce a mighty accumulation of what? Of the things that the laboring men need for their prosperity and comfort of life; food to eat, clothing to wear, shoes to wear, and houses in which to live.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman assumes that the million men will always be at work and all the others, also.

Mr. MANAHAN. I say in reply to the gentleman from Washington that he is not fit to sit as a representative of his constituents in this body if he does not realize that a wise Government would see to it that every willing man in the United States would have work to do, and plenty of it, if the great wealth of this Nation was not controlled by selfish, greedy men, and if the great opportunities of this Nation were opened up to the toiling men of the Nation. [Applause.]

The gentleman knows that in his own State of Washington there are acres and acres of valuable timber to be cut, hundreds of mines to be opened, dams to be built, bridges to be constructed, and with that unlimited field of human opportunity he has the effrontery to stand up and ask the question, Would it not be necessary for the Government to find employment for immigrants coming to our shores? What kind of statesmanship is it in this great arena that we possess in this country that allows so many men to remain out of employment? Why, gentlemen, in the State of Washington alone there are untold resources sufficient to give employment to every man who with wistful eyes in Europe turns this way hoping for an opportunity to make a home for himself and family.

If men coming in, or now here, fail to find opportunity to make homes for themselves the fault lies in our lack of statesmanship, in our lack of intelligence, in our lack of far-seeing patriotism that fails to open these opportunities to these men anxious and willing to work. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, of course, understands that there are a great many hundreds of thousands of men out of work now. What I want to know is how it will improve the conditions to add more to the already unemployed list?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANAHAN. That is two at once.

Mr. McKENZIE. My question will be short. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think the laboring men of America are competent to decide what is for their best interest; and, if so, why do they not oppose this legislation? [Applause.]

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the laboring men of America, if given a fair opportunity to have the question put up to them, are competent to decide, but I answer the gentleman by saying that it never has been put up to them. There is not a laboring man in the United States who will take issue with the fundamental statements that I have been making. There is not a laboring man in the United States who will not agree with me that the trouble with labor is not in the number of competitors, but in the selfish greed of big business that takes from him the fruits of his toil; there is not a laboring man anywhere on earth, in labor unions or outside of them, who does not know that he needs food to eat that must be grown by the toil of other men, that he needs clothes to wear that must be made by the toil of other men, that he needs a place in which to live that must be constructed by the muscle of fellow laboring men, and how does he think that he can get more food to eat or better clothing to wear or better houses in which to live by keeping from this country laboring men who are willing to grow food, make clothes, and build houses for him?

Coming to the question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], which asked how it would improve the condition of laboring men to have others come, I say this, that I thought I was making it clear that what laboring men needed was opportunity to work, and the man who says that in this country of ours there is not an opportunity for laboring men had better go back to the kindergarten and study elementary geography. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. What laws would the gentleman suggest that would bring this opportunity to the laboring man? We would like something specific on that score.

Mr. MANAHAN. That is a very simple proposition, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Kentucky would ask a question so elementary [laughter]; yet I ought not to say that I am surprised.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan rose.

Mr. MANAHAN. Oh, let me answer one question at a time. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] asked me for some suggestions, and I said at first that I was surprised that he should, but when I consider that he comes from a constituency where something in the neighborhood of 30 per cent of the people are illiterate I am not surprised. [Applause and laughter.] I should not have mentioned this argument, because, in a way, it is an argument in favor of the literacy test.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Would not a little Republican legislation also help?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. [Laughter.] The gentleman has no right to interrupt a speaker without first addressing the Chair.

The SPEAKER. That is true; but the gentleman from Minnesota has a right to yield if he desires; and if he does not desire to yield it is his business to indicate it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the gentleman, inasmuch as this is the only intelligent address we will have here, to take the floor and keep it, so that we may hear it fully.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to answer the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] as to the remedies that will give employment to the laboring men of this country. I will have to be very brief, but I say, first, that the full enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law would be one step in that direction. The destruction of monopolies in this country and the prevention of great corporations from exploiting the public by stock-watering manipulation of assets and indirect graft by their officials would be another step. Still another would be the lowering of freight rates instead of raising them [applause] and the squeezing out of the water in the stock of all public-service, and especially all transportation, companies. Another stupendous step would be the freeing of great market places from the intolerable monopolies that now control them and the encouragement of agriculture by placing the burden of taxation upon unused and undeveloped land. All of these would be steps in that direction. Another would be the opening up of the great natural resources of the country by the Government itself for the benefit of all the people. Why, this Government could put a million men to work building roads in this country—roads that would make the cost of living less to every toiling man; roads that would make the channels of commerce busy with the activities of both labor and capital; roads that would stimulate every line of industry; great roads over which could be hauled cheaply the fruits of the earth and the products of toil—not only roads, but the Government could construct great dams and public works of reclamation, irrigation, and drainage, where countless millions of men could work in the production of food and other necessaries of life for the common good of all and every man willing to work could get work. But, you say, would not that increase the taxes?

I have heard men ask foolish questions like that. I have heard Congressmen who considered themselves quite intelligent ask the simple question, How can the Government give laboring men employment without adding to the tax burden of the people? apparently unable to comprehend the simple proposition that every man who toils, whether he works for the Government or an ordinary employer, produces more wealth than he gets, and the whole Nation is richer by his toil, whether he works for the State or for private capital. If a million men come to this country and toil here for the next five years, whether they work for the Government on public works, or for railroads in transportation, or on the farms in raising crops, no matter where, they will increase the wealth of the country, the food supply for laborers, as well as increase the market for the manufactured product made by other toilers.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman suggests that the building of good roads throughout the country would greatly aid laboring men. I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that this House has already passed a measure of that character, which is now in the Senate, and that the President has put the cold hand of death upon it?

Mr. MANAHAN. I have no custody over the President's cold hand of death; I do not know anything about it. [Laughter.] But I can suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky and to the Democratic Members of this House that if nothing worse can be said about the President's record than by reference to this veto he is fortunate indeed as Chief Executive of this Nation, because I think that he has approached the highest point he has yet attained as President of the United States when he put the stamp of disapproval upon this un-American bill. [Applause.]

This phrase reminds me that there are in the United States quite an aggregation of men who style themselves patriotic orders of one sort or another, who have deluged the Congress by petitions and letters to pass this on the theory that everything but the old stock is un-American, arrogating to themselves a higher conception of American nationality than that held by men of foreign birth and their children. I know I dignify more than they deserve the bigoted leaders of these organizations by referring to them at all in this debate, but there are men in this House who are actuated by a sort of subtle fear that these so-called patriotic societies have influence commensurate with their intolerant gall and effrontery and that they may have some merit to back their claims to patriotism; but common sense applied to the known facts of American history shows that these intolerant men, of narrowed minds, of poisoned hearts, are themselves out of place in our free air, and have yet to grasp in the slightest degree the meaning of human liberty and the mission of this Government. What is the spirit of this Government that from its inception has made it what it is? It has been that sublime spirit of fraternity and kindness; of gentleness and asylum, as the President so well expressed it in his message of disapproval. It has been the very essence of sheltering and universal asylum that has made this country truly great. Why, what is a nation? Is it a matter of battleships and armies? Is it a matter of bank accounts or balances of trade? Is a nation measured by geography or by its material wealth? Not in the right conception of nationality. A nation is a spiritual thing, and when you gentlemen who favor this measure take the narrow, selfish point of view that because we have got a good thing in this country therefore we must exclude men from foreign lands from sharing it—when you take that material, selfish point of view you repudiate the essential principle of this Government and the spirit that gave it life at the beginning. Not only that, it is unwise economically as well as being unfair, un-Christian, and unkind.

Furthermore, I suggest that right now in the Old World is being enacted the most tragic illustration of the folly and insanity of the spirit of selfishness, such selfishness as even in our own land here and now actuate the men who are backing this measure; the selfishness of men who want to take the property of all men and hold it to themselves, of men who would profit by the gifts of Almighty God and to the exclusion of other men just as deserving in His sight. I say there is being enacted in Europe a tragic illustration of what comes to nations when they permit their destiny to be shaped by greed, avarice, and selfishness; when they permit the spirit of materialism to control them; when, with greedy hearts, they would take what somebody else produces, and take it by force of arms if necessary. You would not take it by force of arms, perhaps, yet you would hold it by this legislation. You would deny other men the opportunity to labor, to produce wealth from nature, under the same pretense of self-preservation that drives the mighty armies of Europe on one side or the other. Oh, the spirit of materialism and of greed, the spirit of avarice and of power, the spirit of selfishness! Oh, the selfishness of this bill—the brutal selfishness of it! It is a blind and ignorant selfishness, too, because instead of benefiting those who think they would be benefited it would injure them and make them more helpless in the grind of greed. But that does not relieve those who strive to destroy our Nation as the refuge of the oppressed of the odium of being actuated by selfish motives. That does not relieve them of the odium of seeking by this legislation to take away opportunities from other men just as deserving.

The President well said that the inspiration of this people from the beginning, the star of hope that led them through every difficulty, was always symbolic of universal brotherhood and of the equality of man. The immortal declaration penned by Jefferson that all men are created equal and endowed of certain inalienable rights, of life, property, and the pursuit of happiness, meant just what it said. Jefferson did not say all men within the confines of these 13 colonies are entitled to these rights, but he said all men. Thus spoke the philosopher when he was discoursing upon the rights of men as such, all men, whether they be from the south of Europe or from the north of Europe or from New England or Kentucky. So, I say that is the spirit of this great Nation, and a nation's greatness is measured by its spirit and not by its wealth or by its armaments or its bank account. You once inject into the spirit of a great nation the selfishness of exclusion, the selfishness of greed, the selfishness of appropriating what belongs by God's decree to all mankind, you once inject that into this Nation and it is the beginning of the end. Just as we are now witnessing on the far fields of Europe, where the best of the toiling men are being destroyed in mighty battalions, because their Governments and the Governments of their opponents permitted action to be taken along lines of selfishness for their own people without regard to the rights of other people. Until a nation is content with spiritual power and until it can recognize the rights of men as such regardless of where their cradle rocked, until a nation is content with power of serving all men created in the image and likeness of Almighty God, it has no place in history, and no credit in all the annals of time.

I only hope that this great Nation of ours will put behind it the spirit of greed, the spirit of selfishness, the spirit of imperialism and of power, and open its heart, as it did at the beginning, to the toiling sons of Europe, its honest men and honest women who seek opportunity to work and to live, and to do their full duty as human beings. If this Nation has the wisdom to do that all will be well. If we, its representatives to-day, have the wisdom to forget the manufactured sentiment, and the clamoring of bigoted men on the outside, we will sustain the President in his veto. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, there are but two propositions embodied in the President's message calling for consideration of the House at this time. The first proposition laid down by the President is inferentially, and almost expressly, that we owe an obligation to those foreign countries superior to the obligation which we owe to our own citizenship. [Applause.] He stands for the open door in immigration, subject to restriction only with reference to mental and physical defects and criminal tendencies.

Mr. Speaker, we have no such obligation. The question is the effect of unrestricted immigration upon our own citizenship and upon our economic conditions, and that, Mr. Speaker, is an obligation that we owe superior to that which we may owe to any general question of any general brotherhood of men. [Applause.] Our obligation, Mr. Speaker, to our own citizenship is to do that which is within our constitutional power to enlarge the opportunities for the average citizen of the United States, to do those things, Mr. Speaker, which will elevate the character of the citizenship of this Nation. And if unrestricted immigration will narrow the opportunities of the citizenshp now here, if its effects may be to lower the general character of the citizenship, then our obligation is to pass this bill over the veto of the President. Whether such would be the effect of the passage of this bill is a fair subject of discussion upon which patriotic men differ.

But the President in his message does not touch upon that question. It is simply the broad question of whether our superior obligation is to those abroad rather than to those now here. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] spoke of the selfishness of this kind of legislation. Why, Mr. Speaker, whatever our individual views may be, as a theoretical matter, it is our sworn duty to legislate for the people who have sent us here to represent them. And as for selfishness, it is the same kind of selfishness, sir, and none other, as the selfishness you exercise with reference to having a little greater care for the opportunities for the children of your own family than you have for the opportunities of the children of your neighbors. [Applause.] It is a proper kind of selfishness, and unless, sir, we have that kind of selfishness, if you choose to call it such, for the people of our own country, there is little hope, indeed, for our own future.

The next proposition, Mr. Speaker, that the President lays down is that he is not unalterably opposed to this legislation, but that the American people have never expressed themselves upon this subject. He says:

> Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I

make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is not going to use his time, and I therefore will yield the five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. He said:

Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances it would be assumed that a measure that was favored by one Congress by an overwhelming majority, an election had intervened, and another Congress elected by the people, and that second Congress by a two-thirds majority had expressed itself in the same way upon that subject—ordinarily, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that would be taken as some evidence of what the public sentiment was upon that question. But the President of the United States casts that all aside. So far as Republicans are concerned, he perhaps ought not to be condemned for casting their votes for this bill aside, for in his Indianapolis speech he said that the Republicans were either blind, misguided, or most of them ignorant. But the majority of you Democrats of both Houses have voted for this bill, voted for it two years ago, an overwhelming majority voted for it a short time ago, and what about you? Ought not th President of the United States to infer that you represent the sentiment of the people upon this question? But no; he says you do not represent the people. And perhaps he ought not to be condemned too greatly for that, because this is the first important measure that has reached the President of the United States where you have exercised your own judgment at all. It is the first measure that you have passed where you have not first obtained the consent of the President of the United States to pass it. And inasmuch as you did not first obtain his consent, it is natural enough that the veto message is here before us. He says it was not in a political platform. Suppose it was in a political platform, what would it amount to? I need not refer to some provisions that are in a present political platform, and there is not a Democrat looking me in the eye to-day who will say that some of the promises in the platform amounted to the snap of your finger. Perhaps the President takes the position that it shall be tried out in the next election, and that if the Democrats put this in their next platform and the President is defeated, that then it will be an expression that they do not want this legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, you might place in your next platform all the promises that the mind of man could conceive of, and among them this one, and the American people would not pay the slightest attention to that promise, because the test will be not the promises that you make in your platform but what you have done with the power that you have had while you have been in control.

Mr. Speaker, there is no direct referendum on this question. There can be none. And, indeed, if a defeat of a President of the United States who has vetoed this legislation is any indication of public sentiment on this question, I recall that President Taft two years ago vetoed this very bill, and that Taft is not the President of the United States to-day. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this legislation and have before on other occasions cast my vote against this bill. In doing so I have been prompted by the best of motives and the best of feeling for the best interests and the general welfare of my country and for the great body of people who are unable to plead here to-day for themselves. I come from the city of Chicago and the great West. The development of this part of our country and these States is the direct result of a policy that has been followed by our Government for over 125 or 130 years. We have grown and builded not by a policy of restriction, but by a policy of liberality and a policy of welcome for all who have come here to aid us. In my city are gathered representatives of most of the races coming from every section of the world; nearly every tongue is spoken; newspapers printed in most every foreign language are issued daily and weekly, and the effect of this has been for good and of great benefit; and in consequence of it we are solving the problems of the greater future of this country. The old theory of America for Americans I had hoped had long since passed away, and to-day new and more important issues were before us.

I was more than pleased with the President's veto of this bill, and the sentiments conveyed in his message are worthy of more than a passing thought. He has laid great stress upon the fact that the people of the United States have never had this issue presented to them, and it is true. I appeal to every man here to inquire if this is not a true statement. The message stated that while we are the Representatives of the people yet this issue was never submitted to be passed upon in a campaign at large before the people.

Persons and associations banded together and organized for mutual and economic purposes have unquestionably expressed opinions, but let us examine their protests. Are they not signed by the leaders of the interests, and not the voice or the wishes of the persons whom they pretend to represent? The great masses of our people, however, have not passed upon this question.

I have always believed in party fidelity and party loyalty, and I appeal to my friends on my side of the House to remember that we have a leader to-day in the White House who dares to express his opinion, and having expressed it appeals to us to sustain him. That chivalrous spirit ever makes a union successful and powerful. For over 50 years the Democratic Party has not been in power for any length of time, and during all of that period we have looked for a leader. I am saying nothing against any other parties, many members of which will stand back of the President to-day; but I do appeal to that unity of purpose, that unity of interest which the President is entitled to at this hour. It has been stated on this floor that both parties have in their platforms asserted the right of restriction of aliens. In reply to this I will only say that when the platform of my party is examined it will be found that the restrictions there mentioned were never intended to exclude those affected by the literacy test, but the dominant thought was to keep out the undesirables of Europe, and nothing more; and it is unjust to state, as has been stated here to-day, that the platforms of both parties are against the statements made by the President. All this is hardly true when you analyze the real object and intent. You gentlemen can not point to a single rostrum where an advocate stood representing either party submitting the issue as to the literacy test to the people as a part of his argument.

I am surprised at the woeful lack of knowledge that Members display here in regard to our foreign population by advocating this legislation. Do they know anything of those people? Have they ever lived among them to any extent? I do not think so.

I come from and live in a district that is made up entirely of foreigners. The Polish population in my district, the Italian population, the Jewish population exceed by far in numerical strength that of any single district in the United States. My district is in the very heart of the great populous and enterprising city of Chicago. Upon this district in finance, industry, and conveniences these great and progressive peoples by their sterling qualities of manhood and womanhood have impressed their enterprising individuality. And against these people, than whom no more moral or God-fearing people ever lived anywhere, we hear a lot of cheap talk, senseless tommyrot, which proves undeniably that those who declare these sentiments are grossly ignorant of the qualities of these peoples and convince the initiated that they positively do not know what they are talking about. [Laughter and applause.]

These people come here to better their condition, and they are positively doing it, and if you want any evidence of this fact come into my district and I will show you just as great churches, just as good schools, just as big banks, just as happy homes, and just as numerous and just as prosperous people as you can find anywhere upon God's footstool. [Applause.]

The youth of that district crowd the schools and colleges, preparing for all the learned professions of law, medicine, dentistry, pedagogy, and devoting their best mental energies to the study of the arts and sciences.

I see my friend from California [Mr. RAKER] smiling sardonically over there, as he always does when the plain truth is distasteful to him. He referred to some steamboat companies or shipping interests on the Pacific coast, telling us about the crews they employed upon their boats, but he did not tell us anything about the people who unload those boats upon the docks, the poor people who are compelled to unload them upon the docks, who are striving hard to better their conditions, and who have an interest in this matter. [Applause.]

The President's veto message is a masterly document, showing a breadth of vision and a wealth of information of which he has been able to secure possession by reason of the facilities at his disposal to accumulate it. His reasoning is sound, his argument unanswerable, and his patriotism unimpeachable. He has spoken in this ringing appeal with a clearness and a force that will inevitably convince anyone whose mind is free from prejudice and whose spirit is not burdened with intoler-

ance. He has spoken not for the present alone but for all time to come, blazing the way for future statesmen to build up a Nation here in our beloved America that is destined to become the most cosmopolitan, the most progressive, and the most prosperous that the sun, in all its course, has ever shone upon.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to express my sentiments, which will be subjective, rather than objective. I am the son of an immigrant. My father came to this country and he could only write his name. He was as sturdy and as honest a citizen and as useful a citizen as any man that I know of, and I, his humble son, will say, without egotism, that I have, in my humble way, done more for the general mass of the people to reduce the cost of living by championing fair and equitable transportation rates than I dare say any other man on the floor of this House [applause], because I have for twenty-odd years devoted myself to the subject of transportation, the currency of which everybody knows, or, rather, ought to know, is paramount to the currency of money in the development of our country. [Applause.]

I am surprised that you want to come here and legislate against a man who can not write because of the literacy test. Why do you not keep out the European goods? Why do you let them come in here at a less rate than is charged to transport domestic goods from interior points? Why, I was forced to buy goods in England simply because I could save $75 a car from Liverpool via Galveston to Denver instead of from New York via Galveston to Denver.

It is the same way with the express companies. The foreign parcel post, in conjunction with American express companies, will charge you $1.20 for a package of a certain kind, whereas our domestic express companies, shipping a similar package from New York to the same point or destination will charge you $1.75. On the foreign shipment our express companies receive but 24 cents. The parcel post comes along, and it is said it was introduced in order to reduce the cost of living. I am surprised that not one of you has gotten up here to challenge me and to say that these things that I have pointed out are not correct. Now, in order to prove these figures, I have repeatedly issued statement after statement; and now I wish in a concrete way to show you what is happening with the parcel post. I am surprised that the labor unions have not taken this matter up.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I understand the gentleman is in favor of this bill and its provisions as to exclusion, except as to the literacy test?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes. I say the literacy test is wrong—to hold that up——

Mr. RAKER. Is the gentleman in favor of the rest of the bill?

Mr. KINDEL. Oh, yes. I do not want criminals and imbeciles or other undesirables of that kind to be allowed to come to this country, but I am most emphatically opposed to the literacy test.

Now, I will show you what has happened in regard to the parcel post, which the Postmaster General has said reduces the cost of living. A 5-pound parcel from New York to Denver would cost 51 cents by parcel post; by express it is 37 cents. A 10-pound package from New York to my city of Denver would be $1.01 by parcel post, while by express it is 57 cents. A 20-pound parcel by parcel post would be $2.01 from Denver to New York, whereas by express it is 98 cents. A 50-pound parcel from New York to Denver would be $5.01 as against $2.22. Mind you, I am quoting the cost of transportation on edibles, the things that reduce the cost of living. And yet this administration has been for two years compounding and perpetuating this error, with all the rest of the inexplicable and irreconcilable rulings I complain of. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, section 19 of the pending immigration bill is so ambiguous and uncertain and so loosely drawn as to give unlimited power to the immigration authorities who have charge of deportation. Suppose, for instance, that an alien who, having been admitted to this country, has made application for citizenship papers, and the probabilities are that he would receive his final papers at the expiration of five years; then, perchance, some designing person would make complaint to the Bureau of Immigration that this alien, who is on the verge of receiving his final papers, was subject to some of the provisions of this bill, it would place in the hands of that bureau unlimited power. Perhaps some innocent female might be taken advantage of by the exercise of such a power—a power far exceeding any lettres de cachet issued during the reign of Louis XIV—and she might be deported without being given any fair notice whatever.

Under the existing law innocent women have been charged with crimes of which they were perfectly innocent and deported without any protection, and it is now time for legislators to prevent the enactment of such unjust and extraordinary laws and to properly protect the immigrant and to curb such enormous power as deporting anyone who has been in this country for a period of five years. No such power should be placed in the hands of any official or representative of the Government unless properly safeguarded, but as the proposed section is now drawn it gives unlimited power to officials to deport perfectly innocent persons. This section alone should be sufficient to sustain the presidential veto and thus defeat the measure.

The whole spirit and proposition of this bill is opposed to the principles of American institutions and the Democratic Party. Such a measure was one of the causes of our throwing off the yoke of Great Britain and bringing on the Revolution. In the Declaration of Independence the following is contained concerning the obstructions to immigration:

> He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States, for that purpose obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

And this very section which I refer to was one of the principles advocated by the immortal Jefferson.

I opposed a similar measure in the Sixty-second Congress and voted to sustain the veto of President Taft. In opposing such a bill I sustain the principles of the Democratic Party as laid down by Thomas Jefferson in his proclamation concerning foreigners, in which he said:

> It has been the wise policy of these States to extend the protection of their laws to all those who would settle among them of whatsoever nation or religion they might be, and to admit them to a participation of the benefits of civil and religious freedom; and the benevolence of this practice, as well as its salutary effects, renders it worthy of being continued in future times.

In writing to Citizen Genet, the representative of the French Government in this country, on the subject of free immigration Mr. Jefferson said:

> Our country is open to all men, to come and go peaceably when they choose.

And, again, in writing to Gen. Kosciusko on the same subject he said:

> The session of the First Congress, convened since republicanism has recovered its ascendency, * * * are opening the doors of hospitality to fugitives from the oppressions of other countries.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. LEVY. I can not yield.

Instead of abolishing the onerous shipping laws which are on the statute books at the present time, this bill intensifies them and makes them more obnoxious and more troublesome to our merchant marine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired?

Mr. LEVY. Can I have one more minute?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. LEVY. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will vote to sustain the veto of President Wilson, and by doing so they will be following the teachings of the father of Democracy—Thomas Jefferson.

The pending measure is very unfair to captains, masters, agents, and consignees of vessels, as it lays down intricate rules and regulations so difficult to construe as to make it almost impossible to conform thereto, thus interfering with the efficiency of our commerce and merchant marine service. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, what is the score, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The score is as follows: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has 47 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has 54, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 51 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has 28 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] has promised to yield to me three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How does the gentleman from California get his time?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think he gets it from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. I have yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], and it has just been stated to me that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is not going to occupy as much time as I thought, so at the end of the five minutes I hope to be allowed to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee a little more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That question will arise at that time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, we are called upon this afternoon to vote either for America or for the rest of the world. I am for America first, last, and all the time. [Applause.] We are called upon to decide by our votes whether we will legislate in the interest of our own beloved country; our own honest and deserving people; or in favor of foreign lands and alien people; whether our consideration, justice, and charity shall begin at home or on foreign shores; whether we prefer the interest and advancement of the native and naturalized American citizen or the far-away stranger from beyond the seas; whether we will favor the four or five millions of unemployed American workingmen, or whether we will favor more than a million of idle aliens who are landed upon our shores every 12 months by a greedy Steamship Trust. [Applause.]

When this bill was under consideration in this House a year ago, I read the following letter to show how aliens were used to underbid and take labor from our own people:

EDWARD HORVATH LABOR AGENCY,
124 EAST THIRD STREET,
New York City, October 4, 1913.

S. E. & H. L. SHEFERD CO.,
Rockport, Me.

GENTLEMEN: Foreign laborers are now available in this city for less wages than you can secure men for in your State.

Are you in need of any? If so, we can offer for immediate shipment any number of them of any desired nationality.

Trusting to hear from you, we are,

Very truly, yours, M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

After this letter was submitted, the gentleman from New York City [Mr. CANTOR] interrupted with this statement:

Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not an authorized labor agency at all. We are familiar with that letter. This is an old chestnut, 2 years old.

To prove that my statement was correct and the gentleman from New York was in error, I offer the following letter from the manager of the labor agency and a telegram from Commissioner Bell, who, under the law, issues licenses in New York City:

EDWARD HORVATH LABOR AGENCY,
New York City, February 1, 1915.

Hon. R. W. AUSTIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 30th ultimo, in which you inquire whether I am the manager of the Edward Horvath Labor Agency. In reply to the above I beg to advise that I am as yet the manager of the above concern, which has been in existence for the last six years, and is duly licensed and bonded by the city of New York in accordance with the law.

In connection with the above, permit me to express my surprise as to the knowledge of that particular New York Member of the House, who has informed you that our agency was not legal, without license, and a myth.

May I give you yet additional information which that particular Member of the House could not furnish to you?

Yours, very truly,

M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

NEW YORK, *February 2, 1915.*

R. W. AUSTIN, *Washington, D. C.:*

Edward Horvath Labor Agency, 124 East Third Street, is licensed and bonded according to law and was in 1913.

GEORGE H. BELL, *Commissioner.*

As further evidence along the line of this offer to furnish foreign laborers for lower wages in the State of Maine, of how these people are used after their arrival in this country, I call the attention of the House to what the members of a subcommittee of which I was a member, in investigating the coal strike in Colorado last spring, discovered. The proof shows the places of the miners in the first or original strike, occurring several years ago, were taken by foreigners who were shipped in from eastern cities, and in the last strike, in 1913, the strikers' places were filled by labor agents in Pittsburgh, Pa., furnishing foreign miners, some of whom admitted on the witness stand they had been in this country three or four months. When we had this immigration bill under consideration last February I read an article from the daily New York Times, showing there were 331,650 men out of employment in that city. Judge E. H. Gary, chairman of the executive committee of the unemployed, is authority for the statement that "from the best estimate, the number of unemployed in New York City is 200,000 larger than it was at the same time last year." So we now have over 530,000 idle men in that city alone, and the President favors a policy which means landing yearly on our shores more than a million of idle persons, seeking work, from foreign lands, practically all of them to go ashore in New York City. I venture the assertion the great majority of the idle men in New York City are foreigners who do not speak our language and have no interest in our country except to get what they can out of it, regardless of the interest or welfare of our native or naturalized citizens.

President Wilson has vetoed this immigration bill, and in his message he says the American people have never passed upon the illiteracy question. The Democrats in their national convention several years ago placed this plank in their platform:

We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

The Republican Party in its national platform made this declaration:

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

So we have had both national parties indorsing this legislation in one form or another.

Out of 213 Members in the Sixty-second Congress who voted to pass this bill over President Taft's veto, more than 160 were reelected. Of 252 Members of the present House who voted on the 4th of last February for this bill, and whose position was thus known to the voters, 185 were returned. Out of 126 who voted against this bill at that time, only 76 were reelected. In other words, out of a membership of 435 in the next House, there will be only 76 who went on record in opposition to this bill. The American people have passed upon this question by electing President McKinley on a platform favoring the illiteracy test by an overwhelming majority, and President Roosevelt upon a restriction platform; and I venture the prediction the next occupant of the White House will be elected upon a platform indorsing the principles of the bill now before us. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think any President could be elected on a platform pronouncing against the restriction of immigration of that kind?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am absolutely sure no candidate of any party could win on such a declaration or platform. As a patriot and a lover of my country, I am anxious to see this bill passed over the President's veto; but if I considered this matter as a partisan, I would want to see his veto sustained, in order that the American people could face him at the polls in the coming presidential election on the issue he has raised. [Applause.]

Congress must settle this question right for all time. We can not evade, indefinitely postpone, or side-step it. It will not down until a law is written closing our doors against the undesirables of every country on the face of the earth. The President of the United States in 1902 stated in his History of the American People we were receiving too many of what he termed "the lowest class of people from southern Italy and the meaner sort from Hungary and Poland." When he made that statement we were receiving 246,146 annually from those three sections of Europe. Last year we received from southern Italy, Hungary, and Poland 517,590, or more than double the number the President objected to. At the time of the President's criticism in 1902 the foreign steamships landed here a total of 648,743 aliens, and last year the number had increased to 1,218,480. In 1902 we received 165,105 illiterates over 14 years of age, and in 1914 263,225 illiterates landed. When an impartial historian and a private citizen, not a prospective candidate looking for the so-called foreign vote, the President stated, "The Chinaman was to be preferred as a workingman, if not as a citizen, to the coarse crew" we were receiving from southern Italy, Poland, and Hungary. Yet his veto means to keep our doors wide open to the people from these three countries, so they can be dumped upon our shores and their labor brought in competition with free, honest, American labor in the mine, workshop, and in all other lines of industry.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] says only the officials of the labor organizations, and not the rank and file of the members, are against this bill. I deny this. In a number of their national meetings, with delegates from every State and industrial city, they have unanimously asked the American Congress for the passage of this bill. I insist organized and unorganized labor is a unit for this legislation, and it has the sym-

pathy and support of a large majority of the American people—native and of foreign birth.

Two million members of the American Federation of Labor, 3,000,000 of the Farmers' Union and Alliance, half a million of the United Mine Workers, the trainmen's, conductors', engineers', and firemen's associations, and many other organizations, including practically every patriotic organization in the land, have repeatedly asked for the passage of this bill, and as their honest, just, and patriotic appeal fell upon deaf ears when they urged President Wilson to approve the bill, in the coming presidential election they will demand and materially aid in electing a Chief Executive of this Republic who will stand for the American home and for American labor against the cheap labor of Europe. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH]. [Applause.]

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of immigrants coming into this country who can read at least 30 common words of their own language, as provided by this bill.

I quote the literacy provision:

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in some one of the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect.

This provision is the one so much objected to. The following provisions can hardly receive objection, it seems to me, from anyone. I refer to a part of section 28:

SEC. 28. That any person who knowingly aids or assists any anarchist or any person who believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or who disbelieves in or is opposed to organized government, or all forms of law, or who advocates the assassination of public officials, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocates or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized Government.

And also to a part of section 35:

SEC. 35. That it shall be unlawful for any vessel carrying passengers between a port of the United States and a port of a foreign country, upon arrival in the United States, to have on board employed thereon any alien afflicted with idiocy, imbecility, insanity, epilepsy, tuberculosis in any form, or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease.

I wish now to refer you to a statement made by President Wilson in his veto message, which, I think, commends the bill:

This particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

In my State of Michigan we have spent millions of dollars for education, and no money is more liberally or willingly paid by the taxpayers than that paid for education. In that State is located the first great university of the United States—the University of Michigan, at Ann Arbor. We have the first agricultural college founded in this country, and we also have a great normal schools for teachers at Ypsilanti and many other institutions scattered over the State that are creditable and that we are proud of. And I will say for the University of Michigan that it is represented in more places on the globe, and has more representatives upon the floor of this House than any other great educational institution in the United States. [Applause.] In the State of Michigan we compel children under the age of 14 years to go to school under our compulsory-education law, and I am not in favor of letting down the bars to foreigners to come in here without an education and keep them up against our own children. I do not believe that the people of my State are in favor of it, and I can not see how the working people of this country can indorse such a policy. I want to say to you, my friends, that it is a very easy matter to learn to read 30 of the common words in your own language, and I stand absolutely upon the literacy test.

I am one of those who believe that education and good citizenship go hand in hand.

I know that if a man of fair intelligence will take a slate and pencil and sit down for one evening by himself he can learn to write the German alphabet. I say to you that when I heard the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] this morning say that Russians came to this country and set up forges and bakeries and made useful citizens that I would be willing to venture that these very people could read or write 30 common words in their own language. I tell you that letting people come into this country without being educated is not conducive to good citizenship. [Applause.]

An education is the best acquirement a person can obtain. It excels property and it removes mental blindness. Life is much more enjoyable to an educated person than it is to one uneducated.

We now restrict Japanese and Chinese immigration. Many of the people of these nationalities who are prohibited from landing on our shores are educated, but no distinction is made as to them.

Something has been said here that the laboring men are all in favor of the passage of this bill. They are the producers of wealth, a very respectable and considerable part and portion of our population. If they are interested, or if the bill is of any benefit to them, it adds to my interest in its passage.

I notice, from some of the papers, large concerns advertising for help make mention of Slavs, Finns, Poles, and Assyrians preferred. This is all right if they prefer that kind of workmen; and I am not opposed to the manufacturer selecting his own help, and I hope these workmen can all read at least 30 words in their own language.

If they can not read, I would put them in the class with our children and under the law require them to go to school until they learned to read and write, and by so doing give them a benefit which money can not buy nor money alone acquire. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, the disapproval of the immigration bill by President Wilson is founded in such sound common sense, is conceived in such a spirit of humanity, supported by Democratic traditions and American principles, that I cheerfully give my support to the President's position and shall vote to sustain the veto.

The proponents of the measure propose to enter upon a reversal of the historical policy of our Government concerning immigration. It has been one of our Nation's boasts that we have hospitably received the foreigners who, coming healthy in mind and body, law-abiding, and self-supporting, sought habitation in our land. Here, too, it has ever been our policy to give to those who came to our shores from lands where equal opportunity was denied or where educational advantages were withheld, an asylum against oppression and persecution. Yet now it is proposed to close our gates to those who, regardless of whether they are bodily or morally sound, useful in occupation, or self-sustaining, happen, because of educational opportunities denied them abroad, to be unable to pass a literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, as much as any man in this House, I am opposed to the admission to our country of the pauper, the bad and the vicious, and the really undesirable classes. I favor the enforcement of the law which looks to their exclusion. But surely because a man, woman, or child happens to be illiterate does not by any means imply that he or she belong to either of these excludable classes. Go to the great centers of population among the immigrant classes and see how illiteracy decreases, as many of these immigrants avail themselves of the opportunity held out to them to learn to read and write.

I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] describe the conditions in his city respecting the foreign born, their progress and advancement. I come from the city of New York, which abounds with multitudes of the foreign born. Aided by their contribution of thrift and industry, energy and perseverance, my city has grown in wealth and position, in power and in influence, and we who come from that cosmopolitan city, teeming with the myriads of people of almost every nationality, do not in any way share the fears about the influx of immigration so freely expressed on this floor by the advocates of the bill.

I have at all times been a supporter and advocate of the cause of labor. Throughout my public career I have willingly, cheerfully, and unhesitatingly supported the measures designed for the benefit of labor and the betterment and protection of the working classes. I have stood for the principles of organized labor. I, too, want to see the standard of American living maintained and the standard of American wage upheld. I can

not believe that the admission of a few illiterates, otherwise qualified under existing law for entrance to our land, would work the conditions which the advocates of the bill argue on this floor would be produced.

Mr. Speaker, were we to look into the ancestry of many of those who have served city, State, and Nation in public station—aye, of many of those who from time to time have served with honor and distinction in this House—we would find many who came to America from foreign lands illiterate. They, like the immigrants of the present day, quickly entered into the spirit of American life and became imbued with American habits and ideals. They, like the immigrants of the present day, eagerly sent their children to the schools, where, with remarkable aptitude for study, these children made rapid progress in education, and the rolls of honor in our colleges and universities are replete with names of the children of these foreign born.

Through means of immigration our land has prospered, our wealth augmented, our cities and towns upbuilded, and our general welfare increased. Yet for over a hundred years the demand for restriction of immigration has come, more frequently from the narrow minded, the prejudiced, or the ill informed. In the debates on immigration in the House during my years of service I have pointed out, as others, too, have done, the vain fears and gloomy forbodings expressed by the enemies of immigration from the earliest period of the Republic to the present time, yet our country has grown and prospered and become the mighty Nation that it is to-day, while the fears and doubts and pessimistic misgivings have vanished as thin air.

Ah, but some say the quality of immigration is not to-day what it was years ago. Mr. Speaker, that is the same, same old cry. It is the same cry made every time restriction was proposed. Years ago it was directed against the Irish, the Germans, the Austrians, and the Scandinavians. These splendid, sturdy, industrious, and thrifty immigrants made splendid, valuable, most desirable acquisitions to our land. Who now dare deny their worth, their quality, their value to our common country. Now the hand of the restrictionist is directed against the Russian Jew, the Italian, the Roumanian, the Hungarian, the Pole, and the Slav.

You gentlemen who come from districts into which little or no immigration comes do not understand the worth and quality and value of these people. They come hopefully into this country, and, like the immigrants that preceded them, seek, through earnestness of effort, through thrift and energy, through labor, and all that makes for decent manhood and womanhood, to build for themselves and their families and for usefulness and happiness of home. So, sir, aside from those who are honestly and squarely moved to support this bill because they in their judgment believe economic conditions demand it, I fear that much of what underlies the advocacy of the measure in the minds of some is that spirit which is born of narrowness and conceived in racial prejudice.

Time does not permit me to pursue the subject longer. My views, frequently expressed on this floor on the literacy test, are well known to the membership of the House. I ask the House to sustain President Wilson in his scholarly and patriotic message. The literacy test, neither a test of fitness or character, determining neither the morality of the immigrant nor his quality, but used only as a subterfuge for arbitrary restriction, has been three times by Presidents condemned. President Cleveland, in vigorous terms, disapproved it. So did President Taft. Now that great Jeffersonian Democrat who so ably stands at the helm of state, in a message that commends itself to the judgment of fair-thinking men, calls upon us to sustain that policy under which America, as the land of liberty and opportunity, has held its gates open to the stranger from other lands. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the chairman of the committee, to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Speaker, restriction of immigration into the United States has been a fixed policy of our Government so long, I believe, the wisdom of such policy is not now debated.

The act of March 3, 1875, prohibited the immigration of alien convicts.

The immigration of Chinese laborers was prohibited by the act of May 6, 1882. Section 1 of that act was as follows:

> That from and after the expiration of 90 days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of 10 years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby, suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come or, having so come after the expiration of said 90 days, to remain within the United States.

This law was continued in force for an additional 10 years by the act of May 5, 1892, and it was reenacted and continued in force without limitation by the act of April 29, 1902.

The act of August 3, 1882, prohibited the immigration of "any convict, lunatic, idiot, or any person unable to take care of himself or herself without becoming a public charge."

By the act of February 26, 1885, section 1 provided that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.

The following provision was added to this act by the act of February 23, 1887:

> That all persons included in the prohibition in this act, upon arrival, shall be sent back to the nations to which they belong and from whence they came.

Section 3 of the act of March 3, 1891, was as follows:

> That it shall be deemed a violation of said act of February 26, 1885, to assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien by promise of employment through advertisements printed and published in any foreign country, and any alien coming to this country in consequence of such an advertisement shall be treated as coming under a contract as contemplated by such act, and the penalties by said act imposed shall be applicable in such a case.

Subsequently various amendments were added to these laws. By the act of February 20, 1907, now in force, the "contract laborers" who are excluded from admission into the United States are described as follows:

> Persons hereinafter called contract laborers who have been induced or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment or in consequence of agreements, oral, written or printed, expressed or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; those who have been, within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States, deported as having been induced or solicited to migrate as above described; any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes and that said ticket or passage was not paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly.

Thus from time to time our immigration laws have been made more restrictive.

The pending bill provides for further restriction of immigration by excluding aliens who can not read their own language. The bill has been returned to us by the President without his approval, and is now before us for reconsideration.

Do we need further restriction? If so, should the literacy test be used?

The act of February 20, 1907, provided for a commission, consisting of three Senators, three Members of the House of Representatives, and three persons to be appointed by the President, to investigate the subject of immigration.

This commission, after an investigation of three years, made its report, containing 41 volumes, in 1910. The report of this commission states:

> From July 1, 1819, to June 30, 1910, 27,818,710 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Of this number, . . .5 per cent came from European countries, which countries are the source of about 95.5 per cent of the present immigration movement. From 1819 to 1883 more than 95 per cent of the total immigration from Europe originated in the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland. In what follows the movement from these countries will be referred to as the "old immigration."
>
> Following 1883 there was a rapid change in the ethnical character of European immigration, and in recent years more than 70 per cent of the movement has originated in southern and eastern Europe. The change geographically, however, has been somewhat greater than the change in the racial character of the immigration, this being due very largely to the number of Germans who have come from Austria-Hungary and Russia. The movement from southern and eastern Europe will be referred to as the "new immigration." In a single generation Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia have succeeded the United Kingdom and Germany as the chief sources of immigration. In fact, each of the three countries first named furnished more immigrants to the United States in 1907 than came in the same year from the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland combined.
>
> The old immigration movement in recent years has rapidly declined, both numerically and relatively, and under present conditions there are no indications that it will materially increase. The new immigration movement is very large, and there are few, if any, indications of its natural abatement. The new immigration, coming in such large numbers, has provoked a widespread feeling of apprehension as to its effect on the economic and social welfare of the country.

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCKSON. I have not the time. If the gentleman will excuse me, I must decline. If I yield, I will not have time in which to conclude what I desire to say.

The Commissioner General of Immigration, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, says:

Immigration, judged from the results of the year, has apparently reached the million mark permanently, and unless some affirmative action is taken by the Federal Government to restrict it, or steps are taken by European and other nations to reduce the steady stream of persons leaving the various countries of the Old World, we need hardly expect that the number annually entering the United States will hereafter fall far below 1,000,000. During the last fiscal year 1,218,480 souls have immigrated to the United States, 20,588 more than were shown for the previous year and only 66,869 less than the total shown for 1907, the banner year in immigration. Comparison of the record of emigrating aliens with that of immigrating aliens shows that 633,805 left the United States, so that the net increase in population by the immigration was 769,276. It was 815,303 in 1913 and 401,863 in 1912.

Paragraph 8 of the Immigration Commission report, which I have mentioned, is as follows:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demand legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

As far as possible the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

As far as possible the aliens excluded should also be those who, by reason of their personal qualities or habits, would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

The material increase of the head tax.

The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree. A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of the commission.

All the members of the commission excepting one recommended the adoption of the reading and writing test.

The testimony recently taken before the Committee on Immigration also shows an oversupply of unskilled labor in this country. The foreign unskilled laborers are evidently coming to this country in greater number than new positions are being made or supplied. Hence they are crowding out or interfering with the unskilled laborers among us. Many unskilled labor immigrants find such little opportunity here for work that they return to their native country.

We all know that it is impossible for this country to provide for properly and assimilate the millions of unskilled laborers that might come here if they were admitted without restriction. Since we can not admit all we should select for admission those who are most desirable and best fitted for our institutions.

Will the literacy test in the pending bill assist us in making the selections? I believe it will.

True it is that education alone does not prove good character, and the lack of education may be evidence of the lack of opportunity. Yet it is also true that the lack of education may be evidence of the lack of diligence. In some cases the lack of education proves a lack of diligence.

By adopting the literacy test we would reduce the immigration of unskilled laborers and would still receive those immigrants best fitted to become citizens.

As I have shown by the laws quoted, we have been attempting for years to exclude undesirable unskilled laborers. The Chinese-exclusion law prohibits the immigration of "Chinese laborers," regardless of whether they are educated or not educated, skilled or unskilled. The "contract-labor law" excludes persons who have been induced "to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment," without regard to their education or lack of education, except that "skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country." Certain professional persons are also excepted.

It is not morally wrong for a foreigner to promise to work in this country. If it were not for the law prohibiting such an agreement, it would be the part of prudence to have an agreement for a position before coming here.

The laws I have mentioned plainly show that we do not want to encourage the immigration of unskilled laborers but do desire to discourage the immigration of such laborers. The "contract-labor law" is hard to enforce, and it is generally believed that it is being constantly evaded and violated.

Probably 99 per cent of the immigrants who are unable to read come to this country to work as unskilled laborers.

The enactment and enforcement of a law containing the literacy test would greatly check and restrict the immigration of such laborers. Too many are coming here under present conditions. There are good reasons for believing that a still greater influx of unskilled laborers will occur after the close of the European war. I believe existing conditions require a law to restrict immigration without delay. No man has offered a bill better than the bill now pending. Therefore I shall vote for the passage of this bill.

It has been well said:

> This above all: To thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

As with the individual, so should it be with the Nation. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURNETT. How much time does the gentleman yield back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to protest against the effort on the part of some gentlemen to bring this question into the scope of partisanship. I voted to pass this bill over the veto of President Taft, and I would not be consistent or square with my own conscience if I did not do the same in my party lines and vote to pass it over the head of my President.

Mr. DONOHOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I can not with the time I have. Now, in reference to partisanship, in reading a letter sent to me by Michael A. O'Leary, chairman of the Democratic State committee of Massachusetts, I was rather surprised that he should make the statement that if this bill passed it would ruin the Democratic Party in that State, and I think it was a direct attempt to bring the bill within the scope of partisan politics. In the same mail I find that the Massachusetts State branch of the American Federation of Labor, being for the passage of the bill, stated that 200,000 members of labor in Massachusetts desired its passage, and in the same mail also I find that the Central Labor Union of Boston, representing 85,000 workmen of that city, desires to have the bill passed. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire that a letter to Mr. O'Leary, from the president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, be read by the Clerk. I believe the Democrats of Massachusetts need to look around and see where the votes are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1915.

Mr. MICHAEL A. O'LEARY,
Chairman Democratic State Committee,
No. 15 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We are advised that you are circularizing Members of Congress, urging them "that the future success of the Democratic Party in Massachusetts as well as throughout the country would be greatly endangered by the refusal of Democratic Members of Congress to sustain the President's veto of the immigration bill, and that the dictates of humanity, the high ideals of American fairness and justness, as well as party contingency, require that every Democratic Member shall vote to sustain the President."

In view of the passage of the immigration bill, both in the House and in the Senate, by a substantial majority, it would seem that your conclusion that the future success of the Democratic Party depends upon sustaining the conclusion of the President is not well founded.

We have within a few days past sent out letters to Congressmen and Senators in behalf of our 45,000 members throughout the United States urging that the immigration bill be passed over the President's veto.

We believe that we are qualified to speak with authority and knowledge upon the disastrous effect of free trade in labor, which has now left this country with a bread line of monstrous proportions in all the industrial centers of this country.

It has not been considered that the high ideals of American fairness and justness has been invaded by the qualifications along educational lines required to pass civil-service examinations, and thereby curtail the opportunities for employment of those unable to reach civil-service standards. Politicians have found it necessary to reduce through the civil-service plan the number of applicants for employment within the gift of political organizations or political officials. It is not inconsistent with fair play to humanity and justice if the workers of this country seek the slightest protection which might be afforded by the literacy test contained in the bill vetoed by President Wilson. The workers of this country have to share opportunities for employment with a large foreign element, when there are two or three men looking for one job. It is very easy to note that the influences behind opposition to this bill comes from large interests, who appear to believe that there must

be an unlimited opportunity to secure workers, regardless of the compensation they are to receive. The significant statement of Mr. J. P. Morgan before the National Commission on Industrial Relations yesterday that he supposed $10 a week was enough wages for a man if he was willing to accept employment at that rate, and that if that was the rate of wages there was no obligation upon the part of the person seeking employment to take the wages if they were not satisfactory. We can well understand how Mr. Morgan reaches the conclusions of this kind, as he evidently has never been in a position of seeking employment in an overcrowded labor market or with hungry children needing sustenance.

I express my unqualified surprise that the Democratic Party of this State is responsible for the issue of a circular such as you have sent out to the Congressmen. I am quite sure that the rank and file of the Democratic Party of this State will repudiate any such action upon your part.

This, in my opinion, is not a party measure, and I do not believe that the Democratic Party will be sustained if it is found to be lined up with the President in his veto of this important bill.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN F. TOBIN,
General President of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union,
246 Sumner Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. BATHRICK. I desire to insert, in addition to the letter just read by the Clerk, the letter of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, and certain inclosures with reference to the manner in which the opposition to this needed legislation is financed by the Shipping Trust and other big combinations, who want cheap labor at any cost to our standards of living and ideals of government:

[From the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 30, 1915.]

SHIPPING, STEEL, AND MINING CORPORATIONS FINANCE OPPOSITION TO IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION—THE FOLLOWING AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS DISCLOSE THAT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE, WHICH HAS CONDUCTED THE CAMPAIGN TO OPPOSE RESTRICTION AND REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION, HAS BEEN FINANCED BY THE SHIPPING TRUST, THE COAL BARONS, THE STEEL COMPANIES, AND OTHER CORPORATIONS—THE OFT-REPEATED CHARGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY ORGANIZED LABOR'S REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHERS FAVORING IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ARE PROVEN—PRESIDENT GOMPERS ANSWERS PRESIDENT WILSON'S VETO OBJECTIONS TO THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

HEADQUARTERS AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN BURNETT,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is sincerely regrettable that the President found it necessary to exercise his great constitutional prerogative by vetoing the immigration bill which passed both the Senate and House by such overwhelming votes, more than two-thirds of each body. It was hoped that with all the information before the President and with the history of the legislation since and including 1896, he would have reached the conclusion to give the bill his approval.

I have before me a copy of the President's veto message, in which he gives his reasons for his inability to give the bill his approval. Of course any utterance from so learned a man, from a man whose heart and mind are so attuned to the people's welfare as are Hon. Woodrow Wilson's, as well as from a man who, in addition, occupies the great office of President of the United States, is deserving of greatest respect and consideration. And still when a measure of such vital importance is yet under consideration and awaits final action by the Congress of the United States, it becomes the duty of citizens to express either their approbation or dissent, as their judgment and experience warrant. In line with this thought, I beg to submit for your consideration some views which are contained not only by me but which are generally entertained by the people of our country.

The President gives two reasons for his veto: First, that the bill embodies a radical departure from the long-established policy for this country, and would close the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of man; second, that the bill provides for a literacy test.

In connection with the first objection which the President interposes, it should be understood that without regard to that provision of the immigration bill the existing law of the United States does exactly what the pending immigration bill emphasizes. The President's objection is against what is now law, even should the immigration bill fail to become law, and in order to remove that objection, if the immigration bill shall fail of enactment, immediate steps thereafter should be taken to repeal the law which in principle the President characterizes as unjust and improper.

Now, in regard to the second objection of the President—that is, the literacy test—permit me to say that the essential purpose is to restrict and limit and better regulate immigration. In view of present conditions, as well as those which will necessarily confront us after the close of the European war, some measure of foresight is imperative if the menace of an overwhelming immigration is to be averted. No thinking, observing man who has his highest hopes centered in the welfare, the protection, and the mission of the people of the Republic of the United States disputes the fact that there must be some measure to restrict, limit, and better regulate immigration to our country. While a literacy test may not be the highest ideal for its accomplishment, yet that it is the most practical, advantageous, and workable no one in or out of Congress has undertaken to disprove, nor has anyone taken the people of our country into his confidence by suggesting or proposing a better method.

For a moment I must again call attention to what is generally apprehended regarding immigration after the close of the present terrible European war. The nations engaged in the conflict will, undoubtedly, do everything within their power to keep the strong and the healthy men at home. They will do everything in their power to encourage the emigration of the weak or incapacitated men and those whose health is partially undermined. Many will be glad to escape compulsory military service, and will do all they can to get away from the burdens of taxation which will result from the war.

And, pray, where will all these men go? Surely they will not go from their own to other countries now engaged in the struggle. They will come, if they can, to America, and come in such numbers as to overwhelm the toilers already here, to depress their standard of life, and to add to the already large number of unemployed.

The present is the time to make provision against what will surely become a menace unless the laws of our country shall restrict and limit and better regulate immigration.

If ever the citizenship of the United States has given indorsement to any measure of legislation, it has certainly done so to the principles embodied in the immigration bill now before Congress.

Not necessarily for your information, but because of the benefit the record may have, let me here state that:

In 1896–97 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto. In the Senate it failed of passage over the veto by a few votes.

In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill, it is generally conceded, was crowded out of consideration of the House of Representatives by reason of the Spanish-American War.

In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test.

In 1906 the Senate passed an immigration bill in which the literacy test was embodied. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission. The commission consisted of nine members, eight of whom recommended the adoption of the literacy test as the most practical means for restricting, limiting, and better regulating immigration.

In 1913 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the test recommended by the commission. The bill was vetoed by President Taft. That bill passed the Senate over the President's veto, but failed to pass the House over the President's veto by four votes.

In 1914–15 the House and Senate passed by more than a two-thirds vote the immigration bill now before Congress, which contains the literacy test. That is the bill which President Wilson has vetoed.

In the President's message he asks the following question: "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter?" The answer is found in the Democratic and the Republican national platform declarations as far back as 1896. The Democratic national convention platform made the following declaration:

"We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market."

In that same year—that is, in 1896—the Republican national convention platform contained the following declaration:

"For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our working men against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write."

And, as you know, the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States nominated upon the platform containing this declaration were elected.

Of course it is sometimes profitable and always justifiable to ascertain the real purposes sought to be attained by and actuating the advocates and the opponents to legislation. Those who advocate the enactment of the immigration bill are persuaded that the needs of the people of our country require some means to protect them, their rights, their work, and their future against wholesale immigration—immigration planned on a great scale to depress the condition of the workers here by large numbers who may and do supplant them and take from them their opportunities to earn a livelihood; immigration which is so potent a factor to intensify and make acute the industrial and social injustice to our people. In a word, there must be some provision to meet a serious and menacing situation jeopardizing American standards of life and American concepts of freedom. If there be any desire for further information as to the justification for the attitude of the advocates of immigration restriction, ample evidence can be found in the report of the Federal Immigration Commission, the report of the Federal Bureau of Labor upon the investigation in Bethlehem, Pa., the report of the House committee giving the results of its investigation of the conditions in the steel industry (known as Stanley report), the statistics of immigration for the last 20 years (now temporarily reduced by the war), and many other sources of official and authentic information. If there be any desire to learn from whence the means has come for America's wage earners' movement to secure the enactment of an effective immigration restriction law the books and papers of the American Federation of Labor are open to you and to any Representative in Congress.

The purposes and the means by which the opponents to the enactment of the immigration law have conducted their campaign are equally a justifiable subject of inquiry. The opponents have openly stated the purpose they have in view. They have publicly declared that their motives are altruistic and patriotic; that they have conducted a campaign open, fair, and square; that the means by which their campaign was financed were contributed by men prompted by motives such as they themselves have openly declared; and that there were no ulterior motives prompting the financial contributors to the campaign of opposition.

Now, there has recently come into my possession a number of documents which place an entirely different light upon the motives, the purposes, and the methods of the campaign which has been conducted in opposition to immigration legislation. These documents have been printed. I make part of this letter a true copy of the documents I have. They are inclosed. If you or any other Representative or Senator in Congress cares to examine as to whether what is inclosed are authentic copies of the documents I have, I should be very glad to afford an opportunity for that purpose.

In conclusion it is earnestly hoped that the Congress of the United States will enact the immigration bill, the President's veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

Very truly, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

WHAT THE STORY TELLS.

Trusts furnish money to National Liberal Immigration League to finance campaign against immigration legislation.

League affirms friendship for National Association of Manufacturers.

Hamburg-American Steamship Line notified by cablegram that league owes $7,000 and is liable to be sued and forced into bankruptcy.

French steamship company urged to aid in financing "a tremendous agitation" against immigration legislation.

Steamship companies campaigned for the appointment of Charles Nagel as Secretary of Commerce and Labor under President Taft. Mr. Nagel is referred to as one "not likely to favor legislation restricting immigration."

Hamburg-American Steamship official tells an associate that "a number of delegations composed of members of various nationalities" were sent to Washington to oppose immigration legislation. He says: "The delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality." It is stated that the campaign includes "visiting the societies of various nationalities, as Italians, Hebrews, Hungarians, etc., including the unions, for the purpose of advocating liberal immigration."

"We have to send appeals and communications to some 15,000 influential persons, most of them clergymen," says the steamship official.

National Liberal Immigration League, in another appeal for financial aid, tells trusts it is making possible "the influx of alien unskilled labor," and if contributions are not received "we will not be able to keep up our work."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 30.*

A sensation was sprung to-day in this city by the publication of authentic documents, many of which bear their own authenticity, and others so circumstantially proven that there is said to be no escape from their purport. As will be observed, among the documents are letters and appeals from the officers of the National Liberal Immigration League to corporations for funds and "subventions"; letters from the officers of the Liberal Immigration League to shipping companies of Germany and of France; cablegram appeal for funds by Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, and a carbon copy of letter to the same company confirming the cablegram; financial statement of the receipts of the National Liberal Immigration League showing that $15,000 was paid as an annuity for the conduct of the campaign against protection of America's workers from stimulated immigration; letters from Mr. Benar, managing director of league, to Messrs. Japhot and Sagot, Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Rue Auber, Paris, France, and the reply of Mr. Rene Sagot; appeals by B. A. Sekely, field secretary of the National Liberal Immigration League, who, in addition to his salary, it is declared, became entitled to 25 per cent of his successful solicitations; correspondence on official letterheads between Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, and Emil L. Boas, resident director and general manager of the Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York City, and J. Pannes, the St. Louis representative of the company, in the campaign to make Charles Nagel the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor in President Taft's Cabinet, whose campaign was conducted upon the platform that he was an anti-immigration restrictionist; the documents also expose the fake of the delegations representing their own nationalities, for as one official informs his associate that "the delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality."

In view of the immigration bill now before Congress for a vote over the President's veto, the means by which the National Liberal Immigration League financed its campaign by contributions from the corporations most hostile to the interests of America's workers is both timely and of great import.

This is one of a series of circular letters appealing to corporations for the customary contributions and cash signed by the field representative, who is B. A. Sekely:

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Educational committee: N. Behar, managing director; John E. O'Brien, secretary; B. A. Sekely, field representative; Arthur F. Day, George M. Dodge, Michael J. Drummond, Charles W. Eliot, Judson Harmon, John J. Haynes, G. Gunby Jordan, Charles R. Parkhurst, Charles L. Stickney, William E. Story, William Sulzer, F. William Vogt.

[National Liberal Immigration League. (Selection and distribution rather than restriction.) Headquarters, No. 150 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone 4762 Beekman. P. O. Box 1261.]

OCTOBER 14, 1913.

SUSQUEHANNA COAL CO.,
907 Arcade Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: There are now eight new restrictive bills before Congress. One of them, introduced by Representative Roddenbery, provides for an educational test, increase of head tax from $4 to $25, possession of $100, and a physical test like that imposed on recruits for the Navy.

Worst of all these bills is the new Dillingham measure, providing that not more than 10 per cent of the number of any nationality in this country shall be admitted in any one year.

As soon as the regular session of Congress opens there will be started a bitter fight on immigration. We must be prepared, and the most effective way is to strengthen the hands of this league, which is the official organization of the liberal immigration movement. To do this is the duty of every citizen who believes in keeping the gates of America open to deserving immigrants.

This league has no lobby in Washington, and never has had one. It has always worked openly in legitimate and commendable ways, by educating public opinion, by holding meetings in various parts of this country, and sending delegations to Washington when necessary. We believe this honest expression of enlightened public sentiment will in the end triumph over the methods of the restrictionists. But we must present a united front, and to that end we ask you to send your contribution, as you did last March.

Very truly, yours,

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
Per ——— ———, *Field Representative.*

—

Some corporations' contributions.

1912.

Nov. 20. Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., New York	$500.00
May 24. Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., Pittsburgh	250.00
Aug. 26. Pittsburgh Coal Co., Pittsburgh	200.00
Nov. 25. Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh	100.00
May 2. Jacob H. Schiff, New York	100.00
Sept. 23. Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	50.00
91 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	357.30
Total	1,557.30

1913.

Mar. 1. Susquehanna Coal Co., Philadelphia	$500.00
Feb. 2. Lackawanna Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y	100.00
Mar. 24. Rogers-Brown Iron Co., Buffalo	50.00
Mar. 26. Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa	50.00
76 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	304.90
Total	1,004.90

MAY 29, 1913.

INCOME OF THE NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE FROM JANUARY 1, 1913, TO DATE.

Mar. 1. Susquehanna Coal Co., Philadelphia, Pa	$500.00
Feb. 2. Lackawanna Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y	100.00
Mar. 24. Rogers-Brown Iron Co., Buffalo, N. Y	50.00
Mar. 26. Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa	50.00
May 27. Carnegie Corporation of New York	250.00
114 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	558.40
Total	1,508.40

—

Rough drafts used as basis for letter to Andrew Carnegie, appealing for contributions and indorsing National Association of Manufacturers:

DEAR SIR: May I for a moment claim your kind attention to the character and labors of the National Liberal Immigration League?

The chief aim of our league is to preserve for our country the benefits of immigration, while keeping out undesirable immigrants.

Amongst our definite achievements I may say that since December, 1905, our league has, by means of open agitation through mass meetings and the distribution of argumentative literature, defeated all anti-immigration bills, beginning with the Gardner bill No. 8495, introduced that year, which provided for a $40 head tax. Conspicuous amongst such bills defeated by us was the Hayes bill of 1910.

All along we have ceaselessly been advocating the distribution of immigrants and labor, improvements in steerage conditions, and increased facilities for the naturalization of aliens worthy of that privilege. While on the other hand it has been our continued aim to promote good citizenship and patriotic sentiment amongst immigrants.

Up until recently we were receiving from a steamship line * * * $15,000 per annum, which, however, scarcely covered our running expenses, considering the vast amount of literature we print and distribute during the year. But the steamship line in question no longer see their way to keep up their contribution. And so we are compelled to fall back for support upon appeals to private citizens. We are confident that the responses will come in according to our deserts.

As a friend of our cause, as shown by yourself in your letter to our president February 2, 1911, we would appeal to you to head our list of subscribers.

Sincerely, yours.

The league, however, is fully inclined to indorse the National Council for Industrial Defense, organized and conducted under the leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers. We are convinced that their activities are beneficent to labor as well as to capital, to employees as well as to employers.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

The foregoing paragraph was evidently an afterthought.

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE.

Statement of income and liabilities, July 1, 1910, to Nov. 20, 1911.

RECEIPTS.

Paris	$15,000.00
Subscriptions for the distribution of Prof. Charles W. Eliot's letter	1,584.30
Dues and donations	380.42
Total income	16,964.72

EXPENDITURES.

From July 1, 1910, to Nov. 20, 1911	19,476.19
Deficit	2,511.47
Deficit July 1, 1910	1,680.70
Total deficit Nov. 20, 1911	4,192.17
Liabilities to date	1,974.97
Total deficit and liabilities	6,167.14

The foregoing financial statement discloses a deficit of $6,167.14, and shows the reason why Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, sent the following cablegram and letter confirming the same:

[Postal Telegraph commercial cables telegram.]

DECEMBER 15, 1911.

Director STORM,
Hamburg-Amerika Linie, Hamburg, Germany:

We owe over $7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy with disagreeable consequences for all concerned.

BEHAR.

Mr. ADOLPH STORM,
Director Hamburg-Amerika Linie,
Hamburg, Germany.

DEAR SIR: This morning I said to Mr. Boas that I am continually assailed by creditors to whom we are indebted for rent, printing, etc. I added that it had been suggested to me to send these people to him, but he had always acted so kindly and gentlemanlike that I found it my duty to spare him any trouble. He suggested to me to address to you the following cablegram, "We owe over $7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy, with disagreeable consequences for all concerned," which I did.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

The following is a banking statement of Nissim Behar in account with the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York on the company's financial blank:

Nissim Behar, 150 Nassau Street, New York. In account with Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

If no report be made within ten days the account will be considered correct. Vouchers returned.

Line No.	Day.	Checks.	Day.	Total checks.	Date.	Deposits.
1	10	$1,083.13	10	$1,083.13	9	$11,083.13
2	17	200.00	17			
3	28	9,800.00	26	9,800.00		
Balance interest to Dec. 28						8.13
Total Dec. 31, 1910				11,083.13		11,091.26
Balance						8.13

The following is a carbon copy of a letter sent by Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, to Messrs. Japhot & Saget, Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Rue Auber, Paris, France, appealing for contributions to start a tremendous agitation throughout the country against immigration legislation. The letter discloses the activity of former Congressman Bennet and the "service" rendered by the socialist paper, the New York Call:

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
November 23, 1910.

Messrs. JAPHOT & SAGET,
Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Rue Auber, Paris, France.

GENTLEMEN: We arrived safely on the 22d instant. I was permitted to leave the steamer without any formality as an American citizen, but my baggage, naturally, went with the rest to Ellis Island, causing me some annoyance and loss of time. On the 24th I went to Washington to see the Secretary and hand him over a letter from the secretary of our league, of which I inclose copy. I inclose also clipping from the Sun on this subject. The same has been appearing throughout the press generally, even in the Call, which is the socialist paper.

Though I am personally not unknown to the Secretary, still I took with me my friend, Mr. William S. Bennet, who is prominent in the Republican Party. The Secretary assured us that he and the President are anxious to prevent the breaking of family ties of American residents, but the law must be obeyed, according to the decision given by the solicitor, as per inclosed. But he will do his best to make the application as rare and as lenient as possible.

As to the consequences of the last elections, I was told at Washington that they would be felt in the tariff question, the Democrats being since long declared against the tariff, if not unanimously, at any rate in an overwhelming majority. As to the immigration question, there are Democratic restrictionists, as well as liberals, and, to be more correct, they go according to the manifestation of public opinion.

I will urge all my friends to start a tremendous agitation throughout the country, beginning in December and continuing through January. I shall be very glad to receive your contribution as soon as possible, as I am compelled to make inroads now before the end of November in the supplies which are to last until August, 1911.

Respectfully, yours, ——— ———.

The following letter is from Mr. Rjene Sajot to Mr. Behar, responding to the latter's letter of November 23, 1910:

PARIS, *30th December, 1910.*

DEAR MR. BEHAR: I was glad to hear that you had a good crossing on the *Chicago* and that you landed safely on the other side.

I suppose my chiefs have now written to you. Anyhow, I must thank you for the very interesting literature you have forwarded to me.

Would you mind in future addressing your correspondence to my chief alone and not mention my name on the address, as I am far from being on the same footing in the firm?

Wishing you a happy, healthy, and prosperous New Year, believe me, dear Mr. Behar,

Yours, very truly, RENE SAGOT.

—

Here is a copy of the original letter sent by Mr. Pannes on the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
902 Olive Street, St. Louis, January 20, 1909.

Mr. E. L. BOAS,
Resident Director and General Manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York.

DEAR MR. BOAS: Your wire arrived too late to secure to-day the information you want on Charles Nagel, but I shall do my best to write you fully to-morrow.

The inclosed article appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of January 19.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

The following is a copy of a newspaper dispatch printed in the St. Louis Globe Democrat:

NAGEL SLATED FOR CABINET POSITION—SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR PORTFOLIO FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN—HIS NAME ON THE LIST—TAFT PLANS TO KEEP IT THERE ACCORDING TO RELIABLE REPORT—NO PULLING FOR HIM—ST. LOUISAN'S WORK ATTRACTED ATTENTION OF PRESIDENT ELECT LONG AGO.

WASHINGTON, *January 18.*

From a source whose reliability can not be brought into question it was learned to-day that the name of Charles Nagel, of St. Louis, appears at this time on the tentative list of the Cabinet of President-elect Taft. The place opposite the name of Mr. Nagel is that of Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

From the same source comes the story that Mr. Taft, having completed a tentative draft of his Cabinet slate, does not propose to change it before his departure for Panama. He will upon his return take up with Senator Knox, who is to be his Secretary of State, some of the Cabinet places which have not been definitely offered to the men picked out for them. Close up to March 4, when he is to be inaugurated, the President elect will make his final revision in the light of some inquiries which Mr. Knox is to make for him.

WANTED MISSOURI TO HAVE PLACE.

It develops that early in his consideration of his Cabinet the President elect determined that Missouri should have a place. One of the fond desires of Mr. Taft was to carry Missouri. He felt that there would be a labor defection which would make him suffer in some parts of the country.

Mr. Roosevelt during the campaign twitted Mr. Taft repeatedly about carrying Missouri, telling the candidate that he might make a good race (the President was always confident of Mr. Taft's election, and said so to all who asked him), but he never would duplicate his own performance in introducing the "mysterious stranger" into the Republican camp. When the slow returns made it apparent that Taft had carried Missouri there was a rapid-fire exchange of pleasantries between the two.

HEARD GOOD ABOUT NAGEL.

Mr. Nagel was brought to the favorable attention of Mr. Taft during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Taft was several times the guest of Mr. Nagel. Mr. Taft often heard eulogistic references to Mr. Nagel from Mr. Roosevelt. While the national campaign was on, the best of reports came from Chicago as to the intelligent advice which Mr. Nagel was able to give to the campaign managers. Not only was he deferred to in many steps taken in the Middle West, but he had a controlling voice, so it was said, in many of the general policies adopted in the national campaign.

It was also asserted to-day that no member of the Taft Cabinet will come into his place with less of wire pulling and solicitation in his behalf. It is said that after a dignified presentation of Mr. Nagel's name from the right quarters no campaign was carried on in his behalf, and that the only further representations made were at the solicitation of Mr. Taft, who sought additional information.

ONLY ONE ADVERSE REPORT.

The only adverse movement in connection with Mr. Nagel's name was that which involved bringing the President elect's attention to the fact that Mr. Nagel's law firm had as clients a big brewery concern, and also, at one time, the Standard Oil Co. This information was conveyed to Mr. Taft by one of his senatorial friends with whom he went over his tentative Cabinet list. Recently the President elect has fully informed himself as to the reports. After weighing them carefully, he is said to have fully determined that Mr. Nagel's high personal character and the character of his law service has been such in no way to disqualify him for the service which Mr. Taft seeks at his hands.

Although Mr. Nagel's name has been frequently associated with the place of Secretary of the Interior, it is said that place will go to R. A. Ballinger, of the State of Washington.

TREASURY PORTFOLIO UNFILLED.

AUGUSTA, GA., *January 18.*

That the President elect has not determined who is to be his Secretary of the Treasury is indicated by the circumstance that he to-day had a conversation with J. Shaffer, president of the Chicago Post, regarding the qualifications of the several Chicagoans whose appointment has been urged by Shaffer, who came here at the special request of the President elect for this conference. He says Mr. Taft is giving careful attention to the Treasury portfolio, and that he may not decide the matter until immediately before his inauguration.

Walter S. Dickey, Republican State chairman of Missouri, will talk politics with Mr. Taft to-morrow.

—

The following letter is upon the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line and discloses the campaign to make Mr. Charles Nagel Secretary of Commerce and Labor of President Taft's Cabinet:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
902 Olive Street, St. Louis, January 21, 1909.

Mr. E. L. BOAS,
Resident director and general manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York.

DEAR MR. BOAS: The inclosed abstract from the Book of St. Louisans contains condensed information on Mr. Nagel's professional and political career, also of the career of his former partner, Judge Finkelnburg.

Mr. Nagel is an intimate friend of Mr. Adolphus Busch and is attorney for the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association.

I am now waiting for additional information from Mr. Jos. A. Wright, an attorney with whom I am very well acquainted and on whose discretion I can rely absolutely.

Information secured from other sources is too general in its nature, and I suppose of no use to you. I refer to the general statements that he is highly respected, upright, a conservative, etc.

The inclosed clipping is from to-day's Globe-Democrat.

I hope to have other particulars to-morrow morning in time for the mail which reaches New York on Saturday afternoon.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

NAGEL QUITS PIERCE CASE—FILES FORMAL NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL IN MISSOURI SUPREME COURT—HIS CONNECTION WITH SUIT—ACTION IS NO SURPRISE, BUT MAY HAVE BEEN HASTENED BY TALK OF A CABINET OFFICER.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 20.*

Charles Nagel, of the firm of Nagel & Kirby, of St. Louis, who is said to be on the Taft Cabinet slate for Secretary of the Department of Labor, to-day filed with the clerk of the Supreme Court of Missouri formal notice of the withdrawal of his firm as associate counsel for the Waters-Pierce Oil Co., which, in the ouster suits, was shown to be largely owned by the Standard Oil Co. The notice of withdrawal was sent by mail.

When Gov. Hadley, then attorney general, filed his oil suits to oust the Standard Oil and Republic Oil Cos. from the State and to revoke the charter of the Waters-Pierce Co., the latter a Missouri corporation, Charles Nagel was to have been general counsel for the Waters-Pierce Co. His outlined policy of defense did not suit H. Clay Pierce, president of the board of directors of the company, and Judge John D. Johnson was made general counsel and Judge Sam Priest his associate. Nagel was retained in a minor capacity and took little part in the hearing of the oil cases before Commissioner Anthony. About his only connection with the case was in consultation and in making a final argument of about an hour before the commissioner in St. Louis when the case was submitted on the testimony.

Although Mr. Nagel stated some time ago that he meant to withdraw from the case, the fact that President elect Taft has slated him for a Cabinet position as a reward for his good work for Republicanism in Missouri while serving as national committeeman may have hastened his action.

Here is a biographical write-up of Mr. Charles Nagel:

[From Book of St. Louisans, published by the St. Louis Republic, 1906. Data for biographical sketches furnished by the parties themselves.]

Nagel, Charles, lawyer, born in Colorado County, Tex., August 9, 1849; son of Dr. Herman and Fredericka Nagel; educated in country school in Colorado County, Tex.; academic course in private school and high school, St. Louis; two years' course in St. Louis Law School and one year in University of Berlin, where studied Roman law, political economy, etc.; married, first, Louisville, Ky., 1876, Fannie Brandeis; one child, Hildegard, living; married, second, St. Louis, 1895, Anne Schepley; four children, Mary S., Edith, Charles, and Anne Dorothe. Returned to St. Louis after studying abroad in 1873, and engaged in practice; associated at different times with various partners, and January 1, 1903, became partner in firm of Finkelnburg, Nagel & Kirby, which changed, on the withdrawal of Judge Finkelnburg, June, 1905, to Nagel & Kirby. Since 1875 has been professor at St. Louis Law School; has been member of the board of trustees Public Library, trustee Washington University, member of board of control of St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts, member St. Louis Turner Society; Republican; member Missouri House of Representatives, 1881–82; president city council, St. Louis, 1893–1897. Clubs: St. Louis, University, Commercial, Mercantile, Round Table, Noonday. Office, 700 Security Building; residence, 3726 Washington Boulevard.

Finkelnburg, Gustavus Adolphus, lawyer, born near Cologne, Prussia, April 6, 1837; educated in Germany and St. Charles, Mo.; attended St. Charles College, Missouri, and graduated Cincinnati Law College; married, first, Emma Rombauer; married, second, Ida M. Jorgensen. Admitted to Missouri bar 1860; member Missouri Legislature, 1864–1868; Member Congress, 1868–1872; Republican nominee for governor of Missouri, 1876; defeated; same for supreme judge, 1898; defeated; appointed district judge May 20, 1905; member American Bar Association; Republican; author: practiced in supreme court and the courts of appeal in Missouri, 1894; wrote article on the "Power of the State to regulate prices and charges," American Law Review, July, 1898. Clubs: Mercantile, University. Office, room 320, Customhouse; residence, 4312 Westminster Place.

The following is another letter on the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line, which is self-explanatory:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
962 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo., January 23, 1908.

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,
Resident Director and General Manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR MR. BOAS: Mr. Wright could not let me know until to-day the result of his inquiries about Mr. Nagel. Mr. Wright says that in the opinion of Mr. Nagel's intimate friends he is well fitted for the post and not likely to favor legislation restricting immigration, since Missouri and the Southwest are in great need of immigrants.

This and the information already sent you is all I can secure at present. If you wish me to try for more definite information, I shall do my best to find out more.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

Here is a most illuminating and interesting letter from Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, to Mr. Emil L. Boas, resident director of the Hamburg-American Line:

JANUARY 24, 1908.

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,
Resident Director Hamburg-American Line,
35 Broadway, New York.

DEAR SIR: The league has so far succeeded in checking the efforts of restrictionists, but the foes of immigration are the kind of people whose energy is increased by opposition, and whose earnestness and enthusiasm grow by defeat. The Junior Order tents have multiplied in Pennsylvania and in other parts of the country, and the delegates of the Immigration Restriction League and of other restrictive organizations are agitating everywhere.

We have sent to Washington a number of delegations composed of members of various nationalities, but the delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality. If we are to continue the campaign successfully we must penetrate into the masses and interest them to send delegations and instruct Congress that they are opposed to further restriction of immigration.

Our agitation should be carried on in the following ways:

First. Through mass meetings organized in all important centers voting resolutions.

Second. Through delegations to Congress and to all important conventions.

Third. Through public lectures and through special delegates visiting men's and women's clubs throughout the country.

Fourth. Through delegates visiting the societies of various nationalities, as Italians, Hebrews, Hungarians, etc., including the unions, for the purpose of advocating liberal immigration.

Fifth. Through literature. The league ought to continue to send pamphlets and other publications to the Members of Congress and other notable citizens, and to the public in general.

Sixth. Through correspondence. We have to send appeals and communications to some 15,000 influential persons, most of them clergymen.

In order to prove effective the propaganda must be carried on steadily all the year round. It would require vast financial resources to cover adequately all the above-enumerated points. However, if we had a definite sum of money to spend annually, we could arrange a plan for a systematic campaign, selecting the most important means of agitation. The formulation of such a plan is obviously impossible when we have no idea to what amount we may commit ourselves. We therefore suggest that a regular subvention would greatly enhance the value of our activity.

Hoping you will take this matter into consideration for the present year, I remain,

Sincerely, yours, _____
Managing Director.

The following is a circular letter sent out by the National Liberal Immigration League, of which Mr. Edward Lauterbach at the time was president:

[Edward Lauterbach, president; S. M. Newman, first vice president; William D. Eckert, second vice president; Frank Y. Anderson, third vice president; J. B. Young, fourth vice president; Antonio Zucca, treasurer; N. Behar, managing director; Mark J. Katz, John E. O'Brien, secretaries. Advisory committee, William S. Bennett, Benjamin F. Buck, David James Burrell, Frank S. Gannon, Louis N. Hammerling, J. J. B. Johnsonius, Herman C. Kudlich, Louis Edward Levy, R. D. Silliman, Thomas R. Slicer, Benjamin F. Tracy, Gallus Thomann. National Liberal Immigration League. For the proper regulation and better distribution of immigration. Headquarters, No. 150 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone 4762 Beekman. P. O. Box 1261.]

GENTLEMEN: Since 1906 this league has kept America's door open to deserving immigrants. Without it, as Members of Congress and others have repeatedly asserted, laws would have been enacted to shut out yearly hundreds of thousands of immigrants whose labor is so much needed for our great industries.

In addition, this league has constantly advocated remedial legislation, such as Federal distribution of immigrants, deportation of criminals, and other measures that would take away the evils of immigration while preserving its great blessings.

We also do educational work by distributing our literature among libraries and debating societies, from whom we receive daily requests for pamphlets. In this way we are building up a public opinion in favor of liberal immigration among future citizens.

Our league had fully carried its claims for support from all public-spirited citizens, and especially those who are connected with industries whose existence is made possible by the influx of alien unskilled labor that can not be replaced by the native element. In default of such support we will not be able to keep up our work, and the Immigration Restriction League, of Boston, will have the field to itself.

Mr. B. A. Sekely, our field representative, will call on you and we bespeak your kind consideration on his behalf.

Yours, very truly, _____,
President.

No contract binding upon this league unless countersigned by the managing director. No person is authorized to use the name of the league otherwise than in connection with its corporate activity.

The following financial statements of the National Liberal Immigration League showing moneys which they received from some of the corporations:

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *April 10, 1907.*

DEBIT.

Amount brought forward from statement of Nov. 9, 1906	$411.60	
To expenditures from Nov. 9, 1906, to Apr. 10, 1907, as per detailed account herewith	14,913.71	
		$15,325.31

CREDIT.

By cash received	15,000.00	
By donations received	46.50	
By membership dues received	36.00	
		15,082.50
Balance due		232.81
Liabilities		2,071.15
		2,303.96

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *January 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To expenditures from Apr. 8, 1907, to Dec. 31, 1907, as per detailed account herewith	$6,642.92

CREDIT.

By cash received—			
On Apr. 23, 1907	$500		
On May 6, 1907	500		
On May 13, 1907	225		
On June 4, 1907	500		
On July 3, 1907	500		
On Aug. 5, 1907	500		
On Sept. 4, 1907	500		
On Oct. 3, 1907	500		
On Nov. 4, 1907	1,500		
On Dec. 17, 1907	500		
		$5,725	
By subscriptions to league, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		$17	
By donations to league, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		82	
By subscriptions to Federation Review, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		42	
By advertisements in Federation Review, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		31	
			$5,897.00
Balance due			745.92

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *February 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To balance as per last statement	$745.92	
To expenditures from Jan. 1 to 31, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	932.46	
		$1,678.38

CREDIT.

By cash received Jan. 8, 1908	1,500.00	
By subscriptions to league, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	3.00	
By donations to league, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	14.00	
By subscriptions to Federation Review, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	.50	
		1,517.50
Balance due		160.88

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *March 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To balance as per last statement	$160.88	
To expenditures from Feb. 1 to 29, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	1,111.08	
		$1,271.96

CREDIT.

By cash received Feb. 6, 1908	1,000.00	
By subscriptions and donations, Feb. 1 to 29	26.38	
By advertisements in Federation Review	2.50	
		1,028.88
Balance due		243.08

LIABILITIES.

To Wm. Siegrist, printer	$569.08	
To H. Berlin, for arrears in salary	100.00	
To H. S. Ely & Co., March rent	52.50	
		721.56
Deficit		964.64

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *April 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To balance as per last statement	$243.08	
To expenditures from Mar. 1 to Mar. 31, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	1,309.70	
		$1,552.78

CREDIT.

By cash received Mar. 2, 1908	1,250.00	
By subscription and donations, Mar. 1 to 31	2.00	
By advertisements in Federation Review	5.00	
		1,257.00
Balance due		295.78

LIABILITIES.

To William Siegrist, printer	$382.46	
To H. Berlin, for arrears in salary	100.00	
To Law Reporting Co., for reporting league meeting	45.00	
To H. S. Ely & Co., April rent	52.50	
		579.96
Deficit		875.74

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *July 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To balance as per last statement	$295.78	
To expenditures from Apr. 1 to June 30, as per detailed account herewith	4,492.58	
		$4,788.36

CREDIT.

By cash received Apr. 1	1,250.00	
By cash received May 1	2,500.00	
By cash received June 1	1,250.00	
By subscriptions and donations to league, April	13.50	
By subscriptions and donations to league, May	80.80	
By subscriptions and donations to league, June	2.00	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, April	1.50	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, May	13.50	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, June	12.00	
		5,123.30
Balance on hand		334.90

IMMIGRATION BILL IS DISCUSSED—PRESIDENT WILSON HEARS ARGUMENTS BY BOTH SIDES AT OPEN MEETING—THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS, AND FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS PLEAD FOR THE LAW—CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL INFORMED THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE "1,000,000 SOCIALISTS" OPPOSE BILL—TAMMANY AND "BIG BUSINESS" ALSO PROTEST.

WASHINGTON, *January 30.*

In the White House last week 300 men and women urged President Wilson to sign and urged him to veto the Burnett immigration bill. It was an interesting assembly that arranged itself in a semicircle around the Nation's Chief Executive, who gave close attention to the workers' pleas for restriction and the oratorical flights of "big business" representatives. The battle was waged on the section of the bill providing for a literacy test.

Unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and the farmers' organizations asked that the bill be signed. On the other side were patriotic representatives of "big business," vote-hunting politicians from every party, and those who opposed the bill for sentimental reasons.

Ex-Congressman Bourke Cockran, New York lawyer, and Congressman GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, led the opposition. Their rounded sentences and inspiring appeals for the American flag might well be termed classics for schoolboys. Such gems as this were common: "A constellation in the firmament of civilization."

Mr. Cockran indicated who he represented, however, when, in opposition to the literacy test, he said, "I believe a hand calloused with labor should be a better passport."

Former Lieut. Gov. Whitman told the President he represented Tammany, and that that organization was opposed to the bill.

Charles Edward Russel, magazine writer and lecturer, said, "1,000,000 socialists" oppose the bill, which, he declared, was "unsound and could not be enforced."

Secretary Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, diplomatically called attention to the opposition of some associations "that depend for existence for contributions from the employing class." In referring to the $60,000,000 annual income of steamship companies, he said, "this will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men and the attorneys of business men," whose freight charges might be increased to meet the companies' deficit if immigration was restricted. The unionist presented organized labor's position on this question, and showed, by the testimony of investigators, that workers are correct when they state that ignorant aliens are beating down the living standard of American wage earners.

The President gave two and one-half hours to the hearing, which was divided between the two forces. Secretary Morrison had charge of the time for friends of the bill.

J. H. Patten, representing the three farmers' organizations, comprising millions of members, presented resolutions passed by National and State conventions in favor of the bill. The speaker denied the claim that farmers desire the sort of immigrants the bill is intended to exclude. He protested against the "Russianizing" of American labor because of the influx of ignorant aliens.

William M. Clark, vice president Order of Railroad Conductors, spoke on behalf of the railroad brotherhoods, representing 350,000 workers, who favor the bill.

Dr. Stewart Paton, of New York, on behalf of various organizations of alienists and State boards of health said that three-fourths of the insanity in certain sections of the country is the result of illiterate immigration. He said the cost of maintaining them is greater than the cost of our common-school education. His figures were startling. He said this insanity could be largely traced to the flood of aliens arriving every year.

Prof. Fairchild, of Yale University, insisted that the illiteracy test is American and fair. He stated that when this same bill was up for consideration in previous Congresses Italy built schoolhouses in anticipation of its passage. The schoolhouses were abandoned when the bill was defeated.

Prof. Ross, of Wisconsin University, said that of all the tests that had been proposed to restrict immigration the one of illiteracy was the best.

Opponents of the bill showed much alarm at the prospects of this country running short of labor. Many opponents declared in favor of restriction, but "not this kind." None of them, however, even hinted of an effective substitute. Among the other speakers against the bill were Representatives Sabath, of Illinois; Goldfogle, of New York; J. Hampton Moore, of Pennsylvania; and Prof. Larned, of the University of Pennsylvania; Oscar Villard, editor New York Evening Post, and several representatives of foreign fraternal and other organizations.

LITERACY TEST FAVORED BY TRADES-UNIONISTS; AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR SECRETARY MORRISON TELLS WHY.

At a public hearing in the White House last week President Wilson listened to arguments for and against the literacy provision contained in the Burnett immigration bill, which has passed both Houses of Congress by overwhelming votes. Secretary Morrison spoke for the workers of this country, and in urging that the President sign the bill, presented the following defense of the literacy-test clause:

"Mr. President, the proposition to prohibit immigration to the United States of able-bodied men and women because they can not read has a sympathetic viewpoint, where individuals are considered; but, notwithstanding such a viewpoint, the American Federation of Labor, which represents the organized workers of the country, and which is the only method or organization or agency which can with any justification or reason represent the unorganized workers, has repeatedly declared by resolutions in conventions 'that the literacy test is the most practicable means of restricting the present immigration of cheap labor whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign.'

"A great deal has been said and published in an endeavor to create the impression that it is necessary to induce immigration to come to this country for the purpose of securing agricultural workers. There is no question in my mind but that such agitation has for its purpose the enticing of emigrants to our country to supply the United States Steel Co., the great manufacturing concerns, coal companies, packing houses, and railroads with men willing to work at a cheaper wage than those who are born here.

"That there may be no misunderstanding in regard to what the farmers think about using immigrants for farm hands, their representative, in his statement to you to-day, has clearly placed the farmers' organizations on record as opposed to the proposition of bringing immigrants into this country to do agricultural work.

"The opponents of this test make the argument that common laborers would belong to the class that could not pass the literacy test, and that this country is very much in need of that particular kind of labor.

"The great industrial companies of this country have more men to-day than they can employ, but they want the present conditions of unemployment to obtain. They want two men for every job. They know that unemployed men must work to live, and their necessities will force them to accept any wage set by the companies. Hence the workers' wages are literally held below a living wage by the hunger, misery, and distress of the unemployed.

"The organized wage workers have declared in favor of restriction of immigration to maintain unlowered the American standard of life. Those who oppose restriction are representatives of companies and associations composed of employers of labor, whose dominant interest is the dollar, and associations that depend for their existence upon contributions from the employing class.

"They feel that a reduction of immigration will result in a higher wage for their workers, which will disturb the profits and dividends from products manufactured by them, or perhaps they have been informed that if the steamship companies do not receive $60,000,000 a year for transporting aliens they will raise their freight rates.

"This reason will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men, and the attorneys of business men. Restriction may interfere with their profits.

"With them it is always the dollar—with never a thought for the success or comfort of our millions of wageworkers or the hundreds of thousands who are continuously without sustaining employment. The steamship companies' interest in immigration is the $60,000,000 or more a year collected by them for carrying aliens to and from our shores. These companies have no interest in the welfare of our people. Their interest is in the dollars they collect.

"We oppose any attempt to lower the standards of American life. We want to raise them, and we are opposed to the exploitation of millions of aliens with its attending evils to swell the profits of the steamship companies, even if it adds to the resources of those companies $60,000,000 a year, even if it enables the United States Steel Trust to pay dividends and interest on $400,000,000 of stocks and bonds which never cost that company one cent.

"I wish to call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not; that the products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to our shores all the time; that the manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

"The opponents of this measure say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the products at a much higher price than can be obtained in other countries and will be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The protected manufacturer does receive a higher price than the products can be sold for in other countries, and the second contention—that they are thus made able to pay higher wages to their employees—is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages.

"We find that the most highly protected industries, particularly the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing houses, and textile industry, pay to their employees the lowest wage in the country, and some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages paid in these industries.

"We hold that limitation of immigration to our country will compel social and industrial reform in the countries from which the immigrants flow. The fact that these countries have an outlet for a great number of their people means that there is an outlet from the oppressive conditions in those countries. For that reason those countries delay social and industrial reforms. As a consequence industrial and social misery is perpetuated in those countries, because their citizens are induced to come to this country.

"Those of us who have made a careful study of the question and have watched the census have been forced to the conclusion that it has become a habit of mind of the people of this country to have small families. The foreigners who come here have large families, but after being here some time they seem to get into the habit of mind which prevails among those born here; that is, the ever-decreasing number in a family. Those who have given this particular subject much thought and observation have come to the conclusion that this habit of mind is one of the direct results of the tremendous influx of foreign immigration into this country, which causes competition, increases the difficulties in way of obtaining a living wage, and forces the workers to the conclusion that it is their one recourse to enable them to sustain the American standard of life, and to survive the competition of the million or more aliens that have been coming here each year.

"The fact is that immigrants have been exploited to such an extent that workers possessing American ideals can not compete with them.

"On February 2, 1914, Representative AUSTIN read the following letter:

[Edward Horvath Labor Agency, M. Engel, manager. Licensed and bonded. Telephone, Orchard 1039. 124 East Third Street.]

NEW YORK CITY, *October 4, 1913.*

S. E. & H. L. SHEPHERD CO.,
Rockport, Me.

GENTLEMEN: Foreign laborers are now available in this city for less wages than you can secure men for in your State.

Are you in need of any? If so, we can offer for immediate shipment any number of them of any desired nationality.

Trusting to hear from you, we are,

Very truly, yours,

M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

"The following advertisement appeared in a Pittsburgh paper:

"'Men wanted—Tinners, catchers, and helpers to work in open shops; Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians preferred. Steady employment and good wages to men willing to work. Fare paid and no fees charged.'

"The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration, because they desire to retain the American standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor of this country is the result of many years' effort by organized labor. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard wage, he not only takes the place of a man working at a higher rate, but he assists in forcing downward the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, which result carries with it a corresponding reduction in the physical, moral, and intellectual standards of American life.

"It is now an undisputed fact that in many industries the immigrants who come here are working for wages so low that the American worker, insisting on American standards, can not compete with them. In fact, they can not support a family on the wages paid them.

"In support of my statement that the American worker can not compete with this induced immigration and support a family on the wages paid, I refer you, Mr. President, to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, representing over 16,000,000 people, and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Department of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

"The committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, commenting on the wage scale at Bethlehem, said:

"'This is a wage scale that leaves no option to the common laborers but the boarding-boss method of living, with many men to the room. When a man has a family with him, they take in lodgers, or often the woman goes to work. It is reported that immigrant parents send their children back to the old country to be reared while the mother goes to work. On such a wage basis American standards are impossible.'

"Again, they say:

"'None of these common laborers in any of these steel mills are paid a living wage for the average-size family.'

"The literacy test is an expedient which should be adopted now, and time and experience will demonstrate what further legislation will be necessary in the interest and for the safety of the American people, for the improvement of American citizenship and homes, and for the perpetuation of the American Republic.

"The American Federation of Labor, at its convention held in November in Philadelphia, unanimously adopted a report urging the speedy enactment into law of the immigration bill. I will read so much of the report as refers to the literacy test:

"'It may be well understood that the Governments of Europe will exert themselves to the utmost to the end that those who are fit and who survive the destruction of the present conflict will not be permitted to leave their native countries, but will be seduced by whatever promises are necessary to remain and aid in the restoration of those countries to their lost position in commerce and industry, at the same time offering whatever inducements or assistance they may to the migration of the unfit to the United States, Canada, or any other country that may receive them. * * * For this, if for no other reason, the organized labor movement of the North American continent should devote without cessation its most earnest endeavor to secure the speedy passage of the Burnett bill, containing the provision for the literacy test.' * * *

"Mr. President, no other single proposed addition to our immigration laws has received the indorsement accorded to the literacy test. Seven times since 1894 bills to regulate immigration have passed one or the other Houses of Congress; in each case they have been passed by large votes. The Immigration Commission, which studied the question for nearly four years, said in the statement of its conclusions:

"'The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations.'

"A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most favorable single method of restricting undesirable immigration. The majority in this case consisted of eight out of nine members of the commission.

"The men who are chiefly interested in importing cheap labor into this country are the great tariff barons, the great mine barons, who want cheap labor. They know that they can not get cheap labor unless they get ignorant labor, because ignorant labor is the only labor that does not organize, that does not combine, and does not defend itself. When you bar men because of illiteracy, you do not bar them because of themselves—you bar ignorance. You bar ignorance, because ignorance is dangerous to free institutions in a self-governing country."

PRESIDENT VETOES IMMIGRATION BILL—UNIONISTS URGED TO WRITE REPRESENTATIVES—QUICK ACTION NECESSARY TO OFFSET INFLUENCE OF POWERFUL STEAMSHIP LOBBY AND ITS ALLIES—SUCCESS DEPENDS UPON A TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

WASHINGTON, *January 30.*

President Wilson communicated to the House of Representatives, Thursday, that he disapproved the Burnett immigration bill because of the literacy test. The American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and farmers' organizations prepared for this possibility, and have been urging their members to communicate with Representatives, who are being urged to not sustain the President's veto. It is agreed by House Members that action on the veto will be taken next Thursday, February 4. A two-thirds vote is necessary to reject the veto. Both sides in the House have issued a call for absent Representatives, as it is predicted the vote will be as close as when President Taft's veto on the same bill was sustained in the House by but 4 votes.

Trades-unionists are urged to immediately telegraph their Representatives to not sustain the veto. All other believers in maintaining the American standard of living are urged to do likewise. It is imperative that this action be taken to offset the influence of the shipping interests and their allies, who are working under the guise of "liberalism" to permit them free access to the world's cheapest labor markets.

The passage of the Burnett bill is necessary for workers in their struggle to maintain American ideals and living wages.

Inform your Representative of this fact to-day.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1915.

Hon. JOHN BURNETT,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since my letter to you of yesterday, in which I undertook to meet the objections interposed by the President in vetoing the immigration bill, and in which letter I also referred to the source from which the National Liberal Immigration League obtained its financial backing, and in which I also incorporated copies of documents which came into my possession, I have this morning by mail received several documents of importance bearing upon this latter subject. One of them is a copy of an agreement entered into between the National Liberal Immigration League, Mr. N. Behar, managing director, and Bela N. Sekely, field representative of the league. The agreement provides for the commissions which B. A. Sekely shall receive for financial contributions made by trusts, corporations, and holding companies, and special reference to the United States Steel Corporation. For your information, as well as for the record, I inclose a copy of that agreement.

I also inclose a copy of a pen-written letter by Mr. Behar from Wiesbaden, Cologne, under date of August 22, 1913, to Mr. Sekely. These are of the most important among those I received.

In addition, I should say that the person who placed these communications in my possession writes me to the effect that if the documents submitted to you yesterday and the inclosed should be supplemented by others, or if he is wanted "to appear before any properly constituted body to substantiate by statement," and anything in reference thereto, he will be glad to comply. It seemed to me that as chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the House of Representatives all this information should be in possession of yourself, of your committee, and of Congress.

Very truly, yours,

SAML. GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

AGREEMENT.

Entered into June 17, 1912, by and between the National Liberal Immigration League, of New York, party of the first part, and Bela A. Sekely, of New York, party of the second part, witnesseth:

First. Party of the second part agrees to endeavor to raise financial support for the National Liberal Immigration League and party of the first part agrees and obliges itself to pay to party of the second part commissions as stated in the following paragraph for each and all contributions and donations secured by party of the second part.

Second. It is mutually agreed by the contracting parties that party of the first part will pay to party of the second part the following commissions on each of the donations and contributions secured by party of the second part—

(a) On sums over $10,000 a commission of 10 per cent.
(b) On sums over $5,000 up to $10,000 a commission of 15 per cent.
(c) On sums over $1,000 up to $5,000 a commission of 20 per cent.
(d) On sums amounting to $1,000 or less a commission of 25 per cent.
(e) On all contributions and donations made by parties after one year has elapsed since their first contribution was made party of the first part will pay to party of the second part a commission of only 10 per cent irrespective of the size of such contributions or donations.

Third. It is mutually understood and agreed that when a single contribution is made by business concerns known as trusts or holding companies this contribution comprising the contributions of several subsidiary companies of such trust or holding company—like the United States Steel Corporation—then the amount of such contribution is to be subdivided by the number of companies belonging to such trust or holding company, and the percentage of commission is to be determined by, and to be paid on each of the average amounts shown by the subdivision stated above.

Fourth. Party of the first part agrees to pay to party of the second part a weekly sum of $25 to cover his personal expenses, the total of such payments, however, to be deducted from the total of commissions due to party of the second part.

Fifth. Party of the first part agrees to pay the traveling expenses for party of the second part and such necessary business expenses as typewriting, etc.

This agreement can be discontinued by either party in giving two weeks' notice to the other party.

BELA N. SEKELY.

N. BEHAR.

WEISBADEN, COLN., *August 22, 1913.*

MY DEAR MR. SEKELY: I am going shortly to Liverpool, as everything depends on the decision taken there.

I will do my best—as far as argument and persuasion can go.

Received your friendly lines the 5th instant. I hope by this time you have received from Mr. Waron or otherwise the $30.

Very glad to hear that you will go often to the office.

I enjoyed the trip in the steamer, where I could do good service by refraining from sitting at table at night for supper. No more so, since I must count the sous and the pfennigs.

Let us hope, with kind regards for you and Mr. Berlin.

My address: 9 Rue Wauquelin, Paris.

Yours,

N. BEHAR.

I hope you will obtain from Mr. O'Brien to sign a letter to the signatories, which I will send by next mail. The object of the letter in question is to notify our signatories that we will append their names to our arguments.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to use some of his time.

Mr. MOORE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably a strong sentiment among a large number of people in this country that this measure should prevail. These people are actuated by the very highest ideals; they are among our very best citizens and sincerely believe that the immigrant coming to this country who can not read or write is a menace to our institutions. I respect their views, and if I could bring myself to agree with them, I would gladly vote to-day to override the President's veto.

This country was settled by immigrants. Our forefathers came here that they might enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and have an opportunity to work out their own and their children's happiness. I am heartily in favor of keeping out the undesirable alien, and when this measure was under consideration voted for it with the literacy test eliminated. I regret sincerely that it did not pass in that shape. It would have been a stronger and better measure than the one now in force.

Much has been said to-day of the attitude of labor on this important question, and it has been argued that the coming to this country of large numbers of immigrants has tended to decrease the earning capacity of the American citizen. My observation in the great city of New York, where we have to meet and work out this problem, is entirely contrary to that view. I have been a close observer of labor conditions in the city and State of New York and of the wages paid there. I know that 30 years ago the men engaged in the common labor in our State were largely of Swedish, Irish, German, and English extraction. Now the children of these same men are engaged in the skilled trades at wages from 25 to 50 per cent more than they were paid 30 years ago. The effect of immigration has been to force up the wages of the immigrant of 30 years ago, who is the American of to-day. Common labor in the city of New York is now almost entirely performed by the Italians and the other races from southern Europe. We have spent in New York State during the past eight years on the roads in our rural communities and in the rebuilding of the Erie Canal over $150,000,000, and have now under contract or in contemplation the expenditure of over $300,000,000 for the extension of our great subway system in the city of New York. More than half the labor in these great public improvements is performed by unskilled workmen, and the vast majority of the men engaged in this work are illiterate. In New York State we have a law which compels every boy and girl to go to school until they are 14 years of age. In the northern European countries the same law also prevails. Neither the young American or the alien from the countries referred to will perform the common laboring work demanded in the great public improvements we have undertaken in recent years.

I said a moment ago that in New York City we have this great problem to solve, and we are solving it successfully. It is true that at present over 400,000 men and women in our city are out of employment, but in this vast number few are among the illiterate. These people take care of their savings and, when the hard times appear, are able to live on their savings until business revives.

My observation, Mr. Speaker, is that when the illiterate foreigner comes here he is the first one to see the necessity of education. I have gone through some of our night schools and find the great majority of those attending are from our foreign-born population. They can neither read nor write, and they improve the first opportunity to gain this advantage. They learn in these night schools the rudiments of an education and respect for our American institutions, and most of them when they are here long enough to become citizens are sufficiently advanced to present themselves to our courts and be accorded the rights they are entitled to under the law. I have visited some of the high schools in the city of New York. I find that a majority of the boys and girls attending there endeavoring to obtain an education are children of foreign-born parents. These parents, realizing their lack of education, grasp it immediately for their children. I am informed that in the College of the City of New York the parents of three-fourths of the children are of foreign birth. Men on this floor have criticized the character of the citizenship of our city. We are proud of it. The leveling influence of our great public-school system is doing more to solve this problem than all the laws we can place on the statute books. We want the strong, decent immigrant. We need him. We can assimilate him. We are assimilating him. We do not want the criminal, the anarchist, the unclean or indecent, and I am in favor of making the law just as strong as possible to keep out the men and women who, from their character, their health, their previous habits, will not in the end become good American citizens.

The other day, in a conversation with several Members of the House, it was suggested that our pension laws should be amended so as to prohibit the granting of pensions to pensioners who did not reside within the boundaries of the United States. This brought very forcibly to my mind the story of two cousins of my maternal grandfather who came to this country at the outbreak of the Civil War—two young Irishmen who could neither read nor write. They had heard of the war for the preservation of the Union. They knew this country had been the haven for the oppressed of their land, and they offered their services to the United States. One of these illiterate lads was killed at Gettysburg and the other severely wounded. The wounded boy returned to his old home after the war and there married a young Irish woman, and shortly after left her a widow. She is living in the old country, drawing a small pension, which I am sure, when the circumstances are understood, nobody will try to take from her. I simply point out this incident to indicate how unfortunate it would have been if at that time these two young liberty-loving Irishmen had been unable to come here and serve this country in its hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, I address the House to-day with some misgiving. As I indicated in the opening of my remarks, many of the best people in my State and city differ with me on this question. Frankly, I have at times struggled with myself in an effort to see if it were not possible to agree with them on the subject, but I can not do so. In a matter of this kind one must vote according to his conscience, and I can not bring myself to vote to shut the door of opportunity to the unfortunate man or woman who has been denied the chance that you and I have had.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, having supported the bill now pending before the House, I shall now vote to pass it, the veto of the President notwithstanding.

The necessity of some character of restriction to keep from our shores undesirable classes of immigrants has been growing more apparent from year to year, as the records have disclosed an annually increasing number of arrivals at our ports. Various methods have been proposed to solve the problem during the decade that I have been a Member of this body. In 1907 Congress provided for the appointment of a commission to make a thorough study of the entire question. At that time a bill providing a literacy test was pending. Before adopting this plan the House desired that a thorough investigation of the whole subject should be made. This commission was composed of three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House, and three others not Members of Congress. One of these outsiders was a distinguished citizen of the State of California, Mr. William R. Wheeler. An investigation was made of conditions abroad. Exhaustive hearings were had. In reporting the commission was unanimous that some method of restriction was necessary. As I recall—and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] so stated upon the floor yester-

day—eight of the nine members of the commission advocated a literacy test.

The President in his veto message declares that he knows of no desire on the part of the American people for this character of law. My experience in this House has taught me that when a measure passes this body by an overwhelming vote it is in response to a well-defined public sentiment throughout the United States. Upon two occasions a literacy test has passed this House by an overwhelming vote. I maintain there can be no better or more accurate test of public sentiment throughout the country than shown by a majority vote of the Members of Congress representing every section, and who are responsible to the people of their various districts for their every act. Yes; and I have found that the Members of this House are quicker to detect public sentiment than any other body or individual in the country. They appeal to the people every two years.

The President also declares that the political platforms should speak. It seems to me that the President of the United States is the last person upon the face of the globe to disapprove a bill because it is not mentioned in the platform of the party. We have seen too many planks repudiated that were contained in the platform of the Democratic party. We saw the free-toll plank repudiated; and now the President and his party are about to repudiate another plank in the Democratic platform—the one in reference to a second presidential term. So, it seems to me, that this argument falls to the ground. Oh, it may be that this test will not keep out of the United States all of the undesirable immigrants we would desire to keep out, but, in my opinion, it is a step in the right direction. [Applause.]

This method may not be perfect, but what better plan is offered? It will be found that most of those who oppose the literacy test are unfavorable to any form of restriction.

As a nation we have always welcomed the thrifty and industrious immigrant, and will, I hope, continue this policy. Those who fail to have the proper respect for our institutions, those who do not appreciate the value of American citizenship and would subvert our laws, this class we do not welcome. The literacy test, in my opinion, will bar many.

I freely acknowledge that many of our best and most desirable citizens are foreign born. Had they come to this country under present conditions, considering the advance the world has made in education, there would be few, if any, who would have been unable to meet the simple literacy test provided in this bill. Any foreigner imbued with the proper ambition and possessed of sufficient enterprise would fit himself for the test.

In this connection I will quote the language of the literacy test. I do not see how it can be seriously objected to in this enlightened age. It reads as follows:

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in some one of the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect.

When the war in Europe ends the Pacific coast will be confronted with a new immigration problem resulting from the opening of the Panama Canal. Then the European immigrant will land directly at our doors. We are taking steps to meet the situation. The best methods of locating immigrants in the soil is being studied. With this in view, a Pacific coast immigration congress was held in San Francisco in April, 1913, attended by 327 delegates from 42 cities in California, Oregon, and Washington.

As shown by evidence already placed in the RECORD, the chief fight against this section is being inspired by the foreign steamship companies which profit so largely from the traffic. They want no restriction of immigration. It is not surprising that these companies have contributed to the fund raised by the National Liberal Immigration League, which is the leading organization fighting against the restriction of immigration. Probably it will be impossible to override the veto of the President owing to his power, but the issue will be a live one in the next campaign. Organized labor is interested. Patriotic men and women in every section, anxious to raise the standard of American citizenship, will continue the fight.

In California no man or woman can enjoy the privilege of full citizenship, can exercise the right of the ballot, unless able to both read and write. Should not the immigrants entering that State be able to read at least, as provided in the literacy test?

We of the Pacific coast want restriction that will aid in excluding the undesirable classes, and, in my opinion, this bill is a marked advance over existing laws or any new law so far proposed. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Mr. FARR addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE].

Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, if the Democratic Party were going to remain in power indefinitely there would be no occasion to restrict immigration. The Democratic Party always has restricted immigration, and for a splendid reason, and that reason is that when the Democrats are in power there is no work in this country for the laboring man, whether he be foreign or domestic. The Republican Party was divided in the last presidential campaign. However, notwithstanding that division, I want to make this observation, that if President Wilson had gone before the American people with the statement that there would be a bill such as this before the American Congress, and that it would pass both the House and the Senate and that he would veto it, he never would have been President of the United States. [Applause.] There never would be a man elected President who was opposed to restricted immigration if the people knew his position prior to the date of election. They say that they qualify quickly in this country; that they learn to read and write quickly. I see no reason why a man, if he is competent, can not qualify just as quickly in some other country as he can after he gets here. I fail to see the force of that suggestion.

I have in my office now no less than 100 protests from different sections of the United States, all coming from organized labor, requesting that I vote to pass this bill over the President's veto. I have two letters on my desk at this time requesting that I vote to sustain the President of the United States. And I apprehend, gentlemen, that the ratio of population of this country is in accord with the ratio of letters which I have received pro and con upon this question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma. I can not yield now. I undertake to say that for every man in America, whether for labor or otherwise, for every man who is opposed to restricted immigration there are no less than 50 who favor restricted immigration, and you can generally rely upon the disinterested, honest, frank, and candid judgment of the American people.

Talk about its not being in the Democratic platform. The President says it has been in no platform. The President is mistaken about that. Every party that has ever mentioned it has always declared in favor of restricted immigration. But the President has been for some things that were not only in the platform, but which declared for the opposite of his subsequent position. I speak particularly of the Panama Canal tolls. The ladies went to him some time ago and interrogated him in respect to woman suffrage. He said, "I can not do anything, because it is not in my party's platform." Well, I will tell you there was something, gentlemen, in the Baltimore platform; there was a plank or paragraph in that platform that the people of America were for. I refer to rural credits. There was an affirmative statement in favor of rural credits in that platform, so that the President, it seems to me, could find something to do by taking up things they did declare for. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a notification of the resignation of a Member. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *February 1, 1915.*

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Washington, D. C.:

Have this day tendered my resignation as Member of House of Representatives to the governor of New Jersey. Formal notification mailed to you this morning.

EUGENE F. KINKEAD.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message vetoing this bill, in speaking of the literacy test, employed the following language:

> Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a nation, would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics.

That is true, Mr. Speaker, but the American Government of to-day is unlike the American Government of yesterday. Conditions prevailed then not only in this country but in other countries very much different from now.

New and changed conditions have made necessary new and changed laws. What was the situation in the formative period of this Government? Here was a great country with untraveled forests, unexplored streams, and unbounded opportunities; a country that extended an invitation to the oppressed and adventurous of other lands—an invitation, however, that was accepted mainly by the sturdy Anglo-Saxon, whose ambitions cried out for liberty and whose heart beat for freedom. The undesirables, the riffraff, the outcasts, and the scum of other countries did not accept the invitation, first, because they were unable to feel its warmth of meaning, and secondly, because they did not breathe the spirit of adventure, thrift, and liberty—qualities that make a people strong, a nation great.

There were in those days, Mr. Speaker, no great steamship lines to encourage and bring over for selfish purposes the criminals and illiterates of other lands, but those who came were moved by a spirit of liberty, a love of freedom. If you say few of them were educated, I answer yes. If you say that had the literacy test then been invoked few of them could have entered, I answer yes. All that is true, yet it argues nothing. In those days many people, not only in America, but in the great countries of Europe were uneducated. One hundred and twenty-five years ago few colleges and no public schools could be found in this country, but since that time no fact has been appreciated quite so much by the American people as the necessity of education. They see in it the preservation of high ideals, the perpetuity of Christian institutions, the stability of the Government, and the greatness of the Nation.

In 1800 there was expended in this country for education a little more than $1,000,000. Last year there was expended over $700,000,000. Since the foundation of our Government we have expended incalculable sums for education, and to-day schoolhouses nestle on almost every hill and great towering universities and magnificent colleges are found in almost every community throughout this country.

The spirit of education pervades all our people, and why? Because we would inculcate into their hearts and minds the highest ideals of good government and good citizenship. A similar condition is found in practically all the civilized countries of the world. There is no reason now, as there might have been in former days, for any person in any part of the civilized world to be deprived of an education—the best test of the true qualities of good citizenship.

I ask you, sirs, in view of these changed conditions, is it asking too much that the same test be applied by this Government to those who would seek the opportunities and advantages of our land, the protection of our Government, and the society of our people as is applied to our own citizenship? [Applause.] There is nothing unfair or unjust in the literacy test. It will deprive none who are entitled to come from coming; it will allow those who ought to come to come; and by the adoption of such a test as is embodied in this bill the high ideals and splendid character of our people will continue to be exerted, shedding the benign influence of liberty and freedom and good government to all the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it was before the House, and I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

I do so with some doubts on the subject, because there are arguments in favor of restriction that appeal to me. But, Mr. Speaker, restriction of immigration runs counter to all our history and our democratic sentiments. I am not yet convinced that we need restriction of immigration in the United States.

It is true the conditions of to-day are somewhat different from those of 100 years ago, but to-day in America, with millions of untilled acres of land, thousands of acres of forests untouched, vast resources that are undeveloped, this country could support in prosperity and happiness millions and hundreds of millions of more people than it has to-day. If the coming of men to America meant that every man who came took some bread out of the mouths of those already here, if the amount of wealth was limited and it meant sharing it with more men, if our resources were developed and our power to support population fully matured, then, indeed, it would be wise to restrict immigration. But that is not the fact, and every man in this country knows that it is not the fact.

Furthermore, even if it were necessary to restrict immigration to-day I would be opposed to the literacy test, which is no test whatever of a man's qualifications to become a citizen of the United States. The question is not whether you can read or write or whether you have been educated, but are you educatable, are you the kind of people who will take advantage of the opportunities for education and work if you have them?

Unfortunately there are many countries in Europe peopled by men who have fine human qualities, where the opportunities for education are very limited, and thousands and thousands of men get no opportunity whatever to go to school. I do not believe that it is American, I do not believe that it is just to exclude such men merely because they have not had opportunities in their own land. I would point out to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who speaks of the vast amount of wealth we spend in education, the fact that that wealth that we put into education has been largely created by immigrants and the sons of immigrants. These men who come here bring with them not only mouths to feed, but hands to work with, and they produce more wealth than they consume.

The one argument, Mr. Speaker, that appeals to me in favor of restriction is the one from the labor-union point of view. There is no doubt that the steady flow to this country of large numbers of unskilled laborers from other countries makes more difficult the great problem of union labor, and with that I sympathize. But I believe that we can help laboring men more in this country, and labor unions more, not by this crude makeshift policy of exclusion, but by better laws for the distribution of immigrants when they come, and better laws governing the distribution of wealth which the workers receive in this country. [Applause.] I will go as far as any man in Government action to encourage unions, to protect the right of men to organize, but restriction of immigration does not appeal to me as a way of helping the workingman.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I shall vote to sustain the President's veto. [Applause.]

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1365), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order on the bill.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect anything to arise that would call for an effort on my part during the short time that I am to be among you as a Member of this honorable body. But an occasion has arisen which I can not conscientiously ignore, especially as no one else seems to insist on the aspect of the matter which appeals so strongly to me.

I leave Washington on March 4 next with the conviction that I have been made a better and broader-minded American citizen by my term in Congress and by contact with the many men of brilliant parts who, in the ranks of different parties, are serving their country unselfishly and well.

But before going from among you I feel in duty bound to give voice to a protest and a warning, and I do it not only as a Member of this House but also as an American citizen trained from youth to respect authority.

As Members of Congress we are called to be the big men of the country. This is the place where big things have to be dealt with that concern a big Nation's health and prosperity. As Representatives of the people in the work of national legislation we should be a pattern for the people in all that makes for sound citizenship.

It is in this spirit that I protest with all the earnestness and energy within me against the insinuating language which has been used on the floor of this House with reference to the President of the United States.

We enjoy the privilege of differing with the President on each and all of his policies. We have the privilege of voicing

such differences either here or elsewhere and of giving the reasons that seem to justify our opposition to his plans and measures for the welfare of the country. We have the privilege of fighting against his policies with all the energy of our convictions. But I hold, gentlemen, that we are doing a positive injury to the Nation and to the dignity which should characterize all our activities as Members of this important branch of the Government when we descend to personalities and to mean insinuations that seem to imply dishonest or dishonorable conduct on the part of the President.

By choice of the people he is President of the United States, and as long as he occupies the White House he is President not merely of the Democrats but of all the people—your President, gentlemen of the minority, as well as mine. As such we owe him respect, and we should be the first to give this example to the Nation.

Remember, it is not opposition to the President—it is not persistent and conscientious antagonism to policies the President may favor—which I am protesting against as hurtful. My protest is entirely against the manner in which that opposition has been expressed on the floor of this House; against unjustifiable accusations and insinuations and language that was full of disrespect for the Chief Executive.

Deep down in our souls, gentlemen, we of this House know that Woodrow Wilson stands before the country and the world as a man of transparent patriotism, unshakable honesty, and singleness of purpose—a man whose whole thought is the welfare of the Nation, the peace, happiness, and prosperity of its people. We know him as a man of courage and strong convictions, so conscious of rectitude that he can court the searchlight of publicity with confidence in the sound judgment of the people.

In the political history of the Nation there have been many truly great men. We have a Washington, a Jefferson, a Jackson, and a Lincoln to honor and be proud of. Yet in their day, when the country was profiting by their service, their patriotism was questioned, their motives maligned, and they themselves made the butt of many a jibe and sneer. Disaster was prophesied as a result of their policies. Well, these critics have passed into oblivion, but the names of these great Presidents are enshrined in the memory of the Nation forever.

Who of us to-day would dare to stand on this floor and insinuate that President Lincoln was a sneak? Who would dare speak of Jackson as a coward? None, of course, because we know that to do so would be to sound the death knell of one's political career. Yet these accusations have been hurled at the head of our present distinguished President, and while the gentlemen who went to such extremes may have been able to convince themselves that there was sufficient foundation for their accusations, I am maintaining that they are false, and that such language is a disgrace and an injury to all of us as a body and to the people we represent, and may be productive of consequences which these same gentlemen would be the first to regret.

There was a Brutus once, "the noblest Roman of them all, who loved the name of honor more than he feared death; who would have brooked the eternal devils to keep a state in Rome," yet the smooth and sweet-tongued Cassius and his fellows, with persistent insinuations, under the guise of a sublimated patriotism, were able to inveigle even Brutus into believing that the undoing of Caesar was for the good of Rome, and moved him to a deed which he regretted only when it was too late.

And if a Brutus could be so influenced against the man who called him friend, and who, when he plunged the dagger in, said, "You, too, Brutus?" what of the ever-present multitude whose passions are easily inflamed by words spoken in high places, perhaps in haste and without the judicial calmness which should mark the utterances of all Members of this distinguished body?

In times of great stress great passions lie smouldering near the surface, and oftentimes a trifling word or act may start a flame that would develop into a conflagration. Among the many millions of our people there are always those who seem forever wandering on the very brink of fanaticism, ready to leap beyond the bounds of all restraint on the slightest provocation. We as a Nation are at the present time going through such a period of stress.

The terrible war into which all of the great European nations have unfortunately plunged has prolonged and emphasized the slight depression which was bound to follow the great body of legislation which this Congress has enacted into law. Most naturally the condition affects more acutely the great multitudes who labor and who have little or no resources to fall back upon, who in their present need see little comfort in the good that is predicted. Many of these are not inclined to search beneath the surface of things for real causes, but slip into the old fallacy of arguing "after this; therefore because of this," or, in other words, "the milk soured after the new moon, therefore the new moon caused the milk to sour." They blame their troubles on the new administration, and there are politicians petty and unpatriotic enough to further their own selfish ends by fostering this attitude in the minds of such people.

For these people the administration centers in the President, particularly when, as now, the President stands out predominant as a big man; a strong man who has admittedly accomplished big things. Therefore we should weigh our words and let them be the result of serious reflection, the words of men who measure up under all conditions to the dignity of the position they occupy.

Besides, gentlemen, we are a cosmopolitan Nation. Many of our citizens are children of nations now unhappily at war, struggling perhaps for their very existence. Most naturally their sympathies go out to their native land in the present gigantic conflict, and even though the administration is trying most scrupulously to maintain an attitude of strict neutrality, it would not take a great deal of unjust criticism to convince some that the Executive of the Nation is not doing all in his power to preserve an impartial attitude toward all.

We as a Nation are blessed with peace amid almost universal turmoil, with glorious prospects ahead, please God, because of peace, and we look forward to the happy time for which we pray when, because of neutrality, we shall be a strong force in securing for all a happy and lasting peace.

As regards the great forces of labor in this country, to which one Member referred while charging the President, I can say that, having come from the ranks of labor myself, I yield to no man in my sympathy and in my respect for that great institution—the laboring man.

I have worked for them with Wilson, both in the State of New Jersey and the Nation, and I am firmly convinced that when he lays down the burden of office the workingmen of America will have lost the truest and most sympathetic and effective friend that ever occupied the White House.

The times are big, gentlemen; big with calamity; big with prospects for the future. Let us be big and avert calamity from our Nation; big to grasp all opportunities for our people. Paraphrasing Wolsley's advice to Cromwell, Let all the ends we aim at be our country's, our God's, and truth's. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill because it restricts immigration. Had I lived a hundred years ago I would have been opposed to it for the same reason that I am in favor of it now. One hundred years ago we needed more people, now we need less. A hundred years ago there were more opportunities than there were men. During the long years of the century just passed people have been coming here by the millions. One opportunity after another has been taken, until now our country is full of men and our cup of opportunities is about empty. There are at least a million more people now here than there are jobs. We ought to send a million undesirable men back to their native land instead of permitting any more to come. It is true in times past we made this country the asylum for all the world, but our gates should now be closed, for the room is all taken. Years ago we had an insane asylum at Napa City, Cal., but after a while it became full, and the management refused to admit another patient. I say, as an asylum for immigrants, the United States is full. Ninety-nine million people are all it will hold, and we have a hundred million on hand. For one I am in favor of closing the gates of our country against laboring immigrants, at least until what we now have are assimilated.

Some one has said:

> The literacy test, and the tests and restrictions which accompany it, constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation.

The same force of reason could have been used against the failure of the management to admit patients to the Napa Insane Asylum after it was full.

You might just as well demand that your friend should drink a barrel of water because he asked for water when thirsty as to claim the United States should not stop foreign immigration when its needs are supplied. [Applause.]

I consider the passage of this bill of more importance than was the passage of the Underwood tariff bill or the banking and currency bill. Those measures dealt with the finances of the country; this bill deals with the personnel of the country; and as men are of more importance than dollars, so this bill is of more importance than any measure dealing with money. This country is rich in financial resources. As far as wealth is concerned, it will last forever. Our valleys, rich with alluvial soil, and our mountains, stored with gold, are a guaranty against poverty; but bear in mind gold and silver are not the greatest consideration of a nation. Especially is this true of a Republic that claims to be the light of the world. With the advantages God has given us, foolish, indeed, would we be if by the passage of nonsensical laws we confound our resources so our temporal wants can not be supplied. Our forefathers established a Government that, like our soil, is the best there is on earth, a Republic where every man has an equal opportunity and an equal say, and where each man's power is as great as that of his fellow's. This land in the days of our forefathers was full of opportunities but empty of men, and so they threw wide open our eastern and western gates, invited the European to come by the way of New York and the oriental by the way of San Francisco, but at no time have they intimated that their invitation would never cease. An invitation is always limited to time, place, and numbers, and by its very nature signifies there will come a time when the gates will be closed.

When our fathers won this land on the bloody battle fields and extended an invitation to the world to come, they reserved unto themselves and their children the right to withdraw the invitation whenever they should see fit, and during the years that have passed we have exercised this right whenever we so desired.

In 1892 we closed our western gates to the Chinese and departed from our original policy in reference to them. At that time there were a hundred million of them who wanted to come, but we told them frankly that our invitation to them had ceased. We did not do this because we dislike them or because it was for their best interests to stay away, but because it was for the best interests of our country that they should not come. Doubtless by this act we prevented many good men from coming here, but, nevertheless, by the exclusion we did our country a thousand times more good than harm.

This country does not belong to the world, as some people seem to think, but it belongs to us and our children forever, and the question is, Are we wise enough to keep it? To-day, in spite of the Chinese-exclusion and other exemptions we have made, we find too many immigrants are coming to our shores and that we must make a further exclusion.

Being unable to assist all of the unfortunate, poor, and needy, have we not the privilege to decide who shall be the recipients of our bounty? Unfortunate, poor, and miserable people pass the door of each Member of this House daily. Do you take them in and warm, feed, and clothe all of them? No; you decide according to your best judgment and aid the ones whom you consider are most apt to be worthy. As a class, the foreigner who can not read in his own language is an idler, spendthrift, and has no capacity or desire to learn. There are thousands of exceptions, doubtless, but what I have stated is the rule.

At least you will admit the illiterate class has a greater percentage of people who would not make good citizens here than the class which is composed of people who have had energy and capacity to acquire a little learning at home. We would not, however, want it to be understood we favor excluding the ignorant people because our hearts do not beat in sympathy with them, but, being obliged to exempt another class from the benefits of this country, we consider it wise and just to decide in favor of the intelligent class as being most desirable to us and, as a class, the most deserving. By making this choice we decide in favor of intelligence and learning, and thus impress upon the people of the world the value of knowledge, and in this way emphasize upon the minds of ignorant people of all lands the fact that the human race is developing, and that all must keep apace with the times.

Enlightenment being necessary in this country, we have decided to exclude the ignorant. Some one has said:

This is an exclusion against those who have not had opportunity.

Such is not the truth. Many people in Europe have not had an opportunity to attend a college or university. Some have not had an opportunity to attend a school of any kind; but all have had an opportunity to learn to read simple words in their own tongue. A primer in any language can be purchased for a few pennies or a dime, and anyone who has been sufficiently frugal to earn traveling expenses with which to come to this country and money enough to guarantee against becoming a pauper certainly has had the opportunity to buy a little book. On the corner of almost every street in any city of the world can be found persons who will help another learn his letters and to read 40 simple words. I am sick of hearing people talk about poor, lazy mortals, covered with dirt and scurvy, never having had an opportunity in the world.

The man who has not had an opportunity to learn to read 40 simple words in his mother tongue, has never heard of the United States, and should he by chance wander onto a ship coming to these ample shores, would be excluded from landing by the immigration authority under the present law on the ground that he was an idiot. I do not say all who can not read in their own language are idiots, but I do say all who have not had an opportunity to do so are of unsound mind. I freely admit there are thousands of good people in the world who can not now meet the educational test of this bill; but I claim it would be no unreasonable hardship while earning sufficient money with which to pay traveling expenses here to employ an hour or two each evening for a couple of months learning enough to meet this educational test. [Applause.]

Certain animals when born have not the power of sight, but nature has ordained that such shall not wander from the parental nest until they can see. This bill provides that prospective immigrants must stay at home until through their intellectual eyes they begin to discern at least some rays of light. It is better they remain at home during the black hours of intellectual night in a monarchical form of government where others see and think for them, in a government they can not harm, than to come to this Republic, where enlightenment is the watchword and where all are equal.

Ignorance is the greatest enemy of a republican form of government. It will no more live in harmony with a republic than will fire exist in harmony with water. Wherever a republic and ignorance meet, one subdues the other; it means an uncompromising fight to the finish. Sometimes one is victorious, and sometimes the other; it depends altogether, and always, upon the relative strength of each. But bear in mind that victory for either in a way means defeat, for the victor always comes out of the ordeal more or less injured. Just in proportion as you fill up a republican form of government with ignorance, just to that extent do you bring down its standards. If the standards fall below a certain point, the ship of state will be left to unskilled hands and will soon drift among the rocks of revolution and be lost, and ignorance will prevail. If the standards are left just above this point, the ship will still take its feeble course without proper attention soon to become a byword among men. For one I am not in favor of mingling the clay of ignorance with the iron of this Republic.

Ignorance thrives in a monarchical form of government, for there the subjects do not govern themselves, but are governed. The more ignorant the subject is, the easier is he governed. I would rather the prospective immigrant would stay at home while he is ignorant, where his ignorance is a blessing, than to come to this country where his ignorance is a curse. Let him prepare himself while in his own land, to be a blessing to our land when he comes. When I invite a tramp to abide under my roof, I always insist that he take a bath before he retires for the night. Once I purchased a Texas steer, but I sawed off his horns before I turned him loose, for fear he might harm the other stock. I insist that care and preparation is necessary before any radical change is made, for without it one may become injured, or may injure others.

As I said before, I would, if I could, stop all immigration of the working classes to this country, not because I hate the working classes that might come but because I love the working classes that are now here. The working classes come to this country to get a job, and there are not jobs enough for those who are already here. There are a million men in this country now, looking for a job. They might just as well be looking for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. The one does not exist any more than the other. It is because I love the working classes at home, and the working classes abroad, that I would restrict immigration. The working classes that come would be disappointed, for they would not find what they seek, and the working people here would be disappointed to have the foreigner come and be their competitors, so it is a blessing at home and abroad, to have them not come. The only persons who will be benefited by immigration are those connected with the transportation companies, the agencies across the water that thrive on immigration, and the employing classes here. If 1,000,000 immigrants come to this country each year, and there are frequently more than that number, and the transportation companies charge $50 apiece for bringing them here, it is plain to see their gross income will be $50,000,000 per annum. Viewed from this standpoint, it is not strange there are some whose hearts are turned to stone

in reference to the working classes at home, but whose hearts fairly bleed for the men intellectually as dark as night, who live in the jungles across the sea.

I am in favor of restricting immigration, because I believe in equality, and immigration, under its present condition, works a hardship upon the working classes in this country, while the capitalists receive a great benefit. The more men there are hunting jobs that do not exist, the more competition there is in labor, and the more labor is degraded. The more men there are hunting jobs which do not exist, the greater the benefit to capital that is anxious to secure cheap labor. Every man who comes here hunting work is a blessing to the capitalist, for he wants work to be cheap. Every man who comes here seeking work is a curse to the laboring man, for he wants expensive work. The working classes that come to this country must be assimilated by the working classes that are now here. Some people seem not to know how the working classes feel on this subject of foreign immigration. Let me call the attention of such to the fact that the American Federation of Labor, with its membership of more than 2,000,000 wage earners, in every national convention of recent years, with all the States represented, has asked for this legislation. The United Mine Workers of America, with 450,000 deserving members, are in favor of it; in fact, the last resolution they adopted a few days ago demanded the suspension of all immigration until the million of unemployed men now in the country could be furnished with work. The Farmers' Union, 3,000,000 strong, demands this legislation. The National Grange, the Farmers' National Congress, the Railway Trainmen's Association, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Conductors, and Firemen, all are praying for the passage of this bill.

Within the last 48 hours I have received letters and resolutions from S. E. Heberling, international president of Switchmen's Union; G. W. Perkins, international president of the Cigar Makers' International Union; O. L. Baine, general secretary-treasurer, at international headquarters, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union; J. T. Carey, president-secretary International Brotherhood of Ropemakers, Albany, N. Y.; V. A. Olander, secretary-treasurer of Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.; J. W. Hays, secretary-treasurer International Typographical Union, Indianapolis, Ind.; E. Lewis Evans, secretary-treasurer Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville, Ky.; John P. White, president, and William Green, secretary and treasurer, of United Mine Workers of America; Frank Duffy, general secretary of United Brotherhood of Carpenters-Joiners; S. J. Konenkomp, international president, and Wesley Russell, international secretary-treasurer, of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Chicago, Ill.; James Wilson, general president Pattern Makers' League of North America; and others too numerous to mention, all demand in the strongest terms the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The issue in regard to this measure is clearly drawn. All the laborers, toilers, farmers, artisans, mechanics, and those who wear gloves to protect their hands against blisters and slivers are on one side while the transportation companies, the rich and employing classes, all who wear gloves to keep their hands from becoming sunburned are on the other. Every man who wants a job is in favor of the bill and every man who has a job that he wants to fill with a man is against it. If you who are opposed to this measure only had faith enough in the judgment of the working man to believe he knows what he wants the controversy would end right now in favor of the bill; but you are not willing to make such a monstrous concession. You will never be able to say that you did not know what the toilers wanted, for they have written, telegraphed, and sent you resolutions by the thousands. You will not find one intelligent toiler anywhere in the 48 States of this Republic, who is posted and willing to use his own judgment, who will not tell you he is in favor of suspending all immigration of the working classes until again there are more opportunities in this country than there are men. [Applause.]

Some say this country is a refuge and asylum for the poor and oppressed, therefore we should not make the exclusion. If not now, when we have a hundred million people, when shall we make it? Will not your arguments be just as applicable when the time comes? Is anyone so shortsighted as to claim the exclusion should never be made. Is it the idea of such that here should be the great melting pot; that the gold of this country should be mingled with the silver, the copper, the tin, the zinc, and the lead of all lands? If so, let me tell you the crucible, when finally cooled, will contain a base metal without quality and without use. The gold will have lost its ring, the iron will have lost its strength, and the individuality of each metal will be gone forever.

Some say ignorant immigrants should be brought to this country to occupy positions which the people here now will not fill, that we are continually evoluting and leaving behind a class of work that we have outgrown. I object to this conclusion, because the premises are not true. Such a notion is against the fundamental doctrines of this Republic. In this country we have no use for kings, crowns, titles, caste, or class. In this country all work is honorable and the hands of every honest man, regardless of what kind of work he does, are clean.

Gentlemen talk in sentimental tones about the men in Europe coming here to escape the tyranny and oppression of their native land. I would like to invite some of you city-bred, hothouse, sentimental gentlemen to come out into the great West and temper your sentiment with observation and reason. If you did, you would be convinced that illiterate foreigners do not come here to escape anything save, too often, the laws of their own land, which they have violated. They come here because the financial opportunities are greater; because more pumpkins can be grown on an acre of land; and because red wine costs but 19 cents a gallon. There is no more sentiment about these letterless immigrants than there is about a swine drinking clabber milk. The only purpose the majority of them have in coming to this country is to get their feet into the trough.

My friends, will you kindly stop figuring from the standpoint of the man in Europe and figure from our own standpoint, and tell me, as long as we can not admit everybody, why we should not take our pick, and have the best?

As our cup will only hold so much, why not fill it with strawberries instead of soap root and choke cherries?

Why should we invite to become members of our great national family people of whom we will be ashamed?

In this country where we spend millions of dollars each year combating ignorance, why should we import more?

Why not import men to help us fight ignorance rather than import ignorance for us to fight? [Applause.]

I am sorry this bill is not broad enough at least to exclude Japanese, Hindus, and other Asiatic laborers. The people of the East do not yet realize the importance of this matter, because they have not come in contact to any extent with this strange people from across the sea.

California being on the shores of the Pacific seems to be a dumping ground for the undesirable from Asia, and I assure you the Hindu and the Japanese are the greatest problems and the greatest plagues we have in the West. Japanese are very spirited and proud fellows, who consider nothing too good for them. They locate in the garden spots of the State, bring their customs and manner of living, of course, with them; consequently as they come in the refined American with his ideals goes out. It matters not whether it be city lots or country property, the land adjacent to Japanese habitations continually decreases in value from the standpoint of an American purchaser.

You may be surprised when I say the influx of Hindus into the West threatens to be even a greater menace than the immigration of Japanese. Hindus are now going to the Pacific coast by the thousands. They are an odd, inferior people, bound down by strange traditions and religious fanaticisms. They ever present the appearance of slothfulness, stupidity, and pity. They appear to be oblivious to the sensations of either pleasure or pain. The Hindu is as tough as whalebone, and instead of eating when hungry simply takes up another notch in his belt. It is impossible for the American laborer to compete with the Hindu laborer. The Hindu will wear the clothes which the American discards, eat the food the Americans will not use, and can work 20 hours a day if necessary.

Some time ago I filed a bill asking for the exclusion of these strange specimens of humanity. When it comes before the House I am sure every man who understands the true condition will vote for it. They must be excluded sooner or later, and why not now? Every dollar the Hindu gets is sent to his native land, with which to pay the traveling expenses to this country of his cousin, and it is very discouraging when we take into consideration they all seem to be cousins, and millions of them are anxious to come.

The most important matter pertaining to immigration is to keep from our shores all who lower our national standards. The hand that brings down the standards of a nation is an instrument of sure destruction. You might as well take the warmth from the sunbeams of heaven, or innocence from the heart of a child, as to take away the ideals of a people.

A tidal wave may sweep over a land, wash down its buildings, and change the face of the country, but by and by the sun and time will do its work, the land will become dry and be restored; earthquakes may shake down a city and leave yawning fissures everywhere, but after a while rehabilitation will

do its work, and the effect of the earthquake will be no more; famine, gaunt and hungry, may hover for years above a fruitful land, but by and by years of plenty will come, and the nation will still live and prosper; but when the ideals and standards of the people are gone they are gone forever, and destiny has decreed that nation shall cease, and it matters not the size of her standing army or the number of her warships on the sea, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting" is written high upon the wall. Mr. Speaker, I object to promiscuous immigration, because it lowers our national standards.

First. It lowers our standards as to labor. When the American laborer, educated, cultured, and possessed of high ideals, is obliged to work by the side of a man or a number of men who can not read or write and who do not know whether Napoleon Bonaparte was once the Emperor of France or the captain of a whaling vessel on the Northern Sea, it has its effect on labor and causes a man of spirit to feel that he is too good a man to do no higher grade of work than such fellows are capable of doing. What would a young wife think of her husband if he persisted in working with such a band of human scarecrows? The presence of these ignorant workmen brings down the American standard of labor.

Second. They bring down the standard of wages as well as the standard of labor. If there are 25,000,000 people in this country who want a job and there are 25,000,000 jobs in this country, each can be accommodated; but send a million more men, making 26,000,000 who desire a job, and they will compete with each other, bringing down the standard of wages, and after all a million of them will be obliged to remain idle. Thus will be lowered the standard of American wages. [Applause.]

Third. The standard of living and the standard of morality of our people are lowered by the arrival of this ignorant and immoral horde from across the sea. I tell you, whatever lowers the moral standards of our people strikes at the very heart of this Republic.

Fourth. Intelligence is another one of our great standards. When the immigrant comes to this country, while yet far out at sea, he sees the great monument, the Statue of Liberty—Liberty enlightening the world. From this he gets the idea, first, that we are a liberty-loving, patriotic people; and, secondly, that we are an enlightened people, each of which is true. We love to think we are the most enlightened Nation. We love to think the United States of America is the intellectual light of the world. Every person in this country who has a piece of property as large as an oyster shell is taxed to maintain our public-school system. We claim this system to be the best there is in the world. We have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in public schoolhouses, in colleges, and universities of learning. We have State laws compelling children to be sent to school.

In California, my State, every child under the age of 14 years must go to school. If the parents will not send him the parents are arrested and punished. If the parents are not able to send their children to school our local authorities will do so; and, as a result, in the great State of California there is not one native son or daughter who arrives at the age of 18 who has not a fair knowledge, at least, of the grammar course. I presume the same condition prevails in the other States of this Union. If they do not now, I am sure in the near future they will, because intelligence is one of our national standards. We do not thus compel a child to attend school simply for the benefit of the child, but we do it to keep up our standards.

I want to ask you gentlemen who are opposed to this bill if you think it would be right, in view of all this, to permit each year a half million of full-grown men and women, intellectually as dark as midnight, incapable of reading a word in their native tongue, to come to this country, associate with our children and our people? Will you dare tell me such would not debase our intellectual standard?

Fifth. Unrestricted immigration lowers the standard of patriotism in our country. In considering this phase of the subject let us forget for a moment all other effects which it produces, for they are as nothing compared to this. Labor may be considered a disgrace, wages reduced to a minimum, our schoolhouses and colleges may become inhabited by owls, yet nationally we may live as long as we respect our Constitution and enforce our laws and the fires of patriotism continue to burn. [Applause.]

Every man who comes here who does not love this form of government lowers the standard of patriotism. How can a person love this form of government who knows nothing about it, and how can a man know anything about this form of government who has not taken interest enough at home sufficient to enable him to read and write? After such a one comes to our shores and begins to learn and think, his early environments and naturally debased tendencies may drive him to anarchy and revolution. I like your banking and currency act, your project to build a railroad into Alaska, all laws calculated for the financial betterment of this country and its people, but these are nothing compared to keeping up the standard of our citizenship. We may lose much of our wealth and yet be prosperous; lose standing among the nations of the earth and yet succeed; but when a large proportion of the people of this country are not in love with our Constitution and laws we are marked as a lamb for the slaughter. [Applause.]

Gentlemen seem to figure that this Nation, because it is named the United States of America, will endure forever; an unwise conclusion, I assure you. Nations, like everything else, have their morning, their noon, and their night of life, and the only way we can stay the lengthening shadows of this Nation's day is by keeping our people in harmony with its fundamental principles and desires. When this Nation shall go the way of the other nations of the earth it will not be because some hostile foe has come across the waters and sunk our ships. It will not be because our valiant Army has been defeated upon the shore, but it will come in the form of revolution; come from within, and not from without. When that sad day shall come to curse the earth and this Republic of freedom and liberty shall go down in wreck and ruin, a mighty tower should be erected out on the great highways of the earth and in that tower the bells should never cease to toll, and on it should be written in letters of black, "The Government of the United States of America was lost by reason of the lack of patriotism of her people." [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time now?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, after a studious consideration of all the arguments that have been advanced in opposition to the literacy test as applied to our immigration laws, I am constrained to add by voice and vote in favor of this bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question of an amendment to our immigration laws that would in some degree regulate and restrict the great tide of aliens flowing into the country from southern Europe has been much agitated and discussed in Congress and in the public press during the last two decades. That an urgent necessity exists for some legislation that would conserve the peace and the material and social welfare of the country has been the almost overwhelming sentiment of Congress during that period, as shown by the record of what has been done here, and I believe the action of Congress has been supported almost unanimously by public opinion.

HISTORY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

In 1896–97 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto. In the Senate it failed of passage over the veto by a few votes. In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill was crowded out of consideration of the House of Representatives by reason of the Spanish-American War. In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. In 1906 the Senate passed an immigration bill in which the literacy test was embodied. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission. The commission consisted of nine members, eight of whom recommended the adoption of the literacy test as the most practical means for restricting, limiting, and better regulating immigration. In 1913 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the test recommended by the commission. The bill was vetoed by President Taft. That bill passed the Senate over the President's veto, but failed to pass the House over the President's veto by 4 votes. In the present Congress the House passed by more than a two-thirds vote and the Senate by a vote of 7 to 1 the immigration bill now before the House by reason of the President's veto.

It will be seen that the literacy test, which is the main feature of this bill, was supported by a large majority of both Houses of Congress all through this period and incorporated in all the acts passed. Finally, the able commission created by Congress to investigate the subject of immigration, after four years of exhaustive inquiry, at a cost of nearly $1,000,000, made a report, covering 42 volumes, from which the following conclusions are summarized:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF IMMIGRATION COMMISSION.

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demands legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

(c) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should also be those who, by reason of their personal qualities or habits, would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

(a) The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

(b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

(c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

(d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

(e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

(f) The material increase of the head tax.

(g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in greater or less degree. A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

INDORSED BY LABOR AND FARMERS' UNIONS.

It has been truly stated that no single proposed addition to our immigration laws has the indorsement that has been given to this test of literacy. The party platforms of two political parties advocated it in the election of 1912; the Farmers' Educational Union, representing 3,000,000 farmers in the United States; the Federation of Labor; and numerous other labor and patriotic organizations have urged its adoption. Wherever an inquiry or caucus of individuals or societies has been made the sentiment in favor of such a provision has been found to be almost unanimous.

DESIRABLE IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED.

It has been estimated that in some portions of northern and western Europe the operation of the law would exclude not more than 1 per cent of the immigrants, and in some sections 2 per cent. Of the Scandinavians and Bohemians, who make desirable additions to our population, less than 1 per cent would be excluded; of Scotch, Irish, and English less than 1 per cent, and of the Germans not more than 2 per cent. But of the vast hordes that in recent years have been coming from southern Europe, 60 per cent would be kept out, and of the Greeks and Syrians about 40 per cent. These latter classes are those that settle in the congested districts of our cities, who are never producers, and who, to a great extent, engage in occupations that are not really useful or necessary.

The truth of this statement is borne out in the report of Dr. Thomas Darlington, president of New York Board of Health under the administration of Mayor McClellan, who investigated the conditions referred to. He says:

I have heard the assertion that immigration is necessary to carry on our public works, to build railroads, to dig canals, and the like. But the present immigrants now coming over do not come for that purpose, and will not do that sort of work. No; they prefer to become push-cart peddlers and to live in our cities in poverty, breeding crime and disease. They occupy our streets, the streets for which our taxpayers have paid heavily. They interfere with traffic and break the laws of sanitation which we have decided are necessary for the preservation of public health.

Even in the early days of the Republic, President Washington foresaw the possibilities of undesirable immigration, and expressed his views, as follows, in a communication on the subject:

My opinion with respect to immigration is that, except of useful mechanics and some particular descriptions of men or professions, there is no need of encouragement, while the policy or advantage of its taking place in a body (I mean the settling of them in a body) may be questioned, for by so doing they retain the language, habits, and principles, good or bad, which they bring with them. Whereas by intermixture with our people they or their descendants get assimilated to our customs, measures, and laws; in a word, soon become one people.

For more than 75 years after this the immigrants coming voluntarily to our shores were the kind the country needed, men and women who came with a sincere purpose to attach themselves heart and soul to the New World, to share its benefits and destiny, from Ireland, Germany, and Scotland, and later from Sweden and Norway. These, with their habits of industry and thrift, assimilated with the American people, and became a part of the great bone and sinew of the Nation. But, Mr. Speaker, in the years since 1885 the tide that has swept in upon us from other parts of Europe has been of a vastly different type. They have come with their different ways and customs and ideas of life, their illiteracy and uncleanliness, their lack of thrift and morality. They have huddled together in the already congested sections of our cities under the most insanitary conditions.

UNDESIRABLES NOT WANTED HERE.

Many of these people do not come here with any intention of becoming citizens of the country. They are sought out in the highways and slums of southern Europe by agents of the steamship companies and of the great corporations that can use unskilled labor. On arrival here they do not go out to the farms, where conditions would be tolerable, where they could find employment that would enable them to live comfortably, but go into the already congested sections of cities, to become a menace and a burden.

The pitiful conditions that exist in the so-called Ghetto district of New York City have been ably portrayed, and constitute a scathing arraignment of those who are aiding hordes of paupers to come to this country, where they require them to work 16, 18, and even 20 hours a day for wages so low as to be almost beyond belief. It is charged that a very large percentage of the thousands of low-grade immigrants arriving in this country every month for years past have been aided to come by these commercial influences for their own purposes. Three hundred thousand unfortunate human beings live in the Ghetto district under conditions that are appalling. Families of six and seven persons, including young men and women grown, are found inhabiting one basement room and sleeping side by side on the floor. There are filthy tenements in which children sleep under their parents' beds in dark, unventilated rooms, without a glimpse of the sun or of trees or flowers during all their early childhood. These are illustrations of the conditions that exist among the illiterate and undesirable class whom this bill would in future exclude from the country.

It is an admitted fact that, as a general proposition, those who are ignorant of language are likewise ignorant of all the qualifications of good citizenship, and do not come here to acquire any permanent interest in the country. Even when not actually criminals or of the vicious classes, they become a burden and a menace to the social life and institutions of the Nation.

It is charged against them that they are lowering wages by underbidding the American laborer, that they are driving the American entirely off the field of fair competition by reason of their willingness to live and toil under conditions of congestion and filth to which the American wage earner can not submit. They are charged with preventing a general introduction of the eight-hour law and a general betterment of the status of the laboring man by reason of their willingness to work any number of hours a day for any kind of wages in any kind of a place. It is further charged that by reason of their congesting our already overcrowded cities they breed and disseminate there all manner of crimes and diseases; that they are filling our jails, reformatories and brothels, our orphanages, hospitals, and almshouses. This is the indictment that has been drawn against them by those who have made a careful study of the immigration question. Can we safely afford to further delay legislation for the protection of the laboring men and women now citizens of the country by limiting the influx of this undesirable horde?

I happen to have at hand statistics for a period of one year ending June 30, 1914, during which time there were received into the United States 1,218,480 immigrants, of whom 122,657 were Poles, 138,051 Hebrews, 251,612 from the south of Italy, and 25,819 Slovaks, showing a large increase over previous years. These people have flocked into our cities, to the factory towns of New England, and to the coal-mining districts of other States, where they are displacing the American laborers that were there by reason of their willingness to work for starvation wages. This is not a fanciful picture. In many of the cities of the districts mentioned the foreign population has increased at an incredulous rate during the last few years.

It is estimated that more than three-fourths of all immigrants have remained in the cities. In the great city of New York over 40 per cent of the population is foreign born; in the little manufacturing city of Bridgeport, Conn., it is 38 per cent; in Lowell, Lawrence, and Fall River, Mass., large factory cities, the foreign population has increased to nearly 50 per cent, and conditions in these cities at the present time are reported to be deplorable. Wages in the mills have been reduced to the starvation point, and thousands of former operatives have been supplanted by this cheap labor. The city of Philadelphia has 24 per cent of foreign-born population; Chicago, 35 per cent; Cleveland, 33 per cent; Worcester, Mass., over 33 per cent; Paterson, N. J., 36 per cent; and Providence, R. I., 34 per cent. These figures illustrate a situation that is rapidly producing what may soon come to be intolerable conditions.

Prof. Louck, who has made an exhaustive study of the immigration question, in a published document states:

Of the employees in the bituminous mines of Pennsylvania in 1909, only 15 per cent were native Americans or born of native father and 9 per cent native born of foreign father, while 76 per cent, or slightly more than three-fourths, were of foreign birth. What is more significant is that less than 8 per cent of the foreign-born mine workers were English, Irish, Scotch, German, or Welsh. The majority were from southern or eastern Europe, with the Italians, Magyars, Poles, and Slovaks predominating. The term "American miner," so far as the western Pennsylvania field is concerned, is largely a misnomer. When they work these miners average, as in the case of the Roumanians, as low as $1.85 a day, while in the greater number of cases the range is close to $2; more than one-tenth of the Ruthenians, Roumanians, Poles, and Croatians earn on an average under $1.50 a day. But unemployment in the course of the year brings down the general average for heads of families to $431. The south Italians earn only $399 and the Poles $324 a year.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident beyond controversy that we have confronting us in this immigration question a great problem and one that must be speedily solved if the American ideals, for which we have struggled and legislated, are to be preserved. I shall record my vote in favor of this bill, because I believe it will stay in some degree the vast tide that threatens to overwhelm us.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR OWN PEOPLE.

The idea that these United States should extend the glad hand to all comers regardless of source or condition is not so attractive to our minds as it may have been in the days when half the country was unoccupied. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and of nations as well. Charity begins at home, and we should make sure for the future of our children and their children's children, before receiving on our shores more than one and a quarter million foreigners annually, unless they are of a character which will not crowd out our own wage earners and make it impossible for them to maintain their present high standard of living.

MILLIONS SENT TO EUROPE.

The drain on the Nation's wealth represented by the money sent abroad by foreign immigrants in this country who do not intend to make America their home is alarming, amounting to over $200,000,000 annually.

We have in this country several millions of industrious naturalized citizens who came here from other lands, and who have become as much a part of the body politic as those who are to the manor born. A great number have gone into the mines and shops, others have helped to construct our railroads, and have aided in the development of our resources. Is it fair to them, most of whom are dependent upon their earnings to support themselves and family, to continue to admit to our shores millions of uneducated and undesirable people who are unfitted for becoming citizens, and who by underbidding the labor market deprive those now here of their means of livelihood and bring distress upon our industrial communities?

BUT A SMALL PROPORTION OF IMMIGRANTS LIKE THE FARM.

One of the remedies that has been recommended by various philanthropists and students of government for our immigration troubles and the overcrowded condition of our cities is the distribution of the surplus upon the land and through the farming districts of the country. But unfortunately for them, these people are not farmers, and do not want to become farmers, even if they had sufficient capital to install themselves upon farms. They can not be induced in any appreciable numbers to leave the cities. Two or three years ago the agricultural bureau of the State of Pennsylvania made an earnest, organized effort to secure from the cities much needed help for the 228,000 farmers in that State. The appeal was sent to the farm congress, or committee of distribution in New York, but out of a very large number of requests to send immigrants, but few responses were noted. This is the experience of other States and localities.

FARMING LAND AVAILABLE IN WEST.

Easily within the memory of many of us now living the United States has acquired vast areas of territory which have from time to time been added to the public domain for settlement. To quote the language of a distinguished citizen of my own State:

The Congress of the United States has done and is doing much toward providing homes for the people within our borders, both native born and naturalized. Under the public land laws millions of acres of fertile land have been given away to those who desired it, and now that the most desirable land has been given away, millions are being expended to reclaim the desert places, that they, too, may be divided among the people. No charitable or humanitarian effort can hope to compare in generosity and magnitude to the donations made by the United States; and yet, in spite of it all, congestion such as has been described is an alarming condition in many of our large cities. Will not the embarrassments which now exist in our cities because of this congestion increase rather than diminish? How long can we continue to add to the number of impoverished in our cities without detriment to our Nation?

It has been claimed that we need more labor here to carry on our improvements and develop our resources. It is true that there is need of labor that will till the land and increase the products of our farms, but, as has been already shown, we are not getting many of that class of workers among the immigrants now coming into the country. It is also true that there are still large resources to be developed. In all the Rocky Mountain States there are excellent opportunities for trained farmers; but those immigrants who would be kept out by the proposed law and who are now buying tickets on the installment plan in southern Europe, with the intent of landing in San Francisco, Portland, or Seattle after the opening of the Panama Canal, are of the same class that now congests the cities of the Atlantic coast. They have no intention of going into agricultural pursuits and are not desirable additions to our population. They are men and women with barely enough money to permit them to enter under existing laws and must secure employment at whatever wages they can obtain, bringing disastrous competition upon many of our own native-born and naturalized citizens, millions of whom are now seeking employment themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this bill may not be a complete remedy for all our immigration ills, but it is the best possible solution that has been evolved after an agitation of nearly a score of years; it meets the recommendations of the Immigration Commission, which made such an exhaustive study of the question in this and foreign countries; it has passed this House by nearly a two-thirds vote, and there were but 7 votes against it in the Senate. It is to be regretted that the President has felt impelled to veto the bill, regardless of the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the proposed legislation, as indicated by the arguments advanced and the affirmative vote of a great majority of the Representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a few selected communications which I have received, which indicate the interest that is being taken in this legislation by the labor organizations of the country:

WALLACE, IDAHO, *January 29, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of Wallace and vicinity Trades and Labor Council, representing 16 local organizations of labor, are unanimously in favor of passing the immigration bill over President's veto, and earnestly request your fullest unqualified support.

JAMES G. ARTHUR, *Secretary.*

—

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Every member of organized labor, and approximately every citizen of Idaho, request that Congress pass immigration bill over veto. We respect our President, but feel that he has made a mistake, which must be remedied, or disaster is likely to follow.

MOSCOW CARPENTERS' UNION.

—

BOISE, IDAHO, *January 28, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

As a relief to the unemployed of this State and Nation, organized labor of Boise unanimously request that you work and vote for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto.

P. H. SPANGENBERG, *Secretary.*

—

BOISE, IDAHO.

Hon. BURTON L. FRENCH and Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Members of Congress from the District of Idaho:

We, the undersigned citizens of Boise City and Ada County, Idaho, respectfully request that you do all within your power to place upon the statute books of this Nation the immigration bill, which was recently vetoed by the President. To this end we desire that you take such action as is necessary to pass said bill over the veto of the President.

The electrical workers and other unions are talking of and watching this matter. If, in President Wilson's opinion, the voice of our Representatives is not the voice of the people, what is it?

Respectfully,

H. B. DECIUS.

—

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *January 29, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee, representing the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, respectfully urge you to give your support and use your influence to secure the passage of the immigration bill, indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, over the President's veto. Organized labor in this vicinity is strongly in favor of this immigration bill as recently passed by both Houses of Congress.

Yours, very truly,

JAS. W. PURDIE,
THOS. DARCY,
JOHN BONNER,
Committee.

I have also received urgent communications from the following organizations urging the passage of this bill over the President's veto:

American Federation of Labor executive council, Washington, D. C.
Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
Central Federated Union, New York.

International Protective Association of Retail Clerks, La Fayette, Ind.
Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.
International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.
Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters of America, Indianapolis, Ind.
Railway Employees' Department, St. Louis, Mo.
Pattern Makers' League, Cincinnati, Ohio.
International Seamen's Union of America, Chicago, Ill.
Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg, Pa.
Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
New York State Federation of Labor, Utica, N. Y.
International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y.
Cigar Makers' International Union, Chicago, Ill.
Washington Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C.
Boot and Shoe Makers' Union, Boston, Mass.
United Mine Workers of America, Indianapolis, Ind.
Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville, Ky.
International Typographical Union, Indianapolis, Ind.
Iron City Central Trades Council, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Switchmen's Union, Buffalo, N. Y.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.
Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] in his speech on the floor of the House this morning made the statement that 30 per cent of the constituency whom I have the honor to represent are illiterate. If that were true, it would be all the more reason why I should vote to prevent more illiterates coming to this country. If there is anything in the gentleman's statement, we already have too many illiterates in my district.

But I deny the charge of the gentleman. I deny the truth of his statement. I want to say to him that that statement is a remarkable perversion of the truth. Instead of having 30 per cent of illiterates in my district over 10 years of age, there are less than 20 per cent. There is in the entire State of Kentucky an average of 16.5 per cent of illiteracy. This includes, of course, the great cities of Louisville and Lexington and other cities in the Commonwealth, as well as the far-famed blue-grass region of the State.

Mr. MANAHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANAHAN. I will ask the gentleman if the figures he gives are for the entire population of his district or just for the native whites?

Mr. POWERS. The figures I give are for the entire population of my district, including the colored people. The percentage is not so great if you count the whites alone. No man here represents brainier or better people than I have the honor to represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to correct my statement. I had in mind evidently another district in the South, mentioned in the last debate, where the percentage of illiteracy was approximately 3 per cent, and I made a mistake in attributing it to the district represented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS]. I will accept 19 per cent as the correct figure, and I say that that is a serious reflection upon his district, ruled by native Americans for many generations; and I will say further that from the experience all over the North of the competition that comes from live-blooded foreigners, if he will bring into his district from southern Europe, or any other part of Europe, men and women with nerve and ability and ambition and live red blood in their veins, the apathy and backwardness of his people will be overcome, and the percentage of illiteracy will be decreased from 19 per cent to approximately 3 per cent, as it is in the State of Minnesota, where 75 per cent of our people are foreign born or the children of foreign born.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, medical societies, patriotic orders, the farmers' union, the farmers' national congress, and the Federation of Labor all indorse this specific measure. The American people are demanding its passage. Eight of the nine United States immigration commissioners have indorsed the literacy test. American patriots who have devoted their lives to the study of the question of immigration have indorsed the reading test. Twice in two years both branches of Congress have passed this bill, and the eyes of the country are upon us to-day. What are we going to do? The reading test would not prevent the coming of any man worthy of American citizenship, but it would raise the general standard of intelligence among our alien arrivals. This bill contains provisions which make the mental and physical examination of aliens more effective and would exclude a large number of those whose coming would tend to lower the mental and physical standards of our people.

Is citizenship here of such small consequence that the foreigner wishing to obtain it will not learn to read just 30 words in the English or some other language? Are we to strike down the reading test, put a premium on ignorance, and throw our doors open to the scum of the earth in order that the army of cheap laborers may increase its numbers and the steamship companies ply their trade? In New York, the most populous State in the Union, the insane asylums and charitable institutions are full and overflowing with the feeble-minded, the lame and halt of the immigrant army. This condition has become so annoying and so burdensome that the governor of the State is calling upon the Federal Government to help New York care for the decrepit and feeble-minded foreigners pouring into the State. The State commissioner of lunacy tells us that in 1911 there were in the civic hospitals 5,700 patients, and that 2,737 of these were foreigners, and the New York State hospital bulletin states that in 1912 there were 31,000 patients in the 14 State hospitals and that 41 per cent of them were of foreign birth. The New York Herald, April, 1912, said that more than 60 per cent of the occupants of charitable institutions and insane asylums in New York were foreigners. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that foreign countries have taken advantage of our loose and lax immigration laws to rid themselves of the criminal element and the feeble-minded of their people, and instead of caring for their own diseased and insane people they are sending them to us with every steamship that sails. Mr. BURNETT has told us that Police Commissioner Bingham, of New York, said:

> This wave of immigration that brings to New York hundreds of thousands of criminals who don't know what liberty means, and don't care; don't know our customs, can not speak the English language, are in general the scum of the earth.

Frederick A. Pope, who was prosecuting officer in New Jersey, wrote to President Taft in February, 1913, that he had prosecuted in a certain length of time for various crimes 114 foreigners, and that 91 of them were illiterate—they could not read—and that out of 8 crimes against women, 7 were committed by men who could neither read nor write.

Southern Europe is encouraging large numbers of people to go to the United States, take the place of the American laborer, accumulate money and send it home, and others are urged to return when their fortunes are made. Thousands of these illiterate people are placed in charge of a foreign priest or minister who advises them not to become citizens of the United States. I read of an instance where the priest or minister told them that it was all right to work here and send their money back to Europe, but that they must hate the American flag and remain loyal to the mother country. The number of unnaturalized foreigners in the United States has grown so enormously that the people of southern Europe refer to them as "our colonies in America." And, Mr. Speaker, it is a deplorable fact that these European colonies in America have injured the standard of the laboring man, reduced wages here, and they have driven thousands and tens of thousands of American wage earners into the ranks of the unemployed. [Applause.] Millions of Americans who toil in the mills, dig in the mines, work at the bench, or beat at the forge are praying this day that you will shield and protect them from further invasion by cheap laborers from foreign countries. [Applause.]

If you are the friend of the wage earners of America who make their living by the sweat of their faces, love our institutions and follow our flag, now is the time to show it. If you have any regard for the wishes and the welfare of the millions of American farmers, you must tell them by your vote to-day. If you would guard our civilization and protect the life of our Nation from the dangers that threaten it, I call upon you now to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish the steamship companies well, but I am not willing that they should flourish at the expense of American ideals and institutions. An official of our Government tells us that it is the deliberate plan of certain European Governments to send to the United States the most undesirable of their people. Marcus Braun, of New York, an immigrant inspector sent by our Government to Europe to investigate immigrant conditions there, reported to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that the Hungarian Government had a contract with a steamship company, the Cunard Line, to deliver to their vessels 30,000 Hungarians a year, to be carried to the United States. The Hungarian governmental official told the American governmental official that the contract to send so many of their people to the United States every year was none of our business. When will this traffic in human beings stop? This law would injure

the traffic of the steamship companies, but it would greatly benefit the American people. [Applause.] A few years ago the new King of Denmark pardoned 700 criminals, degenerates, swindlers, thieves, and murderers. The people of Denmark did not want these criminals to remain in their country, so they made up money and purchased tickets for every one of them, placed them on board a steamship and sent them to New York.

Representative BURNETT, while in Sicily investigating the immigration question asked, "Where are the bandits who gave you so much trouble a little while ago?" And the answer was, "They have all gone to America." Think of that, Mr. Speaker; no longer the asylum for the oppressed, no longer the promised land of the worthy, but a place to which foreign countries may send their undesirable people, a place on which the steamship companies unload more than a million people every year. [Applause.] Time was when the industrious and worthy foreigner who wanted to come to our country went to work, secured funds, and paid for his own transportation. Then the deserving foreigner went to work to meet American requirements in order that he might come over and share the blessings and benefits of this great Republic. Now the steamship companies have their agents abroad, urging every class and condition to go to the United States. Pictures are displayed showing savings banks and foreigners standing around with their hands full of American money, and they are told that it is an easy matter to make money here. All kinds of stories are told to induce the coming of the immigrant horde. All that the steamship company wants to know is, can he pay his fare? They have excursions and give cheap rates, and then the agents go out with their dragnets and gather them in, and tramp, tramp they come—more than a million a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston Transcript speaks truly when it says that there are those in this country who are opposed to any and all restriction of immigration. Thomas Jefferson said more than a hundred years ago, "While we are providing for the fortification of our country against a foreign foe, I am in favor of fortifying it against the influx of undesirable immigration." [Applause.] And yet, Mr. Speaker, there are gentlemen here who will not vote for a measure that will keep out of our country thousands and tens of thousands of undesirable persons. What strange and unnatural influence is it that impels gentlemen here to oppose any measure that will restrict immigration? Is it the fear of certain constituents at home who care more for the business of bringing in more people from foreign countries than they do for the welfare of our own country? Mr. Speaker, if this un-American influence is strong enough now to prevent the enactment of a law to restrict immigration, what Senate or House a few years from now will even dare to undertake the difficult task? [Applause.] Yes; every 12 months the steamship companies unload upon our shores more than a million of foreigners; and Mr. Speaker, at this rate, the time will soon come when you can draw a line across the Republic and place the native born and their descendants on one side and the foreign born and their descendants on the other, and they will outnumber us. Then if we should be engaged in war with a foreign power, foes from without and foes from within, you will have reason to be concerned about the safety of your country. If these influences are strong enough to stifle the American desire that is in you to protect our country against this horde of undesirable foreigners, if these baneful influences shall cause you to take the side of foreign countries who want to continue to send to our country the refuse of their own, the day will come when your children whose birthright you have bartered for a mess of political pottage will curse you in your graves.

You talk about preparations to prevent a foreign army from invading our country when, by your votes and un-American conduct, you are letting in every year thousands of men more dangerous to the vital life of America than could possibly be the attempt at invasion by any foreign army. We would be on the lookout for such an army and would prevent it from landing upon our shores; but here is an invasion dangerous to American ideals and institutions—an invasion that enriches the steamship companies and sends out of our country every year $150,000,000, and works great injury to the American laboring man. Mr. Speaker, thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of cheap laborers from Europe are here enjoying the blessings and benefits of free America, competing with loyal citizens in every line of industrial endeavor and in all the marts of trade. [Applause.] And yet some of you will vote against this measure and then talk about protection to American labor. What the American laborer needs most and what he is praying for this day is protection from the vast army of cheap laborers coming into our country every year.

In his farewell address President Washington admonishes us to "promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge." How fitting, Mr. Speaker, that in the month of his birth we should be engaged in the work of providing for the diffusion of knowledge among those who are to come here and share with us and our children the blessings and benefits of this great Government. Thomas Jefferson has said that when every man can read the country will be safe. Here we are trying to follow the advice of Washington and take the first step toward providing for the diffusion of knowledge among our alien arrivals, and here we are setting up requirements that will enable the foreigner who desires to come here to read and learn for himself of American institutions. [Applause.] It is high time that some of our citizens who come here from foreign countries and swear allegiance to the American flag were showing their unwillingness to permit all kinds of foreigners to come into our country. If these men really love our country, they are in favor of immigration laws that will permit only worthy and desirable people to come. If they do not agree with us that something should be done to prevent undesirable and unfit foreigners from coming here, then we may well ponder the question whether we shall preserve the Republic in all its integrity for our children and our children's children or permit it to become the dumping ground for the scum and refuse of every country on the globe. [Applause.]

Here, in full view of the likeness of Washington and looking upon Old Glory, our country's flag, let us reconsecrate our hearts, our strength, and our all to the highest and best interest of our country. This is not a party question, but a question of supreme importance to the American people, and I want this vote to-day to show to the country and to the world that far above the blaze of partisanism loom the altar fires of our patriotism. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the voice of Lincoln and the voice of Davis, the voices of Grant and Lee, could be heard in this House to-day they would admonish us, from the North and the South, from the East and the West, to support this bill and in so doing strike hands about a common center for the good of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer my congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and his intrepid and patriotic Democratic associates on that side of the Chamber for rising above party considerations and resisting the menace of the pedagogic lash from the White House in order to serve the best interests of their country by voting to pass this bill over the President's veto. All honor to your courage and good judgment. I am glad that this is not being made a party question here. It ought not to be. And, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think that if we had less partisanship and more patriotism in this House the country would be better off. [Applause.] Instead of this being a party question I should say it is rather a geographical question in view of the territory represented by its advocates and opponents. And incidentally the question of expediency may figure in it, too.

I voted to pass a similar bill over the veto of President Taft, and I did that with no less pleasure than it will afford me to vote to pass this bill over President Wilson's veto. I thought the leader of the Republican Party was wrong then, just as I think the leader of the Democratic Party is wrong now. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to concede that our party when it was in power was more or less remiss in its duty, and to that extent it was inconsistent when it failed to make the restriction wall around this country as high as it made the protection wall. It is no more detrimental to American labor to send the products of cheap foreign labor here to compete with them than it is to send the foreign laborers themselves here. Indeed, the competition is all the greater in the latter case. Believing earnestly, as I do, in the doctrine of protection, I am just as much in favor of applying it at the immigrant stations as at the customhouses. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] yield me another minute or two?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it does not require the gift of prophecy to foresee some of the results of the war in Europe. Ultimately I think it will result in there being fewer monarchies and more Republics in the world, but that much-desired result

can not immediately follow it. There is one thing, however, that will immediately follow. The oppressed of all those countries that are in the throes of the conflict, all those who are discontented with royalty and its methods of government, will want a home in this great Republic, this land of neutrality and of promise. For that reason I regard it more important than ever before that our immigration laws be better safeguarded to the end that the coming to our shores of so many undesirable aliens may be stopped. If that could be accomplished in some other way more effectively than by the literacy test, I would gladly vote for that; but no better way has been found by those who have made an exhaustive study and investigation of the whole subject. Besides, I can see no good reason why we should add foreign illiterates to our population when we are struggling so hard to remove illiteracy from our land, so as to give the blessings of education to all our people. The failure of this bill to pass will be almost a calamity to our country. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, this war has already taught us a valuable lesson, which is that our greatest national safeguard lies in our sticking closer together as a people, selfish though it be, and that we should "sharpen our wits" to help each other rather than to open our markets and our opportunities for employment too much for the benefit of the people of other lands. All of which, to my mind, vindicates the wisdom of the policies both of protection and of restriction of foreign immigration. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania consume some of his time now?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have no more time to yield to any other gentleman except to myself and I prefer to conclude for our part after the gentleman goes on.

Mr. BURNETT. We have only one other speech besides mine and that is a short speech.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] reserving his time entirely for one speech?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask because there are two gentleman here who want to be recognized for half a minute, but neither is on the floor at the present time. I am already to have my time closed in a single speech by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. I am not going to speak myself.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman intends to conclude with the yielding to Mr. FESS?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from Illinois says that he will consume some of his time himself.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman be willing to consume his time now? I will give way to Mr. MOORE, if the gentleman will speak now.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will then reserve his time and close after both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself?

Mr. GARDNER. No; after the gentleman has closed, then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will close, and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is immaterial to me, and I am perfectly willing to go on now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk the article which I have sent there, and I would like particularly to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Sir Walter Scott said:

"I have read books enough, and conversed with enough of eminent and splendidly cultivated minds; but I assure you, I have heard higher sentiments from the lips of poor uneducated men and women, when exerting the spirit of severe yet gentle heroism under difficulties and afflictions, or speaking their simple thoughts as to circumstances in the lot of friends and neighbors, than I ever yet met with out of the pages of the Bible. We shall never learn to respect our real calling and destiny, unless we have taught ourselves to consider everything as moonshine compared with the education of the heart."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the eight years of my service in this House I desire to say that every vote I have cast on labor questions has been in the interest of labor. If I thought for one moment that my action and my vote to-day would be against the interest of labor, I would rather resign my seat in this body than to cast that vote. But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that my action is in the interest of the American laboring man. For 20 years, as has been stated, immigrants have come here in large numbers, larger than in the entire 80 years preceding, and I want to say to you that within the last 20 years, notwithstanding the large immigration, the conditions of the laboring man during that time have improved. Not only have the living conditions improved, but the wages of the American laboring man have increased. Twenty years ago, or in the year 1890, the yearly average earning of the American laboring man amounted to about $335, and the average earning of the American laboring man to-day is over $550. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that not only have the wages increased, but the hours of labor have been shortened in nearly every industry in the United States. For that reason I believe that immigration has not been detrimental to our country, but has been beneficial. It has helped the American laboring man to advance and secure a better position than he occupied before that immigration commenced. Oh, we hear that the Federation of Labor and other labor organizations are opposed to this measure. I admit that organized labor has done much for the laboring man, but I maintain that immigration has done even more. It has given the Federation of Labor their great leader, Mr. Samuel Gompers, as well as the able secretary, Mr. Morrison, who is a native of Canada. It has given this country the great Secretary of Labor, Hon. William B. Wilson, and it has given the Federation of Labor more than 50 per cent of its executive committee. The members of that organization know, or should know, that immigration is not detrimental to organized labor. In addition I desire also to state that not all of organized labor is in favor of this legislation. I hold in my hand a resolution which I received this morning signed by nine different labor organizations protesting against the enactment of this law.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman please name those organizations?

Mr. SABATH. I really have not the time to spare to read the entire resolution, but in the interest of my colleague, whom I know is honest and a sincere man and means well, but is misled, somewhat as a great many others are, I will have the Clerk read the resolution, notwithstanding that it will take more time than I really desire to give to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Burnett immigration bill has been vetoed by President Wilson. We learn that strong efforts are being made by the opponents of immigration to pass this bill over the President's veto.

The impression has been created that organized labor, without exception, is in favor of this bill, which seeks to restrict immigrants chiefly on the ground of illiteracy. We wish to call your attention to the fact that a large number of powerful organizations within and without the ranks of the American Federation of Labor are unreservedly opposed to the Burnett bill, and believe that its provisions are unjust, essentially un-American, and harmful to the best interests of our country.

Even from the standpoint of those who seek the interests of the workingmen, the restriction of immigration is not calculated to do them any good; but if put into practice will most likely result in serious harm. Immigration has not been responsible for the increased cost of living, but has, on the other hand, directly developed a higher standard of living, particularly among the workingmen, on account of the prosperity and opportunity for labor that immigration has afforded.

That immigrants do not lower wages or represent an unorganizable laboring element is strikingly demonstrated by the fact that the American Federation of Labor itself has grown in strength and influence largely through the increase in its ranks of great numbers of immigrants in every part of the country and in all trades.

The movement of unionism among women has been most successful in the case of immigrants, which shows the remarkable capacity for organization among the recent immigrants.

As representatives of great labor organizations embracing thousands of workingmen, we earnestly protest against the adoption of a measure which strikes at the roots of our American principles of equality by an insidious and indirect form of exclusion.

We trust that you will not only vote against the bill, but will do all in your power actively to prevent any attempt to override the President's veto from becoming successful.

Will you not kindly let us hear from you at an early moment to learn what you expect to do in this matter?

Very earnestly and sincerely, yours,

[Seal: The Workmen's Circle (Arbeiter Ring), Feb. 2, 1915, 175 East Broadway, N. Y.]
[Seal: International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, 32 Union Square, New York City.]
[Seal: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 32 Union Square, New York.]
[Seal: United Laundry Workers' Union, Local 34.]
[Seal: The Hebrew Bakers' Union, Local 160. Incorporated 1903.]
[Seal: United Neckwear Makers' Union, Local 11016 A. F. of L. Organized Dec., 1905.]
[Seal: United Hebrew Trades of the State of New York. Org. Oct., 1888.]
[Seal: International Cabinet Makers, Machine, Hand, and Wood Turners' Union, Local 2 of N. Y.]
[Seal: Shirt Makers' Union of Greater New York.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a further question. I would like to ask if there is a seal on that communication?

Mr. SABATH. Those are all seals.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like also to ask if the gentleman does not know that some of those organizations are not official trade organizations?

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman know they are not?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. There is one of them organized for purposes of this kind—the labor circle. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman might know more about various labor organizations, but I am satisfied he is mistaken in this particular.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I take it the gentleman does not want to mislead the Members of this House.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows me too well to believe that of me.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. For that reason I rose to ask the question. I take the position that these are not legitimate trade-union organizations.

Mr. SABATH. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

In this connection I wish to say that I have other communications from other laboring organizations and societies, but time does not permit me to read them all. I will, however, read a few of them.

I have a telegram from the Iroquois Club, of Chicago, which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, *Washington, D. C.:*

At a special meeting of the Iroquois Club held February 2, 1915, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Iroquois Club commends the President for his veto of the immigration bill, and urge the Illinois delegation in Congress to uphold the President in his veto."

WM. ROTHMANN, *President.*
LORING R. HOOVER, *Secretary.*

I have a letter from the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 50 per cent of the membership of which are business men, which reads as follows:

ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, February 1, 1915.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, on behalf of the members of the organization, urged President Wilson to veto the immigration bill, because it contained the literacy test, which they believe unfair. You are respectfully urged to use your influence to sustain the President's veto.

Very truly, yours, JOHN M. GLENN, *Secretary.*

I have a telegram from the Slovak Guards of Illinois, which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Slovak Guards of Illinois, representing 30,000 law-abiding naturalized American citizens, appeal to Members of Congress to vote to sustain the President's veto on immigration bill.

EMIL TEHLAR, *President.*

The Polish-American Alliance and the Polish Catholic Union of America have also sent me the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In behalf of thousands of our countrymen who have been deprived of the opportunity of acquiring an education in the mother country, we urge you to vote to uphold the President's vetó of the immigration bill.

POLISH-AMERICAN ALLIANCE,
POLISH CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to embody as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from one of the most beloved and fair-minded judges of our country, Judge John Gibbons, of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY,
Chicago, January 7, 1915.

Hon. A. J. SABATH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I desire to register a solemn protest against the enactment of the immigration bill because it contains the literacy test. In no adequate manner can such a test determine the quality of good citizenship. Such a test would be unjust, undemocratic, and un-American.

The establishment of the Republic was a proclamation to the world that at last a land was opened and a government instituted in and under which all men could enter the lists of life and endeavor upon an equal footing with full opportunity to work out their own elevation and betterment. America soon became the Mecca of the Old World's oppressed thousands, hungering for freedom—freedom to speak, to act, and to grow. This opportunity for free individual action and development, never before offered to the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," was what moved them throughout all lands, as by a common impulse, to flee from the servitude of their native countries to build new homes and better, broader lives in a strange land. No class greater in numbers or stronger in purpose took advantage of this opportunity than the artisans and laborers, many of whom could neither read nor write. No class has proven itself more capable of growth and advancement under these benign conditions than they. In all that constitutes the true citizen and patriot, when the life of the Nation was in peril, they proved themselves peers of the noblest and the best. Such has been the result because here they found and utilized a fair field and full play for individual energy, talent, and effort.

Very respectfully, yours,

JOHN GIBBONS.

The organization known as the Friends of Russian Freedom submit the following communication:

FRIENDS OF RUSSIAN FREEDOM,
February 2, 1915.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: To us it seems of very great consequence that the right of political asylum shall be maintained inviolate in this country.

The history of nations—of others as well as of our own—teaches that at times only through the unlawful destruction of property and the advocacy of this may despotism be thrown off and representative government attained.

Born of revolution themselves, surely the American people have signified no desire to reverse their attitude toward those who in other lands, inspired many times by America's example, fight for liberty and democracy even as the founders of this Republic fought.

We may not now present to you, as we presented to Congress last year, substitutes for the clauses which in the existing law and in the bill before you wrong the political refugee and injure our own name.

We can only urge you to vote against passing the immigration bill (H. R. 6060) over the veto of the President. This we do solely on the ground that the bill in our opinion runs counter to the proper and historic policy of this country in excluding and deporting (secs. 3 and 19) aliens "who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property," and in subjecting to fine and imprisonment (sec. 28) "any person who knowingly aids or assists any * * * (such) alien to enter the United States."

Yours, very truly,

HERBERT PARSONS,
President Friends of Russian Freedom.

And in this connection I wish to read the names of a few of the gentlemen who comprise the national committee of this wonderful organization:

Herbert Parsons, president; Right Rev. David H. Greer, vice president; George Kennan, vice president; James Bronson Reynolds, chairman, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; Joseph M. Price, vice chairman.

National committee: The officers, members of executive committee, ex officio, and Dr. Lyman Abbott (editor the Outlook), New York; Jane Addams (Hull House), Chicago; Miss Alice Stone Blackwell (editor Woman's Journal), Boston; John Graham Brooks (author), Cambridge, Mass.; W. Franklin Brush, New York; Edward B. Butler (president of Butler Bros.), Chicago; Prof. John B. Clark (Columbia University), New York; E. H. Clement, Boston; R. Fulton Cutting, New York; Horace E. Deming, New York; Dr. Henry B. Favill (physician), Chicago; Dr. John H. Finley, New York; Homer Folks (ex-commissioner of public charities), New York; David R. Forgan (president First National Bank), Chicago; I. K. Friedman (author), Chicago; A. S. Frissell (president Fifth Avenue Bank), New York; Prof. Franklin H. Giddings (Columbia University), New York; E. R. L. Gould (president Thirty-fourth Street National Bank), New York; Rev. Percy S. Grant (Church of the Ascension), New York; Rev. Thomas C. Hall (Union Theological Seminary), New York; Norman Hapgood (editor Harper's Weekly), New York; Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch (Sinai Congregation), Chicago; W. J. Holland (chancellor Carnegie Institute), Pittsburgh; Charles L. Hutchinson (banker), Chicago; Dr. Abraham Jacobi (physician), New York; Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins, New York; Prof. W. R. Shepherd (Columbia University), New York; P. Tecumseh Sherman (ex-commissioner of labor), New York; Rabbi Joseph Silverman (Temple Emanu-El), New York; Cyrus L. Sulzberger (merchant), New York; Algernon T. Sweeney (ex-judge first criminal court), Newark, N. J.; Miss Ida Tarbell (author), New York; Charles R. Van Hise (president University of Wisconsin), Madison, Wis.; Oswald Garrison Villard (editor Evening Post), New York; Willoughby Walling (banker), Chicago; T. K. Webster (manufacturer), Chicago; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise (the Free Synagogue), New York; William M. Kingsley (vice president United States Trust Co.), New York; Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE (United States Senator), Madison, Wis.; Henry M. Leipziger (director, department of education), New York; William H. Maxwell (superintendent of schools), New York; John G. Milburn (lawyer), New York; John E. Milholland (publicist), New York; Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst (Madison Square Presbyterian Church), New York; Jacob A. Riis (philanthropist), New York; Julius Rosenwald (vice president Sears, Roebuck & Co.), Chicago; Jacob H. Schiff (banker), New York; Prof. Henry R. Seager (Columbia University), New York; Prof. E. R. A. Seligman (Columbia University), New York.

Mr. Speaker, great stress has been laid upon the statement contained in the President's message, that no party has ever adopted the text of this bill as part of its platform. What the President did say was this, that no party has gone to the country on this proposition. This question has been raised not only by Members of the House, but in a special edition of the weekly news letter of the American Federation of Labor attention has been directed to just this part of the President's message, wherein he inquires whether any political party has ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter and gone to the country on it.

The article dwells upon the fact that in the year 1896 a President and Vice President were elected upon a platform containing a restrictionist clause. Is it possible that the gentleman had forgotten what the real issue was in that campaign? During the long campaign no one paid any attention to that portion of the platform.

In 1912 the Republican Party enacted the following as one of the planks in its platform:

We pledge the Republican Party to the enactment of appropriate laws to give relief from the constantly growing evil of induced or undesirable immigration, which is inimical to the progress and welfare of the people of the United States.

Surely no one can question the importance of this, and what was the result of the election in 1912? No party has ever suf-

fered such a humiliating defeat as the party which adopted this provision as a part of its platform.

Three times has the Democratic Party succeeded in carrying the Nation. It was in the years 1884, 1892, and 1912.

Four times did the Republican Party go on record against liberal immigration and three times did the Republican Party go down to defeat.

In upholding the sacred traditions of the country and of the Democratic Party, the Democratic platform of 1884 contained the following:

We oppose sumptuary laws, which vex the citizens and interfere with individual liberty.

In reaffirming the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1856, that the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith.

In the platform of 1892, while the Democratic Party favored the enactment of more stringent laws and regulations for the restriction of criminal, pauper, and contract immigration, the following provision was also embodied:

We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

In the latest pronouncement of Democratic doctrine, our platform of 1912, we have this ringing declaration:

No treaty should receive the sanction of our Government which does not recognize that equality of all our citizens, irrespective of race or creed, and which does not expressly guarantee the fundamental right of expatriation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] who opened the remarks in favor of this bill stated that President Wilson is a great President. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. I agree that we have in Woodrow Wilson a great President, a President who has done more to bring about favorable legislation in the interest of the American people and laboring man than any other man who has ever occupied the White House. [Applause.] I admit that men as great as President Wilson have made mistakes, but I challenge the gentleman from Indiana to show that our President has made a mistake in vetoing this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] cite the large number of foreign-born people in our insane asylums. They, however, neglect to show that in proportion to the population the percentage of foreign-born people is smaller than that of the native-born citizens.

Does not the gentleman from California know that under the provisions of the present law those persons suffering from insanity or even what the Department of Labor terms feeblemindedness or presenility are now debarred.

The gentleman from Alabama is fearful for our future citizenship. If he would take the trouble to visit the homes of these people whom he dubs the scum of the earth and undesirable citizens I feel confident that he would not stand on the floor of this House and slander these hard-working, sincere, and law-abiding people.

Mr. Speaker, I, as well as these gentlemen, am desirous of protecting the standard of American citizenship and our American institutions. No man who is familiar with conditions can say that so far immigration has lowered the standard of American citizenship; and I maintain that, on the contrary, immigration has forced the standard of American citizenship to a higher level. Surely, this is true of the American workingman. The immigrant has come here and dug our million ditches, while the native American has been elevated to the positions of foreman, timekeeper, assistants, and so forth, positions which the native-born American is as yet not too proud to fill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is fearful that immigration will lower the character of our citizenship. He comes from a State where nearly 80 per cent of the population is composed of foreign-born citizens, or citizens of foreign parentage. Does he desire to make us believe that his State is not up to the standard? He represents the State. The truth is that he, as well as so many others, has been poisoned by the malicious representations of certain lobbyists, whose activities have been directed against the policy of our Government and against the unfortunate immigrant.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt great stress will be laid on the great $1,000,000 Immigration Commission report, which no one has read, and with which none of the members of the commission are familiar, even though they have assumed to base their recommendations to the House on it.

In the face of these recommendations of the commission Prof. Jenks and Mr. Lauck, members of that commission, have the following to say in their book on "The Immigration Problem" (see pp. 335 and 344):

In the judgment of the commission, as well as of most other enlightened citizens, the United States should remain in the future, as in the past, a haven of refuge for the oppressed, whether such oppression be political or religious. Any restrictive measure should contain a provision making an exception of such cases. We clearly ought not to close our doors against those whom the common opinion of the world would consider really the subjects of oppression.

No doubt great stress will also be laid on the activities of the Liberal Immigration League of New York City. As to that organization, I wish to state that I did not agree with their activities, but will say that I fail to see wherein they are guilty in asking aid from all to help the cause which they advocated, unless it be from steamship companies and the five other corporations from which they received money, according to the statement. All in all, it amounted to $5,000 in five years, and the largest contribution was $500. I have a statement before me which shows that the league is over a thousand dollars in debt. The various items which it is charged they have collected appear to be reasonable, and in view of the fact that they are not able to meet their expenses puts them in at least a better light than the various restrictive organizations which have been flooding the mails with bitter, restrictive literature, and which obviously have abundant funds to meet all expenses, however heavy.

May I ask the gentlemen who are so vitally interested in the dictates of the Junior Order of American Mechanics and kindred so-called patriotic organizations who it is that is furnishing the funds for these organizations?

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that Democracy can be proud of the wonderful, excellent record that it has made under this great and wonderful President. We have given the country and the laboring people more favorable legislation than any other party in the history of our Government, and for that reason I feel confident that, notwithstanding the fact that the Federation of Labor has taken a stand on this one question contrary to the President, they will realize and recognize that he is a great President, a wonderful man, a man who desires to help the cause of humanity, to help the cause of the people.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, I can with pride point to my closing remarks in the speech which I delivered on August 23, 1912, and which read as follows:

And in conclusion I desire to say this: I have been and am now a Democrat who believes in the Democratic doctrine, in equal rights to all and special privileges to none. I became a Democrat because of my belief in these principles and because the Democratic Party was the party that stood for them. I am a Democrat because I believe the Democratic Party is the party of the people and for the people; that it stands for and does what is just and right. I firmly believe that it stands for justice and equity; that it is a party that is broad and liberal; that and through it the people can secure beneficial legislation that will relieve them from oppression.

It stands by its pledges. It carries out its promises. And, notwithstanding the fact that I stand for and firmly believe in all its fundamental principles and have been active ever since 1888, voting for Cleveland, Bryan, and Parker, and have been many times honored by it, if I believed that our candidate for President—the Hon. Woodrow Wilson—had intentionally spoken unfairly of our foreign-born citizens and actually was prejudiced against them, I would unhesitatingly refuse him my vote and my support.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that he is a man of broad and liberal ideas, a man of excellent judgment, a man of great knowledge and intelligence, honest and fearless, and I feel confident that, after he has been elected the President of the United States, the greatest and most glorious country under the canopy of heaven, and President of the greatest and most hospitable people inhabiting any portion of this globe, he will demonstrate to those who are endeavoring to place him in a false light that he can not and will not be swayed from the path of righteousness and justice, and will easily shine after his days of service are over with the other illustrious stars—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen are going to try to make the membership of this House believe that most anyone now can come to our shores. For the information and enlightenment of those gentlemen I desire to say that last year alone we debarred at our ports 33,000 immigrants; and from July to November, 12,000; and we have deported over 4,000.

The gentlemen who have been and are now advocating the passage of this bill seem to show a great deal of solicitude for organized labor, and lay great stress upon the action of the Federation of Labor, but I am unable to place them. I can not just recollect where they were when other important legislation in favor of the American laboring man was being considered on the floor of the House. I am unable to recall the speeches which they made in favor of other bills which had for their purpose the betterment of the conditions of the laboring classes.

The RECORD must be at fault, for you will fail to find the names of many of these gentlemen included in the list of those who voted for legislation which was really in the interests of the laboring man.

Also, let me ask the gentleman how many labor organizations they have in their respective districts. Have they helped the cause in any way? The truth is that in a great majority of the districts represented by the gentlemen who are favoring this bill labor is not organized.

The gentleman from Tennessee in his speech proclaimed that he is for America.

Mr. Speaker, so am I. I am not only for America but I am for American institutions, for American citizenship, and for the American laboring man.

Due to immigration, our country is the wonder of civilization. Its population is made up of all the peoples of the earth. We have here all races, all religions, all nationalities. They have come to us from all quarters of the globe, and we have the best. Only the courageous hearts and adventurous spirits, who had the courage to face away from their native country and the homes of their birth, their kindred and friends, to face out to an unknown land, where the language they spoke was not understood, with nothing to beckon them on but the beacon light of human liberty, are the ones who have sought to make this country their home. They have planned to establish themselves where the tyranny of monarchy, the oppression of caste, and the insolence of titled wealth would not place heavy feet upon their throats. They brought with them their courageous hearts and adventurous spirits, their strong arms, their industries. The arts, sciences, professions, culture, genius, wisdom, and philosophies of thousands of years of civilization in the lands beyond the seas they gave to us. It has served to make us at once the envy and the wonder of the world. Best of all, they brought with them love and reverence for our institutions. [Applause.]

For the benefit of the House I will read, to refresh the memory of the Members, what the first Democratic President since the Civil War, Grover Cleveland, said on this question in his veto message:

MARCH 2, 1897.

To the House of Representatives:

I hereby return without approval House bill No. 7864, entitled "An act to amend the immigration laws of the United States."

By the first section of this bill it is proposed to amend section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891, relating to immigration by adding to the classes of aliens thereby excluded from admission to the United States the following:

"All persons physically capable and over 16 years of age who can not read and write the English language or some other language * * *."

A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigrants is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the zealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.

A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and a willingness and ability to work.

A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to rouse a sentiment in its defense, for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

It is not claimed, I believe, that the time has come for the further restriction of immigration on the ground that an excess of population overcrowds our land.

It is said, however, that the quality of recent immigration is undesirable. The time is quite within recent memory when the same thing was said of immigrants who, with their descendants, are now numbered among our best citizens.

A careful examination of this bill has convinced me that for the reasons given and others not specifically stated its provisions are unnecessarily harsh and oppressive, and that its defects in construction would cause vexation and its operation would result in harm to our citizens.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to submit the veto message of a Republican President, William Howard Taft:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3175.

I do this with great reluctance. The bill contains many valuable amendments to the present immigration law which will insure greater certainty in excluding undesirable immigrants.

The bill received strong support in both Houses and was recommended by an able commission after an extended investigation and carefully drawn conclusions.

But I can not make up my mind to sign a bill which in its chief provision violates a principle that ought, in my opinion, to be upheld in dealing with our immigration. I refer to the literacy test. For the reasons stated in Secretary Nagel's letter to me, I can not approve that test. The Secretary's letter accompanies this.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 14, 1913.

And I do not believe that I would have completed my duty if I did not here and now bring to your attention once more the veto message of our great, wonderful, humane, peace-loving President, Woodrow Wilson:

To the House of Representatives:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a Nation, would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction of this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *28 January, 1915.*

In connection with President Wilson's great message I wish to read to you an editorial appearing in the Chicago Examiner on February 1, 1915. This is a paper which everyone knows has not demonstrated any very great friendship or love for our President:

WILSON ACTED WISELY IN VETOING THE UNAMERICAN IMMIGRATION BILL.

The President has done a distinct service to his country. He has, moreover, freed his party from a most menacing situation and has saved it from a humiliating exhibition of its lack of true Democracy. He deserves the approval of all true Americans, and especially the warm commendation of all genuine Democrats.

It seems incredible that any faction of the party in Congress should be fatuous enough to plunge it back into the mire from which it has been thus extricated by an effort to pass this most indefensible bill over the President's admirable veto. Should any such effort be made, the responsibility of those to whom it is credited will be a hard one for them to carry before the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I had 14 minutes left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I regret that my time has expired, but permit me to say, in conclusion, that I trust all Members who desire to vote in the interest of humanity and justice will vote to sustain the President in his veto. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

[Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire very briefly to state the reasons which prompt me to vote for the immigration bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

The reasons assigned for the veto are: First, the purely sentimental one that America is the refuge of the oppressed, the suffering, and distressed; and, second, that the subject treated in this bill has never been passed upon by the American people.

These reasons are unconvincing in view of certain well-known facts.

We now by law exclude the diseased. As a matter of self-protection we exclude them, notwithstanding their manifest suffering and distress.

We now by law exclude the penniless and the pauper, even when he comes here to better his condition, and we do this for the purely selfish reason that he might become a public charge.

So we see that immigration to this "land of the free," from the first, has been restricted in order to protect American citizens.

The policy of "restriction" is not new. From time to time as the conditions of the country have changed these restrictive laws have been made more and more exclusive.

The "literacy test" proposed in this bill is not new. It has been considered by the people as perhaps few other measures have been considered.

A learned commission, after a full and exhaustive consideration, reported unanimously that immigration should be restricted, while eight out of nine of the commissioners advocated the adoption of the literacy test.

An American Congress by a large majority enacted such a law, which was vetoed by President Cleveland.

An American Congress enacted such a law by a great majority, which was vetoed by President Taft.

This Congress by an overwhelming majority passed this measure which has been vetoed by President Wilson. How can it be said then that the people have not considered this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this literacy test will restrict immigration, to an extent which I am informed will probably be 300,000 a year, though I do not regard it as the best measure that could have been desired.

When the bill was under consideration in the House I offered an amendment which would permit a man otherwise eligible, when accompanied by a wife or minor children to enter though he could not read or write. Such a modification of the measure would in very large degree remove the objections to the literacy test.

But, sir, as soon as it becomes known that immigrants must be able to read, those who have it in mind to emigrate to this country will know in advance of the date of their sailing sufficiently long, to acquire the meager ability to read, prescribed in this bill.

Restriction as a necessary self-protection is already our firmly established policy of self-protection. What then is the protection sought by this bill? It is twofold. Unrestricted immigration would open the doors and put American labor in side-by-side competition with ignorant hordes that have been coming in and will continue to come in, and would continue the absurd policy of pretending to protect American labor against foreign-made goods, while the foreign workman is permitted to come in, bringing with him his foreign habits of living; and would continue the ruinous policy of admitting hundreds of thousands of men who come here without any intention of citizenship, to work here for a season and carry his earnings home with him.

The literacy test would go far to avoid the present danger that great masses of ignorant and illiterate people coming here, unfamiliar with the language and habits of the American people, naturally follow the counsel and advice of adroit and educated fellow countrymen who come here, who make their contracts for them and live upon them and find in these illiterate masses a fertile field for the propaganda of anarchy and the destruction of property and the overthrow of all constitutional government.

This is one of the most important reasons, in my opinion, why the bill should pass, notwithstanding the veto of the President, and I shall so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry because of a situation which makes it necessary that some of us should disagree with that splendid, clean, capable man who presides over the destinies of the American people; but I find no grounds for criticism because of his action. It is easy for me to understand that in cases where our party has failed to outline a policy he might hesitate to join with us in assuming the responsibility for the enactment of legislation of this magnitude; but as for myself my duty appears plain.

The seventh district of Kansas, which I have the honor to represent in this House, contains 32 counties, almost one-third of the entire area of the State. This district is nearly 250 miles long east and west and 125 miles wide north and south, and is traversed by two transcontinental lines of railroad, in addition to other lines of lesser importance. For some years it has been the custom of the companies operating these various lines of railroad to import Mexican laborers under contract to perform the section, track, bridge, and other construction work of a similar character on these various lines of road. These laborers are imported under a contract to work for a period of six months, their transportation being paid, and at the expiration of the term practically all of them return to Mexico.

The people of my district bear no malice toward the Mexican people as a race, and no ill will toward these laborers, but they do believe that the law which permits this is unwise and unjust to the laborer domiciled within our State, and that there is an urgent necessity for the enactment of more stringent legislation that will prohibit this practice.

These imported laborers own no property within our State. They pay no taxes there. They decline and refuse to work our roads; yet hundreds of their children attend our public schools, and not a few of them are inmates of our jails, our reformatories, penitentiaries, and insane asylums, and all without contributing to the burden of taxation borne by our citizenship.

Practically all of them reside in dilapidated box cars along the railroad right of way, in houses built there from old ties set on end and covered over with sod, or, perchance, in a hut constructed of grain doors and such odds and ends as they have been able to gather. They pay no rent, and, being content to exist on coarse fare and without comforts, they have forced wages down until they have practically driven out of the labor market that humble American who heretofore has been satisfied with an employment that permitted him to rear his family near some convenient church and school and enjoy the comforts of his toil.

During the campaign of 1910 I was constantly interrogated as to my attitude on this matter, and I pledged my people then, as I did at the special election held afterwards, and again in the campaign of 1912, that if sent as their Representative to this House I would vote for some kind of legislation that would prevent the continuation of this condition; would prohibit the importation of laborers under contract in competition with our own citizenship and restore the old opportunity for the laborers of our State.

The chairman of this committee, Mr. BURNETT, was kind enough to grant me a hearing; and after going into the matter carefully, the following provisions were incorporated in this bill, reading as follows:

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit, or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit the importation or migration of any contract laborer or contract laborers into the United States, unless such contract laborer or contract laborers are exempted under the provisions of section 3 of this act, or have been imported with the permission of the Secretary of Labor in accordance with said section; and for every violation of any of the provisions of this section the person, partnership, company, or corporation violating the same shall forfeit and pay for every such offense the sum of $1,000, which may be sued for and recovered by the United States as debts of like amount are now recovered in the courts of the United States; the Department of Justice may from any fines or penalties received pay rewards to persons other than Government employees who may furnish information leading to the recovery of any such penalties, or to the arrest and punishment of any person, as hereinafter in this section provided. For every violation of the provisions hereof the person violating the same may be prosecuted in a criminal action for a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of $1,000, or by imprisonment for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years; and under either the civil or the criminal procedure mentioned separate suits or prosecutions may be brought for each alien thus offered or promised employment as aforesaid.

SEC. 6. That it shall be unlawful and be deemed a violation of section 5 of this act to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit any alien to come into the United States by promise of employment through advertisements printed, published, or distributed in any foreign country, whether such promise is true or false, and either the civil or criminal penalty imposed by said section shall be applicable to such a case: *Provided*, That States or Territories, the District of Columbia, or places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may advertise, and by written or oral communication with prospective alien settlers make known, the inducements they offer for immigration thereto, respectively.

SEC. 7. That it shall be unlawful for any person, association, society, company, partnership, corporation, or others engaged in the business of transporting aliens to or in the United States, including owners, masters, officers, and agents of vessels, directly or indirectly, by writing,

printing, oral representation, payment of any commissions to an alien coming into the United States, allowance of any rebates to an alien coming into the United States, or otherwise to solicit, invite, or encourage or attempt to solicit, invite, or encourage any alien to come into the United States, and anyone violating any provision hereof shall be subject to either the civil or the criminal prosecution prescribed by section 5 of this act; or if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that any owner, master, officer, or agent of a vessel has brought or caused to be brought to a port of the United States any alien so solicited, invited, or encouraged to come by such owner, master, officer, or agent, such owner, master, officer, or agent shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located or in which any vessel of the line may be found, the sum of $400 for each and every such violation; and no vessel shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine imposed remains unpaid, nor shall such fine be remitted or refunded: *Provided*, That clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit with the collector of customs of a sum sufficient to cover such fine: *Provided further*, That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that the provisions of this section are persistently violated by or on behalf of any transportation company, it shall be the duty of said Secretary to deny to such company the privilege of landing alien immigrant passengers of any or all classes at United States ports for such a period as in his judgment may be necessary to insure an observance of such provisions: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be held to prevent transportation companies from issuing letters, circulars, or advertisements, confined strictly to stating the sailing of their vessels and terms and facilities of transportation therein.

SEC. 8. That any person, including the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall conceal or harbor, or attempt to conceal or harbor, or assist or abet another to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, vessel, railway car, conveyance, or vehicle, any alien not duly admitted by an immigrant inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for each and every alien so landed or brought in or attempted to be landed or brought in.

From the above it will be seen that the present law, which simply provides a penalty of $1,000 to be recovered in a civil action in the name of the Government of the United States, the suit to be prosecuted at the instance and expense of the informant who is to receive one-half of the amount of judgment recovered, will be changed so that not only will there be a liability of $1,000 in a civil suit brought by the Government of the United States but the offense is also declared a misdemeanor and punishable with a thousand dollars fine and by imprisonment of not less than six months or more than two years, with separate suits or prosecution either civil or criminal for each alien offered or promised importation.

I believe this legislation will accomplish the desired result; that it meets the demand of the people of my district and State; and that in voting for this measure I am obeying the instructions of those whose representative I am.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to pass this immigration bill over the recent veto of President Wilson. I voted for this bill when it passed this House during this Congress by a vote of more than two to one. Since that time it has passed the United States Senate with only seven dissenting votes. This bill was also vetoed by President Taft, and I voted in this House to overturn his veto. This House failed by only four votes to pass the bill over President Taft's veto.

President Wilson, in his veto message, says:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

It clearly appears from this language that the President would admit into this country the ignorant, illiterate, and un-American horde coming from every country under the sun, and it is equally as clear to my mind that he is absolutely wrong in his views on this very important subject.

This is the third time that a President of the United States has used his veto prerogative to prevent the literacy test becoming part of the immigration laws that have been passed by both branches of Congress. I am not urging my views on this on account of a narrow view of the question, but I realize that the very corner stone and foundation of a republican form of government such as ours rest upon the intelligence of its citizenship, and we can never expect to maintain a stable form of government if hordes of illiterates are allowed to come into this country unrestricted as they have been in recent years.

The conditions that so recently prevailed in West Virginia, Michigan, and Colorado, which caused such bitter warfare, would never have existed if it were not for the exploitation of these illiterate immigrants by those corporations who have practically made slaves of them. In my opinion those corporations have usurped the power of free government by taking advantage of these people and voting them through their bosses or padrone system. I urge you to pass this bill over the President's veto, as at this time there are millions of idle men unable to procure employment in the United States, and among them are millions of illiterates who have come to this country in recent years.

President Wilson further on in his veto message says:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

The President is mistaken in asserting, inferentially at least, that no political party ever has avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter and gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control its legislation. The President is clearly wrong in this contention, as will be shown by the following plank taken from the Republican platform of 1896, and which is as follows, viz:

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me aright, Mr. William McKinley was that year elected President of this United States on that platform. I remember very well losing my vote that year in that election, cast by me for William J. Bryan for President.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic platform of 1912 also contains this declaration, namely:

We repeat our declaration of the platform of 1908.

The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of the wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of their wages and the improvement of labor conditions, and to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

Again, in another place in the platform:

We pledge the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law creating a department of labor represented separately in the President's Cabinet, in which department shall be included the subject of mines and mining.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I find, as far back as the Democratic platform of 1892, this language concerning immigration:

SEC. 12. We heartily approve all legitimate efforts to prevent the United States from being used as the dumping ground for the known criminals and professional paupers of Europe.

Reading these Democratic platform pledges in the light of reason, is not the Democratic Party pledged by them to vote to exclude from our shores all illiterate immigrants? Their exclusion will be the most legitimate means of preventing undesirable persons from entering our country. Mr. Speaker, from every part of this broad land come petitions, letters, and telegrams, from all kinds of labor unions and associations, imploring this House to pass this bill over the President's veto; and as an honest Representative, under my oath of office and in view of the above Democratic platform pledges to the laboring people of this country, I can not and will not do otherwise than vote to pass this bill over the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, the President assumes by his veto message to stand between the people of our various districts and ourselves, and to prevent us from doing a wrong to our own constituents. I am constrained by my own self-respect and by my intimate knowledge of the views and conditions of the people of my dis-

tried to differ with the President, and to positively assert that I know more of their views and wishes on this or any other political subject than the President can possibly know; and I know that I am voicing almost their unanimous wish in voting to exclude from this country all illiterate immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, as samples of the many telegrams that I have been receiving on this subject I will submit as part of my remarks the following ones, viz.:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *February 3, 1915.*

JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Eighteen hundred union men of Wichita Falls urge you to support House immigration bill No. 6060 over President's veto.

C. W. JOHNSON,
Secretary Wichita Trades and Labor Council.

AMARILLO, TEX., *January 30, 1915.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Members of Pecos Valley Lodge No. 235, your honor, request that you support the immigration bill asked by American Federation of Labor by your earnest efforts in voting to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Yours, respectfully,

W. R. MCDOWELL, *President.*
J. S. HAYNES, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I will now submit a few of the hundreds of letters I have been receiving on this immigration subject, and they will tend to show, in my judgment, that our good, wise, and patriotic President has been deceived into thinking that the people of this country are not in favor of excluding illiterate foreigners from our shores.

These letters are as follows, viz.:

GALVESTON LABOR COUNCIL,
Galveston, Tex., January 29, 1915.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you at the instructions of the Galveston Labor Council, a body representing 8,200 union men of this city, to plead with you to support and try and repass House bill 6060, known as the immigration bill, over the President's veto.

Hoping you will confer upon us this favor, the same as you have favored us on previous occasions, I beg to remain,

Yours, obediently,

JAS. P. WALSH, *Secretary.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 28, 1915.*

To the Honorable Members of the
House of Representatives, Sixty-third Congress.

GENTLEMEN: With deep regret we learn through press dispatches of January 28 that the President has vetoed the immigration bill. With reference to that bill, our hopes now rest with Congress, confronted with the cold fact of competition with cheap labor of illiterates coming from foreign countries, while thousands of our people are suffering from unemployment. For the welfare of the working people of this country—our people, our country—we earnestly urge the enactment of the immigration bill over the President's veto.

Respectfully,

INTERNATIONAL SEAMEN'S UNION OF AMERICA,
T. A. HANSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 1, 1915.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It becomes our duty as officers of the Railway Employees' Department of the American Federation of Labor, representing 350,000 railway shopmen, to voice their earnest protest against the President's veto of the immigration bill embodying the literacy test. We earnestly beseech your cooperation and support in the interest of maintaining a standard living wage for the workers of this country to vote for the passage of this bill as a safeguard against the invasion of our country by the pauper labor from Europe.

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be rigidly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

Hoping that our earnest appeal will receive your full support, to the end that the immigration bill will be passed in its original form, we are,

Yours, very truly,

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' DEPARTMENT,
A. O. WHARTON, *President,*
JOHN SCOTT, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

NATIONAL COUNCIL DAUGHTERS OF LIBERTY,
1604 East Passyunk Avenue, Philadelphia.

HONORED SIR: In the early history of our country immigration was necessary and desirable and was readily assimilated with our population. It is now undesirable, because we do not assimulate it and it is making its impress on our American life, to its deterioration and injury. It has increased in such numbers that it has become a menace by reason of its low quality of illiteracy (73 per cent).

"Ignorance fosters vice." This is clearly shown by the Immigration Commissioner's report. We are appealing to you for protection to the American laborer and to maintain the standards of American life and morals.

House bill No. 6060 is opposed by every sordid influence, from which every principle for the benefit and protection of Americans and American institutions have been eliminated and they mercilessly shut out every consideration and sentiment that could be termed American.

The opposition maintains by their attitude that the man in a foreign land is entitled to the first consideration and the American second. Why should not our own have first consideration?

If parties were true to their platforms they should be true to their constituents. The Democratic Party adopted the following: "We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market." And the Republican Party, the following: "For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write." Protection that has the true ring is that which protects both the workingman and the manufacturer.

With the hope that we shall find your name recorded in the column to pass this bill over the President's veto for the welfare of all Americans, we are.

Sincerely, yours,

ALBERT L. BRADLEY, *National Councilor.*

Attest:

W. V. EDKINS, *National Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., January 30, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Cigar Makers' International Union, with a membership of 50,000, covering all ramifications of our country, I respectfully urge that you vote to pass the immigration bill, including the literacy test, over the veto of President Wilson.

The reasons for this request are many, chief of which are: That labor, in so far as it has been able to give free expression to its opinion, is practically unanimous in its advocacy of the immigration bill; that the American Federation of Labor, the supreme parliament and final authority through which labor's expression may be had, at its Seattle Convention, 1913, practically unanimously declared in favor of the immigration bill; that we hold that a free Democracy can not sustain its high ideals, justice, liberty, equality, and freedom in a state befitting advancing civilization, without the great mass of its voters possessing average intelligence and wisdom born of knowledge; that there is a vast difference between the immigrants now and those of 50 years ago; that all foreign countries have laws regulating and controlling both immigration and emigration, especially emigration, through a system of passports, the check-off plan, discretionary authority given to the emigration commission, and its system of spies and police surveillance; that under this discretionary power it becomes an easy matter for each country to keep out the immigrant not wanted and to hold back the sturdy, desirable citizen who would emigrate, and at the same time make it easy as well as helpful for the derelict and so-called undesirables to emigrate; that we personally know of cases where immigrants now here are more in favor of restricted immigration than are native-born Americans; that there are even in normal trade conditions and at all times fully 1,000,000 idle men seeking employment which they can not find, and that during periods of industrial and commercial stagnation this army of unemployed is doubled, if not tripled; that under the planless system of immigration millions of immigrants have landed on our shores with no concept of the responsibility that goes with citizenship here, and because of pressing poverty are forced into gainful occupations for wages, hours, and conditions, in the making of which, because of dire conditions bordering on starvation, they have no choice or say.

For these and a multiplicity of other reasons, with which I shall not burden you at this time, we favor the immigration bill including the literacy test. We again urge and respectfully ask that you vote for the immigration bill now in your hands.

Yours, respectfully,

G. W. PERKINS,
International President.

INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Representing 65,000 members of the International Typographical Union, I am directed to request that you use your vote and influence to secure the passage of the immigration bill over the veto of President Woodrow Wilson.

Yours, truly,

J. W. HAYS,
Secretary-Treasurer, I. T. U.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Our international organization, the United Mine Workers of America, is much interested in the passage of the immigration bill, which provides for a literacy test.

We ask you therefore to help pass the bill by your vote and influence, even though the President has seen fit to veto it. It is unnecessary to submit arguments in support of this measure, because you have no doubt given the subject very thorough consideration.

The 400,000 members of our organization believe the passage of such a law is necessary not only for the protection of American citizens but the foreign immigrants as well. This is an American measure and we believe ought to receive the support of yourself and associates in Congress.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN P. WHITE, *President.*
WILLIAM GREEN, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 29, 1915.*

Congressman JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently President Wilson vetoed the immigration bill containing the literacy test.

I am instructed by the general executive board of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs of America to write you requesting you to vote in favor of the passage of this bill over the President's veto.

It means a great deal to the membership of our organization. We have thousands of men out of employment in every section of the country. It can not be possible that the President of the United States

thoroughly understands industrial conditions. The American workingman is being driven to the wall year after year mainly as a result of immigrant labor. The children of the American workers are filling our jails and penal institutions because of the fact that they can not find suitable employment, resulting from the overcrowding of the labor market.

Employers' associations and shipping trusts are selfish in their desire for unrestricted immigration conditions, because a surplus of labor means cheaper labor for the employers, and the overflow if immigrants to this country means to the Shipping Trust enormous profits.

Religious organizations that are opposed to the literacy test take the position that unrestricted immigration will enlarge their congregations in thi country.

The interests of the working masses of the Nation are entirely overlooked by the above-named interests. We who are in the front fighting and struggling with the thousands and thousands of workers know the conditions and we speak from actual contact with the workers and experience with conditions of life. If conditions continue as they are—that is, if the hundreds of thousands of workers from foreign countries are allowed to come into this country each year without any restriction, and especially the ignorant and uneducated class—it will be but a short time until the toiling men and women of this country will have to fight for bread that they and their children may live.

Look into conditions in New York and Chicago, in St. Louis and in Boston this winter, with 1,000,000 men and women out of employment struggling for something to eat—not the riffraff who never work, but those who are willing to work and are unable to find employment—and ask yourself, as a free-born, honest-thinking representative of the people, if you are justified in still continuing unrestricted immigiation.

Our membership of 70,000 English-speaking American workingmen ask you to vote for the passage of the immigration bill containing the literacy test over the President's veto.

Respectfully, yours,

DANIEL J. TOBIN,
General President International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I desire to submit as a part of my remarks statistics which show the urgent necessity for the immediate passage of this bill, so as to close and bar the doors of our country against this vast stream of foreigners now flowing into our country, making it harder year by year for our own people to earn a living in the face of so much foreign-labor competition.

These statistics are as follows:

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

A Department of Commerce bulletin just issued shows that there were 13,515,886 persons of foreign birth living in the United States in 1910. These figures show an increase of approximately 3,500,000 over the number of foreigners residing here in 1910. The increasing ratio is slightly in excess of the general increase in population.

Approximately 10 per cent of this foreign-born population live in New York.

Pennsylvania ranks second as a permanent abode of foreigners, with 741,000. The majority of these people are miners. Illinois has a foreign population of 604,000, and Massachusetts has 453,000.

Germans represent more than one-fifth of the entire foreign population. There were 2,501,181 Germans scattered through the country. The tremendous Russian immigration during the last decade places the Czar's subjects in second place with 1,602,000. Italy was third with 1,343,000, and Ireland, which formerly led the list, was in fourth place with 1,333,000.

There were 1,174,000 Austrians in this country and 876,455 Englishmen.

The report shows that the American migration to Canada was offset by more than 1,000,000 English and French Canadians living in this country.

Other foreigners living in this country: From Sweden, 665,183; Hungary, 495,600; Norway, 403,858; Scotland, 261,034; Mexico, 219,302; Denmark, 181,621; Finland, 129,669; Switzerland, 124,834; Netherlands, 120,053; France, 117,326; Greece, 101,264; Portugal, 57,625; Wales, 82,479; Roumania, 65,920; Turkey, 59,702; Belgium, 47,397; Cuba and the West Indies, 23,169; Spain, 21,977; all other countries, 59,701.

The number of foreign-born males over 21 living in the United States was 6,648,317. Of these, 1,034,117 were naturalized, 570,772 had first papers, 2,266,000 were aliens, and there were 775,393 citizens not reported.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. It is a pleasure to find the President in a position in which we can give him our support. His veto of the immigration bill follows the example of his worthy predecessor in the White House. I shall vote to sustain him to-day.

No man can outdo me in my zeal for a high standard of citizenship, nor can anyone go further than I in barring from this country anarchists and those whose criminal tendencies or aversion to well-ordered government or those who are so mentally or physically defective as to prove a burden or a menace to our people.

But it has been declared by one of the advocates of this bill on this floor to-day that an alien can learn an alphabet in a single night and thus qualify himself for admission. I am opposed to saddling the Government with an enormous expense to enforce a bill which can be so easily evaded.

Another gentleman cries out in despair, "What are you going to do with the 4,000,000 idle men in this country?" In reply to that I would say: "Give them a little Republican legislation and a little less Democratic folly and you will do away with their idleness and put an end to the bread line."

There are millions of acres yet to be cultivated in this country, railroads to be built, tunnels to pierce the mountains, and new industries to be established in every section.

The time has not come when this Nation can afford to reverse its policy of more than a century and bar the worthy immigrant merely because he was deprived of educational opportunities beyond the seas.

It is a man's character and not his education that determines his worth as a citizen. A rugged body, an innocent mind, and a pure heart, combined with a manly ambition, is far more preferable in a citizen to a decrepit physique, a vicious heart, and a criminal, cunning, educated mind, which enables the anarchist and the enemy of good government to pass through the gates of American opportunity while the unfortunate is denied admission.

[Mr. LINTHICUM addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, it might be regarded that an affirmative vote on this measure to-day would be a rebuke to the President of the United States. That is not true. The President's function in legislation is limited to the veto power. I called the attention of this House once before to the legislative function of the Executive of the Nation. It is not positive in character, it is negative. It is not so much to say what the law shall be as it is to say what it shall not be so far as the Executive is concerned, and therefore when the President vetoes a measure he is within his rights constitutionally and is not subject to criticism of any Member upon the floor of either House when he has exercised his constitutional right as written in the Constitution. The President has put his veto upon the ground of two items in the bill. The first is—

It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural inalienable rights of men.

The clause in the bill that induced the President to make that statement is in these words:

Who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that it is not a pleasant situation for any Speaker to be required to ask for order in the greatest legislative assembly in the world, and yet it seems that debate on this floor has reached a place where it is thought that a man is seeking to be heard and not to convince, and I think it is a suggestion of a public opinion which emanates from this floor that is not complimentary to any Member who speaks or to those who hear. The one thing that would induce me to vote for this measure, strange to say, is the language that the President has asked us not to vote for, for if there is anybody who ought to be excluded from the shores of this country it is the person who advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, and not only that, but who will attack the constitutional institutions of our country.

The other point that the President has allowed to be his determinant is the educational, or the literacy, test. Speaking as one who believes in education, a citizen of a Nation that believes in a compulsory system of education, a citizen of one of the 48 States of the Union, most of which have compulsory laws compelling education, I for one will not vote against a measure that requires the same test of an immigrant who comes here that we require of the individuals growing up under laws that compel them to obey certain regulations pertaining to education. It is not unfair for a nation to put a demand upon a man who seeks to come to our shores that we put upon the children who grow to manhood within the nation. It is inconsistent to take any other position, it seems to me. Then, on the other hand, while I could understand why Members of the House who are opposed to a system of protection, as the Democratic Members, might oppose this limitation of immigration, yet I can not for the life of me understand how Members on this (Republican) side of the House, who believe in a system of American protection, can argue against an immigration bill on the basis of protection to American labor.

My Republican friends, whether you believe in a system of protection to American wages, as has been announced over and over again in the platforms as we publish to the world, and whether you do that because you belong to a particular party promulgating it or not, matters little to me, but it does matter when men stand upon a platform that pronounces for the protection of the present system of wages, through a protective tariff, and then argue for the admission of the laborer who becomes a competitor of American labor. If it be wrong to admit goods made by him, then why is it not wrong to admit him? Cheap goods in competition with our American goods we refuse, then why allow competition in American labor and thus reduce the wages paid to labor in this country to the wages paid in the country from which he comes? [Applause.]

As a consistent believer in a system of wages that allows a workingman to have a carpet upon his floor and modern conveniences in his home, I insist that whether we have a protective tariff or a revenue tariff, the time is here for this country to put up protective bars against indiscriminate introduction of European-paid labor to force down American labor to such a basis.

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. KINDEL. Since you believe in the protection of American labor, why do you permit the goods to be shipped in at a lesser rate than from interior points to distant western points? For instance, we of Colorado now buy our pottery in Europe because the freight rate is less from Europe than it is from Ohio to the same point.

Mr. FESS. My friend is introducing parcel post, and I am not up with it sufficiently to make a satisfactory answer. [Laughter and applause.] I would say this, however, that my contention has been, and is now, to prevent the goods made in Europe by a cheaper labor coming here to enter into competition with the sale of the goods made by higher-priced labor, and that is the only reason why I should stand upon a protective tariff policy. [Applause.] How can you, believing in that policy, vote out the goods he makes and vote in the men who make them and to introduce this competition? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FESS. If it will not take too much of my time.

Mr. KINDEL. I want to ask you this question: Why do you concede the point that Lord & Taylor, of New York, must establish a plant in Europe, as well as in this country, whereby they supply from Europe to the western part of the United States at 81 cents for 11-pound parcel-post packages while from New York to the same points in the West it is $1.32?

Mr. FESS. I would not pass any law in this country to compel Lord & Taylor, of New York, to go to Europe to manufacture an article for which they would pay the cheaper labor in Europe and then sell it back here free of duty, to come into competition with their competitor who employs American labor, which will thereby be reduced to the wages paid by Lord & Taylor in Europe.

I was pleased and edified, as every Member of this House was edified, with the argument of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS]. I wish every man on either side of this Chamber would be as frank as that gentleman was when he said, "I have not come to the place where I believe that the Nation ought to enter upon a policy of limiting immigration."

Why does not the rest of the opposition take that position? You talk about objecting to this bill because of the literacy test or other items. The facts are, you object to it because you oppose restriction. No matter what be the item, you are against the limitation of immigration at all, and that is the issue we now have here to meet. I say to you that the gentleman from New Hampshire has taken the only legitimate position on that side of the question, namely, that we do not want to limit or restrict immigration at all.

But I say to you that we do want to limit and restrict immigration; we must meet this issue, and we should do it now. [Applause.] That is a policy that we must enter upon. It is no argument to say that the mothers of great sons in the past never went to school, were illiterate, and therefore you would crowd out some of the greatest and most useful people in the world by this literacy test. Yes; it is true. But, in the beginning, with no common schools and no colleges open to every boy and girl as to-day, with the doors swinging open both ways, many people grew up without education and became splendid citizens. But that was the time when there was no chance. They had to grow up that way or not grow. People who years ago never went to school, if they lived now would not plead for ignorance. Those same people never rode in an automobile. They may never have seen a carpet on their floor. They may never have talked over a telephone. They may never have walked over paved streets. They may not have known anything about modern civilization, but because they did not, do you mean to say that they now would reject them, or that they should be restricted the same as if they had not all of these privileges? No. This time demands that the standards of immigration be restricted in order to get a better class of immigrants. My contention is that you can not open the floodgates of Europe, admit indiscriminate citizens from Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, and southern Europe, and then hope that your standard of living among the labor of the country will not be reduced to the level of those people. Let us vote for this measure as a beginning of a national policy that must be met, if not by this then by a future Congress. [Applause.]

In this connection I submit a letter from Dr. Jenks, a most thoughtful student of the question now before us.

THE FAR EASTERN BUREAU,
New York, February 2, 1915.

Hon. S. D. FESS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FESS: Through my membership in the Immigration Commission and because of the study I have given to it during the four years covered by the commission's investigations I have come to believe that the immigration question is one of the gravest importance to the future welfare of our country. May I ask you, considering the present emergency and my own experiences as an impartial student of this problem, to take the time to read this letter?

The arguments against the literacy test, which I have lately read, seem to me to be largely beside the point.

The chief reasons for the imposition of any test of that kind at the present time are—

(1) The absolute necessity of restriction, in order to maintain American standards of living among our unskilled working people;

(2) The fact that no other restrictive measure at the present time could pass Congress; and

(3) While the literacy test is restrictive, it is also beneficially selective.

A vote to defeat the literacy test is a vote to encourage such public calamities as the Lawrence strike. Working conditions in Lawrence were doubtless sufficiently deplorable to incite the strike. Why did such conditions exist? On account of the great numbers of immigrants continually asking for positions at decidedly lower wages than those paid by employers. Of course, under such conditions, employers have little incentive to increase wages.

Trustworthy investigators, not only during the trouble at Lawrence but later, found from 25 to 30 single men living in houses that would accommodate satisfactorily families of not more than 6 or 8 people. Often there were 12 men sleeping on mattresses laid side by side on the floor of the room in which was their cooking stove and all their household goods. Here we have excessive immigration turning what should be homes into mere bunk houses, insanitary and incentive to the grossest immorality.

Shocking conditions of this sort, proved to be prevalent in Lawrence, are duplicated in very many places throughout the manufacturing and mining regions of the East and Middle West. Many of the investigators and members of the Immigration Commission were opposed to restriction when they began their work. They were made unanimous in favor of restriction because of conditions such as those at Lawrence, brought about wholly by excessive immigration. Of course, you do not wish to help perpetuate the transformation of the American home into the bunk house, with all its loathsome characteristics. Restriction of immigration can alone protect our communities and our unskilled American workers against this menace.

You yourself are, of course, conscious of the fact that Congress has repeatedly voted in favor of this particular measure of restriction. The country is determined to have restriction. If this bill is defeated by the President's veto, such defeat will merely strengthen the demand for restriction, and the next attempt to crystallize in legislation this sentiment is likely to be one regarding which there can be not the shadow of a doubt—a percentage test that would reduce immigration far more decisively than would the literacy test.

The greatest menace comes from the immigration of hundreds of thousands of men unaccompanied by their families and who, investigation proved, have no intention to make their permanent home here, but who come merely for the purpose of earning nest eggs with which to rejoin their families at home and to start anew in their own countries. These men are attracted solely by the sordid advantages presented by American economic standards. They have no interest in or sympathy with our American ideals or institutions. They come deliberately to underbid American wage earners if necessary to obtain work, to exist sometimes 12 or more in a room, and to send all their savings home. More than 90 per cent of the immigrants from Bulgaria and Greece and other such countries are males; they are mostly single men or married men without their wives or children.

The investigation made by the Immigration Commission revealed that 90 per cent of the married Bulgarians, 74.7 per cent of the Greek, and 36.9 per cent of the South Italian immigrants themselves reported that their wives continued living in their native countries. Between 1899 and 1909 the percentage of male immigrants from Europe increased from 58.5 to 73 per cent, and since then the rate of increase seems to have been continuous. That, in itself, is a very serious problem. Comparisons with early immigration, you see, are no longer valid.

The literacy test will exclude primarily men coming from the countries whence this particularly unsuitable type of immigrant emanates. According to statistics issued by the United States Census Bureau on January 26 the percentage of illiteracy in the United States for the total population over 10 years is 7.7 per cent and for the native white population 3 per cent. In Bulgaria the illiteracy percentage is reported as 65 per cent; in Greece, 70 per cent; in Italy, 37 per cent; and in Servia, 79 per cent.

The test is therefore beneficially selective.

This sort of undesirable immigration is directly responsible for our unemployment problem. Three days ago in New York City, Jeff Davis, so-called "king of the hoboes," declared that the "swarms of such undesirable immigrants, underbidding American workers, are turning our unskilled wage earners into hoboes, bums, outcasts, and criminals." I do not think there is any doubt but that increase in unemployment and criminality can be traced directly to excessive undesirable immigration.

During 1914 there was expended in this country on public-school education, in round figures, $500,000,000. The primary purpose of this great expenditure was, and is, to obliterate illiteracy. Trustworthy investigators are convinced that education is the best means of fighting pauperism and crime. Is the object of the expenditure of these millions to be nullified in fact by retaining the "open door" for illiterates who refuse to avail themselves of opportunities to learn even the rudiments of reading and writing?

On my return from Italy in a steamer carrying immigrants, the Italian commissioner of immigration in charge of the Italian immigrants on board that steamer told me he hoped the United States

would impose the literacy test, because, as he expressed it, "such restriction would within three years put a schoolhouse on every hill in Italy," and would "do more to further general education in Italy than anything the Italian Government could itself put into practice."

The argument that men can not learn to read in any country in Europe, including the Jewish Poles in Russia, is untrue and unfounded, as every well-informed Hebrew knows. Very few male Hebrews would be excluded by this test; and as you of course know, boys, wives, and parents—male and female—are not required to take the test provided their adult male relatives can read. There has been gross misrepresentation throughout the country on this point, as there has been gross misrepresentation of other provisions of the Burnett bill.

You have doubtless seen the published statement that "Lincoln's mother would not have been admitted into the United States had this test been in force in her time." Lincoln learned to read under conditions probably more difficult than those confronted by possibly 95 per cent of the present European immigrants. And Lincoln's ability to read would have brought his mother in.

It is frequently stated that this bill "would have excluded Carl Schurz and Garibaldi, and have prevented Congress from hearing Charles Stewart Parnell's famous plea in behalf of the oppressed Irish race." These great men would not have been excluded. They were not men who either applied or advocated "the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property." The bill specifically provides that "nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense, purely political, not involving moral turpitude."

The bill would exclude such men as the anarchists who were executed in Chicago some years ago; Czolgosz, the assassin of President McKinley; and men who are ready wantonly to destroy property and valuable machinery in times of strike, a proceeding not countenanced by any reputable trade-union leader.

I am reminded that Charles Stewart Parnell more than once denounced the very acts and opinions prescribed by clause 3 of the bill; that he repudiated in the name of the Irish people association in the Phoenix Park murders; that the greatest living Irishmen denounce and deplore assassination and wanton destruction as political weapons; and that the greatest Irishman of modern times, Daniel O'Connell, declared that "the salvation of Ireland is not worth the shedding of a single drop of human blood."

I trust that the serious consideration of the real welfare of the American people, as manifested by the standards of living of their poorer classes, will easily outweigh any of the merely sentimental objections, largely hypothetical and unsound, that have been raised in opposition to the literacy test; and that you will further note the very numerous "admirable, well-conceived, and desirable" important parts of the bill mentioned by the President, which, as he says, if "enacted into law" would "undoubtedly enhance efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of public service to which it relates." Those most familiar with the administration of our immigration laws would probably lay even more emphasis upon these provisions than does the President.

Very sincerely,

J. W. JENKS.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

[Mr. SLAYDEN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE].

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to pass this bill over the veto of the President. When it passed the House last year I gave it my support, and I see no reason why it should not still become a law. I heartily join in every word of praise that has been accorded to our American citizens of foreign birth. There is evidence on every side to establish the fact that our Government and institutions have the power to remold and recast the lives and character of people from every civilized nation. We are therefore justified in the belief that the principles upon which our Government is founded and which should control its administration affect the fundamental elements of human character.

The record of achievement which has been made in the assimilation of immigrant peoples into our American life well challenges the admiration of the world. Every door of opportunity has been kept wide open to the foreigner who has sought our shores. He and his have been accorded every advantage given to those of our own Nation. While the immigrant has laid upon us many obligations, he has been given many privileges.

Those who oppose this legislation assert that they are controlled in their judgment by humanitarian motives. It is stated that we are closing the doors of opportunity to the deserving people of other nations; that we are darkening the sky of hope to the distressed and downtrodden of other countries; that we are refusing to extend a helping hand to those who are seeking our aid. We can not divorce the principles of humanity and justice in considering this legislation. We must deal justly with our own people and our own interests as well as with the desire of those who may seek our shores. We should act upon this question in the light of present-day conditions. Is restriction of immigration desirable? Will it relieve an overburdened labor market? Will it improve the living conditions of the toilers who are now among us and who must remain citizens of this country? Will it in any way reduce the burden of taxation and build up American institutions? I believe this legislation will contribute to these ends.

The European war has arrested business operations in this country. How soon these operations will become normal no one can say. For the past six months there has been a great congestion in our large centers of population of those out of employment, and yet it is proposed to make no effort to stem the tide of foreign immigration that will undoubtedly seek our shores as soon as the war now raging is brought to an end. The opponents of the bill claim that there will be so much activity in the resumption of manufacturing, in the building up of devastated cities, and also in the development of agriculture, that there will be little, if any, immigration to this country. I do not share this belief. Our great country which has enjoyed the blessings of peace will prove more attractive than ever to the residents of other lands.

The impetus to seek new environment and to cast their fortunes in this favored land will be stronger than ever. Those who have been driven from their homes and who have seen their fields laid waste will dread the task of rebuilding new homes upon the ruins of the old and amid the devastation that has occurred. Just as we seek new environment when old associations become burdensome and unattractive, so will many thousands of those who may be left after the war has ended seek our favored land to repair their shattered fortunes. This bill is not harsh in its terms. Our doors would still be wide open to those who possess even the minimum of intelligence and who thereby indicate to some degree the existence of mental activity. The great need of our country to-day is for a more intelligent and patriotic citizenship. We do well to support and maintain our great institutions of learning and to accord every possible support to our great public-school system and to require that every American child shall be an educated child. If we ever lose any of our national ideals or our governmental power shall in any way become weakened, it will be due to our failure to enforce these obligations. This bill recognizes this fundamental element of our national character in requiring the immigrant to pass what is known as the literacy test. I am surprised that this provision of the bill has aroused such bitter opposition and do not understand why it should not receive the support of every loyal American. I can well understand why the great industrial corporations are opposed to this measure. They have recruited their ranks of workers from the immigrant class. It has been a most profitable source of supply. Men who lack intelligence and power to acquire knowledge of American independence and opportunity become ready victims to corporate greed and avarice. Conditions in mine, mill, and large manufacturing centers where our foreign population has largely gathered prove conclusively that many of the great trusts of the country have been built up by the exacting toll which they have levied upon foreign and ignorant workingmen. A better day is near at hand. Our society demands that human beings shall no longer be exploited for private gain. There will always be dangerous and unhealthy employment, but public sentiment, as expressed through legislation, will require that these shall be reduced to the lowest possible minimum. We have much to do along this line, and these problems and many others relating to them should be worked out under the most favorable conditions.

It will be the part of wisdom for us to settle and determine many problems arising from the large foreign population we now have without intensifying them and adding to their complications through a continuance of an increasing tide of immigration. The congestion of laborers in our cities should be relieved by some proper system of distribution. Agricultural life should be made attractive to the foreigner. There are vast areas of public domain that should be settled and developed. When we have found the remedy for these conditions and when we have put into operation proper means of assimilation and distribution, we can then open the flood gates and allow the stream of foreign immigration to flow in. Would it not be well, in view of these facts, to work out the necessary remedies? These can and will be found. The problem is worthy the best endeavor of our statesmen and leaders of public thought. The flow of immigration should be temporarily reduced until we are better prepared to take care of those who will come to us. This legislation can be justified, in my opinion, on the highest humanitarian grounds. We are doing little for the immigrant to permit him to come to us and lose himself in the congested tenement population of the city. If we can discover some adequate way through which we can immediately avail ourselves of his productive power, we will be doing him the highest service, and he will become a most valuable asset. He has been such an asset in the past, but there is fear that he is becoming a liability. It will be best both for him and us to

allow some period of readjustment that will enable us to solve some of the problems which have arisen from unrestricted immigration and permit us to properly care for the foreigners who are now here and those who will undoubtedly be able to come by meeting the conditions of the bill now pending. In supporting this measure, I believe I am doing a service not only to the citizens of my country but also to those who will seek a home under the protection of its flag.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I feel compelled to cast my vote to make this bill a law notwithstanding the President's veto, but I take it that a Representative, in the exercise of his prerogatives, may sometimes find it his duty to differ with the Executive, and may do so without disrespect or criticism. However much any of us may differ with the views of the present occupant of that great office, none will say that he has acted other than what, in his opinion, is for the best interests of his country. During his entire occupancy of that exalted position he has been so uniformly right that it makes it all the more difficult for us, especially his party associates, to be compelled to differ with him now. The President, in the exercise of his constitutional right, has seen fit to disapprove this measure, which a large majority of this Congress, as well as several preceding Congresses, has approved, and has returned the bill to this House, giving his reasons for withholding his approval. If the reasons thus given are not convincing, and we believe in the principles embodied in this bill, and believe the best interests of the country require its passage, we should not, in my opinion, shirk the responsibility as Representatives of the American people.

For many years I have believed some further restrictions should be made in our immigration laws, and as the years have passed and I have observed the operation of our laws on this question, I have become more and more convinced of the wisdom of such legislation as this bill proposes.

It must be apparent to all those who are informed on this question that we have outgrown, as it were, the present laws on immigration. It has been argued here that we have greatly prospered under our present law, and that we should not therefore depart from the old principles of the open door and let our country remain the asylum for the oppressed of all nations. This theory sounds well, Mr. Speaker, but things have changed. We are no longer a sparsely settled wilderness. We are no longer an undeveloped country comparatively. We no longer have a hundred jobs for one man to do, as in the early days of this Republic. We have passed the formative stages, the experimental stages, if you please, and by our brain and industry, coupled with patriotism, we have transformed this vast undeveloped wilderness into a great, living, vital, throbbing world power.

In those early days we could afford to be more liberal and less discriminating than we can now, because conditions are different now. We could better afford to take the chance of making good American citizens of those who came to our shores, because we needed people. We needed laborers. We needed everything that goes into the making of a great nation. It may also be noted that in the early days the people who came to cast their lot with us spread out over the rural portions of our country, and did not to the same extent as now flood and congest our cities, because we had no large cities as now. It must be admitted that our forefathers, in the main, made desirable citizens, and many who were illiterate contributed to the betterment of the Nation; but that does not prove that because of their ignorance they were as useful as if they had not been illiterate.

I am perfectly willing to admit that literacy is not a true test of character, but I am not willing to admit that it is desirable to have it in unlimited quantities. It is argued that as we have done so well as a Nation we should not change our policy in this respect; that is to argue that the laws governing trade and commerce should not be changed to conform to growth and changed conditions. It is to argue that trusts and monopolies should not be regulated because the country was prosperous under laws that made possible their existence. In fact, it is to admit that we must stand still and that we have not the wisdom to legislate for changed conditions.

It is almost equal to the admission that popular government is impotent and ineffectual. We may not be fully grown as a Nation; in fact, I believe we have undreamed of possibilities ahead of us, if we exercise that prudence and wisdom which have characterized us in the past and have the courage to meet such questions as this in a spirit of patriotism and not permit ourselves to become mere sentimentalists.

From a handful of colonists we have grown into a great Nation of nearly a hundred million of souls; a people filled with love of liberty and patriotism; and yet it is contended that we should keep the bars down to everybody who desires to become experimental American citizens, at a time, too, when there is a large alien element who have not been assimilated, and also at a time in our history when our progress commercially has been arrested by a great war.

When many of our own people are temporarily out of employment, it does seem to me that the opponents of this measure would stop and consider whether they owe most to the already American citizen or to the prospective American citizen that a mere sentiment would ingraft on our body politic. Do you not realize that many of our citizens are out of employment, due to abnormal world conditions? Do you not know that even in normal times there is always a large percentage of American citizens seeking employment? Do you not know that there are more people in the country now than can find work to support themselves and families? I do not mean that everybody is out of work, as is reported for political effect, and that it is due to the Democratic Party; but I do mean to say, gentlemen, that our immigration laws are so lax that we have permitted more people to come in than we have been able to assimilate properly, with the result that the labor market is overstocked and we have a great mass of undigested labor on our hands. This being the case, let me ask you which is the higher duty—to protect American labor from further congestion or, because of sentiment, refuse to restrict immigration? In other words, are we for American citizens and American labor or will we legislate for foreigners instead?

I would not want to utter one word that would foster selfishness on our part as a Nation, nor say a word of disparagement of the citizens of other countries, but I do say that our first and chief duty as representatives of this great people is to legislate for America and Americans. Then, when we have done what is for their best good, do all we can to help all other peoples in the world.

I do not believe it can be successfully shown that it is conducive to our best interests as a Nation to continue this wholesale, indiscriminate policy of immigration. If we do, it means that all this imported ignorance must be educated at our expense. It means that our own American labor must be further hampered by cheap labor. It means that the now splendid standard of living by American labor must be lowered. It means that our great farming interests must come into increasing competition with this vast horde of aliens that will continually pour into this country every year. It means an increase in crime; an increase in pauperism; an increase in insanity. The percentage of insanity among foreigners is greater than among American born.

Government statistics show that of the total number of inmates of insane asylums on January 1, 1910, 28.8 per cent were white, of foreign birth, while of the total population of the United States on the same date only 14.5 per cent were white, foreign born.

Two years ago I had occasion in an official capacity in my State to visit many of the insane institutions in other States of the Union, and I recall that the superintendent of one of the New York institutions at Ward Island stated that 75 per cent of the 5,000 inmates were foreign born.

As a Nation we have wards enough of our own without importing any. It is generally admitted that when the present European war is over—which I pray may be soon—that emigration will be greatly stimulated. The people who are left, many of them, will want to get away from devastation and strife, especially the element that are devoid of patriotism, the shiftless, and the anarchist; and where else would he wend his way but to America, the land of peace and of liberty? But some will say, "Shall we be so heartless as to deny him the privilege? Shall we refuse asylum to him?" I say yes. If we do not need him, would it not be a kindness to say to those people, "We are already overstocked with cheap labor. We can not assume the burden of educating you and providing you employment. We have passed the point in our history when we can do a good part by you. We can not take you all. We have 100,000,000 of our own citizens whose interest and happiness are paramount. We can only assimilate a part, and we have decided that it is to our interest to take the intelligent part. You remain where you are and help to rehabilitate your own nation, and work there in your own land in the interest of constitutional government."

By adopting such an attitude we will be doing what is best for them as well as ourselves. We have a tremendous responsibility as a Nation. We are almost the only great nation at peace with all the world. When this present war is over we will stand out

among the nations of the world as never before. We will be looked up to as never before. The peoples of the world will ask themselves, Whence the greatness of this great nation of peace? Why has America remained tranquil and at peace when all other nations were clamoring for blood?

The people of these unfortunate countries will begin to inquire the cause, and gradually will begin to realize that it is because we are a Government by and for the people. That we rely upon right and justice as between men; that we will not tolerate oppression; that our defense rests not with the sword, but we are secure because of the patriotism in the hearts of our people.

Getting such a conception of us will stimulate the people of all nations to follow our example. A love of freedom and constitutional liberty will spring up in their hearts and eventually put an end to the ruling of kings and potentates the world over. The example we are setting the world will perhaps eventually result in the universal rule of the people.

What a destiny and what an example, and what a tremendous responsibility is ours. How jealously we should guard the sources from which spring our power—citizenship itself. Our greatness as a Nation will continually be measured by the quality of our citizenship, and it is a matter of the gravest concern that our citizenship, which is the source of power, be kept free from contamination. It is the highest function of government to raise the standard of citizenship and see that the average is never lowered.

In what better way, let me inquire, can this be done than by the restriction of ignorance and superstition in our immigration laws? It is estimated that the American people are expending something like $1,000,000,000 annually for education and the eradication of ignorance and the growth of high ideals; and yet in the face of this stupendous effort many men stand here and plead with Congress to add more ignorance to the sum total of national illiteracy. The chief thought in all our education is the instilling of love and respect for our American institutions. It is a well-known fact that very many of the immigrants who yearly come to our country come primarily because of the desire to accumulate wealth and not because of a desire to become a part of us. It is a question of take all and give nothing in return. This is evidenced by the fact that thousands of aliens do not take the trouble to fit themselves for American citizens after they get here, and thousands in our large cities have never fitted themselves to exercise the highest privilege of an American citizen—that of casting a ballot and participation in government. Many such as these will be eliminated if this bill becomes a law, and they should be eliminated.

It is contended in some quarters that a question so far-reaching and involving such a radical departure from our time-worn policies should not be disposed of without first being made a party declaration and then passed on by the American people. While this may not have been done exactly, it has been made the subject of party declaration in general terms time and time again and for many years back. As far back as 1896 the Democratic national convention platform made the following declaration:

> We hold that the most efficient way to protect American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

In that same year—that is, in 1896—the Republican national convention platform contained the following declaration:

> For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

And, as you know, the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States nominated upon the platform containing this declaration were elected.

I believe this bill represents the desire and will of the great body of Americans without regard to party. As early as 1896 this legislation has been before Congress and before the country, having been passed by one or both branches of Congress at intervals since that time. In addition it has been vetoed by the President of the United States three times, including the present veto, and has barely escaped passage over two previous vetoes.

In view of all this I do not think it can be successfully contended that this is new legislation or that it has not received the indorsement of the American people. Admit for the sake of argument that the policy should not be changed permanently, but that we should maintain our century-old policy of the open door to those who would find asylum here; admit that we should still continue to educate foreign ignorance; that we should continue the importation of cheap labor to compete with our own American labor; that we should continue to legislate in the interest of selfish employers' associations and the Shipping Trust, enabling them to pile up enormous profits at the expense of and to the detriment of American labor and the American farmer; admit even for the sake of argument that the appeal of every labor organization in America be ignored; admit that we should give no heed to the appeal made by 3,000,000 of the tillers of the soil of the Nation; yet we would be justified in passing this bill as an emergency measure on account of the European war. This Congress has been called upon to meet many grave questions growing out of this war.

When our revenues fell off on account of war we promptly passed an emergency tax bill to make good these deficiencies. We are proposing a ship-purchase bill, not because the Government wants to engage in shipping, but in order to move our commerce across the seas and because there seems to be no other means to do it.

For the same reason, if for no other, this bill should be enacted into law, so that our country may be protected immediately after the war and until world conditions again become normal.

But this should not be treated as an emergency measure, but passed for broader reasons, namely, in order that our policy should be permanently modified. I therefore appeal to this House of Representatives of the American people to consider the best interests of your own countrymen. I appeal to you in the name of the great agricultural interests of the Nation. I appeal to you in the name of American labor from one end of this great country to the other. I appeal to you in the name and for the sake of American institutions that cost the precious blood of many of our ancestors to establish. I appeal to you to protect American citizenship, the American home, and the American boy by casting your vote to make this bill a law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill, notwithstanding the President's veto.

For 20 years I have supported this legislation. My constituency knows my position. They have returned me to Congress knowing my position, and therefore I take it for granted that a majority of my constituency favor this legislation. Nearly two-thirds of this House voted for this legislation four years ago. The constituencies represented by this House knew the position of their Representatives.

After four years the issue comes again, and we find that when the bill is before the House more than two-thirds of the Representatives of those constituencies vote in favor of the legislation.

I believe that the Representatives upon this floor always endeavor to voice the sentiments of their constituencies on whichever side they cast their vote. But when you find that after the issue has been presented, the American people understanding the issue, two-thirds of this House reflect that sentiment in legislation, I say it is idle to contend that it requires the pronouncement of a great party in convention assembled to determine the sentiment of the American people. [Applause.]

The reason of my support of this legislation is the very reason for which the President says he vetoes the bill. He says the object of such a provision—referring to the literacy test—is restrictive and not selective. There is not a man in this House who is not in favor of selective restriction and who has not always been in favor of it. There is not a man in the country who has not been in favor of selective restriction. But that is not the purpose of the bill. It did not go before the American people with that purpose. It went before the American people with the avowed purpose of restriction of foreign immigration into this country. And why? Not because we have not benefited in the past by liberal admission of immigration into the United States, but because our conditions have changed.

Now, the real question that confronts this House to-day is the question whether or not, acting on your responsibility, you will sustain the verdict that you rendered in favor of this bill but a few weeks ago. The real question that confronts you is the question whether or not you stand first for the American standard of life, the American standard of living, and the American standard of wage. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have only one other speaker. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] desire to conclude now?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in Philadelphia, back in 1776, the Declaration of Independence, drafted by Thomas Jefferson, was first made public. The colonists who resisted King George and the burdensome legislation that was coming from the other side of the water declared through the patron saint of Democracy and the other patriots of those days that the King had "endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither; and raising the conditions of new appropriations of land."

That is the real basis of all immigration to the United States from the period of our independence down to the present time. We desired immigrants from foreign countries. We desired the brain and the brawn of the men who could populate this great land of ours. We had to send abroad in the days of George Washington for farmers to till our soil. We were short on industries and were obliged to gather up from other countries men who could work in the mills of those days. We were dependent upon this kind of immigration; and as we have grown in industries and in wealth we have been more and more dependent upon it. It has come to us because we have grown faster, almost, than it could serve us.

The President of the United States, in the message vetoing this bill on Thursday last, indicated that to pass a bill thus restricting immigration to the United States would be to reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that had gone before. That is to say, it would reverse the policy of the Declaration of Independence.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], one of the militant restrictionists upon this side of the House, has indicated the purpose of those who favor this bill to be restriction—restriction absolute—and my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a moment ago took the same ground. I am not surprised that one who has been as forceful in all his campaigns as the gentleman from Massachusetts should take so positive a stand upon this question, but I am almost brought to doubt the attitude of the gentleman from Ohio, for his kindheartedness is characteristic.

The difficulty with these gentlemen, and with others who have advocated the passage of this bill over the President's veto, is that they fail to distinguish between an economic question and a question of humanity. If he were standing on a pier at any one of the ports where the incoming ships bring these unfortunate people of other lands to look forward with hope and expectation to better lives than they have ever enjoyed, I can not conceive that the distinguished and learned doctor from Ohio would then have the heart to say, as he now seems to say: "Turn them back; turn them back."

But the gentleman goes further and criticizes those advocating protection who fail to urge the passage of this bill over the President's veto. In this the gentleman again fails to distinguish between the economic and the human side of this question.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it has been declared over and over again upon this floor that immigration has not reduced the wages of the laboring men in the United States. It has been stated time and time again, and is capable of proof, that during the last half century, in which we have received the greatest immigration, wages have steadily gone higher, and higher, and higher, until they are at the very apex of the wage scale of all the countries of the world. No one disputes that. It has been demonstrated further, and can be proven, that as wages have ascended regularly, in spite of all immigration, the hours of labor steadily have gone lower, and lower, and lower, until the laboring man to-day gives less in time to his employer than he ever did before in the history of the world.

But the gentleman from Ohio and others have indicated that the man who advocates protection is inconsistent in opening the door of hope to those who have asked for the right that was given to his forefathers and to mine—the right to come to this country from lands of oppression, lands where prejudice prevailed against them, so that they might acquire the opportunity of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences and enjoy the blessings that all of us seemed to have enjoyed in this great and bountiful country of ours. [Applause.]

Would the gentleman from Ohio, would any Republican, prefer that we should take the goods made by the Singer sewing machine employees in Scotland, where they work for $6 or $8 a week, and bring them into this country to compete with the sewing machines made in Connecticut, where the wages are twice as high and more? Does the gentleman from Ohio prefer that we admit these foreign goods, made by cheap foreign labor in this way, or would he prefer, when our industries are crying for help—they are not crying very loud in these Democratic times, but when they are crying for help—would he prefer to have the men themselves come into this country to make machines here at the American wage, to be sold both here and on the other side at the American price?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman asks me whether I would be willing to let the product of the Singer sewing machine factory in Scotland, with the——

Mr. MOORE. Yes; foreign made, at foreign-labor prices, come into this country. That is what I asked the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I would not.

Mr. MOORE. Of course you would not. You are a protectionist, as I am.

Mr. FESS. And I would not let the labor employed over there come into this country in competition with the labor employed here, either.

Mr. MOORE. If, after it got here, it obtained the American wage, I think you would.

Mr. FESS. No; I would not.

Mr. MOORE. I think I can demonstrate that when foreign labor which is skilled comes into this country, it no longer works at the foreign price. Give the labor unions some credit for that. They aid in bringing these foreign laborers up to the American standard. Let them continue their work not solely for the purpose of keeping their competitors out of the country, but for the purpose of keeping up wages in the United States; and if they have not done that in this era of high wages, then the labor unions themselves and the protective tariff law of the Republican Party both have been dead failures; and I do not think they have.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I would not interrupt him without his consent.

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. What did the gentleman mean when he said I was an absolute restrictionist?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman stated that yesterday on the floor. In the speech in which he led off this debate he declared for complete restriction.

Mr. GARDNER. What do you mean by that? I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MOORE. Shutting the door of hope forever to any laboring man in Europe who wants to come to this side of the water.

Mr. GARDNER. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. MOORE. I understood the gentleman to define the policy of the restrictionists, and I also understood him in one of his questions to-day to take issue with the President of the United States, who indicated that the voice of the people had not yet been heard on this subject. Am I in error as to that? If I am, I send to the Clerk's desk this extract from the Springfield Republican, published in the gentleman's own State, which throws some light upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LITERACY AND POLITICS.

In challenging the majorities in Congress that placed the literacy test in the immigration bill to make this issue one of the party platform planks in 1916 President Wilson raises a point that will not be met. No party would care to go before the people as the advocate of a policy that, if adopted earlier, would have seriously retarded the settlement of the United States and kept out some of its best people. The literacy test is not a question upon which either Republicans or Democrats are likely to take a stand, and, in view of the strong opposition to it from those who have studied the matter most carefully, it is surprising that it has been able to muster such strength in Congress.

Mr. MOORE. I think the Clerk is reading the part that I crossed out and not the part that I intended to have him read. I ask the Clerk to read the part that is not scratched out.

Mr. LANGLEY. Let it all go into the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. I will put it all in, but I do not wish to use up my time in having all of it read. The part not crossed out is the part I want the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Every party politician outside of the South would oppose desperately a literacy test plank in his national party platform if he had the least hope of having his ticket carry pivotal States like New York and Illinois. Massachusetts politicians have not forgotten so soon Congressman AUGUSTUS GARDNER'S frightful fiasco with his immigration issue in running for governor in 1913. Few candidates for office in New England or the Central Eastern States or the Middle West would care to face the large number of naturalized voters with a plank demanding that no immigrant should be admitted unless he could read a book, or even the headlines of Mr. Hearst's newspapers. No party will accept the President's challenge and make his veto an issue in 1916.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly yield a minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if he desires to respond to the Springfield Republican. It may be in order for him to say whether his venture into the field of popular opinion on the subject of restricting immigration was a success.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] wishes to speak for a minute. Will the gentleman yield that time to him?

Mr. MOORE. Oh, certainly not. I love the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], as I do all Members of the House, but I wanted the gentleman from Massachusetts to say whether, in his differences with President Wilson, he came out best.

Mr. GARDNER. As between President Wilson and the Springfield Republican I would very much favor the opinion of President Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman made a gallant and brave fight for governor of Massachusetts on the immigration issue. Did the gentleman win?

Mr. GARDNER. Most unfortunately I was the worst-beaten man who ever ran for governor of Massachusetts on the Republican ticket. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I knew the gentleman from Massachusetts would be square enough to acknowledge it.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I will acknowledge it, because the figures acknowledge it if I would not; but I do not think that had much to do with the issue—possibly it had something to do with the issue, for it takes some time to get the people educated up to the necessity of restricting immigration.

Mr. MOORE. Although the gentleman has been laboring for more than eight years to pass this bill, and it has been one of the vital issues with him, he did not succeed in that time, even in educated Massachusetts, for apparently the people there did not support him.

Mr. GARDNER. But in my own district, where I have been trying to educate them somewhat, I seem to have managed to fool them to the extent of 12,000 majority this last time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. When the gentleman admits that he fooled the people of Iowa, he surely places himself in the presidential class.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; if I could fool the people of Iowa I would be; but the gentleman misunderstood me. I said I had been educating the people of "my own" district, not an "Iowa" district.

Mr. MOORE. Then the gentleman evidently "put one over," as the President did at Indianapolis; but I am afraid he will not succeed in "putting one over" now.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had 31 minutes. He has used 14, and that leaves 17 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Let us see where the opposition to this bill springs from. Patriotic societies? Yes. Many of them want this bill passed, because those who for a long time have been active in those societies desire to show results. I do not blame any man who is the organizer of a patriotic society for keeping up this agitation. I have been on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee for eight years. I had no desire to go on that committee; but I have found during the whole of that time that the organizers of the patriotic societies have been on the job. Sometimes I question whether we ought to pass this bill, for fear we might put them off their jobs, and they would have little else to do. In saying that I have as high a regard for them as anybody. This, I believe, is the apologetic stage, when we ought to explain ourselves to folks, so that we may lay the foundation for our votes, and yet it seems to exercise our judgment as legislators whether we please or displease our friends the organizers, or whether we find the galleries applauding the sentiments we express or not.

Now, amongst the many communications that have come from the patriotic orders I find one that purports to have been sent by the National Council of the Daughters of Liberty. This is an interesting document, because it quotes political conditions and the provisions of platforms. It is quite a learned and informing production. What is most interesting about it, however, is the fact that in the largest type on the outside of the envelope under the title of the National Council of the Daughters of Liberty is this cheerful inscription: "Liberal pay to organizers." Yes; liberal pay to organizers, and I have no objection to organizers being liberally paid for legitimate work in agitating this or any other subject. I understand, however, that the Liberal Immigration League, about which I know little, has been very severely criticized by the proponents of this bill for attempting to collect a fund from somebody to conduct an organization to prove to Congress the other side of the case. So that if this be reprehensible with respect to the Liberal Immigration League or any other body opposing the measure, it is fair to raise the question as to labor bodies and patriotic orders. And as to this, what may we say of the American Federation of Labor, the great central body of organized labor, which has been indulging the habit?

The president, Mr. Samuel Gompers, has issued quite a document within the last few days which has given much satisfaction to my friend from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] in that it intimates, with great sensational headlines, equal to those in the Hearst journals, that there is a deep conspiracy here involving "the Shipping Trust," which, I would say parenthetically and in view of the agitation of the shipping bill from the White House, might be regarded at this particular time as a covert slap at the President of the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not there a difference in the source of revenues of the one you refer to and the Liberal Immigration League? Is not there proof from the original copy of letters that the Liberal League was making appeals to the steamship companies and Coal Trust for revenue in order to carry it on?

Mr. MOORE. I do not think there is very much in the documents put out by Mr. Gompers. What is the difference between appealing to those who have charge of large industries and those who have charge of small industries, or those who draw upon labor, or those who appeal to prejudice?

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman ask that question of me?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. There is this difference: The large industries that want to bring cheap labor to the country want to bring it here for the purpose of beating down wages of the people who are already here.

Mr. MOORE. I want to say, and it will not take long to do it, that those people who come from foreign countries to compete with American labor are of the intellectual or reading and writing class; there is scant complaint of the laboring class that go into the sewers and do the rough work that is avoided by the students. They are not welcomed into the cotton fields of the South or generally on the farm lands of the North. The kind of labor that comes into the country and which the gentleman would bar is not competitive; if it had been the wages in the skilled trades would have gone down, and these wages, in spite of all the gentleman says about immigration, steadily have gone up. [Applause.]

Why, we have the testimony of a distinguished labor leader, no other than Frank Morrison, the secretary of the American Federation, on certain phases of this question, and I hope I may get time to read something that this intelligent leader has said upon the subject. But that reminds me of the fine campaign work that has been done in concentrating this movement in the body of the American Federation of Labor. The work of informing Congress has been done thoroughly and well. A week ago, in the White House, under the leadership of Mr. Morrison, the forces favoring this bill, lawyers and professors of the great colleges of the country, pleaded for education, education, and more education. It was a great symposium for learning contrasted with the actual toil upon which education must thrive. Yes; and I am afraid that some of our professors in this House are inducing us to stand for that excess of education which teaches a man to despise work. There are too few of us indeed who teach that other form of education which advances with the work. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Speaker, let us see how this thing has been worked up. I say this in no offensive way. If I were an organizer of the Federation of Labor, I would agitate and organize with all the ability that I possess. Still, as a Member of this House I would exercise my judgment and try to consider both sides of this matter. I would stop to consider that while the American Federation of Labor and centralized labor organizations affiliated therewith number a little over 2,000,000 members, and other organizations not affiliated might carry the total up to 3,000,000, there are 30,000,000 wageworkers in the United States, 27,000,000 of them not organized. Who is to speak for the 27,000,000? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] rises, and in an outburst of eloquence which we all admire asks that the cotton fields in the South be protected from this foreign invasion. Is there a difference in the price of labor? If I had time, I would like to quote from Mr. Morrison on this subject. I would like to take a few minutes to let you hear what he says. Let me see if I have not got it here. Yes; here is an

extract from the hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Friday, December 12, 1913:

Mr. MOORE. Have you made a study of Southern States at all?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; we had a representative down there a number of years ago, and found conditions very poor in the textile mills.

Mr. MOORE. Did you find that the operatives in the textile mills were foreign or native born?

Mr. MORRISON. They were people from the mountains. I do not know that there are very many foreigners who have been able to get down there.

Mr. MOORE. Very early settlers, were they not?

Mr. MORRISON. The people that moved in from the mountains are people who are accustomed to live on very little. They went in with their families and worked in the mills, which has not been a benefit to them.

Mr. MOORE. How did you succeed in organizing the mill workers of the South?

Mr. MORRISON. We have not been successful in organizing them.

* * * * * * *

Mr. MOORE. Do you regard your organization work in the South as satisfactory?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. You have paid very little attention to organizing the South?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, yes; we pay attention all over. There was a man who left headquarters the other day to go South. He will be in Atlanta, Ga., in about three weeks, and is going to this point, the name of which escapes my memory. It is quite a large place——

Mr. MOORE. Augusta?

Mr. MORRISON. That is it—Augusta.

Mr. MOORE. Do you remember the old slogan, "Eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, eight hours for what you will"?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; I know all about eight hours.

Mr. MOORE. You have made the eight-hour question a specialty for many years?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask how the eight-hour question appeals to the farmer?

Mr. MORRISON. Short hours never appeal very strongly to the average employer.

Mr. MOORE. I am confining this to the farmer. I want to know whether the farmers' unions have specifically indorsed or approved the eight-hour proposition?

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know.

Rise, Mr. HEFLIN, and tell me whether you want the eight-hour system working in the cotton fields of your State?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Now, let the labor unions answer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not only that, if the gentleman will permit, but no farmer in the South wants any eight-hour proposition, and I do not know of any farmer in the North who wants it, and if there is any farmer in the gentleman's district, I am sure that he does not want it.

Mr. MOORE. Union labor wages in the mines in my State are $2.56 per day. Will the gentleman tell me what the wages are of those who pick the cotton in the fields of Alabama, where you have no organization? We are up against organization. What are you paying?

Mr. HEFLIN. Sometimes they get 50 cents a hundred for picking cotton and sometimes they pick 500 pounds in a day, which is $2.50 a day. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. And incidentally, if they ever pay that much in the cotton fields, it is for a 14-hour day.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows that in Colorado and in New York the people in the whole State voted three to one for an eight-hour day, and that included the farmers?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and I know what the eight-hour day means as well as the gentleman. It means contraction of labor. I have voted for it and supported it many times. I think I have followed the gentleman in this House many times; but when it came to protecting eight-hour labor in the United States against the product of foreign labor that works at cheaper wages more than eight hours a day, the gentleman from Illinois was not with me. I know what it means—contraction of labor for one section of the country and for one set of industries, not for all. That is the point.

Now, let us see how well this thing worked out. The American Federation of Labor sent out these letters during the last week. I have an armful of them here, and I am glad to receive them, because I respect these men and admire their ability. But the question they raise, as I view it, is one of humanity, of barring the door of hope against the unfortunates of foreign lands. They want to keep them out of the United States. Who wants to keep them out? Mr. Gompers? Yes. And where was Mr. Gompers born? Born in England—a good man and one of the ablest leaders of labor this country has ever seen. Mr. Gompers, self-educated, has become a tower of strength within the civic bodies and amongst the labor organizations of the United States. But he was born in England. Take the secretary of the Department of Labor, who is another one of the great champions of this movement. Where was he born? Over in Scotland. He is a member of the President's Cabinet. Take Mr. F nk Morrison, whom I have just quoted, the vigorous secretary, whose careful, detailed work has helped to make the federation what it is. Where was he born? In Canada. Here are three of the leading men, whose word is forceful with the affiliated bodies, that have informed Congressmen during the past week that this bill should pass. Here is a pile of their correspondence. The story is told in language that varies but little. The hotel and restaurant employees and the International Alliance and Bartenders' League of America are uppermost before me. They write and tell us that they want this bill passed. Oh, you prohibitionists who vote against the President, beware the new alliance you are making on this head! [Laughter.]

The restaurant employees and bartenders' alliance are with you, for they do not want foreigners to come up to the bar. They are aiding prohibition already, though the federation opposed it. The International Brotherhood of Paper Makers say that foreign labor can not assimilate with the wage earners now here. Why, Lord bless you, we have all assimilated in one form or another or we would not be here. Every one of us is the outgrowth of assimilation of foreign stock, and I would like to know what foreigner coming from southern Italy, for instance, or Roumania, where the Jews are now being drafted for war service against their will, and who could not escape it if this bill passes, will compete with a skilled body of workmen like the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers. The Shipwrights and Joiners' Organization tells us the passage of the bill will benefit the organization. Will the Polanders who work in the mines compete with the skilled shipwrights? The International Seamen's Union of the United States opposes this bill. Why, the struggle we have recently had here has been to get some recognition for American seamen, but the tendency on the Democratic side has been to admit foreign labor into the shipping business of this country. What voice of protest against these shipping bills has come up from the International Seamen's Union of America? I would like to go on with these. I have too many of them, however, to discuss them all in the time remaining. But I glory in them, even though some of them may be overenthusiastic.

Mr. Morrison tells us in his testimony before the committee that the membership of the American Federation of Labor is a little over 2,000,000—I think 2,071,000. Remember these figures, for 12 bodies affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, that have endeavored so earnestly to impress Congress with their strength that they alone, if their communications are not at fault, have certified to a total membership of 2,625,000. There are dozens of others that give no figures at all. It is interesting also to note that one of the oil companies is also suggesting that we have a restriction of immigration. But I shall have to extend my remarks.

In closing, I will refer to what I regard as the crux of this whole situation. Mr. Clark, the vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors, a very intelligent and active leader of the labor movement in the United States, was asked a few questions about the development of men in the railway business. I can not go into all of it, but he tells us that brakemen must pass through various grades, that conductors must pass through various grades, that all such employees must serve a virtual apprenticeship of from 3 years to 10 years before they can qualify from one standard to another. What he said of the railway men is true of most of the skilled and organized trades. Competition comes from men who are not illiterate, but from those who must stand a variety of tests. An illiterate who is serviceable in digging ditches would not compete with the skilled mechanic who is driving an engine. If he had the training, he might, but an illiterate must learn and serve an apprenticeship before he displaces a trained hand. What illiterate Polander, coming to better his condition, to find work at first digging sewers, which the American boy will not do, can become a railway conductor in the United States? What downtrodden Slav or native of southern Italy would compete with a shipwright in the United States without educating and training himself for the task? And when he has done that, will he work for foreign wages? Mr. Clark goes on to say, in answer to certain questions, that his own son is a farmer. In answer to a question as to whether his boy would dig the sewers or work in the mines, he replied that the boy was made of better stuff. That is the spirit. I told Mr. Clark it was the spirit. Yes, my friends, our boys are made of better stuff; they are born in the United States. Will they work in the sewers? No. Ask Mr. Morrison what his children are doing, and the answer comes, they are studying, they are striving for a professional calling. it is commendable. But who is to do the drudgery? If we are

educated to despise the lowly, who will do the man's work on the road or the woman's work in the kitchen? Take away the untaught foreigner, who has done so much to develop and construct our institutions, and rely too much upon that excess education and pride of scholarship which abhors the basic labor, and you will halt our national progress. We have more to consider than the possibility of driving our own wives into the drudgery of the scullery or of pleading with our scholarly men to go down into the trenches. We must deal with the problem as one of humanity, which involves no crime save that of the misfortune of illiteracy. If we need the labor and it will be useful to us without displacing the labor we already have, the advancement of the illiterate under American tutelage and conditions will readily take care of itself. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, just 12 months ago to-day this House, by 252 to 126, registered its vote in favor of the passage of the bill whose fate will in a few minutes be decided. Some have said that there are Members going out of Congress who will go back on their records and stand by the President and vote against overriding his veto. Mr. Speaker, I hope there is no Member here who now has less regard for the commission that the people gave him two years ago, and which he still holds, than he had for it before the last election. I can not believe there is any man who will look on that commission as any more sacred before the election than it is now. I do not believe that there can be a Democrat or a Republican, who, merely because his term of office is about to expire, will change his vote if he believes that the vote he cast 12 months ago was right or that it was in accordance with the will of his people.

But, gentlemen, the people are not asleep, and the man who voted for the bill a year ago will be watched by his people if he changes his vote to-day. Whether you are going out or not, if you voted for your people then, they will ask you why you did it if you vote against them to-day. Some have intimated that for the appointment of some Member's choice of a postmaster, or for some other sordid reason, men will barter their votes to-day. I can not believe it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred to the fact that Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison and Secretary Wilson are all foreigners. That is true, Mr. Speaker, but those gentlemen are of that stock to which President Wilson referred in one of his books, when he said:

> Throughout the country men of the sturdy stock of the north of Europe had made up the main strain of foreign blood which was every year added to the vital working force of the country, or else men of the Latin-Gaelic stock of France and northern Italy; but now there came multitudes of men of the lowest class * * * and men of the meaner sort, * * * men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy, nor any initiative nor quick intelligence; and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population, the men whose standards of life and work were such as American workmen had never dreamed of before.

That latter is the class, Mr. Speaker, which this bill proposes to keep out. That sturdy stock from northern Europe that the President was referring to is not touched by this bill. I am not here to say one unkind word against the great Chief Magistrate who graces the Executive chair of this country, called by the people to that high position. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] must have written the speech which he has just read before he heard the speeches that were delivered here to-day, and he therefore anticipated that gentlemen would say unkind and harsh things in criticism of the President. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I have ever heard any debate in which there was less of partisanship, except what was injected by gentlemen who represent the opposition to this bill. I feel none. I believe, as said by my friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS], that our President did that which he not only had the constitutional right to do, but he did that which he believed to be right under the information and the light that he had.

But, gentlemen, it is a different question with you. You have studied this matter for years and years. As stated by some one, seventeen times the question of the illiteracy test has been passed by one or the other House in one form or another. Hence it can not be said, my countrymen, that we do not understand this proposition. Evidently the President by the question that he asked in his message has been misinformed by some one who assembled the facts for him. He asked the question whether any party had ever indorsed this proposition and gone to the country upon it and been commissioned to control its legislation. In 1896 the Democratic Party declared in favor of the positive prevention of foreign pauper labor coming into this country, and the Republican Party declared squarely in favor of the illiteracy test ingrafted on this bill. The Republican Party did then go before the country with that declaration in its platform, and did win, and the President's question is answered and the people's mandate has been heard. The Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, went further than the Republican Party, for it pronounced for absolutely preventing the importation of foreign pauper labor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] tries to get around this declaration by saying no party has ever gone to the country on it as a single issue. Certainly, no party has ever gone to the country with any platform entirely upon one single issue. The President has not that same sort of information that we have when he believes that the country is not informed upon this question and when he believes that the 252 men who last February voted for this bill and those who were paired for it were not informed as to the wishes of their people. My friends, this is a proposition in the interest of labor, not simply the man who works in the shop and in the mine and on the railroads and in the manufactories of the country, but the people of the agricultural districts as well. For years, through every national grange and farmers' congress that has been assembled, through every farmers' union that has been held, both in the local and in the national unions, through the Federation of Labor as well as the railroad trainmen, through the patriotic organizations and hundreds of other independent organizations all over the country, this measure has been discussed and favored.

Mr. Speaker, these Members of Congress desire to reflect the wishes of the men whose servants they are. Many of you have had appeals from the organizations that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has condemned to-day. I was at the White House the other day when the President had a public hearing on this bill. Many on both sides presented their arguments. One who represented the railway laborers wound up his appeal to the President by saying, "Mr. President, the boys want this bill." He was followed by a distinguished orator from New York, with silver tongue and soft hands, who sneeringly repeated the statement that the "boys wanted it." When that jeer was made it was cheered by the assembled people opposing the bill, many of whom had perhaps been sent there by the steamship trusts, or the Liberal Immigration League. Mr. Gompers a few weeks ago denounced this so-called Liberal Immigration League and showed by decisive proofs and from the records themselves—the originals and carbon copies—that the officers of this league appeal to the steamships, the Coal Trust, and the Steel Trust for funds to finance an institution which they claimed to be altruistic and honorable; and this appeal had not been in vain.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BURNETT. I decline to yield. Yesterday I saw one of the attorneys of this liberal (?) league "gumshoeing" through the House Office Building. He told me, however, that he would not be here to-day. He ought not to be after the exposure Mr. Gompers made of the infamy of the league.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other proposition, outside of the literacy test, upon which the President bases his veto is that he says the bill seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum, which always have been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men. On that question the President again has been misled by some of his advisers. Many of the people that would come within the class of Czolgosz and other anarchists already have been excluded by the progressive restrictive laws that have been on the statute books for years. All that this bill adds to that part of the law is the exclusion of those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

Is that what the President thinks will keep out those who desire the right of constitutional agitation?

Mr. Speaker, whom does it embrace? It embraces many who come from southern Europe, like the lawless herd in the Lawrence strike, with a torch in one hand and a bomb in the other. It embraces the militant suffragettes of England, who believe in blowing up churches and destroying mail boxes and private and public property. Are these the ones whom he calls constitutional agitators? Is the right to unlawfully destroy property the right of constitutional agitation? I want to say here to the splendid women of this country who believe in equal suffrage that there were no stronger advocates of that provision on our committee than the three gentlemen from the Pacific coast who live in equal-suffrage States.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that the President believes that that class of people ought to have the door held open to them. I do not believe he has studied this question, my countrymen, as you have studied it, and hence you, in voting for the bill, will be doing an actual favor to the great President of the

United States by saving him from this error. [Applause.] He overlooks the fact that in section 2 of the bill we expressly provide that "nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political not involving moral turpitude." What more could he ask? I think the closing words of his message show that he actually invites you to act on your own knowledge of what your people want. He says, "I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than her chosen representatives know them," and, gentlemen, you are the chosen representatives of the people. You have had the question before you for years. You have said to the workingmen that rallied to you last year and two years ago that you were their friends. You who are on the other side have often appealed to them as "the boys." You have asked the boys to come to your aid, and they came. There are gentlemen upon this floor to-day with labor cards in their pockets who are about to strike a Joab thrust at the very vitals of labor. [Applause.] My countrymen, do not do it. If you betray them now, next year when you appeal to them again you will see written upon every gatepost and upon the lintels of every door, "Anathema maranatha"—Let him be cursed with a curse. When you approach the home of the peasant and of the man who toils he will say, "Depart from me, I never knew you."

Mr. Speaker, a great war is going on in Europe. The farmers, the laboring people, the patriotic people of the country, feel that just as soon as that war is over there will be the greatest influx of the worst people that ever have come to this country. My colleagues, if by your vote to-day you allow that door to remain open, and in one year or two years you see those surging hordes coming to this country, driving out the man that toils on the farm and in the mine and in the shop you may take the sweet unction to your souls that by voting against this bill you have helped to bring them here.

Gentlemen, do not think that this is going to stop. If you strike it down to-day, it will rise again next session. [Applause.] Brave, true men are back of it, and they know it is good.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again—
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies amid his worshipers.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read, if I had time, this letter. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to read from a letter written by Mr. Oberlander, one of the superintendents of new prisons in New York, in which he states that in the city of Buffalo within the last three years five electrocutions have occurred, and four out of the five criminals were aliens who could not read. Last year when the Colorado and the Michigan mine strikes were being investigated it was stated on this floor, and all over the country, that it was the new immigration that was causing the trouble there. One of the big mine operators in my State said to me a few years ago that the Italians were the poorest of all his laborers. I said, "Why do you employ them, then?" He said, "For the purpose of regulating the price of wages."

The insane asylums of New York and other Eastern States are being filled with the very ones whom the illiteracy test would keep out.

You gentlemen, I believe, are all honest in your convictions; but, for God's sake, and in the name of the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, do not register your vote to help the Steel Trust and the coal barons to keep down the wages of the men who are struggling to maintain the lives of those whom God has given into their care. The workingman only asks for decent wages and decent standards of living. Give him these. [Applause.]

I can readily see how you who were against the bill can vote to override the veto of the President, because you believe that the President, while he is exercising a constitutional right, is yet exercising a right which should not be used except in cases of extreme emergency. The veto power is a dangerous one. My friends, your commissions—some of them—will expire on the 4th of March. I beg you return those commissions to the men who handed them to you just as untarnished as when they placed them in your hands. [Applause.]

Talk about platforms. My friends, it is not always in platforms. We do not all have to receive our training from the classic shades of Princeton or from the conventions and declarations of our party. But over yonder, in the little red schoolhouse on the hill, with the American flag on its top and our mother's Bible on its shelf; down there where the sugar cane grows, down amid the cotton and the corn, and out there on the bounding prairies of the West, and out on the golden shores of the Pacific, and out in that country where "the frost is on the pumpkin and the fodder's in the shock" [applause], and down in the old Kentucky home [applause], and out by the Wabash you hear from them. From the mines and the shops, the factories and the stores, the railroad tracks and cabs of the engines come the mute appeals of brave men whose homes you seek to destroy. Here are letters from the great organizations of America urging you to stand by the man who toils. They can not send their hundreds here as can the Steamship and Steel Trusts to browbeat you into doing right or wrong; but I hold in my hand their mute appeals. Seven hundred thousand of them appeal to you from the great State of New York, men with calloused hands, and men who know what labor is and who know what it is to be driven out of their positions by that influx of foreign people, to pass this bill. [Prolonged applause.]

You understand this bill. Thousands who are urging you into opposition to the bill do not. A few days ago Cardinal Gibbons wrote to Mr. Epstein, stating that foreigners who were fairly educated in their own language would be excluded by this bill. Prof. Jenks, a member of the Immigration Commission, wrote him, calling attention to the fact that it is only necessary for them to read 30 or 40 words of their own language or dialect, and Cardinal Gibbons at once wrote him the following letter:

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 NORTH CHARLES STREET,
Baltimore, January 28, 1915.

JEREMIAH W. JENKS, Ph. D., LL. D.,
Director of the Far Eastern Bureau, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: Your most courteous favor of yesterday came to hand this morning, and I thank you for calling my attention to the fact that the Burnett bill, regarding immigration, does not exclude aliens capable of reading their own language or dialect, though incapable of reading ours.

It affords me great pleasure to receive this information, and, of course, it modifies, in consequence, to the same extent my opposition to the bill.

I also note with much pleasure the other points you submit for my consideration, and I am happy to assure you that, when I can, they shall receive my serious attention.

In the meantime, believe me, very sincerely, yours,

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

You see the misinformation in regard to this bill. You see that even our great President has been mistaken.

Gentlemen, your people understand the bill. Your mail from the universities, the colleges, and country schoolhouses for years has been filled with requests for literature on the bill.

Be not deceived; the people are not fooled. The man who dodges this vote will be held even more responsible than the man who votes against the bill.

Your constituents will brand the word "coward" across the brow of every man who ducks the vote. "He who dallies is a dastard; he who hesitates is damned."

The eyes of America are on you this day. Upon this record you place your name either for right or wrong, for the people or the trusts; the responsibility is yours. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

If the steamships be your masters, serve them; if some prospective office for yourself or constituent be your master, serve that; if the people be your masters, serve them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the immigration bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? In plain, everyday English, if you are in favor of passing this bill over the President's veto, answer "yea," and if you are opposed to it, answer "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 136, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 56.]

YEAS—261.

Abercrombie	Borchers	Clark, Fla.	Drukker
Adair	Bowdle	Claypool	Eagle
Adamson	Brockson	Collier	Edwards
Aiken	Brodbeck	Connelly, Kans.	Evans
Ainey	Brown, W. Va.	Cooper	Falconer
Alexander	Browning	Cox	Farr
Allen	Bryan	Crisp	Ferris
Anderson	Buchanan, Ill.	Cullop	Foss
Anthony	Burke, S. Dak.	Curry	Fields
Ashbrook	Burnett	Danforth	Finley
Aswell	Butler	Davenport	FitzHenry
Austin	Byrnes, S. C.	Davis	Flood, Va.
Avis	Byrns, Tenn.	Decker	Floyd, Ark.
Baker	Callaway	Dent	Foster
Baltz	Campbell	Dershem	Fowler
Barkley	Candler, Miss.	Dickinson	Francis
Barton	Cantrill	Dies	Frear
Bathrick	Caraway	Difenderfer	French
Beall, Tex.	Carlin	Dillon	Gard
Bell, Cal.	Carr	Dixon	Gardner
Bell, Ga.	Carter	Doolittle	Garrett, Tenn.
Blackmon	Church	Doughton	Garrett, Tex.

Gillett	Johnson, S. C.	Murdock	Smith, Idaho
Glass	Johnson, Utah	Murray	Smith, J. M. C.
Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Wash.	Neeley, Kans.	Smith, Saml. W.
Good	Jones	Neely, W. Va.	Smith, Tex.
Goodwin, Ark.	Keister	Nolan, J. I.	Sparkman
Gray	Kelley, Mich.	O'Hair	Stanley
Green, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.	Oldfield	Stedman
Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, Iowa	Padgett	Stephens, Cal.
Gregg	Kent	Page, N. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Griest	Kettner	Palmer	Stephens, Nebr.
Gudger	Key, Ohio	Parker, N. J.	Stephens, Tex.
Guernsey	Kiess, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Stout
Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid	Patton, Pa.	Sumners
Hamilton, N. Y.	Kirkpatrick	Peters	Sutherland
Hamlin	Kitchin	Platt	Switzer
Harris	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley	Talbott, Md.
Harrison	Kreider	Porter	Tavenner
Hart	Lafferty	Post	Taylor, Ark.
Haugen	La Follette	Pou	Taylor, Colo.
Hawley	Langley	Powers	Temple
Hay	Lee, Ga.	Price	Thomas
Hayden	Lenroot	Quin	Thompson, Okla.
Hayes	Lesher	Ragsdale	Thomson, Ill.
Hellin	Lever	Rainey	Tribble
Helgesen	Lewis, Md.	Raker	Underhill
Helm	Lewis, Pa.	Rauch	Underwood
Helvering	Lindbergh	Rayburn	Vaughan
Henry	Linthicum	Rothermel	Vinson
Hensley	Lloyd	Rouse	Volstead
Hill	McGuire, Okla.	Rubey	Walker
Hinds	McKellar	Rucker	Walters
Hinebaugh	McKenzie	Rupley	Watkins
Hobson	McLaughlin	Russell	Watson
Holland	MacDonald	Saunders	Weaver
Houston	Mapes	Scott	Webb
Howard	Martin	Seldomridge	White
Hughes, Ga.	Mondell	Sells	Wingo
Hughes, W. Va.	Montague	Shackleford	Witherspoon
Hulings	Moon	Sims	Woodruff
Hull	Morgan, Okla.	Sinnott	Young, N. Dak.
Humphrey, Wash.	Morrison	Sisson	Young, Tex.
Humphreys, Miss.	Moss, Ind.	Slayden	
Jacoway	Moss, W. Va.	Slemp	
Johnson, Ky.	Mott	Small	

NAYS—136.

Bailey	Donovan	Kennedy, Conn.	Reilly, Wis.
Barchfeld	Dooling	Kindel	Riordan
Barnhart	Doremus	Konop	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Driscoll	Korbly	Rogers
Bartlett	Dupré	Lazaro	Sabath
Beakes	Eagan	Lee, Pa.	Scully
Booher	Edmonds	Levy	Sherley
Borland	Esch	Lieb	Sherwood
Britten	Estopinal	Lobeck	Shreve
Broussard	Fairchild	Loft	Sloan
Brown, N. Y.	Fergusson	Logue	Smith, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Lonergan	Smith, N. Y.
Bruckner	Fordney	McAndrews	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	McGillicaddy	Stevens, Minn.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gallivan	Madden	Stevens, N. H.
Bulkley	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Burgess	George	Mahan	Stringer
Burke, Pa.	Gerry	Maher	Taggart
Burke, Wis.	Gill	Manahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Calder	Gilmore	Mann	Taylor, Ala.
Cantor	Gittins	Miller	Taylor, N. Y.
Carew	Goeke	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Casey	Goldfogle	Moore	Thacher
Chandler, N. Y.	Gordon	Morin	Towner
Clancy	Gorman	Mulkey	Townsend
Coady	Goulden	Norton	Treadway
Connolly, Iowa	Graham, Ill.	O'Brien	Tuttle
Conry	Greene, Mass.	Paige, Mass.	Vollmer
Copley	Griffin	Park	Wallin
Cramton	Hamill	Patten, N. Y.	Walsh
Crosser	Hardy	Peterson	Whaley
Dale	Howell	Phelan	Williams
Deitrick	Igoe	Reed	Winslow
Donohoe	Keating	Reilly, Conn.	Woods

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kahn	Steenerson

NOT VOTING—24.

Cary	Hoxworth	Metz	Roberts, Nev.
Cline	Kennedy, R. I.	Morgan, La.	Smith, Minn.
Dunn	Langham	Nelson	Vare
Elder	L'Engle	Oglesby	Whitacre
Faison	Lindquist	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, Fla.
Graham, Pa.	McClellan	Prouty	Wilson, N. Y.

So the House on reconsideration refused to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask for a recapitulation of the vote, and I will ask if this is a proper time.

Mr. SABATH. Why, Mr. Speaker, the vote has not yet been announced.

Mr. BURNETT. That is why I am asking if this is the proper time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise to have a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. This is the proper time to have a recapitulation, if we are ever going to have it.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to have it.

The SPEAKER. The vote is so close that the Chair thinks it ought to be recapitulated. [Applause.]

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FAISON with Mr. STEENERSON.

On this vote:

Mr. NELSON and Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. KAHN (for sustaining veto).

Mr. DUNN and Mr. ELDER (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. METZ (for sustaining veto).

Mr. WILSON of Florida and Mr. L'ENGLE (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. VARE (for sustaining veto).

Mr. LANGHAM and Mr. LINDQUIST (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (for sustaining veto).

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I wish to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening at the time his name should have been called?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7212. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6981. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 5, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21236) to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1363); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) to create the national rural credit commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1364); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21200) quieting and confirming the title of the Methodist University of Oklahoma in and to certain tracts of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1366); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21122) to validate certain homestead entries, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1367); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 21315) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 21316) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to William B. Green Post, No. 100, Grand Army of the Republic, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 21317) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land in Minnesota for demonstration-farm purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH (by request): A bill (H. R. 21319) to abolish the saloon and the retail sale of spirituous liquors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 723) authorizing the payment of $1,200 to Norman E. Ives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 21320) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 21321) granting a pension to Henry J. Wing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 21322) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21323) granting a pension to Katherine Sternberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21324) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21325) granting an increase of pension to James H. McCampbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21326) granting an increase of pension to Esther Phoebus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 21327) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore, receiver of the Mobile Marine Dock Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of various labor organizations of the United States protesting against the veto of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 356 citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, asking that the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Evangelical Church, German-American Alliance, and Germania Maennerchor, all of Newark, Ohio, asking for the passage of legislation which would prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war to the belligerent European nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Iron Molders' Union, No. 152, Newark, Ohio; the Martha Washington Council, No. 5, Daughters of America, Dennison, Ohio; the International Union of United Brewery Workers and the International Association of Machinists, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the veto of the President; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Coshocton (Ohio) Council, No. 65, of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Coshocton (Ohio) Local Union of Mine Workers of America, favoring Kern-Foster bill, providing for extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petitions of the Mansfield (Ohio) Trades Council; the Washington State Federation of Labor; the Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union; the Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity; the Massachusetts State Branch of American Federation of Labor; and the National Council, Daughters of Liberty, asking for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of Allegheny Branch of National German-American Alliance, of the German Evangelical Church; of the Allegheny County Branch, National Federation of German Catholic Societies; of the Knights of St. George; and the Homestead and Mount Oliver German Turnverein, of Pittsburgh and vicinity, favoring House joint resolution No. 377, to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war during the present trouble in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial and protest of the National Polish Alliance Associations of Pittsburgh, McKees Rocks, Horning, Homestead, Duquesne, Carnegie, Munhall, and Clairton, Pa., against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh and vicinity against Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh and vicinity favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Duquesne Council, United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring Roberts bill to change date of election of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of Saars Sholen Lodge No. 154, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring support of President's veto of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of 7 citizens of Wellston, 10 of St. Louis, and A. Anthes, of St. Clair, all in the State of Missouri, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Catholic Union of Missouri State League, composed of 387 members, of St. Louis, Mo.; 60 citizens of St. Louis, Mo.; German-American Alliance, Middletown, Conn.; 7 citizens of Boston, Mass.; 2 citizens of Wellesley, Mass.; A. E. Stickling, Milwaukee, Wis.; and German Beneficial Union, District 97, Johnstown, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of all war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of delegates of the Evangelical Protestant Church, representing a membership of 30,000, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; 28 congregations of Lutheran churches of St. Louis; 13 citizens of Marthasville; 26 citizens of Florissant; Holekamp Lumber Co., of Webster Groves; Rev. G. Schultz, of Morrison; and Theodore von Derck, of Bismarck, all in the State of Missouri, favoring passage of bills to prohibit the export of all war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 114 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., Holy Cross and St. Cecilia Benevolent Societies, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTON: Petition of citizens of Kearney, Nebr., favoring free and unthrottled press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of the Browning Club, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against the sending of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pomona and Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Pomona and San Gabriel, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 334, for the appointment of a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of citizens and organizations of New York, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also petition of citizens of the Bronx, county, city, and State of New York, respectfully urging support of the Burnett immigration bill in its entirety when said bill is returned to the House of Representatives for a final vote; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Miss Mary C. Griffin, of New York City, favoring excluding the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of Associated Physicians of Long Island, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions by 38 citizens and residents of Stockton; Federated Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo; Machinists Local No. 252, of Vallejo, all in the State of California; the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America; the Cigar Makers' International Union of America; and the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions by the Switchmen's International Union, the Pattern Makers' League of North America, the International Typographical Union, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the United Mine Workers of America, the Tobacco Workers' International Union, the Illinois State Federation of Labor, the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, the New York State Federation of Labor, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, the International Union of United Brewery Workers of America, the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, the Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, the International Association of Machinists, the Washington State Federation of Labor, the Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers' International Union, the Central Federated Union of New York and vicinity and others, favoring the passage of the immigration bill without amendment over the veto of the President; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition by the Federal Labor Union, of Vallejo, Cal., favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Locomotive Superheater Co., New York, against ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of conference of American citizens, representing church, benevolent, educational, and other civic organizations, held at Washington, D. C., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Union Guard and Holy Name Society, Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Memorial of Democratic caucus, house of representatives, of Oklahoma Legislature, relative to removal of Republican officeholders; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Lane, S. Dak., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of merchants of Peabody, Burns, Cottonwood Falls, Florence, Clements, Cedar Point, Saffordville, Lehigh, Burdick, Lost Springs, Marion, Hillsboro, Ramona, Tampa, Durham, Lincolnville, Elmdale, Strong City, and Aulne, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of United Presbyterian Congregation and Reformed Presbyterian Sunday School of Eskridge, Kans., against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of Albin S. Fendel, Union Hill, N. J., and W. H. Stowenhagen Co., of New York City, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of St. Johannes Verein, La Crosse, Wis., composed of 67 members, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALCONER: Petitions of Local Typographical Union No. 170, and various organizations of workers in the United States, urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARR: Protests against the passage of the immigration bill from members of the Amos Lodge, No. 136, Independent Order B'rith, and members of the Young Men's Hebrew Association, Scranton; members of the Polish-American Citizen's League of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; members of the Friends of Russian Freedom, New York; and members of the Kosciuszko Polish Club, Taylor, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions in favor of the passing of the immigration bill from Charles Perry Taylor, Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; Ernest Bohm, of Central Federated Union, New York, N. Y.; O. Edward Risely, Scranton, Pa.; A. F. Butz, Scranton Council, No. 33, O. of I. A., Scranton, Pa.; George Preston, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.; 965 miners, Hyde Park shaft, Scranton, Pa.; and National Council Daughters of Liberty, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Federated Irish Society of Massachusetts, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Manhattan Wholesale Grocery Co., U. S. Ring Traveler Co., James F. Bergin & Co., of Providence, and I. B. Crandall, of Westerly, R. I., protesting against preventing the Government from printing stamped envelopes bearing printed return request; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of M. W. Beebe, of Pawtucket; H. M. Laughlin, of Bradford; and United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Newport, R. I., favoring passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Providence Central Federated Union, Providence, R. I., protesting against the increased cost of flour and urging investigation of same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Court Rochambeau, No. 3597, Independent Order of Foresters, of Providence, R. I., urging the passage of the civil-service reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Providence, urging the passage of the Palmer-Owen child labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Charles McCusker, of Arlington, R. I., urging the protection of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petitions of J. S. Wood and Amos N. Barron, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in regard to the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of St. Joseph's Men's Society and other societies of Chicago, Ill., also citizens of the third Illinois district, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of John Ruf, of Philadelphia, Pa.; church, benevolent, educational, and other civic organizations of Washington, D. C., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of International Seamen's Union of America and various other organizations of workers of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the German Society of Philadelphia, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petition of citizens of Petersburg, Reynolds, Robinson, Sawyer, Sheldon, Sykeston, Turtle Lake, Wahpeton, Wild Rose, Willow City, and Great Bend, all in the State of North Dakota, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of St. Boniface Society, of Hartman, Ark., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Sacred Heart Branch, No. 993, Catholic Knights of America, of Morristown; Ira B. Faust, of Coal Hill; and St. Boniface Society, of Hartman, all in the State of Arkansas, favoring excluding certain papers from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of Labor Council, United Laborers' Union No. 1, International Moulders' Union No. 164, Stationary Firemen's Local No. 86, all of San Francisco, Cal., and other labor organizations throughout the United States, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 70 citizens of Evans City, Pa., against granting to Postmaster General authority to exclude

from the mails certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of St. Michael's Society, of Monessen, Pa., against Burnett-Smith immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of sundry citizens of Takoma Park, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws, or any bill with the same title; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Stephens Benevolent Society, of Hartford, Conn., relative to use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of German Lutheran Church congregation, of New Britain, Conn., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of J. J. O'Keelly and 384 others, of Kingston, N. Y., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Cook, Nebr., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of Scheller Lodge, No. 92, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Middletown, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of German-American Alliance of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, letters from Messrs. Leach & Smith, Friedenbach Bros., and L. C. Morgan Co., all of Fortuna, Cal., urging the passage of H. R. 5308, providing for a tax on mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions and letters from sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war during the present European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of citizens and organizations against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Allegheny County Branch, State League, G. R. C. Societies of Pennsylvania, favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Charles L. Bernheimer, New York, relative to settlement of international disputes by arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Watertown, Conn., against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Council of the New York Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, favoring creation of a national defense commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York and the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, against ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Woman's Board of Trade of Massachusetts, favoring a law prohibiting use of foreign labels on goods made in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Communications from the Central Federated Union of Greater New York; the Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union; the International Association of Machinists; the Massachusetts branch, American Federation of Labor; the International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America; the Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; the National Council, Daughters of Liberty; telegrams from the Butchers' Union of San Francisco, Cal.; the label section of the San Francisco Labor Council; and Local Union No. 164, International Molders' Union, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of citizens of New York City, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of 26 citizens of Mount Sterling, Ill., favoring a free press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Protest against immigration bill from Young Men's Hebrew Association, 250 members, Perth Amboy; Polish Cadets, Sayreville; and St. Joseph's Society, South Amboy, all in the State of New Jersey; Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against class legislation for the District of Columbia; American Federation of Labor, protesting against the Taylor system; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, communications favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto from International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, Indianapolis, Ind.; the American Jewish Committee, New York; Pattern Makers' League, Cincinnati; Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville; Switchmen's Union, Buffalo, N. Y.; International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y.; Railway Employees' Department, St. Louis, International Protective Association; United Mine Workers of America; International Typographical Union, Indianapolis; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis; Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Boston; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance; Bartenders' International League of America, Cincinnati; the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Chicago; Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union, Cleveland, Ohio; International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, Cincinnati, Ohio; Washington Camp, No. 111, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Asbury Park; Cigar Makers' International Union, Chicago; Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, Boston; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial and resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of New York; New York Nonpartisan Citizenship Committee; International Seamen's Union of America, Chicago; New York State Federation of Labor, Utica, N. Y.; Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg, Pa.; American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.; New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Newark, N. J.; Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.; and the Iron City Central Trades Council, Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of citizens and organizations of New York, Tacoma, Wash.; Cincinnati, Boston, Washington, St. Louis, and La Fayette, Ind., favoring passage of Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition or memorial of Friends of Russian Freedom, favoring sustaining of President's veto of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition or memorial of Women's Political Union, of Colorado Springs, Colo., against passage of immigration bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Sterling and Amherst, Colo., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of citizens of Sagerton and of Mills and Runnels Counties, Tex., protesting against the export of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of 1,000 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Browning Club, Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipping American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Denver, Colo., urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 2,334 American citizens, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of Local Union 128, Plumbers and Steam Fitters' Association, of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against employment of alien labor in the Canal Zone, Panama; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 5, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that Thou hast come so close to human life that we dare not make an appeal to our fellow men that does not justify the ways of God with men. Every appeal that we make to human activity and human service, whether for justice or for liberty, is but a reflection of the commanding voice of God, and every aspiration that rises within us that looks to human helpfulness, to the uplift of the race, is but an emanation of the heart of God overflowing with an infinite love for man. May we cherish as our most precious and blessed heritage the spirit that prompts to service. May we in all our service conform our action and our appeal to God, who is the author of our liberty and the guardian of our human rights. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had, on January 28, 1915, approved and signed the act (S. 6121) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara and State of New York.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the business of the Patent Office for the year ended December 31, 1914. The Chair is in doubt as to what committee the communication should be referred. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES. I have here a telegram sent by the secretary of state of the State of Washington under the direction of a resolution of the legislature of that State. It relates to the veto by the President of the immigration bill, which has been disposed of for this session; but coming, as it does, from the legislature, I think it would be well to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 4, 1915.*

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill; and
Whereas the same is to be brought up for action on the President's veto Thursday, February 4, 1915: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington be, and he is hereby, directed to telegraph to each member of the delegation in Congress from this State a request to vote for the passage of the said Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill over the President's veto.

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a resolution from the Rural Credit League of America on rural credits, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the Rural Credit League of America indorsing the principles of the resolution by Senator SHEPPARD to investigate personal rural-credit bills.

We maintain that the function of a congressional body to investigate a purely scientific question, like credit, is judicial rather than legislative; and being judicial in character, its machinery should comport with that of other judicial bodies, which provide that the interested parties may appear by expert representatives and establish by sworn testimony the truth of their contentions. We hold this to be the most efficient, most expeditious, and most economical method of conducting an investigation of this important subject.

It is the most efficient, because the commission could require the proponent's expert to take up his bill section by section and show his precedent for each and every provision or state his reason for not following the precedents and experience of other countries. Then the bankers' expert would be present to test the credibility of each witness introduced by the proponent's expert. The commissioners would not only have the right to interrogate any witness introduced and introduce other witnesses, but they would confine the experts of the parties at interest to the issues involved and not encumber the record with immaterial matter. Furthermore, the commission could, and doubtless would, require each of the parties to brief his case, and this would greatly aid the full membership of both bodies of Congress in readily grasping the question.

This is the most expeditious method, because if an investigation were to be conducted in the ordinary way it would be next January before the committees could begin work; whereas under the proposed method the record and report of the commission and briefs and arguments of the parties at interest could be placed in the hands of each Member of the Sixty-fourth Congress at the beginning of its first session.

The expense to the Government in conducting the proposed investigation would be nominal compared to the expense of conducting other monetary investigations. It would be less expensive than an ordinary committee investigation, because the commission could, and should, require each party to pay for the attendance of its own witnesses.

In conclusion we would say that we suggest that the Committees on Agriculture appoint the subcommittees to make this investigation, because every member of both of those committees has bankers as well as farmers as constituents, and we do not know of any other instance in which that thing exists as to all the members of any other two committees of both bodies.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Miami, Fla., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions of the Miami Board of Trade, of Miami, Fla.

Whereas the United States, by its act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, did grant to the several States the lands known as "swamp and overflow" lands, made unfit thereby for cultivation, to enable the States to contract drainage works to reclaim the lands; and
Whereas said act provided that the proceeds of said lands shall be applied exclusively to the purpose of reclaiming said lands, and thereby imposing the trust upon the States of reclaiming said lands and making them fit for cultivation and disposing of said lands for the uses and purposes of said trust only; and
Whereas the State of Florida requested and received upward of 20,000,000 acres of such "swamp and overflowed" lands, which include the Everglades of Florida, an open prairie overflowed by the flood waters of the upper drainage basin carried by the Kissimmee River to Lake Okeechobee and spilled over upon the grass-covered plain of the Glades; and
Whereas the control of the waters of Lake Okeechobee and its use as a storage basin for flood waters to prevent overflow, and the vast extent of the canals and other drainage works necessary to reclaim the 4,000,000 acres of the Everglades, make it necessary to raise large amounts of money, and only by first reclaiming and making fit for cultivation said lands can they be sold for sufficient money to pay for the construction of the necessary drainage works; and
Whereas the trustees of the lands have been unable to sell the lands for sufficient money to construct the necessary drainage works and can not sell the undrained lands without a sacrifice of value so great as to defeat the purpose of the grant of the United States and many thousands of purchasers of these lands are waiting the reclamation of the lands to settle upon and cultivate them; and
Whereas the United States has by its said act of September 28, 1850, declared its purpose to aid the States to reclaim these rich and fertile areas and make them fit for cultivation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we do respectfully pray the good offices of the United States, by its representatives in Congress assembled, to aid the States to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands by its grants to the States by enacting suitable provisions in a drainage-aid act, which shall enable the States to raise sufficient money to construct the necessary drainage works; saving, however, the United States harmless from loss or gift of money by pledging to it the taxes which may be levied upon and the proceeds from sales of said swamp and overflowed lands in each drainage project of said lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Florida are respectively requested to use all honorable means to cause the enactment of such drainage-aid law.

Mr. NELSON. I present a large number of petitions from citizens of Minnesota, asking for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war to belligerents. I move that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I present resolutions of the Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor in reference to the shipping bill, and I ask to have them read. They are very short.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read, as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 15, 1915.

HON. W. S. KENYON,
Senator from Iowa, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution, unanimously adopted by the above body, is hereby submitted to your kind support:

"Whereas the best interests of all the people of this country will be impartially protected and served only by a Government-owned merchant marine, the upbuilding of which, even in private hands, has so far insidiously been prevented by foreign interests, carrying nine-tenths of the American products in foreign bottoms, but which service broke down on account of the European war, thus leaving our country almost bare of the so necessary transportation facilities of our products to other countries desirous of buying from or trading with us, to the great detriment of our economic interests, and especially those of the laboring population: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor hereby respectfully asks all similar organizations, and especially our State Federation of Iowa and the American Federation of Labor, as well as our Congressmen and His Excellency President Wilson (all of whom to be notified by this body), to use their best efforts for the passage of the Government ship-purchase bill; but be it further

"*Resolved*, That we are utterly opposed to the further recommendation of President Wilson; i. e., that this service should be turned over to private capitalists after our Government has brought it to a paying basis with publi: funds. This would not only invite a certain recurrence of the above calamities, but also turn the national interests of all the people, which can properly be protected by the Government only (as disastrous experiences with railroads and other national institutions have abundantly proven), over to the mercy of its greedy exploiters and egotistic despoilers, which would be worse than turning over the

post-office or the parcel-post systems, now that they have been brought to a paying basis, to the express companies."

Very truly, yours,

[SEAL.] D. MORRISON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a short telegram protesting against the ship-purchase bill, which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

GREENVILLE, PA., *February 5, 1915.*

Senators PENROSE and OLIVER,
Washington, D. C.:

Hold Pennsylvania hot in opposition to ship bill purchasing scheme, for country has been driven far enough hellward and over to socialism and war.

W. LOOSER.

Mr. KERN. I ask to have read the telegram which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., *January 30, 1915.*

JOHN W. KERN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The directors of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce adopted resolution indorsing the principles involved in the ship-purchase bill as the bill now stands.

B. F. MCLEOD, *President.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cawker City and Winfield, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to curtail the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Schiller Lodge, No. 92, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Middletown, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the German Lutheran Church, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 127, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Derby, Conn., and a petition of the Metal Trades Council of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Metal Trades Council of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to trades in the Army, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of white and colored persons in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 321, Cigar Makers' International Union, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade and Business Men's Association of Willimantic, Conn., and a memorial of Centennial Lodge, No. 100, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Naugatuck, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present law affecting the printing of Government return envelopes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of the congregation of the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Portland, Oreg., and a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon City, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Bendixen offers the following resolution:

"Whereas it has been proposed and is being urged from various sources that the Congress of the United States place an embargo on the exportation of agricultural products; and

"Whereas this is not being urged on the ground of any shortage or prospective shortage of such products, but on the ground that prices have recently advanced somewhat, especially on cereal products; and

"Whereas such embargo would be unjust and unfair to the agricultural interests of this State in that it would deprive such interests of the advantages and benefits derived from the demand from foreign nations for these products; and

"Whereas the agricultural interests of this Nation by Federal legislation have been placed in direct competition with the same interests of other nations and are justly entitled to all the advantages of an open world market; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota is preeminently an agricultural State and would suffer greatly from such embargo, and all its business interests would be seriously affected by the injury that would logically and necessarily follow such embargo: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, earnestly and emphatically request the Representatives in Congress and United States Senators from this State to use their influence and vote to defeat any measure proposing such embargo; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house and secretary of the Senate be, and hereby are, instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of the Representatives in Congress and each Senator from this State."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 964) accompanied by a bill (S. 7566) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 370. Mary A. Attmore.
S. 989. Josiah L. Burton.
S. 1120. Charles L. Greene.
S. 1650. Ida A. Mitchell.
S. 1806. Mary J. Forbes.
S. 1819. Sarah E. C. Emerson.
S. 2006. John H. Churchill.
S. 2135. Richard Woods.
S. 2281. John Banks.
S. 2185. Mollie C. Warren.
S. 2187. Lucinda Traub.
S. 2195. Samuel W. Harden.
S. 2298. Albert N. Raymond.
S. 2394. Charles R. Gentner.
S. 3177. Rodney Jones.
S. 3425. David H. Hall.
S. 3460. Moses H. Laughlin.
S. 3759. Robert I. Morrison.
S. 3815. Lou E. Hecox.
S. 3998. Peter L. Miles.
S. 5399. Thomas Hickman.
S. 5750. Eliza J. Arthur.
S. 5832. Bettie Dodge.
S. 6132. Maria Love.
S. 6262. Robert Degray.
S. 6263. Luther Curtis.
S. 6372. Orlando L. Daugherty.
S 6456. Martha E. Messenger.
S. 6470. Minna Schue.
S. 6471. Gordon P. Ostrander.
S. 6476. William W. Chew.
S. 6487. Minerva M. Walsh.
S. 6521. Ellen Garlick.
S. 6523. Sarah E. H. Bartlett.
S. 6553. George Schmidt.
S. 6566. George Fulford.
S. 6628. George W. Weitzel.
S. 6654. William M. Allen.
S. 6668. Catherine C. Abbott.
S. 6678. Samuel Lilly.
S. 6813. Edwin Forbes.
S. 6814. James W. Toler.
S. 6816. George Wort.
S. 6817. George W. Markland.
S. 6818. William A. Rusie.
S. 6844. Reuben F. Longley.
S. 6873. Anna Mott.
S. 6875. Thomas Shapley.
S. 6903. Cleora A. Carver.
S. 6908. Mary A. Lowry.
S. 6909. Wiley Whicher.
S. 6921. Amos Poe.
S. 6935. Martin Perkins, alias Charles Shepherd.
S. 7088. Florence Ada Tinney.
S. 7093. Susan J. Alexander.
S. 7094. John H. Van Meter.
S. 7100. Lewis C. Lame.
S. 7119. Imogene M. Burk.
S. 7133. H. B. Crouch.
S. 7135. Mathew Crawford.
S. 7139. Joseph Raphile.

S. 7142. Jonathan Sargent.
S. 7144. John P. Simpson.
S. 7146. Albert Baur.
S. 7157. Thomas T. Jones.
S. 7161. David Cox.
S. 7171. Richard Dobson.
S. 7175. Joseph H. Dearborn.
S. 7176. Sarah L. Hammerton.
S. 7177. Theresa L. Breese.
S. 7181. Thomas E. Dunbar.
S. 7195. Ephraim D. Edwards.
S. 7202. Nelson B. Tool.
S. 7204. Josiah Hasbrook.
S. 7218. Irena Ward.
S. 7228. John W. Fletcher.
S. 7244. James Menaugh.
S. 7246. Michael Kirk.
S. 7248. George W. Windell.
S. 7249. Benjamin F. Shepherd.
S. 7254. William R. Minert.
S. 7260. Allen C. Goodwin.
S. 7265. Daniel H. Pettengill.
S. 7276. Olive Lunn.
S. 7290. Harriett S. Crooks.
S. 7295. William H. McKinley.
S. 7301. James F. Hobbs.
S. 7311. Evander V. Turner.
S. 7312. Mary E. Clark.
S. 7315. Elizabeth M. Norton.
S. 7327. Alicen W. Poe.
S. 7330. Mary E. Searle.
S. 7331. Thomas M. Wall.
S. 7332. Hugh M. Cory.
S. 7342. Madison T. Trent.
S. 7344. Rose Barnes.
S. 7349. Lewis A. Huffaker.
S. 7351. David Parker.
S. 7408. Edward Dudevoire.
S. 7469. William Hawkins.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 965) thereon.

PAN AMERICAN MEDICAL CONGRESS.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 210) to authorize the President to invite certain Governments to send delegates to the Pan American Medical Congress, and I submit a report (No. 966) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to invite the several Governments of the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, Haiti, and Santo Domingo to send official delegates to the meeting of the Pan American Medical Congress, to be held in the city of San Francisco, Cal., Panama-Pacific International Exposition, June 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, A. D. 1915.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES. Does it involve any expense on the part of this Government?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations took the matter under consideration and referred the joint resolution to a subcommittee. It appears by former resolutions which have been passed regarding this matter that while it is possible an appropriation may be asked, yet Dr. Johnson, who presides over the society in this city, has filed with the subcommittee, and it will be a part of the records of the committee which submits the report, a statement that in no event shall the amount asked for exceed $10,000.

I wish to say, in order to avoid objection, that this Congress is composed of a great body of medical men all over the Americas, North and South, and meetings have been held not only here in the first instance, but in Panama, in the city of Mexico, and in Habana. On all those occasions the Governments have always appropriated a sum of money to defray, for example, the expenses of a banquet to be attended by the members. The gentlemen who compose this very valuable association are extremely desirous that it shall not appear that the Government is refusing to bear any expense and that they can simply come as private citizens if they want to. They think it a very important matter, and the committee agree with them on that. We have limited the expense as far as we could.

Mr. JONES. I would like to know if it will result in the establishment of a sort of bureau controlled by other Governments to which we will have to send representatives and the expense of which we shall bear very largely? That has been the case in a great many other instances.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It is the first time I have heard such a suggestion made by anyone.

Mr. JONES. My colleague upon the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], can bear me out in the statement that a great many of these things have come about just in that way, and I simply want to bring this matter to his attention. If he has no objection to it as representing the majority of the Committee on Appropriations I shall not object, but I shall expect to see it result in just what we tried to cut out of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill last year.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there have been some dozen or more resolutions of this kind which passed Congress from time to time, whereby these different scientific experts may go to foreign countries and their expenses are paid. They seem to establish a bureau at some capital, like the Hague or Potsdam, or somewhere else, and then bind the United States to become a continuing member. For example, I had a case before me this morning; and I will say to my colleague on the committee that we concluded to strike out a good many of such items from the appropriation bills, there are so many delegates making trips to Europe. We found that they had bound this Government with other Governments that they would hold an annual meeting over there, and then they would establish a bureau, and all such things. The meetings are held abroad so that our delegates get a trip to Europe, and we have to pay the expenses. This morning we heard of one such congress that is to be held at Potsdam, and over $3,000 was asked to be appropriated for it—$500 to pay the expenses over there and $500 extra, and so on. I have forgotten the exact amount, but it amounts to about $3,500. Our continuing expenses are $1,500 to pay our bureau and for this system of representation. All these things amount to a great deal of money at the end of a year.

I was astonished, and so was my friend from Washington [Mr. JONES], when I came to look into this appropriation bill, at the large sums of money it appropriated, not in one case but in dozens of cases, and to find that in the bill the United States had bound itself to have these delegates go abroad and attend the meetings of associations, resulting in establishing a great bureau in which no American is employed. Here we are paying for the employment of foreigners in some bureau in a foreign country in order that some Americans can attend every year some convention to be held. We pay his expenses and pay all the necessary incidentals, and so on.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not intend to object to the consideration of this joint resolution, but I wish the Senator from Delaware would explain to what persons in Mexico we are to extend this invitation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not know whether Dr. Carranza has a medical title or not; I have sometimes heard him called by that title; nor do I know whether Dr. Huerta has one, but any of them might attend that meeting with profit to themselves. I want to say, however, Mr. President, that it seemed to the committee having this matter in charge that this was a particularly laudable object at this time, and a courteous invitation only was desired to be extended to these gentlemen.

We have taken a very prominent part, both in North and South America, in trying to do away with infectious or contagious diseases. We have been called upon, I think, recently in Ecuador to make sanitary the condition at Guyaquil, which is threatening our traffic through the Panama Canal.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that I simply want to make sure that we are extending the invitation through the proper President of Mexico, whether it be Villa or whomsoever it may be to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think it might be well to call upon the leader of the majority now existing upon that side of the Chamber as to what we are going to do in regard to this. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] introduced this joint resolution, and I know he is very much in favor of it. So I ask him to reply to his own colleague.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I introduced the joint resolution because I am very greatly interested in the matter of sanitation and health, not only in our own country but through-

out the world. It will be admitted that we can not have our own country free from contagious and epidemic diseases unless the matter is discussed and considered by other Governments as well as ours.

This is a great medical association. It has received the courtesies of other Governments; delegates have been sent from the United States, and have been treated with great consideration; these important questions have been discussed and the results have been published. I have myself read them with great interest and, I think, some profit. Now, it is designed that this association shall be invited to meet in this country. There may be later on some suggestion as to a small appropriation for the purpose of reciprocating courtesies which our own delegates have received from these other Governments.

It is a trivial matter, Mr. President. I see no danger of it ever resulting in the establishment of a bureau or that we shall be involved in any financial obligation that will become troublesome to us. If Congress does not choose to make an appropriation when the matter is presented to it later on, of course Congress will not make the appropriation; but unquestionably the invitation ought to be extended. We can not very well do ourselves justice without extending the invitation, and I trust no objection will be made to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the joint resolution does not provide for any appropriation?

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 529, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] on the 2d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to subpœna witnesses, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and the expense thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if there are any contemplated hearings to be had by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, for the information of the Senator from Utah, that this is what has happened: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, thinking that it had authority to hold certain hearings, employed a stenographer, and it owes him money for his work. He can not be paid. I told him that the committee would have to obtain the authority of the Senate through a resolution before payment could be made. The resolution was therefore offered and referred to the committee, and I have been authorized to report it back favorably.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me, under the wording of the resolution, it would be to pay for hearings hereafter to be had and not for hearings which have already taken place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee contemplates the possibility of having to continue its hearings. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who offered the resolution, is not in his seat just at this moment, but I understand the committee think there is a possibility, though not any very great probability, of the continuance of some of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was agreed to.

LABELING AND MISBRANDING OF GOODS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before bills are received I desire to ask a question concerning a bill that has been reported. I address my observations to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

I find on the calendar Senate bill 646, providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale which enter into interstate commerce, and providing penalties for misbranding.

This bill seems to have been reported from the Committee on Manufactures. I am a member of that committee, but I never heard of a meeting of the committee nor was I consulted as to the matter of the report. As I have received communications concerning the bill, in which complaint is made that no hearing was held on the subject and that there are certain parties who desire a hearing, I will ask the Senator from Ohio if it would not be compatible with his views to have the bill recommitted to the committee for the purpose of giving certain interested parties an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. POMERENE. That bill was referred by the Committee on Manufactures to a subcommittee, of which I was a member. The matter was taken up with the department. As a member of that committee I was not advised that any individuals desired any personal hearing on the matter. The bill seemed to have the indorsement of the department. I knew of no objection—I say that individually—on the part of any interested parties to the provisions of the bill until very recently. The matter is now being considered by the members of the committee in view of the fact that certain persons have indicated a desire to be heard. No later than this morning one of the members of the subcommittee and myself had a conference on the subject. We expect to have a further conference during the day, and if the matter may be allowed to rest for the day I think there can be something determined upon which will be entirely satisfactory to those who are seeking a hearing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no disposition to press any suggestion at all, but I thought it was rather remarkable that I had never been notified of the meeting of the committee, as I have some views on the matter which I would have desired in my usual modest way to present to the committee had I been notified of a meeting and had the privilege of attending.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as one member of the committee, I did not know the Senator from New Hampshire was interested in the subject. Had I known of the fact, he certainly would have been advised. The subcommittee was authorized to report on the bill, as I now recall.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am gratified to know that the subject is being given further consideration, for it is a very important matter which will lead to a good deal of discussion if it comes before the Senate unless certain matters are adjusted in connection with it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I may say that, since these objections have come to my attention, my personal feeling about the matter is that there ought to be some further hearings on the bill with a view to perfecting it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills is next in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7567) granting a pension to James Gallagher (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert W. Potter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 7569) granting a pension to Charles H. Nelson;

A bill (S. 7570) granting a pension to Sumner P. Boies; and

A bill (S. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Joann P. Swift-Libby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE:

A bill (S. 7572) for the relief of the heirs of Eldred Nunnally, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 7573) granting a pension to Anna Trickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 7574) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON (by request):

A bill (S. 7575) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels and to regulate equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7576) granting a pension to John Lilly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 7577) granting an increase of pension to Orra M. Duncan;

A bill (S. 7578) granting a pension to Josephine W. Bullis; and

A bill (S. 7579) granting a pension to Georgianna G. Furey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7580) granting a pension to Elias Lyon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Shell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 7582) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 7583) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Reid (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, etc., from $110,000 to $360,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THORNTON (for Mr. BANKHEAD) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $225 to pay Fay N. Seaton for extra services rendered to the Committee to Investigate Joint Parcel Post, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of pests of orchard and other fruits from $56,115 to $58,255, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

SUPERINTENDENT OF POST OFFICE.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19906), and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The amendment was read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

Strike out line 8, on page 5, and in lieu thereof substitute the following:

"The office of postmaster is hereby abolished, except in third and fourth class offices, and in lieu thereof is created the office of superintendent of post office. Each post office of the first and second classes shall be in charge of a superintendent. In each office where there is an assistant postmaster such assistant postmaster shall be appointed to the office of superintendent of post office if qualified therefor, and shall hold the same subject to the laws and regulations of the classified civil service. Thereafter all appointments to the office of superintendent of post office shall be made upon merit, and, where practicable, by promotion or transfer from the employees of the Postal Service, and shall hold the office without regard to politics or political recommendations, upon the terms and conditions and subject to such tenure as is provided by the laws and regulations governing the classified, permanent civil service. For compensation to such superintendents of post offices there is hereby appropriated $15,000,000. This section shall not apply to postmasters now in office whose terms have not expired, but they shall be allowed to serve out the term for which they were appointed."

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. LEWIS. I tender an amendment to the present pending shipping bill (H. R. 6856), and ask to have it printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend section 1, on page 2, after the words "objects and purposes," in line 8, by adding:

"*Provided*, That no purchase of ships from any source whatever, or of foreign subject, or of any ship belonging to any foreign country, shall be made until the Department of Justice and Department of State has certified that it has examined the title of the tendered ship and that the same is available in all respects and free from any question involving any international complication or violation of any international law."

SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURES.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have here a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 1, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I quote the following from a letter to me dated 29th January, from the George P. Plant Milling Co., St. Louis:

"On December 8 we made a contract with the Holland-America Line to transport 20,000 sacks of flour from New Orleans to Rotterdam at the rate of 47 cents per 100 pounds, with the understanding that we were to ship the flour from the interior in January and furnish them with the necessary permit of the Holland Government, and they, under the contract, were bound to clear the flour in February. We sold this 20,000 sacks of flour to the Netherlands Government through our agent in Amsterdam, Holland, and made an identical contract with the Netherlands Government; that is, they were to furnish us with the necessary permit and we were to guarantee the clearance of the flour during February.

"We have complied with our contract, having shipped 20,000 sacks of flour from here between the 20th and 25th of January; we also secured the necessary permit through the office of the Holland-America Line in New York City, who in turn advised their office in New Orleans that this 20,000 sacks of flour would move under permit N. Y. P. 880, but in the last week the agents of the Holland-America Line in New Orleans, who are the Texas Transport & Terminal Co., have used every means in their power to stop us from shipping the flour, and have advised us that they will not clear the flour in February, and certainly not till March or April.

"Our representatives in New Orleans have intimated that whereas we have this freight booked at 47 cents per 100 pounds and the Holland-America Line are now getting a rate of 70 cents per 100 pounds, that this difference in the revenue to be earned by them accounts for their attitude; but we can not believe that such a company as the Holland-America Line would stoop to such a position, and we believe that if some pressure is brought to bear upon the line by your department that we not only can secure a fulfillment of the contract that we have with them, but that their attitude toward contracts they have with others will be quite satisfactory hereafter.

"We will be pleased to have you take this matter up with the Holland-America Line if you will, both at their New York City office and their New Orleans office, and if you wish any further information in the matter we will be pleased to supply same by telegraph if you will advise us what is necessary."

I have instructed the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of this department in New Orleans and New York to look further into this matter.

Yours, very truly,
WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary.

—

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 3, 1915.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hand you, for such use as you may think fit, copy of letter from the Utilities Manufacturing Co., which I find upon my desk on my return to-day, and which speaks for itself. The last paragraph seems to me worthy of publication.

Yours, very truly,
WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary.

—

UTILITIES MANUFACTURING CO.,
18 Broadway, New York, January 26, 1915.

W. C. REDFIELD, Esq.,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have read with great interest your brilliant defense of the plan of the United States Government to purchase ships in order to make possible the shipment of American manufactures to foreign markets and bring back to this country the products of the South American countries, in particular, who are suffering from a lack of communication and who are therefore unable to make purchases, not having any market for their products.

We need hardly say that your plan has our heartiest moral support, and in addition to the records that you have already gathered on the subject we desire to inform you that just because of this serious lack of shipping facilities and because of the corresponding outrageously high freight rates we have lost a very large order from a firm in Alexandria, Egypt, and another one from a firm in Auckland, New Zealand, to whom we had quoted and who had given us their orders amounting to many thousand dollars, and both of which firms were forced to cancel the shipment by cable on account of the very high freight rates which would have made the retail price of our products prohibitive in their country. With an adequate American merchant marine it would be impossible for the few operating companies (English and French) to monopolize the freight rates and dictate to the American public what they must ship and at what prices. To speak in plain words, the situation has become so serious as regards our export business that we have had to give up free on board quotations, which, as you may know, are so essential, and as a consequence our business has suffered very badly in spite of the fact that the foreign competition during the past three months has been minimized and one of the best advertised brands and greatest sellers in almost every foreign country has had their plant destroyed by the war. We have been forced to lay off part of our help and are losing this rare chance of extending our business for no other reason excepting the lack of fur-

nishing at reasonable prices our merchandise which is in such great demand at the present time.

Yours, very truly, UTILITIES MANUFACTURING CO.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, under the rule I desire to present a notice that on to-morrow I shall move an amendment to the rules. On to-morrow I shall ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules, as I have no idea that it could possibly secure the attention of this body at the present session; but I want to have it presented now in order that it may receive such consideration as it will deserve with a view of passing it at the extra session, which everyone admits is soon to follow, at which time I shall ask for its consideration and adoption, if possible.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did I understand the Senator to say that everyone admits we are to have an extra session?

Mr. NORRIS. Whether everyone admits it or not, I presume it is unavoidable under all the circumstances.

Mr. GALLINGER. Suppose we should be wise enough to take up the appropriation bills and pass them, would there be any necessity for an extra session?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I should not think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope that may be done.

Mr. NORRIS. I doubt whether we are going to be wise enough to get through with the business of the session.

I ask to have the proposed rule read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The notice of an amendment to the rules was read, as follows:

In accordance with Rule XL of the Senate, I hereby give notice that on to-morrow I will propose an amendment to the rules of the Senate by adding thereto a new rule, as follows:

"Rule XLI. It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion, when made, shall lie over one day and shall then be decided without debate. When it has been decided to consider a bill or resolution under this rule, the same shall first be considered in general debate, during which time no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall be allowed to speak more than three hours. At the close of general debate the bill or resolution shall be read for amendments, and on any amendment that may be offered no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall speak for more than 15 minutes: *Provided*, That any Senator who has not spoken for 3 hours in general debate shall, in addition to said 15 minutes, be allowed additional time; but in no case shall such additional time or times, including the time used by such Senator in general debate, exceed in the aggregate 3 hours. When the bill is being read for amendment all debate shall be confined to the amendment which is then pending."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will lie on the table.

THE OLD ROMAN SENATE.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a history of the rules of procedure of the old Roman Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator what is his request? I could not catch it.

Mr. GORE. The request is to have printed as a Senate document a history of the rules of procedure of the old Roman Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. For what year, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. GORE. It covers a number of years, about as many years as debate lasts in the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Is it accompanied by the rulings of the Chair?

Mr. GORE. It covers about as many years as an ordinary debate lasts in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

WAGES ON AMERICAN AND BRITISH VESSELS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have had carefully compiled a comparison of American and British wages paid on two steam colliers, one a British collier of 4,200 gross tons and the other an American collier of 4,417 tons. It is an interesting statement, and I ask consent to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparison of American and British wages paid on steam colliers.

AMERICAN COLLIER "LYRA."

(4,417 gross tons.)

Master	$260.00
Chief officer	100.00
Second officer	85.00
Third officer	70.00
Carpenter	55.00
8 sailors	400.00
Steward	$75.00
Chief cook	75.00
Second cook	60.00
3 messmen	110.00
Chief engineer	150.00
First assistant engineer	100.00
Second assistant engineer	85.00
Third assistant engineer	70.00
3 oilers	165.00
6 firemen	330.00
3 coal passers	135.00
Total per month	2,265.00
Total per year	27,180.00

BRITISH STEAMSHIP "MASCONOMO."

(4,200 gross tons.)

Master	$121.50
First mate	48.60
Second mate	34.02
Third mate	25.51
Carpenter	31.59
Boatswain	25.51
Steward	31.59
Engineer steward	12.15
Cook	26.73
Mess-room boy	4.86
8 able seamen	174.96
First engineer	80.19
Second engineer	58.32
Third engineer	38.88
Fourth engineer	34.02
8 firemen	184.68
2 oilers	46.17
Total per month	979.28
Total per year	11,751.36

Annual difference in wages, $15,428.64.

NOTE.—The wages given for the *Lyra* are the union rate for white crew on the Pacific coast. Sailors, firemen, coal passers, etc., can be shipped in the Atlantic-coast trade at from $15 to $20 per month less than in the Pacific; but the wages of officers and engineers, who usually stay by the ship, are nearly as high now in the Atlantic as in the Pacific.

Charges based on cost of construction.

	American Lyra	British Masconomo.
First cost	$325,000	$217,000
Interest, 5 per cent	16,250	10,850
Depreciation, 5 per cent	16,250	10,850
Insurance, 6 per cent	19,500	13,020
Total	52,000	34,720

Annual difference in charges based on cost of construction, $17,280.

COST OF FOOD.

American crew—35 men, at 50 cents per day, for 365 days	$6,387.50
British crew—32 men, at 40 cents per day, for 365 days	4,672.00
Annual difference in cost of food	1,715.50
Annual difference in wages	15,428.64
Annual difference in charges based on construction	17,280.00
Annual difference in operating American and British collier	34,424.14

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I desire to offer a resolution (S. Res. 537) and move its adoption under Rule XXVI. For the present I ask that the resolution be read and that the motion go over under the rule for a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce is hereby discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 7552.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the resolution which he has just offered relates to the bill which the Senator himself introduced on Wednesday last?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which was referred to the Committee on Commerce yesterday?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has become impatient at the lack of action?

Mr. GORE. Oh, no, Mr. President; I profess to have an unlimited amount of patience. I think the Committee on Commerce will have ample time to deliberate on this bill before the motion comes up for consideration.

PURCHASE OF VESSELS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 528) submitted by Mr. BURTON on the second instant, as follows:

Whereas the pending ship-purchase bill, being Senate bill No. 6856, contemplating by certain of its provisions the purchase of shipping tonnage already constructed, and therefore suggests the possible acquisition of ships belonging to belligerents, some of which are interned in American and other ports as the result of the war; and

Whereas the purchase of such vessels would raise questions of vital importance to the interests of the United States, a knowledge of which is of supreme importance in order that the Senate may reach an intelligent conclusion as to the advisability of enacting said bill and as to the propriety of incorporating in its provisions certain amendments: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested and is hereby directed to transmit at his earliest convenience to the Senate of the United States information responsive to the following inquiry:

Has the Secretary of State, through private or official channels, received any information from any responsible foreign source as to the attitude the Governments of the belligerent nations, or any of them, might be expected to assume in relation to the transfer to the American flag and American register of merchant ships which have heretofore carried the flag of a belligerent State?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I see no objection to the resolution. I think there is no reason why it should not be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE SENATE MANUAL (S. DOC. NO. 938).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate another resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 535) introduced by Mr. OVERMAN on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 250 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from North Carolina object to an amendment to the resolution providing for the publication of a vest-pocket edition of the rules in convenient form?

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is the desire of the Senate, that can be done. The Constitution has been prepared and is ready to print. We find about 400 errors in this book. The seventeenth amendment is not in it, and some Senators—notably the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]—have never been included in it. It is now brought down to date, and we have the Constitution; and it will be very little trouble, if the Senator desires it, to print a vest-pocket edition of the Constitution, with the citations.

Mr. GORE. And the rules of the Senate? I move that as an amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator mean the Constitution and the rules of the Senate in a vest-pocket edition?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir. It will be a very great convenience.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We would have to have it printed on India paper, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to state the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I move that the pending resolution be amended by adding:

Provided, That the Committee on Rules is further directed to prepare and print a vest-pocket edition of the rules of the Senate and the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How many copies?

Mr. GORE. I should say a thousand copies.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has been printing vest-pocket editions of the platforms, and so forth, and has been sending them to the Senate. I do not know whether or not we ought to return the compliment by sending copies of this edition to the Members of the House. If that be so, it would take more than 250 copies.

Mr. GORE. I would suggest a thousand copies. A thousand would cost very little more than 250.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, if it could be done without much trouble, if it would not be well to have declared on the margin of the rules the date upon which each rule was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would be very little trouble, I think, Mr. President.

Mr. BRYAN. It would not require any amendment to the resolution to bring that about.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all; just the suggestion from the Senator will be sufficient.

Mr. BRYAN. I make that suggestion to the Senator, because in the construction of a number of the rules very much depends upon when the rule was adopted. For example, the second paragraph of Rule XVI provides that amendments to general appropriation bills moved by members of a standing committee, and so forth, shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It likewise requires amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills to be referred to the Committee on Commerce and amendments to bills establishing post roads or proposing new post roads to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Now, it is very possible that at the time this paragraph was adopted those were the only committees outside of the Committee on Appropriations that considered appropriation bills at all. Since then a number of other committees have been empowered to consider appropriation bills; and the question came up and the Vice President was compelled to rule upon it as to whether an amendment to an appropriation bill—for example, where the Committee on Naval Affairs was concerned; I do not remember the committee involved—should go to the Committee on Appropriations or to the committee having charge of the particular appropriation bill. My recollection is that the Chair ruled, and I think correctly, that in all probability this paragraph was amended when there were no other committees except those mentioned in the paragraph that considered appropriation bills, aside from the regular Committee on Appropriations.

If we could have printed in the margin the dates upon which the rules were adopted, it seems to me it would be of great value to every Senator, and it would be very little trouble. The policy followed out in the annotation of compilations of statutes of the States or of the Revised Statutes of the United States could be very easily adopted. I hope the committee will see that that is done, now that we are to have a new edition of the manual.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very wise suggestion, and I will order it done.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether or not he contemplates publishing in this edition the names of Senators elect?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the purpose of it. There are 17 Senators whose names will have to appear here. Some of them are Senators who are already in the Senate; one, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who was here, I think, last time, but whose name was left out by mistake. That was the purpose.

I want to say that there has been great demand for this book, an unusual demand. Senator Crane introduced an amendment on the 3d day of March two years ago, and it became my duty to look into it. There was the same number of copies printed then, and there are just 10 copies left—only 10—and there is a demand right now for the book. Only yesterday a Member of the House came over and asked for one, so they will soon be exhausted. There are just 10 copies left, and we want to get out the new edition as soon as possible, and we want each new Senator furnished with a copy with his name on it. They are entitled to that.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. There is an additional reason, it seems to me, and a more important reason, for the publication of another edition of the rules, because several amendments have been adopted since this edition was published, and unless Senators happen to remember what those amendments are they can not know what their rights are under the rules and can not know what the rules are. The Vice President has gone to the trouble of having pasted in his copy of the rules those that have been adopted since 1913, but they are not available to the Senate generally.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is more important to print it now than ever before. I think there have been more amendments to the rules than ever before. Here is the fifteenth amendment,

and there is no decision relating to the Constitution brought down since volume 225—10 volumes of the reports. Take "due process of law"; there have been many decisions under that head since that time; and, of course, if the Senators want the Constitution, they want it annotated to date.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I entirely agree with the Senator from North Carolina. The resolution ought to pass, and the printing ought to be done, and the book issued at the earliest possible date. If Senators have any copies to spare, I presume there will be calls enough for them. I know in my own case calls for copies from members of legislatures of the States and others interested in parliamentary matters take up all the extra copies I have, and I often have to ask my colleagues for extra copies.

I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. These rules are printed in the Manual, a copy of which every Senator has. For my part, I do not see any necessity for going to the extra expense of printing them in a different form.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is not a different form.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; it is not a different form.

Mr. THOMAS. It is practically in a different form; that is, the rules are printed and bound separately.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no, Mr. President. It is proposed to reprint them in the same manner.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] was defeated.

Mr. THOMAS. Defeated yesterday?

Mr. BRYAN. No; just now.

Mr. THOMAS. I was out of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SHIPS OF BELLIGERENT NATIONS.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. There was another resolution (S. Res. 527) calling for information which I introduced, directed to the Secretary of the Treasury. I think that ought to come up at the same time with the other resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate the resolution to which the Senator refers went to the calendar, the morning hour having expired while the resolution was being considered. It can be taken from the calendar only on motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution mentioned by him.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I think I shall have to object in his absence. I understand that he objects to its consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Do I understand that there is objection because of the absence of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KERN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. Morning business is closed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, on yesterday, before I suspended my remarks, I had referred to the fact that at the first conference of Democratic Senators during the present session of Congress there was a general agreement that the policy of Democratic Senators during this session should be, first, to pass the necessary supply bills, and then, after that work was accomplished, if time remained, to devote it to the legislative program suggested by the President.

Because I made that suggestion a statement has been made in the public press to the effect that some caucus secret had been disclosed. Unless my memory is very much at fault, the reverse is true. Following the practice of the conference, at its adjournment the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], who presided at that conference, gave a brief statement to the press stating what I have already stated on the floor of the Senate as the action of the conference.

I refer again to that action by the Democratic conference for this reason: To indicate to the Senate what the deliberate and unanimous judgment of Democratic Senators who were experienced in legislation and acquainted with the rules of this body was as to what it was possible to accomplish during this session of the Congress, and how, uninfluenced from any other quarter or by anybody else, the position they then took was, in my judgment, the sound position, the one that the country expects of us—that we should first of all and certainly pass the great supply bills that are necessary to run this Government, and then, after that necessary work was done, should go home and give the people some time to digest the great constructive legislation that we have been passing since the Democratic Party came into power.

I believed that such a course was for the best interests of the Democratic Party and of the country alike; and at that time, unless I am sadly in error in my memory, not a single Democratic Member in this Chamber raised his voice in opposition to that idea.

Mr. President, reference has been made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the caucus—you will observe I no longer say "conference"—resolution adopted on the 15th day of December, 1903, by the gentlemen who were then Democratic Senators from the various States of the Union. I want to read it again so that this body may catch the exact and accurate import of that resolution. It reads:

Resolved, That hereafter all members of the Senate Democratic caucus shall be bound to vote in accordance with its decisions made by a two-thirds vote of all its members on all questions except those involving a construction of the Constitution, or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents, or received instructions from the legislature of the State he represents.

This resolution, of course, was adopted before the constitutional amendment relating to the manner and mode of electing Senators had been agreed to, hence the last clause.

Mr. President, it will be observed that there are at least two classes of cases in which express provision is made that no Democratic Senator shall be bound, even by the vote of a caucus, when two-thirds of the members of his party assent thereto: First, upon all questions relating to the Constitution. Why? Because we are patriots, I hope, before we are partisians; and for the further reason that every Member of this body has sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and no man can be constrained to violate his oath of office.

In reference to the pending bill, there are Senators on this side, myself included, who have at least grave doubts as to the constitutionality of this measure. I do not profess positive conviction, because I have not yet fully matured my convictions on this subject; but I do express the gravest doubt as to the constitutional power of the Government of the United States to enact this legislation. Not long ago, on this floor, during the progress of this debate, I witnessed a spectacle and heard a colloquy that was amazing to me. Some Senator—I do not wish to call names now—sitting on the other side of the Chamber asked one of the distinguished Senators in charge of this bill, a Senator for whom I have the highest personal regard, and who has had long and distinguished service in this body, this question: "Upon what constitutional power do you rest this legislation?" The reply was made from the Senator on this side—the Democratic side, forsooth, of this Chamber—"The general-welfare clause of the Constitution."

Then the rejoinder came with crushing force, and it was deserved, that the Senator was the first Democrat who had ever lived to get to the Senate of the United States who gave such an answer like that to a question like that. The rejoinder was, "Well, if we can enact one bill because we believe or contend that it is for the general welfare of the people of the United States, we can enact all bills that we believe to be for the general welfare of the people of the United States," and what then becomes of the ancient Democratic, yea, the ancient American doctrine, that this is a Government of delegated powers, and that this Federal Government of ours may not exercise any power save that which is expressly conferred upon it or may be necessarily implied from the express powers?

So to me at least, young as I am in years, although somewhat old-fashioned, I admit, in my Democratic beliefs, the rejoinder upon the other side of this Chamber was not only crushing but complete, and I do not believe that in the future we are likely to hear any Senator of the United States, on this side of the Chamber at least, say that he rests legislation on the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. Certainly I could never rest my vote for any legislation on the general-welfare clause.

What other power, then, of the Constitution can be invoked as the basis of this legislation? Has not the Government the power to construct and maintain a Navy? Ah, Senators, that is

true, but as this bill is worded, when we consider its history, when we consider the current events that are transpiring, when we consider the arguments that are made for it, when we consider the language in which it is phrased, when we consider the provisions of the measure itself, it is impossible to deny that that contention is little more than a subterfuge. There are a great many very able writers on this question who contend, and contend with some degree of force, according to the way I look at it, that in this age of specialization, when vessels, as well as other things, are specialized, the type of ship best adapted for auxiliary purposes in the Navy is not the type of ship that you need for commercial purposes; and the contention is not disguised, yea, it is vociferously urged on this floor, that what we really want in respect to this matter is ships for commercial purposes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what the bill says.

Mr. HARDWICK. The bill says that, as my friend from Utah suggests.

Now, one other thought. If this bill is to provide ships for the real purpose of giving us an auxiliary for the American Navy, and that is not a mere subterfuge, a mere incident, why is that in no draft of the bill? During the many different revelations that we have had on this great question nobody has proposed that the Secretary of the Navy or anyone representing that department of the Government shall have a voice in the matter or representation on this board, with a view to determining that ships of a character suitable for naval purposes shall be either purchased or built under the operation of this measure.

Can the pending bill rest on the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce? I not only doubt that proposition, but I flatly deny it. The power to regulate either interstate or foreign commerce does not include in it the power to engage in such commerce. I do not care to argue that proposition further than to state it. It seems to me like a construction that contends because the Constitution of the United States authorizes the Congress of the United States to regulate commerce between the several States and with Indian tribes and among foreign nations, therefore it authorizes the Government of the United States to go into the business on its own hook and for itself in those kinds of commerce, is far-fetched and untenable.

If that be sound, then I ask my Democratic friends what becomes of your doctrine of a government of limited powers, of a government of constitutional limitations? The commerce clause of the Constitution already is the vehicle of almost every encroachment of Federal power upon the reserved rights of the States of this great Republic, and if you are going to give it that construction both as to the interstate-commerce clause and the foreign-commerce clause you had just as well wipe out your State lines and abandon your dual system of government and forswear all allegiance to the principles of local self-government that you have prated about for generations.

Mr. President, there is another kind and character of cases in which the caucus resolution itself expressly provides for exemption from its operation. Senators who can bring themselves within its terms are bound on all questions except those involving a construction of the Constitution or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents.

Speaking for myself alone, I fling it back into the very teeth of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] that his denunciation of my conduct is as unjust and unjustifiable a proceeding as was ever heard upon this floor as between two Senators who belong to the same party, or even to different parties, for that matter. In the campaign that I made in the State of Georgia for the Democratic nomination for the Senate, which finally, of course, resulted in my election to this body, I pledged to the people of Georgia in almost every one of about 200 speeches which I made in that great Commonwealth—I stated to them rather, because I did not put it in the form of a pledge—my unalterable opposition to any form, kind, shape, or fashion of Government ownership of transportation facilities.

It is true this shipping bill was not mentioned because, as far as I know, it was not pending then. It certainly was not being generally discussed then. Nobody in Georgia at least was considering it. I got into that position because one of the distinguished and able gentlemen who were my competitors for that nomination insisted that I occupied a reactionary position, because I had been unwilling to agree to an extension of the weight limit and of the distance zone of the Parcel Post System. I met that attack by stating frankly that I had been opposed even to going as far as we had gone, that I would not under any circumstances go one inch farther in that direction, because if we were to go into the business of transporting freight for hire it meant necessarily and inevitably the Government ownership and operation of transportation facilities which must carry that freight. To that form of government activity I avowed in almost every county of my beloved Commonwealth my unalterable opposition.

Now, I appeal to my colleagues who have been inclined to criticize my conduct, while I am new in the service here, I can accept no man's judgment upon what my position shall be, but I want them to consider the position in which I find myself. I had rather be a Senator of the United States from the great State of Georgia for three weeks, my own man, and voting my own convictions, than to be here for three decades somebody else's man and voicing somebody else's convictions.

What am I to do? What ought I to have done? Could I tell the people of Georgia in the very campaign that resulted in my election that I was opposed to this form of governmental activity and then embrace it before the echoes of the campaign have died away? I can not. I will not. No 38 men, no 38,000,000 men can make me do it; and if I understand the genius of democratic institutions and the rules of the Democratic Party in this House and in the other House, too, there is no rule of any caucus that attempts to do it.

Mr. President, it is also true, for the purpose of enabling any gentleman who wants to criticize me here or elsewhere to have his full and fair oportunity to do so. I say now in that same campaign in Georgia I did proclaim in a general way my devotion to the great Democrat who sits in the White House at present. And let me pause right here long enough to say that while I differ from him on this question honestly and conscientiously, because I am bound to do it as a matter of conscience unless I stultify my own mentality, yet I regard him as the greatest Democrat who has ever lived in this land since the days of Thomas Jefferson. He is not perfect; he is not infallible. I do not think Jefferson was that; no mortal man has ever been. I simply can not agree with him about this question, because my judgment, my mind, and my conscience do not lead me in the same way that this bill leads.

In a general way the people of Georgia understood that I hoped to have the privilege and pleasure of supporting that great Democrat in this administration. So I shall, but not upon a matter about which my express and explicit declaration is expressly and explicitly to the contrary.

Furthermore, I took occasion in that contest—and then I will pass from these localisms; they can not entertain the Senate, and they weary me; I simply do it in order that I may state my own case as briefly as may be—I took occasion in that campaign to say, while expressing my admiration for this great Democrat, of the great work he had helped us to do here, that on certain questions I had already disagreed with President Wilson, and one question particularly that I proposed never to allow a certain thing he was suspected of wanting to do to be done in this Chamber, unless the rules of the Senate were changed or I was carried from this floor feet foremost first. So any fair construction of friend or foe in my own State or elsewhere can not mean that I was pledged to slavish agreement with the President of the United States or with anybody else. I would not willingly serve here a single day on such degrading terms.

Now, Mr. President, passing on to certain other general matters connected with this matter, there are one or two more exceptions from the operations of this caucus rule that, while they are not expressed, are, in my judgment, necessarily and unavoidably implied. First of all, I do not think that any one of my Democratic brethren would contend, and certainly if they did so contend I know that no considerable body of men anywhere in this Republic would sustain them in that contention, that the caucus can or would undertake to bind men in matters of conscience, to bind men to do things that they themselves honestly believed were wrong. I do not think it has ever undertaken to do that, and I do not believe any member of it would contend that it possessed such an authority.

Furthermore, I lay down the proposition as sound for my own party and sound for any party, and as sound for the Republic and as absolutely necessary for the independence and dignity and power of this great body, that there is one other exception to this rule that all parties must observe unless they want to get into trouble just like the present one. And what is that? By mere caucus dictum, by mere caucus action, no party ought to attempt to make a matter that is not declared party policy or principle a party matter. Whenever it is undertaken, woe for that party that makes the effort to do it, unless its virility is gone, unless the fires of independence have died out of the heart of its sons.

And yet that very course has been adopted here in respect to this matter. Pardon me in this connection if I venture to bring to my support on that great question the recent conduct and the recent words of the distinguished President of the United

States. Only a day or so ago he found occasion to disagree with more than two-thirds of his associates in this body and with almost two-thirds of his Democratic associates at the other end of the Capitol. It was about a matter that there was no Democratic platform declaration—upon the literacy test of the immigration bill. President Wilson used this language:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it.

Gentlemen, I am on the other side of that question from the President of the United States, and, by the way, I so stated in my campaign, and yet, while I should willingly have voted to have overriden that veto if I had had the opportunity, I have not in my heart or head the slightest criticism for the manly way in which the President has exercised his undoubted right and has discharged his duty as he sees it.

But it is to be observed in this connection, first, that the President of the United States takes to himself the right to differ from a vast majority of his party associates and colleagues in the two Houses of Congress upon a matter, because it is not a matter of declared party policy or principle.

Second. That the President of the United States exercises an undoubted right—and his bold exercise of it is one of the things that makes him a great man—and exercises his own mental independence to dissent from his colleagues on this immigration bill. All right. But I want to inquire of the American people and of the American Senate, Has the day yet arrived when a Senator of the United States has less right to independence about legislation that he must vote upon than the President has about vetoing it? Must a Senator be constrained on a matter that is not a matter of declared party policy and principle when the President refuses to be so constrained? Must the "teamwork" be all on one side, or is the "teamwork" to be reciprocal?

Senators, I do not believe that the President of the United States has any desire to be autocratic. I could not have honestly and truthfully said of him what I said just now, that I regard him as the greatest Democrat since Thomas Jefferson, if I thought that or if I believed that. In the past I have had occasion to differ from him vitally on important questions. Never yet have I seen him either intolerant or unjust. Surely, Senators, we have not a Democratic President in the White House to-day who claims to exercise for himself rights that he undertakes or that his friends undertake to deny to Senators of the United States who belong to his own party.

This shipping bill is not a matter of declared party precedent or policy according to the tenets of Democratic faith, and I believe I can demonstrate that. It contradicts every declaration of Democratic faith on the subject in many years. If so, I wish to ask what 40 men in this body or in all this American Republic who are for it, or 40,000, for that matter, can bind Democrats to vote for it? If we had a solemn conference or a caucus—I do not care which—over the tariff question, and some Democratic Senator formally and eloquently presented a resolution that the Committee on Finance of the Senate be instructed to construct a tariff bill along protective-tariff lines it would not be binding on me—not for one-half a second. I will suggest that. You can not bind me to do that sort of thing. Of course it would not be done, but I am illustrating and taking an extreme case to illustrate with.

I want, first, to read from the national platform of the Democratic Party of 1880. We made this declaration on the shipping question then:

Free ships and a living chance for American commerce on the seas and on the land.

Our record, then declared and published to the world, was for free ships; the removal of tariff duties so that ships might be built on American soil by American builders as cheaply as they could be built on foreign soil by foreign builders.

Again, in 1884 the Democratic Party made this declaration; it is more of an oration at that time, it happens, in regard to the matter, but I will read it, because it sounds good to me:

Under a long period of Democratic rule and policy our merchant marine was fast overtaking and on the point of outstripping that of Great Britain. Under 20 years of Republican rule and policy our commerce has been left to British bottoms, and the American flag has almost been swept off the high seas. Instead of the Republican Party's British policy, we demand for the people of the United States an American policy. Under Democratic rule and policy our merchants and sailors, flying the Stars and Stripes in every port, successfully searched out a market for the varied products of American industry; under a quarter of a century of Republican rule and policy—despite our manifest advantage over all other nations in high-paid labor, favorable climate, and teeming soils; despite freedom of trade among all these United States; despite their population by the foremost races of men, and an annual immigration of the young, thrifty, and adventurous of all nations; despite our freedom here from the inherited burdens of life and industry in the Old World monarchies, their costly war navies, their vast tax-consuming, nonproducing standing armies; despite 20 years of peace—that Republican rule and policy have managed to surrender to Great Britain, along with our commerce, the control of the markets of the world. Instead of the Republican Party's British policy, we demand, in behalf of the American Democracy, an American policy. Instead of the Republican Party's discredited scheme and false pretense of friendship for American labor, expressed by imposing taxes, we demand in behalf of the Democracy freedom for American labor, by reducing taxes, to the end that these United States may compete with unhindered powers for the primacy among nations in all the arts of peace and fruits of liberty.

So your party declaration went in the year of grace 1884, when we first elected Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President after the Civil War. In 1888, in 1892, in 1896, and in 1900 there seemed to have been no declarations of any party policy or principle in regard to this matter; but beginning with the year 1904, when Judge Parker, of New York, was our candidate for President, we find this subject again recurring in Democratic platforms. I read next, Mr. President, from the Democratic platform of the year 1904. In that year we said this:

We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury.

In 1908 we repeated that language, except that we said "we believe in" instead of saying "we favor."

In 1912—the last campaign, the one which resulted in President Wilson's election—we used this language:

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation—

Were those words put there for nothing? It seems to me as though in this present moment and in its full light they have a significant and powerful meaning.

MERCHANT MARINE.

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Ah, Senators, I told you just now that, as I regarded my own circumstances, I was pledged specifically to the people of Georgia against Government ownership of almost every kind. I tell you now that, in my honest judgment, taking this platform as it is written and giving it a thorough and just construction, every Democratic Senator who has been elected since its adoption or who concurred in its sentiments in the campaign in which it was promulgated is likewise bound not to support any proposition to build an American merchant marine by bounties or out of the Public Treasury. And yet the pending bill proposes to build these ships entirely out of the Public Treasury and at the expense of the taxpayers. And yet some of our colleagues say that we who favor recommittal are recreant to Democratic faith because we do not take their judgment in this matter, which is either not a declared matter of party principle or policy, or, so far as we can fairly and reasonably judge from what has been declared, is in the teeth of every platform that the national Democracy of this great Republic has ever written. Instead of being the "new freedom" it is the "new departure," and for one I am unwilling to take it.

Senators, in the beginning—and I have enough faith and confidence in the President to believe it is so even yet—the President occupied a position on this particular measure that was not incompatible with the ancient Democratic faith nor with the declared principles and policies of our party on this great question. In the beginning President Wilson insisted—and, so far as I now know or have a right to say, he still insists, in spite of the action of this body or of any Democratic conference of this body—that this was to be a temporary measure. I can prove that to you not only from the address that he made to the Congress of the United States when Congress assembled in December last, but also from the recent speech that he made in the city of Indianapolis on the 8th day of last January.

Referring to this bill, which was then pending in the House of Representatives, not yet incubated in this august body, the President of the United States used this language on the 8th day of December last, when he addressed the two Houses of Congress in joint session assembled:

Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session but as yet—

And I emphasize the words "as yet"—

passed by neither House. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and can not wisely be postponed. The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide.

Senators, if you will pardon me an aside for just a moment, the "gates of trade" to which the President referred on the

8th of December were the "gates of trade" between this country and South America. Now, it seems that for political reasons it is contended in this body that the "gates of trade" which it is desired to open are those between this country and Europe, in order to ship our cotton and grain and products of that kind, so as to put the impelling force of the people who think they will get something out of it behind this measure.

The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable—

Now, mark this language, Senators, particularly—

and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

Showing that the great President of the United States himself recognized the soundness of the Democratic position I have taken to-day on this floor and that has been enunciated in many national declarations of our party, and was urging this as a temporary war measure to meet an abnormal situation for a brief period of time until normal conditions should return.

Not only that, but in his speech at Indianapolis, delivered on the 8th day of January, the anniversary of Jackson's victory at New Orleans, in discussing the shipping bill, the President of the United States used these words to his audience:

Do you know, gentlemen, that the ocean freight rates have gone up in some instances to ten times their ordinary figure, and that the farmers of the United States—those who raise grain and those who raise cotton, these things that are absolutely necessary to the world as well as to ourselves—can not get any profit out of the great prices that they are willing to pay for these things on the other side of the sea because the whole profit is eaten up by the extortionate charges for ocean carriage? In the midst of this the Democrats propose a temporary measure of relief in a shipping bill.

Senators, I have the shipping bill before me, the last substitute offered on this floor by the distinguished and able Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and I defy any Senator in charge of this bill, or any other Senator on this floor—and I gladly invite interruption on this point—to show me anything in it which makes this a temporary measure by its terms as written. On the contrary, I want to read you some provisions to indicate that, so far as this bill is concerned, it is a permanent departure that we are engaged in if we vote for this bill in its present form and shape. I read now from the last substitute presented by the Senator from Florida:

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

In other words, until Congress passes a law repealing this measure, it is to remain in force forever and ever, and unless Congress at some future date does pass a law repealing this measure, then it is to be of full force and effect forever and a day. Again:

SEC. 10. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report—

And so forth.

Ah, gentlemen, the President of the United States, recognizing the true and ancient Democratic faith, but insisting that a great emergency had arisen in which normal rules could not be applied and normal principles could not be strictly adhered to, asks you to give to the people of this country a temporary measure to meet a great war emergency. Yet you have given us a bill that, so far as the law itself is concerned, is permanent and perpetual in its operation and is in conflict with every tenet of Democratic faith from Jefferson's day to this. You did not do it in the way and put it on the ground that the President of the United States insisted upon—that it was a great war emergency measure to meet an abnormal condition, an enterprise which was to be abandoned as soon as the normality of the situation could be restored.

So I say that as this bill now stands it is not in accordance with what the President of the United States recommended and urged upon the Congress of the United States or upon the people of the United States; it is not in accordance with Democratic faith, and we can not justify it upon that basis; and men who feel as I do, and who are pledged as I am, and who entertain the convictions of a lifetime as I do on this subject, can not and will not do it; that is all.

Not only that, but to make it worse, piling Pelion upon Ossa in this matter, I propose to show now that this Democratic caucus that denounces seven of us for standing true to the faith of the fathers and standing even by the President himself upon the proposition of whether or not this measure shall be temporary, voted down a proposition calculated and intended to make this measure a temporary one. It was when I learned of that action, when I saw that purpose written into words and expressed in the bill, and heard that they had denied the proposition that this measure should be made temporary in its character and in its duration, I made up my mind that, as a Democrat who had been nurtured in the school of the ancient faith and as a man who had made the pledges and declarations to his constituency that I have made, I could not, without self-stultification, support the bill in such a form, permanent and epoch making instead of temporary.

I trust I will not be considered as having referred improperly to conference secrets or caucus secrets when I mention the fact that my own distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] offered this proposition. It was overwhelmingly voted down. I got the information from the press, for, because I long had feared that this bill might evolve from that caucus in such a shape that I could not support it, I had not felt at liberty to continue to attend a conference whose work I might not be able to uphold. My colleague, however, offered this amendment, and if I may judge from the public press and from the references made to it here on the floor by Democratic Senators and one Republican Senator, it was overwhelmingly defeated.

I have a great many doubts on the practical and business aspects of this question, but I say frankly that they are not such doubts as would cause me, standing alone and by themselves, except on possibly one question, to venture to dissent at so early a period in my service from the judgment of a vast majority of my colleagues; and yet, when added to the other objections that I have, they may have to some extent influenced my judgment and position about this matter.

If I support this bill at all—and I should like to do it if the necessity for it is as great as is contended, and I should like to do it in order to live and dwell in harmony, so far as my convictions will permit me, with my party associates here and elsewhere—it has to be a temporary measure; and if it is a temporary measure, if that is what it means, if we are standing on President Wilson's message to the Congress on this subject or on his Indianapolis speech, either or both, let me ask, Is it a practical proposition as a temporary question?

If we pass this bill we have got either to build these ships or to buy them. If we buy them, unless we are going to pay extortionate prices, where will we get them except from the belligerent powers? I have no doubt that we could make fairly reasonable trades for these interned German vessels; but, for one, I must confess that I would never, under present circumstances, vote to give to any shipping board on this earth a power that might involve us in grave international troubles and that might lead us into the most ruinous war that we have ever had.

Sometimes I think, when I look at the desolate condition of the South, that about the only blessing we have left down there at the present moment is peace; and I am not going to surrender its safeguarding to any board on this earth, whether made up of Cabinet officers or otherwise. I am not going by my vote to give them the chance or the possibility to do something which I believe, in all probability, will lead us into international complications so grave as to precipitate a great war upon this country.

Well, if we are not going to buy the German ships, the interned vessels—and that seems to be pretty generally conceded now—where are we going to buy them? If the freight rates are as high as the proponents of this bill insist when they urge it, the proposition on which they started on December 8 of last year is unsound, because private capital is then reaping the richest harvest it has ever reaped since the beginning of time in this sort of venture; and if that be true, what man with a ship that can make its value on almost every voyage it takes will sell it unless he gets a value proportionate to the profits he would now make if he retains it? Therefore, unless the Government is to buy either a war or a gold brick, it will buy no ships.

How, then, are we to get them? Of course there is one other way to get them. We might build them. I made some investigation of that subject. The contentions vary as to the length of time it will take to build ships. I will take a 7,500-ton ship as a standard. The contentions as to how long it would take to build such a ship vary from 6 months, as suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], to about 18 months, if my memory serves me correctly, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. If the truth lies between these two extremes, as it usually does, and is somewhere or other about halfway between them, it would take probably about 12 months at least to construct these ships and get them ready to operate, and by that time, in all human probability, I believe—I hope, at least—this great war will be over, and then, before you can get this temporary expedient rigged up, the necessity for it will pass.

Mr. President, there have been various statements made, with more or less temper and acerbity, about the conduct and position of myself and other Senators who have ventured, have dared, on this question to stand squarely, four-footed on our own feet and do what we thought was right. We have been assailed in and out of this Chamber by men who ought to have more self-respect than to condemn us for venturing to have a soul that each of us calls his own. Ah, Senators, think on what slender ground this condemnation, this judgment of conduct, rests. All that we have done in this matter so far is to say that we think this bill ought to be recommitted. We have no agreement, no understanding, no sort of contract, express or implied, with anybody on this earth except to recommit this bill to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator believe, if this bill is recommitted, that there is any probability whatever of its being reported back to the Senate during this session?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator frankly. Of course he understands that I answer absolutely and only for myself.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I can answer for no one except myself. I can tell the Senator what I know, so far as I am concerned, and what I believe—that if this bill is recommitted to the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Commerce amends it, as I believe it will amend it, so as to make the measure a temporary measure to meet a great and abnormal war situation, as the President recommended and urged, and so that it contains also a provision that no shipping board shall be allowed to purchase interned ships without the consent of the opposite belligerent powers, so that we may not involve this country in a war, then I believe the bill will be promptly re-reported and, as far as I am concerned, will be passed. With these amendments I could support it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield, of course.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says that if the bill is reported back and if certain amendments are made he believes it will be passed. He, of course, is more familiar than I with the purposes of those members of the Committee on Commerce with whom——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator pardon me for just a moment? Let me interrupt the Senator. I notice that the public press of New York contains a statement substantially like that from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who entertains practically the views that I do on this question. I mention that merely as corroborating the answer I have given.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator inform us, upon the assumption that the bill will be amended and reported back, why the Republican minority has taken this method of getting rid of the bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will ask the Senator, in answer to that question, to inform me why certain Republican Senators are reported to have entered into a compact with the majority in order to amend a so-called Democratic bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will answer that question, so far as I can, by saying that I do not know that this is the situation.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will ask the Senator another question, then. Does the Senator know whether the Democratic caucus appointed a committee of Senators to see how many Republican votes they could secure for this bill by making concessions to Republicans?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will be equally frank. A committee was appointed such as the Senator mentions——

Mr. HARDWICK. For that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. To confer with Senators upon the other side whose objections to this bill were said not to be fundamental except as it is now framed, but who would be perfectly satisfied with a bill containing some modifications, and whose opinions have never been concealed, but have been openly expressed by one of them at least upon this floor, a situation made necessary by the present attitude of the Senator and his associates.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well. The Senator and I understand each other very well, and I think the Senate and the country understand the situation. There are certain Democrats here who are not willing to vote for this bill without amendment and are not going to do it, and there is not enough power in the United States to make them do it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not doubt the word of the Senator, because he has stated his position very clearly and very positively several times—that he does not intend to and will not vote for the measure.

Mr. HARDWICK. As now framed, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. THOMAS. As now framed. It is that circumstance which has made it necessary to meet and appoint committees to see what, under the circumstances, can be done with other Senators, and which I hope will be done, for the purpose of making this bill effectual.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, Mr. President, I can understand full well why the Senator from Colorado feels that way. I have the highest public and private regard for the Senator, and yet, from his speech yesterday, I find myself as far away from him as the South Pole is from the North Pole. The Senator avowed that he was fast becoming a convert to this new idea of Government ownership; that he at first looked upon it with alarm, then with complacency, and was now about to embrace it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is always frank, and I have no doubt about the positiveness of his convictions. It is true that upon this and perhaps some other matters of public concern we are wide asunder. The fact is equally true over there.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. It simply shows that party organizations at present are held together by the force of party tradition. It simply means that public opinion and party organizations are in flux. I trust the time will soon come when the forces of political gravitation will bring about an alignment which sooner or later is inevitable, since divergence of opinion between the units of parties as they are now organized necessarily means difference, and difference means party dissension. These conditions will bring about a new alignment, and then of course these situations can be met and disposed of, as they should be, by men working in harmony who are now divided by party names.

Mr. HARDWICK. The observation of the Senator from Colorado but confirms the argument I made at an earlier stage of this address against the senseless and futile attempt to make a party question of a matter that is not a party question, and about which men in the same party entertain honest and deep-seated and fundamental differences of opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is a single question of national importance upon which Republicans, so called, or Democrats, so called, are a unit, I do not know what it is. We are on this side of the Chamber because we call ourselves Democrats. Senators on the other side of the Chamber are there because they call themselves Republicans. I venture the assertion that there is not, and for the past 10 years has not been, a question of overshadowing public importance upon which the members of these two great organizations have been a unit upon either side of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I want to submit now for the consideration of my distinguished friend from Colorado, and of certain other Senators on this side who have busied themselves about this matter, this question: Why are you so willing to trade, even on the contents of the measure itself, with Republicans rather than with your own associates, who are demanding no more of you than the President of the United States requested of us all?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, without conceding the last remark to be correct, we are doing so because of the position which the Senator has announced so positively, that we can not under any circumstances longer agree upon our own side of the Chamber, and in his own case I meet the question by repeating it and ask whether it was not necessary for the Senator to make the arrangements they evidently have made with the other side because of his objections?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation, to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will continue.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, in the subsequent part of my remarks I wish to refer again to the difference between my friend from Colorado and myself. To the charge, certainly as far as I am concerned, that I have bolted the Democratic Party, I answer that it is untrue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have not made that charge.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not expressly. I am not alluding to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I should very greatly deplore the fact if it were true.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator knows it is not true. It is untrue. Under the express rules of the caucus itself, I have not been bound to support this measure from the beginning, but the charge that we did not advise Democrats on this side whom we knew were opposed to this motion to recommit of the fact that it was about to be made, I answer that it is manifestly foolish to expect sensible, practical men who want to adopt a motion to recommit or any other parliamentary motion in any legislative body to go to the enemies of the particular proposition they have in mind for support when they know in advance that they can not get it under any circumstances. The Senator knows, of course, full well, as all his associates do, that in the Democratic caucus we made repeated demands and repeated pleas for these things that we now ask publicly before the Senate and before the people of the United States.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I was present at the Democratic caucus all the time the Senator was there, and I do not recall that the Senator made any repeated demands or repeated appeals or repeated arguments along the line he now presents.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator from Maryland will do me the honor to read in the RECORD in the morning my exact language, he will see that I did not claim I did it myself. Being a young and modest member of the caucus and of the Senate, I left most of the talking to others. But I want to say this to the Senator: I stayed in the caucus until I became convinced that it was no longer a free conference, such as Democrats have been holding in this body for, lo, these many years, and that an attempt to gag and bind me was against my convictions. I discovered you were not going to follow the path your President and mine had pointed out to both of us, and that you were going to make this measure permanent instead of temporary, as he had urged. I stayed in caucus until I became convinced that if I should support the measure as the caucus proposed and framed it I would stultify my mentality in the matter and violate my pledges to my own constituency.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to ask the Senator if he gave to his associates knowledge of the fact that he was going to leave the caucus?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I am just about to come to that very point. The Senator's interruption is timely. When I discovered what the situation was and what the result of this conference in all probability would be I conferred with my distinguished colleague from my own State, advising him of my conviction and of my views, and I requested him to inform the caucus—and I have been informed since that he informed the caucus—of my position and state that the measure as originally framed would not, unless amended, receive my support, owing to the pledges I had made to my own constituency.

Now, referring once more to the charge, disingenious and insincere, of secret dealing, of conspiracy, if you please, that the distinguished diplomatic and wise Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]—I am sorry he is not here—ventured to make on this floor against certain of his Democratic associates; if we conferred with certain Republican Members of this body to find out whether or not they intended to support this motion if made, we did so, as I said just now, without committing ourselves to the defeat of this bill in any form, without committing ourselves to vote for or against any amendment. If we conferred, we had a distinguished example. We had distinguished company. Before this time Senators in this Chamber and the Chief Executives of both parties have not hesitated to confer with Senators of the opposite party about various legislative matters. In this particular matter the Senate Democratic conference appointed a committee of three, if I may believe the public press, to confer with Republican Senators. A committee of three, consisting of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], were appointed to confer. To confer with whom? To confer with their Democratic associates who had troubles about the bill in its present form, but might be able to support it if concessions were made to them? Not primarily, at least, but to confer with certain distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle, to go to them with hands up and say, "Help us, Cassius, or we sink. What do you want? What do you demand? What is your price? We will let Republican Senators really write this bill rather than to concede to our own colleagues, who base their stand on Democratic principles and Democratic doctrine as old as the fathers of this Republic." You conferred with them. You did this because we, forsooth, did not like the way they acted about this matter, because we found Democratic principle and precedent set at naught. We were ignored, and they said, "We will go to the Republicans and let them write this bill."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it only fair that the Senator should state that the committee to which he has just referred was instructed first to confer with him and his associates.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought it was the other way. I am glad the Senator has advised me to the contrary.

Mr. THOMAS. And we consented to an adjournment of 24 hours at the request of the President pro tempore of the Senate for that purpose, but our intended negotiations, as we feared, proved abortive.

Mr. HARDWICK. If it will not embarrass the Senator and he will not object, let me ask him this question: Were the same Senators who were instructed to confer with these Senators also instructed to confer with the Republicans?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes, Mr. President. We apprehended, as the situation afterwards proved, that the attempt which the Senator says we should have made would prove, as it did prove, disappointing.

Mr. HARDWICK. It was the very reverse, with all deference to my friend.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think I am mistaken. If I am, I stand corrected.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not mean to question the fact, but I am simply stating what I heard. The very reverse, as I understand it, is the true situation. On the question of appointing the same committee at one and the same time to confer about the bill reaching this way and that way I will not characterize it. It was not very respectful nor appropriate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator and his associates had only let us know in advance that his idea of the ceremony to be observed would have been the appointment of two separate committees, then we would have done it in the caucus. If that is the objection which caused them to refuse to accede to our request, we will appoint a separate committee now.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. That is a mere matter of taste. De gustibus non est disputandum. There is nothing further to say about it.

But the proposition that we declined to consider anything I can not allow to go unchallenged. What we did do was this: We asked the committee to agree to the motion to recommit, and further we explained the views we had and the amendments we would like to have made. We discussed that with our associates with candor and with some fullness.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is correct, Mr. President. There is no difference between us.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right. I am glad we are at last together on one point.

Mr. THOMAS. We are together on that proposition, but if the Senator will pardon me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If they had informed the committee that they had committed themselves and were in honor bound to vote to recommit this bill, as we would know full well that that meant to settle it for all time, so far as this session was concerned, we necessarily would have had to accept it as a finality. I am here to say, Mr. President, that I believe if this bill is recommitted without positive and mandatory instructions to report it, it is "as dead as Cæsar" at this session of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to say to the Senator when he makes that statement he takes a great deal upon himself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is my belief, and I will assume all the responsibility.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is an awful responsibility for a Member of this body to take about the conduct of his associates with which he is not informed.

Mr. THOMAS. I said that was the assumption made in consequence of negotiations ended, and also that it is my belief and my conviction that the recommittal of the bill means its death, in so far as this session is concerned.

Mr. HARDWICK. That any bill will pass at all at this session is a matter of great doubt under these rules and with vigorous and determined opposition to a measure of this kind. At this present session of Congress the Senator knows as well as I do that it is almost beyond our power to pass such a measure unless we were harmoniously united on a certain proposition, and even then it is doubtful.

But what I do say to the Senator, and what I do not want him to get wrong, is this, that it is possible that this bill might be amended so as to meet some of the most serious objections of Senators on this side so that we all might have a chance to agree on it and to see that a united Democratic, or practically a solid Democratic, support should be given to it.

Mr. President, I had intended, before I discovered how much time I was consuming, to make some few references to some of the gentle and diplomatic statements of my two friends, the distinguished Senators from Missouri. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is one of my warmest personal friends in this body. He is one of the gentlemen who made me welcome in it, and he has done all he could in a personal way to make my short stay in this body pleasant. So far as the junior Senator from Missouri, whom personally I like very much, undertook to read us a lecture about the "poor old Shipping Trust," of course he did not mean to do it; he was speaking upon the spur of the moment and in excitement when he intimated that this Shipping Trust had somebody by the throat. If the Senator meant to apply that to any one of his colleagues on this side, either he or the Senator in question would be unworthy of a seat here. I know the Senator from Missouri did not mean anything of the kind. It just shows to what extreme men can go when they get excited. And yet I have heard such suggestions as that thrown out on this floor on all sides in debate. They are simply disgusting. They are unworthy of Senators and unworthy of the Senate, and can not be made legitimately under the rules of this body.

Now, I will not say any more on that. It is beneath my notice, and I have not intended to hurt the Senator's feelings in saying that much. I say it is beneath my notice and beneath my dignity and worthy only of contempt. So far as I am concerned, I shall make no reply to such vile suggestions. Of course the Senator meant nothing personal by it, but I say this to the junior Senator from Missouri, his present rôle is both refreshing and unusual. With all the zeal of a recent convert he rushes to attack a position that he thinks the President now holds, and assails the position that the President assumes in public speech and public message. Oh, gentlemen, if I had not made these remarks too long and if good nature permitted me, I would be glad to read to the Senate and the country a few chapters from REED on Regularity.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I trust the gentleman will do so. If he can find where I have ever violated a Democratic platform, where I have ever broken a caucus regulation, where I ever have either gone into a caucus or stayed out of a caucus and refused to obey the will of the majority of my associates expressed in caucus, I shall be very glad to have him present the evidence.

Mr. HARDWICK. If I could do it, I would not.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator can not do it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I might call attention to some things.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. HARDWICK. I could call attention to some recent performances of the Senator. I do not know whether you made the banking and currency bill a party measure or not. Did you? They did in the other House?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we took the banking and currency bill into caucus. I sat in caucus and I helped to frame it in caucus. I made a speech for it on the floor. I defended it from attack on the floor. I voted for it.

Mr. HARDWICK. What was the Senator trying to do when he was kicking up so much stir over here?

Mr. REED. I expect I was agitating a number of misinformed gentlemen who did not know what the committee was doing or what I was doing. We were trying to make the bill a good and workable bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what we are trying to do with this one.

Mr. REED. No; the cases are not parallel.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right.

Mr. REED. That hole in the fence is not large enough even for the gentleman to squeeze through. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly, I will yield to the Senator as long as he likes.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator has brought up this matter. The banking and currency bill came from the House of Representatives and went to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Many grave questions came up in the committee which the committee discussed from time to time. One of the early questions was whether there should be hearings. In company with some others I insisted upon hearings. We continued the hearings for about two weeks, with the result that the chairman of the committee, who had himself introduced into the Senate an exact duplicate of the House bill, wrote and submitted some 234 amendments. Thereafter we continued our deliberations, various important amendments being made. Then came a division in the committee, which I think never ought to have occurred. In company with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] I joined the four Democrats who had seen fit to leave the committee; we joined them and sat with them and continued to amend the bill. Finally a caucus was called, and we carried the bill to the caucus of our associates. We debated it with them; we took party counsel upon it; and when the caucus had passed upon the bill, we came on the floor of the Senate and defended it.

Now, that is the fact, no matter what the fuss may have been. I say frankly to the Senator I do not blame him for laboring under a misunderstanding, because there was a good deal of wild talk at that time, but, so far as my part is concerned, if a man's party regularity can be demonstrated by his acts, my regularity and devotion to the party was demonstrated by my every act in regard to that bill. As is well known, I gave up many things that I thought were important, yielding to the judgment of my associates, and finally spoke and voted for the bill as the caucus had directed. Moreover, as one of the conferees of the Senate, I contended stubbornly to sustain in conference the mandates of the Democratic caucus.

Now, if the Senator knows of any other particular irregularity of mine, I would be glad to have him mention it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I do not believe I will; I might.

Mr. REED. I should be glad to have the Senator try. He could do it if anybody could.

Mr. HARDWICK. As far as that is concerned, let me say to the Senator that to my mind consistency is one of the important virtues, and I would be the last man in the world to criticize him for some of his performances, even if they were untenable, as I thought they were. So I will not pursue the subject. I accept the statement the Senator makes about his own conduct. He knows better than anybody else in the world. I had an idea that he had been kicking up a good deal, and that the rôle of President's defender and champion of the party caucus was a new one for him. But I am new to the Senate, and I may not know.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon a further interruption?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I am not posing as the President's defender. I have not undertaken that rôle. I have not been requested to assume it. I think the President is not likely to call on anyone to act as his mouthpiece or champion. This particular bill commended itself to my judgment, not in every respect but in its main features. I went into the party caucus. By going into the caucus, I in effect said to every other member of the caucus, "I meet with you; I shall insist upon my views; if I get them, I will be happy and you must abide the result. If, on the other hand, my views are not accepted and yours are, I shall likewise abide by the result." That has been my attitude.

I made a speech here the other day, as the Senator says, on the spur of the moment. If he will permit me just one word, I did not in that speech say the Senator from Georgia or any Senator was owned by the Shipping Trust. I meant nothing of the kind. I meant to say that the action they had taken seriously endangered if not, in fact, killed the shipping bill. I meant to say that the Shipping Trust had been opposing this bill, as it has been opposing nearly every other bill that has been introduced in Congress for many years which in any way trenches upon its supreme control of the shipping business of the seas. I said, and now say, that the votes which had then just been cast had made the trust very happy. I did not mean to say that the trust had reached, by improper influences, any Senator. Indeed I know some Senators who voted for the motion to refer the bill who were inspired by the loftiest, although the most mistaken, of motives. I know that; but unfortunately those lofty motives led them to take action which exactly coordinated with the desires of the Shipping Trust, and so I made a few remarks about the Shipping Trust.

As far as the personal honor, honesty, and integrity of the Senator from Georgia are concerned, no man has ever questioned it. I certainly would be the last to do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the Senator. Of course I knew he felt that way. I know further that if the Senator from Missouri had in his campaign made pledges to his constituency inconsistent with the support of this measure, in its pending form at least, he would not abate therefrom one jot or tittle. No party conference or caucus could require such a sacrifice of any Senator. It would be infamous if it sought to do so.

Mr. President, I have almost concluded the remarks that I wished to make. In the beginning of my remarks to-day I told the Senate and the country my high estimate of the present President of the United States. At a time when many Senators on this floor who now are almost sycophantic in their attitude were fighting him from one end of this Republic to the other and were asserting that he was unworthy of the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I was at home campaigning my own State for him and doing my best there and elsewhere for his nomination as well as election. I did not then agree, and I did not thereby agree, to surrender my manhood to him, to surrender my judgment to him, to surrender my principles to him, and I should never have had the high respect for him I have if I thought he was a man to even desire such a sacrifice of any man.

Mr. President, I will say one thing, because it ought to be said, and it ought to be said in this presence, on this floor, and now, in my honest judgment. I do not know what has led the President into a position of appearing to coerce the Congress. I sometimes think the Members of both Houses of Congress have gone to him and pushed him into these things, have sought to unload their troubles on him, to unload their responsibilities on his broad and magnificent shoulders, until we have gotten into a situation, in my judgment, which is unfortunate for this country.

For one I believe in the coordination of powers. I believe in the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of this Government remaining independent, separate, and coordinate and coequal. For one I dare assert in this presence, here and now, that it will be a sad day for this Republic, a sad day for the Democratic Party, a sad day for whatever party establishes the practice or the doctrine that legislation is to be written by the executive departments of the Government and that this great Senate, so long the sheet anchor of American Government, in many respects surrenders its independence to any man, however great. God forbid that that day should come. I should feel recreant to the oath I took at that stand, I should feel unworthy of the imperial State whose commission I bear on this floor, if I did not stand in my manhood against any such thing as that.

The President of the United States in vetoing the immigration bill used this expression in withholding his approval, as I said a moment ago, from a measure on which almost two-thirds of his legislative colleagues in the Democratic Party dissent from him. He used these words:

> But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

The President is right, everlastingly right, although I disagree with him fundamentally on that particular question. If his judgment and his conscience do not approve a measure, if every Democrat in both Houses of Congress voted for it, he ought to veto it; but I say that same doctrine applies to a Senator of these United States and to a Member of the House of Representatives. They, too, have constitutional functions to perform; they, too, have sacred public duties to discharge. I say that any one of them would be false to the highest and best conception of American government if he did not stand for his own convictions, if he did not do what he believed to be right. I do not mean by that to say that we must not have party cooperation, and even party action, on subjects that are real party matters; but I do say that a man ought to stand by his conscience and his judgment as to what is right and wrong in legislation, and he ought to keep the pledges he has made, just as it is reported—and, of course, there is no doubt about it—that the President was keeping a pledge made in the campaign when he vetoed the immigration bill.

I read again from President Woodrow Wilson's speech at Indianapolis on Jackson Day, in which he himself describes his concept of his duties and responsibilities as to matters of this kind. He said:

> I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent person.

Ah, Senators, I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent Senator when it comes to these great fundamental questions on which I am pledged to my own people, and which I have a right not only in party forums but in that higher forum of conscience and of honor and of duty to assert my convictions. The President said:

> I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent person; and I want to say this distinctly, I do not love any party any longer than it continues to serve the immediate and pressing needs of America. I have been bred in the Democratic Party, but I love America a great deal more than I love the Democratic Party.

A broad, independent, patriotic statement from a great American. I am not reading it to criticize him, but I am reading it to ask the Senate and the people of this country how seven Senators, who, following a profound conviction of public duty, have dared to be independent, have dared to voice their convictions for what is best, for what is right, and for what is necessary for the people of this country, can be criticized for exercising that same independence for which we glorify our great President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the able argument just delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] leaves very little for me to say or rather makes it necessary for me to say but very little in defense of the position which I have taken on this bill, and for which I have been, along with the other six recalcitrants, very bitterly and cruelly criticized.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party is greater than any man, or self-selected set of men, however great they may be in their own conceit. The virtue of the Democratic Party is in the purity of its principles, and its strength lies in the consentient judgment, the moral qualities, and intellectual acquirements of its adherents. In the realm of reason there is no proscription and where pure democracy prevails shackles are unknown.

> "We must be free or die who speak the tongue
> That Shakespeare spake: the faith and morals hold
> Which Milton held."

The hour has struck, the time has arrived when calmness and serious thought, undisturbed by passion and uncolored by prejudice, should characterize the deliberations of this body. An angered brain is the storm center of indiscretion—the Pandora box of infinite evil. A wise economy of words in debate may probably serve to cement and unite the Democrats of this body in the service of the Nation. Let me commend to the Senate, and especially my brethren on this side, the wise words of an ancient Greek, whose heroic soul had felt the hot iron of adversity and experienced the trials and vicissitudes of a stormy public career:

> "Tossed on a sea of troubles, Soul, my Soul,
> Thyself do thou control;
> And to the weapons of advancing foes
> A stubborn breast oppose;
> Undaunted 'mid the hostile might
> Of squadrons burning for the fight,
> Thine be no boasting when the victor's crown
> Wins thee deserved renown;
> Thine no dejected sorrow, when defeat
> Would urge a base retreat:
> Rejoice in joyous things—nor overmuch
> Let grief thy bosom touch
> 'Midst evil, and still bear in mind
> How changeful are the ways of humankind."

Mr. President, we were regaled with a very remarkable fulmination in this Chamber from one of the Members of this body on Wednesday afternoon. I shall not emulate the example of

the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri in the manner of his oratory or the viciousness and egotism of the subject matter of his extraordinary discourse. His verbal evacuation is flavored with the bile of malice and smells to heaven with the odor of duplicity and the stifling fumes of injustice. His arrogant assumption of leadership of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate would be considered immodest and unbecoming—aye, unexpected—of one less gifted in the art of political tergiversation and sleight-of-hand performance in the rôle of statecraft. His fame for performing acrobatic feats and the harmonizing accomplishments of the chameleon, like the fame of Joshua of old, has been noised abroad throughout the land. I would not transgress the rules of this body or be guilty of the indecorum of which I would be guilty if I dared to reciprocate in kind the courtesies shown by the distinguished Senator in debate to the seven Senators who were the targets of his obloquy and biting criticism by relating all that rumor whispers—much of which may be true, but I trust not, of the peculiar antics cut in politics, in days gone by, by the learned and choleric senatorial scold from Missouri. Behold him as he appeared on that occasion in this Chamber. A past grand master in the rôle of mock heroics, with a countenance clouded with the gathering storm of affected righteous indignation, his lips pouting like the mouth of the blowfish emptying its belly of bad air, eyes streaked with the fury of the tempest raging in his outraged soul, he holds up to the scorn and contempt of the American people Senators whose only offense was refusal to yield to his imperious dictation—to crook the pregnant hinges of the knee that patronage might follow fawning—to violate their every sense of obligation to their constituents and repudiate every idea of loyalty to the Democratic Party, its platform of principles, and its sacred, time-honored traditions, to follow his lead.

Mr. President, in the name of all the dead gods of ancient Greece at once, upon what meat doth this great Senator feed that he hath suddenly grown so puffed up? Mr. President, the issue which confronts the Democratic Party and the Nation at this moment is an important one. The present is pregnant with much good or much harm to the Republic. It may be the turning point of time in the economic policy of this great Government; it may be the inauguration of a policy which may work for the good of all the people, for the preservation of our institutions, and for the general welfare of humanity. On the other hand, the result may be the contrary of what I have described and for which we all hope. I trust, however, the former may be its fate. I believe in Democratic principles. I believe in the Democratic polity of government. I believe that upon the right understanding and correct application of Democratic principles depends the life of the Republic. I am also profoundly of the opinion that Democratic ideas and principles can not be enacted into law without maintaining a compact, efficient, militant organization. As a matter of truth no great governmental scheme or principle of political economy was ever enacted into law but that had behind it the all-impelling force to that end, of a well organized and disciplined political faction. For that reason I have always believed in party primaries and conventions. I have always maintained that political platforms should be carefully framed and thoroughly considered, and when adopted by the people they should be carried out religiously in letter and spirit by the public servants of the people. They should be the political confession of faith for every man and woman who maintains allegiance to that organization. There is no obligation so binding upon me in the performance of my duties as a United States Senator as the platform promises enunciated at Baltimore upon which Gov. Woodrow Wilson ran and was elected President of these United States. That platform is the chart which shall guide me over the political seas during the next two years as it has been the chart to guide me in the two years just past. That platform shall be the polar star by which my political craft shall be steered. To that platform I owe allegiance and I shall not respect or recognize the right of any one man, or 36 men, behind closed doors, away from the searching eye of public scrutiny, under the direction, probably, of some extraneous influence, to do and utter things which many of them in their hearts may not believe or approve, to instruct me to violate that platform.

Now, let us consider this question for a moment. Let us see if there is anything in the Baltimore platform touching upon the question at issue. The Democratic platform of 1912 contains this plank:

"We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury."

Is there anything in this bill demanded by this plank of the platform? Are the ships proposed to be bought to be run at public expense? The President announced in the outset that the venture was to be of such a doubtful nature that private capital could not be expected to invest. "Big business" could not afford it, but the patient toiler who can not help himself may be taxed to supply the necessary funds. Is it proposed to take any money out of the Public Treasury for the purpose of carrying on this losing business? Is any additional burden to be put upon the aching stoop of the man who tills the soil? Is toll to be exacted of the man who delves into the bowels of the earth and takes out the coal that makes the steam that turns the wheels of commerce? The laboring men on the railroads, in the shops, and factories—are they expected to make good the losses of this business?

The farmers of Mississippi and the South were forced to sell their cotton last fall at less than one half of its value because of the conditions brought about by the war in Europe for which they were in no way responsible, and when we went to the Federal Government, when we implored the President, to help us pass the bill providing for lending the Government's credit that the farmers might be enabled to hold their cotton and wait for normal conditions to be restored before being forced to sell we were met with the statement that such a proposition was socialistic, populistic, and visionary. We were told that the head and not the heart must settle this problem. It was socialism to help the toiler; it was populism run mad to help protect the man whose labor clothes and feeds the world; but it is orthodox democracy, sound political economy, and the flowering of justice now to take the money contributed for the support of the Government by the suffering laborer and spend it to maintain a line of boats to carry the cotton to foreign markets for the speculator and the broker. Not content with permiting the farmer to be robbed of the products of his patient toil he must now be burdened with another debt in order that the great masters of finance, the promoters of "big business" shall enjoy larger profits. And I as the representative, the servant, of that toiler, commissioned by him and all classes of people in my State to do equal and exact justice to all and special favors to none in matters of legislation, am commanded by the secret caucus to vote to pile higher and higher still the burden under which he is now groaning.

Mr. President, the suggestion is monstrous. It outrages every idea of loyalty and sense of fidelity to a sacred trust. I believe a man can stay in Washington long enough to lose the common touch, to forget him who, bowed by the weight of taxation, leans upon his hoe and gazes upon the ground, the tragedy of injustice written upon his sad face and on his back the burden of the world. Rather than betray him in that way I would surrender my commission—my right to a seat in this Chamber—and go back to the quiet shades of private life.

I have no fear of the withering scorn of the self-constituted censor of the secret caucus, the petulent senior Senator from Missouri; his threat of political ostracism has no terrors for me at all. I despise with all my heart and spurn with ineffable contempt the suggestion. My service to the Democratic Party in this body does not depend upon what somebody may think, say, or do. I am not a mere parasite, existing upon the patronage of power or the prestige of place. I shall live by my own convictions. I shall act the things I believe. "No pleasure to me is comparable to standing upon the vantage ground of truth." And from the altitude of that high purpose I shall look down with pitying contempt on the unfortunate individual who would question my right to do so.

But let us go a little further. The Democrats, in the platform of 1908, had this to say:

"We believe in upbuilding the American merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury."

When was that command withdrawn? Who authorized the self-idolized leaders of the immortal thirty-six to revoke that order?

But that is not all. The platform of 1904 has something to say on this subject also:

"We denounce the ship-subsidy bill recently passed by the United States Senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical, and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstructions raised by Republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea. We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury."

There is no doubt about the meaning of that language either. It has no uncertain sound. It is the voice of the unterrified, patriotic, brave masses of this Republic—the men who really keep the banner of democracy in the air—men who would "spurn with contumely the power that bends the coward's knees and forces from the lips of treachery the lies of praise." If it was the truth then—principles do not, like Senators, change; they are immortal—it is the truth now, and I will not violate it.

Mr. President, I have searched the annals of the Democratic Party. I have studied carefully its platform announcements. I have read the great debates of able Senators—George, of Mississippi, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever sat in this body; the erudite and accomplished Vest, of Missouri, in whose seat the scolding Senator from that State now expands; and scores of others—who have discussed the question of ship subsidy in this Chamber, and I have failed utterly to discover or find one scintilla of argument of approval in the history of the party in favor of the principles involved in this ship-purchase bill. To my mind it is the worst form of subsidy, because we do not know how much it is going to cost the taxpayers. It is vaguely indefinite—the flowering of legislative disingenuousness. It is also class legislation of the most indefensible and atrocious type. Whatever may be its purpose or design, there is one thing certain—it will not do the laborer, the farmer, the producer, any good. As I said a moment ago, the laborer will bear the burden and somebody else will reap the profits.

No, it will not benefit the men who need help, but, on the contrary, the patient, silent, long-suffering many will be forced by this law to contribute their hard-earned pennies to the already plethoric purses of the favored few.

You can not build up a merchant marine such as is contemplated in the Democratic platform of 1912—such as all patriotic Americans desire, such as I with all my heart desire—at the expense of the Government unless you are going to build up a permanent Government-owned merchant marine. It has been clearly and unmistakably demonstrated in this Chamber that in order to make a shipping business profitable there must be land connections, there must be feeders to give the ships cargoes. You can no more build up a profitable, independent, permanent merchant marine under this bill than you can teach a child to walk without putting its feet on the floor.

Now, if it is the purpose of the President to embark the United States Government upon a new policy—if the principles for which the Democratic Party has stood during all of its history are to be set aside and the National Government is to go into the business of owning ships and other agencies of transportation and commerce—I shall be glad to cooperate with the President in the development of a plan looking to that end. But it is a matter that can not be worked out in a day. For such an undertaking to succeed the foundations for the superstructure must be laid broad and deep. Perfect symmetry must be preserved if the system shall endure. And I do not think that the Democratic administration would be justified in embarking upon this entirely new policy until the people shall have been given an opportunity to pass upon it. I have infinite faith in the good judgment and divine common sense of the masses. This is their Government, and before taking a step which involves a measure of such far-reaching consequences I prefer to hear from the people.

Discussing this question, the historian Bancroft said—and I quote his language as the better expression of my own views:

"If reason is a universal faculty, universal decision is the nearest criterion of truth. The common mind winnows opinions; it is the sieve which separates error from certainty. The exercise by many of the same faculty on the same subject would naturally lead to the same conclusions. But if not, the very differences of opinion that arise prove the supreme judgment of the general mind.

* * * * * * *

"The public is wiser than the wisest critic. In Athens the arts were carried to perfection when the 'fierce democracy' was in the ascendant; the temple of Minerva and the works of Phidias were planned and perfected to please the common people. When Greece yielded to tyrants her genius for excellence in art expired, or, rather, the purity of taste disappeared, because the artist then endeavored to gratify a patron and therefore humored his caprice, while before he had endeavored to delight the race.

* * * * *

"In like manner, the best government rests on the people and not on the few, on persons and not on property, on the free development of public opinion and not on authority, because the munificent Author of our being has conferred the gifts of mind upon every member of the human race without distinction of outward circumstances. Whatever of other possessions may be engrossed, the mind asserts its own independence. Lands, estates, the produce of minds, the prolific abundance of the seas, may be usurped by a privileged class. Avarice assuming the form of ambitious power may grasp realm after realm, subdue continents, compass the earth in its schemes of aggrandizement, and sigh after worlds, but mind eludes the power of appropriation; it exists only in its own individuality. It is a property which can not be confiscated and can not be torn away. It laughs at chance, it bursts from imprisonment, it defies monopoly. A government of equal rights must, therefore, rest upon mind, not wealth, not brute force; some of the moral intelligence of the community should rule the state. Proscription can no more assume to be a valid plea for political injustice; society studies to eradicate established abuses and to bring social institutions and laws into harmony with moral right—not dismayed by the natural and necessary imperfections of all human effort, and not giving way to despair because every hope does not at once ripen into fruit.

* * * * *

"It is hard for the pride of cultivated philosophy to put its ear to the ground and listen reverently to the voice of lowly humanity; yet the people collectively are wiser than the most gifted individual, for all his wisdom constitutes but a part of others. When the great sculptor of Greece was endeavoring to fashion the perfect model of beauty he did not passively imitate the form of the loveliest woman of his age, but he gleaned the several lineaments of his faultless work from the many. And so it is that a perfect judgment is the result of comparison, where error eliminates error and truth is established by concurring witnesses. The organ of truth is the invisible decision of the unbiased world; she pleads before no tribunal but public opinion; she owns no safe interpreter but the common mind; she knows no court of appeals but the soul of humanity. It is when the multitude give counsel that right purposes find safety; theirs is the fixedness that can not be shaken; theirs is the understanding which exceeds in wisdom; theirs is the heart of which the largeness is as the sand on the seashore.

* * * * * * *

"It is alone by infusing great principles into the common mind that revolutions in human society are brought about. They never have been, they never can be, effected by superior individual excellence. The age of the Antonines is the age of the greatest glory of the Roman Empire. Men distinguished by every accomplishment of culture and science for a century in succession possessed undisputed sway over more than 100,000,000 men, until at last, in the person of Marcus Aurelius, philosophy herself seemed to mount the throne. And did she stay the downward tendencies of the Roman Empire? Did she infuse new elements of life into the decaying constitution? Did she commence one great beneficent reform? Not one permanent amelioration was effected. Philosophy was clothed with absolute power, and yet absolute power accomplished nothing for humanity. It could accomplish nothing. Had it been possible Aurelius would have wrought a change. Society can be regenerated, the human race can be advanced only by moral principles diffused through the multitude."

As to the wisdom of waiting for an expression from the people, I take the same position on this question that the President does on the question of woman suffrage, and in his veto message on the immigration bill. While it is not pertinent to the question at issue, it is not out of place at this time for me to say in this connection that I do not agree with a great many of my colleagues on the question of Government ownership of public utilities. I remember when the Hon. W. J. Bryan, some years ago, made the prediction that Government ownership of railroads would come in the course of time. His prediction raised such a violent storm of protest in the ranks of the Democratic Party that it looked for a while like the idol of Democracy was going to be knocked into a cocked hat, but not with dignity. I was editing a newspaper in Mississippi at the time, and I was among the few who defended that great statesman's views. Government ownership of railroads, telephones, telegraph lines, and other public utilities has no terror for me. Nor am I opposed to Government ownership of steamboat lines, when I am sure that they are going to be run for the benefit of all the people and contribute to the well-being of society. But this is a matter that can not be entered into in a moment. It is a system that can not be established in a day. The suggestion that it is an emergency measure has no merit in truth.

Now, I want to again asseverate my desire and loyalty to every proposition to build up a merchant marine. Since I came to the Senate as a Member of this body I have voted for every

measure looking to the proper upbuilding of a merchant marine. I have endeavored to carry out the platform as interpreted by the President when he was a candidate for the Presidency in building up a merchant marine. By giving them free passage through the canal, I hoped to stimulate the spirit of enterprise tending to that end. And I also maintained that we have the legal and moral right to extend these special privileges to our own ships, not only ships engaged in coastwise trade but ships engaged in over-seas commerce. With all my heart I believe in building up a merchant marine according to constitutional methods and sound economic principles. But I do not think it would be safe to embark upon a policy of Government ownership at this time for the reasons I have already stated.

Now, something has been said in this discussion about the influence of the Shipping Trust upon certain Senators whose position on this bill does not please a majority on this side of the Chamber. That same unjust intimation was made when a majority of the Democrats, followed the lead of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], in violation of the Democratic platform on the tolls question. They charged us with protecting the coastwise shipping monopoly. But when an opportunity came to open up to the shipbuilders and shipowners of every country in the world the privilege of engaging in the coastwise trade of America these same Democratic Senators who were inclined to denounce the monopoly when the tolls bill was up voted to exclude foreign-built ships.

O, consistency, I fear thou art not the choicest jewel of the senatorial soul!

But, Mr. President, I do not like to dwell upon this phase of this subject. It is indisputable evidence of weakness of any cause for its advocates to abandon the high plane of legitimate argument and descend into the mire of villification. It is unworthy and unbecoming a Senator to indulge in such dishonest and contemptible methods. Their cause must be a weak one if to support it they must resort to such miserable and disingenuous schemes. If the agents of the shipowners of Europe and America have appeared upon the scene, if one of them has discussed this question with a Democratic Senator, be he for or against the bill, I have not heard of it. I am sure such a one has not favored me with the courtesy of a call. I am not, Mr. President, a very hospitable host to the man who is lobbying for legislation in his own interest, and therefore I am not at all surprised that I have been overlooked.

But, Mr. President, the suggestion, I repeat, is too contemptible to deserve even a passing notice. Such a statement, if intended for me, falls absolutely harmless at my feet. Conscious of the rectitude of my position, with no other desire save to serve the people of Mississippi and America as God has given me the light to see it, I can view with serenity the miserable machinations of those who would attempt to injure me. No; it does not hurt me in the least, but it places the man who suggests it in antithesis to truth. He is the antipodal of veracity. He injures his own soul by his mendacity, but does not hurt me. I should despise myself if I had nothing to support my position on this measure but mere suspicion that some banker or his kinsman close to the administration had suggested the purchase of the interned German ships in order that some official high in authority might ultimately profit by it. I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe the President and his Cabinet and the majority of Senators on this floor are doing what they believe to be their duty under the circumstances. Whatever may be their motives, it in no way affects my own. And I despise with all my heart the methods of the assassin of character, it matters not by whom practiced.

But we have been criticized for conferring with the Republicans on this measure. I see nothing morally or politically wrong in that. I have discussed a great many public questions which have come before the Senate with the Republicans of the Senate. But I have not gone to the Republicans in this instance. The Republicans have come to me. I am standing on the indestructible rock of Democratic truth and intrenched behind Democratic precedent. The Republicans have abandoned their former position on the question of ship subsidy and have come over to help us defend the Baltimore platform against its former friends.

Times change and men change with them.

> "Now the good god forbid
> That our renown'd Rome, whose gratitude
> Toward her deserved children is enroll'd
> In Jove's own books, like an unnatural dam
> Should now eat up her own."

But, admitting for the sake of this discussion that the majority of my Democratic colleagues are correct, can it possibly be any worse or more of a crime for me to confer with the Republicans than for the Democratic President and his Don Quixote lieutenant, the astute senior Senator [Mr. STONE] from Missouri, to plow with the heifers of the Progressive element of the Republican Party? It does not lie in the mouth of you gentlemen who have been offering to members of the Republican Party the privilege of amending the bill and going into partnership with you in its formation to criticize me or any other Senator for conferring with the Republicans to the end that we may defeat what we believe to be a measure congenitally pernicious.

Now, I do not object to the President conferring with the Republican Senators. He can do it if he will, but people who live in glass houses ought not to carry too many rocks about in their pockets. Really, Mr. President, I think if this bill shall be passed at all, it should be passed with Republican votes. It is essentially a Republican measure.

Now, a matter personal to myself. It is always distasteful to me to be in discord with the head of my party and those with whom I affiliate politically. But if I am so mentally constituted that I can not change my views on a serious and important matter just to please some one else, I must do one of two things—I must stand by my own convictions and bear the odium of being characterized as a recalcitrant, or prostitute myself by becoming a mere puppet to be moved by the presidential pull. That I will not do. The President may be right. He is a man of great learning. I have never questioned his patriotism. He has his duty to perform as President of this Republic. I honor him for doing it according to the dictates of his own conscience. I sympathize with him, and he has my best wishes. I honor the man—

> "Born and taught
> That serveth not another's will,
> Whose armour is his honest thought,
> And simple truth his utmost skill."

And I arrogate to myself nothing that I do not cheerfully concede to every other man. When this bill came before the Committee on Commerce, I studied it carefully and I endeavored to find out its purposes and to reach a conclusion as to its ultimate effect. I thought the bill should provide that the ships to be purchased should engage in the coastwise trade. My purpose was to reduce the loss to the minimum, and at the same time lower freight rates and thereby break the coastwise shipping monopoly. Some of my colleagues agreed with me, but they said that if that provision were inserted it would result in defeating the bill. They were endeavoring to carry out the President's wishes. They insisted that the measure was temporary in its character—a mere makeshift. It was expected to be a losing investment at first; but they hoped that after a while, when the gates of commerce should be opened wide, it would become profitable, after which the Government was to turn the business over to private enterprise. I said that I could not vote for the bill. I gave my reasons for it in the following interview, which appeared in the public press long before anybody except possibly those who are permitted to enter the holy of holies of the White House thought of making the measure a party question.

I ask permission to have this appear in my remarks without reading, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"I am opposed to this bill because I believe it is the most indefensible form of subsidy yet proposed. It is one of those peculiarly dishonest measures which will 'keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope.' It is violative of every tradition and platform declaration of the Democratic Party. The scheme, as interpreted by the President, is a mistake in policy, wrong in morals, pernicious in principle, and therefore will be disappointing in its ultimate results.

"FINDS NO JUSTIFICATION.

"If the Government ownership and operation of steamboat and railroad lines is to become a permanent policy, there might be some little excuse or justification for this measure; but when we are told by the President that it is only a temporary makeshift—and who will question the authority of the President to speak in this matter?—it leaves it without excuse or justification. In his address to Congress on the 8th of December last the President said: 'It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even when the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.'

"It is a peculiar character of mind which reasons to a conclusion and justifies the appropriation and expenditure of

funds contributed by all the people to an enterprise of this character, which it is admitted must be a losing and unprofitable investment from the start. Congress has just as much right to donate funds from the Public Treasury to the cotton growers of the South who, because of the war in Europe, have lost by the depreciation of the product of their farms something like $450,000,000 this year. Congress has just as much authority to subsidize the cane growers of Louisiana, the beet growers of the Northwest, and the manufacturers of the Northeast as it has to appropriate money to buy ships to carry the manufacturers' products to foreign markets at the cost of all the taxpayers. The cotton growers of the South proposed to give the Government unquestioned security for the loan of $250,000,000 of credit in order to save themselves a loss of $500,000,000, but the Congress, headed by the President, turned a deaf ear to their appeal.

"If their demand was without merits or wrong in principle, who will say this measure is right? I am opposed to this bill because it is class legislation, pernicious in its conception, and necessarily unjust in its execution.

"SEES WASTE OF MONEY.

"It will be remembered that the bill provides for ships to engage in the foreign trade exclusively. The cast-iron, rock-ribbed, Government-favored coastwise monopoly is treated as a sacred thing—too sacred to be touched. The Government-owned boats are to be mere pioneers or business missionaries, as it were. Regardless of the expense, they are expected to go to the waste places of the earth and work up the business to be turned over later to private individuals, who are to reap the profits of a business which has been built up at the expense of all the people. The whole scheme, to my mind, involves an unwarranted, illegal, and immoral prodigality of money coined by the sweat and blood of the masses of this country and extorted from them by unjust and immoral laws.

"It is a dangerous departure, an innovation upon our time-honored system, violative of the spirit of our Government, and, I fear, the issue will be trouble to the party that proposes it and chagrin for the men who conceive it. I am in favor of an American merchant marine. I shall vote for such measures as may be necessary to put our ships on the dead level of opportunity with the ships of all other countries that come into our ports. If we shall by law, which we have a right to do, improve the standard of living for the sailors, we will at the same time elevate the standard of character and manhood of the men who operate the ships.

"OPPOSES HOTHOUSE ECONOMICS.

"I am opposed to the hothouse methods of economics in governmental matters. I do not think it is fair to take the money from the pocket of the wealth producers of this country and donate it to the owners of ships. Such a policy can not be justified by any other rule than that of the rule of might. It can not be defended upon any other theory than that might is right. The contention that the ships be bought under the terms of this bill will facilitate the transportation of cotton grown in the South to the foreign markets is not the proper spissitude to fool anybody. The suggestion that the Government of the United States will send its ships to places where privately owned ships flying the American flag will not go is absurd. As a matter of fact, Government-owned ships will be more careful not to violate the laws of neutrality. They will be more careful to avoid every possible complication with the belligerent powers of Europe than will ships owned by private individuals.

"But there is one thing that would happen, I am quite sure. A lot of unprofitable property in ships that are floating idly in the ports of this country in order to hide from the gunboats of hostile nations would be unloaded upon the Government of the United States at a good profit. And I am sure that after the war is over, and especially after the people of the United States shall have had an opportunity to pass judgment upon this proposed bill, that these same ships will be resold to private owners, and the American people will pocket a loss of $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. No; to my mind, the bill is a legislative evil without a mitigating incident, and, from the depths of my heart, I sincerely hope it may be defeated."

Mr. VARDAMAN. This statement was published. Little thought I at the time that the pressure from the White House would ever lead the Democratic Senators to undertake to make this indefensible measure, as I regard it, a party question; a measure which is a flagrant violation of the letter and the spirit of the party platform. When the caucus was called to consider it I told the chairman of the caucus, the honorable junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], that I would not attend the caucus. I did not expect to support the bill, and I did not care to take part in framing the bill when I felt sure what the conclusion of the caucus would be. I believed then what I now know, that the White House had ordered it, and that the Senators would obey that order, and I did not want to place myself in the indelicate position of being present while the measure was being framed when I was sure that my sense of duty would lead me to oppose it on the floor of the Senate. So I remained away from the caucus. And when I was told that I was bound as a Democrat by certain of my colleagues, who behind closed doors had determined to buck and gag every Senator who differed from them, to override my wishes, strangle my independence, humiliate my manhood, in a word, for me to violate my sense of duty and obligations to my constituents and betray the Democratic platform and support this measure, Mr. President, I simply declined to make the sacrifice. I declined to yield my own individuality. I must refuse to violate my idea of duty to myself and my constituents in order that I might win the much-coveted, approving smile of the seldom-smiling senior Senator from Missouri as reward for party regularity.

No; "I shall not be carried about by every wind of doctrine" that may blow from the wind centers of sycophancy. I shall not permit any man to make and brand my Democracy. Nor shall I permit any number of men to dictate to me how I shall perform my duty to my constituents as United States Senator. To paraphrase the language of another, "While I breathe heaven's air and Heaven looks down on me and smiles at my best meaning, I remain master of mine own self," and shall control my own vote, particularly in this matter.

Mr. President, the times are not propitious; the clouds that overhang the sky cast a somber shadow. The sea of passion rolls high. No good can possibly come of quarreling. Crimination and recrimination will not promote solidarity in the Democratic ranks. Men can not be driven. Decent Senators can not be bought either with flattery or patronage. Bickerings promote disintegration. I have no desire to interfere with the honest thought, nor do I question the patriotism of any Senator in this Chamber. I would not be the keeper of his conscience. I would not be responsible for his performance of the duties of his place. He understands to whom he owes allegiance, and I am not going to be so uncharitable, so egotistical, so contemptible, vulgar, and indecent as to question the honesty and patriotism of his motives because he happens to differ from me. I believe that my position is right. I shall maintain it. I do not arrogate to myself infallibility. I realize that I have all the limitations that encompass about and beset other men. But—

"If I am right, Thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay;
If I am wrong, O teach my heart
To find the better way.

* * * * *

Teach me to feel another's woe,
To hide the faults I see;
That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the beautiful composition upon the Roman Empire. I was wondering whether or not my genial friend the Senator from Mississippi, from that lofty pinnacle upon which he placed himself, could see such an insignificant object as the Senator from Missouri.

Whatever the Senator from Mississippi may say about the Senator from Missouri, he ought to recollect that that great Commonwealth has been more lavish with her honors upon him than any other one of her many illustrious sons. The fact of his election as governor, the fact that he was three times elected to Congress—twice elected to this body, and at the last election returned here by an unprecedented majority—is sufficient attestation to the character, aye, to the Democracy, of the Senator from Missouri, no matter from what quarter the assault upon him may come; and do not you know there is something about the conduct of the Senator from Missouri that warms my heart to him? So long honored by his party, reelected, with six years in front of him, he comes back and takes the same old Democratic sword in his hand, and does not get too big to fight the battles of the party that has honored him so long and so greatly. Mr. President, that is a lesson that would not be a bad one for some other Senators to follow.

My friend from Mississippi told us that we went to Republicans for recruits. Senator, there are two kinds of Republicans, just like there are two kinds of Democrats. The difference is this: You went to the standpatters, we went to the Progressives, for aid; but we did not do it until, like a shot from a subma-

rine fired upon our party, we found ourselves hopeless and helpless within our own ranks.

Why, sir, when Gorman and Smith, in the sad days of Cleveland's administration, sought to separate themselves from their party, they did not do it by ambush. They did not do it by sudden attack. They stood upon the floor of the Democratic caucus and sounded the alarm and gave the notice to the party that it might expect such an attack.

I want to say here and now that I believe in Democracy. I can not agree with some Senators in the announcement that has been made upon this floor that party obligations rest heavily upon the people from whom they seek their commission and rest lightly upon those who wear the senatorial toga.

I should not have risen upon this floor to discuss this bill, Mr. President, but for the fact that I find myself going one road and my colleague [Mr. CAMDEN] traveling another one.

The highest honor that the proud people of Kentucky can bestow upon one of her sons has been given to me, as to him. It was given to both of us by the Democratic Party of Kentucky; and as I love the banner of Democracy in Kentucky, and proudly bear her commission here given me by 300,000 brave Democrats, I shall not desert it now upon this floor.

What is the law in Kentucky about a primary election? And let me pause here to observe that a primary election in Kentucky is but another name for a caucus here. The only difference is that a caucus of Senators usually assembles at 8 o'clock and adjourns at 12. A Democratic primary is called under the law of our State, and the officers assembled to hold it, and the voters commence to cast their ballots at 6 o'clock and continue until 4.

When my friend Senator CAMDEN ran for the Senate, before he could run for that great office he had to be able under our law to say that at the last regular election he supported the nominees of the Democratic Party. But for that, under the law of Kentucky, his name could not have gone upon the ballot as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Senator. A voter that comes to cast his ballot there must be able to state that at the last regular election he supported the Democratic ticket. More than that, Mr. President, he has to say that he will support the nominee of the Democratic primary, whether it is his own choice or his neighbor's choice. The Democratic Party's nominee then takes the banner, and he goes from one end of the State to the other appealing for support. The same rules and regulations apply to candidates for a Republican nomination. It is held under a State-wide primary law. But when, the other day, my friend the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN], in colloquy with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], said, "I did not attend the Democratic caucus," that was no excuse.

Who would have heard a Kentucky Democrat say in the last election, when my friend was appealing for support as the nominee of his party, "I am not bound to support the nominee because I did not attend the primary election"? The question is, "Senator CAMDEN, why did you not attend the caucus? You were elected by the Democratic Party. You affiliated with the Democratic Party in Kentucky, and sought its honor and its nomination, and received election by reason of its votes"; and I insist that when he comes here he should associate himself with the party that honored him.

Why, Mr. President, at every Democratic national convention that assembles the Democrats are sent from the various States, and when they are sent there every man must sacrifice something. Why, gentlemen, we can not all have our way. No great law ever was written upon the statute books of this country by reason of the force or power of one individual. It is only the power of the collection of numbers, through great political parties. When the Democratic national convention was assembled the various States sent their representatives there, and they all considered the platform. They took a vote upon the question, and the majority ruled. While it takes two-thirds to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for President, a majority pronounces its faith and declares its platform.

Suppose a Kentucky Democrat should say, "Well, that platform does not suit me. I can not agree to everything in it. I want an amendment to it." Then here comes up another one, "I can not vote the Democratic ticket, because the platform does not meet my views. I want this amendment added to it." And here comes another Democrat and says, "I can not agree to the platform because I want to offer an amendment to it." The result would be, instead of a great, cohesive Democracy marching shoulder to shoulder against the serried ranks of a common enemy, that we would have 8,000,000 different Democratic Parties, and so the power of Democracy would die.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. Wherein the senior Senator from Kentucky and myself differ is that the platform does suit me. I came here and I conscientiously voted for and supported every Democratic measure. I have stated my reasons—that this shipping bill is not in the party platform.

Mr. JAMES. I am glad to know that we had one Democratic platform that suited the Senator.

Mr. CAMDEN. This suited me very well.

Mr. JAMES. How about the other platforms in 1896, 1900, and 1908? Did they suit the Senator?

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, this is not germane to the subject, but I am very glad, indeed, to say that more people in Kentucky agreed with me about that platform than agreed with the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Two hundred thousand of them were Republicans, however. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not going to continue to be a megaphone for the benefit of the galleries. There is a rule of the Senate that the occupants of the galleries shall not interrupt by applause or otherwise. The Chair has been sitting here day after day and making that announcement. He is not going to do it again. The galleries will be cleared unless the occupants of the galleries obey the rule of the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. The answer of the Senator from Kentucky means this, that he voted with the enemies of Democracy in 1896, and they carried all the electors but one. Am I right? What about 1900? You did not vote with the majority then, nor did you vote with the majority in 1908, because Democracy triumphed in both elections in Kentucky.

But aside from that, you say you stand on this platform. I greet you with delight. What is there about this platform that in any way contravenes the question that is now at issue?

I thank God I belong to a party that in a great war, an emergency like this, is not hugging a technical delusion to our bosom in order that the sea may be made the subject of the piracy of a great trust and monopoly that was undertaking to rob all the consumers of the world.

But even more than that, Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, I may say, is pledged to support this bill, and I believe that I can show it. It is a matter with him. What I am saying to him is emphatic and positive, not in anger. Great God, I am willing, in the name of the 300,000 Democrats in Kentucky, to put my arms around him and pray with him to come back into the Democratic Party. The Democracy of the mountains of Kentucky, across her waving blue grass, over the pennyroyal, and, through the purchase, on to the Mississippi River, are praying this day that the Senator from Kentucky will come back to the old Democratic household. Mr. President:

> The moving finger writes; and having writ,
> Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

The junior Senator from Kentucky made a speech when he was running for the Senate, and I have it here. I will read from the Courier Journal of Thursday morning, October 27, 1914. Here it is:

> The all-important question in the November election—
>
> Said Senator CAMDEN—
>
> The all-important question in the November election, said Senator CAMDEN, is not so much the personnel of the candidates for United States Senator "as it is whether the people will give Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic administration the encouragement of their indorsement by electing Democrats to assist and uphold the hands of the President in further carrying out his great program of constructive legislation."

The people in Kentucky thought that Senator CAMDEN meant by that that he was not only going to uphold his hands by speech but by vote in every way it was possible. But it seems like they were mistaken. What the Senator from Kentucky meant when he said he was going to hold up President Wilson's hands was that he was going to hold them up while the Republican Party tied them. [Laughter.] That is the Senator's own statement to the people in Kentucky——

Mr. CAMDEN. May I interrupt again?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, there is nothing more misleading than a statement that is half true. If the Senator will go back several paragraphs he will find I said that we will aid the President on the party platform pledges.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, Mr. President, I have no sort of objection to going back just as far as the Senator will have me go and quote all of it. It is a speech of a column and a half.

Mr. CAMDEN. All right, sir.

Mr. JAMES. If there is anything in it the Senator said that qualifies in any way what I have quoted I shall gladly put it in the RECORD.

Mr. CAMDEN. I will state that I did not pretend to indorse everything the President said, because, if I mistake not, somebody at one time wanted to knock somebody else into a cocked hat.

Mr. JAMES. Yes; and the Democrats of Kentucky are going to knock somebody else into a cocked hat, too, when they get a chance. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment. The Chair is compelled to enforce silence in the galleries by the rules of the Senate. The Chair is also in duty bound by the rules of the Senate to preserve order in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I am perfectly happy to go back and read if the Senator will only indicate where I shall read. Senator CAMDEN discusses the Federal reserve act, and he says:

Senator CAMDEN discussed the Federal reserve act, which, he said, "stands out as possibly of more vital importance in the country than even the passage of the downward-revised tariff bill," and to which he referred as an "unspeakable blessing to the country at large" and "especially helpful to agriculture."

In strong terms the Speaker praised President Wilson's foreign policy, saying that if, when assailed by a pitiless storm of criticism and abuse, the President had been less courageous and less firm in his conviction of what a strong and powerful nation's duty toward a weak and distracted one was, we would be engaged in a bloody conflict, the end of which could not be seen, with both continents plunged in war.

"Don't you know," said he, "that we owe it to Wilson that we are permitted now to have the inspiring vision of this great country towering sublimely above the clouds of war that encompass despairing nations, and that the standard of Democratic civilization has been placed upon high and unassailable ground?"

Why, then, Mr. President, it seems the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] had great confidence in the President of the United States. That was the one name to be conjured with in Kentucky. The Wilson banner was the one flag that everybody wanted to bear. The Senator said that he would uphold the President and the Democracy of Kentucky if he were elected into a seat in this body.

Mr. CAMDEN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. I should like to ask the Senator whether he voted with the President in 1896.

Mr. JAMES. I voted with the Democratic Party then as I am voting with the Democratic Party now.

Mr. CAMDEN. But with the President?

Mr. JAMES. That is a matter you will have to settle with the President. I voted with the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party to me is greater than any man in the Nation though he occupies the lofty station of President. But at the time the Senator from Kentucky told the people that if elected here he would uphold the hands of President Wilson in enacting into law his great constructive policy, the one thing that stood out like a column of light, that the President was advocating at that time, was the shipping bill. I have here before me an interview which was published in all the papers of the country, which I shall put in the RECORD, where the President, September 24, 1914, and also September 28, 1914, nearly a month before the speech of Senator CAMDEN was delivered, stated that he was urging the passage of the shipping bill, and he was going to insist upon it when Congress reconvened in December:

[From newspaper interview with the President, Thursday, September 24, 1914.]

Does the ship-purchasing bill remain a part of the legislative program or has there been an agreement to defer action?

The PRESIDENT. It remains a part of the program. I think it is very necessary in order to handle things that private enterprise can not be expected to be asked to handle.

Do the number of applications for registry under the ship-registry law come up to the expectations of the administration?

The PRESIDENT. I have not even inquired about that.

Have you been informed of any disinclination on the part of the House——

The PRESIDENT. I have heard of the opposition of individual Members.

[From interview, September 28, 1914.]

Mr. President, with reference to the shipping bill, do you share the general feeling that the urgency is passed?

The PRESIDENT. No; not in the least. The urgency has increased.

Mr. President, Judge ALEXANDER said Saturday that his advices were that the emergency for it was over; that there were plenty of ships for it.

The PRESIDENT. For the ordinary trade, yes; but that is not what it is for. It is chiefly for the development of American trade where it will be unprofitable for private capital to develop it and where I know for a certainty that private capital will not develop it. It could not be expected to.

Mr. President, you told us last week that the opposition to the bill was rather negligible.

The PRESIDENT. So I was then informed.

Do you not think that it has grown?

The PRESIDENT. Apparently it has. I do not know whether it is apparently or really. You know a few persons can make a great deal of noise sometimes, particularly a few persons who are interested from an investment point of view.

Does that alter your views or position any?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir; because the circumstances are not altered. Opposition does not alter me; circumstances, I hope, do.

Mr. President, is not that opposition chiefly toward taking it up at the present time rather than toward the proposition?

The PRESIDENT. That may be. I do not know. I am going to confer with some of the Members of the House just as soon as I can find space on my calendar. I will find that out; that may be all there is in it.

Can you say anything of the visit of Mr. ALEXANDER or Mr. UNDERWOOD to-day?

The PRESIDENT. That is about that subject.

Your present judgment is, Mr. President, that it ought to pass at this session of Congress?

The PRESIDENT. Unless I learn something that changes my judgment in the matter. I do not mean something about the opposition to it, but something about the urgency.

Mr. President, if the day shall ever come, which God forbid, that I no longer can affiliate with the great party that has honored me with their commission here, I shall have the courage at least, and the honor at most, to tender back to the brave Democracy that honored me the commission I accepted, to the end that they may send some one here who can fight their battles, speak their language, and cast their votes.

Mr. CAMDEN. Let me again interrupt the Senator.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. It seems to me that the people of Kentucky have passed upon my election. If I am not mistaken I received a larger popular vote than you ever did.

Mr. JAMES. Than I did?

Mr. CAMDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator knows when I ran for the Senate I was nominated in the popular primary and got over 100,000 more votes than the other man's name who was on the ticket received. He had even withdrawn, but his name still remained on the ballot. How many votes did the Senator get? You never got 100,000 majority nor anything that in any way approached it. So that much of this dispute seems to me to be well understood.

Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. I served with him for 10 years in the House. He is a brilliant Democrat, at least he was when he spoke in the House on March 27. I want to read you how he goes after a bolter when he thinks he is one. On page 5957 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1914, they had under consideration the tolls bill. Of course, there had been no caucus on that measure in the House. The Speaker of the House, Mr. CLARK—CHAMP CLARK—took an opposite view of that question from the President. Not being bound by party caucus in the House to take another view or to yield his judgment to the will of the majority of the party he made his speech there. He let it be understood that he was going to speak on it and that he was going to take that position. Let me show you the handsome fashion in which my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] trimmed him up:

"Oh," they say, "you have not given to us a reasonable opportunity for amendment." I say we have given you full, ample opportunity—all the opportunity that this question requires. [Laughter.] Oh, gentlemen, possess your souls in patience. This is not a tariff bill with 4,000 items that might be raised or lowered. This is not a currency bill with many and difficult and complex provisions that might be changed. This is not an appropriation bill with hundreds and thousands of items that might be increased or decreased. This is a plain, simple proposition: Shall we give these American ships this exemption or not? And we can answer that question "yes" or "no." There is no need of dodging; there is no need of evading it; there is no need of amendment. Let this Congress answer "yes" or "no." Will you stand by this great Democratic President in his plea for the national honor? Yes or no? Under which flag will you fight? Will you fight under the flag of these gentlemen, who assail their own party leadership and desert their own administration?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. JAMES. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. The men to whom I had special reference on that occasion in the speech from which the Senator quotes did not claim to be acting under the instructions of a caucus nor in accordance with the principles of the party or the belief that the proposition was a fundamental tenet of Democracy, as I understand.

Mr. JAMES. I am not familiar——

Mr. HARDWICK. Nor, if the Senator will let me add one word——

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Nor on any constitutional ground did we have any doubt or political differences. If the Senator from Kentucky had listened to the few remarks I submitted to-day, he would know that I still entertain the same high regard for our great Democratic President who sits in the White House that I have ever had, and it is a matter of regret that from my constitutional view and my sense of what is absolutely right I can not support him in this matter. I would not impute improper motives to them under any circumstances, and I cer-

tainly would not attempt to criticize them for their own independence, and, if my language can be so construed, I freely confess now I do not recall it.

Mr. JAMES. I am not through reading this.

Mr. HARDWICK. Read it all.

Mr. JAMES (reading)—

Let this Congress answer "yes" or "no." Will you stand by this great Democratic President in his plea for the national honor? Yes or no? Under which flag will you fight? Will you fight under the flag of these gentlemen—

Not seven; I do not know the number—

who assail their own party leadership and desert their own administration, stabbing it in the back without a moment's notice and without an instant's warning, or will you follow that glorious Democrat from New Jersey who has made this country its greatest President since the days of Thomas Jefferson? [Applause.]

Senator HARDWICK, that is one of the ablest speeches you ever made. [Laughter.] Of course, I can understand, and I question no Senator's motives. You put it on the ground of conscience. A man named Shakespeare once said, "Conscience doth make cowards of us all," and now an additional sin is added to it, it makes bolters of some. But every Senator at last must explain his own acts to the people, and they alone can judge. I am perfectly willing that my acts shall be subjected to their final judgment.

But of all things most surprising to me is that when our Democratic friends went into this alliance with the Republicans they did not give us a chance, as my friend Senator HUGHES said, to get the women and children off the ship before they submarined it. The days of auld lang syne would at least have entitled us to that right, if nothing more.

And as to the other side, the Republicans—with what delight I saw them coming over here! When I would see them get up to one of the seven Senators who had left our party and get their arms around him and get to whispering sweet things into his ear and then go off smiling and wink the other eye I knew they could see indeed visions of two years' advance of the old fleshpots. They could hear coming back the same old brigade. They could see the same old standpatters in control. Yes; and our friends upon the other side of course felt delighted. I do not blame them. There is nothing on earth that is as dear to the Republican side, the standpat Republican view, as an idle man except a bolting Democrat. [Laughter.]

But this bill, Mr. President, what about that? Who are the gentlemen who filibustered here for days and days, speaking 13 and 14 hours at a time? They are Republicans. They are the same men who advocated a ship subsidy. To do what? Not to build ships to be operated by the Government of the United States in order to make rates reasonable, in order to deliver the products of the farmer, the merchant, and of the manufacturer to people abroad. They were willing to take $9,000,000 a year of the people's money out of the Treasury and do what with it? To put it into the pockets of the Shipping Trust that is at this very hour robbing in a conscienceless way every single shipper in the United States who wants to send anything to the other side. If you had given them that subsidy then, which the Democratic Party prevented you from doing, they would have been robbing in the same old way as they are to-day. Even our working people, the toiling millions, the school children, are giving of their mite to send food and other supplies abroad to suffering people, but when they go to the dock to put them on the ship it is standing there, this conscienceless monopoly, that says, "No; though you gathered from the humble walks of life, yet we must have a freight rate in order to take it abroad that is not only oppressive but practically confiscatory."

I know that our Republican friends, of course, do not want this bill to pass, and why? To-day, when half the world is on fire, the greatest war in all the history of mankind, our factories and our people have more orders than ever before. We want to fill those orders. We want the laboring people to be employed. You gentlemen are doing in this contest what you have done all during the Sixty-third Congress. You are seeking to keep this Government from returning to prosperity, because you know that when it does return to prosperity your day and your hope are passed.

It even commenced, Mr. President, when we were considering the tariff bill. Day after day these gentlemen would put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which it will show, clipping after clipping from newspapers showing that somebody was out of work, that some factory was going to shut down. What a delight it was to them. But the standpat Republican does not live who can point to a single article that he put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing returning prosperity, or the employment of people, or of great orders being placed with the manufacturers of the United States.

Of course, you Republicans are not for this bill. You know that when it passes the factories will commence to hum; you know that you can find no idle men; you know that the farmers' products will go abroad; you know that this country will bloom and blossom with prosperity never known before. It is no wonder that you filibustered all night long, and put up your great leader, Mr. SMOOT, to break the record in a 13-hour speech. You are fighting for the life of the Republican Party.

They say that it will bring war. When did you get that idea? For almost two years I have heard the Republicans on the other side rise and assail the President of the United States for his "watchful waiting." How you sneered at him! How you said he was a weakling! How you talked about Mexico, Mexico. But the President, the greatest advocate of peace who has appeared upon this earth since the Prince of Peace stood at the Sea of Galilee, prevented his country from going to war. And now what is the matter? We have not ships to send our products abroad, because you are afraid that this man who stood for peace even under your bitter attack after attack will do what? Force the country into war.

You know the war they are afraid of, Mr. President. The war that the Shipping Trust is afraid of is not a war between countries; it is a war upon their outrageous and confiscatory rates upon the American shippers, the farmers of this land, the manufacturers of this Nation. That is the war they are alarmed about.

But let us see about that. You do not believe that President Wilson would force the country into a war. You will have an opportunity to vote for amendments putting that even beyond all possible doubt. My friend from Kentucky, Senator CAMDEN, gives in his speech his idea about this thing, and I want to read it in order to be accurate:

Democratic Senators, I solemnly warn you that it is madness to push this bill to embark our Government upon this perilous and uncharted business sea. Does not Britain well know that if one of this country's boats should be sunk by a floating mine—in an accidental way—we might say, then, we would not only be feeding Britain, but we would find ourselves fighting for her, which she well knows.

Now, the idea that because one of our vessels was over there close to Liverpool, and by accident, as Senator CAMDEN says, should be destroyed, that this Government should go to war for Great Britain! Gentleman, just to state that, just to read it, is to show the weakness to which men are driven in order to make some criticism of this bill.

Mr. President, this Government would not go to war because one of our vessels was accidentally sunken. Not at all. This great Government here would not do for itself, for all the people, of this great Government what it would be unwilling to do for the humblest citizen in the land. This Government would no more quickly go to war in order to resent an injury done to a vessel owned by itself than it would go to war to resent an injury done to a vessel owned by the humblest sailor who is upon the sea. If it would, it is unworthy to be a government of all the people. The injury of one is the concern of all. If Senator CAMDEN's fear is to be dissipated, we would have to call to port every ship we have upon the sea at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the bill itself say in so many words that these ships——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be some way whereby the reporters can get the statements or inquiries of Senators.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to raise the point of order that Senators seem to have colloquies between themselves and do not face the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the bill itself say that these ships shall be subject to the liabilities and shall enjoy the advantages of the ships of private citizens of the United States? In substance, is not that the express provision of the bill?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, certainly. Of course, the suggestion of war is ridiculous; but let us see.

My friend from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] said that he sold his wheat and his cattle at better prices than ever before. Well, I am happy to know that; but there are other farmers in Kentucky, Mr. President, beside those who own fine herds and a great amount of wheat. The great money crop in Kentucky is tobacco. What about that? Tobacco to-day is selling for nothing, or it is hardly selling at all. The tobacco planters in my section of the country are unable to get more than five and six dollars per hundred for the dark tobacco. That tobacco is a great export tobacco. It is shipped abroad. It is sold in my section to the buyers from France, from Germany, from Austria, from England, and from all the rest of the world. What has been

the effect upon tobacco? The farmers of Kentucky want to know. I want to read to the Senate a letter upon that question:

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 26, 1914.*

The DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Responding to your request for proofs of how shipments of American goods to Europe are handicapped or made entirely prohibitive on account of high ocean freight rates, we beg to submit the following:

We are shippers of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia tobacco to Europe, and most of our shipments are consigned to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway, and Belgium. At present only shipments to Holland, Italy, and Norway are possible at prohibitive rates. In fact, the latter have become so high that now cable orders "Stop buying" have been received.

Although we have made a yearly contract with the Holland-American Line—the only shipping opportunity from here to Holland—as per copy inclosed, this line has arbitrarily raised its rates 100 to 300 per cent, and even at the raised rates shipments can be booked only "for first available room."

Rates to Italy also have become entirely too high—i. e., from $4 per hogshead of Maryland tobacco to about $27, or nearly 3½ cents a pound—so that tobacco shipments have become out of question.

The Holland-American Line, which raised the rates on December 7, 1914, has now again suspended them, indicating another raise.

Trusting that the aforegoing statement will interest you, we are, dear sirs,

Very respectfully, J. D. KREMELBERG & CO.

Our people in Kentucky have their great tobacco crop practically unsold. Some Senators here say, "Well, you can not get the ships in time to ship this crop." Well, if we can not get them in time to ship this crop, let us get them in time to ship the next crop. Who knows how long this war will last? No one. Here is the freight rate upon the great money crop of my State, upon the great tobacco farmers, as patriotic and splendid a class of people as live in the world, who stood by me and have been my friends, and the rate has been raised upon their tobacco 700 per cent. I can not find it in my heart to stand upon this floor and fail to express what I know is their desire and their hope of this American Congress. I now read from page 15 of this document by Secretary McAdoo, which is a complete and powerful analysis of the whole situation:

BURDEN UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS.

Annexed hereto, as Exhibit 1, is a summary of our sea trade and the estimated freight cost of handling it from July to December, 1914, inclusive, prepared by the actuary of the Treasury Department.

From this it appears that our total exports by sea for July, 1914 (before the war), were $139,225,479, and the ocean freight cost was $7,833,482, or 5.63 per cent; the total of such exports for December, 1914, were $226,000,000 (estimated), and the ocean freight cost was $30,742,500, or 13.6 per cent—an increase over July of 141 per cent.

If the ocean freight cost on December exports had been at the same rate as July, viz, 5.63 per cent, the total freight charge on our exports for December would have been $12,723,800 instead of $30,742,500. In other words, the increased ocean freight tax arbitrarily imposed upon our farmers and business men for the month of December, 1914, only was $18,018,700. If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915 at the December, 1914, rate and the ocean freight charges are the same as for December, 1914, the American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) increased freight charges above the normal rate of $216,224,400, or more than five times the $40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the shipping bill to put into American ships for the protection of our foreign commerce.

In two months and seven days the increased ocean freight charges (above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914) exacted on our foreign trade at the December, 1914, rate would amount to $40,241,761, or more than the total amount, viz, $40,000,000, which the shipping bill authorizes for investment in an American merchant marine.

In 12 months, as before stated, the total increase in the freight tax levied by steamship owners, mostly foreign, upon our export trade, at the December, 1914, rate would amount to the sum of $216,224,400. If the same be applied to our import trade, there would be an additional increase of $95,640,000, or a total increased ocean freight charge on exports and imports by sea in one year of $311,864,400, or 141.6 per cent over the usual cost. (See Exhibit 2.)

Thus far we have been dealing only with the increased ocean freight charges over and above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914. Including these normal rates, and assuming that the December, 1914, total ocean freight charges, viz, $44,342,500, represent an average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade by sea for the year 1915 would amount to the enormous total of $532,110,000. (See Exhibit 1.) Almost the whole of this huge sum would be paid to foreign steamship owners and would have an important bearing upon our foreign trade balances; it might, in fact, turn these balances against us.

MAXIMUM NOT IN SIGHT.

While this report is being written information is received that rates are higher than those given in some of the tables herein presented, and that even at these extraordinary figures it is difficult to obtain cargo space for earlier sailings than March and April.

SUMMARY OF THE MOST STRIKING INCREASES.

From the foregoing tables it will be observed that ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour, 500 per cent; on cotton, 700 per cent.

From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent.

From Baltimore to European ports (excepting German) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent.

From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 260 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent.

From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from $1.25 per bale to $15 per bale.

From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent.

From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

CONTROL OF RATE SITUATION BY STEAMSHIP INTERESTS.

Ocean freight rates are still rising, and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other.

The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates. It can not under existing law protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice and upon the instant, and our business men are helpless. The steamship companies are their own masters and do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether.

What is another objection urged here? That it may lead to Government ownership. That is a great bugaboo that the Shipping Trust gets up—Government ownership! Mr. President, we can regulate our railroad rates; we can regulate every other business in the United States; but the one thing we can not regulate is the over-seas traffic charges, because these ships are owned by foreigners—the foreign trust is not under our jurisdiction. Every shipper, every farmer, every manufacturer of this Nation is subject to whatever the foreign monopolists seek to lay upon the citizen of this land who wants to ship his product abroad. In addition to that, some of these gentlemen say that Government ownership of this line in this great emergency and condition that no man could foresee will finally lead to Government ownership everywhere.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will it disturb the Senator from Kentucky if I interrupt him just there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JAMES. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Kentucky has suggested that the Congress of the United States has no power to protect the domestic shippers against these foreign combines. The Senator doubtless remembers the legislation we passed providing for the safety of life at sea, by which we refused to allow a ship to clear from one of our ports or to enter our ports until it had been equipped with certain paraphernalia—lifeboats, and so forth. Have we not got the same power to provide that no ship shall enter or clear from ports of the United States unless it charges not more than certain freight rates, and to regulate the matter in that way?

Mr. JAMES. I do not believe the Government of the United States has a right to regulate foreign ships or to say what charges they may lay upon shippers; but, of course, the Senator from Georgia, I take it, is one of those who are afraid of foreign complications. I should imagine that there would be nothing that would more quickly subject us to trouble with a foreign Government than an undertaking of that sort.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, there is not the slightest danger of that.

Mr. JAMES. I am willing, then, to do that if we can do it; but let us do something. Do not let us stand here and say we can do this and that, but let us do it if we can. We have got this bill up now, and let us do this; and then, if we can do what you desire, we shall do that also.

But our friends say, and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] declared, that the Government is incapable of handling anything; that it would not make a success of it. That is not the record nor the history of our Government. We manage the operation of a Navy costing hundreds of millions of dollars, and we do it successfully. We managed the construction of the Panama Canal at an expenditure of $400,000,000, and did it with great success and to the pride of every American citizen. There was no favoritism shown there, and no charge of it; there was no political manipulation of offices there, and there was no charge of it.

But, oh, the Shipping Trust! Whenever you try to engage in the business in which they have got a monopoly, the cry is raised that you have not got the skill to do it; that you will allow political favoritism to creep into it; you will have to go to the Treasury to reimburse yourselves for the great loss that will fall upon the people of the United States. Whenever we undertake to establish competition to the great monopoly that now holds the American people by the throat, that is urged. Well, let us see. I read, Mr. President, a letter from the president of the Panama Canal Co. That company is owned by the Government of the United States. It operates a line of ships and has been operating them for several years now. Let us see what has been the effect of that:

Up to May 31, 1914, we have charged up $358,653.35 to the depreciation of steamers owned by our company; we have maintained a rate of $3.50 for rough goods between New York and Colon and $4.50

per ton on general cargo, as against the $8 rate in effect previous to the time the Government assumed control of our company—

Now, here is a case where, when the Government took control of these ships, the rate charged was $8 per ton, and it forced its competitors to come down to the price the Government was hauling freight for—

and as against a rate of $6 that is now being charged by steamship lines operating vessels between New York and ports contiguous to the Canal Zone; we have carried thousands of employees of the Government and their families from New York to the Canal Zone at the $20 and $30 rates, as against the $75 rate prevailing by other steamship lines; we have competed with foreign lines for the freight traffic moving between New York and ports on the Pacific coast both north and south of Panama, without being parties to rebates, reduced freight rates, or concessions in passenger fares to the important shippers interested in this traffic; we have assisted in the development of traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States as against the transcontinental railroads by allowing steamship cocarriers on the Pacific a proportion of the through rates sufficiently remunerative to enable them to maintain their steamers in the traffic and accepting a proportion for our Atlantic haul that in most cases result in a loss to our line; we have by the operation of our steamship line induced our Pacific Ocean carriers to agree to a gradual reduction in the rates to and from the United States and Pacific ports of Mexico, Central and South America, to the level of the rates to and from Europe, thereby doing away with the discrimination that has for years existed in favor of the European market; by our action in maintaining low and yet reasonable rates between New York and the Canal Zone we have saved the Government very considerable money in the shipments that have been forwarded by other lines that were forced to meet our rates, and notwithstanding all this the operation of the steamship line has been financially successful, as you will note by the following table:

	Profits.	Deficits.
1905	$157,245.49	
1906		$37,158.21
1907	158,562.95	
1908		178,810.67
1909	104,995.98	
1910	167,952.25	
1911	77,187.97	
1912		201,761.13
1913	221,489.92	
11 months to May 31, 1914	267,019.29	
Total	1,154,453.85	418,730.01

I shall print all of the letter in the RECORD, Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The entire letter referred to is as follows:

PANAMA RAILROAD CO.,
New York, September 15, 1914.

Hon. J. W. BRYAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYAN: Your letter of the 5th instant has just been received by me.

When the United States Government secured control of our company we were operating a steamship line between New York and Colon as a feeder for the railroad. It consisted of the steamships *Allianca*, *Advance*, and *Finance*, which were owned by the company, together with other chartered steamers that were secured from time to time, as warranted by the traffic.

The maximum freight rate then existing between New York and Colon was $8 per ton, and outside of a few of our employees, who were carried at lower rates, the prevailing fare for passengers was $75 each way.

The three steamers we had in the service were not, of course, of sufficient capacity to meet the demands for transportation of freight and passengers when the construction of the canal was commenced, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the department of the Government in charge of the work, purchased the steamships *Colon* and *Panama* from the Ward Line and turned them over to us for operation on the basis of our company paying interest, charter hire, and depreciation.

The minimum freight rate was gradually reduced from $8 to $3.50 per ton, and is still effective, and practically all of our passenger accommodations have been availed of for the transportation of Government employees. These demands have been so urgent that we have not been able to accommodate the tariff passengers desiring to sail on our steamers, who have consequently patronized the other lines running between New York and the Canal Zone.

When the steamships *Ancon* and *Cristobal* were purchased for the transportation of cement to the Canal Zone, they were turned over to us without charter expense, because it was realized that any charge of this character assessed against us would be reflected in the rate established for the transportation of cement; and with a view to reducing this to the lowest possible limit, we were relieved from the obligation of paying charter hire for the steamships *Colon* and *Panama* upon the understanding that cement would be carried on the *Ancon* and *Cristobal* at actual cost, and that in arriving at this cost we would credit the Panama Canal with the amount we would pay for the charter of the steamships *Colon* and *Panama*. As a result of this arrangement all of the cement carried by our steamers in connection with the construction of the canal has been burdened with a transportation charge of only $1.25 per ton of 2,000 pounds, while on tramp steamers that we have been obliged to charter from time to time because our steamers were not of sufficient capacity to carry all of the cement needed in the work, the Government has incurred an expense of from $2.25 to $3 per ton of 2,240 pounds.

Up to the middle of August, when we turned over the steamship *Cristobal* to the Quartermaster's Department for the return of American tourists in Europe, we were operating six steamers—the *Ancon* and *Cristobal*, the *Colon* and *Panama*, and the *Alliance* and *Advance*. The last two are the property of our company, the *Finance* having been lost in New York Harbor about four years ago.

Up to May 31, 1914, we have charged up $358,653.35 to the depreciation of steamers owned by our company; we have maintained a rate of $3.50 for rough goods between New York and Colon, and $4.50 per ton on general cargo, as against the $8 rate in effect previous to the time the Government assumed control of our company, and as against a rate of $6 that is now being charged by steamship lines operating vessels between New York and ports contiguous to the Canal Zone; we have carried thousands of employees of the Government and their families from New York to the Canal Zone at the $20 and $30 rates, as against the $75 rate prevailing by other steamship lines; we have competed with foreign lines for the freight traffic moving between New York and ports on the Pacific coast both north and south of Panama, without being parties to rebates, reduced freight rates, or concessions in passenger fares to the important shippers interested in this traffic; we have assisted in the development of traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States as against the transcontinental railroads by allowing steamship cocarriers on the Pacific a proportion of the through rates sufficiently remunerative to enable them to maintain their steamers in the traffic and accepting a proportion for our Atlantic haul that in most cases results in a loss to our line; we have by the operation of our steamship line induced our Pacific Ocean carriers to agree to a gradual reduction in the rates to and from the United States and Pacific ports of Mexico, Central and South America, to the level of the rates to and from Europe, thereby doing away with the discrimination that has for years existed in favor of the European market; by our action in maintaining low and yet reasonable rates between New York and the Canal Zone we have saved the Government very considerable money in the shipments that have been forwarded by other lines that were forced to meet our rates, and notwithstanding all this the operations of the steamship line have been financially successful, as you will note by the following table:

	Profits.	Deficits.
1905	$157,245.49	
1906		$37,158.21
1907	158,562.95	
1908		178,810.67
1909	104,995.98	
1910	167,952.25	
1911	77,187.97	
1912		201,761.13
1913	221,489.92	
11 months to May 31, 1914	267,019.29	
Total	1,154,453.85	418,730.01

I believe the above will give you in a concise manner the result of the operation of our steamship line since its control by the Government, but if there are any further details that you require regarding expenses, earnings, charter, depreciation, or anything else that you think would be of any interest to you, I shall be very glad to furnish them to you.

Yours, very truly,

E. A. DRAKE, *Vice President.*

Mr. JAMES. So, Mr. President, in the light of this letter, what becomes of the argument that we have heard here that the Government can not operate anything successfully? The Government has operated the Panama steamship line successfully and is doing so now, and the Government would operate the lines proposed under this bill successfully.

Mr. President, of course many objections can be raised to legislation of this character. There is no trouble to find fault; but the thing in which we are most interested now is not to try to find fault, but to try to find some remedy. The Democratic Party is in control of this Government. The people look to us for relief. Not a single one of the great laws recently put on the statute books would have been written but for party action. Now shall Democrats here, in control of the Senate, in control of the House of Representatives, and with a Democrat in the White House, fail to meet this great emergency and give relief to the people of the United States of America?

Why, Mr. President, the rate upon cotton has increased from $1.25 a bale, they tell me, to $30 a bale. The cotton crop has not been sold to any great extent. The passage of this bill will give us 80 ships. In addition to that, the bill provides that the auxiliaries of the Navy which are not being used, which are now idle, shall be brought into this service. There are 40 of those vessels, making 120 in all, that we can employ at our various ports in the work of transporting abroad the tobacco and cotton of our farmers and the goods of our manufacturers. Why not take advantage of that opportunity? Why be prevented from giving this relief by a cry that you fear something that in no way has come to us when we have operated other ships, and have been doing it for 10 long years, as in the case of the line from New York to Panama?

In regard to the caucus, there is one caucus everybody attends, and that is the caucus called to give out committee assignments and patronage. No Senator stays away from that; nobody bolts that; that is when we are to get something. Now, when we have a chance to give the people back home something, let us all stick together just like we do when we are seeking something for ourselves.

When there were many Americans stranded abroad—and they were over there enjoying the delights of the Old World—we sent ships over there after them; we sent money over there

to bring them back home. They were stranded. The Kentucky farmer with his tobacco, the cotton farmer down South, and the manufacturer of this land with his products are stranded now. Let us afford them some relief, too. They do not ask you to send money over there to aid them; but they are stranded, just as many of the rich Americans abroad at the time of the outbreak of the war were stranded. They were worth their millions, but they could not get a dollar, just like our farmers have got their hogshead upon hogshead of tobacco and their bale upon bale of cotton, but can not sell it for the price of production, and the manufacturers of this land, with their thousand upon thousand of orders from all the world. They are stranded. Do not let us make flesh of one and fowl of the other.

When we sent ships abroad that gave this relief, it did not call forth the great cry of Government ownership.

Why, Mr. President, the fact is that when these Senators cry out that this bill will be a failure, that is exactly what the Shipping Trust does not believe. If they did, they would be for this bill more strongly than I am. If I could assure Wall Street that this measure would result in a failure and loss to the people of the United States, I could raise $20,000,000 to-morrow in order to aid in the passage of this bill, but that is the very thing they do not believe. What they fear is that it will be a great success; they are afraid that it will drive monopoly off the sea and free the ocean from its piracy. That is what they are afraid of—nothing more.

Mr. President, the people of this country are aroused to the great importance of this issue. The people of Kentucky are aroused. They are for this measure, and they want to see it passed.

To my Democratic friends who have seen proper to bolt their party caucus, to refuse to act with their party after it has registered its decree, I am here to beg them to return to the Democratic Party. Come back. "There is a vacant chair awaiting there; arise and say you will come." It is the party that has honored you; it is the party that has lived for more than a hundred and thirty years; and it is a party so great that no man and no set of men with their betrayal can destroy it. It will live on. I beg these Senators to remember that the smiles upon the other side of this Chamber would not play across their countenances if it were not for the fact that they see in this breach between the Democrats upon this side their only hope of success.

I am not going to be unkind or going to say bitter things to any of the Democratic Senators who have left our party on this question, because I can see plainly written across their once smiling countenances the furrows of regret, and whenever they have further time to think of this question they will come back, I hope, to the Democratic Party.

But, Mr. President, above everything, if this bill must go down, if this great constructive measure must fail, if this must be the first defeat for the greatest President who has occupied that chair in 50 years, if he must fall and above his body the wild shouts of a triumphant Republican Party shall rise, I do pray God that I may be spared the humiliation of reaching down to pull from his body a dagger bearing the impress of the hand of a Kentucky Senator.

RECESS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 8, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 5, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, once more in faith and confidence we approach Thee in prayer. Make us, we beseech Thee, tractable, that we may be led by the holy spirit of truth to a faithful and conscientious disposition of every duty devolving upon us, so that when we are called upon to leave this existence men shall rise up and call us blessed, and, above all, that we may have Thine approval, which will be more blessed than all things else. This we ask in the name of Him who taught us faith, virtue, love, and good will to all men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MILITARY ACADEMY BILL.

Mr. HAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. (H. Rept. 1369.)

Mr. MANN reserved all points of order on the bill.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I have no desire to make any speech in a general way. I am going to offer a substitute for a paragraph in the bill, and I would like to ask whether it is contemplated that there will be any extra time devoted to debate more than is allowed ordinarily under the five-minute rule? I am not asking for it, but it was done, I think, a year or two years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. The practice has varied somewhat. Sometimes there has been a little debate, and then a liberal discussion under the five-minute rule. I have no desire to hold down hard and fast under the rule, but I am willing to allow a liberal debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed two first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $7,800,000 each.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the paragraph that has just been read.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SLAYDEN:
On page 64 of the bill, under "Increase of the Navy," lines 2 to 8, inclusive, strike out the provision for two first-class battleships and insert in lieu of the provision for the same the following:

"Three submarines of seagoing type, to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots, at a total cost not exceeding $1,600,000 each, and 30 submarines of coast-defense type, at a total cost not exceeding $665,000 each, and the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for said purposes, to be available until expended."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is this amendment a substitute for?

Mr. SLAYDEN. For the paragraph at the top of page 64.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, but I will allow the chairman of the committee to first discuss his point of order to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make or reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. If one of them is subject to a point of order, the other is.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to recognize me to offer an amendment as a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to perfect the paragraph, but the gentleman is not now in order because the gentleman from Tennessee has reserved a point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Then I will wait until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that parliamentary law per se has never appealed to me as an entertaining branch of study. I am almost ashamed to admit that I am not familiar with the rules, and I doubt if I have ever read them through. They do not appeal to me particularly; but the substitute for this paragraph which I propose is in the interest of economy, and if my motion should prevail it would, in my judgment, give us a much more effective Navy, a Navy certainly immeasurably better for defensive purposes and, I believe, a much more effective aggressive Navy; and, moreover, I believe it is in order because it proposes a saving.

As I have figured it out, and I think with approximate accuracy, the adoption of the substitute for the paragraph on the top of page 64 which I offer will result in saving to the Treasury $5,116,227.50, to which might be added, as a consolation to gentlemen who possibly would regret the giving up of these majestic but useless battleships, a greater security for the people. There can be no question, in view of what has happened within the last 60 days and what is happening every day, that the weak point of the Navy of the United States and of some other navies of the world, which I will forego mentioning, is an insufficient supply of submarines.

No vessel of war, no implement of war, has grown more steadily and I may say more rapidly into complete effectiveness. The fact is that the activity of the German submarine at this hour has terrified the greatest navel power on earth as naval powers have heretofore been reckoned. That Government which has sailors of rare skill, men of unimpeachable courage, backed up by resources almost unmatched by any other Government on earth, has been to some degree paralyzed by the activity and the intelligent handling of the German submarines. A few days ago these submarines turned their attention from acts of hostility directed at war vessels to the merchant vessels of Great Britain, and, Mr. Chairman, in that connection I would like to call attention to some publications anent that new phase of this great and horrible war. Of course these are newspapers which are the source of my information, but none of us has any better sources of information except, perhaps, the great departments of the Government, and we must rely on that common source of information open to all of the people of the country. I mention that fact because some gentlemen may impeach the authority:

A London dispatch states that the recent destructive raids by German submarines in the Irish Sea, following bold and extensive operations in the North Sea, the Channel, and off the north coast of Ireland, has convinced the British that no waters, no port even, is quite safe from Germany's submersible destroyers. Lloyd's insurance on coastwise traffic jumped at a bound from 5 to 15 per cent. It is reported that a German submarine was observed in the Irish Sea 18 miles from Liverpool yesterday morning.

That is from the New York Sun of a very recent date. The same paper in an editorial says:

WHAT DEFENSE AGAINST THE SUBMARINE?

By sinking two British merchantmen in the Irish Sea the German naval authorities have again disclosed the high state of practicability to which they have developed the submarine boat. The exploits of the U 21 prove that Conan Doyle was not a dreamer when he predicted exactly such attacks on England's ocean-borne commerce, and that Admiral von Tirpitz when last December he suggested the starvation of England by the destruction of her ships off her own coast was revealing a plan, and not speculating as to a possibility.

The New York Commercial, of February 1, says:

A SUBMARINE BLOCKADE.

Like a flash of lightning out of a blue sky came the news that a German submarine captured and sank two and probably three British merchant vessels almost at the mouth of Liverpool Harbor.

Mr. Chairman, within the last week there has been discussion in the English press, echoes of which have been cabled to this country, to the effect that people living up the Mersey from Liverpool are apprehensive that there may be a raid from these German submarine boats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The New York World says:

THE SUBMARINE'S LATEST.

The presence in the Irish Sea of a powerful German submarine, 800 miles by the most direct route from its nearest base, is one of the most significant developments of the war. If one hostile undersea boat can invade waters that are practically a British lake and carry terror to the mouth of the Mersey, others may be expected to follow its example.

While it is hardly to be expected that the Germans will be able right away to execute Admiral von Tirpitz's threat to cut off Great Britain's food supply by this means, there can be no doubt that Saturday's raid puts the greater part of the United Kingdom's commerce upon warning. Henceforth the ocean lanes between New York and Liverpool, no matter how well patrolled they may be in midocean, will present dangers adjacent to the British coast that can not be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to abuse the patience of the House, but I have submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for this paragraph at the top of page 64, which will effect a very material saving to the Treasury, and that will effect a saving which will run up into millions and which, if agreed to, will, in my judgment, add very largely to the security of this country.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How much saving does the gentleman estimate it will make?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Between five and six million dollars. From the defensive point of view of the submarine, I am going to quote a line or two from the testimony of that great man, Admiral Fletcher, whose splendid poise, whose calm judgment, whose patience under trying circumstances, and whose skill in handling delicate relations with another people have given him a high place in the estimation of the people of this country. He says:

The use of the submarine with its torpedoes in warfare may be designated as a weapon of opportunity. If the opportunity occurs for its use it is formidable and destructive, but a skillful enemy need not permit the opportunity to occur.

Possibly not, Mr. Chairman, but one of the most skillful enemies in the history of naval warfare has not been able to overcome the opportunity. The submarine makes its own opportunity. Admiral Fletcher says, in reply to a question by Mr. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee:

It is very effective for the protection of a port or harbor if ships attempt to enter that port or to lie off the port and to obstruct the commerce of the port. It is probable that a fleet would not be able to do that effectively unless protected against submarines.

Elsewhere in this testimony—I have not the time to quote it—Admiral Fletcher says that there has not yet been found any effective protection against submarines, although he anticipates it will develop in time, and perhaps it may. No one can tell what is in the lap of the gods.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have only two or three minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. Admiral Fletcher says also:

The use of the submarine with its torpedoes in warfare may be designated as a weapon of opportunity. If the opportunity occurs for its use it is formidable and destructive, but a skillful enemy need not permit the opportunity to occur.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have read just precisely that statement of the admiral, and I can not yield time to the gentleman to repeat what I had already stated to the House. Admiral Fletcher says in reply to a question from Mr. BUTLER:

No; they [the enemy] would not pretend to land in the presence of the submarines, unless they had assurance that they had secured a safe place of operation where submarines could not attack them.

Mr. Chairman, that seems to me to be a confession of the enormous superiority of these weapons. Speaking of conditions in the Spanish War, Admiral Fletcher says:

The fleet would not have attempted a close blockade. It would have been impracticable to do it that way with effective submarines in the harbor.

He also says:

Submarines could be effectively used against a close blockade. The fleet may have been off 100 miles from the harbor, and yet have been in a position to intercept the Spanish fleet when it came out.

Mr. Chairman, I have not time to quote further from the testimony of this great admiral of our Navy. I wish I had, because I think his testimony sustains the contention that I make. I believe that this amendment will help to secure for our Navy the greatest engines of war that have ever been devised, and at the same time will make an important saving to the Treasury. Right now it is impossible for us to tell how soon it may happen that the relative naval rank of the nations may change. In 24 hours, as I said the other day, we may become the greatest navy in the world, even measured in terms of dreadnaughts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice the gentleman's amendment provides for the cost of these submarines at $3,340,000 each?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to again report the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee still reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is germane to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the paragraph beginning line 12, page 64, deals with the question of submarines and the paragraph to which the substitute has been offered deals with the question of first-class battleships, the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this substitute which I propose was ruled out on the point of order, I would like to be informed by the Chair whether or not it may be properly reintroduced in the next paragraph but one?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, line 4, after the word "constructed," strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is offered for the purpose of having the bill make adequate provision on a minimum basis for our national defense. I am sure that in the present disturbed condition of the world every proposition bearing upon our naval program will meet the very careful and earnest consideration of all Members. I desire very briefly to point out the reasons why this amendment is on the minimum basis. We have vast vital interests that are exposed; larger interests than any other country in the world; in fact, about the equivalent of the exposed interests of all other countries combined. By "exposed" I mean interests within gunshot of the water. Furthermore, those interests of ours are more exposed than similar interests of any other country. We are not a military people. We are a nonmilitary people. We have no great mobile army; other nations have. If other nations get control of the sea, they can strike us without any appreciable resistance on our part. I do not mean to say that in our vital mainland that they could permanently maintain a base, but what I do say is that they could make what is known as "raids" without serious opposition; and a raid in the region of New York, or, say, within 150 or 200 miles of New York, or two or three raids simultaneously, could not possibly be resisted by the available military forces we have. The enemy could levy tribute upon more than half of all the wealth of the Nation. Now, to imagine they would not levy tribute, would be simply to fly in the face of history and of current events. Then the enemy could retire with his tribute, and we would have no possible chance to strike back at him. Moreover, when he retired, he would have destroyed the plants of our shipyards, navy yards, arsenals, and the factories for military supplies, and put us in such a position that for months, if not years, we would be unable to make the preparation necessary to prosecute a war to a successful termination. As to our outlying possessions, the Philippines, Hawaii, Alaska, the Panama Canal, Cuba, Porto Rico, an enemy in control of the sea can seize and permanently occupy these without serious resistance. Therefore I lay down this as fundamental: Being thus defenseless, having such vast values exposed, America can not afford permanently to live in a status where a military nation of Europe, having a great standing army all ready, has control of the sea.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman has just stated that our seacoast cities—he did not use the phrase, but I understood him to mean that—are utterly defenseless in the presence of a raid of an enemy's fleet. Admiral Fletcher says that the present forts, supplemented by mines, are expected to be able to prevent any fleet from bombarding New York. How does the gentleman reconcile that difference of opinion?

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman would study the plans worked out by the War College as to how an attack would be made on New York City or farther down the coast, he would find that an enemy would not have to stand up and bombard New York City. He would land one or more Army corps on Long Island and on the coast of New Jersey and approach New York from the rear.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I will be glad to, but I want to say if my time is thus taken up I shall have to ask an extension.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I shall ask an extension for the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly; I will yield.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to another statement of Admiral Fletcher. Mr. BATHRICK asked him the question if an enemy would be likely to approach a harbor if they knew submarines were located there, and Admiral Fletcher answered no; so, according to the opinion of Admiral Fletcher, who is a fair authority on naval matters, I supposed we had adequate defense.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the Germans have submarines in the English Channel, and yet the English troops have been landing in France without interference and British transports are continually passing without hesitation. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Has not there been evidence in the last two or three days before the fortifications committee tending to show that New York can be bombarded?

Mr. HOBSON. I understand that it can, and I believe that it can.

Mr. GARDNER. And did not Admiral Fletcher's evidence show that he was unaware of the fact that foreign superdreadnaughts were now carrying guns which outranged the guns on our seacoast defenses?

Mr. HOBSON. I do not know as to that. I do know that the standard coast-defense 12-inch gun of disappearing type was never built with carriages for long ranges, such as would be chosen in a bombardment. These short-range guns are the types upon which we now chiefly depend for our coast defenses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I lay it down, and it can not be disputed successfully, that as a living policy, a status of defense for this Nation, as a permanent policy, we can not safely permit any great military nation of Europe that has a great standing army and has a vast merchant marine supplying transportation, and therefore always ready to have what is known as the control of the sea between its shores and ours. We could not strike them back if we had control of the sea, because we would have no Army, and the fleet alone can not go ashore, but if they have control of the sea they can strike us almost instantly without any chances of resistance on our part. The same principle applies to the Pacific Ocean. We can not safely permit a nation in Asia that is a great military nation, with a vast standing army available and a merchant marine ready for transportation, to be in control of the sea in that ocean. Now, then, these oceans are so far apart that we can not permit this condition to exist in either ocean. Therefore a single-fleet Navy will not answer. We must maintain as a living proposition a fleet in the Pacific Ocean superior to the navy of Japan and a fleet in the Atlantic Ocean superior to the navy of Germany, both at the same time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Panama Canal is not a sea-level canal like the Suez Canal, and there is a question whether the Suez Canal is going to remain permanently open even when it is under the protection of a nation in control of the sea. If we are in control of the sea, troops can not land on the Panama Canal. We may be able to give it such protection as to insure its integrity so that when occasion permits and the strategy demands we may then be able to concentrate our two fleets and get the superiority that will insure us the victory. But we can not depend upon it. Having no great standing army there, if an enemy gets control of the sea he will soon control the Panama Canal. Of course, we might destroy the locks before we surrender it, but then it would be out of use for us as well as for the enemy.

Therefore I lay it down as a fundamental principle of self-preservation that this Nation to-day ought to establish its naval strength on the basis of being equal to the navy of Germany and of Japan combined.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why would you limit the equality to Germany? Why not to England?

Mr. HOBSON. I am coming to that now, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. Chairman, the war in Europe has brought out certain matters of cardinal importance in their bearing upon our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that if a belligerent of Europe has undisputed control of the sea, that belligerent will curtail the rights of neutrals in time of war. America is the chief of all the neutrals of the world. You might call her a chronic neutral. The nations of Europe are chronic belligerents. In the interest of our own commerce it is clear that we can not conduct that commerce and expand it in time of war when the European nations are belligerent and when one of the belligerents has undisputed control of the sea. In the years to come it will be realized more and more as a result of this war that a chronic belligerent can not in justice to all the neutrals, can not in justice to the weak nations of the world, can not in justice to the cause of general peace—whose commerce ought not to be entirely dislocated when war exists—be safely intrusted with the undisputed control of the high seas. With such control it is clear that not only a belligerent can overthrow what otherwise would be peaceful over-sea commerce of its enemies, but it can overthrow the peaceful commerce of neutrals. The English undisputed control of the sea to-day not only is tending to throttle Germany, but it is tending to prevent the development of America and her over-sea commerce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can not ignore a fact that this war has brought out. The Anglo-Japanese alliance is offensive and defensive. No matter where the war may take place, such is the case. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman help me to get a little more time in case I yield?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HOBSON. Then I will go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, one of those nations would have undisputed control of the sea. The other would have a great army, and the one would have the bases for operation right along our shores and contiguous to our own frontier. In addition to these vital interests affected fundamentally, there is the Monroe doctrine, which is a permanent part of our international policy, though not accepted by international law. The American people are going to maintain in the Western Hemisphere the principle of protecting the weak people of this hemisphere against the oppression of the strong military nations of Europe, and maintain the principle of equal opportunity in trading with this hemisphere—fair chance and no favor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOBSON. I have had to decline to yield to one colleague, and I must do the same with my friend.

Likewise in the Pacific——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman knows that I have declined to yield.

Mr. MANN. I was going to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman might have a little more time.

Mr. HOBSON. Pardon me, then.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how soon does the gentleman's time run out?

The CHAIRMAN. In one minute.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Alabama have 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for 10 minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Now I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. The question I want to ask you is, if I remember correctly, several years ago the question of the alliance between Japan and England came up, and at the request of England Japan consented to a modification of that alliance agreement whereby the United States was excepted from its operations?

Mr. HOBSON. And I remember very well, Mr. Chairman, that also not very long ago, since the period to which the gentleman refers, when the question of our relations with Japan over the matter of land-ownership bills passed by the Legislature of California was cleared up, and everything was straightened out, the English papers distinctly stated how relieved they were to find it so. They said, in effect, that if trouble had come they would have felt the obligations of their alliance.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield first to me for a moment at that point?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. It was the California dispute that called for a revision of the treaty of alliance, and England asked for the revision because of the California dispute?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; and it was felt—the feeling was expressed—that they were happy that the relations had not become more strained between America and Japan, because of the obligations of their alliance.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. My question was prompted largely by the question propounded by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]. What I desired the gentleman to explain was whether he had any basis for the statement that there was an alliance between England and Japan, both offensive and defensive, that applied to the United States?

Mr. HOBSON. Well, I can state it in the terms of the treaty. If the gentleman will read the treaty he will find that its words specify cooperation in upholding common interests in the Far East. Now, I am coming to that in the next minute, and I will show how the treaty will apply, irrespective of all other considerations, because "interests" are now being affected.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it be true, then, that Japan and England are in an alliance that will require England to come to the assistance of Japan in case of war with the United States, whoever might bring on the war, does not the gentleman think it would be well for us to build a series of several hundred forts along the Canadian boundary line that might protect us from invasion by Great Britain from Canada—along a boundary line which has been unprotected for over a hundred years?

Mr. HOBSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I do not think a series of forts spread along a 3,000-mile boundary line would be any more effective or expedient than to build a series of forts up and down the 3,000-mile coast line.

Mr. BARKLEY. Any more than a series of forts between France and Germany, which could be avoided by the invasion of Belgium?

Mr. HOBSON. Oh, no. To-day Japan has made 21 demands upon China. We have not the power to interpellate the administration in this country, but we have the right to get information. I now call on the Secretary of State to give to us and to the people of America the substance of the 21 demands that Japan has made upon China. What is the occasion for making these demands? Japan has occupied Kiaochow. When China declared that the fighting was over at Kiaochow and abolished the war zone, Japan said it was an unfriendly act. And now Japan has opened up negotiations direct with China to determine the future development of the Chinese Empire, and England has O. K'd Japan's demands, thus making community of interest. When Japan went into Manchuria, to determine the future development of Manchuria, the very next year we lost $20,000,000 of our market for cotton goods, and we all know that the system of distribution there gives the advantage to Japan.

Mr. Chairman, the fate of China and the open-door policy are now hanging in the balance. The European nations that helped to promulgate the open-door policy in China are now tied hand and foot in Europe. It remains for America alone to maintain the open-door policy, to safeguard the integrity of China and the principle of a fair chance and no favor, the principle of justice and right in the Far East, where we have vital interests and have fundamental rights. We joined gladly in proclaiming the open-door policy. It now devolves upon America, and America alone, to say whether the open-door policy is to be a discard forever, whether China is to become a vassal nation to the necessary prejudice of our commerce throughout that whole nation as we have suffered in Manchuria and Korea.

Now, then, what applies to-day will apply for years to come. America has vital interests in the Far East. No one can deny it. America can not sit still and see the Chinese Republic made a vassal nation of a military monarchy.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman tell us how we are going to prevent it if the Chinese reconcile themselves to such a situation? Are you going to shoot them into behaving?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman knows that the Chinese would not reconcile themselves to the domination of any outside power willingly. She yields to force, and she is compelled to yield because she is not prepared to defend herself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, reviewing the first proposition, we must have a Navy in the Atlantic equal to that of Germany and a Navy in the Pacific equal to that of Japan; and, consequently, we must have a total Navy equal to the combined navies of the two countries.

Now for the second conclusion brought out by this war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Japan and England have brought themselves into alliance, why do you limit the necessities of the American Navy to being equal to the navy of Germany and the navy of Japan and not make it equal in addition to the navy of Great Britain?

Mr. HOBSON. I am coming to that. Mr. Chairman, the march of history can not be set aside. America can not escape her responsibilities, even if she would. As Members we may temporarily ignore them here, but the mighty march of destiny in the progress of civilization and the advance of the race is going to demand that in the interests of humanity America shall supplant Great Britain upon the high seas of the world. [Applause.]

The present exigencies may involve the Monroe doctrine in an acute stage in Mexico. We are not certain that after the war is over, if Great Britain should be victorious, she would consent to America's continued paramountcy in Mexico. Our paramountcy in Mexico under the Monroe doctrine and the open-door policy and integrity of China are our settled foreign policies. These foreign policies demand that America should have a Navy as big as the navies of Great Britain and Japan combined. In other words, instead of the British two-power policy it must hereafter be an American two-power policy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want the gentleman's practical opinion. I am more interested in that than in his forecast of the policies of nations. How long will it take us to realize this vast combination of units that the gentleman suggests, and what would be the annual appropriations with which to reach it in any approximate length of time?

Mr. HOBSON. I will now come to that. To start with, for such a vast establishment as our Naval Establishment must be there must be system. The money that we put in must be economically expended. There must be a proper organization. Naval policy is a part of the great scheme of national defense; the whole question of national defense must be determined by adequate and scientific agencies. You may refuse to establish a council of national defense while I am in Congress, but the day will come when you will establish it. The Secretary of War is already inaugurating an informal, irresponsible conference of members of the Cabinet and chairmen of defense committees of Congress—an admission of the need of such a council.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me one suggestion?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman accentuates with great zeal the need of national defense, but if we are going to resist the invasion of China by Japan, have we not embarked beyond the realm of national defense and gone into the great theater of international offense?

Mr. HOBSON. I think not. It is in the protection of our vital interests in China, a protection that all the nations of the world, including Japan, have actually pledged, protection of the integrity of the Chinese Empire—a defense of China and not an offense against Japan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. In just a moment; then I shall have finished my remarks and will answer any additional questions.

In addition to the investigation and scientific determination of the great question of national defense we must have a similar coordination in the Navy Department. You may throw out this bureau of strategy, so called, on a point of order, but you will come to it. The time is coming when you will be compelled to have one.

Now, when we have established a council of national defense and the office of chief of naval operations, then we can balance our measures of defense, take the question out of politics, and insure efficiency and economy in a businesslike way, like Germany, Japan, and England. If these countries continue the general programs they have followed for the last eight years, our program each year will have to provide at least six capital ships. It is on this basis that I am urging four dreadnaughts and two battle cruisers in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], although I do not for one moment imagine that this amendment will be approved by this committee, because I know that it ought not to be. I do not imagine that it will even be seriously considered at this time, although it is offered in sincerity by a very earnest gentleman of conviction who is well acquainted with naval affairs. It is an additional pleasure to say that it is offered by a gentleman for whom I have a fondness, and I regret that he is so soon to leave the House.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to fight, we have not sufficient armament. If we are going to have peace, we have too much armament. [Applause.] This Nation has never had a policy upon the subject of armament. If gentlemen will give me their attention, I will endeavor to not tire them. I do not attempt to persuade or convince anybody. This question involves morals and not, in my judgment, economy. I would not think of economizing if it became absolutely necessary to increase our military in order to defend our national honor, but I do not think the proposed increase necessary at this time. Although, as I repeat, this Nation has never had a fixed policy upon naval development, we have always had sufficient armament to protect ourselves and keep us from harm. Permit me for a moment to refer to myself. For many years I have endeavored to learn what was the right position to take in the way of providing a sufficient armament for the protection of our country, or what is known as a national defense. I am glad to say that no political division has ever shown itself in this House on this subject, and it ought not. Parties in their platforms have from time to time declared that we ought to have an adequate defense. What is an adequate defense? I suppose it is one that defends. I quite agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] that if we are to arm ourselves against all nations and against all emergencies we are not now doing nearly as much in the way of preparation as we ought to do, but in my opinion it is unnecessary at this time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman spoke of agreeing with the gentleman from Alabama in some respects. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania go with him so far as to think that we ought to defend ourselves by invading the Asiatic danger zone?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman think we ought to have a navy large enough to police the world?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not. I would invade no territory——

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BUTLER. Unless it became necessary as a part of our defense during an attack—positively no.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is the point of my question. Does the gentleman believe it is necessary, in order to defend ourselves, for us to go across the world and go into the Asiatic war zone and into foreign questions?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not enough of a military man to answer that question, and I want to keep away, as far as I can, from foreign complications. Eighteen years ago I asked to be appointed a member of the Naval Affairs Committee in order that I might prevent the coming of what I very greatly fear will come to us in the near future if we do not stay at home and behave ourselves as we ought to do. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I should like to get his views on this subject: Suppose—and I do not know that it is a very violent presumption—suppose we should wake up some morning and find that there was a declaration of war against us by Japan. Will the gentleman explain how we would defend the Pacific coast?

Mr. BUTLER. I would leave that to those who know better than I do. I want to answer the gentleman just as civilly as I can.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to know what your theory is.

Mr. BUTLER. Not being able to answer, because I do not know, I will refer the gentleman to those who know better than I do—the military men—but I have no fear of an attack from Japan. I believe that we are thoroughly prepared for any assault that Japan may make upon us. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask for a little more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BUTLER. Of course I will.

Mr. HENSLEY. I have great respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am desirous of knowing whether or not he has heretofore subscribed to the doctrine that preparedness is an insurance against war; and if so, how he feels upon that proposition now, in the light of recent events?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am one with a bursted theory [laughter], but I am thankful to God Almighty that I am strong enough to admit my mistake. [Laughter and applause.] I never for one minute imagined that the civilized nations of the world would be fighting to exterminate themselves, as they are now doing, but my theory has failed, and I believe now, as I will until my mind changes, that nations prepared to fight will fight. [Applause.] And the better their preparation to fight the quicker they will go to it. [Laughter and applause.]

However, I do not propose, as far as I am able and as far as I can see light, to leave this country absolutely unprepared and defenseless. We ask no quarters from anybody. [Applause.] We are both independent and able. We are positively willing at all times to provide for ourselves in our own way, as this great body may see fit.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that this great Government should take a more advanced stand and do more toward bringing about pleasant relationship between other countries, to the end that disarmament may be given to the world, than it has done in the past?

Mr. BUTLER. Of course I do; I would rather visit than fight any day. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. In just a moment. I will confess in my ignorance that I can not see distinctly. I am like a man walking in the dark; I do not know what is the best to do on the present occasion in the direction of a national defense. I want to do what is right, and as soon as I can see it then I am ready for my share of responsibility. I am against any increase of armament at this time above that which we usually provide in time of peace, because I assume—I may be mistaken again as I reckon with human nature and my knowledge of it—yet I assume that after the present great war is over, when these nations are bankrupt, when the people face the miseries of this war, they will be willing to join with us in an agreement limiting armament for a number of years; and if we can obtain that concession we will have done more than civilization has done since Christ appeared upon the earth. [Applause.]

I am not sure that I will then be a Member of this House; but if I am and these present belligerents insist upon increasing their armament, insist upon rebuilding the armament lost in the present war and greatly increasing it, I will join with the American people in increasing ours, because I think it will then be necessary. But until that time comes, until we have an opportunity to make an honest effort with the belligerent nations to reach such an agreement by which we will limit armament, and thereby secure ourselves greater safety, I am unwilling to increase our armament beyond that which we have usually provided. Therefore, if the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama should prevail, it will be without my approval and against my opposition. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. My question was pertinent at the time I asked the gentleman to yield, but it may not be now. Does the gentleman think when we are in the presence of an armed enemy we ought to discontinue all preparations to protect ourselves against any aggressive act?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not; but I do not think we are in the presence of a hostile country.

Mr. MILLER. I did not say "hostile."

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think we are to be attacked. If I did, I would join with the gentleman and all others in making the necessary defense.

Mr. WITHERSPOON and Mr. GARDNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just spoken on the same side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

Mr. GARDNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it proper to recognize two gentlemen in succession to speak in the negative of a proposition when somebody arises to speak in the affirmative?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is within the discretion of the Chair. The Chair will recognize all gentlemen.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is mistaken in saying that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are on the same side. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Reserving the right to object, I call the gentleman's attention to my statement, that on the pending amendment the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are on the same side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to address the House solely for this reason: I want the House to be put in possession of the facts. My service on the Naval Affairs Committee of four years has thoroughly convinced me that with a great deal of study I know nothing about the Navy, and that the only way in which a Member of this House can vote intelligently upon the various questions that arise on this appropriation bill is to get the facts from the only witnesses who know the facts, and they are the naval officers.

In addressing the House a few days ago I reviewed the statements of a number of naval officers who testified substantially that we already have a sufficient Navy, an adequate Navy, to protect us against any attack by any nation on earth except that of England.

I desire to speak this morning in order to call your attention to the testimony of another naval officer, a member of the general board, a rear admiral of the Navy, Rear Admiral Fiske. No man can take his testimony and study it and understand it and believe that there is the slightest excuse for another battleship. If you will give me the time, I will show you that and disprove the necessity for any such appropriation as this bill contains. Let me read you from page 1007 of the hearings. He says:

> But there is one serious fact about naval engagements, especially modern naval engagements, and that is that the victor comes off without very much injury.
>
> The cause for that is mathematical. Say one nation has a slight superiority in gunfire at the start, that puts the other fellow at a disadvantage. That increases, and it increases with accumulative effect.
>
> I published some tables about 10 years ago in the proceedings of the Naval Institute to show how when two forces engaged with each other, if one hit the other 10 times and the second one hit the first one 9 times, in a comparatively short time the relation of those two forces from that standpoint would be 2 to 1 instead of 10 to 9; and it increases very rapidly after that. That explains why in the Battle of Manila Bay, in the Battle of Santiago, the Battle of Tsushima, and in the recent battle off the west coast of Chile, the victors came off almost uninjured.
>
> Mr. ROBERTS. It is a geometrical progression?
>
> Admiral FISKE. Yes.

Mark that. He tells you that where two naval forces oppose each other with just a slight advantage in gunfire on one side, where they stand at the beginning in point of power in the relation of ten to nine, that in a short time the result of having a slight advantage in gunfire will reduce their relation to two to one instead of ten to nine. That is his statement. According to his testimony that is the fact, and I want to apply that to the relation of the American Navy and the German Navy, which is admittedly the greatest on earth except that of England. Admiral Fiske was asked to take up the list of battleships in these two navies and compare them, and he testified as a result of that that ship for ship the American Navy is the most powerful on earth. Take, for instance, the last two ships in the program of each nation. The two German ships are armed with eight 15-inch guns.

The corresponding ships in the American Navy are armed with twelve 14-inch guns, and every naval officer that has testified says that those two last ships in the American Navy are more powerful than the German ships. Take the next three ships in the American Navy and the next three in the German Navy. The German Navy ships are armed with ten 12-inch guns, and the corresponding American ships are armed with twelve 14-inch guns. Not only has each one of them two more guns, but the guns in the American Navy are much more powerful. Then after these five take the next four ships in the American Navy. They are armed with ten 14-inch guns, while the German corresponding ships are armed with ten 12-inch guns. That makes nine. In those nine ships we have one hundred 14-inch guns, and in the corresponding nine ships of the German Navy there are eighty-six 12-inch guns and sixteen 15-inch guns, fourteen less on their ships than on ours; and if you will carry the whole list through to the very beginning you will find there is the same superiority. While the Germans were equipping their battleships with 9 and 14 inch guns we were equipping ours with 13-inch guns. While they were equipping theirs with 11-inch guns we were equipping ours with 12-inch guns. That superiority in gunfire stands from the first to the last ship in both Navies.

Let us see what that amounts to. I asked Admiral Fiske if he did not think that was an immense advantage in gunfire. He said that he would not call it an immense advantage, but he would call it an advantage in gunfire. I then said to him that we were told by Admiral Twining, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, that a 14-inch gun has a destructive force 50 per cent greater than a 12-inch gun and shoots with 30 per cent more accuracy than a 12-inch gun. I asked him whether he approved or disapproved of that statement. He said that it had been such a long time since he had anything to do with ordnance that he would not put his judgment up against that of Admiral Twining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can we not come to some sort of agreement on this thing as to time?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thought that we could run along a reasonable time and allow this debate. Later on in the bill there will not be necessity for so much debate. I think we can run along with liberality and brotherly love at the present time.

Mr. GARDNER. I wanted to see if we could not come to something reasonable. There are so many amendments besides this one to consider that I think we ought to come to some agreement on time.

Mr. PADGETT. It will not be very long, I think, before we can dispose of this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I then said to him, supposing now the statement of Admiral Twining that each one of these 14-inch guns with which our ships are armed, amounting to 100, has a destructive force 50 per cent greater than the 12-inch guns on the corresponding German ships, is accurate, and it has been approved by Admiral Strauss, the successor of Admiral Twining, as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance—supposing that is true, and he said he could not question it, then I asked him if he would consider that just an advantage or whether he would consider it an immense advantage. He then said, if that statement were true, it would be an immense advantage in gun fire. Then I asked if the other part of that statement is true, that these two Chiefs of Ordnance, the greatest experts in the Navy on that subject, are correct in their statement that a 14-inch gun shoots with 30 per cent more accuracy than a 12-inch gun, whether that would be a slight or an immense advantage. He then said that he hardly believed that that was true. He did not question it at first, but when he saw the immense advantage it amounted to, then he began to question the statement. Then I said, "Admiral, let us see whether you approve it or not. The reason given by these ordnance experts why the American gun of 14 inches in diameter shoots with an accuracy 30 per cent greater than the German 12-inch gun is based by them on the fact that it has a flatter trajectory. Suppose you are shooting at this target with a rifle, if you aim right at the book, which is the target, you would hit it every time." He said, yes, that that was true, and that it would not make any difference how far away it was, if it were within the range of the gun and the gun were aimed at it, you would hit it. Then I said that in shooting these big guns they did not shoot right at the target, but that they have to shoot up and the shell comes down. He agreed with that statement. Then I said, "The great problem in accurate shooting is to determine the exact distance to the target." He said, "Yes; that is true." I said, "If you take a 14-inch gun that has a trajectory that comes over like this, very flat, and a 12-inch gun that has a trajectory which has to go away up and then come down, does not the accuracy of the shooting and the chances of hitting increase as the trajectory is flattened and becomes more like a rifle that shoots directly at the target?" He said that that was true. He then admitted that the 14-inch gun was bound to shoot with more accuracy than the 12-inch gun, because it had a flatter trajectory. Then I said, "Admiral, the experts have calculated that accuracy to be 30 per cent, and I ask you again if that would not be of immense advantage in favor of our fleet?" and he said, yes, that it would be of immense advantage.

That is the testimony of this expert. Mr. Chairman, if it be true, as he says, that a slight advantage in gunfire resulted at Santiago in destroying all of the enemy's ships without losing any of our own; if, as he says, a slight advantage in gunfire resulted in our destroying all of the enemy's ships at Manila Bay without losing any of our ships; if, as he says, a slight advantage in gunfire resulted in the battle of Tsushima in the Japanese destroying all of the Russian ships with very little loss to themselves; if, as he says, a slight advantage off the coast of Chile enabled the victors to destroy all of the enemy's ships without losing any of theirs; if that is the result of a slight advantage in gunfire, I put it up to you, what would be the result in a contest between our Navy and the German Navy, with our having what Admiral Fiske admits is an immense advantage in gunfire?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], because I favor fair protection and defense for every part of this great country. I rise particularly at this time to reply to the question asked of Mr. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to the adequacy of defense on the Pacific coast. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is always so fair that I am sure he will correct that part of his statement concerning the defense of the Pacific coast. Mr. Chairman, we have very little defense on the Pacific coast. We are not only not prepared for war, but we are not prepared to keep the peace or to defend ourselves against whatever nation might attack us. I am not a naval expert, but I can imagine, and so can you, that any country expecting to attack the United States could have some of its ships within one or two thousand miles of the Pacific coast and we not be fully aware of the purpose. They could attack the Pacific coast before the vessels of our Navy could get from the Atlantic coast to San Francisco. It takes 23 days, it has been testified to, for a battleship to travel from New York to San Francisco, and I submit that the vessels of any nation that might want to go to war with us on the Pacific coast could get nearer than 23 days before we would know much, if anything, about it.

Mr. Chairman, if war should break out to-morrow in the Pacific Ocean the Pacific coast would be attacked and some of our cities destroyed, perhaps, before we could bring the battle fleet from the Atlantic against the enemy. There is not a first-line battleship out there. The only one we have is the grand old *Oregon*, 20 years of age. We have had no battleships there at any time except when the fleet stopped for a day at each of our ports on the way round the world.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to ask the gentleman whether or not there are coast fortifications on the Pacific coast?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. There are.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have not you very considerable fortifications to protect San Francisco?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. There are fortifications at San Francisco, but the largest guns there are 12-inch guns. There are fortifications at Puget Sound, but the largest guns there are 12-inch guns, while there are ships built or building for the German Navy that carry 15-inch guns and for the British Navy with 15-inch guns. There is no first-class battleship to-day that does not carry at least 12-inch guns.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the gentleman afraid that the ships of the German Navy may reach San Francisco or Panama before the vessels of the American Navy can get there?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. We are not going to war with Germany or any other nation, but whenever a nation desires to attack this country it will have its ships nearer our Pacific coast line, if that is the plan of attack, than 23 days away.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not true that Japan is building four battleships which each twelve 14-inch guns and two battle cruisers carrying each eight 14-inch guns?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I think the gentleman's statement is quite correct. I am sure that Japan is building battleships that carry larger guns than we have in our coast defenses. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members of this House who believes we are to be attacked by Japan at any early date, if ever at all, but I do believe this country should be adequately prepared to defend itself against all comers.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I will.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have heard it stated that if Pearl Harbor was properly fortified the Japs could not get to this country until they broke through those fortifications, and I was talking to an Army strategist who was preparing fortifications at the Panama Canal, and he stated that with our fortifications properly equipped at Pearl Harbor it would take Japan a year to get to the western coast. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I am not a naval expert, and if the gentleman from Texas pretends to be I would like his opinion on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I do not pretend to be an expert.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I was talking to an Army strategist, Morrison, who was sent to Panama to lay out the fortifications for Panama; I went down on the same boat with him——

Mr. STEPHENS of California. In further answer to the gentleman I will say that while I am not a naval expert I can not believe the Army strategist meant what the gentleman thinks he did. The gentleman can see how easy it would be to go far from and not near Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman from California permit?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman wait until I get through with this?

Mr. MILLER. I want to make a little statement in connection with the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am making an inquiry now. If it is necessary for us to have naval equipment enough to meet any possible assault from the Pacific side, would it not be necessary for us under the gentleman's contention to have a Navy over on the Pacific side larger than Japan or any Government that might attack us from that side?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, that would be desirable, but in any event I would like a part of the Navy over there at all times. We have nothing now on the Pacific coast except the grand old *Oregon*, 20 years old, a few armored cruisers, and from three to five submarines.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that a half of a Navy over there when you need a whole one would not be any defense, that if a war should call for a defense from our Navy that half a Navy would not meet any possible attack?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, if I was starving I think half a loaf of bread would help my case, and if there was an attack on the Pacific coast and we had a fleet half as large as the fleet on the Atlantic coast it could hold off the enemy until the larger fleet from the Atlantic coast could get to the Pacific.

Mr. CALLAWAY. But it would not be a real defense on the Pacific coast, according to your idea.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. It would help. We have so little defense now. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. I wanted to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that Pearl Harbor as a defense is only such if we have a powerful Navy? It is a center on which a navy can operate, and a defense that we speak of as being afforded by Pearl Harbor is but that defense that will come from a superior fleet that will radiate from Pearl Harbor as a base.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. What the gentleman says is true. I do not believe it can be seriously contended by men who know and have studied the question of defense that the Pacific coast is fairly protected to-day. With but two fortifications, one second-line battleship, a few battle cruisers, and three to five submarines along our entire coast we certainly are poorly protected. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are hardly protected at all.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may continue for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased, indeed, if I could get the attention of the committee. I do not consume so very much of the time of the House and shall only take this brief time to present some views I have upon this subject. I want to lay down the proposition, Mr. Chairman, that, in my judgment, can not be disputed, and that is this, that the state of preparedness on the part of a nation as well as on the part of an individual determines the degree of aggression. Do you catch that point? I can take the hearings, the testimony given before the Naval Affairs Committee by admirals of the Navy, and they will establish that proposition in a way that no Member of this House can gainsay. The better prepared we are the more insistent we are upon other nations of the world observing what we conceive to be our rights. We are not as willing then as we are, perhaps, under other conditions to submit whatever questions are involved in the dispute to a fair and just consideration before resorting to the use of armaments. But we insist when armed and prepared, as young men frequently insist upon others observing their rights, because we are in a state of preparedness. It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that Members of this Congress now, after having witnessed what we all have, after having seen what has occurred across the ocean, would hesitate some time before they would get up before this body and insist that preparedness in the way of armament means an insurance against war. Was not Germany prepared and did Germany avoid war? By no means. Did the state of preparedness prevent Great Britain from going to war? By no means.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] would insist at all times on this Nation being in a state of preparedness for war. My God, let me say to you that there is no department on either side of that great struggle over there that is prepared upon a war basis to-day. Why, even the hospital facilities are not adequate to meet the needs of those armies. On a war basis the gentleman insists. Why, did you know the gravediggers over there are not upon a war basis; they are not in numbers sufficient to lay away those that have given up their lives in that struggle. Talk to me about a nation being in a state of preparedness for war at all times. Gentlemen, let me say this to you here now, I believe in an adequate Navy, a Navy that will meet the needs of this country, but the question of adequacy I do not want to have determined by men who are interested in these increases. I do not want those who are getting the profits out of it to be the ones who are laying down the policy of this great Government of ours as to what constitutes an adequate Navy on the part of this country of ours.

Now, if we want a Navy to meet the needs of this Government, if it is our purpose to have a Navy for defensive purposes, let us take into consideration the fact that in this war over in Europe Germany has had sunk by submarines something like 200,000 tons of armament. England has had something like 150,000 tons of armament that has gone to the bottom of the sea because of submarines operating on the part of either side party to the conflict. The greatest dangers those men can be exposed to is to put them on board a battleship, unless you hide and conceal your ship so the men operating the submarines can not find them.

I maintain, my friends, that if this war continues for the next six months or a year, beyond any sort of question we can not only pit the armament of this country, in a naval way, against Germany, but we will have the most powerful Navy afloat. You all have observed how the navies of the Old World are being whittled down from time to time. Let me say here and now, that if we accept the position taken by the great concerns that are supplying the material to our Navy, if we take their views as to what constitutes an adequate Navy, we never on earth will have a Navy sufficient to meet the needs of the country, according to their views. If we had a Navy to-day twice as strong as the British Navy, do you mean to tell me that these great supply companies would be satisfied, and that

they would not be clamoring at every session of Congress for other increases in armament?

Mr. CALLAWAY and Mr. HOBSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will first yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman in case that it were possible to have the Government itself manufacture practically all of its material, would the gentleman then change his position and vote for larger equipment?

Mr. HENSLEY. I can not determine that. I will vote for whatever I conceive to be the needs of this Government from time to time. But let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that if the Government establishes its own plants for the furnishing of materials and all those things, so as to take the profit out of the increases in the Navy—profit out of war, if you please—you would not find the clamor over the country for increases of armament that we find to-day. [Applause.] And the gentleman knows well that that is the correct statement of the facts. If I had time, I could convince even those who are fixed in their views on this proposition that it is the supply companies, the men directly interested in this line, who are clamoring and holding up to the American people the needs of the Navy from year to year.

Mr. CALLAWAY and Mr. MILLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I know that the gentleman has given a great deal of study to the details of this question, and——

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes; I will yield first to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have one question to ask. That is about the limitation of these armaments. These people contend that we should have an adequate Navy, and I have been listening to them until I have gotten the notion of their idea of adequacy, that it must be large enough to meet any possible navy or combination of navies that could be brought against the United States. I want to know if it would be, in the judgment of the gentleman, possible for this Nation, with its taxing powers and the resources we have, to make a Navy big enough to satisfy these fellows that are scared, or these men who are now interested in increasing the Navy, or these men that want to take the whole earth under their protecting wing and administer it under the protection of the Federal Government, like the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will answer the gentleman from Texas in this way: He recalls that only in the last Congress the gentleman from Alabama——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] upon the floor of this House in his speeches in former Congresses has insisted that we should have a Navy equal to Germany's Navy in the Atlantic and a Navy equal to that of Japan in the Pacific, and here to-day he comes and presents his views and insists that we should have a Navy in the Atlantic equal to that of Great Britain and a Navy in the Pacific equal to that of Japan. The gentleman a few years ago, as you all know, did not confine his speeches to this House, but went all over the country, and insisted that in a very short period of time this country would find itself involved in a war with Japan. I rejoice over the fact that his prophecy never came true. I am sometimes in doubt as to whether others get the pleasure out of that fact that I do. I sometimes think that folks wedded to their views are disappointed because those prophecies did not come true. I truly hope that my friend from Alabama is not in this category.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have read in a good many newspapers the statement that this campaign which I am carrying on for a proper armament is inspired by those who make war materials. Recently, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, I read an editorial headed, if I recollect rightly, "Gardner's suspicious crusade." There was a peace meeting here in Washington the other night where at least two Members of Congress were present. There the statement was made that this campaign was inspired by the manufacturers of war material.

Mr. Chairman, those statements, whoever make them, are noisome slanders; noisome slanders—I repeat it in case any gentleman on the floor of this House objects to the term.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARDNER. I do.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman suppose that any Member of this House would for one instant charge such a selfish motive as that which the gentleman has spoken of?

Mr. GARDNER. I have read a certain petition prepared at a certain peace meeting, or at least I have read in the newspapers what purported to be the petition—the petition addressed to the Committee on Military Affairs, or something purporting to be the substance of it. I have not seen the petition itself. This petition, according to the newspapers, stated that the manufacturers of war material are at the bottom of this movement for increased armament. It may not have been so worded.

Is there any gentleman on the floor of this House who wishes to comment on that statement of mine? [After a pause.] Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall go on. I am speaking for good old American spunk, and I am speaking against this doctrine that the right way to protect ourselves is with a supine, pliable spine, because that is the doctrine that is being preached to you, gentlemen, and this statement that being prepared for war brings on war simply shows the confusion of men's minds.

Being prepared for war as Germany was prepared for war may induce the bringing on of war, but being prepared against war, which is what I contend for, will never bring about any war. In fact it would tend to prevent war. It would have prevented this war if Great Britain had been prepared, and preparation would perhaps have saved little Belgium.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but I would rather not have my thread of thought interrupted.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I would like to have the gentleman's idea of the amount of equipment that would prepare us for war?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, let the gentleman possess his soul in patience for a moment. I have always subscribed for what is known as the Liberal Yearbook of Great Britain. It is the political bible of the Liberal Party. I have noted the textbooks which are recommended to the English Liberals to read. I find that the Liberal textbooks are pacificist textbooks. Mr. Norman Angell is one of the favorite authors whose works are in the textbook list of the Liberal Party. Mr. Angell, like so many of my fellow Members, last year prophesied that there never was going to be another war, because the bankers would not permit it and the laboring men of Europe would not fight each other.

Mr. Chairman, it was those teachings, it was those textbooks, which the Liberal Party allowed to guide them, and so left England unprepared for war. I hope that we shall find ourselves confronted with no such result here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was astonished this morning to hear extracts read from Admiral Fiske's evidence and extracts from Admiral Fletcher's evidence, tending to show that this demand for dreadnaughts is unreasonable.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if I were to take extracts from the testimony of those gentlemen and not read the context, I could prove anything on earth. But everybody knows that Admiral Fiske is one of the three rear admirals on the General Board which made this recommendation for four battleships which is provided by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] in this very amendment which we are now considering.

But the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] went into a long explanation of the superiority of our 14-inch guns over somebody's else 12-inch guns. He did not tell you that there are 14 British dreadnaughts built and building and 3 German dreadnaughts built and building which carry 15-inch

guns of 45 calibers each. Our largest Navy guns are 14-inch guns. I am not an expert, so I can not say which is best—our 14-inch guns or the British and German 15-inch guns. There was a big fight in the North Sea the other Sunday. Nine big ships were engaged. Every one of them was faster than the fastest battleship we have in our Navy. The slowest ship, the *Blücher*, was sunk because she could not keep up with her sister ships. Her speed was 5 knots an hour less than the others and she was sunk. Yet the *Blücher* was faster than the fastest ship we have in the United States Navy, except the small fry, like submarines and destroyers. Now, gentlemen, you can not get away from facts of that sort even by saying that the people on the Mersey are terrified for fear of attack from some German submarine. How do we know they are terrified? Because the headlines say so? The papers said that London was terrified at the prospect of Zeppelin raids; that early in the winter London was going to be attacked by a fleet of Zeppelins. That prophecy has not as yet been fulfilled. I have had many letters from those with whom I worked in London last summer. Up to date they have not heard of the terror over there.

Now, as to these submarines, I do not know whether the people are terrified by them or not. I am a great believer in plenty of submarines, especially ocean-going submarines, but I want fighting ships more.

In reply to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] as to how big an armament I believe in, I answer in this way: The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] how he proposed to protect the Pacific coast against Japan in case of war, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania replied, "I leave that to the military experts." That is the most sensible remark anybody has made on the floor of this House to-day. What is the use of taking the best officers in the Navy and putting them on the General Board and then, when they report year after year what we need in the way of armament, what is the sense of always telling them, "Oh, that is all wrong. You gentlemen do not know what you are talking about. You are all rascals who are trying to increase your rank. That is what you are. We congressional experts are the only people who know"?

Supposing that we Congressmen are actually the real people who know. Perhaps we know by intuition. We certainly do not know from listening to debates, because we do not listen, and on a good many questions we do not vote because we are in our offices when the Committee of the Whole divides. I took the RECORD of last Monday to find how many of us were present when the votes were ordered on questions relating to the plucking board of the Navy. I found that—counting everybody who came out of the smoking rooms, counting everybody within sound of the division bell, counting everybody from the lobby, and counting everybody in their seats—about 80 Members out of over 400 decided all these questions. By the way, I doubt whether there are more than 80 Members in the Hall at the present moment. There may not be so many. Of those present I venture to say that there are not a dozen who can tell us, as a matter of fact, what armaments our dreadnaughts carry or how many dreadnaughts we have completed.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. You stated a moment ago that the *Blücher* was the slowest ship in the German Navy.

Mr. GARDNER. Not exactly.

Mr. HELM. In that engagement.

Mr. GARDNER. I stated that she was the slowest of the nine big ships engaged.

Mr. HELM. She was the slowest in that engagement.

Mr. GARDNER. Of the nine engaged.

Mr. HELM. And that she was faster than our fastest battleship.

Mr. GARDNER. Our fastest battleship or any other ship except the small fry.

Mr. HELM. Who is to blame for the defect in the construction of our battleships, that do not measure up to the worst ship that was in that engagement, almost all of which battleships have been constructed since the construction of the *Blücher*?

Mr. GARDNER. Do you mean to say, Is the Republican Party to blame?

Mr. HELM. No; just a moment, please.

Mr. GARDNER. I am going to answer.

Mr. HELM. I want the gentleman to understand the purpose of my question.

Mr. GARDNER. What the gentleman wants to know is whose fault it is. It is the fault of the people of the United States, that we cut and pare. When the General Board told us we must have 48 battleships, we have given them 37 instead. When they told us we ought to have 192 destroyers, we have given them 68 odd. Every year we have chopped and cheeseparred until now we have a navy which is a bad third to Great Britain and Germany; and when the ships of France that were built and building on July 1, 1914, are completed and our own ships under construction at the same date are completed, we shall be fourth.

Mr. HELM. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Is it not a fact that this defect is a defect of speed, not a defect of numbers? And, as a matter of fact, instead of having in my mind that it is a dereliction of the Republican Party, if I were going to place the blame, answering my own question, I should place it on the Navy Department and not upon Congress.

Mr. GARDNER. All right. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have my way, I will accept an amendment to the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama and couple his amendment asking for two more battleships with another amendment sending to the scrap heap our three oldest battleships, for they are over 20 years old.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were no battleships engaged in that fight.

Mr. GARDNER. There were nine battle cruisers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But no battleships.

Mr. GARDNER. I shall correct that in the permanent RECORD. The battle cruisers engaged were the *Indomitable*, the *Lion*, the *Princess Royal*, the *New Zealand*, the *Tiger*, the *Blücher*, the *Moltke*, the *Seydlitz*, and the *Derfflinger*.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Those are in a distinct class from the battleships.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to correct that. The *Blücher* is not a battle cruiser, but is an armored cruiser.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The battle cruiser is a different type of vessel from the battleship.

Mr. GARDNER. As I said, the *Blücher* is not a battle cruiser, but an armored cruiser far inferior, with a 23-knot speed; but that is not the point.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it is the point.

Mr. GARDNER. It is not the point. The point is that we have not got in the Navy vessels that can compete in speed with the fleets which they would have to fight in case of war.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me ask the gentleman——

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman will not let me complete my answer.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was trying to keep the gentleman calm.

Mr. GARDNER. What is the question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman if the criticism that we have not the speed of these battle cruisers is not due to the fact that the General Board has not recommended and Congress has not provided battle cruisers, which are needed chiefly for their high speed and for armament, and that the General Board, and Congress following its recommendations, has provided for battleships, which are distinct from the battle cruiser by not having such high speed and being more fully protected by armor.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says that the General Board has not recommended battle cruisers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina). The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that the other day I was allowed 10 minutes in which to present some arguments, and when the time was up I had not quite finished and I asked to have my time extended, and the gentleman from Massachusetts graciously objected. I then asked to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and he objected to that.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I did not. I went to the gentleman and told him that I should not object the second time.

Mr. HAMLIN. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon; but he objected to my proceeding.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman knows that the objection was not directed at him, but at the minority leader.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am not going to act as graciously as the gentleman from Massachusetts did. I am going, as far as I am concerned, to permit him to extend his remarks for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. One moment, Mr. Chairman. I was entitled to recognition, in my opinion, some time ago under the custom of the House, but the Chair thought otherwise and recognized two gentlemen in succession who opposed the amendment. I am going to incorporate in the RECORD a reference to section 1445 of Hinds' Precedents:

> A member of the committee having occupied the floor in favor of a measure, a member opposing should be recognized, even though he be not a member of the committee.

If the gentleman from Missouri will recall, I explained to him that my objection was not directed at him, but arose owing to a difference with the minority leader. I went to him and said if he would ask again I should not object, whereupon he did ask permission and some other gentleman objected.

Mr. HAMLIN. At any rate, the gentleman's objection was effective and I could not extend my remarks. I am not going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman from New York answer my question? I understood him to say that the general board has not recommended any battle cruisers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding is that the board has insisted on battleships as the vital feature of the Navy, and has especially emphasized the recommendation for additional battleships and has not requested battle cruisers.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman is mistaken and that the general board recommended one battle cruiser last year, but it was turned down. If I am mistaken, I shall correct the mistake later in the day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not talking about last year. They have recommended four battleships for eight years past and have been turned down every year. Such action did not discourage them, but they renewed the recommendation from year to year.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman may be right; but the fact remains that we do not have in the United States Navy a battleship of any kind that is as fast as the nine ships that fought the battle in the North Sea.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The *Blücher* was an armored cruiser, was she not?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The largest and most powerful the Germans had?

Mr. GARDNER. I think so.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Would it not be fair to compare it with our own armored cruisers, and would you not find that we had two superior to it in armament and equal in speed?

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely; but there would still be the question as to how we would come out of such a battle as that which took place in the North Sea. I hear some one say, "We should lick 'em." That's the talk. We can lick all creation. Yes; we can send our Naval Militia to man the sound steamers, and they can leave their counting houses some fine afternoon and go out and thrash the British Navy. The gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago says that we may wake up to-morrow and find the British fleet at the bottom of the sea and that we can "lick" what remains. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is no use in building a single battleship. We can swim and "lick 'em"! [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not a naval expert, neither am I a student of war conditions, and I do not propose to involve myself in an argument of that kind; but this House and the country is facing a serious financial condition. According to my estimates of the receipts for next year and the expenditures that are now proposed, the ordinary expenditures will exceed the receipts by some $20,000,000. That is not due to a falling off in the revenue, because the additional revenue or emergency revenue bill that we passed last fall will supplement the revenues that we lose at the customhouses by reason of the war in Europe, but it is due to your increased appropriations. In addition to that—the deficit in ordinary expenditures—there will be a deficit in the Post Office Department, due to a falling off of postal receipts, of at least $14,000,000, unless conditions change very much. Of course that condition has been brought about to a large extent by reason of the war in Europe. Our foreign mail service is not paying the revenues to the Government that it has paid in the past, which is natural, and the cost of the service is practically the same. So that as this condition faces the country and the House, unless you are willing to retrench in expenditures, or unless when the next Congress meets you are willing to increase the taxation, you are going to face a deficit in the Treasury of something like $35,000,000. That is a problem for this House to determine, as to whether or not you propose to go on increasing the expenditures, and when the time comes next year supplement that increase of expenditures by additional taxation, or whether you are willing to retrench in your expenditures.

This bill, as I understand it, carries appropriations for an increase in the Navy of some $58,000,000. I believe that is seven or eight millions of dollars in excess of what the bill carried last year.

Mr. PADGETT. The authorization is $53,000,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Fifty-three million dollars, with an excess of seven or eight millions over what was authorized last year. The question that confronts this House is as to whether or not you are willing to make some reasonable cuts in this bill or whether you think the exigencies that confront the country now justify you in increasing appropriations for armor and armament, notwithstanding the fact that you must, if you go on with your increases, levy additional taxes on the American people to meet these increases. As I say, I am not a naval expert, but I have always believed that the man who carries the pistol around in his back pocket is in very much greater danger of getting into trouble than the man who goes unarmed. [Applause.] I believe that if you propose to enter into a race of armaments because you believe you are behind other nations in your military forces and your naval equipment, the end of the story will mean war. [Applause.] I believe we ought to have a reasonable navy and a reasonable army, but I do not want to see my country have either a navy or an army that will invite us to make issues that may precipitate our people into the caldron of bloodshed and disaster. [Applause.]

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like not to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. I will make the question very brief. Would the gentleman surrender the Monroe doctrine and the open-door policy rather than to fight, or either of them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think the time will ever come when it will be necessary for this country to maintain the great principles of our fathers at the point of the sword. [Applause.] I have no fear whatever that my countrymen will maintain their position in this world, their position for what is right and what is just, and as long as we only maintain for our National Government a position of what is right and what is just, in my judgment we will succeed without the arbitrament to the battle field. [Applause.] But I believe that you can make a reasonable cut in the appropriations provided for in this bill without endangering your position in the family of nations and at the same time go a long way toward meeting the exigency of your Treasury Department.

I suggest that if you would cut out of this bill one battleship it would save for the next year $5,678,000. If you cut out of this bill five submarines, it would save $1,385,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. On the question of the battleship which is authorized this year, would there be $6,000,000 expended on it in the next fiscal year?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I asked the chairman of the committee to give me the figures.

Mr. MANN. Of course, this bill carries an appropriation——

Mr. PADGETT. That is the authorization.

Mr. MANN. Would there be that much expended?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There would be that much appropriation in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have more time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman from Alabama proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I did not suppose it was possible if the battleship was authorized now to expend $6,000,000 upon it in the next fiscal year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I am not an expert on these questions; and not being an expert, not having the knowledge myself, I asked the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would yield for a moment in order that I may correct one of his statements. The gentleman stated that if we would strike out five submarines we would save between one and two million dollars. The testimony before our committee is that those submarines cost $550,000 each, and five submarines knocked out of this bill would save nearly $3,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. That is authorization and not appropriation. The gentleman from Alabama is giving the figures as to the appropriation for the next year carried in this bill for the different authorizations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In other words, that the boats would not be finished entirely next year.

Mr. PADGETT. In other words, the authorization of a battleship is on a cost of about $15,000,000, but of that amount we appropriate the first year only $3,678,999.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not giving the figures which would ultimately be saved to the Government.

Mr. PADGETT. In regard to the submarines, each submarine is $220,000 in construction and machinery and $57,000 in armor and armament. That would be $277,000 each, and five times that much for five submarines would be the gentleman's figures.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The figures which I have here are those given to me at my request by the chairman of the committee. They do not represent the ultimate cost of these boats, but merely the saving which we would save next year. That is the point I have in mind. Now, if you cut out of the bill one hospital ship, you would save $500,000. If you strike out the transport, you would save $1,125,000 for next year, making a total that you can save in this bill in the construction of one battleship, five submarines, a hospital ship, and a transport, of $8,088,000, or about the amount that you are increasing this bill over last year.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The authorizations are about $8,000,000 more; the appropriations are about $4,000,000 more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What I say to the House is this: You are in no more danger of war to-day than you were when the naval appropriation bill was passed last winter a year ago. [Applause.] Evidently you are in less danger of war, because the various nations of Europe are locking horns between themselves, and if this Government pursues its own way wisely and safely, as I believe it will, under the administration of the President of the United States, we are in less danger of war than we have been for many years before. Now, as to the armament, I am no judge of what battleships we should build or what submarines, but I do know this, that the entire naval armament of the world is being tested to-day. The world is learning its first great lesson in the school of experience on the battle line, as to what ships are best to build and what ships in the future may be abandoned as worthless in naval affairs. Therefore it seems to me to-day is a wise time, and instead of increasing your appropriations at least to cut them down to what you have been appropriating in the past, and let the experience of Europe in this war teach you where you can wisely and most efficiently expend your money in the future. Now, before I take my seat I propose to offer an amendment to the pending amendment to strike out four battleships and make it one battleship.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Two.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, there is an amendment to that; I expect to amend the amendment, so that the House may have an opportunity directly to vote upon this question. If I understand that the sentiment of the House is willing to have that reduction, I will then propose to cut down the submarine boats by five, which will reduce them to the number proposed, as I understand, by the naval authorities themselves; but, of course, if the sentiment of this House is to go on with this increase, why, then, I will have to submit, and will submit cheerfully.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy recommended 8 submarines. The general board recommended 16 what we call coast-defense vessels, costing about $550,000, and 3 large seagoing. The 12 of which the gentleman and myself were speaking, and my personal expression to him was made in reference to what I had suggested to the committee, and that is where the 12 came in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The 12 would be at least in a mean between the general board's recommendation and the Secretary of the Navy. Now, in conclusion I only want to say this: Here is an opportunity where you can cut out of this bill between eight and nine million dollars without in any way affecting the efficiency of the public service. There is no imminent danger of war. On account of the conditions that have been brought about by the war in Europe in the Treasury Department you are facing a deficit unless you cut your appropriations, or unless you are willing to go to your constituencies and say that you propose to increase the burden of taxation on them in order that you can increase your expenditures. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHERWOOD. As the gentleman says there is no danger of war and we have more battleships now than we know what to do with, why should not we cut out all the battleships and reduce the amount by $15,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that if I were following my own desire in the matter I would cut out both battleships at the present time. [Applause.] But I want to accomplish something; I want to try to work out a plan that can succeed or has hopes of succeeding. Now, I know that there are a good many men in this House who would not be willing to go too far on such a program, but I think the exigencies of the Treasury Department are such that we ought to make an earnest effort to cut down some of these appropriations, and therefore I am willing to compromise on both sides of the House and strike a golden mean and leave one battleship in there if the House is willing to agree to a reasonable program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 15 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock. That will be a half an hour, and we have already spent nearly three hours in debate on this question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer. I do not desire to speak on the number of ships, but I do desire to have five minutes to speak upon the speed of ships and to offer and speak upon an amendment which I offered, and which was carried four years ago, providing that they should have a speed at least equal to the highest speed of any battleship in the world. I desire to offer that amendment, and I must have five minutes' time in which to speak upon it. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me five minutes for that purpose?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me just a moment. I failed to offer my amendment. If the committee will allow me, I would like to move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama by striking out "four" and inserting "one."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "four" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "one."

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendments are now in order. Two amendments have already been offered.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I offer a substitute for the amendment as amended.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is in order. The gentleman offers a substitute for the pending amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman wanted to move to strike out the paragraph. I think that would be in order.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is what I move to do—to strike out the paragraph

The CHAIRMAN. That will be in order. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning with line 2 and ending with line 8 on page 64 of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to modify my request. We have already been debating the matter about two and one-half hours now. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at half past 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at half past 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GRAY. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that this is the main feature of the bill, probably.

Mr. PADGETT. Largely so; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. We can finish the bill to-day and to-night, anyhow. Let us find out how much time the gentlemen want.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request again and try to accommodate the Members as best I can. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent——

Mr. MANN. I would like to control an hour on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. I was going to leave it to the Chair to control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair prefers the gentlemen shall control the time.

Mr. MANN. I would like to control an hour on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. That the gentleman from Illinois control one hour and I control the other. I will divide that time among the number applying for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in two hours, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the other hour to be controlled by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I want 10 minutes to speak in support of my amendment, and I object unless I can get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

Mr. BATHRICK. He stated he would not object if he could get the time he asked for.

Mr. PADGETT. I move that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two hours.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOWLER and Mr. BATHRICK demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 66, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may consume one hour of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will control an hour and the gentleman from Tennessee an hour. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-six Members are present—a quorum. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph. When will it be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be in order until the amendments now pending are disposed of.

Mr. HOBSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the committee gave me control of one hour.

Mr. HOBSON. That is what I wanted to ask about.

Mr. FOWLER. I object to anybody controlling any of the time except the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's objection comes too late. The Chair stated the proposition and nobody objected, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FOWLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. There are Members on the floor who desire to offer amendments to this paragraph. I desire to know if there will be any opportunity given for the purpose of offering additional amendments and for debate thereon?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that there are now pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] to strike out the paragraph and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], and an amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and until the last amendment is disposed of, no other amendment will be in order; but when that is disposed of, the gentleman will have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the Chair if it is not parliamentary to offer an amendment to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks it might be in order to offer an amendment to perfect the paragraph, but two amendments are now pending for that purpose.

Mr. FOWLER. But is it not parliamentary to offer an amendment to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be, but there is no substitute pending.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that there is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair understands otherwise. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to have the privilege of offering a substitute for the amendment now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. But a substitute is not in order for the reason that there are two amendments now pending, and it is not in order to offer an amendment when two amendments are pending, a substitute being an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. What are these two amendments that are now pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] offered a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. He offered an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was in the form of a substitute, was it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all. The other amendments are for the purpose of perfecting the paragraph, and they will be disposed of before the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I understand that the rule adopted is that the debate on the paragraph and amendments to it will conclude in two hours. Does that cover the substitute I offered for the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does. It covers the gentleman's amendment, together with all other amendments which have been offered and which may be offered. Now the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am not assuming the attitude before this House of a military or naval expert. I am simply trying to apply some plain common sense to the conditions that I find exist from a careful reading of the newspapers. The first thing that attracts me in this morning's newspapers is that an ex-Secretary of the Navy states that the inefficiency of our Navy is due to politicians. Now, every Member of Congress knows the department must submit its estimates and recommend the type of ship, including speed, armor, and size of guns, and Congress has almost always followed the department's lead. The

Congress of the United States has been extremely liberal not only with the War Department but with the Navy Department in all of its requests. Neither of these departments can claim that they have not had ample funds. For the last 14 years, according to this statement coming from ex-Secretary of the Navy Meyer, the total appropriations for our Navy from 1900 to 1914 were $1,656,000,000, while the appropriations for the same period for Germany's Navy were $1,137,000,000.

We have not as effective a fighting organization in our Navy as Germany has in hers. Nobody would dare get on this floor and say that we can go into battle in anything like the state of efficiency that Germany stands to-day. Her navy is organized on a fighting basis. The combined navies of Great Britain and France can not protect their commerce against her.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. One of the chief items of expense in our Army and Navy is the pay of the men.

Mr. HELM. My good friend, if you had been here at former sessions of Congress and heard me criticize the excessive pay and emoluments the officers in the Army have been getting, you would be convinced that you are mistaken. Why, Members have almost been ready to get up and fight because I have been contending for years that the War Department and the Navy Department had not an organization fitted for fighting purposes. It has not been so long since promotions in the Army were based on proficiency as a landscape gardener; the officer that kept his post in attractive order was advanced for that reason. That is the fight I have been trying to make and maintain here for several years. The difficulty is that these departments have not been directing their efforts to the business of building up a fighting machine, but the attention of the Army and the Navy has been directed to getting more pay and emoluments out of the United States Treasury and to the social equation. That has been the line of my fight.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think the enlisted man gets too much or too little pay?

Mr. HELM. No; but the officers do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But the greater part of the expenditure is for the pay of the enlisted men.

Mr. HELM. Oh, no; you are dead wrong, my dear fellow. The pay for these officers of the Army and Navy runs up into millions and millions.

Now, I am trying to point out some of the defects that are so glaring that an unskilled and inexperienced layman as myself can see; the trouble is that everybody here seems to think that the whole problem depends on the number of battleships we have in the Navy and the number of soldiers we have in the Army, when the fact is that both armies and navies consist of a number of organizations perfected into a fighting machine. Please tell me, when gentlemen get up here and show that we have only one submarine that is capable of submerging, what fighting efficiency there is in that? It is an indictment of somebody. We have heard the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs go down the line and prove that while several of our submarines can be used for some purposes, only one of them is a perfect machine.

Whose fault is that? The department has been granted almost all the money it has asked for, yet the speed of our ships is too slow, according to a published statement of an ex-Secretary of the Navy, while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if I understood him correctly, says our battleships are fitted out with torpedo tubes that never have been fired. Am I correct in that?

Mr. GARDNER. No. Does the gentleman want to know what I did say?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I quoted from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, Admiral Straus, in which he says:

> At present all these vessels—
>
> Referring to battleships anterior to the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*—in other words, every battleship now complete—
>
> all these vessels are equipped with a short-range torpedo, which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet.

Mr. HELM. There you are. That is the kind of defect I am complaining about. Here is the gentleman from Alabama, Capt. HOBSON, asking for the building of four more battleships, which, according to his own statement, will be supplied with ineffective 12-inch shells. He ought to know whether this statement is right or wrong. It is a serious statement and a vital matter. If our battleships have been supplied with shells that are to all effects and purposes worthless, have we not incurred the risk of being compelled to go into a naval engagement with no ammunition at all? Whose fault is it, and where does the blame rest? These are some of the fatal defects that I am trying to point out and am trying to get before the attention of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made a plea for economy, and claimed, of course, that the condition of the Treasury was due to the war, and he is pleading for economy upon the ground that the Treasury is empty. Now, if the condition of the Treasury to-day is due to lack of customs revenues, I wish that the distinguished leader had stayed on the floor long enough to explain why it was that the customs revenues last year, as compared with January, 1913, decreased over $5,000,000 seven months before the war. Was that due to the war in Europe? How did it happen that the customs revenues last February, six months before the war, decreased $9,900,000? Was that due to the war in Europe? I wish that some of my mathematical friends on the other side of the aisle would figure out how we happen to have a deficiency of $70,000,000 in the National Treasury due to the falling off of the customs revenues, due to the war, when the figures just issued by the Treasury Department show that our imports last year were only $3,200,000 less than they were in 1913.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members present—a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, when the point of no quorum was made I had just asked that some mathematical genius arise and enlighten the world as to how we could lose $70,000,000 of revenues upon $3,200,000 worth of imports, one-half of which are on the free list.

Referring to the condition of the revenues for just a moment—in May, 1916, sugar will be on the free list, and we shall lose $53,000,000 there. In 1916 the present so-called war tax will end, and we will lose $54,000,000 there. Adding that to the present deficiency, and in 1916 we will have a deficiency of $177,000,000 in the National Treasury. When this happens are you going to quit building a navy entirely? Instead of striking out a battleship would it not be better to place the tariff back upon sugar and revive that industry in the South, and take that much money away from the Sugar Trust and give it to the Government? Although we have already lost $12,000,000 revenue on sugar, will any man on this floor rise and say that he has bought a pound of sugar for one cent less? Would it not be better to restore the duty upon wool and get $15,000,000 into the National Treasury from that source rather than strike out a battleship? Will anyone claim we are buying clothes for less? What are you going to do? Are you going to leave this country without any protection simply because you have not the courage to enact a tariff bill that will produce the necessary revenue? My distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said that the man who carried a pistol is much more apt to get into a quarrel than one who does not. Perhaps that is true. It depends on circumstances. If somebody knew that I had in my home something that he wanted, and was determined to break into my house and get it, I would think I would be very much less apt to have trouble with that gentleman if I was armed and he knew it. China is to-day without a pistol. Shall we imitate her?

Now, I want to turn just for a moment to the Pacific coast. I asked my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] this morning—I am sorry he is not on the floor at this moment—how we would protect the Pacific coast if we had war to-day? His answer was that we were prepared to defend it. How? He did not tell you. On the Pacific coast it is not a question of adequate Navy. We have none there. There is now, and has been for years, but one battleship upon the Pacific. We do not have ample fortifications. The largest battle squadron in the world can go right up to the wharves at Bellingham, a town of 25,000 people, without coming within 15 miles of any gun, and there they can take control of three great transcontinental railroads. Do you tell me that is protection?

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. The Pacific coast has not suffered any because of that situation, has it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what the gentleman means by that.

Mr. HENSLEY. You say you have but one battleship over on the Pacific coast. I ask you whether the Pacific coast has suffered any because of that situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Maybe not, but will the gentleman pretend to say that one battleship is sufficient protection for the Pacific coast? Is that the argument he wants to make?

Mr. HENSLEY. Has it not been sufficient?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes; and we need not have had any Navy on that theory. Why do we need a navy on the Atlantic coast if that argument is good?

Mr. HENSLEY. Why are you so frightened about it right now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not stop to answer so absurd a proposition as that. The gentleman stands as the best illustration of the valor of ignorance that I have ever witnessed.

Mr. HENSLEY. "Upon what meat doth this our Cæsar feed that he is grown so great?"

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not feed on the same that the gentleman does, for I would not make the exhibition of myself on the floor of this House that he has made. If the gentleman wants to interrupt again, why, let him come ahead.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about protection upon the Pacific coast the reply always made so far has been that we do not need to fortify those cities, because they have told us that an unfortified city would not be attacked in time of war.

We have seen the answer to that in Europe. We know that if we had a war the great cities of the Pacific coast, if the enemy could reach them, would be captured and placed under tribute. But the reply they make is that we have our battleship squadron which can be sent through the Panama Canal to the Pacific coast. What are the facts about that? You let war be declared to-morrow, and if it was with Japan and she was prepared exactly as we are prepared—and the presumption is that she would be in much better shape because she would know that she was going to declare war; but suppose she is in no better shape than we are—a battleship squadron from Japan would reach Puget Sound two weeks before you could possibly get our squadron there. What protection would our battleship squadron be to the Pacific coast two weeks after the Japanese squadron had been there? Gentlemen who make the statement ought to study their geography. Take down your map and look at it, and you will see that from Panama, when you are through the canal, to Seattle is almost the same distance as it is from Seattle to Yokohama. We must have a squadron through the canal and on the Pacific Ocean before we would be on equal terms with a squadron starting from Japan.

Gentlemen apparently lose sight of that. We on the Pacific coast have always supported the naval bill but have not received any benefits from it. We have been left absolutely unprotected. We believe that we are still a part of the Union. We think that when we are paying the taxes we ought to receive some consideration. There is not a man on the floor of this House on either side who will stand up in his place now and for one moment say that the Pacific coast is protected from attack. The only thing they say is, "Oh, we can defend the Pacific." How? These boasts do not have much weight. I sometimes think that that class of men—unintentionally, of course—honest, patriotic as any of us, who talk this way, who say that we can raise a million men overnight and that we could defeat any enemy without guns or ammunition; who say, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said; who think that we could swim out and sink these fleets—while they are sincere, I think they are doing the country great injury. If statements of that kind were made by a foreigner, how quickly you would resent it and reach the conclusion that they were doing that only to throw us off our guard. As one man from the Pacific coast, I believe that the only protection to that coast, the greatest guaranty of peace, is in the Navy. I do not advocate a great standing Army, although I would like to see it larger than it now is; but to spend a reasonable amount for the Navy, as a protection for the Pacific coast, is the best guaranty for peace. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will withhold his point of order for a moment.

Mr. FOWLER. I will withhold it.

Mr. MANN. I had figured upon giving 5 minutes more to the gentleman from Washington, but as he does not want it I will be glad to yield it to my colleague from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yields 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. HOBSON. And the chairman has yielded 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], which makes 10 minutes. I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will not withdraw his point of no quorum in the interest of expediting business?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present—a quorum.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just at this point, while Members are here, I want to make a suggestion. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has notified me that he intends to make continued points of no quorum. I am going to ask the House to remain in session to-night until we pass this bill. If Members will stay here and maintain a quorum, it will expedite the passage of the bill. If they do not remain here, it will be just that much more inconvenience for Members and will delay the adjournment to-night. I hope that Members will stay on the floor and avoid that necessity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] that I am to have the 5 minutes which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yielded to him. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Illinois to yield 5 minutes to his colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PADGETT. I am to have the 5 minutes that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. MANN. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the chairman of the committee proposes to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], provided the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yields him the 5 minutes that he yielded to Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. MANN. I decline to do that.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I have yielded my time and I have only 5 minutes remaining, which I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed a most wonderful performance on the floor of this House. This paragraph provides for two battleships, but the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has offered an amendment for four. We have debated this amendment for more than an hour, and now it is proposed to debate it for two hours more, and at the end of that time the debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto is to be closed.

Mr. Chairman, there are Members here on the floor of the House who believe that our Navy is weak and inefficient because of the slowness of our war vessels and a failure to equip them with high explosive shells. We have been led to believe that when we reached this paragraph we would be given an opportunity to offer amendments and ample time to debate these important features, but by the action of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. PADGETT], aided by a few men of his type, we are deprived of such opportunity. Now in order to allay our outraged feelings he and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] generously propose to yield to us 10 minutes in which to present our views. Our disappointment can only be measured by our bitter contempt for such conduct, and I denounce it as an outrage not only upon the American Navy but upon the American people. Such offer to contribute this crumb of time to me is no inducement to me to keep quiet while wrongs are being committed against the welfare of my country. I would not consent to the compromise of any matter, however great or important to me personally, if in doing so it carried with it the compromise of my own honor or the honor of my country.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known, not only in America, but to the people throughout the civilized countries of the world, that the speed of the American Navy drops down so low that it becomes a tub as compared with the other navies of the world. The speed of our dreadnaughts will not average more than 14 to 18 knots. The greatest speed claimed for any of them is 21 knots, while most of them have a much less speed; whereas the speed of the dreadnaught type of other countries such as Great Britain, Germany, Japan, Russia, and even the least country which claims to be a naval power, Italy, is 25 knots. Yet our tub Navy drags along year after year under the influence of a spell thrown over Congress which is like the spell thrown over the king and his audience at the appearance of Banquo's ghost. From what source this spell comes I am unable

to say, but when I was a member of the Illinois Legislature I saw spells come over that body, and when I saw leading Democratic members and leading Republican members hugging and kissing each other in and about the capitol and walking leisurely in arms to the hotels it meant the planning for and final division of a jack pot.

Mr. Chairman, there is an invisible force, an undercurrent influence which permeates some of the greatest affairs of our Government. The Armor Trust has played its part most skillfully, and the only man in the Department of the Navy who has ever had enough courage to beard this lion in his den was Hon. H. A. Herbert, Secretary of the Navy under Mr. Cleveland, until the present Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, arrived on the scene. In both of his annual reports he denounced this infamous, mottled, and many-angled concern as a highwayman, criminally holding him up in naval contracts.

Mr. Chairman, some of the Members of Congress have been studying the philosophy of modern naval engagements abroad and have come to the conclusion that we should not only increase the speed of our war vessels but that we should equip them with high-explosive shells, and we are anxious to offer amendments at this juncture, as it is the only place in the bill which will permit such amendments to be offered without encountering the shoals of points of order, which would be promptly made and which would be just as promptly sustained, but by an arrangement which has been perfected by the influence of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs we are absolutely cut off from offering an amendment for that purpose. Members on the other side of the aisle wanted to offer such amendments——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman very much. Does the gentleman know that those fast battle cruisers cost $22,000,000 each?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I do not know it; but on the other hand I have consulted experts, as great experts as live in this country, and they say that if those two vessels that we are about to authorize were constructed on the battle-cruiser type we would save $3,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not according to the information given to us.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the report I received, and I submitted the question to one of the greatest naval experts in the world. Mr. Chairman, if the American Congress could get a fair opportunity to debate the question of the speed and character of the explosives on these two vessels I have no doubt but that we would find a majority on the floor of the House to-day in favor of both increasing the speed and supplying them with high-explosive shell.

HIGH SPEED IS THE LIFE OF A NAVY.

Mr. Chairman, about a dozen years ago Great Britain began to increase the speed of her warships. Up to that time her battleships had a speed of 17 and 18 knots. Her armored cruisers had a speed of 20 to 22 knots. This was practically the speed of the battleships and armored cruisers of the naval powers of the world, such as Germany, United States, France, Japan, Russia, and Italy. Apparently no effort had been made prior to this date to excel in speed, naval genius having been employed in a desperate struggle to produce on the one hand an armor plate so thick and so tough that it could not be penetrated by a projectile, while on the other side an equally desperate effort had been made to produce a shell which could penetrate the most perfect armor. This rivalry developed the kruppized nickel armor and the armor-piercing shell; both sides were claiming the victory.

Just about this time two high-explosive shells made their appearance in naval circles. They were both invented by Americans—Gathman and Isham. Gathman used guncotton as an explosive and Isham used trinitrotoluol. Each of these inventors claimed that his shell could be thrown out of a gun at long range and that on striking a vessel it would explode and sink the ship.

In 1907 Great Britain decided to drop the armored cruiser and planned the construction of the battle cruiser with a high speed. Critics, not only in Great Britain but in all naval circles, condemned this new type of warship. The advantages of this new ship are summed up in an editorial by the editor of the Naval and Military Record, a British weekly magazine, page 72. I quote the last paragraph:

"We owe the critics of the battle cruiser a debt of gratitude. Despite their activity they did not succeed in deflecting the admiralty from its policy except for a very short period, when money was scarce and the needs of the navy in other directions insistent. The naval authorities persisted in the construction of battle cruisers, and, happily, the Dominions provided two others, raising the total number to 10. And then, at last, in the *Queen Elizabeth* class they evolved the apotheosis of the battle cruiser in which, owing to the substitution of oil for coal and the consequent saving of weight, we obtained a ship with a speed exceeding that of any large cruiser in the world in combination with gun power and armament superior to those of any other battleships built or building for service under any foreign flag. The debt which we owe to critics of the battle cruiser rests upon the assumption that they were in some measure responsible for the failure of other naval powers to imitate our policy and build battle cruisers. The only two nations which realized the value of this type were Germany and Japan. Fortunately, the enemy laid down only one vessel every year, and equally fortunately her strength in effective ships of this class has from one cause and another been steadily reduced. The *Goeben* is lost; the *Von der Tann*, if not lost, is missing; and the *Seydlitz* and *Derfflinger* are evidently out of action for several months. On the other hand, we still possess almost unimpaired the immense advantage which our margin of strength in vessels of this type confers upon us."

Germany soon followed Great Britain and Japan came in later on, and now Russia has four battle cruisers ordered for 1916. At the beginning of the European war Great Britain had 10 of these fast cruisers, with a speed of 27 to 35 knots. Germany had 5, with 3 more ordered, with a speed of 27 to 29 knots. Japan had 2 and 2 building, with a speed of 27 and 28 knots. Besides, Great Britain has increased her dreadnaughts to 25 knots. She now has 4 completed and 4 more building. Germany has increased hers to 23 knots, Italy has increased hers to 25 knots, and Japan and France have increased theirs to 22 knots. United States has stood still.

Just what success may be attained by a fleet of fast vessels can be more accurately ascertained by turning our attention to the naval engagements which have taken place between the British and German fleets since last July. Two decisive battles have been fought. One off the coast of Falkland Islands and the other on the North Sea.

In the battle off Falkland Islands the German fleet consisted of five vessels. The *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau*, armored cruisers, with a speed of 22 knots, the *Leipzig*, a cruiser, and *Nurnberg*, auxiliary cruiser, both of low speed, were all sunk. The British fleet was made up of fast battle cruisers, among which were the *Invincible* and *Inflexible*, with a speed of 28 knots. It is reported that the *Lion*, of 31 knots, was also there. It was a fight between low speed and little guns and high speed and big guns. The result was a complete victory for high speed and big guns.

In the battle on the North Sea the British and German fleets were more evenly matched in point of speed and guns. The Germans had four big ships, one armored cruiser, the *Blücher*, of 26 knots, and three battle cruisers, the *Seydlitz* and the *Derfflinger*, of 27 knots each, and the *Moltke*, with 28 knots. The British fleet had at least five battle cruisers, the *New Zealand*, 26 knots, the *Indomitable*, 28 knots, the *Tiger*, 29 knots, the *Lion*, 31 knots, and the *Princess Royal*, 34 knots. The *Blücher* was the slowest German ship in the fight, and she was the only ship that was sunk. Twenty-six knots proved to be too slow in a running fight and emphasizes the advantage of high speed over low speed.

Vice Admiral Sir David Beatty was in command of the English fleet, and in his report of the battle, found on page 70 of the Naval and Military Record of England, February 3, 1915, he says: "The situation developed by degrees into a stern chase. Speed was worked up to 28 and 29 knots, and the enemy were gradually being overhauled. At about 18,000 yards slow and deliberate fire was opened, and we began to hit at a range of 17,000 yards. * * * The result of the action was the *Blücher* sunk and two other battle cruisers very heavily on fire and seriously damaged." On page 71 of the same periodical, under the head of "The naval outlook," a French correspondent says: "The new victory of Admiral Beatty * * * is held to be a striking confirmation of the lesson of the battle of the Falkland Islands, once more demonstrating that speed, combined with superior caliber, enables the admiral that possesses such assets to force an unwilling enemy to fight and select the range at which crushing concentration of fire can be best realized with the maximum of results and the minimum risk."

Mr. Chairman, the Scientific American of February 6, 1915, page 128, in commenting on the efficiency of the American Navy, says:

"The predreadnaught, because of its slow speed and inferior gun power, would be unable to stand up in the battle

line against modern dreadnaughts. * * * It would seem that our Navy has at last come around to the recognition of the great strategic and practical value of the fast and heavily armed battle cruisers which undoubtedly have done the most work thus far in naval warfare."

The wish of the author of this language certainly is father to the thought, for as a matter of fact no such policy has been recommended by the Department of the Navy or the Committee on Naval Affairs. Many of us have been fighting for such a policy for the last four years, but those who have had charge of the appropriation bills for the Navy have invariably used their skill and power to defeat us, and they have succeeded in doing so.

All other naval powers have fast battle cruisers with a speed ranging from 25 to 35 knots, and ordinary common sense and patriotism demand that we should have them; and we would have them if Congress could free itself from the paralyzing influence of the armor trust. The Scientific American, on the same page referred to above, says:

"In addition to the vessels shown, the United States Navy includes 18 old cruisers of various out-of-date types, vessels which if used for makeshift scouts would be in danger of destruction by the swift and powerfully armed modern scouts and high-speed battle cruisers, of which the leading foreign nations possess so many."

In an editorial of January 26, 1915, the Washington Post, in commenting upon the results of this unfortunate event, under the heading "Big guns and swift ships most perfect defense," said:

"Sunday's encounter between British and German warships in the North Sea was a fair, open fight, with the opponents fairly well matched. The victory went to the British fleet because of large guns and because one of the German battle cruisers was overmatched in speed. * * * Admiral Craddock's big ships went down before heavier guns off the Chilean coast. Admiral von Spee, who defeated him, was in turn defeated, losing his squadron and his life off the Falkland Islands, when he encountered heavier guns and speedier ships. Now, the German squadron in the North Sea is beaten by speedier ships with bigger guns.

"Is any more evidence required by Congress as to the kind of vessels that should be provided for the United States Navy? Great Britain and Germany have furnished an object lesson to the United States that is priceless if heeded. The strongest and most effective defense that the United States can provide is a Navy of swift ships mounting the largest guns that can be turned out."

Mr. Chairman, it is said that the chameleon, a lizard-like animal of Africa, often becomes agitated, one portion of his body trying to go one way and the other part trying to go another way, which renders him unable to move at all. This more clearly represents the attitude of those charged with responsibility of furnishing America with an efficient navy.

HIGH EXPLOSIVE SHELLS.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known to all naval experts that high-explosive shells can be successfully used in naval warfare. In the present European war they have been employed by all of the warring nations, both on land and sea, and have proved to be the most destructive of all other projectiles. These shells were first used by Japan in naval warfare at the battle of Tsushima in 1905. In this battle Russia had eight battleships supplied with armor-piercing shells, while Japan had only four battleships, but equipped with high-explosive shells. By this advantage Japan was able to destroy the Russian fleet with but little damage to her own fleet.

In a target practice in 1911 at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay one high-explosive shell was sufficient to sink the *Puritan*. In November, 1913, the British navy, in a target practice, the *Empress of India* being used as the target, at a range of 17,000 yards, tore holes like great lock gates in her sides by high-explosive shells. In the siege of Liege in 1914 one high-explosive shell, thrown at long range from a big siege gun by the Germans, destroyed a mighty fort and killed 150 men.

Mr. Chairman, both the army and navy of every important country in the world are supplied with these modern high-explosive shells. But neither the Army or Navy nor the coast defense of America is supplied with them, yet they were invented by an American, who has offered us the use of his patent without cost. Admiral Strauss, chief of the Bureau of Naval Ordnance, says they are dangerous and without practical virtue, overestimated, and a delusion. This in the face of the tests which we have made with marvelous results—the destruction of the Russian fleet by Japan in 1905 by high-explosive shells, and the dreadful wholesale destruction of the strongest forts in the world during the present European war. Admiral, you had better get your ear to the ground. Something is going to happen.

THE TORPEDO DIVING SHELL.

At the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, I witnessed a most wonderful test with a torpedo diving shell, fired from a 12-inch gun with a velocity that would give it a range equal to the longest range at which a ship can be seen. When this shell struck the water it did not ricochet like other shells, but it took the water and ran forward 100 to 200 feet and then exploded, throwing up a large column of water, as a submarine mine would do. Had it encountered a war vessel in its path it would have exploded immediately upon striking it. I was informed by a naval expert who was present that former tests made with this shell demonstrated that an impact with the thinnest plate on a torpedo boat, or even a periscope of a submarine boat, was sufficient to cause the shell to explode immediately.

This marvelous experiment proves that this shell is destined to open up a new field in naval warfare. Henceforth torpedo shells may be fired through the air with the range and accuracy of other shells, and in addition to the deadly effect which will result on striking the vessel of the enemy, they may be made to strike the water in front of the vessel and dive under it and then explode against the most tender parts of the vessel with the most deadly effects. Mines may be planted by guns at long range.

The advent of the torpedo diving shell will render armor plate less useful, since it attacks a ship where it is not and can not be protected by armor. Moreover, the underwater part of a ship is a much larger target than that protected by armor; hence the probability of hitting a ship in its most tender parts and destroying it is much greater than the probability of hitting the armored parts. These tests demonstrate that a torpedo shell is available that will destroy any kind of a ship, from the heaviest dreadnaught down to the smallest torpedo boat or submarine, without even hitting them, and independent of their armor protection.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that it is the intention to charge these shells with trinitrotoluol, an explosive which, I understand, is perfectly safe. Now, if the Department of the Navy will supply the 28 battleships which the General Board of the Navy says are outranged and defenseless against fast ships having heavier guns in foreign navies with torpedo shells, the efficiency of the Navy may be vastly improved at a very small cost. If the Department of the Navy is sincere in its demand for greater battleship strength, it can be secured at once by supplying our old ships with these torpedo diving shells, thereby adding to our Navy fighting strength which is not possessed by any other navy in the world.

Mr. Chairman, on looking into the history of the high-explosive shell, I find it has been before Congress and this country for about 16 years. That during this period the advantages of fast warships equipped with these shells have been continuously urged by the inventor. Other countries recognizing the advantage of these modern inventions have built fast ships and equipped them with high-explosive shells, while we have adhered to a policy which has made our Navy the laughingstock of naval experts and the eyesore of those responsible for its inefficiency. The torpedo, the mine, the submarine, the turreted battleship, and nearly every other valuable invention in naval warfare are the inventions of Americans, and this crowning invention, the torpedo diving shell, which supplements all of these, is the invention of an American—Mr. Isham—and he should not only have credit for it, but America should have the advantage of appropriating its use to the exclusion of all other nations.

Like the great Ericsson, Mr. Isham is an engineer. He has gained international distinction in his profession by his works in three countries, and it is as an engineer rather than as an inventor that he has developed his new and wonderful system of attack. In unprejudiced circles Mr. Isham stands very high, and in order that Congress may give more attention to his splendid ideas with a view of securing his inventions for the benefit of our Navy I hereby quote what I recently heard an admiral of our Navy say concerning his ability, which was this: "I regard him"—meaning Mr. Isham—"as the highest authority in the United States on the use of high-explosive shells and their use in warfare."

Should America, through her Congress and Navy Department, fail to take the advantages of this shell and permit it to fall into the hands of other nations, it would certainly be a big blunder, if not a crime.

Mr. Chairman, those who have been charged with the responsibility of furnishing America with an efficient, up-to-date Navy must certainly begin to feel the weight of public criticism

during these troublesome times of wholesale bloodshed. They know that speed, long-range guns, torpedo shells, and torpedo diving shells are elements of strength. All of these are within easy reach and a failure to incorporate them in the future additions to our Navy will be good cause for retirement from public life. The nation which attains superiority in the speed of her ships, in the size and range of her guns, and in the size and explosive force of her shells will be able to control the high seas and dictate the commercial policy of the world.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago it was common to brag of our Navy, and Fourth of July orators often expressed unbounded confidence in our ability to "whip all creation." I never was in accord with this boastful spirit, which so often gave just offense to foreign nations, and if the only effect of the statements of those who defend a larger Navy was to silence these empty vaporings and raise the standard of efficiency in our fleets the result would be highly beneficial. Unfortunately, there are many critics of the Navy who are neither temperate nor accurate. Alarmists in the press and pessimists in Congress have assumed that a great conflict was impending and have gloomily predicted that in case of war our fleet would be annihilated, our coast towns bombarded, our territory invaded, and our national existence only saved by the payment of an immense ransom. The country at large has been astounded and terrified by these reckless assertions. Many whose opinion of the real conditions is based upon these erroneous statements have been clamoring for large additions to the Army and Navy, and, without stopping to think that the cost would not be confined to millions of dollars, but would run into billions, have demanded that we should have a Navy powerful enough to overcome that of any other nation.

Mr. Chairman, I can not claim to have had experience in the Navy, like the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], but I do not belong to the list of those who do not know how many dreadnaughts we have in our own Navy, nor what their armament is, and who have been referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. I have, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] suggested, made some study of these matters in the light of history and past events, and in the light of the lessons as I read them a conflict with England is so highly improbable as to be practically impossible, and a conflict with Japan is so many years away as to make it a remote possibility indeed. If England desired a war with this country, this is not the time that she would seek it. She had her opportunity many years ago, when we ourselves invited it. During a prior Democratic administration, that of Mr. Cleveland, we issued to England, through the message of the President, what was practically an ultimatum on a subject as to which it afterwards developed we were entirely in error if not absolutely in the wrong. At that time our Navy was weak indeed. England's Navy was then so much more powerful than ours as to make our fleet insignificant in comparison. No other international complications at that time troubled England. There was no danger that any other country would make war upon her. An unparalleled opportunity was then presented had England desired to have war with this Nation. This opportunity will never again present itself. England is now engaged in a conflict which will drain her resources for years to come and put war with us out of consideration. It was fortunate for us at that time that England did not call the bluff that we made, for it was more or less of a bluff; and it was fortunate also for England herself, because a conflict between this great Nation and that other great nation would not only be a calamity to the vanquished, but in only a lesser degree a calamity to the victor.

Our Navy is, indeed, much inferior to that of England—so much so that it is doubtful whether it would be possible for us to overtake that nation even if we put no limit upon expenditure. But we do not need such a navy any more than we need forts along the boundary line between us and Canada. The English Government has announced that it does not take into consideration the possibility of a war with this Nation, and we do not need to prepare for it.

It has been intimated that we are in danger of conflict with Japan. Japan is a poor nation, and is to-day in the throes of a financial and industrial depression. It is in urgent need of money, but it is so deficient in resources that its people are to-day groaning under the weight of taxation with which they are oppressed. Count Okuma in a recent public address said that the present war was a great financial and economic injury. When her last Parliament recently added $50,000,000 to their budget in order to pay the expenses of the war in which she is now engaged, the action precipitated a riot on the streets of Tokyo, and the ministry was compelled to resign. The Emperor dissolved the Parliament and new elections were called, to the end that some method might be devised to lessen the national burdens.

Let me say in this connection also, as showing the determination of England not to enter into conflict with us, that while Japan's alliance with England is both offensive and defensive, when Japan protested against the action of California, England had the United States excepted from the treaty which created this alliance in case of war between us and Japan.

Why it should be thought that in the midst of her financial difficulties Japan is seeking to cross swords with a nation like our own, which has a much stronger Navy and resources so much greater, is difficult to comprehend. Japan does not need more territory. It now has Korea, Formosa, and half of the great island of Sakhalin, only partially developed. There is plenty of room in these regions for its surplus population, and its statesmen realize that its future greatness must depend not so much upon its career in war as in the development of the arts of peace. It seems to be thought that it is a comparatively easy task for Japan to sail some 4,000 or 5,000 miles across the Pacific Ocean and attack our western coast. All naval experts have pronounced it to be a stupendous undertaking. Japan has not a single naval base on the way. It has no opportunity to replenish its navy, to keep up its supplies, and satisfactorily provide for its ships on that long voyage. An expedition of that kind would be of a nature that has never been undertaken in all the history of war—and, in my judgment, never will be. Let me say in this connection also, since gentlemen talk so easily of hostile fleets bombarding our coasts, that never in the history of modern naval warfare has any commander attempted or even thought of placing his vessels under the fire of half-way efficient coast defenses.

Even in the war which we had with Spain none of our admirals ever thought for a moment of putting his fleet under the fire of such antiquated fortifications as existed at Havana.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Was not that because they could land at Santiago?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. If we could have bombarded Havana we would have done so and forced its surrender.

Mr. GARDNER. But did not, because there were plenty of other places to land.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. GARDNER. That is what Admiral Fletcher said in his testimony.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He was speaking of another matter.

Gentlemen seem to talk as if there was no way of protecting Puget Sound from the attack of a hostile fleet. They say that its fortifications are insufficient. If this is so, they should make a plea to the committee on fortifications.

Puget Sound presents a region that is most highly adapted for mining and can be fully protected in that way. Gentlemen remember that in the recent battle in the North Sea the British fleet stopped 70 miles from Helgoland on account of the mines and submarines, and yet the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] talks of a hostile fleet not merely making some raid on an unfortified place, like the Germans made on England, but actually capturing our naval stations without any efficient resistance.

I know the gentleman has had the benefit of actual experience in warfare, but a much higher officer, one of our admirals, who has had a much longer and more varied experience, has testified that our ports are actually overfortified; yet it is assumed that a hostile fleet could run past the forts without injury and disregard the mines and submarines. Let us look abroad for some lessons. The English fleet is far superior to that of Germany, yet it never ventures in sight of the German coast, and its commanders have adopted the only safe and practical policy. In this connection I observe that some gentlemen have airily spoken of an enemy's fleet landing a great army upon our open coast as if it were some easy and trifling matter. Mr. Chairman, a fleet of transports engaged as it would be for days in landing an army by small boats would afford the finest target for submarines that could possibly be imagined. Gentlemen forget, also, that warships can not successfully defend such a fleet against an equal hostile force. No naval commander would think of organizing such an expedition until our vessels of war had been defeated and at least half of them sent to the bottom of the ocean.

I do not wish to overlook Germany. It is said that her navy is more powerful than ours. This may be, although it is a matter of some dispute. Offensively our fleets can fire a heavier

broadside, although their tonnage is less; and the effects of the present war, of which I wish to say more later, are rapidly being manifested. Since the war began, Germany has lost 45 armed vessels altogether and about 20 of her regular navy, among which were her best armored cruisers. She has more dreadnaughts than we, but our battleships are more numerous and more powerful. More than this, the German Navy was evidently not built for a campaign across the ocean. Something like 20 of her battleships do not carry enough coal to enable them to safely cross in war times. Germany has, it is true, more fast ships, but our Navy was built to fight and not to run away; to defend our coasts, not to chase merchant vessels.

It is not necessary, however, that I should pursue these comparisons. From every point of view, Mr. Chairman, we are less in danger of war than at any time since our national existence began.

We are most happily situated. We have no territory that any other nation seeks to possess, and we neither need nor covet the possessions of any other nation. However much we may disagree as to the cause of the great conflict now raging in Europe, we must all agree that whatever may have been its cause it has no connection or relation to our situation. A wide expanse of ocean separates us from the great powers, and thousands of miles of water make a barrier superior to any fortifications.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should any nation desire a conflict with us? Assuming that there is some nation animated by a spirit of aggression which seeks new fields to conquer, why should it select one of the greatest and most powerful countries of the world as an easy victim? In the continent south of us are found other and smaller nations, with cities second only to New York and Chicago in population, abounding in wealth, yet with an army inferior to our own and a navy which could not oppose an effectual resistance. Here, also, are vast regions but little populated, which seem to invite rather than repel invasion, yet none of the nations of South America seem to be in fear of aggression. Some may say that this is because of the Monroe doctrine, which binds us to protect them; but all of these nations have manifested a desire to repudiate this principle. They do not ask for our protection, and the fears and terrors of invasion which seem to excite so many of our people are entirely wanting among them, for they believe they are able to protect themselves.

Situated as we are with reference to other nations, there must be somewhere a golden mean between those who want the strongest navy in the world and those who think it already larger than is necessary. The true rule, I consider to be, that our Navy need not be large enough for the purpose of aggression, nor should it be so small that it could not be relied upon for defense. The two dreadnaughts provided for in this bill will cost $15,000,000 each and $1,000,000 each year they are in service. But surely we can afford, and ought to have, a better navy than so poor a nation as Japan, and if we are to preserve our superiority we must make some additions. The value of the submarine, particularly as a weapon of defense, has been demonstrated, and we should add the 16 provided by the bill, together with the large seagoing submarine. The additions to the Navy provided by the bill are reasonable, and should not be reduced.

The great powers of Europe are now engaged in a life-and-death struggle, into which each is now casting the last man and the last dollar. This frightful cataclysm has already absorbed the flower of the youth of each nation and strained their financial resources to the point of breaking. The torch of war has left smoking ruins of great cities and spread devastation through smiling lands. The German casualties to date have been over 2,000,000, and the allies, including prisoners, have lost far more. The cost to Great Britain for war expenses is about $10,000,000 a day, to Germany perhaps a little less, but the total loss to the five great powers, including commercial losses, is now estimated at the staggering sum of $25,000,000,000. Apparently it must continue until both sides are utterly exhausted. In any event the victors in such a war can not recover for half a century.

Mr. Chairman, among these warring nations there is scarcely a household that is not in mourning; there is not a business, profession, or occupation that is not crushed with the burdens of war taxes; each day chronicles the failure of more business houses; each hour extends further the long list of the dead and dying. Can anyone believe any of these belligerents now wishes to add another nation to its opponents? Will it be claimed that when this war ends any will be so bereft of sense and reason as to plan to attack the one great power whose resources in men and money are as yet untouched? Should we not, on the contrary, expect that when it ends they will turn their attention again to peaceful pursuits and seek to restore their shattered resources?

Mr. Chairman, it is fortunate indeed that we as a people have never been imbued with the spirit of aggrandizement, for if we were inclined to aggression a navy more powerful than that of most nations would be an incentive to war. In the final analysis all our greatest protection against war must be in our capacity to act justly and deal honorably as a nation. We should be big and strong morally as well as physically if we would avoid conflict, and our size should never lead us to impose on weaker nations. Thus may we lead the march of nations, not in war's cruelties and barbarities, but in the arts of peace and in the cause of morality and religion. Then when new generations view our wonderful prosperity and happiness, in contrast with nation-wide wreck and ruin—the only result of the sacrifice of countless lives—they will turn in horror from another conflict of nations, and this will be the last great war.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a startling statement to this House, and I want to make it in the brief time given me. I want to invite your attention to this diagram which I have drawn on cardboard, and I will show you how to take 12 of the obsolete battleships and put them in as a live part of our efficient fighting force. We put in the bill the other day an amendment to compel the Navy Department to cease purchasing 12-inch armor-piercing shells until they had proven that these 12-inch shells could penetrate 10 inches of armor at a distance of 12,000 yards. Now, let us see how the armor-piercing shell acts on the water. This diagram is supposed to illustrate the armor-piercing shell fired from this gun, pointed to strike the water near the vessel that is fired at. If it strikes the water at this point, it ricochets over the vessel. If it does not ricochet, it explodes instantly on contact with the water, and the shot is lost. It is a miss. Suppose this armor-piercing shell hits. This is the angle of the trajectory, and you see it comes over and strikes at an angle to the armor: it does not strike the armor plate squarely. We have been experimenting at Indianhead with different charges of powder, firing armor-piercing shells for years. By these experiments at short distances they got a theoretical trajectory, and because they pierced through armor plate under experimental conditions they have considered for years that they could pierce armor plate at 6 miles' distance, or 12,000 yards; but when they experimented by actually shooting these shells at 12,000 yards they could not pierce the armor.

Our subcommittee on armor and armament of the Committee on Naval Affairs and others saw this; it is of record, and everyone should be willing to admit it. Nevertheless, it is insisted that we must go on building millions of dollars worth of those armor-piercing shells of the same alleged type that they have been using. We want them to experiment with this explosive shell, which we have demonstrated will do as shown in this diagram. Notice this trajectory [indicating]. Suppose this shell strikes near the target; it will run on the water, and will not ricochet, and then it will sink and explode. If it explodes within 15 or 20 feet of the vessel—and this has been experimented with and proven—it will cave in that part of the vessel below the water line. Again, if it hits the vessel fairly, it will explode 180 pounds of a powerful explosive, with disastrous results to the ship. For 16 years the inventor of this shell has been working to get it before the attention of the Navy Department, and has met with remarkable and almost inexplicable obstacles. That was what that amendment was for the other day—to force these people to stop buying these armor-piercing shells of 12-inch diameter until they demonstrated that they have an armor-piercing shell that will pierce armor at 12,000 yards and be an effective projectile. The experience in Europe shows that 12,000 yards is the minimum war range; and, that being true, the armor-piercing shell is of little use to us.

Mr. HOBSON. The Chief of Ordnance, Admiral Twining, was asked this question:

> At what range can 10-inch K. C. armor be penetrated by 12-inch armor-piercing shells if they be fired with 2,850 foot-seconds velocity?

And his answer was:

> Nineteen thousand yards, if the impact on armor is normal.

Mr. BATHRICK. Showing how badly he is mistaken.

Mr. HOBSON. And now they are not willing to have that put down to 12,000.

Mr. BATHRICK. Showing they are absolutely mistaken. The real purpose of the shell is to get it through the armor and have it explode on the inside. No such result has been attained

in practice at 12,000 yards. It has been proven incontrovertibly, to anybody with reasonable intelligence, that explosive shells have come in use by foreign nations, and we want the department to try out this shell here. If you vote down the amendment that we got into the bill, they will keep on buying these armor-piercing shells which will not pierce, although we have a very large stock of them now and a sufficient surplus.

I append a letter to me from Mr. Isham, inventor of the shell:

Hon. ELLSWORTH R. BATHRICK,
Member Subcommittee on Ordnance Tests,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Our naval strength is vested in battleships. The value of a battleship is dependent upon the projectile it employs. If this is inefficient, the battleship is worthless. The Navy Department now acknowledges that armor-piercing projectiles can not penetrate even 10-inch armor at 12,000 yards. Then why are they placing 13½-inch armor on our battleships? Three years ago Admiral Twining stated before the House Naval Committee that the 12-inch guns could penetrate 10-inch armor at 19,000 yards. I was accused on the floor of the House of slandering that officer because I branded it as a misstatement. They are now exerting every effort to show that our armor-piercing shells are the best in the world, and that the supply of them must not be restricted by compelling them to be able to penetrate a 10-inch plate at 12,000 yards. If these armor-piercing shells are incapable of doing this, they and the battleships which carry them are useless, numerous decisions having been rendered to show that the vitals of foreign battleships are protected by even thicker armor, for which reason all tests of torpedo shells have been demanded by the department to be made against 12-inch plates. Moreover, 12,000 yards is less than the range at which naval battles are being decided in the present war. It has also been shown by the Proceedings of the Naval Institute and other technical journals that have been quoted on the floor of the House that the *Empress of India* was sunk by British warships employing British shells in a test at a range between 16,000 and 18,000 yards, the shells "blowing holes in her like lock gates."

Nearly 17 years ago I was sent to this Government by our ambassador to Mexico to demonstrate my torpedo shell, which had demonstrated there as a principal advantage over armor-piercing shells that it could destroy a battleship by exploding near as by hitting it. Last week I had my first test in this country to establish that it could be done. It was admitted for all these years that if a shell carrying 100 pounds or more of high explosive could be exploded within 15 feet of a battleship it would destroy it as a mine would do, but they claimed this could not be done; that the shell would ricochet the same as the armor-piercing shell did, and there was no trial until last week, when it was found that this result could be secured. All countries recognize, and the European war has demonstrated, that the torpedo has compelled a minimum battle range of at least 10,000 yards. This test last week showed that at any battle range my shells bite and dive beneath the water, which the armor-piercing shells will not do. The test also showed that after running underneath the water from 100 to 200 feet they will explode; some of them did not because of a too close fitting locking pin. Black powder was used in the shell at the suggestion of the board, but it is obvious that any explosive may be used. Hence the test proved:

1. That battleships may be destroyed by such shells.
2. That armor plate is no protection against such underwater attack.
3. That the target offered to underwater attack is at least five times as great as the armored parts forming the target for armor-piercing shell attack.

If any further advantages over armor-piercing shells were necessary they are supplied by a test made recently at Indianhead, which showed that the same torpedo shell would destroy an 8-inch plate or explode immediately if it struck even the thinnest plating employed on a torpedo boat or a submarine.

To attain these results has required persistent effort for more than 16 years. The question then arises whether this delay has resulted from the influence of interests involved. When the Congress in 1901 authorized the purchase of my torpedo shell—which purchase was never consummated—Gen. Miles and others stated that it discounted the employment of armor plate. Hence, it is possible that for all these years the Armor-Plate Trust may have used its specious arguments to prevent the use of torpedo shells. Again, with the development of guns it has been decided by the General Board of the Navy that 28 of our older battleships are outranged by late ships and are to be set aside as obsolete. But since torpedo shells make all the guns on these old ships effective up to the limit of vision at sea and prevent the ships from becoming obsolete, is it not possible that the shipbuilding companies are trying to prevent the adoption of torpedo shells? Furthermore, it is established that submarines can be discovered by air craft and also by underwater detectors, and although heretofore they could not be destroyed by shell fire, last week's tests showed that this can now be done. Hence, it is believed that an investigation will show that therein can be discovered the source of a growing opposition in certain quarters to torpedo shells. From time to time have been uttered such statements as might be most useful to prevent the test and use of torpedo shells. Year after year I have called the attention of the Congress to these incorrect statements and to the resulting menace to our national defenses. On the 30th day of last September I made five serious charges respecting the failure to investigate these matters before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. These charges were recently inserted in the House record by Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, but it is not expected that action will result until such publicity is given to existing conditions that the people in this country will see what cost they are paying to the special interests engaged in the manufacture of materials and sentiment of war.

Respectfully, WILLARD S. ISHAM.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

OUR SHIPS ARE SLOW.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with any foreign questions, but with the exact paragraph that is before us. Leave out all questions as to the number of battleships that Congress shall appropriate for. If we appropriate for any, we wish the best ships in the world. The paragraph always intended this. It said that our battleships should have as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, and then went on to provide that they should be of the "highest practicable speed." I propose to add after that word "speed" an amendment that was carried through the House a few years ago, so that the speed shall be "at least equal to that of any known battleship." In our desire for armor and armament and to save money we somehow or other have built the slowest fleet in the world—ships that are as much behind those of other nations in speed as our monitors were behind the armored fleets of other nations some years after the Civil War.

SPEED ALWAYS WON.

Speed is a vital characteristic of a ship. Do we not remember how speed took English cruisers under Drake all over the world, how they could not be caught, and how Drake's small fleet with gun power and speed vanquished the Spanish Armada? Do we forget that it was speed that kept the *Constitution* and the *President* afloat when all the English fleets were in chase, and that it was speed which enabled the *Alabama* in the old days to go around the world and capture merchantmen as it pleased, and that enabled the *Emden* to do the same thing quite recently? Do we forget the battle of Tsushima Straits, where the Japanese fleet by their speed could select their place of attack and meet the head of the Russian line with broadsides?

VITAL TO ALL NAVAL WORK.

Without speed you can neither give battle nor evade it. You can neither raid nor catch an enemy's raider. You can not select your position when you go into battle. You can not escape in defeat or complete a victory. You can not make an effective blockade nor can you evade blockade. You can not safely divide your own fleet nor can you concentrate your fleet upon the divided parts of an enemy's fleet. Without speed you can not take a fleet where it is not expected to make an unexpected attack. Speed is the essence, next to gun power, of naval efficiency. We ought to have at least one battleship which is a battle cruiser, that can perform the prodigies that have been performed in this war by swift vessels that could get away from any submarine because of their speed, and could make their own attack where they pleased. In the present great conflict the dreadnaughts have either lurked in harbors, unable to get anywhere, not daring to form a battle line, or else they have come out only to be sunk, as the *Blücher* was sunk the other day, by a swifter squadron. Let us have the best ships we can get, at any rate. We now have no 30-knot battle cruisers. We have not even any fast scout cruisers, such as the *Emden* or the *Karlsruhe* or the *Glasgow*, the only survivor of the English fleet in the battle in the Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. May I have one minute more?

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I say that we have not even any fast cruisers for scouting. They are almost as essential as the battle cruiser. Whether we have few or many, we want to learn how to make these vessels. Vessels are made on a pattern, and I do not believe there is a shipbuilder in the United States now who has made or planned or knows how to make a 30-knot scout cruiser or a 30-knot battle cruiser. We want specimens, at least, in our Navy of every valuable type. I am myself for a larger Navy. But I appeal to gentlemen who are for a small Navy to insist at any rate that it shall be the very best of its size. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I stand before you as a man who notoriously advocates the interests of peace. A long time ago there was a saying that possibly some of you may have heard, to the effect that "War is hell." Along about the time that that dictum was established there was also established a statement that "one of the saddest and most helpless things that can be imagined is a cat in hell without claws." [Laughter.]

We are surrounded by hostile nations. We are surrounded by a world at war—by a world plotting and planning to involve us—and it is our duty here and now and wherever we find ourselves to stand out and to fight for our position as a pacific Nation, as a Nation that will not accept the inoculation of hydrophobia. Under other conditions, under conditions which

I believe should obtain, under conditions where the world is not afflicted with rabies, has not gone mad, I should continue my advocacy of curtailing preparation for war. But with the conditions that now confront us with the jealousy of foreign nations, with our own selfish advocacy of increasing our own commercial supremacy at the cost of those who are now afflicted with rabies, I think it is a time when we should be prepared to protect ourselves.

Whatever preparation we shall make for war ought to be defensive. If we carry out the wildest plans that anybody has advocated in this House; if we compare such prospective preparations with the armaments of the Old World; if all were adopted, we would not be prepared as an aggressive Nation to beat an egg. [Laughter.] What we must do here and now is to solemnly devote ourselves to the cause of peace, and, furthermore, to say that we shall defend ourselves and shall be able to defend ourselves as a peaceful Nation if we are attacked. [Applause.]

Our greatest defense does not lie in warlike preparation. It rests in our right of embargo. If we find that we can not agree with any nation of this world that is now at war, we always have the right of declining to do business with such nation, and if we exercise that right, all nations at war will either accept our views or starve. If their answer be that they propose to come to our shores and force us to trade with them against our will, then it is time for us to consider how we shall defend ourselves against being drawn into a war not of our choosing. We are always subject to foreign hostility, and to treason at home. We ask for peace, and may be obliged to fight for it.

For my part, it makes no difference to me what a foreign nation declares in regard to the rights of an American resident abroad or to one doing business in a foreign nation. If the Japanese people desire to expel every American there resident and to confiscate his property, well and good. But if, on the other hand, any nation pretends to dictate to us what we shall do concerning our own internal affairs, whether that concerns right of ingress, right of land ownership, or right of citizenship, I am here to say that I would rather fight and die than submit to such dictation. Here is where we must draw the line. We must have a certain amount of force behind us to hold our reasonable, rational rights, our just demands for home rule and neutrality, and because of that necessity, because we are living in a world full of rabies and hatred, I am going to vote for two battleships, for submarines, and for defense as a prevention against oppression and inoculation with hydrophobia. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used four minutes. He yields back one minute.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Underwood amendment, and, whether it is adopted or not, I shall vote for the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] to strike out the entire paragraph. In my judgment there is no occasion now for us to provide for the building of battleships or to increase our Navy.

I do not understand the doctrine of the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], who has just left the floor, that the best way to promote peace in this country is to build two battleships a year to get in a better position to fight—more equipment for war. This is a strange doctrine, to my mind, that he advocates.

Now, I would like to ask this question: If we were to build a battleship now, what type of battleship would we build? The type that would be proper for to-day, experience is teaching us from the war in Europe, would be obsolete to-morrow; and if we build a battleship, we surely would not float it in water. If we did, a submarine would come along and blow it out of water. So that if battleships are to be built, they ought to be built with the provision that they are to be used only on dry land, in order that we may preserve them. [Laughter and applause.] Experiences of the European nations in the dreadful war raging there clearly demonstrates how helpless these monsters of the seas are when attacked by the powerful submarines.

Talk about war! Throughout the history of this great country no foreign nation has ever attacked us. If we are to judge the future by the past, another century and more will roll by without any attack on us from any foreign nation in the world. In all the wars we have had we have made the attack, and no foreign nation thus far in the nearly 140 years of our history has ever made an attack upon the United States. We have in all our wars with foreign nations been the aggressor. They have been content to let us alone.

But gentlemen say that to preserve peace we must be prepared for war—prepared to provoke war. If we are prepared for war, we are more likely to provoke war; but if we are prepared for peace, we are more likely to preserve peace. Caution will be exercised, and through it peace will be preserved.

What is the condition of the leading nations of the earth to-day? We are the only great nation in all the world enjoying peace. Every other great nation has on its hands to-day all the war that it can handle, and most of them more than they can successfully handle. We would not expect war from Great Britain, because Great Britain to-day is engaged to her fullest capacity in war. We would not expect war from Germany, because Germany is surrounded with nations in war, fighting for her life, spending her treasure, killing off her men who are suitable for war. We would not expect war from Russia. We would not expect war from Japan. We would not expect war from any leading nation in the world. If we should have war with any of these nations, we would have to make the attack, because no leading nation is in a condition to attack us and carry on a war with us, and will not be for years to come.

And yet gentlemen who advocate a large Navy policy are proclaiming that that policy is to be inaugurated for the purpose of preserving peace instead of provoking war—a strange doctrine indeed. [Applause.] It is the policy of this Nation to maintain peace and avert war, a most humanitarian policy and one that meets the commendation of the people of the world, one that is winning us renown throughout the length and breadth of all civilized nations. It is giving us a commanding position among other nations and one that is winning for us the first place among nations as a world power. We are attempting to lead the world into the great field of industrialism, away from militarism, so that the standard of civilization will be advanced and the happiness of the people assured. [Applause.]

But, sir, this high ideal can not be accomplished, this great humanitarian work promoted, this better era for all mankind secured, by pursuing a policy of militarism, one that is calculated to earn respect through fear, or maintain our position by force. If we are to pursue that policy, the time will come when other nations will resent it and we will have to resort to force to maintain it. Then our situation will be as deplorable as that of the European nations to-day. They are suffering because of the militarism inaugurated years ago, and in the rivalry of the nations of Continental Europe in maintaining that policy they have brought on the pitiable situation in which they are found and from which they are unable to extricate themselves, save alone through the bloodiest war the world has ever witnessed. Their example should be an impressive lesson to us, and one that warns us we should steer clear of such a policy and avoid the consequences it is sure, if maintained, to bring upon us. [Applause.] Let us hope we will.

But, Mr. Chairman, ever since I became a Member of this great lawmaking body, in March, 1909, the building of battleships in the naval appropriation bill each year has provoked more animated controversy than any other subject discussed by Members of Congress. For some reason Members entertain decided views on this question which are altogether irreconcilable. It occurs to me the leaders in these discussions make greater preparation for the debate on this subject than any other, and more tenaciously defend their positions, both pro and con, than is done in any controversy held on the floor of the House.

Evidently the principles underlying this subject are of a nature about which men may widely differ and each have sound basis upon which to found his contention. The motives of both seem to emanate from the highest order of patriotism, and therefore challenge the respect and admiration of all.

For myself, I hope to take a practical consideration of this question, viewing it from a utilitarian standpoint, carefully relying on the conditions which in my judgment should have their influence in solving the question as to how I should vote on the pending measure. It is not alone a satisfactory reason, to my mind, that we should do this or that because some other rival nation is doing something. That would not be a good "hard-and-fast rule" to follow in things, and especially on this question. I have heard the argument made on this floor by the advocates of a big Navy that England was building three battleships; therefore we should build two; or that Germany was building four battleships, and therefore we should build three. Supposing that England is building three and Germany four; why should that make it necessary for us to build two each year? Must we do as England and Germany in a matter of this

kind? Are we the imitators simply of these great nations? Should there not be a better reason than this advanced for our action? Doubtless many people believe that these nations are now reaping, to their sorrow, their own folly in this regard. Perchance if these and other European nations had pursued the policy of keeping peace instead of preparing for war the deplorable situation in which they are found to-day would not exist. Who knows but what if they had been preparing for peace instead of war to-day they would be enjoying peace instead of being involved in the most disastrous war known in all the annals of time, a war which threatens the disruption of nations and a changing of the map of Europe.

For years it has been the settled policy of leading nations of Europe to prepare for war, and they are now reaping the inevitable result of the policy they have so constantly pursued. They can not complain that these policies have brought about the result for which they were calculated. They have boasted about their splendid navies, and they have the natural consequences of their rash preparations. Surely these great navies were not organized for peace, but for war; and war they have. We have been following their examples, and if we continue we are sure to experience the same result. Should not their unhappy condition, as the result of their Navy policy, be an object lesson to us, and we should for that reason follow it no longer. Look at the anomalous position—all these years preaching peace, eternal peace, and yet yearly increasing the preparations for war. What an inconsistent position; one that misleads nobody nor deceives anybody. The world knows what such a policy means. If we are in earnest about establishing universal peace, we should abandon the policy of increasing our preparations for war; if we do not, we will have war sooner than we expect.

If we believe in the doctrine of universal peace and that it can be established by intermediation, as proposed, we should practice what we preach and not the reverse of it. Can we hope to convert the world to our doctrine unless we show by our own action our own conversion? Is it contended by the advocates of this doctrine that we can by speech declare for peace and by our every action show that yearly we are making greater preparations for war convince the world we are for universal peace? Does anyone believe but that the nations of the world will draw their own inferences from the difference between what we are saying and what we are doing, and that they will place more reliance on what we are doing than on what we are saying? Is not being prepared for war more likely, on little provocation, to precipitate war than peace? People assume, and correctly so, that a person prepared for trouble is not only expecting trouble, but is sure to find it. What is true of individuals is true of nations in this respect.

We proceed yearly to increase, instead of curtail, our preparations for war; and when protest is made against this course the response is heralded back that England, Germany, and other countries are increasing their armaments and we must do likewise in order to keep up with the procession. This is not a sufficient reason. If some other country is blundering in this matter, wasting its treasure, pursuing an indefensible policy, they furnish no reason for us to do likewise. We are not required to do as they are doing. Armies and navies produce nothing; they consume only—destroy and waste. The eyes of the world are turned upon production, eliminating wasteful and destructive agencies in order that every available means of human endeavor may be employed in production, creating wealth and enriching the world. [Applause.]

Before the war now raging in Europe it was estimated that the world powers were burdened with the enormous debt of more than $35,000,000,000, practically all of which was incurred for wars and the results of war. The interest on it is paid by the people, the poor as well as the rich, the employee as well as the employer. In our country more than 70 per cent of annual expenditures are made for military purposes, past and present, and the sum grows annually. It constitutes an enormous burden on the people, against which they protest, but in vain. It has been freely stated prior to this year that the nations of the world are annually spending $2,000,000,000 on armaments to enable them to be able, if they desire, to annihilate each other; that more than 20,000,000 men have been taken from the fields of productive labor to man the armies and navies, which entails a loss of approximately $500,000,000 a year. Consider that if these were returned to productive employment what an impetus it would furnish the energies of the world and what a material contribution it would make to the progress of mechanical, industrial, and intellectual life throughout the world. It might well be said, then, that arts of peace are paramount to arts of war; that intellect dominates, and not brute force.

For years England has been spending four and a quarter times as much for militarism as for education; France, 4.3; Austria, 4.5; Italy, nine times as much; and Russia, twelve times as much. Every nation in the world except Switzerland is paying more for militarism than for education. Even our own country is doing so, much to the chagrin, be it said, of the American people, who are peace-loving and God-fearing people. In the last 10 years we have expended more than $1,500,000,000 on our Army and Navy—preaching peace and constantly and expensively preparing for war. This sum applied to education would have educated in our best colleges 2,000,000 young men and women and equipped them to meet the highest responsibilities of citizenship whereby they could have contributed to the advancement of civilization and elevated the standard of a truly national glory. The sum we have thus appropriated for militarism in the last decade exceeds the entire interest-bearing debt of the United States by approximately $500,000,000. This enormous sum has been turned from the field of production into nonproductive channels. Is it not time to change the course of the ship of state in this regard, abandon this policy for one more remunerative, better adapted to promote civilizing influences which will improve, promote, and glorify our age? [Applause.]

Our people have not been a war-serving or war-loving people. We deprecate war, and our people have devoted their energies and abilities to the development of our natural resources, our agricultural and manufacturing interests, accomplishing marvels in these great and useful fields of endeavor until they now outrival almost every other nation in the world. Our national wealth has grown so rapidly that now it aggregates the startling sum of more than $150,000,000,000, the greatest of any nation in the world. So that we have not felt or stopped to consider the enormous growth of our military expenditures. But now, as the growth is so rapid and the sum so large, we are beginning to feel it, and its burden is weighing heavily on the people who must bear it, and they are raising protest against it and appealing for relief.

Because of the deplorable war in Europe we are now pressed for financial relief in governmental expenditures; we deny any intention of engaging in war; we applaud every peaceful effort and frown upon every attempt to precipitate a resort to arms. Then why swell at this time the appropriation to build great dreadnaughts which, if our purposes are realized, will rot at the docks in our harbors? We know that if we appropriate the money to build the battleships provided for in this bill it will be four or five years before the work of their construction will be commenced; that the wars now raging in Europe and in Mexico will have been ended and passed into history long before their hulls will have moved from the dry docks at the place of their construction to the waters of the adjacent harbors, there to be fitted for use. What excuse can we render to our constituents for such inexcusable conduct? Will they not censure our course as indefensible?

If we do not expect war, why make this vast expenditure preparing for war? Why build these great ships to lie idle in our harbors? If we build them, why not dedicate them and those already built to commerce? Why not employ them in the transportation of our surplus products to the markets of the world, where they will bring remunerative prices, realizing attractive profits to our producers—convert them into money-makers for our people instead of burdens on the taxpayers? If half of our naval fleet to-day was employed in the transportation of our surplus products to the foreign markets it would relieve the congested condition here, inspire industry, and add vastly to the prosperity of the country. Convert them into argosies of commerce while peace with us abides and stimulate prosperity. Make them instruments of profit instead of expense. If peril should present itself, they could be easily withdrawn from the marts of commerce and returned to the purpose of national defense. If they were employed for this useful and beneficial purpose they would perform a greatly needed function and save our people the expenditure of many millions, and accelerate the wheels of prosperity. Expenditures of public money should only be made for public benefits and in such channels as will enable it to return profits to the people who are compelled to furnish the same as a toll levied to raise revenues. If adapted to any other purpose it fails to meet the requirements for which governments were organized, and sooner or later it will arouse the opposition of the people and bring the party responsible therefor into disrepute. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this amendment for four battleships. The "General Board" we hear referred to is a body in the Navy Department unprovided for by law, but which has come into existence on the initiative of naval officers and the Secretary of the Navy. While I have only praise and commendation for the members of this board, yet, like all other great, good, loyal, and patriotic men, they are more or less actuated by pride, sentiment, and enthusiasm for the service to which they have devoted their lives.

These four battleships provided for in this amendment are in pursuance of a program made in 1903 by this General Board for a fleet of 48 ships. Since that year this special number of ships has been annually recommended as the proper number to constitute our fleet.

I have made some inquiry to ascertain upon what basis this special number of 48 ships has been recommended. It has been suggested that this special number has been fixed with reference to the fleets of foreign nations. Since this number was fixed the fleets of other nations and their building programs have varied from time to time, so that a fixed number at one time with reference to foreign fleets could not have been applicable to such fleets at other times. But this number of 48 ships for our fleet has remained unvarying from 1903 to the present. We are not building to equal England, as no such recommendation has ever been made by even the most enthusiastic naval advocate. This program of 48 ships could not have been made with reference to Germany, as the size of the German Navy has changed three times since this program was first recommended. From 1900 to 1906 the German law fixed the German fleet to be constituted of 34 ships. From 1906 to 1912 the German law fixed the number to constitute its fleet at 38 ships, and since 1912 the German law has fixed the number at 41 ships, which now constitutes the German fleet, or at least did constitute that fleet when the war began and before her great losses were incurred. This 48-ship program could not have been made with reference to the navies of nations other than England and Germany, for all have been and are smaller than our own.

An inquiry relative to this special number being required for advantageous distribution or effective operation has failed to disclose a reason for this special number of ships for either of such purposes. The following questions asked by myself and responses thereto by Admiral Fiske during the hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs are with regard to this fixed number of ships and show the want of grounds for this special number to constitute our fleet and which inquiry appears at page 1048 of the hearings of this session, as follows:

Mr. GRAY. Admiral, I understand you are a member of the General Board, which has made certain recommendations to the Secretary from time to time.

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. Your board has made recommendations from time to time since 1903 for the number of ships to constitute our fleet?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. Has that number been fixed arbitrarily or has it been made in pursuance of some plan or policy or system for the distribution of the ships and for effective operation?

Admiral FISKE. It has been made with the idea of effective operation. The question of distribution I do not think entered in. The idea would be that the ships would be distributed after they were, of course, in service.

Mr. GRAY. Had the number of ships been discussed a good deal in the board before it reached this number?

Admiral FISKE. I was not in the board then. I have been attached to the board now more or less for something over four years—not continuously, because I was at sea in command of a division—but I do not know previously what led them to that number.

Mr. GRAY. What plan of effective operation would be carried out by this number of 48 ships, if you know?

Admiral FISKE. That is rather hard to answer, because it would lead me to thinking of something I have never thought of before. I never thought of 48 ships, because we have not got them.

Mr. GRAY. I mean, that was the recommendation?

Admiral FISKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. That we were to have them or wanted them?

Admiral FISKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. I asked this question as I would like to know something about it. I have heard about this 48-ship policy. Do you know what was the policy of effective operations to be carried out?

Admiral FISKE. No; I do not.

Mr. GRAY. You say you never heard that discussed in the board?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir; I have heard it discussed, but as a thing which happened a long while before and as only sort of academic interest.

Mr. GRAY. Was there any demand for a smaller number of ships or for a larger number of ships, or were they all agreed on 48?

Admiral FISKE. I do not know. I was not in the board then. I do not know.

Mr. GRAY. Do you know of any reason why, for effective operations, the number should be 48?

Admiral FISKE. No. It might be 47 or 46 or 49 or 50. There is no magic in the number 48.

Mr. GRAY. But this recommendation from time to time has been 48?

Admiral FISKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. I observe here on page 816 of the Navy Yearbook that the policy of giving names to these ships is to name the ships after the States,

Admiral FISKE. Yes; I believe that coincidence in numbers is accidental, however.

Mr. GRAY. All the ships up to this time have been named for States?

Admiral FISKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. Is it the policy to continue the naming ships for the States?

Admiral FISKE. I do not know, sir.

Mr. GRAY. But you know that has been the policy?

Admiral FISKE. I know it has been the policy to name these battleships after States, but having 48 battleships and having 48 States was purely accidental.

Mr. GRAY. Purely accidental?

Admiral FISKE. So I am told.

The CHAIRMAN. We did not have 48 States when this plan was adopted.

Mr. GRAY. If they would go ahead and complete this program now and carry out the plan, giving the name of a State to every ship, we would just have 48 ships, would we not?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. We would not have any more or less?

Admiral FISKE. That is, of battleships.

Mr. GRAY. That is the number that your board recommended we should have?

Admiral FISKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. Do you think the pride in having a ship named for every State or sentiment had anything to do with the naming of these ships or as affecting the number of ships?

Admiral FISKE. No; I believe not.

Mr. GRAY. Is it not a most remarkable coincidence?

Admiral FISKE. Yes; it is.

Mr. GRAY. That the number which the board arbitrarily fixed upon and the number of States that we have and the policy we pursue of giving the name of every State to a ship would all coincide? Is not that a remarkable coincidence?

Admiral FISKE. Not so remarkable as you might think, sir, because a great many of our armored cruisers—in fact, all of them—were named after States.

Mr. FARR. And we did not have that many States at that time.

Mr. GRAY. But it is true the number coincides with the number of the States and the policy of naming each battleship for a State.

Admiral FISKE. Yes; but at the time that policy was formulated there were not 48 States.

Mr. GRAY. There were 48 States and Territories, and it was known at that time there would be 48 States.

Admiral FISKE. I do not know.

Mr. GRAY. Is it not a matter of geography and history?

Admiral FISKE. I really do not know, sir; I really do not know.

Mr. GRAY. And you know of no reason for any purpose, even for the distribution of the fleet or for effective operations, that would fix the number arbitrarily at 48?

Admiral FISKE. No; it might have been 47 or 50 or 49 or 46 or 51.

Mr. GRAY. But that has not been the recommendation of the board since 1903; on the other hand, it has been 48.

Admiral FISKE. Why they fixed on 48 I really do not know.

The annual cost to maintain the military of the world in time of peace is ascertained to be over $2,000,000,000, a sum of such vast magnitude as to preclude estimate, measurement, or comprehension by the human mind, and which would go far to feed the people of the world or to clothe the people of the world or to house the people of the world or to educate the people of the world if made available and used for such purposes. Out of every dollar collected into the National Treasury as taxes from the people 63 cents has been found to be required on account of war and the military of the United States in time of peace, leaving 37 cents with which to pay the cost of government and promote the institution of civil life.

The cost to maintain the military of the United States has multiplied and increased in a growing ratio with every succeeding year. The appropriations to maintain the Navy alone have increased from $65,140,916.97 in 1900 to $144,868,716.61 in 1914, and for the increase of the Navy from $17,140,699 to $41,091,734 for the same period of time. This year the amount recommended by the General Board, composed of high naval officers, for the increase of the Navy is $128,224,972, or over $87,000,000 more than was appropriated for the increase of the Navy last year.

I here give a statement of the totals of the appropriations carried by the naval acts from 1900 to 1914, showing separately the amounts for increase of the Navy:

Years.	Appropriation.	Amount for increase Navy.
1900	$65,140,916.67	$17,140,699.00
1901	78,101,791.00	25,400,000.00
1902	78,856,363.13	22,703,010.00
1903	81,876,791.43	25,925,632.00
1904	97,505,140.94	32,176,860.00
1905	100,336,679.94	42,255,833.00
1906	102,091,670.27	35,475,829.00
1907	98,958,507.50	23,713,915.00
1908	122,663,885.47	30,307,962.00
1909	136,935,199.05	38,819,595.00
1910	131,350,854.38	33,770,346.00
1911	126,478,338.24	26,005,547.67
1912	123,225,007.76	20,569,373.48
1913	140,800,643.52	35,325,695.00
1914	144,868,716.61	41,091,734.00

I also give the estimate of the General Board, composed of naval officers, as their recommendation for the increase of the Navy for the coming year.

Estimates of cost—General Board's 1916 program.

Vessels.	Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery.	Increase of the Navy, torpedo boats.	Increase of the Navy, armor and armament.	Total.
Four battleships	$31,200,000		$28,532,455	$59,732,455
Sixteen destroyers	14,800,000		5,180,385	19,980,385
Three fleet submarines		$10,740,000	2,187,500	12,927,500
Sixteen coast submarines				
Four scouts	16,000,000		4,499,928	20,499,928
Four gunboats	3,000,000		350,775	3,350,775
Two oil-fuel ships	2,280,000		180,514	2,460,514
One destroyer tender	1,400,000		330,500	1,730,500
One submarine tender	1,140,000		179,150	1,319,150
One Navy transport	1,900,000		229,700	2,129,700
One hospital ship	2,500,000			2,500,000
One supply ship	1,475,000		119,065	1,594,065
Total	75,695,000	10,740,000	41,789,972	128,224,972

These ever increasing and multiplying appropriations evince a policy to build up a world-power Navy and commit this Nation to maintaining such a policy. I am opposed to a world-power navy policy for this Nation. I am opposed to the control of the seas policy for this Nation. I am opposed to a rival naval policy for this Nation. I am opposed to any naval policy for this Nation calling for war and such vast expenditures of money to maintain. Such a policy is not only unavailing for defense and protection, but is fraught with all the dangers of strife, antagonism, and conflict, and a jeopardy to our very national existence. The European war is being waged over a world-power military policy. England is striving to maintain a world-power policy, Germany is striving to gain world power, and the thousands of seamen entombed in the hulls of sunken vessels at the bottom of the sea and the thousands of soldiers whose dead bodies are strewn over the battle fields of France and Belgium all proclaim the criminal folly of a world-power military policy.

The true military policy for this Nation should be defense, adequate defense of our shores, while striving for peace and the settlement of international disputes by courts and tribunals, instead of by cruel devastating warfare. Defense is not only the one policy of war justifiable before men and the civilization of the world to-day, but it is the strongest, the most invincible, impregnable, and advantageous position which a nation can take in warfare, and one which compels the aggressor to assume all the burdens of conflict.

Under the policy of defense and military operations at home small nations have prevailed over the great and the weak against the strong and powerful. Under this policy the Colonies wrung independence from England and the South American Republics declared and maintained their sovereign power against the stronger mother country.

Naval and military men not only recognize this principle and the advantage of military operations at home and the burdens which must be assumed in aggression, but agree that no European power could withdraw from their shores to make available against us more than 50 per cent of their fighting force. With this one-half of their navy available to oppose us, a foreign power must meet and operate against—

All our coast defenses;

All our mines planted at the entrance of harbors;

All our submarines operating out from our coasts and seaboard fleets;

All our air crafts sailing out from our shores and dropping explosives on attacking fleets;

And lastly our Army on land to intercept any hostile force which might overcome all these and attempt to land upon our shores.

With England, the strongest naval power of the world, and with one-half of her navy equaling ours and operating against us and with all the burdens of aggression to assume and all the advantages available to us of defense, we would be impregnable in defending our shores even as against that nation, and more than impregnable against all other nations so long as we adhere to a policy of defense.

Defense not only carries with it great strategic advantages and burdens to aggression, but it calls to arms soldiers with courage, valor, and determination, which invasion can not inspire in men.

We should build and maintain a Navy only for the defense of our shores, and we should prove to the world that such is our policy not only by our claim but by our works, acts, and deeds and all our preparation and accomplishments for war, and thereby, while maintaining full security and adequate protection, hold ourselves acceptable and unprejudiced before the nations of the earth as mediators for the settlement of international disputes and ready and in position to lead the way to peace and final disarmament.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] this morning. It has been known to this House, of course, for many years that the gentleman from Alabama is an advocate of a very large Navy, but I think this morning is the first occasion when he has been bold enough to go to the extent of advocating a Navy that would equal the combined navies of Germany, Japan, and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, during the last 14 years the expenditures of the United States for naval purposes have increased 230 per cent. Those of England have increased 180 per cent, those of Japan 330 per cent, and those of Germany 300 per cent. From 1901 to 1914 the expenditures of the United States for naval purposes have increased from $61,000,000 to $141,000,000 per annum. Those of Great Britain have increased from $141,000,000 per annum to $260,000,000 per annum, those of Japan from about $39,000,000 per annum to $61,000,000 per annum. In other words, according to the percentage of increase in United States naval expenditures in the last 14 years, if that same policy is continued for the next 14 years, the annual appropriation bill for naval purposes will amount to the enormous sum of $324,000,000.

During the last year Great Britain, Japan, and Germany expended the total sum of $442,000,000 upon their naval policy. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he believes that if the policy of naval expansion to the extent of an American Navy in the Pacific equal to Great Britain and Japan, and in the Atlantic equal to Germany were carried out, the people of the United States would submit even for a single year to the enormous expenditure of $442,000,000 for the purpose of building up an American Navy? And if the gentleman believes they would submit to such an expenditure, and if the same proportion of increase were to be carried out in the next 14 years, as has been carried out by the nations of the world in the last 14 years, the total expenditure by England, Germany, and Japan each year would amount to the enormous sum of $1,193,000,000 per annum. I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], and I ask the Members of this House, and I ask the United States as a Nation, whether or not we are ready to embark upon a saturnalia of naval expenditures that would amount to more each year than our total Government expenditures at the present time?

Mr. HOBSON. My estimate was on a two-power basis, Great Britain and Japan, not three; and if we managed ourselves economically we would have very little more pro rata than they would.

Mr. BARKLEY. Last year Germany spent only $113,000,000 for her navy, whereas we spent $141,000,000 upon our Navy.

Mr. HOBSON. I am not advocating a three-power navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the motion made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Every business corporation and individual in the United States who has any business capacity is undertaking in every way to pare down expenses during the stringency that is existing while this European war is going on. Everybody knows that by reason of this great cataclysm that has befallen the human race, in which more than half the area and more than half the population of the world is now at war, and the business avenues and connections of the world are disarranged, every man and every corporation and every industry is undertaking to harmonize its conduct with the necessary expenditures and economies brought about by this war. If it be necessary for individuals to economize, if it be necessary for corporations of every description to economize, surely in this hour of turmoil and distress, when the nations of the earth are compelled to spend millions and billions of dollars for defense, we can afford to cut down our expenditures for naval, military, and every other purpose within the purview of appropriations. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct a mistake that I made in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The General Board of the Navy did not recommend one battle cruiser last year, but they recommended four battleships.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for two battleships and the balance of the building program recommended by the

Committee on Naval Affairs. I listened with much interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who just preceded me. He made a good argument. He called the attention of the committee to the condition of our Treasury and the fact that the expenditures of the Naval Establishment has been increased each year until it seems as if we would soon reach the point where we could no longer stand the strain; but I say to him that when he has a house or other piece of property he insures it against loss or damage by fire, by hurricane, or flood——

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. No; I can not; I have only 5 minutes. The man insures his property, and the Naval Committee, acting on the advice of the Navy Department, come to us with a fair, conservative naval program, which seems to me must appeal to the common sense of this House and the best judgment of the American people. It is a reasonable insurance for the country, and I am confident will meet the expectations of the people.

I wish it were possible for us this year to authorize four battleships and an accompanying program that should go with them, but we know that this is impossible on account of the condition of the Treasury, and we must be satisfied with the estimates submitted by the committee.

I was thinking the other day of this question of preparedness for war, and it reminded me of the police force in the great cities of the country. We do not give the police officer a big stick and a revolver and clothe him with authority for the purpose of going around the country killing and maiming innocent people. We give him the authority and implements of offense and defense, because we need this protection for the lives and property of the people within the country.

So we build a Navy and have a reasonable sized Army to protect the country from invasion from without, and to protect us against an uprising that may occur within our borders.

Much has been said about the cost of the Navy, and I believe that Congress ought to give its very careful attention to this question. Our naval bill this year is approximately $140,000,000, which is an annual increase of $40,000,000 since I have been a Member of this House. I believe it possible to adopt a policy in the conduct of the Navy Department that would materially reduce the charge on the Treasury. We have been fortunate in the men who have served at the head of the Navy Department, and I believe that if we should give the Secretary authority to conduct the department on purely business principles he could save the country at least $10,000,000 a year in the management of the department.

If we are to maintain our position as the great power of the Western Hemisphere, if we propose to insist in the future on a strict observance of the Monroe doctrine, we must have a Navy that can enforce our position if necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, while I do not agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] in the reasons that to him are conclusive why we should have a large Navy, nor do I agree with him as to the magnitude of the Navy that we should have, I do agree with him, and with others, that we should make some very considerable additions to the Navy that we now have.

I have listened to-day, as I have on other occasions in years past, to heated arguments by naval strategists from the interior—about the same region that I come from, so I am qualified to speak respecting them—and I notice with not a little interest that the fighting campaign against Navy increase comes from that section of the country where it is improbable a cannon ball will be able to reach if fired from the sea. [Laughter.]

This is too big a country to find sectionalism in the discussion of this question. National defense, like national honor, is a national question, that knows no sectionalism. There are no interests of one section that run contrary to the interests of other sections, for national defense is but a phase of national integrity, and in it all citizens have an equal interest.

In the time at my disposal I desire to give some of the reasons why I believe our country needs a strong Navy.

Democratic governments such as ours are little prone to foreign conflicts and even less prone to foreign conquests. Our people are essentially peace loving. We covet no man's land, no nation's empire. We do, however, place great value upon our political principles and hold as sacred our free institutions. The perpetuity of these institutions is near our hearts, and should be, since without these institutions our boasted country could not long endure.

These institutions must be ever builded upon strong, virile men. Where there is no manhood there can be no free institutions. I am astounded at the language many gentlemen indulge in these days when speaking of our Military Establishment. From their talk we would be persuaded that the only consideration our country ever should have is to avoid armed conflict. They forget that the possession of these sacred, free institutions was secured through war, and that to preserve them it may be necessary again to fight. A race of withering cowards, without patriotism, without virility enough to shape their destiny aright, even in the midst of foes and hostile elements, would not be worth preserving, and yet that is the race we are to become if these gentlemen's views prevail. I am ashamed of a spirit so weak, so contemptible, and so hopeless. It is unworthy the heritage we have received from our fathers.

I deprecate war; I hope we will never experience another; but if I must choose between war and the destruction of our free institutions, if I must choose between war and the dignity and the future well-being of my country, then give me war.

Many of these gentlemen would be the quickest of all to resent a personal insult. Would they, in fact, meekly endure insult after insult upon their country? Do they not think it now the part of wise men to prepare their country against insult, rather than to risk their all avenging an insult that otherwise will be sure to come.

We all prefer peace; we are all ready to work to preserve peace; but how idle to shut our eyes against the actual conditions in the world. There are some peoples in the world, united into strong and powerful nations, whose mission is not peace, but whose national ambition is national expansion and foreign conquest. The good people of our communities abhor thieving, arson, and murder. Do they cry piteously, "We are for righteousness," and pray that crime shall be no more? No; they hire policemen and peace officers—equip them, arm them—in order that safety of life and property may be enforced. In the community of nations there are to-day warring, ambitious, conquering peoples, and if our integrity is to be preserved, if our free institutions are to be protected, if the welfare of our people is to be insured, we must have the armed strength to hold back the foe.

If gentlemen are to be believed, we should shrink within our shell, withdraw from the world's affairs, quiver, perhaps, as we are kicked, but ever, ever decline to raise an arm for our own protection. Let me assure the gentlemen that it would never be possible to cringe into a shape small enough to escape the attack of a foreign foe when once we had established our reputation as a Nation incapable of defending itself. I speak for a robust Nation, a vigorous, virile people, a power to preserve peace in the world, and capable of protecting its integrity against all comers.

We often hear it said that armed preparation is conducive to conflict. The eminent leader of the majority, Mr. UNDERWOOD, expressed this opinion a few moments ago. I agree that armament may be carried to such an extent as to bring this result, but it never will be brought to that point nor anywhere near that point in America. But the statement is never true of a navy. A navy is essentially an instrumentality of defense. In America it is the only defense we have. Our coast line, our enormous coast line, opens our country wide to the world. We can not possibly build forts that will protect us along our great boundary. Under present conditions the only value of a fort is to make certain that a foe will land at some other point. It is the mission of a navy to make certain that a foe does not land at any point.

Our country will never have a large standing Army. To maintain such an Army is contrary to the genius of our institutions. We must fall back quite exclusively for protection upon the Navy of our country. This, Mr. Chairman, is why I am for a strong Navy.

The American Navy has written the most brilliant pages in American history. Our geographical position makes it essential that our exploits on the sea shall be commensurate with the greatness of a great people.

Those who believe America has a high destiny in the affairs of the world have an added reason for strengthening our Navy. The sea has always been the direct highway, the direct and royal highway, to national greatness. Nations have always honored their sons who have gone down into the sea in ships, and in turn those sons have woven the fabric of their nation's greatness. No country has ever become a leader in the affairs of man unless that country had prestige upon the sea. A purely inland nation has never yet become a world power, and in all ages a nation's greatness has been proportioned to her influence upon the sea. Our Nation's commerce must cover the

earth, and there must be an American Navy reasonably adequate to protect it.

Navy experts are far from agreed as to the value of different types of ships of war. I do not profess to be a navy expert, but it seems to me that all history teaches one thing and all the naval history of the past six months teaches it with special emphasis. The lesson taught by history is that speed is one of the vitally essential things in a fighting ship. This bill provides for two battleships, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] moves to increase the two to four. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves to reduce them to one. It is all on the question of battleships. There is no provision in the bill, none suggested, for ships of the battle-cruiser type. I strongly believe our Navy needs a unit of battle cruisers more than it needs an addition of any other fighting craft.

Mr. Chairman, that which made the name of Sir Francis Drake renowned in history, that which made the name of his fellow countryman, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, heroic in the growth of England's power, is that the boats they moved and fought were speedier and faster and quicker than the heavy galleons of Spain. The great Spanish fighting Goliath was no match for the little English David, fleet of foot. Contests on the sea from the day of the first galley's shock down to the present hour have almost always gone to the swiftest boat. And to-day, when the titanic forces man's genius has put into fighting ships have met in struggles on the sea, the two determining factors have been speed and heavy guns. An English fleet in the south Pacific disappeared from the surface of the sea because it met swifter boats with heavier guns. The victors here were with ease destroyed a few weeks later near the Falkland Islands, when they met a fleet still swifter and with still larger guns. The deeds of the swift *Emden* will be remembered as long as sea fights are remembered. The escape of the mighty and swift *Goeben* from Messina still thrills the world. The English victories in the North Sea were both victories of superior speed and larger guns. The boat that sweeps the sea with speed and big guns is the battle cruiser, and we have not one in our Navy.

Naval history is now being made by battle cruisers. When we place beside these boats of 30 knots' speed or greater our clumsy, slow-moving battleships of 17 and 19 knots, armed with guns considerably smaller and with much less range, we must swallow a big lump of American pride. It does not take an expert to know that our fleet needs some boats of the big-gun, battle-cruiser class. Our early naval history is resplendent with the deeds of heroes who swept the sea in swift ships. To-day we find we have the prize turtle navy of the world. While our fleet is moving with ponderous slowness a foreign fleet of swift ships armed with big guns could keep out of our reach and pepper us to pieces. Have our Navy experts become so grooved by the rut of routine that they have permitted other nations to profit by the experiences of humankind while they alone move blindly and stupidly along?

I am for the building of some battle cruisers. I believe our naval officers at heart are for some battle cruisers if only they had the courage to speak out that which they really think. I know and they know and all the world knows that in the recent war the fast battle cruisers have remained afloat and to rule, while the slow ships have gone down to the bottom of the sea.

Prior to the commencement of this great war some of the experts of our Navy refused to enthuse over the battle-cruiser type. We all recall when the great battle cruiser *Moltke*, practically the first of her class, participated in the naval pageant at New York, these experts shook their heads because her armor was too thin. Speed and big guns made no impression. I wonder what these same men think now, after six months of naval warfare.

But recently some of our Navy experts have been willing to admit that the battle cruiser is a powerful ship; but I have heard them say, as doubtless you have, that a navy must consist of units; and a unit consists of four boats, which must be of such similarity in speed and certain other features as to enable them to be maneuvered together. Very well; let us build two each year, and within two years we will have a unit. No nation has built all her battle cruisers at one time; no nation has built four at one time. They are usually produced in pairs, just as we produce battleships. Japan had two of these built in Great Britain, and then she proceeded to build two herself.

In days of ocean greyhounds we are building turtles. We have forgotten the teachings of all naval history. We have even forgotten the teachings of our own. I do not urge battle cruisers to the exclusion of battleships—not for a moment—but we have a considerable fleet of battleships, with no fast battle cruisers; and our Navy, if it is to be a match for any other modern navy, must possess a complement of battle cruisers. If it does not, if we are to drag way behind the procession in naval progress, some day America will pay an awful price for this stubborn adherence to a primitive type.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, though I am from the interior, I am not one of those naval strategists to whom the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] referred. Curiously enough in the splendid Commonwealth which I represent, fifteen hundred miles from the nearest tidewater and a mile or a mile and a half above the sea, there is a strong sentiment in favor of a goodly navy. I think I never cast a vote in this House for battleships where my constituents would not have upheld me had my vote been for a larger number than I voted for. I have been one of those who for a number of years past have been in favor of a two-battleship building program, and now, when in the midst of war's alarm, with a good deal of warm talk at home, the Committee on Naval Affairs keeps its program down to two, and I am inclined to follow the committee, although with the battleship already provided for that would make three this year. The more I have thought of the matter, however, and the more I have read of what is going on over yonder in Europe the more doubt I have had as to the wisdom of building great battleships at this time. Certainly what has occurred in the theater of war about the North Sea has not tended to increase our faith in these mighty leviathans of the deep. We have seen the little deadly wasps of the sea keeping the great battleships under cover of land fortifications, or cowering in midsea fearful to attack, seeking self-protection. In this condition of affairs it seems to me of doubtful wisdom for us to go on building these great ships, which may within a very brief period of time be found to be very largely obsolete or out of date for the battles of the future. It is true that the great naval engagement which is likely to mark the close of the present war may demonstrate the efficiency of the present superdreadnaught; but that is not likely, and in any event the close of this war must find Europe exhausted and in no condition to attack us or threaten us in any way. Then there is another consideration. Whatever caused this war, whether too much militarism or too little in some places, whether it was the lust of power or the desire to use the well-prepared mailed fist, the great nations of Europe are in the most lamentable struggle of all times. Their citizens are being killed by the thousands, their homes laid waste, their property destroyed. In a short time, through sheer exhaustion, this must end, and then inevitably there must be some arrangement for the reduction of armament, and when that time comes this great Nation, the greatest power for peace on earth, would be in an embarrassing position if it had on hand a great program of naval expenditure. In consideration of all these things I shall vote for one battleship. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to offer an amendment, as I later propose to offer, until after the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has been voted upon. My amendment is to further increase our naval program by building battle cruisers, and I want to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the American Nation has not one battle cruiser, that Great Britain has nine battle cruisers, with a speed of from 2[illegible] knots to 35.7 knots; that Germany has four battle cruisers with a speed up to 29 knots.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. And there are also four additional building in Germany, making eight.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Yes; there are in addition to those named four under construction by the German Navy. Japan has two battle cruisers, with two under construction. Italy has four battle cruisers. The United States has none. The fastest battleship in the United States has a speed of a little over 21 knots. In the British Navy the fastest battleship has a speed of 25 knots, and in the German 23 knots. The fastest armored cruiser we have is one of 23 knots, and the fastest armored cruiser that Great Britain has has a speed of a little less than 25 knots.

Mr. Chairman, we need ships with speed, and we need submarines. These two classes of fighting and defense craft have the attention of the whole world to-day, because of the remarkable work done by them in recent naval encounters. Mr. Chair-

man, the United States Navy has not a single battle cruiser, while other nations are provided as follows:

Battle cruisers.

Nations.	Built.	Building.	Speed.
			Knots.
Great Britain	9	1	26 to 35
Germany	4	4	27 to 29
Japan	2	2	27 to 28
Russia		4	25
United States	None.	None.	

Mr. Chairman, the fact that our fastest battleship has a speed of only 21.22 knots, against battleships in British Navy of 25 knots and battleships in German Navy of 23 knots emphasizes our positive need of speedy battle cruisers. I hope my amendment, when offered, will carry.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to finish the presentation to the committee of the testimony of Admiral Fiske. As I have already shown you, according to his judgment, our Navy at present is so much superior to the German Navy, and consequently all other navies except England's, that a naval engagement would, in all probability, result in our destroying the entire German Navy without the loss, scarcely, of any of ours. That is what his statements lead to. Now, he went on and then told what was the matter with our Navy. He pointed out the defect about it, and the defect was not that we have not got enough ships, not that we have not sufficient number of dreadnaughts, not that they are not more powerful than any ships in the world, but he said that there are two defects in our Navy. One is that we do not give our personnel a sufficient amount of target practice. His idea is that a slight advantage in the skill of shooting will turn the scale, and that therefore it is all important that we should give our men the highest training that target practice can give them. That is one of the two defects that he pointed out. The other one was that it is not only necessary to give the training to the officers and the men upon each ship, but that it is just as essential that the four ships that make a squadron should be trained to maneuver and to engage in battle exercises and be trained to operate in battle as a unit, and that all the units, all the squadrons in a navy, should be trained and developed to operate not only as an entire battleship fleet, but in connection with all the destroyers and submarines, so as to make one great fighting machine. [Applause.] He says that that is what we have neglected, and it is the truth. It is just like I have told you all the time in my speeches, and you never did believe me; that is, that we have neglected what is vital and important in our Navy because those things do not require any appropriation of money [applause], and everything that requires us to squander the public funds we have never neglected. [Applause.] There is just the trouble about it.

Now, applying that, he says we have 21 of our 33 battleships in good shape, and he says there are 12 of them that have been put out of commission and in ordinary and in reserve; that more than one-third of all our battleships are fixed so that they can not be used in war. He says that it will take five years, if war should break out, even to get those 12 ships in a shape where we could use them. He said we have not got the officers, we have not got the men, and even after we should get them, though we could get them in two years, that after we have the full quota of men and officers to make these 12 battleships useful, it would then take us three years to put them in fighting shape. Now, instead of trying to remedy the defect, we have been doing everything we could, and we are going to repeat it to-day, to make the thing worse. The naval officers tell us that if you authorize two more battleships to-day the only possibility of using them will be to take the officers and men off of two other ships and put them on those two new ones, and then instead of having 12 useless battleships you will have 14, and the more battleships you authorize, the worse you make the condition. At the same time that the battleships are increasing the shortage of officers we have been permitting this plucking board to eliminate 15 more every year. That is the kind of folly we have been indulging in. Now, my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] gives his view about the thing, and I believe every man in the House has his views. I have my own, but I have always learned this, that when I am sick and I do not know what is the matter with me or how to doctor myself, I go and get a doctor who does know. When a man has a lawsuit and he can not attend to it himself, he goes to a lawyer who does know how to attend to it, and that is the way we do in life in all of its departments. Now, here is the proposition where we are all ignorant, because we have not studied it enough, and I appeal to you to accept the testimony of the only men who do know about it and to act upon the facts that they give you. Nothing else is common sense.

Now, after Admiral Fiske had given that testimony which shows that, according to his judgment, our Navy is absolutely superior to the German Navy on the facts stafed, that the probability of a battle was that it would result in our destroying all of their ships without losing anything, then he was given two opportunities to say something in favor of more battleships, and I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman, evidently was disappointed when Admiral Fiske completed his views, and he asked him this question:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield me a few minutes?

Mr. MANN. I will yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Here is what took place:

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral, in connection with the question that was asked you about the training of men and practice and everything, would you be understood as eliminating the construction of more ships, and devoting all energy to the training of the men and target practice?

Admiral FISKE. No, sir. I am afraid that would be a swing of the pendulum too much the other way. I think we have got to look forward to a good many years of competition, and I think the more we can keep our minds on the idea that it is competition the better off we will be. It is not what we do so much as what the other fellows do. It is wonderfully like a baseball team. It is not what your people do; it is what the team does against which you have to play.

Look at the other fellow, he says; that was his answer to the gentleman from Tennessee. Well, let us look at the other fellow. Who is the other fellow? If Germany is the other fellow, what has she been doing? She has not been increasing her navy, she has actually lost 45 ships and, according to all the probabilities in the future, in the next six months she will lose a great many more than she has up to this time. The same way with England, the same way with France and Russia and all others. The probabilities are that they are going to lose a great many more than they have already lost. Now, if you look at the other fellow, then what is the conclusion? Certainly that we need no more battleships. But that was not satisfactory. So the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] made an effort to get Admiral Fiske to change this testimony, and here is what he said:

Mr. FARR. What do we lack?

Admiral FISKE. The fundamental thing is a general staff, which shall arrange the plans. That is fundamental.

He did not tell him we lacked any battleships or dreadnaughts or any other kind of ships; he did not answer him as he wanted him to answer. That was not satisfactory to Mr. FARR, and so he said:

What in the way of ships, etc.?

He presses it on him to know if we do not need more ships. Admiral Fiske says:

We have not enough personnel to man all the ships.

That is the testimony of the experts. I will tell you gentlemen of this committee if the Members could take the 1,300 printed pages of testimony and see what the naval officers, the only men who know about it, say, they would not vote for any battleships. No battleship would be put through this House in this bill if there were not profits in it. It is the money power behind it which is the foundation of it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if I may.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to read from Admiral Fiske's evidence:

Admiral FISKE. The policy of the General Board is to cut down what we really think we ought to have, because if we told Congress what we really think we ought to have they would say we are crazy.

Admiral Fiske has asked for four battleships.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY].

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I have to the best of my ability given careful study to the questions that came before the committee. I have discovered this, Mr. Chairman, that upon any proposition where individuals or institutions were interested, where there was something to be gotten out of the project that was proposed to our committee, when a stand has been taken against those projects, invariably the protests made by those directly interested have been exceedingly vicious and ugly. For the position that I have taken upon the naval questions

invariably the press of this country, the press in the sections of the country where the increases in the main go, has been indignant and has said the ugliest things possible about the members of the Naval Affairs Committee who have not supported their views in respect to these increases.

Only a few moments ago the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] was making an argument, and he insisted that for many years there had been only one battleship in the Pacific Ocean; that the Pacific coast had not been properly defended; that we should have, with the Navy that is in existence and under the control of the Naval Establishment of this country, more battleships in the Pacific Ocean. In that, I say, the gentleman may be right, for they may be needed as badly out there as anywhere, but when I got to my feet and put the question to the gentleman from Washington whether, in the face of that condition, with only one battleship in the Pacific, they had not gotten along first rate and were not doing very well, without anybody suffering, the gentleman from Washington got very indignant and replied to me in a way, as I see it and understand it, that was ungentlemanly, ugly, and insolent.

As soon as I put the question to the gentleman and he answered me in the fashion in which he did, I recalled that the gentleman had been before the Naval Affairs Committee both last year and this year. I did not suppose that because of the opposition of some of the members of that committee to projects that he was insisting upon that the gentleman from Washington entertained any ill feeling for the members of the committee who did not agree with him. Last year when before the Naval Affairs Committee the gentleman from Washington made a very vigorous appeal, a very eloquent plea, for increases in the Naval Establishment, so as to afford them protection along the Pacific coast. But, my friends, at the conclusion of his statement he was as insistent, he was as eloquent, when he came to the proposition of building a dry dock out in his district as he was in any other portion of his statement before the Naval Affairs Committee. And not only that, but only a few days ago the gentleman from Washington appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee, and on that occasion he was appealing for national defense, but at the same time asking for $20,000——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. May I have one minute?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. HENSLEY. Appealing for an appropriation for a building slip, to cost $20,000, in his district. So I say now, my friends, that this is the attitude of these gentlemen who are appealing for increases, who are insisting upon more battleships, and all of those propositions. They are asking for those things that inure to the benefit of the people of their communities. And so I pass over the ugly, the insulting, the insolent remarks made by the gentleman from Washington, knowing full well that the membership of this House know him to be one of the most insulting and partisan Members of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of my vote I desire to say that I am, and always have been, in favor of a large Navy, but under existing circumstances it is my intention to vote for two battleships for the simple reason that should favorable action be taken by this House on the four-battleship proposition it is likely to be misconstrued on the theory that we are in danger of war. I, however, am of an entirely different opinion. My views coincide with those of the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. HAY], who, when the Army appropriation bill was under consideration recently by this body, made the following statement:

> That we are further off from war than at any time in our history.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will indorse the two-battleship program, as proposed by the Naval Affairs Committee. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PADGETT. How much time did the gentleman use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used two minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee 13 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman to use his time.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman going to close in one speech?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, about two hours ago I heard from the lips of the Democratic leader the statement that this country for the fiscal year 1916 would be facing a deficit of forty or fifty millions of dollars, if I remember the figures correctly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman evidently did not hear me correctly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I read his statement, however.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that there was a probable deficit of $20,000,000 in all expenditures, which, of course, the gentleman understands does not include the Post Office Department.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Let me ask the gentleman on what theory or hypothesis there is to be a deficiency of $20,000,000 in ordinary expenditures?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because the estimated expenditures under these appropriation bills will exceed the estimated receipts to that extent.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What affects the receipts for 1916?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that the estimated receipts are $735,000,000, which, of course, includes the receipts from the new revenue bill. The receipts last year, if the gentleman will allow me, were $734,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I have only five minutes, and I do not want the gentleman to take up all my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So practically the receipts, including those derived from the new revenue bill, are as much as last year, but the estimated expenditures have increased.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the estimated deficit of 1916 is no nearer to what will actually occur than the actual receipts under the Democratic internal-revenue and income tax have been, as compared with the estimates respecting them, I think it is fair to say we shall have a deficit of not less than $50,000,000, and probably more, if the same policies and the same laws enacted by the Democracy are continued on the statute books. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the gentleman from Alabama wants to economize and keep the expenditures within the receipts, why does he select the military defense of the country for the object of his economy? Why not economize in river and harbor appropriations and in public buildings appropriations and in good roads appropriations and in many other of the items in the departmental supply bills, and not effect all economies at the expense of the military efficiency of this Government? And if the gentleman wants to effect these economies, why does he not go the whole limit and cut out all naval building, and by so doing obviate any deficiency in the year 1916?

Mr. Chairman, the building program that has been presented by the committee here is one of the fairest and best-balanced programs that has come out of that committee since I have been a member of it. Many people throughout the country have been swept off their feet by this war in Europe and have clamored that Congress, through its Military Committees, should make extraordinary provisions in the Army appropriation bill and in the Naval appropriation bill. But the Committee on Naval Affairs—and I am glad to say also the Committee on Military Affairs—have not been swept from their moorings by this clamor. They have gone ahead on the even tenor of their way, and this program of 2 battleships, 17 submarines, 6 destroyers, an oil ship, a transport, and a hospital ship is one of the fairest programs that has ever been reported.

The gentleman from Alabama would cripple the battleship feature by cutting out one. He would limit the number of submarines. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no form of warship that so appeals to the public to-day as the submarine. It has demonstrated itself. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] intends to close in one speech?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I have four minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I really had not intended to speak upon this paragraph at all, but I think I shall use the four minutes in submitting an observation or two.

Under the appropriation bill of last year we authorized an extra battleship over the two that were directly carried in the bill, by reason of having obtained $12,000,000 from Greece on the sale of two battleships. That $12,000,000, however, was covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and has been expended with other money received in the Treasury, and

the free money in the Treasury now is getting very low, although that battleship has not yet been built. The $12,000,000 we have spent for other purposes, and if we now authorize two battleships in this bill it will mean that in truth we shall be commencing, practically, three new battleships instead of two, and we shall have to pay for the work that is done on the three instead of for the work that is done on the two.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No; I do not yield to anyone.

Now, I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I have always regarded him as a great statesman, and I do now. [Applause.] He accepts the consequences of his folly. Having brought the Government to the condition where the receipts are rapidly becoming less than enough to support the Government, he accepts the situation and proposes to cut down the expenses. Of course I know that the Democratic side of the House conveniently lays upon the European war every difficulty in the way of Government. But we on our side of the House know that the trouble with the receipts of the Government is the Underwood tariff law, and the trouble with the country is Democratic misrule. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, it is an old and accepted doctrine that you can not have your cake and eat it, too. The country has placed the Democracy in control of the Government. However much the country may desire the enlargement of the Navy, the country must understand that while the Democrats are running the Government and enacting bad legislation there will not be money enough to provide two battleships a year. Hence I propose to accept the consequences and vote with the gentleman from Alabama for one battleship and in favor of economy. [Applause.] And I will say to my friends on this side of the aisle that I am in favor of economy all along the line. As long as the Democratic policies are in control we shall have trouble about the revenues and the expenditures. When the Republicans again gain the ascendancy we shall have money enough and we can make the necessary expenditures. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the time of the committee in the useless and futile purpose of replying to the stale and oft-repeated assertions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Everybody knows that the country is to be congratulated on the fact that we have a Democratic administration and that Democrats are in control of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are meeting many of the extravagances that were put upon the country under Republican administrations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now let us come to the discussion of this matter immediately before the House. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] announced a text which I accept. He said if a man was sick and did not know himself, he should go to a doctor and follow the advice of the doctor. If he had a legal matter and did not know himself, he should go to an attorney and follow the advice of his attorney. Those are sound maxims, but the gentleman does not follow them.

Every single expert that we have, without exception; every admiral, every officer that has come before the Committee on Naval Affairs, not only this year but in the years past, has said that the battleships were the mainstay and the defense and the offense in time of war on the sea, and nothing else can or should take their place. They are the fighting machines. They are the machines that will control the sea. Somebody says that the battleships have not fired a gun. They have accomplished the same result. If there had been a battle and they had destroyed every ship that Germany had, what would have been the result? England would have had control of the sea, and nothing more. She has got control of the sea to-day by the power of her battleships having all of the German fleet either interned abroad or hiding in her own ports behind the protection of her forts. England has absolutely destroyed the commerce of Germany, export and import, amounting to more than $5,000,000,000 a year.

The battleship is the important weapon of war. Not only that, but something was said here a moment ago about battle cruisers. A battle cruiser would be a very great weapon for certain purposes, but it is not the principal fighting machine. A battleship constructed under a modern program carries armor of 13½ inches. A battle cruiser carries 8-inch armor. Now, they talk about the speed. That does not settle anything. In the battle that was fought the other day it was the gun power that decided the fight. England had 13½-inch guns and Germany was fighting with 8½-inch guns. On the question of speed, if the cruiser comes within shooting distance of the battleship, the battleship is within shooting distance of the cruiser, so that the battleship would destroy the cruiser if she stood before the battleship's fire.

The purpose of the cruiser is not to fight, but it is to destroy commerce and to act in the nature of a scout. The aeroplane is being developed to do the scouting and the reconnoitering, and is being used for that purpose. England has nine battle cruisers; but if you will notice the statistics, she is building only one at the present time.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman will notice that with the 1 which is now building Great Britain will then have 10.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. HOBSON. Ten to thirty-six, or more than one-quarter as many battle cruisers as battleships.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. While Germany has 8 to 20, Japan 4 to 6, and Russia 4 to 7.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but all of them recognize that the battleship is the implement that will ultimately decide the fighting, and so determine the victory or the defeat.

Now, let us take the advice of the men who know. The gentleman spoke in glowing terms of Admiral Fletcher. I am only quoting the language of Admiral Fletcher in this statement that I am making before you. Every single officer who appeared before us said that the supreme demand of our Navy is for battleships. Gentlemen speak of the speed. A cruiser is a fast vessel, sacrificing its fighting power for speed; but a battle cruiser of 30,000 tons displacement would cost $20,000,000, as against $15,000,000 for a battleship. It would cost 25 per cent more a year to operate it than it would a battleship. So that we come down to the vital question in this matter, Shall we stand by and take the recommendation and the opinions of the men who know, and the men upon whom we must rely in the time of battle? They are honorable men, they are learned men, they are true, patriotic men, devoted to the interests and the welfare of the country, and they come without exception and tell us that the battleship is par excellence above every other consideration the thing that the American Navy needs. When we have secured the quota of these that we need, we can turn our attention to other things.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Having in mind the present state of the American Navy, does not the gentleman think American naval efficiency would be increased by constructing a unit of four battle cruisers for the immediate future, rather than four battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not, and every officer in the Navy who testified said no. Every one of them recognized and recommended battleships.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield on that question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not the gentleman think that the officers on board the ships who have to do the fighting in time of war and who want to be carried safely to victory and to the shore again, would recommend the thing that they thought would do the best fighting?

Mr. PADGETT. Why, of course. That is axiomatic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up further time in the presentation of this matter. We have these men. We rely upon them in the time of danger. We trust them in the hour of battle. We put them at the front. They have studied these questions. They are responsible for results. Let us, as sensible men, accept the universal, unbroken testimony of these men and stand by their recommendations. There are several propositions here——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. I have not time to yield, much as I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois. There are several propositions here—one for four battleships. The committee have reported in favor of two. Then there is a proposition to reduce it to one, and there is another proposition to wipe out all and have none. The committee gave careful heed and consideration to them; the department did the same. The committee have recommended two battleships; the department recommended two. The General Board wanted more, but the administration stands for two. It appears in the record that the President has approved the recommendation for two. So we have not only the administration, but we have every officer of the Navy standing solidly behind two battleships as the implements of war that will do the fighting and determine the issue and decide the result of victory or defeat.

I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. GORDON. Let it be reported.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 122, noes 123.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Strike out the word "four" in the Hobson amendment and insert "one."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the amendment for one battleship is adopted, will there be an opportunity to vote for two battleships?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; but there will be, of course.

Mr. MANN. If the amendment is adopted, then the Hobson amendment will come next for a vote.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HOBSON.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 142 ayes and 129 noes.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, the vote now recurs on the Hobson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that; but it may be that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is to the Hobson amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the exact place my amendment comes in, but I want it to fit in the appropriate place.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 64, in line 6, by striking out the words "highest practicable speed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "speed of not less than 28 knots per hour."

The CHAIRMAN. That is not germane to the Hobson amendment. The question now is on the Hobson amendment as amended.

Mr. SLAYDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The effect of this if adopted would be to change the paragraph at the top of page 64 and provide for one battleship.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if it is adopted.

The question was being taken when Mr. PADGETT demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HOBSON.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were 139 ayes and 148 noes.

So the amendment of Mr. HOBSON was rejected.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 64, in line 6, by striking out the words "highest practicable speed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "speed of not less than 28 knots per hour."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. No; Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HOBSON. No; Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
Page 64, line 6, after the words "highest practicable speed," insert the words "at least equal to those of any known battleships."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOWLER) there were 20 ayes and 113 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be modified so as to provide for a speed of not less than 25 knots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 64, in line 6, by striking out the words "highest practicable speed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "speed of not less than 25 knots per hour."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak upon this amendment for five minutes. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, now I offer my amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has offered an amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. HOBSON. No, Mr. Chairman; my amendment comes in at the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEPHENS of California:
Page 64, in line 4, after the word "battleship," insert the words "and one batttleship cruiser."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEPHENS of California) there were—ayes 65, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 4, page 64, by striking out the word "battleship" and substituting the words "battle cruisers."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, in line 4, strike out the word "battleship" and insert in lieu thereof the words "battle cruisers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 64, in line 6, after the word "class," by inserting the following:
"Including not less than four 18-inch guns capable of throwing shells of 500 pounds of high explosives at longest range of battleship guns."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOWLER) there were—ayes 5, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WITHERSPOON) there were—ayes 75, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HOBSON: At the end of line 8 insert as a new paragraph the following:
"Two first-class battleships carrying as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, to have the greatest desirable radius of action, with a speed of not less than 30 knots, and as heavy armor as possible to permit the foregoing requirements, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $14,000,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on that.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that offered as a new paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraph just passed is the one to which an amendment providing for battleships is germane.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. The point of order is that this is a different type of battleship.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; that is not my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the gentleman from Alabama should have offered his amendment to the paragraph just passed.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel it ought to be a new paragraph in the bill. If the Chair will read the amendment, he will see that it is not in line with the wording of the battleships provided in the bill, and I felt myself that when the amendment for one battle cruiser was offered as a substitute for battleships in the paragraph it was subject to the point of order. But this is a separate paragraph and is not subject to the point of order. We have a right to make various types of ships in the bill, and this is a type of ship we are going to eventually come to, and I wish to lay it before the Congress, and incidentally before the country, in advance of its final adoption.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply for battle cruisers. It substitutes the word "cruiser" for the word "ship."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention to the fact that it is not for a battle cruiser, but it is an amendment providing for battleships.

Mr. HOBSON. Very well; if the Chair wishes to call it battle cruiser, well and good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not wish to call it anything.

Mr. HOBSON. I am not going to take time. I ask unanimous consent to change that and to make it a battle cruiser. What is there in a name, Mr. Chairman? I would like to be recognized on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not yet decided the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. I thought the point of order had been withdrawn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman can not withdraw points of order for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have sustained the point of order if the amendment had remained as the gentleman introduced it, but as the gentleman has changed it——

Mr. HOBSON. I suggest to change it to battle cruisers. What is there in a name?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, with the word "cruiser" substituted.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair sustains the point of order to the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman now offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two first-class battle cruisers, carrying as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, to have the greatest desirable radius of action, with a speed of not less than 30 knots, and as heavy armor as possible to permit the foregoing requirements, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $14,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The rule, as I recall it, is that it is in order to insert a provision for any new fighting ship where the Navy now possesses one of that class, but where a new type of ship is to be provided for, then that is not in continuation of a work now in progress and must come in in the form of legislation.

Now no one claims, I think, certainly if they do claim it it is only for the purpose of argument, that there are now any battle cruisers in the Navy, hence this is an authorization for a new type of fighting ship and not in order under the rulings which have been made from time to time on that subject.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard upon the point as to the matter of its being in order, but I will say, if the Chair holds that it is out of order, that I will offer this amendment, and instead of "battle cruiser," offer it simply as a "cruiser."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like to be heard upon the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. I will not keep the attention of the House longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is clearly in order, and it has been ruled again and again that the naval appropriation bill may carry warships and things of that sort. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this would give a type of ship with qualities that all the world will have inside of 10 years. Now, I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I will take occasion now to state that at the Naval War College in Newport in 1907, we worked out a series of maneuvers on the war board, and at that time I requested that ships as high as 30,000 tons should be imagined as existing and they were called "Hobsons." It was believed at that time it would be many, many years before the world ever came to the 30,000-ton ship if it ever reached that size, but all the nations are now building them.

The ship called for in my amendment would be of about 40,000 tons. The principle is this: The useful weight—the displacement—varies as to the cube of a linear dimension, and the dead weight—the hull, decks, and the like, like a surface—vary as to the square; so the larger the dimension and the larger the ship then the larger the proportion of the weight will be available for offensive and defensive purposes. We are bound to come to these large ships before long. We should be the first. The vessel would have the high qualities of both the dreadnaught and the dreadnaught cruiser. I realize that this would be a very large increase over what already has been provided; but let me remind my friends that to-day we are not increasing as fast as six nations of the world. Take the matter of capital ships building. Great Britain stands first, with 17; Russia stands second, and ties with Germany, each with 11; France stands fourth, with 8; Japan fifth, with 6; and America comes in sixth, with 4. Now, take the tonnage. In tonnage building to-day Great Britain stands first, with 556,000 tons; Russia stands second, with 407,000 tons; Germany stands third, with 354,000 tons; France stands fourth, with 211,000 tons; Japan stands fifth, with 180,000 tons; and America stands sixth, with 129,000 tons. Do not let anybody imagine that if they vote for my amendment they tend to have the American program on the basis of any two nations. It would barely get America up to fourth place. To-day we are the fourth great nation of the world. We will, when the ships now building are completed, be below France. Even according to this program of two battleships a year, it will not be many years until we are the sixth navy in the world. Now, gentlemen here may take the responsibility. I am going to give them the opportunity. I am going to give them an opportunity to vote down this amendment and say that America shall descend to be the sixth-rate nation in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I would like to look at the Members; I shall not ask for tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as an additional paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, at the end of line 8, add as a new paragraph the following:

"Two scouts, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $4,000,000 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard, but I will not use up the five minutes. I want to call the attention of Members to the fact that our fleet to-day is without eyes. It can not see a hundred miles. It ought to see across the Atlantic Ocean, and as far as from the Pacific coast to the Hawaiian Islands, and from there to Asia. It is the only Navy in the world whose fleet has no scouting vessel, and has no vessel that can be used for an ocean scout. The great battle cruisers and special scout cruisers are the eyes of the fleets of Europe. The former can make reconnoissance in force. That is, they can fight while they scout.

The only scout vessels we have are the antiquated type of the *Birmingham* class, that can not keep the seas—little, small cruisers that ought to be used as gunboats or put into the discard. So to-day our fleet, which lacks aeroplanes with which to scout, and lacks Zeppelins with which to scout, and which lacks enough torpedo-boat destroyers to care for the defense of the fleet, has neither battle cruisers to scout with nor any scouts proper. We maintain the 21-battleship fleet in a condition where it simply could not fight on equal terms with a 21-battleship fleet of any other country. Our fleet is in a condition of inferiority that is exceedingly serious. The General Board urged that we provide four scouts in this bill, two for each division of

the fleet. Instead of that we have not a single one. I am not going to dwell on it. This is a proposition not to increase the Navy. You voted down those propositions. The proposition is whether we are going to make the Navy we now have efficient or not, and on that basis I give the membership a chance to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Chairman. I want to look at those also.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 55, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Six torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $925,000 each.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to make that eight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HOBSON. Make it eight. Strike out the word "six" and insert the word "eight."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 9, strike out the word "six" and insert the word "eight."

Mr. HOBSON. I do not do that, Mr. Chairman, to increase, as I said. This body has determined on two battleships, but the principle of strategy the world over is that every battleship to be effective and have its defense against submarines ought to have four destroyers. It is simply to make the appropriation for two battleships symmetrical.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, after line 11, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That three of said torpedo boats herein authorized shall be built on the Pacific coast: *Provided further*, That the cost of construction on the Pacific coast does not exceed the cost of construction on the Atlantic coast plus the cost of transportation from the Atlantic to the Pacific."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 11, after the word "each," insert the following:

"*Provided*, Such torpedo-boat destroyers shall be so constructed with respect to draft and beam as to enable them to use such coastal waterways and canals as afford means of safe communication in times of peace and strategic advantage in times of war."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. MOORE. I ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order. I did not expect, of course, that this amendment would pass, but——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee reserve his point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. It is too late.

Mr. MOORE. Just for a moment. I want to make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. PADGETT. Very well.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] makes a point of order on the amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One submarine to be of seagoing type to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding $1,400,000, and 16 submarines to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding $550,000 each, and the sum of $3,405,000 is hereby appropriated for said purposes to be available until expended. The sum of $800,000 is hereby reappropriated out of the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and made available until expended for the construction of the submarine torpedo boats herein authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that portion of the paragraph commencing with line 18 down to and including the word "authorized" in line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 18, after the word "expended," insert: "The following sums are hereby reappropriated out of the unobligated balances of the following appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914; 'Equipment of vessels,' $625,000; 'Steam machinery,' $175,000, and made available until expended for the construction of the submarine torpedo boats herein authorized."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the amendment in that it makes this money available until expended, in contravention of the covering-in act, which requires appropriations to be covered into the Treasury at the end of two years.

Mr. PADGETT. The practice of the Navy is to carry it until it is expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no question but that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the "Increase of the Navy" is excepted from the covering-in act. The law exempts the "Increase of the Navy."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman any law there?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not have it with me. Does the Chair sustain the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to sustain it unless the gentleman will cite the law authorizing it.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to strike out the words "and made available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 18, after the word "expended," insert:

"The following sums are hereby reappropriated out of the unobligated balances of the following appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914: 'Equipment of vessels,' $625,000; 'Steam machinery,' $175,000, for the construction of the submarine torpedo boats herein authorized."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 133, noes 29.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk, in reporting the amendment, struck out the words "and made available." The only words to be stricken out are "until expended." It is to be made "available for the construction of the submarines herein authorized." The only words to be stricken out are "until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated.

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] offers a substitute for the amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SLAYDEN: On page 64 of the bill, under "Increase of the Navy," strike out lines 12 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu of the provisions for the same the following:

"Three submarines of seagoing type, to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots, at a total cost not exceeding $1,600,000 each; and 30 submarines of coast-defense type, at a total cost not exceeding $665,000 each, and the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for said purposes, to be available until expended."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word with reference to that. A few moments ago the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] in his fervid oration in defense of a type of war vessel which, in the opinion of many people, is rapidly disappearing as an effective weapon, and which in the present war has disappeared almost completely by immuring itself in certain harbors and refuges of safety, said that the battle was not to the swift, for which he has scriptural au-

thority, but that it was to the biggest ship and the heaviest guns. That contradicts the report made by the distinguished British admiral, Sir David Beatty, the other day, in reporting the result of the conflict in the North Sea. He said that he abandoned the pursuit of his crippled and retreating enemy because the presence of submarines was suspected. Now, Mr. Chairman, experts differ as to the value of the battleship. Expert PADGETT, of Tennessee, differs from Expert Admiral Sir Percy Scott; and I submit that a man who has spent 40 years on the sea and who has achieved such distinction in his profession, and who has been decorated in the manner in which they reward service of that kind in that country, is better entitled to the confidence of this House on the matter of submarines.

But, Mr. Chairman, the submarines are making their own argument very effectively every day, as reported in this afternoon's paper which I had in my hand only a few minutes ago, and which shows that they are extending the war zone into waters which heretofore have been regarded as practically lakes of the British Empire. The submarines are making their own argument, and I shall not detain the House any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question being taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. SLAYDEN) there were—ayes 53, noes 86.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "sixteen," in line 15, on page 64, and substitute therefor the word "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 15, strike out "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, is no debate allowed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, according to all the testimony by the naval experts, there is not the slightest justification for 16 submarines. We already have built, building, and authorized 59. There are only two concerns in the United States that build them, and they have been years and years building those already authorized, and there is just no way to get them built. In addition to that, the naval experts say that we do not need any more submarines. Admiral Fletcher, the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, was urged to say that we needed a large number, and he declined to do it. He said it might be advisable to build a few more, but he told us that 50 were as good as 100 or 500, and that is the testimony of all the experts who have testified on the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that these experts all say it is an erroneous idea that we ought to have enough submarines to station a number in each harbor to protect it. They say that is not the function of the submarine; that the submarines ought to be organized into a flotilla, to go with the battle fleet in case of war; that they ought to be trained to maneuver under the command of the commander in chief, and that they ought to be divided up into small flotillas, say, of 10 each; and that the only function of the submarine is in the battle, for the commander in chief so to maneuver his fleet as to give them an opportunity; in other words, to maneuver the fleet so that he will force the enemy's fleet to come within striking distance of his submarines. The submarine has such slow speed that it is impossible for it ever to get to another ship. Its only chance is to strike when the other ship comes close to it, because it can not catch up with the other ship. They tell us that 50 would be as good as 500. They tell us that if they can not give 50 an opportunity to strike at the enemy they could not give 500 the opportunity, and that if they can give 50 an opportunity they will destroy the enemy's fleet.

There is absolutely no excuse for this expenditure of money for useless submarines. Therefore I hope the House will adopt my amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will not be adopted. The Secretary of the Navy this year recommended to Congress that there be at least 8 submarines, 1 of seagoing type. The General Board recommended 16 of the coast-defense type and 3 of the seagoing type, 20 knots or more speed. The Secretary of the Navy in the hearings before the committee said repeatedly that we should have more submarines than he had recommended, and that he hoped the committee would report more if they could do so without sacrificing a battleship. Now, the committee have not gone to the extreme of the General Board's recommendation in that we only report 1 seagoing submarine and 16 of the smaller type. The gentleman quotes one of the naval experts as saying that 50 submarines are enough. I want to call attention to the speech delivered by Rear Admiral Austin M. Knight before the Efficiency Club, of New York City, on the 29th of January, 1915. I presume there is not in this country a more level-headed, a more sagacious, a better-informed man on the needs of the Navy Department to-day than Admiral Knight.

This speech, a copy of which I hold in my hand, has been favorably commented upon from one end of the country to the other. The admiral says:

We should have at least 100 submarines. Now we have less than 60 built and building. The General Board says that we ought to have at least 100.

All the authorities, except one, quoted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] say that we should have not less than 100 submarines. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and before my time expires I ask unanimous consent to insert this address by Admiral Knight in the RECORD. It is a very temperate, a very deliberate discussion of the situation in our Navy Department to-day with regard to the efficiency of the Navy and what is needed to bring it up to its highest state of efficiency, and I commend the reading of it to every Member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the recommendation of the committee should be sustained.

The following is the address of Admiral Knight referred to:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL AUSTIN M. KNIGHT, UNITED STATES NAVY, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE EFFICIENCY CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 25, 1915.

I appreciate very highly the privilege of addressing you this evening, not alone because of the compliment which the privilege involves, but because of the possibility of usefulness to the Navy and the country which seems to be connected with it. If I do not speak as fully as you might wish me to, I shall at least speak frankly.

It is not my intention to go into questions of the efficiency of individual ships, the results of target practice, and kindred topics. I propose to deal with the efficiency of the Navy as a whole, considering it as a great and very complicated machine, upon which hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended, with one end in view, and only one—the development of a supremely efficient weapon for the defense of the country against any and every enemy which may come against us.

I was asked a few weeks ago what the War College considered that the fleet should do, and I replied:

"The War College considers that every effort of the fleet, and every effort of the department in connection with the fleet, should have for its sole aim the war efficiency of the fleet. Every effort which does not directly contribute to this end is in itself a wasteful expenditure of energy, and so far as it is a diversion from this end is distinctly harmful."

No doubt there are many differences of opinion among those assembled here to-night as to what constitutes an adequate Navy for the defense of the United States. There may even be some present who think that we should have no Navy at all. But on one point I am sure there will be no difference of opinion—that if we are to have a navy it should be as efficient as it possibly can be made. And everybody who knows anything about the Navy knows that this is not its present condition. I am not one of those who hold that it is altogether inefficient. Unsatisfactory as conditions are, it would be very easy to exaggerate them. When things are wrong you can always find extremists to tell you that they are much worse than they actually are. Some people think that this is the only way to make an impression. Others are so constituted temperamentally that they can see nothing good in anything which falls short of perfection as they see it.

I am going to assume that all of you who are gathered here to-night occupy a reasonable middle ground so far as temperament is concerned, and that to make an impression upon you I need not do violence to my own temperament by painting the picture which I shall draw for you in maximum contrast of light and shade.

There is much about the Navy which is splendidly efficient. But as a whole it is far less efficient than it can and ought to be. Our ships are fine. Our officers are capable, industrious, and ambitious. Our enlisted men are the equals of those in other navies. But efficient ships and officers and men do not alone make an efficient navy. They must be welded into an efficient whole by a unity of organization and administration and purpose which coordinates their capabilities and directs their efforts toward a common end, wisely selected and very clearly seen. Here is the first point at which we are lacking. We are lacking also in that harmonious composition of the fleet which is needed to give to every element of it the support that it needs from other elements, to make up a symmetrical and well-balanced whole. And we are lacking to a marked degree in absolutely essential facilities for the care and preservation of our ships, especially in the matter of dry docks.

Finally, we are lacking in efficient organization of the personnel. Here, so far as officers are concerned, the conditions are altogether deplorable. In a service like the Navy, where spirit is everything, where enthusiasm must be the driving power back of every activity, I ask you, to picture the effect of a condition where a young officer, graduating from the Naval Academy full of spirit and enthusiasm, finds himself confronted with a prospect of promotion to the grade of lieutenant at the age of 52 years.

If you ask me who is responsible for these conditions, I can only reply that the responsibility comes home to nearly all of us. Some of it, I am sure, rests with me—much of it, I believe, with you. Certainly it can not be attributed in excessive measure to any one administration of the Navy Department, for it has existed for half a century at least.

So let us not cloud the issue by assuming that it is a new condition, and that all administrations up to some recent date have been models of wisdom and efficiency, or that naval officers themselves always have been ready with good advice. Speaking as the representative of naval officers as a body, I frankly admit that we have not always seen clearly what was needed and have not always worked together even for ends which we did see clearly. As for the Secretaries of the Navy, it is not surprising that many of them have failed to realize that their first duty was to strive, in season and out of season, to promote the war efficiency of the Navy as a whole. Many of them have not remained in office long enough to learn this. Some, perhaps, have realized it more or less clearly, but have not found at hand an organization through which they could produce results. A few have made material contributions toward improved conditions. I shall have the pleasure a little later of calling attention to one important step in advance which was taken by the present Secretary at the very beginning of his term of office.

A large part of the responsibility, especially that connected with the small size and the unbalanced composition of the fleet and the lack of dry docks, rests with Congress, which has always approached naval legislation from the wrong side, so far as efficiency is concerned—asking, not what do we need for efficiency, but what can we afford to spend for efficiency? Behind the responsibility of Congress lies the responsibility of the country—and you, gentlemen, represent the country—because it has not insisted upon having what was needed, without reference to cost. It may be that this attitude of both Congress and the country is necessary and even inevitable. But I am one of those who believe that this great country of ours can afford to have anything in the way of national defense which it needs; and I assume that all present here to-night agree that we need a navy, and if a navy, then an efficient one, and that whatever efficiency costs is the measure of what we can afford to spend.

One particularly unfortunate feature about the application of the policy of "economy first" in naval expenditures is that it often has been invoked to prevent a small appropriation which would have added many times its own cost to the value of those items for which money was cheerfully appropriated. I shall discuss this more at length hereafter.

* * * * * * *

But, after all, is it not rather futile to spend our time in trying to place responsibility for existing conditions? It seems to me that what we ought to do is to recognize the conditions clearly—neither exaggerating nor minimizing them—and to dissociate them absolutely from personalities. We can then proceed with a perfectly open mind to consider how the conditions can be improved.

I ask you to accept this point of view and to banish from your mind all thought of politics and every trace of partisanship and fix your attention upon the question before us as one of national, not of political, significance.

The conditions, then, to which I shall invite your attention are those connected with—

First. The size and composition of the fleet.

Second. The organization of the personnel.

Third. The organization and administration of the Navy Department.

* * * * * * *

First, as to the size of the fleet. I shall not go into this very fully, because my subject is not so much adequacy as efficiency. A small machine may be efficient within the limits fixed by its size. It is from the point of view of efficiency within the Navy as it exists that I wish chiefly to consider my subject this evening. It must be recognized, however, that the actual efficiency for war of a battleship fleet which is efficient within itself may be seriously compromised by the lack of those supporting units which are vitally essential to its operation. There is, moreover, a sense in which we may say that a machine is not efficient if it is too small for the task for which it is designed.

What constitutes an adequate Navy for the United States? The answer will depend, of course, upon the purpose for which we assume that the Navy is to be used. We are all agreed, I presume, that it is not to be used for aggression. Is it, then, to be used solely for defense? If we answer "Yes," we ought to do so with a full recognition of what we are to defend and also of the elementary maxim that the best defense is a vigorous offense. In other words, no matter how resolute we may be to use our Navy only for repelling aggression, it does not follow that we should plan for meeting the aggressor only at our gates. Even if we had no interests outside our borders and no responsibilities for the defense of our outlying possessions and dependencies, we should still, as reasonable beings not wholly ignorant of history, prepare to project our battle line toward the enemy's coasts and to assume a course which would throw upon him the burden of replying to our initiative. In this sense, then, we need a navy for offense; that is to say, for offensive action with a defensive purpose. In shaping our plans along these lines we should not overlook the fact that the policy which dictates the measure of our defense must take full note of the larger national policy which it is to enforce—in relation, for example, to the Monroe doctrine, the Panama Canal, the Philippines, and other matters which are at once of national and of international significance.

The statement is often made—I have heard it made on the floors of Congress—that naval officers themselves do not know what they need. There are naturally differences of opinion among naval officers as to what the strength of the Navy should be and as to the types of which it should be composed. But the country has, in the General Board, a body of mature and experienced officers, whose business it is to study this question and to speak authoritatively upon it. In the main the recommendations of this board from year to year have been consistent with each other and consistent with the best naval sentiment. It has stood, since 1903, for a fleet of 48 battleships and necessary smaller units and auxiliaries. The character of the smaller units and auxiliaries recommended has varied from time to time, following the developments of naval art and science; but the basis of 48 battleships, to be kept up to date by eliminating ships more than 20 years of age and replacing them by new construction, has been steadily adhered to. Now, it may be that we need fewer than 48 battleships or that we need more. Whatever their number is to be, we should have a policy in the matter, looking as far into the future as practicable, and one which, in providing for capital ships, provides also for the smaller units and auxiliaries to round out the fleet into a complete and well-balanced whole, with an appropriate number of cruisers, scouts, destroyers, submarines, colliers, tank ships, supply ships, repair ships, mine-laying ships, tenders, and gunboats.

The program advocated by the General Board would, if it had been followed, have given us 47 battleships, built and building, in 1914. This program has not been followed, and we have at present 37 battleships instead of 47. It seems to me that he would be a bold man who, recalling the history of the last days of August, 1914, when the world passed within a week from a condition of universal peace to one of almost universal war, should say that we do not need the full number of battleships proposed by the General Board, and more.

But battleships alone do not make up a fleet, much less a navy. A fleet without fuel ships is crippled, and one without scouts is blind. It can neither secure information of the enemy's movements nor deny information of its own. To send a fleet thus blind and crippled into hostile waters would be to invite destruction. We have an altogether insufficient number of fuel ships and practically no scouts. Moreover, we are very weak in destroyers, of which a large number should accompany the fleet, to back up the scouts, to act in part as scouts themselves, to stiffen up the screen about the battleships, and to be ready for a dash against the enemy when an opening is presented. The effect of the conditions actually existing is to almost completely nullify the power of our fighting ships. Picture to yourselves the plight of a battleship fleet operating in hostile waters against a fleet much smaller, but with all its elements complete. The smaller fleet, with scouts thrown out a hundred miles or more around its main body, every scout in touch with every other one and with the commander in chief, and with a horde of destroyers backing up the scouts and awaiting the word to attack, would gain and keep touch with the larger fleet while itself evading discovery, and would send its destroyers in at night, unchecked and unnoted by any protecting screen, to drive home an attack which might decide the issue without the main fleets ever having seen each other. And if nothing of this sort occurred, consider the situation where the fleet, with its fuel supply exhausted, finds itself without a reserve supply on which to draw.

There is a widespread and very dangerous opinion that all the fuel ships and scouts we need can be improvised on short notice from merchant vessels. This is one of those miserable fallacies based upon experience in the Civil War and the Spanish War, in both of which we won because our opponents were even more grotesquely unprepared than we were. The Civil War was, I suppose, the most costly war ever fought, and the most unpardonably wasteful in money and in human life. But its cost did not end with the end of the war. Apart from the tremendous pension list, which our most pacific friends insist upon charging up to what they are fond of calling militarism—although it was really the direct result of the criminal folly of unpreparedness—apart from this is the indirect cost of the perpetuation of that folly. Since we were successful in that war—so the implied argument runs—our preparation for it must have been of the kind that makes for success, and we can look for success hereafter from the same policy. To these gentlemen I commend the perusal of a book called "The Military Policy of the United States," by Gen. Emory H. Upton. If any of you here present to-night have failed to read this book, I urge you to read it at once. It exists in conveniently available form as Senate Document No. 494, Sixty-second Congress, second session. It would be interesting to know how many Senators have read it. It is the best antidote I know for the monstrous delusion which sees in every American citizen a soldier, trained, efficient, ready to take his place in the ranks at a moment's notice and sweep the loathed invader from our soil, and in every ship that floats a potential man-of-war complete in everything but guns.

By what seems almost a misfortune, in view of its effect upon the minds of many of our people, the delusion that we, alone of all the nations of the earth, can carry on a successful war without preparation was confirmed by our easy victory in the Spanish War, our opponent, again, being as unprepared as we were. I should be sorry to agree with those who hold that nothing short of an overwhelming defeat in some future war will ever open our eyes to the danger of existing conditions, and I wish to do my part toward opening the eyes of my countrymen before such disaster comes. We must recognize the fact that war is an art, and a very highly specialized art. For every task which it involves there is a need of special tools, efficient in themselves and contributing to the efficiency of the whole organization; and these can not be improvised. Yachts, tugs, and ferryboats can perform certain duties in waters close to our own coasts when they are absolutely unopposed, and any steamer capable of carrying a thousand tons of coal can get the coal to the fleet which is lying quietly outside a quiet port with no threat of interruption to its lines of communication; but no language is strong enough to characterize the fatuity of relying upon such tools for carrying on a real naval war. It is true, no doubt, that there are many fuel-carrying ships that can be utilized by the Navy in time of war; but let us consider, briefly, the characteristics which they should have, and then inquire how many of them we would probably find available in our waters on the sudden outbreak of war. First of all, a goodly proportion of them must carry fuel oil instead of coal or in addition to coal. Second, they must be large. A great number of small craft, manned by untrained crews and commanded by untrained officers, might be a fatal handicap to a fleet operating at sea. Third, they must be fast, for the speed of the fleet will be the speed of the slowest craft accompanying it. Fourth, they must have facilities for handling and transferring their fuel at sea.

I do not know how many such ships there are under the United States flag at this moment, but somebody ought to know how many there are and how and where they can be reached. This should all be provided for in advance; but when it is provided for, it is safe to say that the number will be far short of what a fleet would need, and it is clear that, at the best, such craft could not work at maximum efficiency with a fleet engaged in operations where perfect military coordination is of the first importance.

We need, then, in order to make our 37 or our 47 battleships efficient, more large, fast Navy fuel ships of the *Jupiter* type, many more destroyers, and a considerable number of scout cruisers, designed and built as such, with a speed of not less than 28 knots.

It goes without saying that in these days a scout should carry aeroplanes to be launched from her decks, and this means, of course, that we need a large number of these, and of the most efficient type obtainable. It has been suggested that we can rely upon aeroplanes alone for scouting, sending them out from battleships, and so dispense with cruisers altogether. This might work if no other function were involved than that of locating the enemy, but the screening duty of the outlying line of cruisers is even more important than the scouting duty. To discover an enemy force is helpful; to arrest its advance is far more so, especially when by arresting it we deny the enemy the information about our whereabouts and our movements which it will be his object to secure.

We are weak in submarines; and the submarine, as you are all aware, has within the last few months established its claim to very serious consideration as an element in naval warfare. It has not shown itself the master of the battleship, and I doubt if it will ever do so. But it has taken a more commanding place than most of us have here-

tofore assigned it. I should rejoice if we had to-day 100 submarines instead of less than half that number, built and building. Those that we have are only half efficient, because they lack tenders of the proper type to accompany them and care for their needs and the needs of their personnel. Here again crops up the old idea that a vessel for a special purpose, demanding special characteristics, and vitally necessary to the efficiency of a vital part of our naval force can be improvised out of any old craft which happens to be handy. And here again is illustrated the false economy which in providing a weapon efficient within itself denies it the support outside itself which alone can make it efficient in application.

Running parallel with the omissions in the fleet itself is a corresponding list of omissions in the provision for its upkeep—in dry docks and other navy-yard facilities especially. A fleet without dry docks of suitable capacity and suitably located is only a little less helpless than one without fuel ships.

We have at Guantanamo a station which should be the principal base of our fleet for operations in the Caribbean—the area in which, if anywhere, our control of the Panama Canal will be challenged. But not only have we no dry dock or efficient repair shops there, we have none within a thousand miles of it. Here the expenditure of $2,000,000 might conceivably double the efficiency of the fleet in some critical emergency by making it possible for every ship to go out in perfect condition; and it requires no stretch of the imagination to picture the issue of a war as hinging upon this point alone. After a battle, the importance of a dock close at hand for repairing damages is too apparent to require more than a passing mention. It might enable the fleet to take the sea again after a brief delay, with every advantage over an enemy fleet less favorably situated.

It is understood, of course, that every station which is designed to serve as a base of supply, of repair, or of refuge for the fleet should be adequately fortified. This is a phase of my subject upon which I should like to dwell at considerable length, but time—and other considerations—make it impracticable for me to do so.

If I have made myself clear up to the present point, you will understand by how narrow a margin we have missed efficiency in the composition of our fleet and the provision for its upkeep, and yet of what vast importance is the space that separates us from it. Two per cent, perhaps—5 per cent, certainly—added to our expenditures year after year would have added at least 50 per cent to the efficiency of the fleet as a whole.

* * * * * * * *

I come now to the question of personnel. In an ideal system the development here as regards both officers and men would keep pace automatically with the development of the fleet, through a law by which the authorization for a certain increase in the number of ships would carry with it the authorization for a corresponding increase in officers and men and for a reasonable flow of promotion. Failing this ideal, we should at least have a periodical readjustment, such as to maintain a personnel ample in numbers, amply trained, and so organized as to insure a flow of promotion which will secure contentment, foster ambition, and bring officers to the command of ships and fleets while still in the perfection of their mental and physical powers. Unfortunately, the present conditions are as far from this ideal as could be imagined. To begin with, we have not the officers and men to man our ships efficiently. This is serious enough, but much more serious is the fact that the promotion of officers is so completely blocked that a young man graduating from the Naval Academy must look forward to spending all the best years of his life in the two lowest grades of the service, to performing as a gray-headed man the same duties that he has performed as a boy, and to receiving but a very small increase in salary. I need not point out to you the inevitable effect of this upon efficiency.

For this condition I could not place the responsibility if I would. Congress long has been calling upon the Navy Department for a satisfactory personnel bill. Several bills have been prepared, and every one has had support. But none has had the cordial support of the Navy as a whole. A new one has been presented to Congress this month. I hope it is a good one, but I confess that I do not know.

In this matter, as in that of the fleet, the question of expense stands in the way of every easy solution that can be suggested. Here is the problem in a few words: We need in the three lower grades of the Navy—ensign, junior lieutenant, and lieutenant—a very large number of officers. We can find room in the highest grade, that of rear admiral, for very few. Let us say, simply as an illustration and without any attempt of arithmetical accuracy, that of 100 men who reach the lieutenant's list not more than 5 can ever become rear admirals. Our problem is to eliminate the other 95 between these two grades without injustice to individuals or unreasonable expense to the Government, always remembering that expense is of far less consequence than the efficiency of which it is the price. The interest of the Navy should naturally take precedence over the interest of individuals, yet if it appears that a given scheme, in conducing to the efficiency which we all so much desire, chances to conduce also to the advantage of individuals, it should not on that account be abandoned.

The enlisted personnel is inadequate for the manning of the fleet as it exists to-day, and falls far short of what would be absolutely necessary in time of war. And we have no reserve on which to call. The present shortage is variously estimated at from 5,000 to 18,000 men, the wide difference between these figures being accounted for by different views as to the manning of ships not actually present with the active fleet. The extreme view on one side is that battleships can be laid up at a navy yard for long periods of time, with 50 or 100 men on board, and still be counted as serviceable. The extreme view on the other side is that when a ship is to be laid up approximately half of her crew should remain with her, and she should be kept ready to join the fleet, not in a year or a month, but in 48 hours. If ships in reserve are to be borne on the Navy list, and to stand before the country as available for war, there is no doubt that the second of these views is the correct one. A battleship "in ordinary," as it is called, with less than a hundred men on board, might as well be eliminated from the list of ships available for any service within a reasonable length of time.

Added to the deterioration in the ships themselves, after a certain period of the neglect that is inevitable where crews are greatly reduced, is the fact that among the plans for utilizing the ships in an emergency is one which contemplates manning them with untrained or half-trained reserves. Such reserves may doubtless be made very useful in time of war if they can be distributed throughout the fleet, to be assimilated by the regular crews of active ships. But the fate of the *Good Hope* and the *Monmouth* is an object lesson on the folly of manning ships exclusively or even chiefly with reservists.

Here, again, I want to call attention to the mistake of providing the largest and finest fighting ships in the world—for this is what our dreadnaughts are, and it is largely due to the insistence of Congress that they are so—and balking at the comparatively trifling cost of providing the officers and men to make them fully efficient.

Other factors less concrete than those that I have named have militated and are militating against ideal efficiency. You will all understand that a fleet can not be efficient unless it has abundant opportunity for drilling as a unit. No matter how admirable may be the training and the discipline of the individual ships they will not work together efficiently as a fleet without the teamwork which comes from constant drilling in company with each other under the direction of the commander in chief. And their exercises must be progressive, leading up to war maneuvers on a large scale. We have had too little of this training at all times, and especially within the past year; the necessity of keeping the battleships in Mexican waters having been a controlling factor in all phases of administration of the Navy. This has not made for efficiency, but both the present commander in chief of the fleet and his immediate predecessor testify that the effect upon efficiency has not been as great as might have been expected. Many of the battleships have missed opportunities for target practice; but here, too, the commander in chief reports that the effect has not been disastrous. That conditions remain so good in spite of such extremely unfavorable conditions is a gratifying evidence of the excellence of our ships and the fundamental soundness of our personnel. We must, nevertheless, recognize that the necessity for using battleships in this way is seriously detrimental to their efficiency, and this throws further emphasis upon the importance of an all-around development of our fleet with the demands of peace in mind as well as those of war. If cruisers and gunboats had been available for service in Mexican, Haitian, and Santo Dominican waters, the battleships could have spent the past year together in a good climate carrying on their maneuvers and target practice under favorable conditions.

* * * * * * * *

I come now to what is perhaps the most important part of my subject—the organization of the Navy Department viewed from the standpoint of efficiency. There can be no question that the existing organization is inadequate and would break down under the strain of war. The administration starts from too many sources and flows through too many channels. It lacks the unity of purpose which would come from recognition of the fact that a navy has one excuse for existing, and only one—that it shall always be ready to strike on the minute and with every element of power concentrated behind its blow for the defense of the country.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not telling you that our organization is wholly bad. I am telling you that it is inadequate. In many cases it works rather surprisingly well. But if you analyze these cases you will find that, in so far as the results are good, they are so in spite of the system and because of some personal factor which has compelled efficiency. Moreover—and this is the crux of the whole matter—the cases with which we can deal at the present time are illustrations of peace efficiency, whereas the efficiency upon which our attention should be fixed unwaveringly is war efficiency—not because we are going to have war, but because we may have it, and because the one supreme duty of the Navy is to be ready for it if it comes.

I suppose this relation of the Navy to war, whether possible war or actual war, has always been understood more or less clearly; but it is a singular fact that the organization of the Navy Department takes no account of it. War is the one thing for which no arrangement is made. There are seven bureaus in the department, each with clearly defined duties, but in all the elaborate legislation creating these bureaus and defining their duties there is not a word about the duty of keeping the Navy in readiness for war or preparing plans for war or conducting war after it begins. There would be a certain element of comedy in this if there were not so many elements of possible tragedy. There is a bureau in the department charged with the construction and repair of ships, one with the design of machinery, one with the preparation of ordnance, one with the direction of personnel, and so on; but nowhere is it said, "This bureau shall be responsible for the readiness of the fleet for war, for the preparation of war plans, and for the conduct of war." This, then, is the last and great defect in the efficiency of the Navy. How shall it be remedied? The answer is, I think, by the creation in the Navy Department of a "division of strategy and operations," preferably not coequal with the present bureaus, but superior to them and standing between them and the Secretary. This arrangement would be a recognition of the fact that all the activities of the present bureaus should lead up to the Secretary through a channel which coordinates them all and directs them toward war efficiency.

The title proposed for the new office—division of strategy and operations—covers very completely the ground that I have in mind. As standing for strategy, this division would plan what to do; and as standing for operations, it would direct the execution of its plans. It would correspond more or less closely with the General Staff of the Army and the first sea lord of the British Admiralty, whose duties are thus defined:

"1. Preparation for war: All large questions of naval policy and maritime warfare—to advise.

"2. Fighting and seagoing efficiency of the fleet, its organization and mobilization, including complements of ships as affecting total numbers; system of gunnery and torpedo exercises of the fleet, and tactical employment of air craft, and all military questions connected with the foregoing; distribution and movements of all ships in commission and in reserve.

"3. Superintendence of the war staff and the hydrographic department."

These duties are all performed subject to the general authority of the first lord of the admiralty, who corresponds to our Secretary of the Navy; and I wish to emphasize the fact that I am not advocating a reorganization which would in any way reduce the authority of the Secretary.

I have spoken of strategy as shaping plans which are later carried out by operations. This is a convenient distinction but not an exact one, for in a broad sense strategy both plans and executes. It may be defined as the art of so shaping plans and directing forces as to concentrate the maximum of pressure upon the enemy at the time and place best suited to accomplish the purpose at which we aim. This evidently presupposes a clear conception of what the purpose is at which we aim and a careful preparation—in advance—of the forces and the plans required for attaining the purpose. The strategy of a farsighted nation does not begin with the beginning of war. It has its origin far back in the history of international relations and runs parallel with national policies, taking account of the ends at which these national policies aim and accepting their ends as its own.

First of all, then, strategy is preparation. Secondarily, it is execution; always, if it deserves the name of strategy, through the medium of forces and of plans previously prepared.

I have explained that the defects in the organization of the Navy Department are a lack of coordination of authority, as a result of which the administration starts from too many sources and flows through too many channels, and a total lack of provision for planning and carrying forward the operations of war. It must not be supposed that these defects have escaped recognition or that no efforts have been made to correct them. The most successful of the efforts to secure coordination between the bureaus was the adoption during the last administration of a system of aids to the Secretary, who coordinated the work of the various bureaus, and who, when important questions were under consideration, formed a council upon which he could call for advice. The weak point about this system was and is that the aids never have been legalized by Congress, and therefore have no permanent status whatever. In spite of this, they are in a position to do much toward improving the administration of the department.

The General Board was called into existence in 1900 by an order of the Secretary of the Navy, to provide a body for the consideration of war plans and allied subjects. It has performed, and is performing, work of the very highest importance, but it, like the Council of Aids, lacks legislative sanction, although Congress has for many years past shown great interest in its work and not a little deference to its views.

Another and a very important agency to which the Navy Department looks for a contribution to its work in strategy and other matters connected with preparation for war and the conduct of war is the Naval War College at Newport. The War College has been in existence since 1884 and has been an important factor in the education of officers from the very beginning. For some reason, however, it has failed until very recently to command the full recognition which it has deserved from the Navy Department or even from the officers of the Navy. The present Secretary of the Navy visited the college shortly after coming into office, and, with an insight of which many naval officers have shown themselves incapable, recognized its possibilities for usefulness and pronounced himself its friend. Since that time he has done everything to forward its work which could be dictated by the most thorough comprehension of its mission and its needs, and as a result of this generous support, both moral and material, the college has taken its proper place as an institution for the training of officers for high command, and for the development of the art of naval warfare. Thus the college is enabled to contribute something toward making good the lack of a strategic division in the Navy Department itself.

You will see, therefore, that although no law takes cognizance of the necessity for keeping the Navy ready for war, there are many agencies which cooperate toward that end—the Council of Aids, to which the Secretary would naturally turn in an emergency; the General Board; and the War College. These agencies are so closely in sympathy that they are able to cooperate harmoniously with each other and with the fleet, and this cooperation is having important and very valuable results. This does not change the fact that there should be—that indeed there must be—in the Navy Department itself and close to the Secretary, a coordinating office to bring the efforts of these and other agencies to an administrative focus bearing directly upon the efficiency for war. Such a coordinating office I have already sketched as a division of strategy and operations immediately below the Secretary of the Navy in authority.

The creation of this office would provide a policy for the Navy so far as the activities of the Navy itself are concerned, insuring unity of effort, and shaping plans toward the end which we have recognized to-night as the proper end of all our efforts—preparedness for war.

But a policy within the Navy is not enough. I have said of strategy that it should take account of national policy as applied to international affairs. We need, then, a policy broader than our naval policy and including it. This must be a national policy, dealing with both Army and Navy and bringing the broadest statesmanship as well as the highest technical knowledge to bear upon the whole question of national defense. Its enunciation must come from the highest authority in the land, executive and legislative.

This points to a council of national defense, for the creation of which a bill is already before Congress. In such a council, with the President of the United States at its head, we should have the last word in the coordination of national resources for national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "sixteen" and insert the word "eleven."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, line 15, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert the word "eleven."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy the time of the House in any extensive argument. As I stated to-day, if we strike out one battleship and five submarines and the transport and the hospital ship it will amount to a saving of something like between eight and nine million dollars. On account of the deficit in the Treasury, I regret very much that the House has insisted on the two-battleship program. Of course, that is a decision for the House to make. Unless we are willing to cut the expenditures we might as well recognize the fact that we will be responsible for a serious deficit. I do not intend to take up the time of the House in useless debate, but I think it is only proper that I should renew the motion at this point, in order that the House may have another opportunity to say if it is willing to cut this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 85, noes 94.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were 100 ayes and 96 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 16, strike out the figures "3,405,000" and insert in lieu thereof "2,305,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post entitled "Submarines can take supplies from the undersea depots that may soon surround the British Isles."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to print an article in the RECORD which he mentions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

SUBMARINES CAN TAKE SUPPLIES FROM THE UNDERSEA DEPOTS THAT MAY SOON SURROUND BRITISH ISLES.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *February 4, 1915.*

Simon Lake, the submarine-boat builder, discussing Germany's program of harassing English commerce by undersea attack, to-day stated that the plan was quite practical. With submerged bases of supplies, which undoubtedly already have been planted around the entire island, he said, there is no question in his mind that Germany can soon effect a complete blockade against provisions and arms.

BASES UNDER SEA.

"The success of the German raids," said Mr. Lake, "may be attributed to the use of submerged full and provisions stations, each one of which would supply food and fuel enough for any one submarine to continue activities for months. It is not necessary to look for surface tenders, which would be destroyed by the enemy, and possibly leave the submarine helpless.

"It is now possible to transfer coal from one vessel to another at considerable depth beneath the surface, and it is much simpler to pass liquid from one vessel to another. As far back as 1890 I had constructed a submerged craft of this kind, and successfully transferred a cargo from one boat to another in the Sound off Bridgeport. Sixteen tons of coal were transferred in nine minutes from a sunken barge to a submarine freighter.

AIR LOCKS SOLVE PROBLEM.

"The German submarines are practically Lake boats, as they have adopted all my devices, and it will be recalled that they have diving compartments, which are merely trapdoor contrivances in the bow, connecting the inner portion of the submarine by means of air locks, so that it is a simple matter for a diver to pass from within the boat to the bed of the sea and into another similar diving appliance in a sunken supply ship.

"I believe that, if not already surrounded, England will be soon, with these invisible supply stations, and that the present successes and future blockade of that country by German submarines will be fully accomplished by this method of attack."

The Clerk read as follows:

Eight of the submarine torpedo boats herein authorized shall be built on the Pacific coast: *Provided*, That the cost of construction on the Pacific coast does not exceed the cost of construction on the Atlantic coast plus the cost of transportation from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 24, strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

One transport, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed $1,900,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph. It is not authorized by law. There is no authority to provide for a transport.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Tennessee for what purpose this transport is to be used?

Mr. PADGETT. It is for the purpose of transporting marines of the Navy from point to point in the Naval Service.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that with all of the activities that go toward the necessary equipment of a navy, it would be considered a work in continuation of an establishment provided for by law, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TRIBBLE:

"I move to strike out lines 5 and 6, page 65."

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard at length upon this question. I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the next two paragraphs. This transport and this hospital ship were not recommended by the Navy Department. They carry an appropriation of $4,150,000. The Secretary of the Navy does not want these naval auxiliaries at this time. He stated that he did not want them. I have a letter in my

office that he wrote to me since the Naval Committee reported this bill, since these provisions were forced upon the Naval Committee by the Republicans on the committee. The chairman did not vote for these provisions, and only two or three Democratic members of the committee voted for them. Nobody wants these ships. They are not fighting vessels. I move to strike them out, and I think I have said enough to show the Democrats that their duty is to vote with me on this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will prevail. Marines are carried on fighting ships, and they are expected to be landed as a part of expeditions in which fighting ships are needed. If the Navy Department needs transports to carry marines, it has two transports that are about to be turned over to it. A few years ago Congress appropriated money for the purchase of two vessels of 12,000 tons displacement to be used by the Isthmian Canal Commission in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal. Upon the completion of the canal, or when these vessels are no longer needed, they are to be turned over to the Navy Department as Navy auxiliaries. These two vessels—the *Ancon* and the *Cristobal*—cost $550,000 each, and have a displacement of 12,000 tons each. They are capable of carrying 1,000 men and officers and each has a speed of 12 knots an hour. It has been said that by the installation of an additional boiler in those vessels the speed can be increased to 14 knots an hour. There is no longer need for them in connection with the work of the Isthmian Canal. They were used to transport the heavy materials required in its construction. One of them has already been put out of commission, and has been used by the War Department to convey troops from Vera Cruz to the United States. The other is not expected to make more than a few more trips. If the Navy Department needs transports, it has them. There can not be any excuse at this time, considering the situation relative to the finances of the country, to justify the authorization of a transport for marines to cost practically $2,000,000. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, just a word with regard to the transports in the Navy. You will find in Ships' Data, page 106, that we have six so-called transports. One was completed in 1879, and is therefore 36 years old. The youngest of those ships was built in 1895, and is 20 years old. It is a ship of 1,100 tons burden. It is ridiculous to call a ship of 1,100 tons burden a transport. The transport that is most used—the only one, in fact, now fit for use in the Navy Department—is the *Prairie*, of 6,620 tons displacement, which was built in 1890, 25 years ago. The General Board said of these transports:

> Not one of the four improvised transports now in the service of the Navy, the *Hancock*, the *Rainbow*, the *Prairie*, and the *Buffalo*, is of the size or is fitted for the work required, nor of the character of construction needed for safety in ships carrying large bodies of men. All are old, single-skin ships, without proper water-tight subdivisions.

What are they doing? On the *Prairie*, the only decent transport we have, they are carrying between eight and nine hundred marines on a ship that is only fitted to carry between four and five hundred, and instead of these marines being carried directly from a port in the United States to some foreign port and there landed they are kept weeks or months on this transport. They must be until there is necessity for their employment on shore. The quarters are so crowded on this *Prairie* that hundreds—perhaps that is an exaggeration—but scores and scores of the men have to sleep in the open, exposed on the deck, where the spray or the waves from the sea and the rain from the heavens come down on them day and night.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Did the gentleman know, when he voted into the bill a provision to build this transport, that the *Cristobal* and the *Ancon* were available?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The *Cristobal* and *Ancon* are old ships, and I——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They were built since the Panama Canal was started.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. They are older than the Panama Canal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they are not.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And they are not fitted——

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts (continuing). For transport service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are. The testimony of competent men is to the effect that you can easily carry 1,000, and that you could carry 2,000 marines——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. For the sake of argument, admitting what the gentleman says, we would then be insufficiently supplied with transports.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have more than we ever had.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We are building one. If even the *Ancon* and *Cristobal* are all the gentleman claims for them, we then would have a total of four reputable, decent, fit transports on which to carry our marines and sailors.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The vessels the gentleman mentioned are the Boston Steamship Co.'s vessels which ran years ago out of Puget Sound.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And built in 1905.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Twenty years old, single-skin ships.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nineteen hundred and five is not 20 years ago. They are the best ships that go from this country to South America.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But they are not properly constructed ships on which to carry from 800 to 1,000 human beings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken, for I have gone on those ships myself and I know something about them.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The fact the gentleman trusted his life to them has nothing to do with it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman does not expect to put the marines in a captain's cabin.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But you expect to put them in some kind of a cabin and not on the open deck.

Mr. BUTLER. Marines are entitled to some place to sleep as much as Members of Congress, and it is——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Secretary of the Navy has not asked for this transport; that they are building a transport now that was carried in the appropriation bill year before last, and with that the demands of the Navy will be amply met. If this motion is agreed to, it will take out of this bill an appropriation of $1,125,000. Now, it seems to me as far as this side of the House is concerned, no matter if gentlemen may have differences of opinion on the question of battleships and preparedness for war, this is purely a ship of aggression, to carry your Army or your Navy into a foreign field, and facing this Treasury deficit, if this side of the House is not willing to strike this item out of the bill, then you had better resign your commissions on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 111, noes 70.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

One hospital ship, to cost not to exceed $2,250,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 7, page 65.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, this House has just saved the country $1,900,000 by voting for my amendment and striking from this bill a transport, which added nothing to the fighting strength of the Navy if it had been built at this enormous expense. I now ask the membership of this House to strike out the hospital ship. The Secretary of the Navy says that this hospital ship is not needed; that even if war comes there are several old vessels now used for no purpose on earth that could be converted into hospital ships. Yet with his statement before us and even over the protest of the Secretary of the Navy and over the protest of the chairman of this committee and all the Democrats, except three on the Naval Committee who joined with the Republicans, this hospital ship, to cost $2,250,000, was inserted in this bill and has the support of the committee. I charge that the Republicans on the committee joined with three Democrats and loaded down this bill with things the Democratic administration did not want, and this ship is one of them. If you will vote for this amendment, we will save the country $4,150,000 in a few minutes, and I appeal to Democrats to support my amendment to strike out this hospital ship. [Applause.] The plucking board is dead; now let us continue to improve this bill and the Navy Department.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, whatever the desperate situation of the Treasury may be, I hardly think it is in sufficiently distressed straits that this House will refuse to provide necessary hospital facilities for those defending the flag of the Republic on the high seas. [Applause.] The question, therefore, is whether or not this hospital ship is necessary for the proper care of the sick or wounded men of the Navy.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have not time to yield to the gentleman; the gentleman can take time when I get through. There is no question as to the necessity for this hospital ship. I want to say that in the entire Navy Department there is but one such ship—the *Solace*.

That ship was purchased in 1898 and has never been well adapted for the important use to which it has been put. It is an old vessel now, and was a commercial vessel when we purchased it. This Government paid $600,000 for it, in the first place, paid $100,000 to have it remodeled, and since that time has spent in fixing it up and in trying to make it suitable $776,000 more, or a total of $1,476,000. And those in charge of the Navy Department now say that it rolls and tosses upon the sea and is an unfit vessel in which to care for those who have been wounded or are sick. And not only that, but the vessel has practically outlived its usefulness and can not be depended upon any longer. An officer of the Navy Department told me that when the *Solace* brought home the sick and the wounded from Vera Cruz it had to lay up for six weeks at the docks in New York and could not go back to relieve the situation at Vera Cruz any further. Her engines are old, and it will require an expenditure of $40,000 to replace them. When these repairs are undertaken it will require many weeks to complete them before it can join the fleet again. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but a fleet of 20 battleships is equivalent to a city of 20,000 people out upon the high seas, and you have nothing but this old hospital ship to take care of the sick and the wounded of that floating city, a vessel that was not intended for the purpose in the first place, and can accommodate only 234 patients, anyhow. And, further, in case the fleet is divided, and we have to send a part of it into the Pacific Ocean, we will have no hospital ship for that division of the fleet at all. This extra ship should be authorized in this bill. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this great Government, the richest on the face of the earth, blessed as no other nation has been in a material way in all the tide of time, has not come to a pass, I trust, when we must sacrifice the sick and wounded of the Nation's defenders in order to help out the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, if I have confidence in the Navy Department in one respect more than another, it is the confidence that these men will ask for enough money to carry on the service of that department. I have confidence that pride, sentiment, and enthusiasm which men have for the life work in which they are engaged, without responsibility to the taxpayers, as well as duty, will always prompt them to recommend sufficient appropriation for all necessary requirements. The Navy Department by its estimates submitted to the committee has said that this ship was not now needed. The Secretary of the Treasury has told us that this ship was not required. The chairman of the committee has urged that this appropriation was not necessary and opposed the provision for it in the bill. No naval officer who came before the committee declared for this ship as such an imperative necessity that it must be provided for at this time. The Members who voted for this ship in the committee were those who stand for a large Navy program regardless of cost to the people, and only by a few Members who stand in a position to be responsible to the taxpayers and for the condition of the Treasury joining with them was this appropriation voted in the bill. It does not represent the deliberate judgment of that part of the committee who recognize such responsibility and who realize the condition of our public finances, and should be stricken out.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if these old ships are what are called single-skin ships?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. They are; all of them.

Mr. COOPER. The *Titanic*, which sank and drowned 1,500 people, was a single-skin ship.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not know about that. These are single-skin ships, unfit to carry people on the ocean.

Again we have Democracy putting partisanship into this question of the increase of the Navy, partisanship in taking care of the national defense, and taking care of the welfare of the men behind the guns. The Democratic Party professes its love for the common, everyday fellow; but when they have an opportunity to express it they express it by giving him a stone instead of bread, and then cry partisanship when the Republicans, with a better appreciation of the men and the service, attempt to provide what is absolutely needed. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] says that not an officer asked for the hospital ship. Why, does he forget that when the Surgeon General was before us he said that we ought to have two hospital ships? Does he forget that Admiral Badger, lately in command of the Atlantic Fleet, said that we should have two hospital ships? Does he forget that Admiral Fletcher, now in command of the Atlantic Fleet, told the committee we should have two hospital ships? And yet he says nobody came before the committee and asked for a hospital ship.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Secretary of the Navy never made any objection to the transport and the hospital ship until after the bill was in this House.

Mr. GORDON. He did not ask for it, did he?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It is not fair for gentlemen to get up and say that the committee put into this bill these two items over the protest of the Secretary of the Navy. I want to read what the Surgeon General said in the hearings:

> You can not build a hospital ship in a short time in case of war.

He told us we ought to have one with the Atlantic Fleet and one with the Pacific Fleet, one on the east coast, and one on the west coast. And he said they—

> Should be provided in peace times, and if the big fleets go south, far, far away, with the necessity with large bodies of men for giving in many cases a more careful treatment by specialists the necessity for hospital ships is apparent. And also for the transportation back and forth of the various sick we need hospital ships.

And yet the impression is sought to be given out, when this administration discovers it is not competent to raise money to carry on the Government and we must economize in the Navy, that we have forced these things on the department against their protest, which I wish to deny emphatically, because there was no objection to transports from the Secretary of the Navy before the committee when we were making up this increase in the Navy.

The gentleman who made that statement, that we forced this into the bill against the protest of the Secretary, either does not know the condition of affairs or he is making a statement that has no foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall detain the House but for a moment. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] has been a member of this committee for 16 years. Only in the last six months has he waked up to the necessity of having a hospital ship in the Navy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Secretary of the Navy has unquestionably not asked for appropriation of over $2,000,000 for this purpose. There is no doubt in the world but that we have facilities for taking care of the sick and wounded. At Vera Cruz——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pardon me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It was at Vera Cruz that the necessity was shown for a hospital ship.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When it was necessary to transport our sick and wounded from Vera Cruz we brought them here in good condition. There was no complaint made that they were not handled and properly taken care of. The Secretary himself has said so. We are informed by a member of the committee that there are plenty of ships in the Navy that can be used for hospital ships. This time is no time to make appropriations for new ships that are not needed. The gentleman from Massachusetts would vote for every appropriation for a battleship or a naval supply ship, even if it swamped the Treasury of the Government of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, if he followed my votes to-day, knows better than that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Where did the gentleman vote to-day against anything to increase the expenditures?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I voted against four battleships, and I voted against two battle cruisers. I have voted against the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] for 23 submarines.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not controvert the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Do not make a statement of that kind without knowing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman has voted for the full amount of supplies that he could get in this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I challenge that statement. In the committee I voted against big appropriations for a larger number of ships. The roll call will show it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman a question myself. If you could have put in this bill in committee four battleships instead of two, would you have voted for it?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No, sir. I voted against it in the committee. Is there any other question the gentleman would like to ask?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will proceed, if the gentleman will take his seat. I have the floor. The gentleman stands here to advocate the building up of the Navy always. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Masssachusetts. I will not deny that charge.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The first consideration with him is the building up of a great Navy. My contention is that the gentleman from Massachusetts ought not to lead the Democratic side of this House.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would not attempt it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman from Massachusetts to order. I expect always to treat gentlemen on the floor of this House with decency and politeness.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman call it decency and politeness to say such things to a fellow Member?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish the gentleman to understand that I am willing to yield at the proper time, when he addresses the Chair in the proper way, but I do not propose to be interrupted by ruffian tactics on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will not the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield if the gentleman interrupts me properly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman if he calls it fair and courteous treatment to misrepresent in this House my votes cast in his presence and my vote in committee, of which he knew nothing?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not wish to misrepresent the gentleman's position.

I was under the apprehension that the gentleman had voted for the largest amount. When he said he had not I accepted his statement, but that was no reason why he should interrupt my speech at every sentence——

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the membership of this House that I am not opposed to a reasonable Navy, that I am not opposed to the protection of our country, but I do say it is time for the Democratic side of the House to take charge of this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I hope they will take charge of it by taking out this hospital ship, and I move to close further debate on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, there were—ayes 135, noes 73.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph. Lines 5 and 6 having gone out, I offer it after line 4. I move to insert the words—

One gunboat, to cost not exceeding $750,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I make the point of order that that paragraph has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. TRIBBLE. We passed that paragraph and cut out the two succeeding lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must remember that those lines went out, and the gentleman is now offering the paragraph at the only point where he can offer it, and the Chair thinks the amendment is in order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the Chair hear me?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman goes back to line 4. On my motion lines 5 and 6 were cut out. Now he proposes to go back.

The CHAIRMAN. He must go back in order to have a place to offer his amendment. The language was cut out on the gentleman's motion, and he has got to go back.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I make the point of order that we have passed that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, after line 4, insert:
"One gunboat, to cost not exceeding $750,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield a moment, I want to ask that that amendment be agreed to. It was recommended by the Secretary, and the gunboats are needed very badly, especially in foreign waters, to do the duty that they can do. Without these gunboats they must use battleships.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I trust the request of the chairman of the committee will be acceded to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 91, noes 109.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Except where otherwise directed, the Secretary of the Navy shall build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, or corporations, or the agents thereof, bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "reasonably," in line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 10, strike out the word "reasonably."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the passage of this amendment because it may be that in the letting of these contracts the Secretary of the Navy might lay too much stress upon the word "reasonably," and feel that before he can refuse to accept the bids of any company or trust for the construction of any of the vessels authorized in this bill he must know to a moral certainty that a conspiracy has been entered into by such company, firm, or trust to destroy competition. He might feel that the proof of such combination should be strong enough to leave no reasonable doubt upon his mind.

There is not much difference in the ordinary practical construction of the terms "reasonably certain" and "certain beyond a reasonable doubt," especially when the interests of the trusts are at stake. I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs why this paragraph does not provide specifically for the building of at least some of these vessels in the Government yards in order that our mechanics may be kept busy and the Government always be supplied with trained mechanics competent to do such work?

Mr. PADGETT. There is no necessity for it. The Secretary of the Navy is very strong on that side and is building all he can crowd into the yards.

Mr. COOPER. But this paragraph would not permit him to exercise his choice unless he first be convinced that there is a combination which would deprive the Government of fair competition among bidders.

Mr. PADGETT. He can construct them anywhere, and this directs him to do it if he is satisfied there is any combination or agreement depriving the Government of unrestricted competition.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is mistaken. That is not the proper interpretation of the language of the bill—

Except where otherwise directed, the Secretary of the Navy shall build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, or corporations, or the agents thereof, bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or under-

standing the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels.

Under that language the Secretary is absolutely prohibited from building any of these vessels in a Government yard unless he shall first be convinced that there is a combination among the persons, corporations, or firms bidding for the contract.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken about that. The Secretary has been building vessels under that same language; he built a transport and a supply ship, one at Philadelphia and one at Boston, under this identical language.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the paragraph on page 66, which it seems to me governs this question.

Mr. COOPER. What line?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The last paragraph, beginning at line 15, where it says—

No part shall be used to procure through purchase or contract any vessels, armament, articles, or materials, which the navy yards, gun factories, or other industrial plants operated by the Navy Department are equipped to supply, unless such Government plants are operated approximately at their full capacity for not less than one regular shift each working day, except when contract costs are less than costs in said Government plants, and except when said Government plants are unable to complete the work within the time required, and except in cases of emergency.

Mr. COOPER. That does not meet the point I make against the paragraph on the preceding page, the paragraph we are now considering. The particular paragraph now before us is, in my judgment, susceptible only of the construction that I put upon it. The ordinary rule of statutory construction is that the mention of one thing is the exclusion of the other; and therefore, as this paragraph expressly provides that the Secretary of the Navy may build in a navy yard if convinced that the bidders are in a combination which prevents competition among them, it follows, of course, that he can not build in a navy yard unless he is so convinced. He has first to be convinced that there is a combination among bidders, otherwise he can not build in a Government yard.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken, because they have been building in the Government yards under this identical language.

Mr. COOPER. I am absolutely right, and I appeal to any lawyer on the floor. I distinctly remember that previous bills contained language different from this before they passed the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield? I am intensely interested in this, and if the paragraph on page 66 does not overcome the prohibition I want it remedied.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in order to clear up the matter I move to strike out the words "except where otherwise directed," in line 8, page 65. Then it will read:

The Secretary of the Navy shall build—

And so forth.

Mr. COOPER. No; that does not meet it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more. This is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. I speak of this because in previous Congresses we have had very earnest discussions on this floor over propositions to require the Secretary of the Navy to build at least one vessel in a Government yard. Such a provision has been mandatory in some of the bills, and required him to build certain of the ships in Government yards, the argument in favor of that sort of legislation being that the Government ought at all times to have in its employ experts competent to do high-class naval construction work.

This paragraph is susceptible only of the construction I have put upon it, which is that the Secretary of the Navy must let contracts for constructing these vessels to private bidders unless it shall appear that there is a combination among them—a thing difficult for him to know. How can he determine whether there is a combination to prevent competitive building? In previous Congresses—and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] will remember this—we have had protracted debates on this identical proposition.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What amendment does the gentleman suggest to obviate that?

Mr. COOPER. In previous laws there have been mandatory provisions requiring the Secretary of the Navy to build certain vessels in Government yards to be selected by him.

Mr. PADGETT. We can not build a battleship in a navy yard now, because the only yard that can build a battleship has two in it, and it will be two years before they will be out of the way. It is impossible to build a battleship in a Government yard at this time. We authorized one last year, 10 months in advance.

Mr. COOPER. I am not talking about the facts; I am talking about the construction of this proposed law. The chairman of the committee now gives a different reason. He seems now to acquiesce in my interpretation of this proposed law, but says they could not be built in a Government yard anyway.

Mr. PADGETT. I say as a matter of fact they can not do it. The Secretary has full authority and has been building them all along.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 16, page 65, strike out the period and insert a colon and add: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some merit in the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], and to clear up the situation I have offered this amendment. I believe the Secretary of the Navy, from his position in the past, is in favor of keeping the navy yards up to their present high efficiency, and this amendment gives him power to provide for the building of any of the vessels herein authorized in the navy yards.

I am sure, judging from the results of the past, that the Secretary of the Navy will so arrange the building program that many of the vessels will be constructed in the navy yards of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in support of the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "except where otherwise directed."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 8, strike out the words "except where otherwise directed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, $22,114,459.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 20, strike out the figures "$22,114,459" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$20,664,459."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if that amendment proposed by him is sufficient to make allowance for the two paragraphs which were stricken out above on page 65?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what it is for.

Mr. FOWLER. But $4,000,000 was stricken out there.

Mr. PADGETT. That is, the authorization, but the appropriation is carried here.

Mr. FOWLER. There were more than $4,000,000 cut out.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; $1,900,000 and $2,250,000.

Mr. PADGETT. One million and nine hundred thousand dollars is the limit of cost, but you do not appropriate the whole amount the first year. It takes two years to build it.

Mr. FOWLER. Then the figures "$22,114,459" do not cover the entire cost for the provisions in lines 5 and 6?

Mr. PADGETT. They do not.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, equipment: The unexpended balance on June 30, 1915, shall be transferred to appropriation "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery," and beginning with July 1, 1915, equip-

ment outfits shall be charged to appropriation "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. What does this do?

Mr. PADGETT. In the bill of last year the Bureau of Equipment was abolished, and this is simply to distribute the money that was appropriated under the bill with that bureau in existence to the other bureaus.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy; armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament for vessels heretofore and herein authorized, to be available until expended, $19,048,998.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "$19,048,998," in line 9, page 66, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$18,588,988."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAVENNER:

Page 66, line 9, after the figures "$18,588,998," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall not consider any bid for the supplying of the armor or armament herein provided for unless such bid is accompanied by a sworn list of stockholders and bondholders of the corporation, submitting such bid, such list of stockholders and bondholders to be taken from the books of said corporation as of date of July 1, 1914: *And it is further provided*, That such list of stockholders and bondholders shall be transmitted in a separate report by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order—I will make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore and herein authorized, $45,909,801.

Mr. PADGETT. The total there has to be increased, and we got authority to change totals.

The CHAIRMAN. That has already been agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply desire to call attention to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of each of the sums appropriated by this act, except such amounts as may be required to meet obligations authorized in previous acts and for which contracts have been made, no part shall be used to procure through purchase or contract any vessels, armament, articles, or materials which the navy yards, gun factories, or other industrial plants operated by the Navy Department are equipped to supply, unless such Government plants are operated approximately at their full capacity for not less than one regular shift each working day, except when contract costs are less than costs in said Government plants, and except when said Government plants are unable to complete the work within the time required, and except in cases of emergency.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 24, after the word "emergency," insert:

"*Provided*, That hereafter no appropriation shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any appropriation hereafter be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no claim for services performed by any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. This is different from the provision we put in the Army bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do not know on what ground the gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order, but I will agree this language is different from that on the military bill; but——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois that this provision makes permanent law by inserting the word "hereafter."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. My reason for desiring this in this language is that it probably will prevent having this up in connection with every appropriation bill that passes the House, and for that reason I thought action at this time, when we are pretty well represented, would be desirable. I will agree that if the point of order is made it will be well taken.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is on two grounds. First to the word "hereafter," which makes it permanent law, and then there is another part, which is legislation, in the last two lines, "and no claim for services performed by any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That was in the other one.

Mr. PADGETT. I know, but the point was not raised in the discussion of the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order as to the word "hereafter."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Then I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 24, after the word "emergency," insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no claim for services performed by any person while violating this provision shall be allowed."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order on the last two lines, which read:

And no claim for services performed for any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed.

The Chair thinks that is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I ask to amend the amendment by striking out that part.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers the amendment with that language stricken out.

Mr. MOORE. Is that a request for unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman offers it as an amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. I understood the gentleman was going to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment now with those words stricken out. Does the gentleman make the point of order with those words stricken out?

Mr. MOORE. I do not make the point of order on the amendment as modified if those words have been stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Those words have been stricken out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to suggest that the word "bill" occurs in two places, and it should be changed to "act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Change the word "bill" wherever it occurs in the amendment to the word "act."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to abolish the Taylor system, so far as it applies to the Naval Service, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That is the purpose.

Mr. MOORE. A similar provision was passed during the pendency of the Army bill, and it has had its effect on some of the arsenals already, as I am informed. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not he knows that there is quite a protest on the part of employees against stopping the bonuses that have been received for extra work?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman, if he will yield, that my information on that is that the protest has been worked up by the officers in the Frankford Arsenal who are opposed to this legislation, just as employers always seem to be able to find some employees whom they can coerce or influence in some way to come and oppose eight-hour measures, like they did the woman's eight-hour day here and in Illinois. So far as its being the position of the majority of the employees who have courage to speak for themselves, I do not believe there is any truth in the statement that they are opposed to it.

Mr. MOORE. Has the gentleman heard of any protests from Watertown?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not heard any protests from Watertown. I will read here a statement from a representative of the men who have been seeking this legislation for a number of years, and not only that, but we have a great deal of information in the hearings. We had a special committee to investigate the Taylor system, and they reported in accord with the position taken by organized labor and the labor people who have been protesting against this. It has been established and stated by employers, a large majority of them, I believe, that it is not a system that is acceptable from the employers' point of view.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to say in view of what the gentleman from Illinois said, that probably 300 employees of the Frankford Arsenal have protested against the abolition of this system on the ground that it has worked a practical reduction of their wages. I know the gentleman will doubtless have the ear of the majority on this question, and that his amendment may pass, but I desire to inform him as a friend of labor that at least 300 men and women have protested against the abolition of the system in this instance.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Members of the committee that this question has been investigated by those who are interested in the welfare of the working people.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not under investiagtion now by the Industrial Relations Commission?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do not know a thing about that. This is the information that I have.

Mr. MOORE. I am advised that the whole question of the Taylor system is under investigation now by a commission authorized by Congress and that commission has not yet reported upon it. It was also under investigation by a committee of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read here a statement I have from those who have investigated this, giving the actual information on which I based my statement a few minutes ago. I will read a portion of it and insert the rest in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Hon. GEORGE F. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The clause in this year's Army appropriation bill on page 51, beginning with line 13, is directed against certain objectionable features of the Taylor system of shop management and similar systems, sometimes miscalled by the generic term of "scientific management." The clause prohibits time study of workman and the premium system of payment, which together form the basis for the speeding-up scheme invented by Mr. Taylor. This clause does not interfere with standardizing shop tools and equipment, systematizing production methods, or cost accounting. It is directed only against the abnormal stimulus to activity of the workman made possible by the time-study and premium system.

For your information as to our objections to these systems of shop management I refer you to the marked portions of our hearing before the Committee on Labor of the House during April, 1914 (copy sent herewith). This hearing contains, on pages 16 to 38, inclusive, my testimony before the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations in relation to organized labor's objections to certain features of so-called scientific management. This testimony is considered a rather concise statement.

On pages 38 to 52 of this hearing is written defense of the Taylor system as in operation at the Watertown Arsenal by Gen. Crozier (copy of which I also send herewith). The several subjects are discussed seriatim in my reply. This accounts for the disconnected presentation of the subjects.

This reply also contains many extracts from the writings of Mr. Taylor, showing the underlying purposes and aims of the system. The very fact that any system of the shop management contemplating such drastic and inhuman methods of dealing with employees should commend itself to officials of the Ordnance Department is an indication of the treatment employees could expect if the opportunity to force this system presented itself to those having charge of the work.

The full possibilities of this system has not been taken advantage of at the Watertown Arsenal. This we attribute to the fact that the department has been on its good behavior while several public investigations have been in progress. While the conditions of labor at the Watertown Arsenal, where they are going through the motions of using the system is bad enough, the conditions are not as bad as they would be had no opposition to the system developed.

It is also significant to us that Mr. Taylor has not repudiated any of his writings which were completed before it became necessary for him to defend his schemes before the public, and that the Chief of Ordnance can see nothing wrong or harsh about the aims and methods advocated by Mr. Taylor. These methods to the average man seem abhorrent because of the unadulterated greed displayed and utter disregard for the welfare of the workman.

While the annual reports of the Chief of Ordnance show many glowing accounts of the advantages of the system both to the workmen and the Government, the employees have as yet not been imbued with these alleged advantages to such an extent that they are willing to withdraw their opposition. The employees at the Watertown Arsenal even went so far as to refuse to avail themselves of a collective bargaining agreement proposed by Mr. Thompson, attorney for the Industrial Commission, unless it was specifically stated that the plan was not for the purpose of settling by arbitration their objections to the Taylor system.

As to the advantages to the Government through reduced costs of production by means of the Taylor system it was shown in the investigation by a special committee of the House in 1912 that the alleged savings recorded on page 16 of the 1911 Report of the Chief of Ordnance was largely due to the claim that one-half of the cost of material was saved by the system. It does not seem plausible that any system can save one-half of the material used in manufacture.

The information as to savings contained in subsequent reports of the Chief of Ordnance have not been investigated by others than those who are interested in proving the advantages of the system. However, all the alleged savings due to better equipment, high-speed tools, routing of work, and many other common-sense features which have been appropriated by Mr. Taylor as a part of his system would still be preserved after the passage of the restrictive clause herein advocated. Our case, however, does not stand or fall according to whether or not the system as in operation at the Watertown Arsenal has been developed to the point of oppression as yet. Any man of sound mind can see what such measures will lead to. After our power of resistance has been worn away by the system it will be too late to raise a feeble protest. The Military Affairs Committee is well acquainted with efforts made by every nation to prevent other rival nations from gaining strategic position on the high seas, because of what they can do with the advantage gained. This opposition is shown no matter what the nation about to gain the advantage promises.

Much has been made of the presumption that this system increases wages. This is exceedingly misleading. Mr. Taylor claims that by his system he will be able to hire common laborers usually getting about $1.50 per day and by paying them, say, $2 per day can teach them to do work for which the employer has to pay a mechanic $3 per day. This advanced stage of the development of the system has not been reached at the Watertown Arsenal as yet, but it can be attempted at any time the Chief of Ordnance decides. It would not prove that the system was good even though the Chief of Ordnance should pay the men $10 per day temporarily, which might be done in order to induce some to support the system while the opposition was active. That the Ordnance Department is not given to charity ordinarily is shown by the starvation wages now being paid women employees at the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia. They receive $1.16 per day at present.

Just after the passage of the present bill by the House the Ordnance Department stopped the time study and the premium system at Watertown and Frankford Arsenals; and the officials went out among the employes during working hours to persuade (?) them to protest against the clause herein advocated. When the premium was taken away from the aforementioned women employees their earnings dropped from about $2 per day to $1.16, the latter being the nominal day rate. It is well known that where piecework or any task system exists a wide difference is arbitrarily made between the day rate and the task earnings in order to make the task system appear attractive. If, however, the task work were abolished everyone knows that the day rate would have to be increased. These women who are unorganized, and who probably do not understand the economic basis for wages, might readily be led to believe that this artificial low wage is to be permanent and agree to protest, for the same reason that women in Illinois protested against the eight-hour law on the ground that it would reduce wages.

During the consideration of the eight-hour law by the Senate petitions were filed by workmen against the enactment of the law on the ground that it would reduce wages. These petitions were gotten up in much the same way as in the present case, namely, by the influence of the employer circulating the petitions.

At the Watertown Arsenal, where the employees have also gone back to daywork since the passage of the bill by the House, they are still anxious to have the bill pass.

It is also a significant fact that at the Watertown Arsenal, where the premium system has been in operation for several years, that the wages earned, premium and all, is no greater on the average than the wages received by the same grade of employes at the Boston Navy Yard, which is only 7 miles away; and whose wage scale is presumed to be regulated by the same facts. The reason for this is apparent. Under premium systems employees are usually expected to increase their earnings by working harder, when otherwise an increase should be given directly.

The petty injustices involved in this system are so numerous that it forms a daily ground for discontent among the employees. Employees at the Watertown Arsenal, for instance, inform us that the same amount of effort will net them vastly different results in earnings, showing that the time study is inaccurate, and that it is impossible to make it accurate. The variables, in the machinists' business especially, are so great that no exact standards can be set, and where arbitrary standards are set they result only in injustice to employees.

The last four conventions of the American Federation of Labor have gone on record against the Taylor system. In 1911 the present Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, was secretary of the committee of the convention that recommended against the system (see pp. 77, 287, and 296 of proceedings of the convention). The American Federation of Labor convention of 1913 also has in its proceedings as severe an indictment against the Taylor system as was ever written (see p. 299 of proceedings).

The Ordnance Department insists that we should wait for the report of the Federal Industrial Commission relative to the system in operation at the Watertown Arsenal. The department had up to date paid no heed to adverse reports made by four committees of Congress, and there is no reason to suppose they will cease their attempt to force the system on the employees unless compelled to by law. However, having had much to do with members and officers of the commission, I feel safe in saying that the commission will not make any investigation of the system at the Watertown Arsenal, and therefore no special report will be forthcoming, and their general report on "scientific management" is not likely to be made until after Congress extends the time for the existence of the commission, due to their lack of time to complete the scope of the work started. There has been enough said by the commission to indicate that they do not think these systems safe from the employees' point of view unless accompanied by collective bargaining in which the workmen shall have an equal voice with the management. This the War Department has indicated its unwillingness to agree to.

Our fear that the Ordnance Department will eventually displace the skilled, well-paid mechanic with cheap labor and by men of lower caliber is amply substantiated by a statement on page 15 of the last annual report of the Chief of Ordnance.

For your information I send herewith the documents herein referred to for verification, and also the reports from committees of both House and Senate on bills which aim to cover the same field as the proposed clause in this Army bill.

In order to obviate the necessity of attaching this clause to every appropriation bill passed by Congress, and thus needlessly take up much valuable time, it is respectfully requested that the word "hereinafter" and the words "or any other appropriation" be inserted in the places indicated in the paragraph before your committee.

As a representative of the employees concerned, I shall be glad to make any further explanation that I can, either in writing or orally.

We believe the workmen of the United States have a right to say how fast they want to work and the degree of temptation and stimulus they are willing to submit to day after day. We feel that we have a right to preserve the race from deteriorating influences.

Trusting this will receive your favorable consideration, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

N. P. ALIFAS,
President District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Answering the point raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to whether the arsenal men are opposed to this——

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman embody in that the suggestion that we will get through quicker if the gentleman will listen to what is being said?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close—in what time?

Mr. PADGETT. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask for three minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement from the International Association.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to a paragraph in the address delivered this morning by Romulo S. Naón, the Argentine ambassador, at the meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

This distinguished diplomatist, who represents a friendly power with which our relations are of constantly increasing importance, has expressed a hope in which I am sure we can all join. If it could be realized, the injury done to neutral nations by the war in Europe would be diminished and at the same time the danger of controversy between neutrals and belligerents would be decreased.

Ambassador Naón said:

As you see, one of the practical measures suggested in this dispatch to relieve the needs of our exportations is bottoms enough. It seems to me that perhaps the way to meet this serious inconvenience—the getting of ships in sufficient numbers—would be to procure the complete neutralization of inter-American commerce. It is undoubtedly not an easy task at the present moment to solve as we would desire all the difficulties encountered by the neutral commerce of the world, in view of the conflicting interests of the belligerent countries; but there could be no reason which would justify opposition to the maintenance to the fullest extent and without any hindrance whatsoever of commercial interchange between the ports of our continent. I maintain that the complete neutralization of inter-American commerce ought to be recognized, and therefore I entertain the hope—or, more than that, I might say that I feel the certainty—that we would be able to have the countries at war agree with us in establishing the rule that during the present war no vessel engaged exclusively in the trade between American ports shall be subject to search, detention, or capture by a belligerent, no matter what flag she flies, so long as she is engaged exclusively in that commerce.

With such a rule, we should be able to obtain all the vessels we need for the promotion of our commerce with the United States and the other American Republics to the maximum, developing, as a consequence, our friendly relations with all of them and lessening the sorrowful conditions created by that war.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. FARR. And I make the same request.

Mr. KETTNER. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CURRY. And I the same, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to granting these several requests?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETTNER. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago a distinguished Member of this House remarked to me: "Why are you in favor of two battleships and these submarines? I consider you a conservative business man and should like to have you explain your position to me." I answered by reminding him that our forefathers on the frontier always carried guns, not for the purpose of killing people, but because they recognized the dangers and the necessity for self-protection.

This is true with us on the Pacific coast, with our long coast line from Mexico, including Alaska. Just a year ago this same Member would probably have laughed had I stated that within five months nearly all of Europe would be at war. Who can say what a few years may bring forth? And, as our fathers carried weapons with which to defend themselves, I believe that it is the duty of the United States to provide for the protection of her seacoast.

For example, my home city of San Diego, within 16 miles of the Mexican border, and the first port of call in the United States north of the Panama Canal, occupies an important point in the defense of the Pacific coast. As we are holding an exposition there this year, I hope to have the pleasure of showing a great many of my friends in this House why we feel the need of protection and why we believe that important strategic points have been and are being overlooked.

The climate of San Diego is such that pleasure boats are never put up in the winter, and in the past 10 years there has been one storm where two or three yachts have broken from their moorings. Everything in the market is grown in the Imperial Valley all the year round and is sold in the San Diego markets at reasonable prices. Reports show that the coast just south is admirably suited to torpedo practice, the sand being of a peculiar spongy quality, upon which the torpedoes bounce, and we who study naval bills every year know something of what each torpedo costs and something of how many are lost in the average torpedo practice by being buried in the sand.

We know that for several years the target practice of the cruisers on the Pacific coast has been held at Magdalena Bay, off the Mexican coast.

It does not seem possible, in the light of these facts, that for 14 years a fuel wharf at San Diego was in the process of construction until last year the naval bill carried an appropriation with which to complete the building of coal bunkers and arrange for fuel-oil storage, and the importance of this station is now further recognized by an item of $40,000 in this bill with which to provide for further fuel-oil storage.

While I am not an extremist and do not believe in building up an aggressive navy, I do believe that we should have a navy sufficiently effective so that we can protect ourselves and command respect. I also believe firmly in strengthening our coast defenses, and I am sure, in the light of recent events, every right-minded person will agree that the coast cities are entitled to adequate protection. These remarks might have seemed strange a year ago, but times have changed.

This bill carries 2 battleships and 11 submarines, some of which will be built and stationed on the Pacific coast. They are urgently needed, and, after you have visited the Pacific coast this year, I believe you will agree with me, not only in regard to the harbor at San Diego but that the west coast, with its long shore line and few harbors, needs the protection of additional defenses at her harbors and additional vessels with which to guard her easily accessible and otherwise defenseless shore line.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, there are 1,800 men working in the Rock Island Arsenal, and not one of these men has written to me protesting against the passage of this bill. On the other hand, I have received letters stating that the employees of that arsenal are highly elated over the fact that the House has passed a provision prohibiting the use of the Taylor system in the Government workshops.

Mr. Taylor describes his system in two different ways. One is for the general public and the other is for employers. He says in the one that the object of the system is to increase the pay of the workingman. Then he has a book of instructions to employers who are putting in this system, and in that book of instructions the statement is made that the test is made so strict that only one man out of five can keep up.

This system has been investigated by two committees of this House, and I am happy to say that two Members of this House who assisted in the investigation of that system are now members of the President's Cabinet, namely, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, and the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield.

I want to say to Democrats here that in the campaign of 1912 the Speaker of this House spoke to those men at Rock Island and assured them that if the Democratic Party were placed in power, the Taylor system of scientific shop management would be taken out of the arsenals and navy yards, and I think it is up to this side of the House especially to redeem the promise that was made by our party leader.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman says he has received no protests from the working people at Rock Island against the enactment of this legislation. If the gentleman had received protests from people who had had their wages reduced by the withdrawal of that system he would present them here, would he not?

Mr. TAVENNER. Does the gentleman say his constituents are opposed to the bill eliminating the system?

Mr. MOORE. I am asking the gentleman the question, If he had received such protests, would he present them, as I have done?

Mr. TAVENNER. If I believed that the majority of the workmen were in favor of the system I would not be here speaking against it, but I know that the majority of the men are strongly against it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Taylor efficiency system is in operation in any of the navy yards. I have never heard it discussed in connection with the navy yards. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] know?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand it is not in force in the navy yards.

Mr. CURRY. It is in force in a number of shops in some of the navy yards. It is in force in some of the shops at the Mare Island yard.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand the Taylor or stop-watch system is in force in some of the shops.

Mr. MANN. Two years ago the House, by resolution, provided for a commission to investigate the Taylor system. That commission was composed of Mr. Redfield, then a Member of the House and now the Secretary of Commerce; Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, then a Member of the House and now the Secretary of Labor; and Mr. Tilson, of Connecticut, who was then a Member of the House and who will be a Member of the next House. That commission made an exhaustive study of the subject, but did not report advising that the Taylor efficiency system should be abolished.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. For what?

Mr. TAVENNER. For a question.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that the chairman of that special committee, shortly after he made that report, did bring in a bill to this House providing for the abolition of the Taylor system in the arsenals?

Mr. MANN. I do not know that he did. If he did, it lay in a condition of "innocuous desuetude."

Mr. TAVENNER. The fact is as I have stated.

Mr. MANN. I do not yield to the gentleman for a statement. I do not know whether the Taylor efficiency system ought to be abolished, or whether it ought to be made use of; but here are two Cabinet officers in the President's Cabinet who investigated this subject, and who certainly know more about it than most of the Members of this House. It is within the power of the Secretary of the Navy at any time, by a stroke of the pen, to prevent the Taylor efficiency system being made use of in any of the navy yards now; and while it is true that we adopted a provision similar to this on the Army bill, I think that was mainly for the purpose of making a little further experiment in those arsenals where the Taylor efficiency system has been put in operation, much over the objection of many of the employees as applied there. It seems to me the part of wisdom for the House to leave it to the executive departments of the Government, as this would only apply for the next fiscal year. Doubtless the Secretary of the Navy, advised as he would be by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, who made this investigation and report before, is better qualified to determine how far the efficiency system should be enforced in the navy yards than are the membership of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Chairman, the Taylor system of shop management is not in force in its entirety in the Frankford Arsenal, although I understand that some of its less objectionable features have been adopted there. A few days ago considerable excitement was caused among some of the employees of the Frankford Arsenal by reason of an order that was issued by the Chief of Ordnance abolishing a premium system that had been in force since 1910 at the arsenal. I know that the majority of the employees in the arsenal are opposed to anything like the stop-watch system, but those employees who are receiving very small wages and who have had a task system established for them feel that it is unfair and quite a loss to them to have this order enforced before the proposition in the Army bill abolishing bonuses becomes a law. They feel that it would be more reasonable to let things continue as they were until the 1st of July or until some more equitable wage scale is established.

The bonus system at the Frankford Arsenal was in force mostly in those departments where females are employed. It worked in this way: The wage rate for the women is $1.16 per day, but for the purpose of increasing the output the management of the arsenal said, "We will fix a task for you, and if you come up to it you shall receive $1.40 per day, and for all in excess of that task you shall receive half the rate that you get for producing the rest." The bonus for excess work brought the wages of the more efficient workers up to, I understand, $1.75 or more per day. Now, these women do not like the idea of going back to $1.16 per day, especially since the foremen have served notice on them that for $1.16 per day they will be expected to come up to their former tasks, for which they got at least $1.40 per day.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have been pursuing an unwise policy in the matter of rates of wages. Instead of establishing a uniform wage scale for a particular class of work in the various shops of the Government throughout the country, we have obliged the commanding officers of those establishments to fix wages in accordance with the rates prevailing in the industrial establishments around them, and we know that it is——

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Does the gentleman know that the very system that he has explained there is the speed-up system?

Mr. DONOHOE. I do.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And that makes inroads on the physical and mental resources of the working people, because it compels them to work under a strain.

Mr. DONOHOE. I have no desire to defend the Taylor system, because I regard it as a most inhuman one. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And if they are fair to their employees and expect them to do as much as they did before, ought they not to pay them as much money as they did before?

Mr. DONOHOE. Absolutely so; but I contend that here is the place where we should fix the whole matter by providing for the establishing of uniform rates for the various Government shops in the country rather than by compelling the commanding officers, as we now do, to fix rates in accordance with the prevailing wage rates in their respective localities. The officers inquire of the establishments around them, and it is not reasonable to suppose that the management of these local establishments have any desire to cause the Government to fix rates that are too high for the locality. I feel, therefore, that Congress should correct this absurdity by the enactment of a law providing that the same wage rates shall prevail in all the various workshops of the Government. This would put an end to much of the trouble and would tend to establish rates of wages that would be more equitable than those now prevailing. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to see the arsenal employees, who receive low wages, especially the females, continued on the bonus system until July next, when, I hope, more liberal rates of wages will have been established. It would be manifestly unfair and unreasonable to expect the employees to do as much work for $1.16 as they did when they were receiving $1.40 per day. The cost of living has steadily increased of late years, and wages must be increased if our present standard of living is to be maintained. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were 82 ayes and 21 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DECKER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to bills of the following titles, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCUMBER as the conferees on the part of the Senate:

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum herein appropriated shall be expended for the purchase of structural steel, ship plates, armor, armament, or machinery from any persons, firms, or corporations who have combined or conspired to monopolize the interstate or foreign commerce or trade of the United States, or the commerce or trade between the States and any Territory or the District of Columbia, in any of the articles aforesaid, and no purchase of structural steel, ship plates, or machinery shall be made at a price in excess of a reasonable profit above the actual cost of manufacture. But this limitation shall in no case apply to any existing contract.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, before line 12, insert the following as a new paragraph:
"That no part of any sum appropriated by this act for the construction or equipment of vessels of the Navy shall be expended for materials purchased in a foreign country except like materials for construction or equipment can not be obtained in the United States."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, to that I make a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Such an amendment was offered to the bill last year and a point of order was made, and the point of order was overruled. It is a germane amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not care to say anything on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to limit the purchase of materials that enter into the construction of battleships and to protect the labor in the United States that creates those materials where such materials can be provided by our own labor. The rulings of the Treasury Department, based on the Panama Canal act, gives certain discretion to the departments, and particularly to the Department of the Navy, in the purchase of materials for the equipment of ships. That discretion pertains to the textile industry, for carpets and hangings must go on the ship; it enters into the glass industry, because glassware must go on the ships; it enters into the iron and steel industry, because those two commodities enter into the construction of the ships, and in fact it enters into very many elements of labor in this country that ought to be protected against unfair foreign competition.

The purpose of the amendment is plain—it restricts the power of the department to the purchase of commodities going into American ships to American-made goods unless those commodities can not be obtained within the United States.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt but that the Members of the House understand the amendment just offered. If it prevails, it will put us back to where we once were when the only weapon we had against the Armor-Plate Trust was to threaten them with competition from Europe.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there is quite a movement in the country in favor of "made in America." I believe there is a society or league advocating such a proposition, and I noticed the other day that various people connected with the Cabinet were advertised as having joined the movement in favor of goods "made in America." If the Cabinet under this administration can join such a movement, it seems to me that the Nation itself might join such a movement, and considering the thousands of men out of employment in the country, with the general feeling on the part of the people of the country that we ought to patronize as far as practicable things made by Americans in America, I believe it would be wise and patriotic for this House to say that it will not authorize the purchase of foreign-made goods on even terms with American-made goods. [Applause on the Republican side.] If we build up the Navy and spend the millions of dollars which it is proposed to spend here, that money should be paid to American labor in favor of Americans as against the foreigner. The Navy is for the defense of this country against a foreign attack. Let us also make it a weapon to aid American labor in these days of dire distress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE) there were—ayes 64, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum herein appropriated under "Increase of the Navy" shall be used for the payment of any clerical, drafting, inspection, or messenger service, or for the pay of any of the other classified force under the various bureaus of the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is another limitation which is in order, and I doubt not will receive the support of the majority of the House. On the vote just taken in behalf of American labor I notice that the Republican side of the House voted for it, while the Democratic side of the House voted unanimously against it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, I desire to say that on the vote taken on the last proposition, which would again put the trusts of America in the position in which they have been under Republican administration, enabling them to loot the Treasury at the expense of the American people, it is quite noticeable that the Republicans all voted in favor of the trusts and the Democrats in favor of the people of the country and of the Treasury of the country. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman has no right to make that motion until there has been debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order and the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order which was sustained at the instance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] struck out practically all of the defense that the American people have against combinations of persons, companies, and corporations. That paragraph provided that no part of the appropriations in this bill could be used to purchase structural materials, armor, or armament from persons, firms, or corporations who have conspired or combined to monopolize interstate or foreign commerce or the trade of the United States, and that no contracts for the purchase of shipbuilding materials could be made at a price in excess of a reasonable profit. This was the only provision in the bill which stood between the people and the ravages of the trusts. But when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] interposed his point of order against this paragraph and the Chair sustained it, then all of the protection that we have had and all of the progress which we have made for the last 20 years against the combination of trusts for the control of trade was stricken out of the Navy appropriation bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] undertook to insert in lieu of that paragraph practically gave back to the trusts all of the great advantages which they had gained heretofore over the American people in controlling trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum appropriated by this act shall be used for any expense of the Navy Department at Washington, D. C., unless specific authority is given by law for such expenditure.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk. It is the bill to establish the council of national defense. I realize that a point of order will be made against it, and that the point of order will be sustained; and I ask unanimous consent, in order that I may not take up the time of the committee in reading it, that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that it may be inserted. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

On page 67, at the end of line 21, add the following as separate paragraphs:

"There is hereby established a council of national defense, consisting of the President of the United States, who shall be ex officio president of the council; the Secretary of State, who shall preside in the absence of the President; the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the General Staff of the Army, an officer of the Navy not below the rank of captain to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, the president of the Army War College, and the president of the Navy War College.

"The chairmen of the several committees of the Senate and House of Representatives herein named shall act as members of the council until their successors have been selected.

"Said council shall report to the President, for transmission to Congress, a general policy of national defense and such recommendation of measures relating thereto as it shall deem necessary and expedient.

"Said council shall meet at least once in each calendar year on such date or dates as it shall fix: *Provided*, That in time of war said council shall meet only upon the call of the President of the United States: *Provided further*, That special meetings may be called by the president of the council: *And provided further*, That the council may summon for consultation at any of its meetings any citizen of the United States, and upon request by the council the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall order any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to appear before the council for consultation.

"For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000, to be available until expended, and to be expended upon vouchers signed by the president of the council: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses of the chairmen of committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, when called to attend meetings of said council when Congress is not in session, and the necessary expenses of all persons summoned shall be paid from this appropriation, upon approval by the president of the council."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the various amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment which strikes out the words beginning with the word "*Provided*," in line 23, on page 28, and ending with the word "service," in line 4, on page 29. I also ask a separate vote on the amendment striking out the words, beginning on page 29, line 12, "in all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination." The two amendments have reference to the plucking board and restoration of naval officers.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote on the amendment striking out line 7, on page 65.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment striking out the 16 submarines and reducing the number to 11.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MANN. I ask a separate vote on the amendment on page 16, the Hobson amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I renew it.

Mr. MANN. What is it?

Mr. GARDNER. The reduction in the number of submarines.

The SPEAKER. If there is no other demand for a separate vote, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after the figures in line 17, insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells of 12-inch caliber or larger unless such shells are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10-inch Kruppized plate without breaking up when fired with a standard service powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 108, noes 79.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-four gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pages 28 and 29. Line 23, page 28, after the word "board" strike out "*Provided*, That the action in these cases has been examined by the Naval Committee of the Sixty-third Congress of the House or of the Senate and either or both of said committees have reported or ordered to be reported favorably to the House or the Senate a bill to transfer such officer to the active list of the service."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 121, noes 57.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-two gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. HARRISON. The other side.

The SPEAKER. There is no other side to it.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 12, strike out the following language:

"In all cases where he had not before retirement passed such examination."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. MANN. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. Both the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 75.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three gentlemen have risen, a sufficient number.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported; we do not understand it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The House again divided; and the tellers (Mr. WITHERSPOON and Mr. PADGETT) reported—ayes 105, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand for a separate vote on the submarine amendment.

Mr. MANN. There is no way of withdrawing it now.

The SPEAKER. It can be voted upon now. You will have to vote on it, because it was not included in the other. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 15, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert "eleven."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 7, strike out the line which reads as follows:

"One hospital ship, to cost not to exceed $2,250,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 143, noes 78.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Mississippi opposed to this bill?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I certainly am.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I rise to make a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the motion to the desk, and the Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WITHERSPOON moves to recommit H. R. 20975 to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to forthwith report the bill back to the House with an amendment striking out the word "two," where it occurs in line 4, page 64, and insert the word "one" in place thereof.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit with instructions.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CULLOP. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Does anyone want a roll call on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 165, answered "present" 1, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 57.]

YEAS—149.

Abercrombie	Cramton	Helm	Reilly, Wis.
Adair	Crisp	Henry	Rouse
Adamson	Cullop	Hensley	Rubey
Aiken	Davenport	Hill	Rucker
Alexander	Decker	Howard	Russell
Allen	Dent	Hull	Saunders
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Igoe	Sells
Aswell	Dies	Jacoway	Shackleford
Bailey	Difenderfer	Johnson, S. C.	Sherwood
Baker	Dillon	Keating	Sims
Baltz	Dixon	Kelly, Pa.	Sisson
Barkley	Donovan	Kindel	Smith, Minn.
Bartlett	Doolittle	Kirkpatrick	Smith, Tex.
Barton	Doremus	Kitchin	Stafford
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Konop	Stanley
Blackmon	Eagle	Lesher	Stedman
Booher	Ferris	Lever	Stephens, Miss.
Borchers	Fields	Lewis, Md.	Stephens, Nebr.
Borland	Finley	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Brockson	Fitzgerald	Lloyd	Stevens, N. H.
Brodbeck	Flood, Va.	Lobeck	Sumners
Browne, Wis.	Floyd, Ark.	McKellar	Switzer
Brumbaugh	Foster	Maguire, Nebr.	Tavenner
Buchanan, Ill.	Fowler	Manahan	Taylor, Ark.
Buchanan, Tex.	Francis	Mann	Thomas
Burgess	Garner	Moss, Ind.	Thompson, Okla.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mulkey	Underwood
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	Neely, W. Va.	Vaughan
Byrnes, S. C.	Gill	Nelson	Watkins
Byrns, Tenn.	Goeke	Oldfield	Weaver
Callaway	Goodwin, Ark.	Page, N. C.	Webb
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Park	Wingo
Caraway	Gray	Peterson	Witherspoon
Carter	Gregg	Pou	Young, N. Dak.
Cline	Hamlin	Prouty	Young, Tex.
Collier	Harris	Quin	
Connelly, Kans.	Harrison	Rainey	
Cox	Heflin	Rayburn	

NAYS—165.

Anderson	Danforth	Good	Jones
Austin	Davis	Goulden	Kahn
Barchfeld	Deitrick	Graham, Ill.	Keister
Bathrick	Dershem	Green, Iowa	Kelley, Mich.
Beakes	Donohoe	Greene, Mass.	Kennedy, Conn.
Britten	Dooling	Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, Iowa.
Brown, N. Y.	Driscoll	Griffin	Kent
Browning	Drukker	Gudger	Kettner
Bryan	Dupré	Guernsey	Kiess, Pa.
Bulkley	Eagan	Hamill	Kinkaid
Burke, Wis.	Edmonds	Hamilton, Mich.	Knowland, J. R.
Butler	Esch	Hawley	La Follette
Calder	Estopinal	Hayden	Langley
Campbell	Fairchild	Hayes	Lazaro
Cantor	Falconer	Hinds	Lee, Ga.
Cantrill	Farr	Hinebaugh	Lee, Pa.
Carlin	FitzHenry	Hobson	Lenroot
Casey	Frear	Holland	Levy
Chandler, N. Y.	French	Houston	Lonergan
Church	Gallagher	Howell	McAndrews
Condy	Gard	Hughes, Ga.	McKenzie
Connolly, Iowa	Gardner	Humphrey, Wash.	McLaughlin
Conry	Gerry	Humphreys, Miss.	Macdonald
Cooper	Glass	Johnson, Ky.	Mahan
Curry	Goldfogle	Johnson, Wash.	Maher
Mapes	Patten, N. Y.	Sherley	Temple
Miller	Patton, Pa.	Shreve	Ten Eyck
Mitchell	Peters	Sinnott	Thacher
Montague	Phelan	Sloan	Thomson, Ill.
Moon	Platt	Small	Townsend
Moore	Plumley	Smith, Idaho	Treadway
Morgan, Okla.	Post	Smith, J. M. C.	Tribble
Moss, W. Va.	Powers	Smith, Md.	Tuttle
Mott	Ragsdale	Smith, N. Y.	Underhill
Murdock	Reilly, Conn.	Sparkman	Volstead
Murray	Riordan	Steenerson	Walker
Nolan, J. I.	Roberts, Mass.	Stephens, Cal.	Williams
O'Hair	Rogers	Stevens, Minn.	Winslow
Padgett	Rupley	Stone	Woods
Paige, Mass.	Scott	Stringer	
Parker, N. J.	Scully	Talbott, Md.	
Parker, N. Y.	Seldomridge	Talcott, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Slemp

NOT VOTING—108.

Ainey	Fess	Langham	Rauch
Anthony	Fordney	L'Engle	Reed
Avis	Gallivan	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.
Barnhart	George	Lindbergh	Rothermel
Bartholdt	Gillett	Lindquist	Sabath
Beall, Tex.	Gilmore	Linthicum	Slayden
Bell, Cal.	Gittins	Loft	Smith, Saml. W.
Bowdle	Godwin, N. C.	Logue	Stout
Broussard	Gorman	McClellan	Sutherland
Brown, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	McGillicuddy	Taggart
Bruckner	Griest	McGuire, Okla.	Taylor, Ala.
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Madden	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hardy	Martin	Taylor, N. Y.
Carr	Hart	Metz	Towner
Cary	Haugen	Mondell	Vare
Clancy	Hay	Morgan, La.	Vinson
Clark, Fla.	Helgesen	Morin	Vollmer
Claypool	Helvering	Morrison	Wallin
Copley	Hoxworth	Neeley, Kans.	Walsh
Crosser	Hughes, W. Va.	Norton	Walters
Dale	Hulings	O'Brien	Watson
Dunn	Johnson, Utah	Oglesby	Whaley
Edwards	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Shaunessy	Whitacre
Elder	Key, Ohio	Palmer	White
Evans	Korbly	Porter	Wilson, Fla.
Faison	Kreider	Price	Wilson, N. Y.
Fergusson	Lafferty	Raker	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SABATH (for one battleship) with Mr. GILLETT (for two battleships).

Mr. BARNHART (for one battleship) with Mr. LINTHICUM (for two battleships).

Mr. EVANS (for one battleship) with Mr. LAFFERTY (for two battleships).

Mr. FAISON (for one battleship) with Mr. WHALEY (for two battleships).

Mr. SLAYDEN (for one battleship) with Mr. SLEMP (for two battleships).

Mr. MONDELL (for one battleship) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for two battleships).

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma (for one battleship) with Mr. GALLIVAN (for two battleships).

Until further notice:

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. DALE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. CARY.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. HARDY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. HART with Mr. FESS.

Mr. HAY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. METZ with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. JOHNSON of Utah.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. WALSH with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. RAUCH with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. REED with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. STOUT with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. TAGGART with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. VINSON with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. VARE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. WALLIN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River; and

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order previously made, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 6, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation of $50,000 for the continuation of the building of the United States post office at Portland, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 1558); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $18,000 for the completion of post-office building at Portland, Ind., and the sum of $150,000 for the continuation of the building at New Haven, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 1559); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, transmitting balance sheets for the year ended December 31, 1914, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation to cover cost of transcripts of evidence before the Quebec Bridge Commission and a set of drawings in connection therewith (H. Doc. No. 1569); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18645) for the acquisition of additional site and improvements on Federal post office at Carlisle, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1371), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21239) to increase the limit of cost of the site of a Federal building at Oakland, Cal., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1372), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEALL of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. H. 15767) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1374), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17964) for the relief of Austin G. Tainter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1370), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20702) authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Robert A. Culbertson from Woodlawn Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Rocky Spring Cemetery, Chambersburg, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1373), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21327) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore, receiver of the Mobile Marine Dock Co., and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 21329) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 21330) to provide for the appointment of a shipping board, and to prescribe the duties thereof; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 21331) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," by providing for a bureau of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LOFT: A bill (H. R. 21332) to provide for the unemployed, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 21333) prohibiting the sale, disposal, or having for sale, of intoxicating liquors on railway trains or on vessels or in certain other places used in connection with interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 21334) for the relief of drought and famine sufferers in the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 21335) to establish an entomological station at Wellington, Sumner County, Kans.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 21336) for prohibition of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 416) to authorize the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate a system of rural personal credit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 417) to authorize the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate a system of rural personal credit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Resolution (H. Res. 724) relative to pay of clerks of deceased Members; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the placing of an embargo on the exportation of agricultural products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 21337) granting a pension to Anna H. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21338) granting an increase of pension to Lilborn R. B. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARR: A bill (H. R. 21339) granting a pension to Walter S. Semans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 21340) granting a pension to Melissa A. Coop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 21341) granting a pension to Abbie J. Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21342) to correct the military record of Simon W. Tucker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 21343) for the relief of Catharine Jefferson Dunn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 21344) to amend the military records in relation to William M. Cheuvront; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 21345) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 21346) to amend and correct the military record of William Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 21347) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 21348) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. M. A. Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Coshocton, Ohio, Local Union, No. 379, United Mine Workers of America, favoring Kern-Foster bill to extend work of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition signed by H. R. Schlytter, George L. Gates, and other residents of Wittenberg, Wis., asking that the Burnett immigration bill become a law, and protesting against House bill 20644, known as the Fitzgerald bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Highmore, S. Dak., in favor of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protests of sundry citizens of Avon, Bellefourche, Lead, Okobojo, and Tripp, all in the State of South Dakota, against House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Memorial of Chester monthly meeting of Friends, Providence, R. I., protesting against additional preparations for war, etc., by our Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of George J. Mossner, of Gera; John Lange and 69 others, of Sebewaing; Ludwig Poppeck and 2 others, of Port Hope; Henry Stark, of New Haven; Rev. F. W. Bublitz and 40 others, of Lapeer; A. H. Sauer and 36 others, of Pigeon; Charles Miller and 51 others, of Sandusky; Rev. August Deichmann and 23 others of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Linkville and vicinity, all in the State of Michigan, in support of House joint resolution 377, proposing to prohibit exportation of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of Louisiana State Federation of Labor; White Rats; Actors Union of New York; and sundry citizens of New York, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, protesting against publication against Catholics being sent through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Electrical Contractors' Association of New York, protesting against present postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of G. Gaylord Norton and 34 others, of Elba, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 20644, Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of G. A. Scharlan and 24 others, of Medina; Rev. Richard Stave and German-American Alliance, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of Passaic, N. J., against Fitzgerald bill, giving Postmaster General censorship over publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of 33 citizens of New Lisbon and F. J. Narosky and 80 other citizens of Onalaska, Wis., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Concordia Aid Society, composed of 169 citizens; Frohsinn Singing Society, composed of 105 citizens; and Eighth Ward Aid Society, composed of 410 citizens, all of La Crosse, Wis., favoring bill prohibiting export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Robert T. Allison, Yorkville, S. C., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Arkansas, favoring appropriation to complete locks and dams on White River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 21340, granting a pension to Melissa A. Coop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of citizens of Goreville and Johnson County, Ill., against any curtailment of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post roads.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of East India Marine Society and Salem (Mass.) Marine Society, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of city council of Salem, Mass., favoring passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of monthly meeting of Friends, Bangor, Iowa, favoring bills designed to protect denominational names from use in articles of trade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Massachusetts State Branch, American Federation of Labor, and other organizations of workers in the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Otto Benkmann, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Polish-American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania and Friends of Russian Freedom, protesting against the passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Carl J. Franz, of Ashton, R. I., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Providence (R. I.) Branch of National Association for Advancement of Colored People, against "jim-crow" street car bill for District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KETTNER. Petition of citizens of Olive, Orange, Anaheim, Riverside, Santa Ana, San Diego, Bishop, Laws, Big Pine, Chula Vista, and Coronado, all in the State of California, in behalf of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of citizens of Fallbrook, De Luz, and Indio, Cal.; also from Chambers of Commerce of Los Angeles and San Diego, Cal., in favor of House joint resolution 344; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Macungie, Pa., protesting against passage of House bill 20644, Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petitions of 18,000 citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: Papers to accompany a bill to change military record, so as to include the name of William M. Cheuvront; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petitions of citizens of the second congressional district of Arkansas, for construction of lock and dams on Upper White River in interest of navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Arthur Chagnon, Arctic, R. I., favoring embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Providence (R. I.) Branch National Association for Advancement of Colored People, against the "Jim Crow" law for District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Rev. Charles A. Tukes, Providence, R. I., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of executve committee of the Rhode Island Bar Association relative to a bill to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of I. W. Waterman, of Providence, R. I., against bill to discontinue issuing of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Providence (R. I.) Central Federated Union, relative to increased cost of flour; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Clinton, Mass., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of William H. Joyce, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 344; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of O. F. Dorn, of Chicago Park, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of House bill 18925; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Memorial of numerous citizens of the eleventh district of Iowa, relative to House joint resolution 377 and similar measures; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Mapleton, Iowa, urging Congress to invite all nations to join us in a world federation for adjustment of international disputes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Iowa, favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of Board of Trade of Miami, Fla., relative to a drainage-aid act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of the Hinsdale (Ill.) Liederkranz and 73 American citizens, protesting against the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 6, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God our Father, as the days come and go, to distinguish with more clearness the true and the false, the transient and the eternal, proving all things, holding fast that which is good, and build for ourselves a character which shall stand the test of time and eternity, that we may be worthy of the dignity Thou didst bestow upon us in creating us after Thine own image. And blessing and honor and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MUNICIPAL BRIDGE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the bill H. R. 19424, an act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge at St. Louis, Mo., with Senate amendments, taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House.

The SPEAKER laid the bill before the House, and the Clerk read the title to the bill, also the Senate amendments.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes on Friday next, February 12, 1915, on Lincoln's birthday, immediately after the approval of the Journal on the day celebrated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I stated that I would not agree to any general debate that was not on a bill, but the gentleman from New York, my distinguished and honored colleague, was at the Battle of Gettysburg, and I think we can make an exception to the rule without establishing a precedent.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the gentleman for his kindness and consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for 10 minutes on Lincoln's birthday, February 12, 1915, immediately after the reading of the Journal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to make a statement for a minute. I was here yesterday afternoon, but on account of sickness in my family I was called out and could not get back in time to vote on the motion to recommit the naval appropriation bill. I returned, but too late to have my vote recorded. If I had been here I would have voted against the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANN. That statement is wholly improper.

The SPEAKER. The statement is out of order.

CONTRABAND OF WAR.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, written by John Bassett Moore, on "Contraband of war."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing an article written by John Bassett Moore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COLUMBIAN INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF.

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Washington, February 5, 1915.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a director of the Columbian Institution for the Deaf of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., said resignation to take effect immediately.

Cordially, yours,

T. W. SIMS.

The resignation was accepted, and the Speaker appointed Mr. RAKER, of California, to fill the vacancy.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill; and pending that motion I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if we can agree upon a time for general debate.

Mr. GILLETT. I will say to the gentleman that I have had requests on this side for 3 hours and 45 minutes, which I would like to grant.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What does the gentleman say to two hours on a side?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think that would be a reasonable time; that would not take care of the requests of members of the committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Would the gentleman be willing to agree to three hours on a side?

Mr. GILLETT. We will try to get along with that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be six hours of general debate, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] and three hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to six hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House general debate is limited to six hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the variety of subjects treated in the sundry civil bill makes it very difficult in a general statement to discuss them within a reasonable time and in an intelligent manner. At this time my remarks will be confined to some general observations, in the hope that the committee will defer until we reach the various items in the bill interrogations regarding them.

The estimates upon which the bill is based aggregate $137,616,472.89. The appropriations made for similar purposes for the current year aggregate $130,728,037.39. The bill carries recommendations amounting to $125,927,538.29. So that the bill as reported is $11,688,934.60 less than the estimates submitted by the executive and $4,800,499.10 less than the appropriations for similar purposes for the current year.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time that I have reported the sundry civil appropriation bill as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In fact, it is the fifth time, but in one session the bill failed to become a law and was passed in the next session, so in effect the statement that this is the fourth time is accurate.

I wish to submit to the House a statement of what has been done in the consideration of the estimates submitted by the executive for consideration on this bill by the Committee on Appropriations during the four years that I have been at the head of that committee.

For the fiscal years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916 the estimates submitted for the consideration of the committee aggregated $553,879,863.79. The bills as reported to the House carried $456,473,806.63, or $97,406,057.16 less than the estimates submitted for the consideration of the committee. In other words, during the past four years the Committee on Appropriations have made recommendations in accord with the estimates submitted for consideration in connection with the sundry civil bill of $97,406,057.16 less than was recommended by the executive.

The following table gives the details for each year:

Sundry civil appropriation bills for the fiscal years 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916.

[Comparison of the amounts of each as reported to the House, with the total estimates and with the law for the preceding fiscal year.]

Years.	Estimates.	Preceding law.	Reported to House.	Reduction under estimates.	Reduction under law.
1913.....	$151,991,106.87	$142,638,044.14	$109,577,414.40	$42,413,692.47	$33,060,629.74
1914.....	138,790,634.98	118,126,982.96	113,271,614.66	25,519,020.32	4,855,368.30
1915.....	125,481,649.05	124,689,948.87	107,696,759.28	17,784,889.77	16,993,189.59
1916.....	137,616,472.89	130,728,037.39	125,928,018.29	11,688,454.60	4,800,019.10
Total.	553,879,863.79	516,183,013.36	456,473,806.63	97,406,057.16	59,709,206.73

The bills as finally enacted into law, after consideration in the Senate and the final adjustment of differences, were $59,709,000 less than the estimates submitted to Congress. So that if the appropriations had been based upon the recommendations of the executive departments, as expressed in their estimates in the sundry civil appropriation bill, the bills would have carried, on an average, $15,000,000 additional during each of the four years to which I have referred.

I make that statement at this time, Mr. Chairman, because I have seen some statements in the press from men formerly and at present connected with the administrative departments of the Government openly criticizing Congress for not acceding to every demand for money made upon it by the executive departments. There is a school of political thought in this country which seems to profess that whatever the recommendations of the executive departments, whatever of demands made upon the public purse or otherwise, that the sole function of Congress is to acquiesce in the requests, regardless of the obligation of the Members of Congress under the Constitution to safeguard the Treasury from the rapacity of those administering the public service. Based upon an experience of 16 years in this House, all of which time has been devoted to the assiduous work of studying Governmental finances, 10 years of which have been spent upon the Committee on Appropriations, I undertake to say that in any administration, if the requests of the executive officials upon the public purse were acceded to without a strong, vigorous, and alert opposition on the part of the representatives of the people, the United States, great and prosperous as it is, with its enormous resources and unlimited wealth, would speedily become first among the bankrupt nations of the civilized world. No more patriotic duty devolves upon those serving in this House than to examine with the utmost care the recommendations for money of the various administrative departments of the Government and the exercise of sound and reasonable judgment in passing upon such requests. That Congress has acted in a sound, wise, and reasonable manner is evident from the fact that although $59,000,000 recommended for the various services provided in such bills within a period of four years have been denied to the executive departments, not a single legitimate interest of the public service, not a single legitimate material interest of the people of the United States has been in the slightest degree affected by the failure to expend the money thus requested by the departments.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $137,616,472.89, the estimates considered in the committee in the preparation of the bill, consists of $111,108,822.96 submitted in the regular Book of Estimates at the beginning of Congress, as required by law, and $21,631,649.93 subsequently presented to the House in the form of supplemental estimates.

For the first time this bill carries provision for the Reclamation Service. The appropriations recommended are payable wholly out of the reclamation fund. The estimates submitted aggregated $14,776,000. The committee recommends appropriations aggregating $13,430,000, a reduction of $1,346,000. In reaching the conclusions as to the amounts to be recommended for the Reclamation Service the object of the committee was to provide such funds for the various projects under consideration as would enable the Reclamation Service to carry on during the next fiscal year the essential work contemplated. While there has been a reduction of $1,346,000 in the amounts recommended, every member of the committee who has examined the subject is convinced that ample provision has been made, so that there will not be any embarrassment to the service. Omitting from our calculations all reference to the Reclamation Service, the bill is $9,067,000 less than the estimates and $1,920,000 less than the appropriations for the current year.

Mr. Chairman, at this session of Congress the appropriation bills, from the standpoint of this House, are in a condition of progress toward enactment more favorable perhaps than at any time in many years. This bill has been reported earlier than any bill of similar character during any of the short sessions since 1903. In 1903 the bill was reported a day or two earlier than the bill now under consideration. The consideration of the bill was commenced several weeks earlier by the committee than it had been possible to consider it heretofore, due entirely to the fact that the estimates were obtainable for consideration at an earlier period this year than heretofore. I have a statement which shows the dates upon which the various appropriation bills were reported during the short sessions of the Fifty-eighth, the Fifty-ninth, the Sixtieth, the Sixty-first, the Sixty-second, and the Sixty-third Congresses, which I shall insert in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Date of reporting to the House the regular appropriation bills at the short sessions of the Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and Sixty-third Congresses.

	Fifty-eighth Congress.	Fifty-ninth. Congress.	Sixtieth Congress.	Sixty-first Congress.	Sixty-second Congress.	Sixty-third Congress.
Agriculture	Jan. 25	Jan. 23	Jan. 25	Jan. 17	Jan. 20	Dec. 30
Army	Jan. 10	Jan. 7	Jan. 21	Jan. 12	Jan. 10	Dec. 29
Diplomatic and Consular	Jan. 28	Jan. 18	Feb. 2	Feb. 20	Feb. 3	Jan. 26
District of Columbia	Jan. 21	Jan. 14	Jan. 6	Jan. 21	Jan. 29	Dec. 7
Fortification	Jan. 5	Jan. 9	Jan. 25	Feb. 20	Jan. 17	.....
Indian	Jan. 10	Dec. 15	Jan. 22	Dec. 7	Dec. 7	Dec. 13
Legislative, etc	Dec. 7	Dec. 7	Dec. 10	Dec. 14	Dec. 4	Dec. 11
Military Academy	Jan. 19	Jan. 18	Feb. 11	Feb. 3	Feb. 8	Feb. 5
Navy	Jan. 28	Jan. 27	Jan. 16	Jan. 28	Feb. 20	Jan. 16
Pension	Jan. 9	Jan. 21	Jan. 13	Dec. 12	Feb. 11	Jan. 23
Post Office	Jan. 17	Feb. 6	Jan. 15	Jan. 16	Dec. 12	Dec. 11
River and harbor	Feb. 6	Jan. 26	Feb. 19	Dec. 9	Jan. 16	Dec. 19
Sundry civil	Feb. 14	Feb. 19	...do	Feb. 23	Feb. 17	Feb. 4

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Just what did the gentleman mean by the estimates being ready earlier than usual? I understood the gentleman to say that the consideration of this bill in committee was commenced earlier solely by reason of the fact that the estimates were submitted earlier. I do not understand that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They were available earlier. The law requires the estimates to be transmitted to Congress at the opening of each regular session. That has not always been done.

Mr. MANN. When was the Book of Estimates printed this year—any earlier than usual?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it was not printed any earlier; but the committee obtains in advance copies of the estimates for the purpose of its work. My recollection is that, in my experience, this is the first time it has been possible to get the estimates so as to print them and put them in shape for the sundry civil appropriation bill prior to the Christmas holidays.

Mr. MANN. The estimates were printed in book form long before that, were they not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They may have been printed in book form; yes.

Mr. MANN. I had a copy of them long before that, in any event, though I guess the committee did not know it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. After the estimates are printed in book form it takes some time to arrange them so as to make them available for use in the committee. The Agricultural bill was reported on the 30th of December, the Army bill on the 29th of December, the Diplomatic bill on the 26th of January, the District of Columbia bill on the 7th of December, the Indian bill on the 18th of December, the legislative bill on the 14th of December, the Military Academy bill on the 5th of February, the naval bill on the 16th of January, the pension bill on the 25th of January, the Post Office bill on the 14th of December, the river and harbor bill on the 19th of December, the sundry civil bill on the 4th of February. Seven of the appropriation bills were reported in the month of December. Including the urgent deficiency, three appropriation bills passed the House before Christmas and one other before December 31. I am making this statement to emphasize an opinion expressed then which I discussed quite elaborately on the 24th day of June, 1913—the proposition to establish a committee on estimates and appropriations, the purpose of which was to determine how much each of the annual appropriation bills might carry. The proposed plan contemplated the adoption of a resolution by the House limiting the power of committees to include appropriations in the bills in excess of the amounts fixed in the resolution. I said at that time:

> Mr. Chairman, in a short session of Congress the plan can not possibly work. At the last session I had the subcommittee in charge of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill meet before Congress convened.

The same thing is true as to this session of Congress. Two of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations met prior to the first Monday of December, and the Committee on Appropriations itself convened before the Congress assembled, so that when Congress met, on its opening day the committee reported the District of Columbia appropriation bill and had completed the hearings and most of the marking up on the legislative appropriation bill. If the committees had had to wait until some other committee had had to determine how much could have been incorporated in these bills, and until a resolution had been considered by the House and adopted determining the amount that could have been carried, instead of passing these bills as rapidly before the holidays as was done, the committees would have had to wait until the House had determined the amounts to which the bills should be limited before the bills could have been prepared.

In connection with the bill now under consideration, the estimates submitted in the regular Book of Estimates aggregated $111,108,822.26, and since the submission of the regular Book of Estimates other estimates that had to be considered in connection with this bill were submitted aggregating $21,631,649.93. A very considerable portion of this latter sum was submitted upon the very eve of the report of the bill to the House. Moreover, estimates were transmitted to the House yesterday of items for consideration in connection with this bill aggregating nearly $200,000.

These facts demonstrate conclusively the impossibility of any living man determining on the first day or in the first week of December with any degree of accurate approximation how much could justly be recommended to the House to be included in this bill. I undertake to say that until the work of making the detailed examination that is necessary on the part of committees is concluded it is impossible to tell with any degree of accuracy how much a bill should or should not carry.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Suppose there was a committee appointed to make a distribution of the limits of appropriations between the various appropriation committees. With the pressure that would be brought to bear, would it, in the gentleman's opinion, be almost inevitable that that committee would distribute among the various appropriation committees either the total estimated receipts of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year or an amount equal to the appropriations for the current year, and thereby make a distribution of all that would be available, without regard to subsequent estimates and without regard to Senate amendments?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is difficult to tell just what would happen. In the speech to which I have heretofore referred I discussed that phase of the situation. I am convinced, however, that it is impossible from the standpoint of the House for any man to tell in advance what the total of any particular bill should be, excepting such a bill as the river and harbor bill, where it could first be determined to spend a certain sum for rivers and harbors and then distribute it among a number of projects; but for a bill that has to do with the current services of the Government it is impossible to do so.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with the gentleman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. For instance, to illustrate in connection with this bill, the estimate for carrying on the work of the Alaska railroads was transmitted to the House about 10 days ago. It was an estimate of $2,000,000, and that sum is incorporated in this bill. No one could have known in December that that estimate was to be transmitted. At the time the estimates were transmitted in the regular Book of Estimates, the estimate for the construction of public buildings consisted of a request that legislation be enacted making one fund of all the appropriations which have heretofore been made for specific buildings, and appropriating in addition $3,000,000. Of course as soon as it was ascertained that that had been done, it was apparent that the Committee on Appropriations would be guilty of hara-kiri if it made such a recommendation to the House. The committee insisted that the Treasury Department submit detailed estimates for the sums desired for public buildings. The result was that supplemental estimates aggregating over $12,000,000 were transmitted to the House. My recollection is that the estimates for the continuation of the work of the physical valuation of railroads, aggregating $3,000,000, were submitted subsequent to the estimates contained in the Book of Estimates. Gentlemen can readily see that anyone who early in December attempted to determine how much should be carried in this bill for the public service would have missed his guess, no matter how intelligent or well informed he might have been, by over $15,000,000.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with the gentleman. I think we had an illustration yesterday of what the effect would be of the proposition to distribute, to begin with, a certain amount of money between the different committees. Inevitably, if the estimated receipts were distributed in advance among the different committees, the chairman of the Naval Committee, for illustration, like any other chairman, would fight for the amount that he thought ought to be appropriated for the Naval Committee, and if that amount had been allowed, at the amount that was reported in the bill yesterday, it would be impossible to reduce it on the floor, because it would be said, "That amount is set aside for naval affairs."

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it would have been done by resolution of the House.

Mr. MANN. It would have been said, "You can not add this amount to the apportionment of any other committee, hence we will appropriate it for the Naval Committee"; and the House would be, not theoretically but practically, powerless to reduce the amount carried in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then there is another matter that has attracted my attention. I notice that the position in which the chairmen of other committees find themselves differs materially from the situation which confronts the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. My contests in this House are to prevent the House from increasing the appropriations carried in the bill. The troubles or labors of the chairmen of other committees have been to persuade the House not to reduce the appropriations as recommended by their committees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am very much interested in the discussion that the gentleman is now delivering to the House, and I want to compliment the gentleman from New York by the statement that among all the men in this House I do not think there is any one man who has endeavored as much as the gentleman from New York has to hold down public expenditures within reasonable limits. [Applause.] But I hope the gentleman from New York is not taking the position at this time that some method can not be devised by which this

House can centralize the control of appropriations and limit public expenditures. With very few exceptions, there has hardly been a case where any executive in the world has attempted to limit the expenditures of public money or to decrease the burdens of the taxation. You may find an exception here and there, but the exception only proves the rule. It is rarely the case that any body of men in a legislative capacity, except those who hold their commissions directly from the people, are willing to cut down public expenditures. On the other hand, the reckless expenditure of the public money has always been a cancer that in the end destroyed republics. Of course we are far from that place to-day, but unless this House is willing to take action by which we can centralize the control of these appropriations and limit expenditures within reasonable amounts and cut out the reckless extravagances that sometimes are found in appropriation bills I can see no place where the increased burdens of taxation on the American people are going to stop. [Applause.] And I know of no man in this House who is more capable and competent to lead the fight to establish permanent economy on a safe and sound basis than the gentleman from New York. [Applause.] I expect to leave the field here, but I hope that the gentleman from New York in the future will bring his great powers toward accomplishing this good result for the benefit of his country. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I think with the gentleman from Alabama that the gentleman from New York has displayed great ability and great genius in the field in which he has been legislatively engaged. I think he ought to be encouraged in that work by the Members of the House generally. Now, my notion of how you can regulate the expenditures of public money is this: Control of expenditures should be given to one committee. It may be it ought to be a joint committee of the House and the Senate, and this committee ought to be in session all the year around. It ought to have the power to go to the departments and investigate the expenditures, and the members of such a committee ought to be paid compensation commensurate with the sacrifice they would have to make; but to delegate the power to any single given committee to control the appropriations of the Congress to meet the needs of the Nation and only permit them to be employed during the sessions of Congress would make the work so onerous that no committee could do it. I would select the best men who can be found in both branches of the Congress, regardless of how long they had served in either House, men qualified to regulate the control of governmental expenditures, and then charge them with the responsibility of remaining at their work every day in the year and pay them for the service they render. When you do that you will be able to control the expenditures and keep them within reasonable bounds and save the people from the burden of overtaxation, and you can not do it in any other way. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what both gentlemen have said about myself. I do not wish to be understood as expressing a belief that it is not possible to devise some way to improve our present condition. Perhaps I was indulging in the very human failing of trying to justify a prophecy I made as to the result that would follow certain actions. I believe the expenditures of the Federal Government can be put on a proper basis, and I know they must be put on a different basis if the country is not to rise up and retire every Member of Congress to private life. So long as our revenues were not obtained by direct taxation, but came from indirect taxation, it made very little difference. Everyone believed that some one else was paying the taxes. But now the people are thinking, as they have not done in years, upon the question of taxation. They are now paying direct taxes to the Federal Government. In my State and in my city the question of taxation is to-day a burning question. A direct tax is to be levied by the State.

The city of New York must contribute, I imagine, about $15,000,000 of this direct tax to the payment of the expenses of the State. There has been under consideration by the officials of the city of New York every conceivable form of taxation in order to obtain revenue. Taxation on occupation of residences, taxation for engaging in any particular business, taxation upon the man who works and upon the man who is idle. It makes no difference in what particular condition of life he happens to find himself, some one seems to suggest a form of direct taxation to reach his peculiar condition. When the knowledge of the suggestions became public, the threatened uprising was such that consideration has been indefinitely postponed. Throughout the country the cost of government is increasing at a rate far out of proportion to the increase of population and wealth. Some one must concentrate his efforts to the task of lessening the burdens of the taxpayers. Unfortunately I appear to belong to a very old-fashioned and unpopular and out-of-date school of public finance. It is not the mode to follow the school of public finance in which I have been educated. I believe that the Government should not do those things that private enterprise can do satisfactorily. I do not believe that the Federal Government or the State government or the local government should engage in every conceivable form of activity in response to every whim of every organization or of every class or of everybody who believes it is desirable that certain things be done and appeal to the Government to do them, as it seems to be easier to obtain public funds than have sensible men devote their own resources to many things for which there is public clamor. If we restrict the activities of government to those functions that legitimately should be performed by the Government, it would eliminate a vast portion of the excessive expenditures of the Government. Until something along such lines is attempted, it is useless to think of curtailing the gross expenses of government. If we do not wish to stop our activities along any particular line, but continuously seek out and encourage the Government in entering upon new activities in order to placate or to please or to mollify some particular group or party or band or interest, then we simply keep piling up the available means to absorb the revenues. The people are coming to realize that the Treasury is not replenished by money that falls like manna from the heavens, but that every dollar that is expended by the government—Federal, State, or local—means a dollar collected from the pockets of the people.

When the burdens finally become so great as to be intolerable then the inevitable uprising will take place. One thing that is essential to accomplish in this body—and it will be done some day—is to deprive the individual Member of Congress of the right to initiate expenditures. I believe that if nothing else ever had been accomplished as a result of the war between the North and the South than one suggestion which originated in the constitution of the Confederate States which will yet bear fruit of immense value to the people of the United States, the war would not have been in vain. The Confederate constitution had a provision which prohibited the Confederate Congress from appropriating money for any purpose except by a two-thirds vote of both houses, unless estimated for by the head of a department and submitted by the President, or be asked for the payment of its own expenses or of claims against the Confederacy declared by a judicial tribunal to be just. Take away from the Members of this House the right to initiate expenditures and they will examine and scrutinize and take care that no unsound or improper estimate originating in a department is rewarded by an appropriation.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. What would the gentleman think of the proposition of amending the rules of the House so as to prevent any Member from increasing an appropriation over that reported by the committee?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would not favor such a rule. I would not give to a committee of the House any power that the House itself was denied. If it were proposed to deny the committees and the House the power to appropriate in excess of an estimate from a department, it would be a different matter. But I doubt whether we would be justified in providing that a committee could determine the maximum amount to be appropriated, and that the House, which creates the committee, could not revise its action.

Mr. COX. That is the rule, I will state to the gentleman, in the House of Commons.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; not exactly. The rule in the House of Commons prohibits a grant in excess of that requested or for a purpose not requested by the Crown. Of course, the budget is submitted by the Government, consisting largely of members of the two houses.

Mr. COX. If I am not mistaken, in reading this matter up——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think I have the rule here.

Mr. COX (continuing). They have a rule in Parliament which prohibits any member from offering an amendment which proposes to increase the appropriation provided for by the budget; but, at the same time, it permits any member of Parliament to offer an amendment proposing to reduce an appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They can reduce it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I want to understand the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was it?

Mr. COX. My suggestion was this, although I may be in error, but I looked this question up a year or so ago—that the rules of the English Parliament prohibit a member of Parliament from offering an amendment that proposes to increase an appropriation, but does permit him to offer an amendment that tends to reduce the appropriation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But that was not the gentleman's first suggestion.

Mr. COX. The question first was what he thought of altering the rules of the House so as to prevent a Member of the House from offering an appropriation over that submitted by the committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In order to be logical, why should not the gentleman suggest that when that matter is to be so disposed of no Member save those on this committee should be in the House?

Mr. COX. The gentleman from New York has well expressed it. His trouble in this House heretofore has been to persuade the House to stand by the committee. I have seen the House run over him time and time again, although I have not done so myself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The rule of the House of Commons, dating back to 1713, is:

> This House will receive no petition for any sum relating to public service or proceed upon any motion for a grant or charge upon the public revenue * * * unless recommended by the Crown.

One way of testing whether a particular member of the Government has the confidence of the House is by voting to strike out a proposed grant in the supply bill. If it be on an important matter and the motion is carried, it is usually followed by the resignation of that member of the Government.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me to say that he has just indicated what I was about to suggest, that the real control in England and the British Parliament is that if the House votes against the ministry it resigns, just exactly as the committee here should say that if its estimates were substantially increased or reduced by the House they would think their functions no longer useful and they would no longer serve as such committee. That is the way they manage it in the House of Commons.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That provision evidently has a wholesome effect in the preparation of estimates, because it is very rarely now that the requests are of such a character as to compel the resignation of any member of the Government.

Mr. GARNER. If you had such a rule in this country, where a department of the Government submitted an estimate and Congress refused to grant the estimate, and they would resign, there would be some resignations submitted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There would be chaos if there was any such rule here.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman has referred to a provision in the constitution of the Confederacy which, if I understood him correctly, prohibited the initiation of items of appropriations in the house and confined the power and action of the house and its membership upon the items recommended by the executive or executive departments, except by two-thirds vote. Do I understand the gentleman to speak in favor of a proposition of that kind as applied to the Government service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe that it would be desirable, and I believe that the time will come when such provision must be adopted and the individual Member of Congress deprived of the right of initiative in the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. MARTIN. There are a great many of us who think the tendency to the exercise of power in the executive is too great under the present system and arrangement, and that it would be in the interest of better legislation if more responsibility were placed upon the legislative branch of the Government and less upon the executive branch, not only as to appropriation matters, but as to miscellaneous matters of legislation.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. What I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, is that in the expending of public moneys it is rarely that any department of the Government fails to ask for less than is required to maintain the public service The experience of the Federal Government is that the recommendations of the departments for money, except in the rarest and most exceptional cases, are in excess of what is legitimately required to perform the functions devolving upon the service. So that the trouble to be faced does not come because the executive fails to ask for sufficient money, but it comes from a combination of individuals interested in particular matters insisting upon lavish appropriations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. It comes from a combination of individuals originating schemes for expending public money, regardless of the opinion of those who are administering the public service.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. If you would deprive the Members of the House of Representatives of the power of initiating appropriations—is that what I understand the gentleman to contend for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. For the conduct of the public service.

Mr. BATHRICK. Well, does the gentleman mean to say that he would deprive the Members of the power of originating appropriations on bills that they might introduce that would require money to carry them out?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. I would let Congress authorize certain things. Then whatever sums the Executive believed were desirable to carry them out, let the Executive ask for them. The responsibility for the policy of asking or refusing to ask for funds would fall on the administration.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, then, if a man were to introduce a bill to give a soldier a pension, if the Executive authority did not want him to have it or did not recommend it, he could not get it. Is that what I understand the gentleman would suggest?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not gone into details, but I believe that such a situation would be desirable. I should like an administration to be put in a position where it would be compelled to take the responsibility and not to distribute or to share it among over 400 Members of this body and nearly 100 in the other body. I should be glad to have some one upon whom the responsibility could be centered to say, for example, that John Jones, on his record and under all the circumstances, ought to be pensioned in spite of the fact that under the general law he is not eligible. It would quickly be ascertained under such circumstances whether any of the criticisms, just or unjust, are well founded that the pension rolls are improperly padded.

Mr. BATHRICK. Then a Member could not introduce a bill for any purpose to inaugurate the expenditure of money?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not take such a position. It is really afar, however, from what I intended to discuss. I said that I believed that the time would come when the power to initiate appropriations of money from the Federal Treasury for the conduct of the Federal Government must be taken from the individual. I do not expect it to be done during my service in Congress nor during the term of the gentleman from Ohio, but I believe it is inevitable some time, if the Federal Government is not to break down with the weight of expenditures.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not been able to hear all the interesting observations of the gentleman, but I wish to ask whether or not he has commented this morning in any of his remarks on the right of a President to veto individual items in an appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was a time when I thought it might be a good thing for the Federal Government. In an indirect way I became somewhat familiar with the manner in which the supply and appropriation bills were considered during a certain period in the history of the State of New York. I found that the chairman of the committee on ways and means, in the assembly, and the chairman of the committee on finance, in the senate, and the governor got together and determined among themselves how much money has to be expended, and then they determined the particular items that the man responsible in the house would block, and the items that the chairman of the committee on finance would eliminate, and the ones to be left in the bill to be vetoed by the governor, because it would be embarrassing to either of the other two men to antagonize them. In view of the history of the Anglo-Saxon people, and of what has happened in my own experience in this House, I am not certain but that the right to coerce the Executive by obtaining legislation through a refusal to grant supplies is of so tremendous value and importance to the Representatives of the people that that change should not be made in the Federal Constitution.

But I do not wish to go into that subject. I have spoken a great deal longer than I had intended. I wished to refer briefly to one particular subject, and I have been led far astray.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I wanted to refer to what the gentleman had in mind. I am like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], in that I did not have the pleasure of hearing the entire remarks of the gentleman from New York; but, as I understand, he believes that the time will come, even if it is not advisable at this moment, when the Congress should not be allowed to make an appropriation except where the executive branch of the Government deems it advisable, and that the Congress would only authorize an appropriation and then leave it to the discretion of the Executive as to whether the Executive would utilize that or not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true now. The administration need not now spend the money appropriated.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that; and if the executive department of the Government fails to exercise the authority conferred by Congress, and the Congress in the face of the failure of the Executive authority to exercise that power declared its opinion otherwise, should not the Executive then resign, so that the Congress might have in executive authority some agency that would obey its commands?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would involve too many substantial changes in our organic law. The suggestions I make would not.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think the gentleman from New York would take the position that the Congress ought not to preserve the right to represent and execute the wishes of the American people, and if it were a question of want of confidence in the Executive, in whose hands authority was vested to make the appropriation, I think the Executive ought to resign.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is treating a phase of the subject that I do not think is imperative, because, as I said—although the gentleman, perhaps, may not have heard me—that we are not troubled with the failure of the executive departments to ask for sufficient money for the conduct of the Government service. It is the rarest and most exceptional situation to find anyone not asking more than is needed.

Mr. GARNER. But under any conditions I assume the gentleman from New York would not undertake to take away from the Congress the right to speak as the representatives of the people?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will agree with that broad statement.

Mr. GARNER. And if any member of the executive branch of the Government which was not responsive to the wishes of the people should refuse to carry out the judgment of Congress, it seems to me the rule ought to apply where he would disconnect himself from the service of the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the time will not come when the representatives of the people will try to force money upon an unwilling Executive. [Laughter.] I know it has been pretended that that situation has existed, but it is rarely that the administrative officials have not accommodated themselves to the situation and expended the money as graciously as possible. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I will yield. Then I wish to conclude.

Mr. KAHN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman. Has the gentleman ever considered a proposition of this kind—getting the chairmen of all the great appropriating committees of the House together, and also the ranking minority members of the various appropriating committees, at the beginning of the session, with a view to going over the estimates and seeing what can be done by each committee, so that all the committees shall work in absolute harmony?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I discussed at some length at the beginning something that would apply to that suggestion. I pointed out the fact that at the beginning of this session of Congress the estimates submitted for consideration in connection with this bill amounted to $111,000,000. Since that time estimates for $21,000,000 additional have been submitted, and the man never lived who could tell at the opening of the session of Congress with any degree of approximate accuracy how much this bill ought to carry; and if we should distribute the revenues at the opening of a session, and if we should be living in a time when the Treasury is in a less plethoric condition than it is at present, the result would be very unfortunate.

Mr. KAHN. But could not such a combination of chairmen of committees act, even upon the additional estimates that are sent in, so that the various committees would all discuss the matter and arrive at some common ground?

Mr. FITZGERALD. An attempt was made to do something along such line, I believe, in the last session or the session before that one. The chairmen of the various committees evinced such inability to make reductions in the proposed expenditures that the meeting broke up and was never reconvened.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield for one more question, and then I wish to finish.

Mr. MARTIN. I was very much impressed with the statement of the gentleman, now repeated, that the estimates from the departments for the last four years as to this sundry civil bill have been something like $97,000,000 in excess of what the committee has allowed or recommended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not that suggest to the gentleman that the relief for extravagant expenditures will probably not be found by increasing the power of initiative in the executive department of the Government, but must be found in some real economy in the legislative branch?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have stated the reasons why I believe what I have suggested would work out desirably, that if we take from the individual the right to initiate appropriations, he will then become much more keenly interested in the particular things the departments believe they should have, and will exercise an independence and a scrutiny that otherwise, I believe, is not exercised. At any rate, the experience of mankind is that a popular body will never economize by refusing to appropriate money for the things they think are popular with the people upon whose determination their official lives depend.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Before the gentleman concludes, will he permit me to make a suggestion and ask him a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what has been said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and recognize his great ability and his long experience in dealing with appropriations; he is not excelled by anyone in the House, either in his knowledge of the subject, his ability or experience, and he is equaled only by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]. I want to ask the gentleman if what he has said generally, with reference to reforms in appropriations, applies only to the preparation and passage of bills in the House of Representatives? The gentleman has undoubtedly guided through this House many appropriation bills that he believed were as near accurate and correct as it was possible to make them; and yet when they became laws, the amounts carried had been very materially increased over the amounts carried in the bills when they left the House, and that is usually what happens to every appropriation bill after it passes the House. Now, assuming that there be a system adopted in the House dealing with appropriations along the lines suggested by the gentleman, and others who have discussed the subject, that have given the subject thought and study, how would you obviate the difficulty that we now have in controlling the limit of appropriations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not mean that such a limitation should apply to the Members of this body alone. I meant that that limitation upon the rights of Members must apply to the Members of the two bodies. I do not believe that this House should ever be circumscribed or limited while the other House is free.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one observation? It will be very short.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman in a way to advocate the proposition that no appropriation should be allowed to go through the House which had not been estimated for unless it had received a two-thirds vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I referred to that provision in the Confederate constitution.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman is correct, but that might be the outcome in the end. I should just like to suggest in that connection that that would be turning over practically not only appropriations but legislation to a minority in the House, because most legislation carries with it an appropriation, and a great deal of the most important legislation carries a slight appropriation in the legislative bill; and under that rule you would always have to go and find out from the minority whether they would allow the legislation to be enacted. Of course that would be in favor of the gentleman's party hereafter [laughter], but I am sure he does not advocate it as a partisan proposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have occupied more time than I intended to occupy.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I see on the second page of the report you have made this statement:

Omitting from consideration all sums having to do with the Reclamation Service and irrigation of Indian lands that are involved in the estimates for 1916, appropriations for the current year, and total amount recommended in the accompanying bill the following results are shown:

The bill as a whole, exclusive of the Reclamation Service, makes a reduction in the estimates of $9,067,746.67 and a reduction under the appropriations for the current year of $1,920,999.10.

Additional to the foregoing amounts for the Reclamation Service the further sum of $1,275,187.93, submitted in House Document No. 1481, for irrigation works on certain Indian reservations, was referred to and considered by the committee without favorable action.

I desire to know from the gentleman whether that was because his committee did not consider that they had jurisdiction of this matter and that it belonged to some other committee, or was it on the merits of the appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee felt that the irrigation projects on Indian reservations were matters that had been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and that we should not enter into those matters.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was the information I desired from the gentleman. I saw that the department had referred it to the gentleman's committee, and we desired to know the reason why it was not passed upon by that committee, so that we could govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They sent it to the Committee on Appropriations because the Indian bill had passed the House, but we did not feel that that was a sufficient reason to justify us in taking up those matters.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have been led into a not very profound but a somewhat more or less interesting discussion of some matters not contemplated to be discussed when I rose. A very beneficial purpose will have been accomplished, however, if what has been said here to-day will stimulate the thought of Members and the interest of the people generally in the question of public expenditures. Nothing will be more pressing in the very near future than the financial problems of the United States. The sooner Members begin to think of them and what must be done, regardless of any party consideration or questions of party policy, the better it will be for the welfare and the prosperity of the American people.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. I respect the request of the gentleman from New York not to be interrogated about details, but I would like to ask him whether he does not think this bill could be materially reduced without seriously embarrassing the operations of the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should not like to make that admission. So that that remark may not be misinterpreted, let me say that I believe that provisions are made in the bill for some purposes that could be deferred if it were essential without particularly impairing the public service, but I do not believe that the temper of the country or of the Congress desires that those things be deferred. I do not believe that the Committee on Appropriations would be justified in withholding appropriations for such objects in view of the known sentiment of the House.

Mr. GILLETT. One other question. I know it has always been the custom of the gentleman from New York to discuss on appropriation bills—and this is the last one of the large ones from our committee—the condition of the Treasury. May I ask the gentleman why he has omitted that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that I have been very busy considering and preparing the sundry civil bill. Not taking into account the time that was devoted to hearings on the Isthmus of Panama, the committee commenced the hearings of the civil-service appropriation bill on the 16th of December, and has continued them during the holidays and continually until within a day or two. I might say that I have been busily occupied in attempting to keep within reasonable limits the amount that shall be expended from the Public Treasury by authorizations in this bill. It has been difficult for me to make that searching analysis of possible accessions to the revenue which I should like to have made for such a discussion as the gentleman suggests. There is about a month left, however, and if any public emergency should arise and I should imagine that any observations by myself would be of any particular interest to anyone or of any benefit to the country, I may attempt to discuss our financial condition; and if I do, I shall do as I have always done—I shall give the House the benefit of my unbiased opinion and my best judgment. I hope my views will be in harmony with the convictions of the Members, and will be neither alarming nor distressing to them nor to the country. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the reply of the gentleman from New York to my question asking why he had omitted his usual discussion of the condition of the Treasury was not very frank or illuminating. I had anticipated with much curiosity and interest hearing his statement on that subject, but I am not surprised that he avoids it. Even his remarkable ingenuity would be at a loss to find any explanation of existing conditions which was creditable to the administration.

This is the last of the large appropriation bills. All the others have passed the House and are pending in the Senate. At the beginning of this session, on the first appropriation bill, I called the attention of the House to the fact that in this year of stringency and depression, when all individuals were cutting down expenses a' trying to economize, this administration, seemingly unaware of financial and industrial conditions, apparently thinking that our income was not going to suffer like others, sent in estimates for the next fiscal year larger than had ever been submitted by any President and calling for an expenditure greater than the country had ever indulged in during its most prosperous years.

In the last campaign one of the main grounds of the attack upon the present administration was its extravagance, and yet in the face of that successful attack and criticism, and in the face of the unsettled conditions throughout the world, the enormous destruction of capital and the inevitable stringency resulting, this administration did not think it was prudent to do what everyone else was doing, and economize, but, blind to the signs of the times, requested Congress to appropriate money on a larger scale than ever before.

I said then that not only ought we to economize in our appropriations for 1916, but that in my opinion there was great danger that in this very fiscal year the Government would find itself confronted by a deficit. Two months have passed since then. Instead of changing for the better, it seems to me the lapse of time has but confirmed my fears. Apparently at last even the administration became alarmed, and a few days ago it was reported that Cabinet meetings were held and the leaders of the House and Senate consulted as to whether the appropriation bills which had granted the enormous sums requested by the administration could not even yet be clipped. But apparently effort in that direction was abandoned, and they are proceeding in their regular course.

The original estimates sent in asked for appropriations of $1,090,000,000. The revenues were estimated at $1,055,000,000, leaving an apparent deficit of $45,000,000; but the estimates contained $60,000,000 for the sinking fund, which it was not proposed to really spend, so that left a surplus of $15,000,000 if the revenues should equal expectation. But under this administration revenues have always fallen below expectation, while the expenditures have always exceeded the estimates, and so already the bills which have passed the House or been reported have exceeded the original estimates by $18,000,000, and that should be increased by $2,000,000 because of a reappropriation made in the naval bill. So that already the appropriations exceed the estimates by $20,000,000, and the surplus of $15,000,000 is turned into a deficit of $5,000,000, and there still remains the Senate to be reckoned with. Unless it departs from its invariable prerogative of increasing and never decreasing appropriations the bills will be still larger when they emerge from the Senate and from conference, and the deficit of $5,000,000 will doubtless be still greater.

It is but fair to state that this increase of the appropriations over the original estimates is not primarily the fault of the House, as many of the increases have been recommended by the departments in supplementary estimates. Indeed, except for the $27,000,000 increase in the Post Office bill, due mainly to the refusal to follow the recommendation of the Postmaster General and substitute the contract system for rural carriers, the House has appropriated less than the administration asked for.

The revenues this year have thus far been steadily falling off, though just how much it is impossible for me to ascertain. The customs revenue was estimated at $240,000,000—$20,000,000 more than the current fiscal year. What ground there is for expecting increased imports of dutiable goods next year it is difficult for me to comprehend. Conditions in Europe certainly do not look any more favorable, and we are quite as apt, I think, to have a loss of $20,000,000 as a gain of $20,000,000. I still think that in the present fiscal year we are likely to face a deficit, and that before the 1st of next July the administration will be selling bonds in order to pay the running expenses of

the Government and keep a balance in the Treasury. That balance has shrunk from $145,000,000 on the 1st of July to $55,000,000 on the 1st of February. That is an average loss of $13,000,000 a month, and the Treasury balance is now reduced to as low a figure as Treasury officials have generally thought safe. But there is nothing to indicate that the trend will change at all during the next four months, and at that rate by the 1st of June the Treasury would be empty. Indeed, when it reaches the $50,000,000 mark it is generally considered to need replenishing.

Of course in June the income tax flows in. That is estimated by the department at $80,000,000—$40,000,000 from corporations and $40,000,000 from individuals. Last year those taxes brought in $71,000,000. I can not see on what ground they are expected to produce more this year than last year. Last year the Secretary's estimate was $16,000,000, or 20 per cent too high. I should not be surprised if his estimate this year was equally erroneous. To be sure, last year the depressing and disturbing effect of the Democratic tariff law reduced incomes, so that the tax produced far less than was anticipated. This year, while the tariff continues its blighting effect, we have in addition the tremendous disturbance caused by the war, and there is every reason to expect a great falling off instead of an increase in incomes of both corporations and individuals which will be reflected by a reduction in the revenue from that tax.

But allow that the income tax brings $80,000,000—the full amount of the Secretary's estimate—and that other conditions remain the same—and there certainly is now no material prospect of a change—what would be the condition of the Treasury during the next fiscal year for which these appropriations are made? An excess of expenditures over receipts of $10,000,000 a month from now till then amounts to $50,000,000. We have now $55,000,000 in the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Oh, less than $54,000,000.

Mr. GILLETT. A million does not make much difference now.

Mr. MANN. It shows how rapidly it is decreasing.

Mr. GILLETT. It does. Every time I look it is less than the last time.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is likely that the income tax and the post-office revenue is going to fall off, too.

Mr. GILLETT. The income tax brings $80,000,000, making $135,000,000. Subtract from that $50,000,000 which we will lose before July 1 and it leaves $85,000,000 on hand July 1. That is only a little more than the safe working balance of $50,000,000. But they estimate that the emergency tax will bring $10,000,000 less in 1916 than this year, and there will be nothing to fill the Treasury again until the following June; so that if the present rate of revenue continues, long before the middle of the next fiscal year we will again be reduced to the issue of bonds to pay running expenses. And yet, in face of these figures, the Secretary of the Treasury issues a formal statement after the Cabinet meetings and conferences with Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. FITZGERALD, saying that the conclusion was reached that no reductions could be recommended in the appropriations, and no action was necessary to provide more revenue, and there was no occasion for unfavorable reports about the condition of the Treasury. I sincerely hope he is correct, but I believe he is indulging in optimistic day dreams and taking counsel of hope rather than reason. Of course some favorable change may come to increase the flow of revenue, but no sign of it can be pointed out except psychologically, and unless it comes our Treasury is sure to be emptied.

Our imports are steadily decreasing—they were $138,000,000 in October, $126,000,000 in November, $114,000,000 in December—so that our customs revenues are also shrinking. Apparently all the sources of income for the Government are slowly drying up; we are liable to have a deficit in this very fiscal year; and yet, in the face of all that, there is evidenced by the administration no recognition of these conditions, no attempt at economy, no cutting off of expenses, no attempt to save the Treasury. To be sure, the Secretary of the Treasury did say in his annual report:

> As long as the expenditures of the Government exceed its income there is always danger. A corollary of a weak treasury is impaired confidence.

But this recognition of the danger is not accompanied by any act to avert it, and apparently we are drifting on, appropriating larger sums than ever before, as if the world were at peace, conditions were normal, and we could afford to gratify all our desires. Such a policy is unsound, reckless, and improvident, and unless some sudden stroke of good fortune should overtake us we are likely to face, unprepared, those exact dangers which the Secretary of the Treasury points out. And the administration is bending its whole energies to force through a reluctant Congress a shipping bill which will involve the expenditure of $10,000,000 more and an annual deficit which can not be reckoned.

But the retort is always made by a majority to a minority, "Point out to us where you would economize." It is not a fair retort, because such economy ought to be undertaken by the executive departments when they are framing their estimates, surveying the whole field of Federal expenditure and balancing the different departments, and then it ought to be followed up in the committee room, where the close scrutiny and detailed examination is made. But the minority have already saved for the administration $30,000,000 by the filibuster against the river and harbor bill in the Senate last session.

There are several items in this very bill which I think, under present conditions, ought to be omitted. There are appropriations of about $10,000,000 for public buildings which have not yet been even commenced and for which no contracts are outstanding. They are all of them luxuries, and, in my opinion, many of them are extravagances which ought never to be indulged in, no matter how rich we are, but which certainly ought to be postponed to a time when the Treasury balance is not in danger. There would be a saving of $10,000,000—quite a tidy sum for a depleted Treasury.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will not the $9,000,000 go out into circulation and employ many idle men?

Mr. GILLETT. We might as well say, "Issue bonds for a thousand million and employ them all, if you are going to employ any, and not exercise favoritism."

Another appropriation which I think could be well deferred is the $3,000,000 for the physical valuation of railroads. When that project was first considered it was estimated to cost from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 and to require three or four years for completion. Then the next year the estimated cost rose to an outside cost of $5,000,000, with a limit of five years for completion. Now it is estimated that it will cost from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000, and we have no certainty that it will not cost twice that. Moreover, it will cost the railroads probably quite as much more, for we were told that it is now costing some of the older roads twice as much per mile as it costs the Government, and that, too, the people have ultimately to pay. How long it will take no one can accurately foretell or whether the information will not be so obsolete as to be practically useless. Admitting that the statistics will be valuable in various ways, they are, after all, a luxury which we can live without and which we might well postpone until the Treasury could endure the drain.

There are two large expenditures which might be lopped off and cause no suffering to the people and much relief to the Treasury.

But my main criticism is not against these special estimates and appropriations but against the indifference, the ignorance, or the procrastination which failed to carefully survey the whole field and outline economies which would have left our Treasury in a safe condition to weather any storm. I do not wish to be an alarmist or to excite undue apprehension about the Treasury, but I think the facts ought to be recognized, and with the Treasury balance reduced to $55,000,000, the lowest it has been since the Cleveland administration, and with an average excess of expenses over receipts of from $10,000,000 to $13,000,000 a month, it seems to me the Government will be reduced to issuing bonds to pay its running expenses before the 1st of June.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Personally, I agree with some of the statements the gentleman has made about the possible saving at this time which could have been effected in this appropriation bill and some others, but, knowing the gentleman's sincerity, I want to inquire how he voted yesterday on the proposition to build one battleship or two?

Mr. GILLETT. Well, unfortunately, I could not vote, but I was paired in favor of two battleships, and I expressed in some remarks I made a week ago the full reasons, and if the gentleman will read those he will find there is no inconsistency with what I am saying now and with my vote on yesterday.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman that the purpose of my question was not to reveal any inconsistency whatever. I think the gentleman is more consistent than the average Member of the House in his

votes and statements, and I really did not know how the gentleman did vote yesterday afternoon, but I thought if he lived up to the statement he was making this morning, surely he voted with us for one.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been in Congress I voted for two battleships on yesterday, and I gave my reasons very fully in a speech a week ago, and if the gentleman will read that, though it may not convert him, it may perhaps satisfy him of my continued sincerity.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman stated the large amount appropriated for the physical valuation of railroads. Would the gentleman suggest that that work be suspended during the next fiscal year?

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly would.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Appropriations Committee had the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission before them about it. Did they reveal how much money already appropriated was expended? I was not present at that hearing.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not care to take time to go into those details now. I do not wish to be discourteous to the gentleman, but I do not care to take time for that. I simply say that could be well postponed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman intend to call attention to the Alaska railroad proposition?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think I will say any more now about specific items. There are a number of items in the bill which I think should be dropped. I have not mentioned all of them. I tried in the subcommittee to reduce many, which, of course, I can not properly reveal, but I simply suggest now the two largest reductions and postponements which I think should be made out of deference to the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that the appropriations carried in this bill for the continuation of the Alaska railroad project—I do not mean discontinued permanently—could be safely deferred?

Mr. GILLETT. I do; that is another one which I think could be deferred. There are $2,000,000 more to be saved.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman has given us approximately $85,000,000 as the possible balance in the Treasury on the 1st of July, based upon the estimates by the Treasury Department, which he says he does not believe are accurate. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will favor the committee with his opinion as to the approximate condition of the Treasury on the 1st of July coming?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to give that. I do not think I can prophesy exactly. I think that the income from the income tax will fall at least $10,000,000 below what the administration estimates, and I should not be at all surprised if it were $20,000,000.

And yet the Democrats still dare to call themselves the party of economy. For last year, when they made the largest appropriations ever known in the history of the Government, they might now make the excuse that they did not foresee the European war, and that they honestly, though mistakenly, believed that their new tariff law would draw into the Treasury ample revenue so that, although the expenditures would be enormous, the receipts would be correspondingly and adequately vast. That is, of course, a fair excuse. What is extravagance in a pauper might seem parsimony for a millionaire. It is hard to prove that a person or a government is extravagant which lives within its income. During that series of years when the Democrats so unceasingly denounced us for extravagance they at least could not charge that we did not provide ample means to pay for them. But now they not only exceed in amount those appropriations which they so fondly denounced as extravagant and profligate, but they fail to provide the revenues to meet their bills, which they now call, in the words of the Secretary of the Treasury, "the lowest figure consistent with efficiency of the service and the proper conduct of the business of the Government." They, the self-satisfied monopolists of economy, outrage every principle of sound finance. They appropriate money for larger expenditures than even last year, while at the same time they know that the stream of revenue, insufficient before, is steadily dwindling and with no sure prospect of replenishment. Their reputation for economy has shrunk even more than the balance in the Treasury.

There are many items of expenditures disclosed in the hearings on this bill which suggest criticism, or at least inquiry. Most of them are small—individually may seem trivial and petty—but I shall point out a few of them, because, while each is of no great consequence in itself, yet repeated small instances indicate a trend and form a habit, and it may not be harmful for the departments to know that their items are watched and may be criticized.

A few years ago there was loud complaint here because of the number of horses and carriages maintained for officials of the departments at Government expense, and the abuse was restricted, and I remember nearly the whole of one afternoon was spent discussing whether the State Department was extravagant in spending nearly a hundred dollars a year for horseshoeing. I observe now that for the use of the Secretary of War there are kept one 4-seated carriage, closed; one 4-seated carriage, open; one 2-seated carriage, open; and one 2-seated carriage, closed; and this not being enough to convey him in proper state to his official duties, there was purchased for his use out of the fund for transportation of the Army and its supplies an automobile costing $4,850.

I do not criticize the Secretary of the Navy for visiting the different navy yards at Government expense, nor do I think it was necessarily superfluous for the Assistant Secretary to follow shortly after with a similar visit, but I do not see why the superior dignity of the Secretary required an expenditure of $687, while it cost the assistant only $489; nor do I see why the Secretary should charge the Government for an "official trip" from Washington to Lincoln, Nebr. I appreciate and admire his loyalty in visiting that shrine, but that worship has been sufficiently profitable to him already to allow him to pay his own expenses. If his visits to navy yards had resulted in some effort to abolish some of the useless ones, there would be less disposition to scrutinize them. The Government paid $1,433.71 for the official trips of the Secretary alone last year, including visits to such scenes of naval activity as Spokane, Butte, Denver, Salt Lake, Omaha, Pittsburgh, and so forth.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not pretended there are any naval stations at these places. What was the official business of the Secretary of the Navy at Lincoln, Nebr.? There is not any water there.

Mr. GILLETT. I just pointed out that I did not know.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I trust the gentleman will not detract in any way from the naval station at Lincoln. It is located on Salt Creek.

Mr. GILLETT. The Secretary of the Treasury is also a luxurious traveler. For a month's trip with the Secretary of Agriculture and their attendants to prepare for the establishment of reserve banks the Government paid $6,663.01, over $200 a day. I suppose they thought the magnitude of their financial purpose should be reflected in their expense account.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HELM. Does the gentleman recall a famous trip taken by an ex-Secretary of War, later President of the United States, Mr. Taft, with a shipload of guests and acquaintances and friends to the Philippine Islands, that exhausted the entire appropriation of about $200,000 or more for that purpose, and that they were subsequently compelled to draw on some contingent fund for $70,000 or $80,000 additional?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about the expense. There was such a trip by Congressmen to inspect the Philippines.

But to atone for any extravagance in traveling—if there was any, of which I am not certain, though the figures indicate it—the Secretary boasts in his report of one great saving which was detailed to our committee. Gold coin had always been shipped from one point to another by express. The brilliant thought occurred to the Secretary of saving these express fees and sending by parcel post. In that way he would only have to pay the Post Office Department, and really would not pay at all, as it is only a matter of bookkeeping, transferring a credit from the Treasury Department to the Post Office Department. The express companies insured the gold while the Post Office did not. Seventy-eight million dollars in gold coin have been shipped from the mint in Philadelphia to the subtreasury in New York by separating the coin in small bags so that each bag came within the parcel-post limit of 20 pounds, and in that way between 100 and 200 tons of gold were made up into small packages and sent to New York at no cost to anyone except the railroads, and the Secretary plumes himself on this business transaction.

My instinct is not to criticize any plan which saves money for the Government, for it is so uniformly imposed upon and

buncoed, its operations are conducted at such great cost compared with any other business, that I applaud any device for saving which is reasonable and decent. If at present the railroads were being overpaid for their carriage of parcel post I might think this was a shrewd device to get even. But when they are notoriously underpaid and the extra load and expense imposed upon them by the parcel post has never yet been fairly computed and provided for, to make up shipments of seventy-eight millions of gold coins into little bags and compel the railroads to carry it for nothing, requiring special trains and service, is a sort of Shylock performance unworthy the National Government, and although it saved us money, I do not think it an achievement to boast of. If it indicated a painstaking disposition to save money in the extremity of the Treasury it would be more excusable, but as a sporadic outburst of economy and a specimen of mean and unfair dealing, it is not creditable.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. How much was that saving?

Mr. GILLETT. I have forgotten the amount of the saving. I think it was about $35,000. It was a material saving, however. The express companies have to insure the gold, and the parcel post does not insure it.

Mr. PLATT. Was that gold really shipped from Philadelphia to New York without being insured in any way?

Mr. GILLETT. It was.

Mr. PLATT. And if it had been lost, the Government would have had no recourse?

Mr. GILLETT. It would have had no recourse.

Mr. PLATT. Well, I think that is pretty poor business.

Mr. GLASS. Right on this point may I interrupt the gentleman? Does the gentleman know whether or not the Treasury Department has created this condition of affairs which up to 12 months ago had prevailed for 30 years? The Government of the United States for that period——

Mr. GILLETT. I am yielding for a question. If it is not a question, I do not care to yield.

Mr. GLASS. It is a question, but not a long one.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not care to yield for a statement.

Mr. GLASS. The Government of the United States for a period of 30 years——

Mr. GILLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further. That is a statement.

Mr. GLASS. I have to make the statement in order to ask the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts declines to yield.

Mr. GILLETT. Another act of the Treasury Department which seems to me of a similar character and spirit is connected with collection of the income tax. The law imposing an income tax provides (sec. 2d, sixth proviso):

> That persons liable for the normal income tax only, on their own account or in behalf of another, shall not be required to make return of the income derived from dividends on the capital stock or from the net earnings of corporations, joint-stock companies, or associations and insurance companies taxable upon their net income, as hereinafter provided.

Persons whose annual net income is more than $3,000 and not more than $20,000 are liable for the normal income tax only.

The Treasury Department form 1040 for the return of net income during the 10 months of the year 1913 required (line 2, p. 2):

> Total amount of income derived from dividends on the stock or from the net earnings of corporations, joint-stock companies, associations, or insurance companies subject to like tax.

On February 7, 1914, the Treasury Department issued to collectors of internal revenue a circular (T. D. 1945) quoting the proviso of the income-tax law above set forth and saying:

> You are informed that returns of individuals, when such individuals are subject to the normal tax only, need not include the income derived from the dividends or net earnings referred to above. When individuals are subject to the additional tax, such income derived from said dividends or net earnings must be shown on the return.

This appeared to settle the question conclusively, and it was to be expected that a revised form would make it clear to income-tax payers exactly what requirements they were obliged to meet.

But form 1040, revised, issued for individual tax returns for 1914, contains (line 25, p. 2):

> Dividends on stock or from the net earnings of domestic corporations, joint-stock companies, associations, or insurance companies subject to like tax.

The caption of page 2 of this form reads as follows:

> This statement must show in the proper spaces the entire amount of gains, profits, and income received by or accrued to the individual from all sources during the year specified on page 1, except income derived from the obligations of the United States or any of its possessions, or of any State or political subdivision thereof, including district drainage bonds, and amounts paid by a State or any political subdivision thereof for services rendered as any officer or employee.

Paragraph 1, instructions, page 4 of this form, states:

> This return shall be made by every citizen of the United States, whether residing at home or abroad, and by every person residing in the United States, though not a citizen thereof, having a net income of $3,000 or over for the taxable year.

And the affidavit on page 4 is equally comprehensive.

There is not a line or word anywhere in the form to indicate the exemption of income from corporate stocks in the case of individuals not subject to the additional tax.

This class of income-tax payers—those having a total net income of not more than $20,000—constitute numerically an enormous majority of those affected by the tax; and few of them are familiar with the law, or so sure of the law, as to maintain their rights against the express provisions of a Treasury Department requirement. This requirement operates as an inquiry into their private affairs from which the statute expressly exempts them. Thus the Treasury Department, knowing that it has no right under the law to demand from the great majority of the persons affected information as to the stocks which they possess, after it has been called to their attention and they have ruled and admitted that they have no such right, still send out a form demanding such information, threatening a heavy penalty for failure to give it, and making no suggestion that anyone is excused from it. It is an unjustified and mean attempt either to collect from innocent citizens taxes which they are under no obligation to pay, or to spy into their affairs and acquire information about their property which they are not obliged to reveal.

I can see no excuse for it. It is an irritating assumption of illegal power, a meddlesome attempt to encroach upon the rights of citizens unworthy any officer of a great Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the gentleman thought of the fact that there is a recent ruling by the Secretary of the Treasury that no person will be allowed to deduct his losses from his income this year?

Mr. GILLETT. No. I was not aware of that.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his estimates suggested another great economy and reform, which I am happy to say the committee did not adopt. He recommended that for the erection of public buildings throughout the country a lump sum of $14,000,000 should be segregated, leaving it to him to determine how and when several millions of that money should be spent. This would be very useful for him. It would compel every Congressman who wished a building commenced or completed in his district to go to the Secretary and make terms with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. That provision did not originate with the present Secretary. It was originated by Secretary MacVeagh, and has been recommended several times and always refused.

Mr. GILLETT. It would have been more effective, I suspect, this time than it would have been under any other administration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is only on the theory that this is a more effective administration.

Mr. GILLETT. Millions of congressional pork would be absolutely in the control of the Secretary, to be doled out at such times and on such conditions as he should determine.

The influence of the Executive on Congress during this administration has been greater than at any time since the reign of Andrew Jackson. Its growth is one of the most dangerous symptoms in our politics. It makes one feel like introducing in our parliament the famous resolution which Col. Barre introduced under George III a century and a half ago—"The influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." But here is a shrewd proposition of the Secretary of the Treasury to increase enormously the patronage and influence of the administration. I suppose, as the offices have been largely distributed, and perhaps are giving out, some new source of power had to be invented, and here was discovered a fine method of continuing the dependence and subservience of Congressmen.

My own Massachusetts delegation offers a good illustration of that dependence in the past. In this Congress there were eight Democratic Members. Two of them have been reelected to the next Congress. Of the other six, places have been provided for one as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, for two as postmasters of their home cities, and for one as United States marshal. Of the others, one signed a report against the administration's pet measure, the shipping bill, and so, of course, put himself without the pale; but why the other lone Member has been discriminated against and still left outside the breast-

works of patronage, I do not understand. Perhaps the plum is still kept dangling. [Laughter]. Thus the dependence of the executive and legislative branches of the Government is maintained. Thus the policies of the administration win the support of an appreciative and grateful, if not an impartial, majority in Congress.

We see by the press that the President has invited the Progressive Senators to talk with him about the shipping bill, and, about the same time, that he is considering the appointment of one or two Progressives on the Trade Commission. Remembering how he removed the only Republican member of the Civil Service Commission and filled his place, which the law did not allow to be held by a Democrat, with the nominee of a Progressive Senator, and how long and faithfully that Senator supported administration measures, I shall watch with interest these contemplated appointments. On the Trade Commission, as on the Civil Service Commission, the law compels the appointment of some members of the minority party. The Reserve Board had no such limitation, and accordingly all eight members of that board were Democrats. In many parts of the country the Progressive Party has dissolved, and in his Indianapolis speech the President made a strong appeal to them to join the Democratic Party. Under these circumstances, is it obeying the spirit of the law to appoint accommodating Progressives as representatives of the minority party? [Laughter.]

In the recent campaign I was criticized by my opponent on the stump because I had said:

He [the President] has certainly shown himself a wonderful master in the distribution of patronage. The most experienced politician has never shown greater skill in pacifying a voracious animosity by the distribution of loaves and fishes than this college professor.

I see no reason to retract or modify the statement. I spoke of Andrew Jackson, the great spoilsman, as the prototype of this administration. But I have discovered an earlier model. In the history of the Lewis and Clark expedition I find the following:

The chiefs and warriors held a council among themselves to decide on the answer to our speech, and the result was that they confided in what we had told them, and resolved to follow our advice. This resolution once made, the principal chief, Tunnachemootoolt, took a quantity of flour of the roots of cows, and going around to all the kettles and baskets in which his people were cooking thickened the soup into a kind of mush. He then began an harangue, making known the result of the deliberations among the chiefs, and after exhorting them to unanimity concluded by an invitation to all who agreed to the proceedings of the council to come and eat, while those who would not abide by the decision of the chiefs were requested to show their dissent by not partaking in the feast.

[Laughter.]

The concluding appeal of the orator effectually stopped the mouths of every malcontent, and the proceedings were ratified, and the mush devoured with the most zealous unanimity.

[Laughter and applause.]

Tunnachemootoolt lived a hundred years before his time. He should be canonized with Andrew Jackson as one of the patron saints of the Democratic Party. Does not his statecraft charmingly illustrate and anticipate the success of this administration? And if the request of the Secretary of the Treasury had been granted and he had been given full control over the expenditure of the fund for public buildings, what an eager rush there would have been toward the bowl of mush and what unanimity in voting! [Laughter.]

In glancing over the list of special attorneys employed by the Attorney General my eye happened on the two familiar names of Bryan and McAdoo, and an unsuspecting interest in the pursuit of abstract truth brought out the surprising information that these names were attached to the persons of sons of two Cabinet officers. The Attorney General obviously knew earlier than we did of the animating principle of the premier of this administration expressed so forcibly in the now famous Vick letter, and indicating that Government offices exist in order to give employment to deserving Democrats—and, of course, all members of the family should be included. The Secretary of the Treasury is to be congratulated on having a son so brilliant and precocious that when just commencing the practice of law he is worth $2,000 a year to the United States as a lawyer. The son of the Secretary of State, the premier of the administration, was, of course, worth a higher salary.

As indicating how the principles of the Democratic Party, like everything else mortal, are subject to change, I am reminded of an incident in the Forty-fourth Congress, when the House was Democratic and removed from office the Doorkeeper, Fitzhugh, the man who attained fame by the expression, "I'm a bigger man than old Grant." The report of the Committee on Rules recommending his removal contains this sentence:

The appointment of his son, a mere boy, to a $2,100 place, and when that was vacated by him then his reappointment and retention as file clerk at a salary of $1,800, shows a disregard of a principle of civil service frequently commented upon of late.

This referred, of course, to nepotism. How heretical and antiquated that sentiment would seem to this administration! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In a recent speech the President compared himself to the captain of a college football team. He did not give any details of his organization, but it does not require much imagination to fill up the membership of his first team. I venture to make a guess at it. The President, as he says, would be captain. The captain has despotic authority. No one questions his commands and the slightest disobedience is punished. So far the President's metaphor is perfect. The President would also doubtless fill the position of quarter back, the one who gives the orders on the field. The title of end men is so appropriate to those promoters of national merriment, Secretary Daniels and Secretary Bryan, that I am sure no one would contest with them those places. The stalwart form of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would doubtless be selected for center, whose duty it is to pass the ball up to the quarter back, having first received from him exact and explicit orders. The tackles would be those wiry athletes [laughter], the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House [laughter and applause], although after our colleague had made his speech describing the mess of the Democratic Party he might be relegated to full back, and even farther back than that, although he would certainly be brought forward again when any kicking was to be done, for no one would dispute his preeminent qualification in that line. [Laughter.] For half backs to carry the ball the captain would undoubtedly select those two dispensers of patronage, the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury, for he could be certain that no member of the team would ever lose sight of the ball as long as they carried it, but would follow them desperately and unfalteringly to the goal. It is a question whose tactics would be most successful in advancing the ball, the elusive and sinuous and artful dodging of the Secretary of the Treasury or the mad, headlong, straightforward rushes of the Postmaster General, but each could be sure of the team's enthusiastic support until the last office was distributed. There are so many candidates for the position of guards, particularly guards of the Treasury, and they are all so incompetent, that I shall not undertake to guess who would be selected. And when the line was formed for a grand, final struggle and the captain wished to call upon the team for their supermost exertion and extract from them the last frenzied ounce of strength he would doubtless shout out to them the signal, not in the usual mysterious numbers, but in four gladdening letters—P O R K—and with that incentive and inspiration the team would put forth their extremest effort. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] As long as the intoxication of that magic slogan lasts who could withstand their onset?

Thus I have endeavored to point out some of the defects which came to my mind during the formation of this bill. I will say frankly what I am sure you would not otherwise suspect, that I do not claim to have always spoken in a purely judicial and impartial spirit. Very likely some of the items I have called attention to were quite justifiable. But I consider that a proper function of the minority is to call attention to abuses or probable abuses or tendencies which may grow into abuses. We may not succeed in righting or even discovering a wrong, but it is always healthy for any administration to know that to commit wrong is unsafe, that it is watched, that it may be detected, and is never secure against disclosure and public criticism. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been consumed on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York used 1 hour and 12 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts 53 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to undertake to reply to the very able speech that has been delivered by the minority leader on the Appropriations Committee [Mr. GILLETT] nor to address myself to the bill under consideration at this time. An incident that has been brought to my notice within the last few days in connection with the administration of the tax laws of the District of Columbia in the matter of assessment of taxes, relative to which a great deal has been said at one time and another by various people in the consideration of the District bill and District legislation, leads me to call the attention of the House, and incidentally those who are administering the laws of the District of Colum-

bia, to the situation that exists in connection with the levy and collection of taxes.

The contention has been made by certain gentlemen in this connection that the levy of taxes both as to assessment of real estate as well as of property that is covered under that assessment in the District of Columbia, is extremely favorable to the property owner here. On the other hand, there are those in the House, as elsewhere, who have contended with a good deal of vehemence that the property owner in the District of Columbia bears as great burden of taxation as does the average citizen of the States of the Union or other municipalities.

I am not at this time going to express an opinion as to whether or not the contention of those I have first mentioned is true or that of the latter. There is a feeling on the part of a great many Members of this House that there are certain classes of property owned in the District of Columbia that should be placed on the tax list which at present, under the law, are not. Under the present law there is an assessment levied upon the property of the District through an organization in the assessor's office, as far as real estate is concerned, of a valuation of not less than two-thirds and 1½ per cent on that valuation.

The law also provides for an assessment against tangible personal property, and the rate placed upon this is also 1½ per cent. However, the law under which this tax is levied has upon a little investigation upon my part revealed its weakness. Further than this, I am satisfied that those who are administering the law in the matter of placing an assessment, particularly on personal property in the District of Columbia, are not carrying out the law as it is written—certainly not in spirit.

Necessarily, in order to bring to the attention of the House the matter I have in mind, I am forced to be personal. So far as I remember, during my residence in the District of Columbia for 10 years I have never been asked to file an inventory with any official of the District of the personal property that I own. I find that a great many other gentlemen with whom I have conversed are in exactly the same condition.

The other morning, a few days ago, I received from the assessor's office of the District of Columbia a notice of a delinquency on my part for not having paid taxes on personal property. I presume other gentlemen may or may not have received a like notice. That notice read as follows:

Hon. ROBERT N. PAGE,
1827 Park Road.

SIR: You are hereby notified that the board of personal tax appraisers, under authority of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, as amended by the act of Congress approved April 28, 1904, has made an assessment of your personal property in the sum of $2,400, which includes a penalty of 20 per cent, upon which there is levied a tax of 1½ per cent upon said assessed value, a tax of $36—

And so forth.

I am entering no personal complaint about the amount of the assessment that I am called upon to pay, but I do feel that I have a grievance in that the first notice that I have received relative to my indebtedness to the District of Columbia upon my personal property carries with it a penalty of 20 per cent of the amount assessed.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. Did the gentleman inquire why he did not get the original notice?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am reaching that. My curiosity was aroused somewhat, and I immediately called up the assessor of the District of Columbia and asked him for an explanation as to why I was taxed with a penalty upon the very first notice I had had that there was anything due the District of Columbia from me for personal taxes. I said, "Have I filed with you any inventory of personal property?" He said, "Probably not." My next question was, "How did you arrive at the amount of the personal property, to wit, $2,400?" He answered, "Upon the best information we could obtain." I was still insistent and a little curious. I said, "How did you get the information, and from whom did you get it? You certainly did not inquire of me, nor did I give it." He hesitated to answer that question. I fired another at him, in which I wanted to know how they determined the amount of personal property of citizens in the District. I was not only amazed, but I was shocked, as many of you will be when I tell you his reply—"that his employees in the office walk the pavement in front of my dwelling and the dwellings of other people who live in the District of Columbia and guess at the amount of personal property it contains."

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. What would they do in the case of an apartment house?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I suppose he would go in and look at the number of letter boxes in the lobby and guess at the personal property of each one of the occupants. In explaining his method he mentioned 1620 Massachusetts Avenue. I do not know who lives there. He said:

My assessor or my employee from this office goes by on the sidewalk and views this house on the outside and makes an assessment on the personal property therein.

Mr. MONDELL. How does he know whether the house is abandoned or closed, and whether it is practically stripped of the furniture or full of the richest and finest furniture?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Necessarily he does not know, and the gentleman from Wyoming knows he could not know. I suggested to him that even the house at 1620 Massachusetts Avenue might contain nothing more than a dining table and two chairs, and yet from the outward appearance his employee might guess that it contained $10,000 worth of personal property.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not the inevitable result of the system that those who are underassessed say nothing and all that feel themselves aggrieved protest?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Of course, and that is the point I was coming to. Under any such system as is in vogue in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia on personal property the result must necessarily be that those who are overassessed complain and those who are underassessed pay the amount they are assessed without mentioning the fact that they have more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps I could obtain the information elsewhere, but the gentleman probably has it at his finger's end. Who appoints this tax assessor?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked a question I was coming to in a moment. This tax assessor is named by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and I wonder how many Members in this House are aware of the fact that he is named for life, upon good behavior, that there is a specific clause in the law, a provision that he can not be removed except for malfeasance in office, neglect of duty, or inefficiency. That applies not only to the assessor but to his assistants as well.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman say that the policy to which he has referred as the one in vogue indicates good official behavior on the part of the assessor? Does the gentleman know of any other place on earth where that sort of system would be tolerated for a moment?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, possibly I ought not to relate here a conversation that I had with the gentleman over the telephone, but this led me to ask this gentleman why he did not place in the hands of the owners of personal property in the District of Columbia a blank inventory upon which they might fill out under oath what they had and file it with him, so far as the personal property was concerned. I asked him if he knew of any other assessor anywhere on earth who did not undertake to place in the hands of the people whom they were taxing an opportunity at least to file an inventory of their taxable property. He freely admitted that he knew that the Treasury sent out such a notice. Whether he knows that every county in every State in this Union does the same I do not know; but the conversation went so far, I will say in answer further to the gentleman—and at that time I did not know that this man held his office for life; that he could not be removed except for cause—that I said to him that a man who had no more administrative ability and no more initiative had no business holding the office that he held.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is there no requirement in the statute that compels this man to serve notice on and have the taxpayers make a return?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Absolutely none to compel him to serve notice. That is a defect in the law. He is doing no more than he is compelled to do, whereas if the man had proper initiative and was really trying to carry out the law as it is written, not only in its letter but in its spirit, he would himself initiate methods, whether they were laid down in detail in the law or not, by which he could reach the property and see it was properly assessed and those taxes paid.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. In the gentleman's investigation did he discover whether there was any way by which a taxpayer could pay his taxes on personal property without this penalty?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not know that I asked exactly that question; but taking the case in point, if the gentleman will point out to me how I could have paid my taxes and have avoided this 20 per cent penalty, when this is the first intimation I ever had of what they had assessed against me—and I suppose I am treated as other property owners in the District are treated—I would be very glad to have him do so. I can conceive of no such way.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman that I received such a notice as he did, and I am glad that he investigated it. I thought of doing so, but neglected to do so. I do know that the tax collector does invite all of those who feel that they are overassessed to object, and ask for a reduction, by referring them to the blank space for a schedule on the back of the notice.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is done on this notice to me. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that this gentleman gave as an excuse to me for not doing certain things I suggested to him that he did not have the force; that his office was not equipped so that he could do these things. I want to put into the RECORD at this place the fact that for the office of the tax assessor of the District of Columbia in the current appropriation bill there is an appropriation for the purpose of assessing real and personal property in the District of Columbia of $63,740. Salaries are carried for 41 people. The tax assessor is paid a salary of $3,500, and he has three assistants, at salaries of $3,000 each. He has two other assistants, at salaries of $2,000 each. He has four people at $1,400; four people at $1,200; seven people at $1,000 each; two at $900 each; one at $1,200; one at $900; one at $1,200; two at $1,000; two at $600; one at $1,500; two at $720; one at $1,500; and a lump sum of $500 for clerk hire, amounting in all to $47,940 in salaries appropriated to this office for the purpose of assessing real estate in the District of Columbia. In addition to that, for personal property he has two assistant assessors at $3,000; one appraiser at $1,800; one clerk at $1,400; one clerk at $1,000; three inspectors at $1,200, and clerk hire to the amount of $2,000, making a total of $15,800 for the personal-property assessment, or $63,740 in all for the assessor's office.

I want to say, and other Members of this House can bear me out, that with an equal number of people to be assessed in many of the counties represented here by various gentlemen there are as many individual taxpayers as there are in the District of Columbia. In many counties there are practically as many individual taxpayers as there are here, because this gentleman told me yesterday that there are only 16,000 people who pay taxes on personal property in the District of Columbia. In my county the assessments are made upon the property of every property holder in the county, both real and personal, and the assessor receives $2,500 a year and has one clerk at $600 a year. The taxes are collected in that county by the sheriff. He is paid a salary of about $2,500 and has one deputy at less than $1,000. The property, real and personal, of every man in that county is placed upon the tax books, and the taxes are collected, at a cost of less than $6,000, whereas we are appropriating in this bill for the purpose merely of assessing the property in the District of Columbia $63,740, and providing for the employment of more than 40 people. And yet this man says to me that he has not the force necessary to send out notices and induce the taxpayers to file an inventory of their personal taxes. Now, the gentleman in this House who supposes that the method of taxation and the assessment of these taxes and their collection in the District of Columbia is ideal has another guess coming. I venture the assertion there is not another political jurisdiction in the world that is as faulty in its administration in this respect as is within the District of Columbia, nor is there another place where there are as many people subject under the law to assessment and levy of taxes who escape altogether any taxation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask the gentleman to use some time on his side.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Wyoming if he has charge of the time for Mr. GILLETT?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] asked me to yield 40 minutes to myself on his behalf.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, at the close of the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority Member, asked the gentleman from New York if in his opinion this bill could have been further reduced in the amounts carried in the various items without serious injury to the public service. I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts intended to be facetious or not. If that was his intent, his question was certainly a most excellent joke, for I want to bear testimony to the effect that when the careful and painstaking chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York, gets through with his trimming process on an appropriation bill in the face of a deficit in the Treasury, no one else need to undertake the job with a view to finding any fag or loose end which might properly have been eliminated. The gentleman from New York is the most scientific trimmer that I have ever had the pleasure of meeting.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not like that expression.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean a trimmer of appropriation bills. The gentleman from New York is never a trimmer in any other way. He is upright and downright and four square to all the winds that blow, but his fine hand in trimming an appropriation bill is a thing to admire if you are seeking economy. Yet I want to say for the gentleman from New York that a fairer man does not live, that with all of his efforts at economy, which are commendable in the state of the country's finances, that he has endeavored, and I think successfully, in the main, to make reasonable appropriations considering the circumstances and the condition of the Treasury for every governmental activity. Certainly, he has been painstaking and, I hope, successful in avoiding any cut which would actually seriously embarrass the officials of the Federal Government in carrying on the more urgent part of the Nation's business.

It is regrettable, when the Treasury of the country is in the condition in which we now find it, without regard to the causes which produce that condition, that necessitates refusing almost every request, no matter how reasonable, for enlargement and extension and betterment to the public service. It even leads to the refusal to appropriate for the reasonable upkeep of some classes of Government property. Under these conditions there is bound to be a parsimony which is not always economy in the long run; of course, there must be a denial of that growth and expansion and improvement of the public service which is desirable in a great and growing country like ours. Now, the minority has not the same sort of responsibility in regard to expenditures that the majority has; and yet the minority has a certain responsibility, and particularly the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations. While we can absolve ourselves from all responsibility for those things which we believe in the main brought about this deplorable condition of the Treasury, still we can not absolve ourselves from our responsibility as Representatives not to plunge the Nation toward bankruptcy or in the direction of bond issues for expenditures that are not absolutely essential. The unfortunate and somewhat embarrassing position which a Member of the minority finds himself in is when we come to consider just how far we may cut an item without disastrously affecting the service—just how much we can agree with the majority in leaving out items without depriving the Government service of those betterments and improvements and enlargements that are needed and in some cases almost essential. In view of the present lamentable condition of the Treasury, rapidly growing worse, heading in the direction of a bond issue, I for one am glad to join with the members of the committee, of which I am a member, in economy, so far as that can be done, without considerable and lasting injury to the public service; and therefore I shall support the committee in the main in this bill, although I regret the extent to which many items have been reduced. There are a few items in the bill which I believe ought to be increased, but in the main it is my purpose to stand by the committee in its work and in its decision; and I particularly commend the chairman of the committee for the splendid work he has done in connection with this bill, for the care he has given to the preparation of its items, and the absolute fairness at which he has arrived at in his judgments with regard to the various items.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I noticed the gentleman's chivalrous assumption of part of the responsibility for economy. Does the gentleman assume any of the responsibility for the necessity for this economy arising——

Mr. MONDELL. I think I said a moment ago I assume no responsibility at all for the legislation and the attempt at legislation and general bad administration which, in my opinion, is

almost wholly responsible for the present lamentable condition of the Treasury.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will realize, of course, in answering the question of the gentleman from Nebraska, that practically all the activities that are appropriated for in this bill are the inheritance of former administrations; that they are not created by the present Democratic administration, but that administration is taking care of the expenses contracted under a Republican administration to which the Government is obligated, and, of course, we must meet that obligation.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true, but nobody is complaining about that——

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. The complaint and the criticism is that the gentlemen of the opposition in inheriting these responsibilities did not have the wisdom and judgment to provide the funds for carrying on these important works and activities.

Mr. SLOAN. And it is observed that these activities are recognized as beneficent, wise, and prudent?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, always. While Republican legislation is anathema in its enactment so far as the opposition is concerned, it is always approved and upheld so far as its effects are concerned when it actually gets to work. Even as to those features of our legislation which they constantly continue to criticize as a matter of policy, such as our tariff views, they do not dare to criticize the results in splendid progress, development, and prosperity in the country and in keeping the Treasury constantly replenished to meet the necessary outgo in the interest and for the benefit of the people of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The Committee on Appropriations in this bill appropriates for the first time for the Reclamation Service, the service that has charge of the construction of works for the irrigation and reclamation of arid lands in Western States. There was some question of jurisdiction as between this committee and the Committee on Irrigation in regard to that matter, and I felt a little, although I am a member of this committee and not a member of the other, in that regard like the fellow who when quizzed on his deathbed as to where he hoped and expected to make his home in the future, said that he had conflicting emotions, because he felt that he would find friends in both places. So far as the interests of my State in reclamation matters are concerned, I am sure they would be properly considered and cared for whichever committee had charge of the matter, and therefore, except for the fact as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am very glad indeed to have to do with these matters, I am not much disposed to get excited on the proposition of jurisdiction. I do think that under the present rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations unquestionably has jurisdiction, and that the decision arrived at was a proper one.

Up to June 30 last there had been received from the receipts of public lands in the States and Territories where those receipts flow into the reclamation fund the sum of $81,813,772. A number of years ago, as the result of a bill I introduced, a bond issue of $20,000,000 was provided for to aid in carrying on these projects and in their development. From these two sources there was available up to June 30 last for the service $101,813,772. Of this sum $91,664,628.76 had been expended in the construction. There had been, however, repayments relating to construction in the sum of $5,206,018.61, leaving the net expenditure $86,458,610.12. Projects had been undertaken in all of the States subject to the reclamation law and under its provisions prior to the present fiscal year, with the exception of the State of Oklahoma, and this bill contains an item for a small project in that State. The total of estimates presented to the committee for the fiscal year 1916 was $14,776,000. The total recommended in this bill is $13,430,000, a reduction below the estimates of $1,346,000.

It is my purpose at this time to briefly discuss, particularly for the benefit of my friends from the States affected, the reasons as they appealed first to the subcommittee and then to the full committee for these various reductions. I shall not have time in the period allotted to me to discuss the projects generally. I shall not, unless I am requested to do so by some gentleman, refer to any of the projects except those where there has been a reduction below the estimates. The first reduction below the estimate submitted is in the case of the Yuma project, which is partly in Arizona and partly in California. Before I go to that item, however, I want to say this as to the desire and view of the committee in making these appropriations. It was the aim of the committee to provide the sums necessary for the maintenance and for the orderly development of all projects estimated for, except the one which is eliminated and to which I will refer later. Though Mr. Ryan, the comptroller of the service, under whose direction the estimates were made, stated to the committee that the estimates were liberal, no reductions were made except in those cases where it was clear to the committee beyond a reasonable doubt that the project could be developed according to the plan of the service and substantially as contemplated by them during the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made for a lesser sum than the service had asked.

Coming now to the first case—the Yuma-Arizona-California project—the estimate was $934,000.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. As I understand it, these estimates in regard to the construction were based upon the reports of the engineers as to what it would take to do a given amount of work?

Mr. MONDELL. The engineers in the field.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Yes, sir. Now, what I would like to know is how the committee arrived at the conclusion that these estimates were incorrect?

Mr. MONDELL. The committee did not exactly arrive at the conclusion that the estimates were incorrect. That is not a correct statement to make. If that were the view with regard to every reduction that is made in this and other appropriation bills, then we would have to hold that no branch of the public service submitted correct estimates, because here are thousands of reductions in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. The gentleman is correct about that. I would not contend any such thing as that, but I just wanted to know how the committee arrived at it, so that I can form an opinion of my own as to whether the committee or the Reclamation Service is correct.

Mr. MONDELL. This is a fact, that we know these estimates were made hurriedly. The service did not have very much time in which to prepare and present to the department the estimates on which this bill is based. In some instances, so they informed us, they telegraphed the district engineer to send in his estimate, and in some cases those estimates may have come in by wire. We are all of us more or less familiar with the public service, and we know that under those circumstances it is not at all likely that any project engineer would underestimate his necessities or underestimate the amount that he needs. Further than that, as I have said, Mr. Ryan, who prepared these estimates in the office of the Reclamation Service, assured the committee that the estimates were liberal, though they were in some cases, no doubt, below the estimates sent in from the field. Further than that, the hearings themselves developed the fact, both in specific cases and through the hearings as a whole, that the estimates were, as Mr. Ryan said, liberal. And yet the committee made no reduction except in those cases where we believed from the testimony, from the thirteenth annual report of the service, and from a very valuable volume which they prepared for our use, a volume of very great detail and of some 500 pages, under the title "Discussion of Projects," that the reductions were justified. We secured information from all these sources, and we only reduced where, in our opinion, it was quite clear and evident, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the development which the service contemplated, and to the extent that the service did contemplate it, could be provided and paid for for a lesser sum than the sum estimated. There is only one case in which we departed somewhat from that in our theory in regard to the reduction. That is in the case of the Sun River project in Montana, where the committee was of the opinion that certain work planned in the nature of storage on that project need not be developed as rapidly during the coming fiscal year as the service anticipated developing it, though the reduction we made would not necessarily halt that particular feature of the project if, in the opinion of the service, that feature of the project was more important than the distribution system for which provision was made.

Mr. BORLAND. I was going to ask the gentleman whether it was not a fact that the hearings developed in some cases that there were certain portions of new work estimated for that were not in immediate demand for practical purposes in connection with these projects and that they could very well wait for subsequent appropriations?

Mr. MONDELL. That was true; but the only case in which the committee made any considerable reduction on the theory that any particular work contemplated need not be carried on during the fiscal year was in the case of the Sun River and, to a certain extent, in the very project that I was proposing to

discuss, namely, the Yuma, where there is a class of work the necessity for which can be determined only by the conditions of the flow of the Colorado and the Gila Rivers as they develop.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, another question for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands: Did not the estimates of the engineers, so far as possible, tend to the completion of projects that were near enough to completion to cover their final completion to the point where they could be brought to a condition of utility to the settler? In other words, were not the estimates of the engineers based upon the theory of bringing each project that was already sufficiently near to completion up to the point of practical service?

Mr. MONDELL. That was true; and the committee made no attempt to halt the work along those lines and in that direction. Its reductions were made—if I may state it again—first and in most cases where it was so clear that there could not be any reasonable doubt that the work contemplated and proposed could be done for a lesser sum, and, in the case of the Sun River project, where it was believed that the development of the Sun River storage project as rapidly as was anticipated would not be necessary, and therefore not necessary to have so large a sum appropriated.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. That brings the gentleman up to the point of giving the information I desired a moment ago. I understand the amount appropriated for the Rio Grande and New Mexico project was about $100,000 less than the estimates.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; $104,000 less.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. What I wanted to get at was whether or not the committee, in reducing this appropriation, left out some particular unit of the work that the estimates provide for, or whether the general estimate as a whole was scaled down just so much?

Mr. MONDELL. If I have the time, I shall go over every project that was scaled in detail and give the reasons for the reductions in each particular project. Neither in the case of this particular project nor any, except the Sun River project, did the committee make any reduction on the theory that any of the work proposed by the service was to be curtailed or put over to a later date. In the case of the Rio Grande—and I will discuss that more in detail later if I may have the opportunity—estimates were made for 1916 for a considerable amount of work that is now being done, the major part, at least, of which will be done before the close of the fiscal year; so that, as a matter of fact, we were asked to appropriate money in 1916 for work that will be paid for before these moneys become available. That being true, this item reduced $104,000 still leaves the good, juicy sum of $1,265,000. We felt we could reduce it $104,000 without interfering at all with the orderly, progressive, satisfactory development of the work.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. The committee, then, has not cut out any of the work that was proposed to be done?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me remind my friend from Texas [Mr. SMITH] that his project was not reduced as much as the project in which I am, as a Representative, most interested. His project was not reduced one-third as much as one of the projects in Montana. I intend no reflection when I remind the gentleman in this connection of the fact that his great State, which I helped to bring under the reclamation tent, has never contributed one cent to this great fund of $81,000,000 from the sale of lands, while some of the States, like that of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT], have contributed $11,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. It is not my purpose in asking these questions to antagonize the Committee on Appropriations. I was asking the questions for information. But I want to say, in reply to what the gentleman from Wyoming has said, that the State of Texas in truth has not contributed anything to the reclamation fund, and neither has the State of Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. The State of Wyoming has not contributed?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. No, sir. The public lands of this country belong to the Government, and upon that basis none of the States has contributed anything, and it was upon that theory that the act extending the Reclamation Service to the State of Texas was passed.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I will say to the gentleman, as to that, that it was just out of very broad notions of good-fellowship on the part of the people in the arid States that we extended the helping hand to the State of Texas, and I was very glad to be one of those who helped. As for the gentleman's statement that the public lands belong to the people of all the States, if we applied that rule to Texas she would now be owing the country many millions of dollars for her public lands she disposed of. She has eaten her cake and has it also. I realize that the gentleman from Texas is not criticizing and has no desire to antagonize the committee; but I want to remind him that he certainly has no ground for criticism, first, because the reduction in his case is less than the reduction in quite a number of other cases, and that reduction will not, I will assure the gentleman, in any appreciable degree delay the development contemplated by the estimates.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] referred to new work. Are we to understand that new work is contemplated under these appropriations—new work on new units? I wish the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. MONDELL. I can not say that the committee laid down any hard and fast rule or adopted any particular policy with regard to any new projects. There is one small new project, very small, in the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman explain whether or not there are any new units, as distinguished from new projects, contemplated in the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. There are no new units, in the sense of units, not long since planned and proposed.

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to make myself clear on that. Are there new units, in the sense of units, on which money has not been expended heretofore in actual work on the ground?

Mr. MONDELL. There are several new units in the sense that the carriage ditches have not been built; but there are no new units in the sense that there are new areas taken up that already have not been obligated heavily under the projects. In all cases at least storage and diversion are under way or completed.

Taking up now in detail the projects where the estimates were reduced, I first desire to submit a statement of the various projects, the amounts estimated, and the amounts approved by the committee for each, with a statement of the reductions in each case in which reductions were made. It is as follows:

Projects.	Approved.	Estimate.
Salt River, Ariz.	$500,000	$500,000
Yuma, Ariz.-Cal.	725,000	934,000
Orland, Cal.	87,000	97,000
Grand Valley, Colo.	702,000	702,000
Uncompahgre, Colo.	469,000	469,000
Boise, Idaho	1,650,000	1,699,000
Minidoka, Idaho	410,000	410,000
Jackson Lake, Idaho-Wyo.	476,000	476,000
Garden City, Kans.	2,000	2,000
Huntley, Mont.	150,000	155,000
Milk River, Mont.	1,100,000	1,101,000
Sun River, Mont.	1,100,000	1,451,000
North Platte, Nebr.-Wyo.	1,140,000	1,248,000
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.	70,000	85,000
Truckee-Carson, Nev.	236,000	236,000
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	128,000	128,000
Hondo, N. Mex.	6,000	6,000
Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1,265,000	1,369,000
North Dakota, N. Dak.	25,000	25,000
Lawton, Okla.	50,000	50,000
Umatilla, Oreg.	366,000	366,000
Klamath, Oreg.-Cal.	317,000	317,000
Belle Fourche, S. Dak.	144,000	144,000
Strawberry, Utah	393,000	393,000
Okanogan, Wash.	51,000	51,000
Yakima, Wash.	1,250,000	1,283,000
Shoshone, Wyo.	478,000	478,000
Secondary projects	50,000	61,000
Total	13,430,000	14,776,000
REDUCTIONS UNDER ESTIMATES.		
Yuma	$209,000	
Orland	10,000	
Boise	49,000	
Huntley	5,000	
Milk River	1,000	
Sun River	351,000	
North Platte	108,000	
Lower Yellowstone	15,000	
Rio Grande	104,000	
Yakima	33,000	
Secondary projects	11,000	
Oregon (cooperative) omitted	450,000	
		1,346,000
Total recommended		13,430,000

For the information of gentlemen who may become confused because of the difference of the classification of projects as estimated and as reported, I want to call attention to the fact that in some cases the storage system and the carriage and distribution systems of projects were separately estimated. The committee were of the opinion that it was not logical or wise

to separate the storage of a project from its irrigated areas, and wherever this had been done the committee combined them. For instance, the Milk River project in Montana and the St. Mary storage project were combined as the Milk River project. The Rio Grande project and the Elephant Butte storage project were combined under the title "Rio Grande project." The Yakima storage project, the Yakima-Sunnyside project, and the Yakima-Tieton project were combined under the title "Yakima project."

The reductions below the estimates were as follows:

YUMA PROJECT, ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA.

Estimate	$934,000
Appropriation	725,000

This reduction of $209,000 was made because it was believed that the total estimate of $498,500 for drainage and flood protection would not all be needed during the fiscal year of 1916, if, in fact, so large a sum is needed for those purposes at any time. Of this $498,500 for drainage and flood protection, $137,000 is for drainage and $361,000 for levees along the Colorado and Gila Rivers and for rock revetment for the levees already built. Should the reduction in this item of $209,000 be considered exclusively as a reduction of the amount to be used for flood protection there still remains, after the reduction, $152,000 for this class of work. This work, however, is only necessary in case of unusually high water, and Director Davis, of the service, informed the committee (p. 62, hearings) that the revetment would not be placed or needed except in case of high water. Gen. Marshall, in the hearing before the committee in the matter of the protection of the Imperial Valley, called attention to the fact that the change in the bed and course of the Colorado River below Yuma had reduced the high-water level of that stream in the vicinity of Yuma in the neighborhood of 7 feet. It is quite possible, therefore, that the amount needed for flood protection on this project in the future will be much less than has been anticipated. The large estimate for this work was, to a considerable extent, an insurance against possible contingencies. In view of the fact that the entire sum provided for this project could be used, if necessary, for this class of work and that 10 per cent of all of these appropriations may, in case of necessity, be used interchangeably, the committee did not believe it was wise to provide so large a sum for purposes for which it may not be needed during the fiscal year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Do I understand, then, that the reduction of $209,000 below the estimates on this project is only for work in the nature of levee protection in that connection?

Mr. MONDELL. The reduction was made on the theory that they could not or would not use as much as they estimated in the coming fiscal year for levee protection. However, of course the gentleman knows the money is made available interchangeably for any feature of the work.

Mr. HAYDEN. But that was the reason for the reduction.

Mr. MONDELL. That was what we had in mind in the reduction in this case, that as a matter of fact a considerable portion of the estimate was largely in the nature of a very safe insurance. Assuming that the cut was entirely on that item, which is only so as a matter of theory, there still remains for that particular work $152,000, besides doing everything else that is contemplated.

ORLAND PROJECT, CALIFORNIA.

Estimate	$97,000
Submitted	87,000

One of the items in the detail of the estimate for this project was item 10—$10,000 for preliminary investigations for the Stoney Gorge project, or unit. The committee doubted the advisability of making so large an expenditure for this new and entirely independent project, for it is, as stated by Mr. Davis (bottom of p. 65, hearings), absolutely new and independent, and in any event the propriety of making such an expenditure out of an appropriation chargeable to the Orland project may well be questioned.

BOISE PROJECT, IDAHO.

Estimate	$1,699,000
Allowed	1,650,000
Reduction	49,000

Among the items in the detailed estimate of this project is item 4: Drainage and flood protection systems, $587,400 (p. 102, discussion and estimates). It is contemplated that $100,000 of this shall be used to complete the drains contemplated in the Pioneer irrigation district. This work is well along and will be largely completed before these sums are available. The remaining portion is largely for drainage in the Nampa-Meridian district, where work is not yet begun. The committee were of the opinion that even a larger reduction than that made could be made without in anywise interfering with the work contemplated on this project.

HUNTLEY PROJECT, MONTANA.

Estimate	$155,000
Allowed	150,000
Reduction	5,000

The largest single item of the estimate for this project is for "Drainage and flood protection," $103,797. This sum is estimated as sufficient for the construction of 54,500 linear feet of tile drains and the excavation of 70,000 cubic yards of material. The officers of the service stated, "There is not sufficient information at hand to furnish general plans and location of the work covered by the drainage estimates." The estimate for this drainage work was clearly very liberal, and in all probability considerably more than will be needed. It might have been safely reduced even more than the $5,000 reduction made by the committee.

MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA.

Reduction	$1,000

This makes the appropriation an even $1,100,000.

SUN RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA.

Estimate	$1,451,000
Allowed	1,100,000
Reduction	351,000

Among the items making up the total for the Sun River project is one of $629,325 for storage works. With this sum it was proposed to proceed rapidly with the development of the Warm Springs Reservoir on the north fork of the Sun River with a view of securing a storage capacity of 106,000 acre-feet as a supplemental supply for lands on the north side of the Sun River. In the hearings it developed that the orderly and reasonable development of this project did not necessarily require that as rapid progress be made in the development of the Warm Springs Reservoir as was contemplated when the estimate was prepared. There is some water available from the ordinary flow of Sun River during the entire season, and Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, stated that for a year or two, at least, and until all of the lands on the Fort Shaw unit were irrigated some water could be furnished from the Willow Creek Reservoir for the lands on the north side of the Sun River. At the rate at which it is anticipated the lands to be ultimately served by the Warm Springs Reservoir will be brought under cultivation, the two sources of supply named, to wit, the normal flow of Sun River and the available supply from Willow Creek Reservoir, will serve these lands for several years to come. In view of these facts the committee was of the opinion that the total estimate for this project might safely be cut $351,000. This will still leave a sufficient sum to carry on all other features of the work as contemplated by the service and still leave $278,325 for the development of the Warm Springs Reservoir. If, however, the service considered a larger sum necessary for this development, the necessary sums could be obtained by slightly reducing the amount proposed to be used on the carriage and distribution system. Under the conditions surrounding this project it is believed that the sum authorized by the committee is abundant for reasonable and proper development.

NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, NEBRASKA-WYOMING.

Estimate	$1,248,000
Appropriated	1,140,000
Reduction	108,000

One hundred thousand dollars of the reduction in this item is in the estimate for the carriage system of the Fort Laramie unit. It is believed that this is as large a sum as perhaps could be advantageously expended on the canals of that unit during the fiscal year. It was the opinion of the committee that the drainage and flood-protection item for the interstate unit might safely be cut $8,000.

LOWER YELLOWSTONE, MONTANA-NORTH DAKOTA.

Estimate	$85,000
Appropriated	70,000

The item "Drainage and flood protection, $37,110" for this project (discussion and estimates, p. 222) is believed to be larger than necessary, as only 100 acres of land are reported water-logged, and further water logging is more or less problematical.

RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NEW MEXICO-TEXAS.

Estimate	$1,369,000
Reduction	104,000
Appropriated	1,265,000

The work contemplated on this project under this appropriation includes the expenditure of $428,000 for storage at the Elephant Butte Dam, the remainder being for carriage and distribu-

tion systems. These are in the Mesilla and El Paso Valleys on the Rio Grande, the first being above, the second below El Paso, Tex. In the Mesilla Valley the extension of the present system, built by the Reclamation Service, is contemplated. Also the construction of an additional diversion dam and main canals. With regard to these features of the work, the following statement is made by the Reclamation Service (discussion and estimates, p. 304):

As these features are provided for in the estimate for the fiscal year 1915, and as there is a possibility of their being constructed in that period, a portion of the distribution system is planned to be built in the fiscal year 1916.

The detailed estimates contained items totaling $198,405 for work on the carriage system, which is already well under way and which will be largely disposed of before this appropriation is available. In view of these facts, and the further fact that the estimate is evidently quite liberal, and that all of the appropriation for this project and others is available, so far as needed, for any feature of the project, it is the opinion of the committee that a cut of $104,000 can be made in the estimate without in any wise interfering with the steady and reasonable development of the project as contemplated.

YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON.

Estimate	$1,283,000
Reduction	33,000
Appropriation	1,250,000

Seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars of the estimate for this project is for the storage unit. It developed in the hearings that the estimate for this feature of the work for the year was probably quite liberal. For the distribution system of the Sunnyside unit of the Yakima project the sum of $306,310 is estimated. It has been the policy on this unit to extend the distribution system, "as water-right application is made for lands to which delivery has not yet been built. On this basis it is believed the estimate for this work is quite liberal, as is also the estimate for the Outlook and Snipes Mountain pumping plants. Viewing all these matters together, it is believed that a larger reduction than that of $33,000 made by the committee might have been made without seriously interfering with the development of this project.

SECONDARY PROJECTS.

Estimate	$61,000
Appropriated	50,000

The committee is of the opinion that in the present state of the development of the projects already under way it is not necessary or wise to make very large expenditure in investigating new projects, and that the sum agreed upon is abundantly sufficient for this work.

OREGON COOPERATIVE PROJECT.

The estimate of $450,000 for proposed cooperation with the State of Oregon was the only estimate entirely omitted. The committee was asked to drop the cooperative feature of this proposal on the ground that the State of Oregon had already appropriated and spent on an irrigation enterprise the sum of $450,000, which it was originally intended should be used in cooperation with the Reclamation Service. The committee did not feel justified in approving this item, either with or without cooperation. To do so would amount to starting an entirely new project, and, what is even more objectionable, starting a project, or authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to do it, without any knowledge on the part of the committee of its size or character.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, in these days of war and rumors of war the public mind is not in condition to be focused on a business proposition, but there never was a time when opportunity was knocking so loudly at the doors of this Government.

The commerce and business of a continent are within our grasp if we are keen enough to realize it and to grasp them. I think I am well within the limits of accuracy when I state that the manufacturing enterprises in Central and South America are very, very limited. Indeed, they are very, very few, and it is to this matter that I wish the attention of the country could be directed.

It is my further opinion that few if any of the Republics to the south of us have any means of transporting or delivering their products to any other country. If that is true, then while the facilities of the United States are limited, yet it is not wholly without them, and it has some means of delivering its products. Under existing conditions all the trade of Central and South America flows across the Atlantic Ocean, when that trade ought to be flowing from North America to Central and South America.

The best means—in fact, about the only means—of creating commercial and business relations is by means of banking facilities, transportation, press bureau, and mercantile agencies. It is true that under the Federal reserve act a bank with $1,000,000 capital in the United States can establish a branch bank in any of these foreign countries in Central or South America. While I do not claim to be a financier, this provision, in my opinion, does not meet the conditions. What we need is a bank of sufficient proportions and magnitude and importance and prestige to handle the business of a continent. Furthermore, an Illinois bank will not do much business in Kentucky; an Iowa bank will not do much business in Indiana. There is a local touch to the proposition that must be met and dealt with.

We own the Panama Canal Zone. There is one strip of country in the region to the south of us that is going to be stable and steady as long as this Government endures. The government of the Canal Zone is going to be just as stable and steady as the Government of the United States. Now, if we establish a bank on the Canal Zone, what is the proposition right on its face? It gives it a birthmark, so to speak. It gives it a distinctive feature. It becomes identified with its locality. The stability and credit and prestige of our Government are behind this proposition. That guarantees confidence and makes it a sure go. These Governments to the south of us will be inspired with confidence in the institution.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. While the Panama Zone was under discussion the question was raised whether or not we might not put the zone to some commercial or agricultural use, and gentlemen on the other side said there could be no use of the zone for agriculture, and others insisted that the project was not commercial, but entirely military. I am one of those who believe we might make some commercial use of the zone, but that has been already apparently settled by the law now enacted for the government of the zone. How can we establish such a bank as the gentleman favors?

Mr. HELM. That is what I am coming to. This is no new proposition, and it is not without merit. If it came from some Member who enjoyed a reputation—for instance, a banker from the great city of Philadelphia or the city of New York, a Wall Street banker—the proposition would be, perhaps, received differently from what it will be.

As I say, this is no new proposition. Back in the eighties—in 1887 or 1889—such a proposition was contemplated, and President Harrison approved of it. Secretary of State Blaine strongly advocated just such a proposition as this. We have appropriated $100,000,000 or more for the Army. We appropriated about $150,000,000 for the Navy. Let us do a little business while we are doing so much fighting. The Governments in Europe have been selling bonds by the billions for war; let us do a little business while they are fighting.

England, France, and Germany have Central and South America absolutely in their grasp for trade, and there is no reason in the world why we should not go out right now and capture it. We can do it. Here are some Panama bonds, the sale of which has been provided for; let us sell a few millions of bonds and start a bank. Let us start with twenty-five millions; let us have a good one while we are going into it. Let the Government own the majority of the stock—thirteen millions—and let it be under the control of the Federal Reserve Board and under the inspection of the Comptroller of the Currency. Let the remainder of the stock be offered to the public, so that whosoever will may buy; and if any Republic to the south of us wants to get in, let them have an interest. We will have the controlling interest and we will elect the majority of the directors.

It can not issue notes to circulate as money, thereby eliminating any possibility of expansion or contraction. It could have no possible motive to hoard money; lending money is as essential to the life of every bank as breathing is to an individual. It could have no greater power of centralizing or controlling money or credit beyond its capital stock and deposits than any other bank of equal capital and deposits possesses. The Federal Government has fostered the banking business ever since the enactment of the national banking act.

These countries need help worse than any people on the globe. Every country on the globe to-day is needing help, and the emancipation of these countries from London, Paris, and Berlin credits must come from the United States. They are worse paralyzed financially than we are; they can not move a peg; they are now trying to get credit in New York.

Now, I want to remind you, you New Orleans gentlemen, of something. It looked to me like New Orleans ought to have had a Federal reserve bank. Let us have a branch bank of this institution at New Orleans, for New Orleans is like the cities

of Philadelphia and New York; they are seagoing people and are in touch with the business world.

What is more, we have a wireless station on the zone, and it is possible to talk right now from this building to Colon. We have a cable laid there; and if this canal is going to be what we think it is, or anywise near what we think it is, the commerce of the world is going through there. Ships from all over the world are going to pass through that great highway. Big business—stupendous business—has got to move through the canal, and we must have a big bank to handle the business. Ancon is as much in touch with the balance of the world as any other center of business. You can telegraph, cable, or send wireless messages from Ancon as quick as you can from New York City. Of course there are not so many ships now as there are at New York, but there is not going to be very much difference in the near future, in my opinion. There is going to be a ship ready to go through there every time there is an opportunity for one to get in and get out.

Now, the balance of trade has been against the United States with the southern Republics. Sterling exchange is the only exchange known to them. They do not know what a United States Treasury note is, so little do they know about or come in touch with our method of doing business that you have to identify it. We buy a cargo of hides or wool in the Argentine, and how do you make your settlement? You buy a London draft. What does that mean? You have to take United States gold and deposit it in London. That takes away good reserve money and gives London the use of our gold; that gives them the interest on it and enables London to be the clearing house of the world. New York, in the United States, has the opportunity to be the clearing house of the world if we will only act and act promptly, strike while the iron is hot, make hay while the sun shines.

We buy coffee from Brazil, and we sell a few things to Brazil, but the balance of the trade, not only with Brazil but almost every South American country, is against us. We send our money to London; it is sent by draft to Brazil, and they send the draft back again; there is about 90 days or longer consumed in the transaction, and we are out the use of that money for that length of time.

Even though that banking business is adverse to us, yet if we could handle that adverse balance of trade as a banking proposition it would be money in our pockets.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the banking facilities that Great Britain and Germany have in respect to their relations with South America?

Mr. HELM. I can not speak as one who is fully advised, but, generally speaking, I think it is true that every country in South America has an English, a German, and a French bank, one or more. They are thick there; in fact, about all the banking business done is done by those countries. I think I am absolutely correct when I say that there is but one United States bank south of Panama.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that the South American people have very little knowledge of American banking methods, and do have a great deal of knowledge and confidence in the banking methods of Great Britain and Germany?

Mr. HELM. I have just stated that they do not know a dollar when they see it. They do not know United States money when they see it. They do not recognize or honor a draft on New York. So little do they circulate there.

Before the outbreak of the European war our exports to Central and South America were decreasing, while our imports were increasing. This condition has been more marked since the outbreak of this war. Our exports in 1913 amounted to $323,775,885; in 1914 to $282,070,153; while our imports in 1913 amounted to $442,419,973, and in 1914, $469,082,667; showing a trade balance against us for 1913 of $118,644,088, and in 1914 of $187,012,514.

How to divert this flow of trade current in our direction is one of the problems of the immediate future and is a matter of much interest and concern to us.

A bill (H. R. 21160) to incorporate the Pan American Bank.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known and may be referred to as the "Pan American Bank act."

SEC. 2. That there shall be established a bank to be known as the Pan American Bank, which shall have its principal office at Ancon, in the Canal Zone, and may have branch offices elsewhere.

SEC. 3. That the United States Government, acting through the Federal Reserve Board, shall subscribe to the capital stock of the Pan American Bank hereafter organized under this act upon the terms and conditions herein mentioned.

SEC. 4. That the powers of the Pan American Bank shall be substantially those of a national bank, except as modified by this act, or in so far as the provisions regarding national banks may not be applicable to the bank organized under this act.

SEC. 5. That the capital stock of the bank hereby established shall be fixed at $25,000,000, divided into shares of the par value of $100 each.

SEC. 6. That the United States Government, through the Federal Reserve Board, shall subscribe for 130,000 shares of the capital stock of said bank at par, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the Federal Reserve Board, shall issue and sell any of the bonds of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relative to the issuance of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal; the remaining 120,000 shares of the capital stock of said bank shall be offered for public subscription.

SEC. 7. That the Pan American Bank may begin business as soon as $13,000,000 of said stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States Government, and shall have succession for a period of 20 years from its organization, with the right to extend its period of succession an equal number of years unless sooner dissolved according to the provisions of the national-bank act, or until its franchise becomes forfeited by some violation of law.

SEC. 8. That the board of directors shall consist of seven members, the majority of whom shall be appointed by the Federal Reserve Board; the minority directors shall be elected by the stockholders, except the United States Government shall not participate in their election. The board of directors shall appoint a president, vice president, cashier, and other officers, define their duties, and in its discretion require bond of them, dismiss such officers or any of them at pleasure, and appoint their successors to fill their places.

SEC. 9. That the Pan American Bank hereby incorporated shall not issue notes or obligations in any form to be used and circulated as money.

SEC. 10. That any moneys held in the general fund of the Treasury, except the 5 per cent fund for the redemption of outstanding national-bank notes and the funds provided for the redemption of Federal reserve notes, may, upon the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be deposited in the Pan American Bank, which bank, when required by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agent of the United States; and the revenues of the Government or any part thereof may be deposited in said bank and disbursement be made by checks drawn against such deposits.

SEC. 11. That the Pan American Bank may, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, purchase and sell in the open market, at home or abroad, either from or to domestic or foreign banks, firms, corporations, or individuals, cable transfers and bankers' acceptances and bills of exchange of the kinds and maturities by the Federal reserve bank act made eligible for rediscount, with or without indorsement.

It shall also have power—

(A) To deal in gold coin and gold and silver bullion at home or abroad, to make loans thereon, exchange Federal reserve notes for gold, gold coin, or gold certificates, and to contract for loans of gold coin or bullion, giving therefor, when necessary, acceptable security, including the hypothecation of bonds of the United States or foreign countries, or other securities which Federal reserve banks are authorized to hold;

(B) To buy and sell, at home or abroad, bonds and notes of the United States or foreign Governments, and bills, notes, revenue bonds, and warrants issued in anticipation of the collection of taxes or in anticipation of the receipts of assured revenues of any State, county, district, political subdivision, or municipality in the continental United States or foreign Governments, including irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts, such purchases to be made in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board;

(C) To establish from time to time, subject to review and determination of the Federal Reserve Board, rates of discount to be charged by the bank for each class of paper, which shall be fixed with a view of accommodating commerce and business;

(D) To establish accounts with banks for exchange purposes and to open and maintain banking accounts in foreign countries, appoint correspondents, and establish agencies in such countries wheresoever it may deem best for the purpose of purchasing, selling, and collecting bills of exchange, and to buy and sell, through such correspondents or agencies, bills of exchange arising out of actual commercial transactions.

SEC. 12. That loans may be made by the said bank, with the consent of the Federal Reserve Board, on real estate in any foreign country in which a branch bank has been established, to the extent of 25 per cent of the capital stock set aside for the business of said branch bank, or one-third of the time deposits held by said branch bank.

SEC. 13. That branches may be established, with the consent of the Federal Reserve Board, in the United States or in any of the countries of South and Central America, including Mexico and the West Indian Islands.

SEC. 14. That before the Pan American Bank establishes in foreign countries branches which may act as fiscal agents of the United States, the place or places where such branch is proposed to be established and the amount of capital set aside for the conduct of its foreign business shall be first approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, and said branch bank shall be required at all times to furnish information concerning the condition of such branches to the Comptroller of the Currency upon demand, and he may order special examinations of the said branches at such time or times as he may deem best. Every such branch shall conduct the accounts of each branch independently of the accounts of other branches established by it and of its home office, and shall at the end of each fiscal period transfer to its general ledger the profit or loss accruing at each branch as a separate item.

SEC. 15. That it shall be the duty of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board, and they shall have the authority, to examine the Pan American Bank and its branches in the manner provided by section 21 of the Federal reserve act.

SEC. 16. That the stockholders of the Pan American Bank shall be held responsible for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such bank, each to the amount of his stock therein, at the par value thereof, in addition to the amount invested in such stock. The stockholders in said bank who shall have transferred their shares or registered the transfer thereof within 60 days next before the date of the failure of such bank to meet its obligations, or with knowledge of such impending failure, shall be liable to the same extent as if they had made no such transfer, to the extent that the subsequent transferee fails to meet such liability; but this provision shall not be construed to affect in any way any recourse which such shareholders might otherwise have against those in whose names such shares are registered at the time of such failure.

SEC. 17. That any person committing any offense under this act, the Federal reserve act, or any other act relating to the powers and duties of banks or bank officers, where the acts constituting such offense were committed wholly or in part outside of the jurisdiction of the United States, may be prosecuted and tried in the district in which he may at any time be apprehended, and the time after the commission of the offense during which he was outside of the jurisdiction of the United States shall not be included in computing the running of any statute of limitation of prosecutions or actions.

SEC. 18. That the Pan American Bank may go into liquidation in the manner prescribed by law for the liquidation of national banking associations, in so far as the provisions relating to liquidation thereof may be applicable to the bank incorporated under this act.

SEC. 19. That if for any violation of law its franchise should be subject to forfeiture, the proceedings thereunder shall be the same as in case of forfeiture of the franchise of any national banking association.

SEC. 20. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or any part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or any part of this act thereof directly affected by the controversy in which judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 21. That the right to annul, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill has been drawn with a view of attracting business and of doing business. Complete control and ample visitorial powers are vested in the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency. The vast credit of the United States is behind the institution to inspire confidence, stability, and prestige, and would be an inducement to the Governments of Central and South America and the West Indian islands to promptly sanction the establishment of the branch banks provided for in the bill and to become stockholders in the institution.

It reports to Congress and is at all times subject to examination.

The principal place of business is Ancon, on the Canal Zone, which stamps it as the distinctive feature of the bank to meet the Republics to the south of us halfway. It is the outgrowth of the South American financial situation resulting from the European war. It is a movement for the Western Hemisphere to get together and stand together. The canal promises to be the converging point of all over-sea ships as well as those plying between North and South America, and is equipped with ocean cable and wireless stations, all of which put it in as close touch with the world as any other business center on the globe. The canal will be a lodestone for business of the greatest volume and magnitude and is a logical location for the bank, with a branch at New Orleans or New York.

The commercial tie-up resulting from the European war convinced everyone that foreign trade is a vital element in our domestic prosperity and that the continents of North and South America have a greater identity of interest than was ever realized before; the countries of these continents had been made to feel the importance of increasing the commercial intercourse between them which has been retarded by lack of adequate banking facilities and means of exchange.

Trade revival for the southern Republics must emanate from the United States.

The United States must convert more of its raw material into manufactured articles and go after the trade now dominated by Europe. All trade balances are made through London, hence the balance of credit is greatly against us. We are compelled to keep large gold balances in London to meet these difficulties. This not only takes gold out of the United States, but loses us interest, credit balances, and reserves. New York bills on South American banks have been penalized by almost prohibitive cost on London exchange.

The foreign bonded debt of South American Republics is about $1,632,488,580; the bulk of this is financed in London. The preponderating influence of the holder of a mortgage lien is fully understood by bankers. The banking business of South America is conducted by British institutions. This has made sterling instead of dollars credits of the South American trade. Exports and imports are shipped direct. Payments for both are made almost exclusively in sterling bills of exchange.

The bill supplies the new credit machinery for establishing a merchants' "cooperative exchange," or clearing house, for South American trade by matching credits, supplies the means of bringing together the North and South American exporters and importers, standardizes credits, affords a means of reaching an agreement as to rates of exchange between South American currency and United States dollars, furnishes the indispensable information as to seasonal variations of shipments, customs duties, means and rates of transportation, pilotage and harbor charges, fulfilling the function of a much-needed bureau of information, indispensable to the acquisition of a business footing and standing.

Recent attempts to establish direct exchange by branch banks authorized in the Federal reserve act have not been successful, because the credits available have been wholly inadequate.

Our consular agents for Central and South America should be selected from Porto Rico whenever it is possible to do so; furthermore, those Porto Ricans who are familiar with our business methods would be the most efficient representatives of North American firms doing business in those countries because of their knowledge of the languages and customs of the people with whom we are seeking to establish intimate commercial relations.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF LATIN-AMERICAN TRADE COMMITTEE.

[Appointed by the Hon. W. C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, pursuant to resolution of the informal Latin-American trade conference at Washington, Sept. 10, 1914.]

Industrial, commercial, and financial conditions throughout the world have been disorganized by the European war. The trade of the United States with Latin America has been seriously affected. The present period of confusion will, however, be succeeded by one of readjustment and reorganization. Your committee was appointed to investigate this situation, and to suggest measures to relieve the emergency and to place the trade of the United States with the sister Republics on a permanently satisfactory and mutually profitable basis.

The products of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Peru, exported to the United States differ each from the other, and are dissimilar in turn from those which we in this country import from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela, from the Central American States, and Panama, from Mexico and from Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti. These products, for the purposes of this analysis, may be considered together as raw materials, just as the goods which we export to these countries may be classified as manufactures. Mutual advantage for both the United States of America and the other Republics lies in a wider interchange.

In a properly comprehensive report the trade of the United States with each of the Latin-American Republics should be separately considered. We realize that in each case the problem is different and demands an individual solution. In general, however, this trade rests solely on exchange of commodities; that it has, in its essentials, been barter, with a settlement of balances through London, and has not been built up by extensive investment of foreign capital, as has been the case with British and German trade.

The accompanying report deals with certain underlying principles applicable to our Latin-American trade as a whole. We feel that recognition of basic facts affords the only proper basis for meeting problems which, while they differ in the several countries, are nevertheless fundamentally the same.

Your committee feels that articles recently appearing in the press regarding commercial opportunities in Central and South America have unduly emphasized the promising aspects thereof, and have, in most instances, failed to state that our exporters already doing business with these regions find that their sales have been decreased rather than increased owing to the war.

Your committee recognizes the present time as one when competition is less effective than in the past and than it will be in the future, until European bankers, merchants, and manufacturers recover from the effects of the war.

Your committee, moreover, believes that an opportunity is now afforded to place the trade of the United States with other American nations upon a firm foundation, supporting a more comprehensive structure, which may be built as the situation again more nearly approaches normal.

Your committee feels, however, that there is great danger that our merchants and manufacturers unfamiliar with Latin-American conditions may be induced by recent publicity to undertake ventures in that field which not only will be unremunerative, but actually disastrous, and, in their ultimate result, make for a reaction of the very healthy and much to be desired interest in foreign trade now manifest throughout the United States, an interest which if properly directed should be of great permanent value.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE CONDITIONS.

The trade of the principal South American countries with England, Germany, and the United States is shown by the following table:

Imports and exports to the South American countries from and to England, Germany, and the United States for the years specified.

[Compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, from official reports of the respective countries.]

Countries.	Year.	England.		Germany.		United States.	
		Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
Argentina	1913	$126,305,556	$116,154,937	$68,815,721	$55,888,788	$59,861,703	$22,096,385
Brazil	1912	77,509,079	43,006,473	52,945,352	51,856,965	48,043,322	141,720,216
Chile	1912	38,599,282	55,340,706	33,189,670	28,321,776	16,806,341	24,526,811
Peru	1913	7,779,616	16,561,235	5,138,902	2,970,857	8,541,934	14,761,355
Ecuador	1911	[1] 2,835,854	986,148	2,385,758	2,139,532	2,591,629	3,190,069
Uruguay	1912	[1] 12,575,508	6,508,127	[1] 7,849,094	7,860,272	[1] 5,638,402	2,655,371
Paraguay	1912	[2] 1,295,248	[3] 799	[2] 1,500,958	[2] 843,459	[2] 304,888	[2] 590
Colombia	1912	[2] 7,838,878	[2] 4,376,182	[2] 4,201,125	[2] 1,854,211	[2] 7,612,037	[2] 15,832,882
Venezuela	1913	3,994,733	767,031	2,586,986	5,563,768	6,944,136	8,470,563
Bolivia	1912	3,528,042	26,044,974	6,423,892	4,357,101	1,787,321	152,583

[1] Figures are for 1911 and are taken from the Almanach de Gotha.
[2] Figures taken from U. S. Daily Consular and Trade Reports.
[3] Figures are for 1911 and are taken from Pan American Union publication.

The above figures show that exports from Great Britain and Germany to South America considerably exceed imports from that region.

This balance in favor of Europe may, in a measure, be explained by the fact that proceeds of loans issued by the South American Governments in Europe are remitted, not in cash, but in goods.

AMERICAN EXPORTS CONCENTRATED.

Our export trade to South American countries particularly, and to a lesser degree the Central American States, is concentrated. It is estimated that 75 per cent of our principal exports to South America are the products of large organizations. Our principal exports to the River Plate may be roughly stated to consist of agricultural machinery and allied products, steel products, oil products—kerosene, gasoline, etc.—and printing paper of various kinds. Our exports to Brazil, Chile, and Peru are largely limited to steel and oil products, locomotives, and electrical machinery. Our trade in cotton cloths, shoes, stockings, wearing apparel, and miscellaneous goods has not made up an important part of the total because of our unwillingness or inability to meet British and German competition.

Even before the war our export trade to all Latin America, and notably South America, had begun to decrease on account of the prevailing financial stringency. Our imports, however, increased in value, and the trade balance adverse to the United States for the fiscal year 1913–14 greatly exceeded that of 1912–13 both for all Latin America and for South America alone.

The accompanying table shows the distribution of this trade:

	Exports.		Imports.	
	1913	1914	1913	1914
Central America, West Indian Republics, and Mexico	$177,627,892	$157,530,244	$224,685,344	$246,405,592
South America	146,147,993	124,539,909	217,734,629	222,677,075
Total	323,775,885	282,070,153	442,419,973	469,082,667

Trade balance adverse to the United States.

	1913	1914
In trade with Central America, West Indian Republics, and Mexico	$47,057,452	$88,875,348
In trade with South America	71,586,636	98,137,166
In trade with all Latin America	118,644,088	187,012,514

EFFECT OF THE WAR ON SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES.

Since August 1 of this year the countries in South America whose currency is not already on a gold basis have experienced a serious depreciation of their paper money.

The export of copper, tin, nitrates, coffee, and other products has been curtailed because of loss of the normal European markets. As indicative of financial conditions, bank holidays and moratoria were declared at the outbreak of hostilities, which were extended in certain countries from 60 to 90 days. The effect has been damaging to American exporters, as, under such circumstances, drafts due in August will not be liquidated until November or December. This means a large accumulation of draft indebtedness never contemplated by the shipper. Specie payments were suspended.

Collections throughout South America, therefore, are difficult, orders are falling off, and after our exporters have completed their contracts for this year there seems less prospect for new business, unless steps are taken to relieve the situation.

DIFFICULTIES OF SETTLEMENTS FOR SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

Since the balance of our trade with South America is heavily against the United States, there should be exchange facilities which would enable our exporters to obtain payment from balances created in New York in settlement for goods imported into this country from South America.

Such balances, however, are not maintained in this country.

The external debt of the South American Republics (Federal, State, and municipal) amounts, approximately, to $1,632,488,580. The bulk of those funds were borrowed from Great Britain. South America therefore invariably has payments to make in London.

The greater part of South American banking business, moreover, is conducted by British-owned institutions. These facts, together with the facilities offered by the London discount market, have induced German and other European-owned banks trading in South America to maintain London agencies. Sterling credits, therefore, have been the basis of South American trade.

Our exports to and imports from Latin America are shipped direct. They are, however (almost exclusively in South American trade and largely in Central American trade), paid for in sterling bills of exchange.

United States exporters have in the past converted their dollars into sterling at the rate of the day, drawing against their South American customers at 90 days' sight, payable in 90 days' bills on London. Importers have accepted 90 days' sterling bills, which they have liquidated at the current rate of exchange. This has necessitated the conversion of dollars into sterling in the United States and a reconversion in South America from sterling into the currency of the buying country.

Thus, although the balance of the South American trade of the United States has been increasingly heavy against this country, we do not make settlement direct. We have been obliged, either by the shipment of gold or goods, to settle this adverse balance by remitting to England either gold or goods to meet interest charges on the South American debt and to pay for goods purchased in Europe by the South American countries.

Recent attempts to establish direct exchange with South America have not been successful in relieving the trade congestion incident to the dislocation of London exchange. A few New York banking institutions have been ready to extend accommodation to American exporters, but the credits available have been wholly inadequate. This fact, together with the difficulty of making collections in South America, has seriously embarrassed our exporters, while our importers, finding it practically impossible to dispose of New York bills to bankers in South America, have been penalized by the almost prohibitive cost of London credits.

PRESENT PROBLEMS.

(1) Because of the war the Latin-American countries are confronted by the necessity—

(a) Of marketing their products despite the shrinkage of world purchasing power.

(b) Of obtaining funds to move crops and to continue indispensable industrial and agricultural development normally financed by Europe.

(2) The United States is confronted—

(a) By the necessity of holding its normal export trade with Latin America.

(b) By the possibility of increasing that trade by filling Latin-American needs for merchandise hitherto purchased in Europe, which Europe can not now supply.

The solution of these problems depends upon—

(1) Production.

(2) Transportation—Shipping and insurance.

(3) Financing: (a) Of production, (b) of transportation, (c) of settlements.

Production in the United States can be maintained if there be a sufficient market at home and abroad for American goods. Production in South America may continue, but can not be further developed unless financial assistance be obtained.

At the present time steamships are available and sailing regularly from this country to the principal ports of Latin America and from those ports to the United States. Many of these vessels are unable to obtain full cargoes. Although only a limited number are under the United States flag the above will clearly indicate to exporters, importers, and manufacturers that they need not hold back from entering the field on this account.

Before trade can resume its normal course the exchange problem must be solved either by the restoration of old or by establishment of new credit facilities.

NEW CREDIT MACHINERY NEEDED.

Old methods may no longer be serviceable in the situation which will result from the readjustment following the war. It should now be possible, indeed, in the mutual interest of the Latin-American Republics and ourselves, to create new credit machinery to perform the functions of the old, and which will at the same time rid us at least partially of a dependence upon the London credits and European financial markets, which, though essential in the past, has proved to be seriously embarrassing.

Deprived of the European loans with which their resources were being developed, Latin-American countries are now undergoing a serious curtailment of industry and development. The consequences in many instances will be serious, not only to these countries themselves, but also to the countries which expected to supply the materials.

It has been increasingly the practice of European bankers to stipulate the use of European material in the projects which they financed. Latin America is now turning to the United States for funds. This country is hardly in a position to undertake considerable investments at the present time, but industries with an already considerable trade at stake may well consider the necessity of protecting that trade by obtaining for their customers some relief from the present stringency. Such investments, if judiciously made, would yield an ultimate fair return and meanwhile provide a market for American materials which can not now be sold.

The question of creating a market for Latin-American securities in the United States, therefore, is highly important. The development of our trade with those countries is largely dependent on its satisfactory solution.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL CREDITS MOST IMPORTANT.

Unless the restriction of commercial credits be remedied, however, we will not only be unable to extend our trade, but we will lose a considerable portion of that which we already have.

The present effort to secure cooperation of American bankers in massing a gold fund to satisfy our obligations abroad by promising to cause London exchange again to approach normal will lessen to the American importer the expense of liquidating in London his South American indebtedness. It will nevertheless give effect to the old alienation of the selling power we should derive from purchases of South American products. Liquidation of our South American indebtedness in London will pay for British exports to Latin America at a time when American merchandise, intimidated by moratoria, remains congested on our docks. Our available money will serve Great Britain's effort to capture South American markets vacated perforce by Germany.

Whenever there is a great disturbance of the world's finances American exporters and importers in South American trade are injured because of the dependence on London. This has happened four times in 25 years.

So long as South America must meet interest settlements in London by shipment of goods to the United States, under the old three-cornered system our South American trade must to a certain degree depend upon London exchange.

But in view of the facts above mentioned it has seemed to your committee that the need for independence, emphasized by the present situation, should be recognized. We feel that an attempt should now be made to evolve some plan whereby we might take advantage of our large direct trade with Latin America to make a market for bills drawn in dollars and establish a direct exchange, not with the view to eliminating sterling credits now or later, but in order to provide an exchange channel which will supplement, offset, or compete with London and be available in an emergency when London exchange is disorganized.

The maintenance of exchange relations depends on a credit machinery and reciprocal balances. This machinery will partially be provided under the Federal reserve act, which permits American banks to open branches abroad and permits a rediscount in this country of commercial paper, based on shipments of commodities in foreign trade. These steps, however, have not yet been effected, and your committee, appreciating that the installation of this machinery may require considerable time, has considered means for temporary relief.

COOPERATIVE EXCHANGE AS EMERGENCY MEASURE.

A plan for the establishment of a merchants' "cooperative exchange" or clearing house for Latin-American trade has been proposed. This, it has been suggested, would enable importers and exporters of goods to and from Latin America to watch credits, balances to be remitted on certain definite settling dates. The chief argument for such an institution is that it would bring together exporters and importers, among whom there is now no cohesion. Both know their cash requirements each month. If the exporters require, say, $5,000,000 to pay for their

October shipments to Brazil and the importers a like amount to pay for their imports from Brazil, such an exchange might be able easily to liquidate transactions in New York.

The plan, however, is open to serious objection for the following reasons:

(1) The necessity and difficulty of securing the cooperation of a sufficient number of importers and exporters.

(2) The necessity and difficulty of standardizing credits.

(3) The difficulty of reaching an agreement as to the rate of exchange between South American currency and United States dollars.

(4) The difficulty due to the seasonal variations of shipments of South American produce and the consequent fluctuation in the demand for balances in New York or South America.

(5) The disorganized financial situation in South America, which increases the risk in securing settlements in the South American Republics.

(6) The necessity of creating and maintaining an expert and, therefore, expensive organization.

The difficulty as regards South America, however, would still remain, for it would be impossible within any reasonable time to organize in the principal cities of South America sufficiently extensive cooperative associations of importers and exporters of American products.

Standardization of South American credits, therefore, could only be secured by the guaranty of American shippers or importers, or by the guaranty of the South American Governments themselves.

Your committee, therefore, after careful consideration, feels that the suggested "cooperative exchange" would not be practical, although a powerful banking group or large banking institution willing to assist in maintaining and developing our Latin-American trade might be able to secure and render mutually beneficial the organized cooperation of exporters and importers in matching credits.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

Your committee, however, believes that the extension of credits might be facilitated and some relief afforded pending the establishment of the Federal reserve banks if, in addition to permitting national banks which have signified their intention to enter the reserve associations to accept commercial paper, action to be taken by the Federal Reserve Board to make immediately effective the rediscount provision of the new banking system, thus assuring early establishment of a discount market.

Your committee, while appreciating the necessity of conserving the banking resources of this country for the protection of our domestic situation, nevertheless believes that the cessation or curtailment of our trade with Latin America will in itself be highly injurious to American industry, just as we believe that the extension of this trade would make for the prosperity of the country at large, as well as of those directly interested. We therefore hope that American banking institutions may be induced to meet the present emergency, not by tentative and inadequate measures, but by extending accommodation sufficient at least to assure the maintenance of our already established trade.

EXTENSION OF TRADE.

The question of extending American commerce with Latin America depends primarily, as does the problem of maintaining our trade, upon the establishment of commercial credits, upon our ability to finance Latin-American enterprise, purchase the products of its soil and industries, and upon the perfection of our selling machinery.

Your committee has not attempted to formulate suggestions as to the manner in which the individual manufacturer should proceed to establish a market for his products in South America. Nor does it here dwell upon the importance of adaptation of the product to the needs of the market or proper packing. Too high praise can not be given the Government, particularly the Department of Commerce under the Hon. W. C. Redfield, for its effective propaganda on these essential points and for its efforts adequately to assist extension of our foreign trade.

The enlightened services of the Pan American Union in safeguarding good understanding among the Republics of the Western Hemisphere and in making its information and advice available to all affected by the commercial problems arising at this juncture are worthy of the warmest commendation.

CAUTION NOW ADVISABLE.

Your committee feels, however, that merchants and manufacturers now contemplating an entry into the Latin-American field should be careful to avail themselves of the easily accessible information concerning these markets. It is suggested that they should at the outset remember that the cost of maintaining individual representatives would probably be too great for any one of them to bear themselves. It is therefore suggested that associations consisting of the smaller firms or corporations engaged in kindred lines of production might be formed, and that either one or more representatives should be sent to South America to look after the interests of such associations, thereby bringing the cost of representation within a reasonable limit.

It has been suggested that American manufacturers should combine to send to South America trade exhibits showing the various articles which they have for sale. Your committee, however, is not inclined to feel that such measures would be productive of any permanent results. It is suggested instead that manufacturers and dealers desiring to place their products in Latin America, and who, for any reason, prefer not to send their own representatives there, could establish connections with export houses already doing business in those countries and maintaining large branch offices in the principal South American cities fully equipped with efficient sales organizations or who have established connections, and in certain lines of goods—foodstuffs, notions, and miscellaneous articles—join in establishing what might be called, for want of a better name, an "American store" in certain of the most important cities.

Ventures of this sort, however, require considerable capital and experienced men, and for the sake of the ultimate development of mutually beneficial commercial relations with Latin America it is believed that our merchants and manufacturers should not attempt to install their own establishments in Latin America unless they are prepared to meet initial losses and disappointments before realizing even moderate profits in what must necessarily be a developing rather than a ready-made business.

Your committee begs, therefore, to summarize the results of the investigations and to state its belief that the present disorganization of the trade of the United States with Latin America may best be remedied and placed on a permanently satisfactory basis as follows:

1. The establishment of a dollar exchange.

(a) By the ultimate creation of a discount market.

(b) Pending the establishment of a discount market, by the extension of adequate accommodations by banking institutions, and the establishment of reciprocal balances in the United States and in Latin America for financing Latin-American trade.

2. Perfection of our selling machinery.

(a) By furnishing additional support to commission houses already familiar with Latin-American business.

(b) By forming asssociations of merchants and manufacturers to be jointly represented in Latin America.

(c) By obtaining information as to the possibilities of developing retail stores in large Latin-American cities.

THE WORLD RACE FOR THE RICH SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

A COMPETITION FOR COMMERCIAL SUPREMACY IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS PITTED AGAINST GERMANY, GREAT BRITAIN, AND ITALY, AND IN WHICH WE ARE HANDICAPPED BY LACK OF BANKING FACILITIES, BY MEAGER SOURCES OF CORRECT NEWS, BY INADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF CONDITIONS, AND BY MISDIRECTED TRAINING OF OUR TRADE REPRESENTATIVES—THE NEED OF YOUNG MEN TO GET THE BUSINESS FOR US—A SURVEY OF THE EFFECTS OF THE PANAMA CANAL UPON SOUTH AMERICA, AND A STATEMENT OF OUR UNPREPAREDNESS FOR A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY.

[By Charles Lyon Chandler, of the American Consular Service.]

There are many barriers against American trade expansion in South America and many handicaps which American investors to-day have to overcome. But perhaps the most important are these: We need in South America American banks, American young men, a better-informed press, and our investors there need better labor; that is, cheap, dependable labor.

There is not an American bank south of Panama. Here are two examples of what this means to American business:

Shortly after I had taken up my residence in Buenos Aires I went with a friend, a representative of one of the United States Government executive departments, to the cashier's window of a foreign bank in South America to have a Treasury draft cashed. The draft was literally thrown back in my friend's face. It took him three days to secure the money on that draft. Think of it! Uncle Sam's check so strange a thing in South America that a bank would not take it.

But that is simply the picturesque side.

I knew a young American, Herbert Leonard, who had come to Callao while I was connected with the consulate to represent an American tin-roofing manufacturer. There was a wealthy rancher at Callao, Elogio Castro, who owned a ranch about the size of the State of Delaware. The order for the tin roofing for all the sheds and shacks on that ranch was a choice morsel, and Leonard spent many days cultivating the acquaintance of the wealthy don.

Finally, in the midst of a two hours' conversation one day, the rancher let fall a dozen words which made Leonard certain that he had not spent his time in vain, and that the order was his. To make a tedious Spanish sale short in words, Leonard quoted prices for the roofing and waited for Don Elogio to send in his order. After several days of delay there came, not the order, but a courteous note, stating that Señor Castro regretted that he could not place his order with the Señor Leonard, as he most assuredly desired to do, because the Señor Leonard had quoted him prices considerably higher than those which he had quoted to several other purchasers in Callao and Lima. Señor Castro ended his letter with a list of the names of those other purchasers.

Of course, Leonard sold his goods, as do all salesmen, on a sliding scale of prices. His quotations necessarily varied according to the size of the order and the grade of material. To dealers he quoted discounts. Then, too, he had a certain margin to meet competition. His price to Don Elogio was fair if viewed in this light, but the don cared nothing for the reasons why Leonard should charge him one price and some other buyer another.

Leonard dropped in at the consulate that afternoon and showed me the letter. "It gets me," he said. "I know that he might have got one of my customers to tell him my price, or, maybe, two of them. But how he got the whole list is more than I can figure out."

He and I studied the matter for weeks. Finally we located the leak. The bank that Leonard dealt with copied every invoice, every scrap of paper, that related to his business. Don Elogio and half the other prominent men in the town were directors of the bank; consequently all of Leonard's invoices were at their disposal, and his business became public property. Moreover, there was no way for him to escape the trap, much less to retaliate. The whole banking business of the city—and the same would have been true of any South American city—was absolutely controlled by interests opposed to his own. He must either place himself in the hands of his purchasers or else in the hands of his trade rivals, for those banks that were not controlled by South Americans were in the hands of citizens of European countries competing directly with Americans.

Why, then, you may ask, have we no banks in South America? Mr. Samuel McRoberts, vice president of the National City Bank, of New York, says that all that is needed to cause American bankers to establish branches in foreign lands is for Congress to amend the law to permit American national banks to operate them. Recently the National City Co. sent Mr. William Morgan Shuster, formerly treasurer general of Persia, and two associates to South America to study the South American field with a view to the betterment of American banking connections there. Since the National City Co. operates in a wider field than a national bank, it may find a way to overcome the handicap placed against American bankers in foreign countries by our antiquated banking laws. But there will still be the imperative need for an amendment of our banking laws by Congress, so that all our banks may be free to enter this new field.

It is currently reported in South America that one chain of banking organizations sends copies of every invoice in its hands—and a good many of these invoices are from American customers—to the head office of the bank in one of the European capitals for the information generally of exporters in that country. That country is one of America's largest competitors in the world's market. Surely, any American exporter can realize what an advantage it would be to him if he knew every price quoted by every French, English, German, and Italian firm to every South American buyer. This practice can hardly be condemned if we Yankees refuse to do our own banking.

Another phase of the situation is this: The more heavily we finance our foreign commerce with our own capital the sooner we become a creditor nation. The development of new countries is dependent upon creditor nations to finance their growth—to build railroads, canals, and wagon roads, to found factories and other industrial institutions, and, above all, to take up the issues of national and local bonds. There is no part of the world of which it would be more advantageous for us to become a creditor nation than Latin America. If we do this, we will be an integral part of the growth of those countries, and, controlling the financial supplies furnished, we will secure a prior lien, as it were, on its future prosperity and on its busi-

ness generally. This is the chief argument in favor of that promotion of big business in South America which the State Department has recently taken up under the "dollar diplomacy."

The big business, the loans we are floating, and the railroads we are building in South America to-day are substantial bowlders which will hold open against the attacks of our trade rivals the door of commercial opportunity in South America for the small exporter. But England, France, Germany, and even Holland have so far anticipated us in this respect as to make it problematical to many at first sight whether an American banking institution there would stand the strain of competition with those which have been for 50 years established in the field. This doubt, however, is quickly dissipated when the volume of our commerce in South America is considered. We have the commerce, and that is the essential warrant for the existence of a bank. In one decade, from 1901 to 1911, our exports to South America increased 288 per cent. In that period the total trade of South America increased somewhat more than 150 per cent. To-day the Argentine Republic stands ninth among our customers; in 1900 she was fourteenth. Brazil stands thirteenth; 10 years ago she was sixteenth.

The bulk of our investments in South America also indicates the possible success of an American bank in this field. We have $30,000,000 in mines and other properties in Peru; $20,000,000 in packing plants in Argentina; $15,000,000 in packing plants and railroads in Uruguay; to say nothing of our capital in Colombia's banana plantations and mines and in Venezuela's asphalt fields. Ecuador's railroads are under American control. A Harvard graduate manages the electric and power plant of Rio de Janeiro.

The banks of other countries in South America show large earnings. The London & River Plate Bank not long ago paid a dividend of 20 per cent and the London & Brazilian Bank a dividend of 17 per cent. The British Bank of South America and the Anglo-South American Bank paid 15 and 10 per cent, respectively, and the "melons" of the banks of other nationalities were just about as good.

Again, good banks are needed for national "team play" in trade expansion. Bankers are the men on the coaching lines in foreign business; the directors of German, French, and English banks have their fingers in many enterprises—in home companies exporting railroad ties or agricultural machinery, in railroad loans, and in sewerage and other business operations. How can our people back home keep in touch with these opportunities for investment and for business unless they have such men on the spot to advise them?

There is one point, a bit aside from banking, that deserves mention here. Nothing is harder for the average exporter to ascertain than the standing, or credit rating, of firms in foreign countries unless he has the assistance of a good mercantile agency. The lack of such agencies has handicapped American exporters in many South American countries very seriously, and until they are established American bankers in South America could be very useful by supplying the information they usually give.

An American bank would be welcomed in those countries. Just before I left Buenos Aires for the United States the last time Dr. Jose Maria Rosa, the Argentine minister of the treasury, told me that he could hardly understand why we had no bank in Buenos Aires, a city as large as Philadelphia. "The Argentine Government will give all possible assistance toward its establishment," continued Dr. Rosa. "How can your trade with us ever grow unless you have a bank here, Señor Chandler? It is so very important. Tell your countrymen to come here and found one."

Dr. Eliodoro Lobos, the minister of agriculture, was even more emphatic. He said, "Your President and Secretary of State will make their names immortal if they will only get such a bank started. We need such a bank as well as you. Otherwise our trade with you can not grow, and nations are better friends if they see more of each other and have more dealings with each other. Your packing people are moving here to the Argentine, and they will require one more than ever."

That last point of Señor Lobos's is worth remembering. The meat-producing center of the world is rapidly shifting to the River Plate. Of all the beef consumed in London 78 per cent is shipped from the Argentine. If our supplies of live stock in the United States continue to diminish 9 per cent every 10 years, while our consumers increase 21 per cent, as our census statistics inform us, we shall have to turn elsewhere for our meat, and that "somewhere" will almost certainly be either the Argentine or Uruguay. Are we going to let all money transactions in our food supplies be controlled by our trade rivals?

American shoe manufacturers are now buying a large percentage of their hides from South America. They are competitors in the world's market against the shoe manufacturers of England, Germany, and France. Isn't it rather a serious thing that for lack of amendment of a single law this country should give into the hands of English, French, and German shoe manufacturers the knowledge of prices paid by their American competitors for their raw material? We are dependent upon South America for more things than we realize, perhaps. How many know that we depend upon the nitrate beds of Chile for all our powder, dynamite, and a great many other valuable commodities in the manufacture of which nitrate is used? We are dependent upon South America for our coffee and cocoa. The finest kid skins for ladies' gloves come from that corner of Brazil which juts out into the Atlantic Ocean.

We do not realize the price we pay foreign bankers on this immense trade between the two continents. It has been roughly estimated that the British banks alone have made more than $80,000,000 from citizens of the United States in South America, and some authorities will tell you that this is too low an estimate. The toll is constant. It is like the old French seignorial river dues that never ceased because the river never stopped flowing.

These foreign banks in those lands for more than 50 years slowly but ever so surely have reared a great fabric with branches in all the big trade centers. They now present an organization as closely knit as any army or navy, all aiding in the advancement of the interests of their home countries, from the presidents and boards of directors—most of whom are generally interested in railroads and other lucrative South American enterprises—down to the newest "clark" fresh from London. We also need such a machine as this for our trade.

THE NEED OF YOUNG AMERICANS.

For us the South American commercial field is essentially a young man's field.

The general retail trade—the selling of general lines of hardware, of paint, and of miscellaneous dry goods manufactures to the retailers of those countries—has received little development. That is the business which is to come, and I consider it more important in building sound commercial relations with other countries than the big business. Of course, the big business makes it easier for our exporters to get the little orders of the retail merchants. But many other countries, notably Germany, have already made great progress in clinching the South American retail trade. When we go in for that business we shall have to fight for it, and it is only the young men of our country who can secure it for us.

Why? Because little orders are placed with friends. For the drummer selling to Jeremiah Smith, of Kalamazoo, it is worth a good many orders to gain the good graces of Mrs. Smith, and it is a strong point for that drummer to be on such terms of easy familiarity that he can ask if Jeremiah, jr., has recovered from the measles. This is just as valuable with Señor Alvarez, of Montevideo. Indeed, it is much more valuable. You know that in our own country the element of personal relations in business getting is much stronger in the South than in the North, and if you multiply this difference many times you will have a very good idea of the importance of personal relations in business fields in South America.

One of the hardest things for an American salesman, newly come to a South American State, to understand is why he must spend so many precious days simply attempting to gain a social entrée to the dons as a preface to the privilege of placing a business proposition before them. The only reason is that it is the Latin's way, and if his business is to be gotten the American salesman must first learn and appreciate his customs.

Only the young man can do this. He has the adaptability and the years to spend at the task. He expects to spend a long time preparing himself. Germans in the foreign trade are trained from—well, I often wonder how many years a German will spend just to saturate himself with a knowledge of the country where he is to be his firm's business getter. A German does not leave his country for a business tour to drum up business. He comes to live in the South American country, and when you find him finally established he has become about the nearest facsimile of a South American incidentally engaged in representing a German house that you can imagine. And this is why the Germans are getting the general trade of these countries.

I remember one day when, as I sat in the office of the consulate at Montevideo, a type of the older, seasoned American salesman entered. He practically admitted to me later that the only reason he had come to the consulate at all was that some one had told him that it was the right way to begin, and that the only thing he had in mind to ask me for was a list of customers, with their ratings, so that he could get out that afternoon and hustle for business. He had one of the best lines of hardware, he told me, ever sold out of Chicago. For 10 years he had represented his company in various places through the Northwest, and he had recently come from Michigan, where he had made such a success that when the directors of his firm decided to branch out into foreign lands they had chosen him as the logical man to get the business.

He knew his line. If I had just then been in the market for an automobile I believe he could have convinced me that it was one of his magnetic tack hammers I really wanted. I asked him if he was as steady on his feet with Spanish as he was with English. He said he had been at it for six months before he left "the States," and that, although he did not profess to be able to colloquialize in the lingo, he guessed he could brush along in it well enough to sell his goods. I fired a fair amount of Spanish vocabulary at him. It submerged him completely. I suggested that perhaps he would find it difficult to sell his goods to merchants who would counter to his arguments with an even more formidable shower of Spanish than that to which I had treated him. For about 15 minutes we argued the point. I suggested also that he familiarize himself with the way of doing business in Montevideo, with the banking facilities, and with the Spanish idea of credit. Although I do not clearly remember all the details of our talk, I distinctly recollect his closing remark.

"Well," he said, squaring himself, "I sold this line in Kalamazoo; I guess I can sell it in Montevideo."

Having written that line out, it appears to me almost too absurd a speech for a man of his experience to have made, yet I have heard others express about the same idea. To do this particular salesman justice, he proved a sticker. He gave up in the long run, but he clung to his forlorn task longer than I had ever supposed he would. I accompanied him on his first few tours. It was pitiable to see him grope for the few familiar words in the sonorous Spanish of the merchants and to try to catch just enough to get the sense of their conversation. Even more lamentable were his vain efforts to phrase some incontrovertible argument about the value of his wares in his one-syllable Spanish. As much as I could I acted as translator for him. A Spanish merchant would raise a question. The drummer would instantly take from his resourceful mind some smashing argument which he had used a thousand times at home—prepared to obliterate every objection of the doubting don—and then he would wind up with a two-line statement that was lame, halt, and blind, and that must have sounded to the don like an extract from a primer. When he was asked to give six months' or more credit he seemed to think that I had purposely guided him to every dead beat in Montevideo.

One of the first questions he put to me was, "How could he start an advertising campaign?" I suggested a couple of the best weeklies—a curious combination they are of our own Saturday Evening Post, Life, and Police Gazette. No. What he wanted to do was to circularize his trade individually. That practice was then new in Montevideo. I happened to remember a printer who, on opening his establishment, had sent out a circular to his friends, so I secured a copy of the circular to show the American salesman how circularizing was done in Montevideo. For he had, even in that short time, come to see that he would have to follow custom to get business.

After laboriously reading the circular he remarked to me that he could not tell from it whether the printer had invited his prospective customer to visit him for a month or was proposing for his daughter's hand. Well, that is the way they do such things in Montevideo. One sends out a business circular. In itself that is an innovation, but Heaven forbid that one should rudely quote prices in that circular. One simply calls to the attention of the highly esteemed Señor Gomez the exquisite pleasure which it would afford the proprietor of the printing establishment if he, the highly esteemed señor, would, when having under consideration such work of that character as his great and wonderful business must constantly demand, only bear in mind the fact that there was in Montevideo such a printing establishment, which, although it was not quite good enough to do such work as was due the illustrious señor, had nevertheless a proprietor who would consider it the highest honor of his life to be given the slightest intimation that he was worthy to be thought of in connection with the esteemed Señor Gomez's orders.

The Yankee salesman declared that if he had to begin with that soft pedal and work his way up with a series of circulars until he had gotten sufficiently into the merchant's graces to be granted the privi-

lege of putting a business proposition before him, he guessed the business wasn't worth the time of any man over 18 years of age.

After this salesman had returned to the United States, his firm, probably at his advice, sent to Montevideo a bright young man who had had about two years of sales experience, but who had, on the other hand, a very sound, if somewhat stilted, command of Spanish to back him and who was willing to bide his time, as, indeed, at his age he could afford to do. When I left Montevideo this young man had worked up at least enough business to justify his existence, and had acquired a circle of friends and a familiarity with the ways of the people which I knew would in the long run bring him business beyond his dreams. Perhaps you will think this is an exaggerated case, but it is not.

THE NEED FOR BETTER NEWS SERVICE.

Another of the greatest handicaps against the American in South America is, I think, the lack of good news service between the two continents and of sound knowledge of South American history and economic conditions. A great quantity of distorted and injurious "news" is circulated about us in South America, and, as a consequence a prejudice against us is created which is perhaps our greatest handicap in making friends. I read some time ago that Secretary Knox, in a speech quoted an article from some South American journal printed as a dispatch from Washington, stating that the American Government was this year showing a deficit in governmental expenditures for the first time since the Civil War, and that as a measure of economy it was intended to abolish the office of Vice President and to reform our national lottery. I have frequently read statements in South American papers that described our international policy in language even more absurd than this.

This need of better knowledge, of correct daily news, is as great with us as with South America. By reading any one of our metropolitan dailies we can follow the course of the home rule bill through the British Parliament. Yet what have our papers said of the sweeping electoral reforms which the Argentine Government has recently adopted? Perhaps it is fortunate that we have had so little to read, for what I have seen printed in American papers is mostly untrue, and so, when the exchange of news is bettered, we shall not have so much that is wrong to unlearn. And how many Americans speak Portuguese? How many know that as much Portuguese as Spanish is spoken in South America? How many know that the label on the can of tooth powder shipped to Pernambuco must be printed in Portuguese and on that shipped to Bocas del Toro or Bahia Blanca must be in Spanish? No; we are still asking the man from Buenos Aires if he has any hotels in his city. We wish to know if the Argentine has any roads that an automobile can run over, though I had an office in the same building in Buenos Aires with an Italian automobile salesman who sold two or three $5,000 motor cars every month.

Our schools should pay more attention to this need, and, above all, our colleges and universities should not merely lay much more emphasis on teaching Spanish and Portuguese, but should insist that instruction be given in at least the rudiments of South American history and economic condition. For a Nation of 94,000,000 people we are absurdly inadequate in our training of young men for as useful and old a profession as exists—international trade. Our whole system of modern-language instruction needs revision, with teachers who can teach the Spanish of Madrid rather than the Spanish of East Boston. How many institutions are there such as the Boston High School of Commerce and the Philadelphia Commercial Museum? At how many colleges can one learn a word of Portuguese? We have more than $150,000,000 worth of trade with Portuguese-speaking countries. Do you think that one high-school boy in a thousand can tell you that Buenos Aires is larger than Philadelphia or that the highest railroad in the world is in Peru?

There is nothing more humiliating for an American than to visit one of the large South American universities and find the eager young men there studying Kent and Story in law, James in philosophy, Trent in American literature; or to hear the correct answers given to such questions as: "How long was the term of the President of the Confederacy?" or "Who was Edward Everett?" and to imagine the answers the students in our universities might give to similar questions about Rivadavia or Unánue or Garcia Moreno.

When the ships of the Atlantic and Pacific brim Culebra Cut there will set in a tide such as once flowed in our own country from east to west that will call out from our universities, from offices, and from shops the youth that has most ambition, most daring, most resourcefulness, and most adaptability. Col. Goethals tells us that he is going to put the first ships through the canal next August; so it does not seem too soon to get ready for the change to-day. Certainly, none of the great exporting nations of Europe are letting the grass grow under their feet, and we can not afford to let this South American business escape for lack of preparation of our young men.

SOUTH AMERICA'S NEED OF IMMIGRATION.

The Panama Canal is viewed by Americans almost wholly as a channel of commerce for wares. But vessels carry more than wares. In their steerage are future nations. The Panama Canal is certain to prove one of the greatest channels of immigration in the world. It is just here that so many people make a mistake in prognosticating the influences of this canal. They compare it at once with the Suez Canal; they modify the effect of that waterway to suit the commercial conditions prevailing in North and South America and present to you a complete table of alterations in the world's trade which the canal is to bring us. But any comparison between the Suez and the Panama Canals is impossible, because the Suez Canal connected 400,000,000 East Indians with 200,000,000 Europeans. At one stroke the two most populous continents of the earth were given the cheapest and quickest transportation route.

Now, South America is still a country for settlement as well as for development. Only after a person has roamed over that vast territory from Panama to southern Argentina does he realize the sparseness of its settlement and the immense possibilities of its future. Even by touching at its ports he gets a false impression of the continent's population. He sees Buenos Aires with its skycrapers, its big hotels, and its busy thoroughfares, and he can scarcely realize that it is at the threshold of a still unsettled country, a country of immense cattle ranches like those in our own West 20 or 30 years ago. In Uruguay one-seventh of the people live in Montevideo. The land is held in enormous tracts by wealthy "estancieros" (ranchmen) and the Government is just now trying, by adopting the European scheme of furnishing money at cheap rates to small farmers, to build up a substantial agricultural class. If we touch at the coast cities of Brazil, or even traverse the southern provinces, we get no idea of the astonishingly vast unsettled regions in the basin of the Amazon or in the table-lands of the interior.

Therefore, the greatest effect of the canal is to be in the people it will bring. They will compromise with the present inhabitants of the country to build a greatly altered, perhaps a new, South America, industrially and politically. This change has begun in one country already. Argentina has become a melting pot, and her institutions have felt the change, her commerce has grown beneath its influence, until to-day that country has the second largest foreign trade in the Western Hemisphere. Argentina has received most of the immigration because of the steamship lines from her ports to Europe. The remainder of it has gone only to Brazil and Chile. Now the Panama Canal will bring the steamship lines to the west coast.

Let us consider what this immigration will mean to the west coast of South America. (Peru holds the oldest Caucasian civilization of the western world. I studied there in the oldest seat of learning in the Western Hemisphere, an institution many years older than my own Harvard.) The Spaniards enslaved the natives but, in time, as so often happens, the conquered in arms became almost dominant in blood. Since that first settlement Peru has received little new immigration. The benefit of the Spanish influx is dying out. This is true as well of the other countries of northern South America—of Ecuador, of Colombia, and of Venezuela. Bolivia is still almost an Indian country. The immigration which the canal will bring is certain to revolutionize these countries industrially and probably politically.

The new immigration will give to Peru, for example, new laboring classes. In time it will fill the great void felt to-day—the utter lack of a solid middle class. It will give hands with which to cultivate the soil and energetic merchants to sell the soil's products. One of the most commercial activities of South America is fruit growing. Let us apply the benefits of immigration to the fruit industry of Peru. Wine of very good quality is produced in the Ica Valley. The industry has been carried on for three centuries, since it was first introduced by the Spanish, but, as no people followed them, for lack of labor it has never received any real development. Give this valley new immigration from Spain, Italy, and the islands of the Mediterranean, and you have at once the possibility of a thriving industry.

The banana industry exists to-day successfully in northern Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia, although it is very little developed. The truth is that there is no market for the product at present, except in Chile. The canal will give to these countries a market for their bananas, and new immigration will develop the industry.

I have bought pineapples at two for a cent in Lambayeque, Peru. That town is now being connected by railroad with the seacoast. The canal will give the pineapple growers a market in the United States for their fruit, but Peru will need new blood and virile wage earners if she is to develop these resources. On the west coast of Colombia they are now building a road from Buenaventura to Cali which will place within three or four days of the Isthmus one of the greatest tropical fruit-growing districts in the world. It may not be many years before the Peruvian "palta" will be on sale in the fruit stores of New York City.

There are also opportunities for the development of new industries. Peruvian coffee—and I have never tasted better coffee than is grown on the plantations of northern Peru—is produced now only as a garden product for the use of the owners of these plantations, who live in Lima. Italian immigration gave the first impulse to the enormous development of the coffee industry in Brazil. Why shouldn't it do as much for Peru?

Directly, then, immigration into South America will mean cheap, good labor, and, indirectly, it will mean a steadying influence politically upon the Governments and a quickening influence upon the industrial life of the nations. The American investor, the American exporter, can both count these changes to their benefit. All these changes have been seen in the Argentine Republic. Half of the people of that country either came there since 1857 or are descended from people who arrived there since that year. Therefore, Argentina is no longer strictly Latin-American in the sense that the northwestern countries are. It is cosmopolitan. The peoples of both southern and northern Europe have placed an indelible stamp upon the nation's institutions. Therefore, the country's commerce has grown, and the investment of foreign capital in the Argentine Republic has increased. It is no longer a country of politics but a country of industry.

[House of Representatives, Rept. No. 3054, 54th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. BROSIUS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 875) to provide for the incorporation of an international American bank, respectfully report the same with the recommendation that it do pass with certain amendments, indicated in the bill hereto attached.

The purpose of this bill is to carry into effect the recommendations of the International American Conference of 1889 by the incorporation of an international American bank. That body of eminent statesmen from all the American Republics, after an exhaustive discussion, embodied their recommendations in the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the conference recommends to the Governments here represented the granting of liberal concessions to facilitate inter-American banking, and especially such as may be necessary for the establishment of an international American bank, with branches or agencies in the several countries represented in this conference."

The bill has been drawn with great care, and it vests no powers in the proposed bank not necessary to enable it to execute its purpose effectively. The exercise of its powers is amply safeguarded, with a view to the protection of its shareholders, depositors, and those doing business with it. Complete visitorial power and control are vested in the Comptroller of the Currency. The Government is in no sense a party to the corporation, assumes no liability on its account, and is in no event responsible for its engagements. The only purpose in chartering the bank by act of Congress is to have an institution with a corporate franchise conferred by the Federal Government to inspire public confidence and secure safety through Government supervision and control. Foreign countries, taking note that the bank was projected by act of the Federal Government, a source of authority they are accustomed to recognize, would at once see the propriety of granting such concessions to their own people as would be necessary for the establishment of the branches contemplated by the bill.

The most effective provisions of the national banking act relating to periodical reports to the Treasury Department of the state of the bank's business and general publicity of its affairs, through newspaper publication, with full power vested in the Comptroller at all times to examine into its management and compel any impairment of its capital

stock to be made good, have been incorporated. The bill, in short, is thoroughly guarded and wisely adapted to the purpose intended.

The people of the United States, in common with those of the Central and South American Republics, feel the importance of increasing commercial intercourse between the different portions of the American Continent, and they believe that the development of such intercourse has been retarded by the lack of adequate facilities for exchange between the several countries, and their hope for a revival in trade is based upon the establishment of improved banking facilities which will emancipate these growing countries from their age-long servitude to the bankers of London and the Continent of Europe.

No one has expressed the situation more tersely or more forcibly than Mr. Theodore C. Search, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, after a tour of observation through South America. He says:

"As in our ocean commerce, so also in our financial relations with other countries, we are dependent largely upon the services rendered by foreign interests. Particularly in our dealings with the nations to the south of us, we are in urgent need of direct international banking facilities. We do $150,000,000 worth of business with South America in a year, and yet all our balances have to be settled through English or European banking houses. In the great trade centers of South America the English, the German, the French, and the Italian have their banks, but I think that I am right in saying that there is not an American bank in all South America. Manifestly this is a serious hindrance to our trade."

The conditions of international trade which have given European countries, notably Great Britain, the lion's share of commercial intercourse with South America are brought into distinct view by the report of Gen. I. W. Avery, the commissioner to South America from the Cotton States and International Exposition, who visited that continent in the interest of the exposition. He informs us that of the $911,000,000 foreign trade that South America does each year only $130,000,000, or one-seventh, is done with the United States. Of the latter sum our country sells South America but $32,000,000, or one-fourth, and buys $91,000,000, leaving a balance of $59,000,000 against us.

Embracing in our view all the Republics south of us, the figures are still more significant. The total foreign commerce of Mexico, Central and South America is about as follows:

Imports	$557,504,462
Exports	722,364,251
Total	1,279,868,713

Of the total imports the United States supplies $99,814,538, or a little over one-fifth, while of the total exports they receive $207,384,623, or nearly one-third, leaving a balance against them of $107,570,085.

The financial part of all this business, he informs us, is carried on through Europe. European vessels carry the goods, Europe receives the commissions and freights, and sells most of the goods consumed in South America, while the United States is the largest purchaser. This condition of the trade, he says, is due to five facts, namely:

First. We have no banks in South America; Europe has them everywhere.

Second. We run few steamships to South America; Europe runs them to all her ports.

Third. We have no United States stores in South America; Europe has her stores in all parts of that continent.

Fourth. We sell for cash; Europe gives credit.

Fifth. Europe makes goods and packs them to suit the South American trade; we do not.

Without underestimating the importance of the other facts named, it is quite obvious that the first one is at this time pressing with great urgency upon the attention of the American people in connection with the universal desire to increase our commerce with our southern neighbors.

A comparison of our lack with the great abundance of facilities enjoyed by European countries for the South American trade brings into view as a conspicuous agency in European commerce suitable and convenient means of exchange. Every leading European nation has established banks in the South American countries to facilitate exchanges. It was stated recently that France is about establishing a bank in Brazil with a capital of $2,000,000 for the purpose of opening more direct financial relations with that country. French traders are not satisfied with existing facilities, which compel them to operate through English banks.

United States Consul Johnstone, at Pernambuco, Brazil, said recently that English and German banking houses were scattered throughout the entire eastern and western coasts of South America. These banks, while doing a general exchange business, are established especially for the benefit of the trade of their own countries. It is said that there are 60 incorporated banks in London with a capital of $294,000,000 exclusively devoted to international banking.

In the report of the commission referred to, it is said, speaking of Argentina:

"Four-fifths of the present banks of Argentina are branches of foreign banking houses, all of which are European. The United States is the only country attempting to do business without a banking representative, and it is the opinion of those well informed on the subject that any large increase in our business with Argentina will necessitate the establishment of direct banking connections. Minister Buchanan, after a careful investigation of the conditions, says: 'This city (Buenos Aires) offers a splendid field for American banking capital, and I am satisfied that an American bank, conducted as our banks are, would command great favor here and find many advantages and facilities extended to it. I am equally certain that it would be the means of extending and enlarging our commerce with this country.'"

It can not be doubted that trade might be increased between our own and the countries south of us by improved facilities for transportation and by catering to the tastes of the people and adapting our goods to their markets, but over and above all possible gain from these sources there is a large benefit to be derived from a coincident extension of the means of exchange. The mechanism of exchange is only second in importance to that of transportation. Improvements on both lines might well progress concurrently.

It is not easy to see how the currents of trade that have been flowing so long across the Atlantic from Central and South America can be changed and made to flow north and south without the aid of an international mechanism of exchange which will afford facilities at least equal to those existing between this continent and Europe.

The indirect exchange, which has been our chief recourse in the past, entails great loss upon the United States and affords ample gains to European bankers, which American bankers ought to enjoy. This is obvious enough to all who understand the course of our foreign trade. Our imports from the south of us greatly exceed our exports, creating a balance against us on our trade ledger, while Great Britain exports to those countries largely in excess of her imports from them, leaving a balance against the latter countries. We pay our balance to South America indirectly with the British goods shipped to her in excess of what Great Britain imports from her. In other words, there is a triangular trade between the United States, Great Britain, and South America. British ships sail with goods from British ports to South America, thence to the United States with sugar, coffee, teas, and spices, and finally return to Great Britain with American cotton and food products. Not only do British interests enjoy the benefits of this trade, but British ships pocket the freights and British banks the commissions on the exchange required in the financial settlements.

To see how British banks secure these advantages we have only to look into the mode of conducting our commercial intercourse with our southern neighbors.

Take, for instance, a purchase of wool, which we will say costs in Argentina £1,000 or about $5,000. An importer here when he orders the wool from a merchant there (Argentina) furnishes a letter of credit of a London banker, which is taken out for his account in favor of the shipper. The shipper draws under this letter of credit at whatever usance is named, usually in South America at 90 days' sight, accompanying his draft with shipping documents, which are to be given up to the drawee in London on his acceptance. Duplicate documents are forwarded to the correspondent of the London banker in New York, so that the goods may be taken charge of on arrival of the ship here. The drafts on London are accepted at, say, 90 days' sight and charged to the American importer in that way. Upon arrival of the goods here the importer applies to the banker's agent or representative, and if the importer is of good standing he usually receives the documents in exchange for an engagement to hold the goods (with liberty to sell) or the proceeds in trust for the bankers until the acceptance in London is covered.

In this way an importer from South America would receive his goods about the time the shipper's drafts would reach London, and he would thus have about 90 days' credit, say sufficient time to sell the goods, and out of the proceeds to protect the drafts drawn. To cover the London banker he would, of course, buy a draft on London at whatever the rate on London would happen to be.

A settlement in a case like the foregoing could not be effected advantageously by direct exchange with Argentina under existing conditions, and such exchange with any South American country is scarcely known. A New York house, which has been doing business with South America for 27 years, states that nearly all their transactions were carried on through credits on London. The reason is obvious. No matter how good the customer is in South America, it is not possible to negotiate a draft on him at any reasonable rate of exchange, as there is no means of ascertaining his standing and credit, and hence a draft on him must go a begging in the United States.

It is easily seen that American bankers, excepting the few houses doing an exchange business, have no agency to speak of in these transactions and enjoy none of the benefits of them excepting so far as they may be the agents of British bankers and operating in their interests.

Can we conceive of a situation more humiliating than this to a patriotic American? Seventy millions of the most enterprising people on earth, the greatest Republic on which the sun shines, the richest nation in material resources and productive capacity obliged to obtain a letter of credit from a European bank before it can buy a bill of goods from a neighboring country on our own continent; compelled to conduct a rivalry in international commerce with European nations for South American trade with the fiscal agencies employed in effecting exchange practically in the hands of our most formidable competitor.

Not only that, but for the carriage of our goods, our mails, and ourselves to South America we are dependent upon steamers built and owned in England and operated under British management. Every American cheek should tingle with shame at the thought of the recourse to which a commission of manufacturers from the United States was subjected this year. C. D. Mitchell, of Chattanooga, Tenn., one of the vice presidents at large of the National Association of Manufacturers, expressed the situation in this indignant phrase. He said:

"It was a national disgrace when sending a business commission to Argentina and Brazil this year to acquaint us with trade prospects that they were compelled to cross the Atlantic twice each way in foreign-owned and foreign-made steamers. In a 3 months' absence they had only 25 days to "spy out the land," whereas could they have gone direct they would have had 60 days in which to do their allotted work. Thus the disgrace is overshadowed by the injury and loss."

Direct exchange between the countries concerned was the consummation which the delegates from all the countries represented in the International American Conference hoped to achieve. A discussion of which precedes the other in the order of development, commerce, or banking is of too academic a character to be useful. It is entirely obvious that where commerce between two or more countries has arrived at a given state of development under inferior facilities for exchange an additional impetus to trade will come from an extension of the means of settling accounts. This is attested by all observation and experience. The greater the facilities for direct clearance on account of goods exported against goods imported the greater will be the volume of commodities exchanged.

When we consider that the countries south of us are not manufacturing countries, but produce largely raw material which it would be materially advantageous to exchange for our manufactured goods, the desirability of the object had in view is distinctly emphasized. The delegates from the South American Republics pointed out this consideration in their arguments in support of the resolution quoted. They looked north and saw a great manufacturing nation in need of raw material, and they fully realized that their people needed the manufactured goods we produce, and which are now supplied by England and other nations.

This condition of commerce is injurious both to the United States and the southern Republics. Over and above the loss of the reciprocal advantages which trade affords, we are paying a large bounty to European bankers for effecting our exchanges for us, because we have not the means of making them ourselves. With suitable machinery for exchange established between the countries of the American Continent we would save a large amount of commissions paid to English and continental bankers and direct large streams of profit to American financial centers which now flow to European markets. Under existing conditions we are compelled to suffer this loss in addition to the indirect injury we sustain, for the president of the National Association of Manufacturers in his recent report well says:

"There are abundant reasons for the belief that the commercial interests of the United States in South America would be greatly benefited if they were independent of England in their financial transactions."

In the report of the committee appointed by the International American Conference to consider and report upon this question, it was declared that there was not in the countries represented in the conference any organized system of bankers' exchanges, or credits; for instance, they said drafts upon the United States were not obtainable at all in many of the markets of South America, and in most of them are only salable at a discount below the sterling equivalent. In like manner, drafts upon South and Central America are practically unknown in the money markets of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Chicago, and Boston. Necessarily, therefore, the merchants who import goods from these southern countries make their exchanges through English bankers' credits. We pay for the goods we buy by remittances to London or the Continent to cover drafts drawn in the exporting markets against European letters of credit, and we pay 1 per cent for the privilege of doing so, which might be saved, as well as interest and commissions, if we had an international banking system so developed as to afford a market for drafts drawn against letters of credit issued in America, such as now exists for drafts drawn against European letters of credit.

One of the delegates from South America said if a merchant from Argentina wished to send goods to the United States he must ask the one to whom he sends the goods (consignee) to authorize him to draw upon some bank. The consignee has to send him a letter of credit on London, because there is no bank there that can issue a draft, nor would the merchant know what to do with a draft if he received it, as there are no banking institutions to which he could sell such a bill of exchange. The consequence is that the banker in London must be paid a commission of 1 per cent upon the amount simply for placing his name upon the paper.

Another delegate, observing the necessity for branches in the South American countries, argued very cogently that the banks in those countries have no relations with each other, nor have they any knowledge of the operations of each other. There is, for instance, no way of knowing in Argentina whether a draft drawn by the Bank of Costa Rica is valid or not. Likewise a draft on the Bank of Mexico might have some difficulty in being accepted in any of the South American Republics, because its solvency would not be known in those countries. But with branches established in every section the international American bank could draw on its branches anywhere with perfect knowledge and implicit confidence. The obvious result would be the dissemination of knowledge of the standing of merchants and business men in the commercial centers of the several countries and the promotion of that confidence indispensable to that commercial association and intercourse which carries on its wings blessings to all concerned.

As money is the great instrument of association among men, States, and nations, so any extension of the facilities for making money available and supplying media of exchange, such as banking operations afford, always quickens the currents of trade and stimulates intercourse among merchants in the same and likewise in different States and nations. Putting capital into banks, at least to the extent of meeting all reasonable demands, has ever been and always will be a distinct benefit to business.

The committee of the international conference referred to say in their report:

"Your committee believes that the best means for facilitating the development of banking business, and generally of financial relations between the markets of North, South, and Central America, as well as for improving the mechanism of exchange without calling on any Government whatever to exceed its functions, would be the passage of a law by the United States incorporating an international American bank, with ample capital, with the privilege on the part of the citizens of the several countries in the conference to take shares in such bank pro rata to their foreign commerce; which bank should have no power to emit circulating notes, but which should have all other powers now enjoyed by the national banks of the United States as to deposits and discount, as well as all such powers as are now possessed by firms or private bankers in the matter of issuing letters of credit and making loans upon all classes of commodity, buying and selling bills of exchange, coin, bullion; and with power to indorse or guarantee against proper security, and generally to do whatever can be done by the great banking firms who are carrying on their business without the aid of corporate charters under the laws of a general partnership."

With such an international bank established, with branches in all the Republics on the continent, there would be a stimulation of intercourse, commercial and financial, such as would surprise those who are content to transact American business through European bankers and are satisfied that Europe should buy from us and reship the same goods to South America at a profit which we are too slow or stupid to secure for ourselves.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION.

The objection made by some to this measure based upon a supposed constitutional limitation of the power of Congress in the premises is not, in our opinion, at all tenable. It is provided inter alia in article 1, section 8, paragraph 3, of the Constitution, as follows:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

The constitutional meaning of the words "to regulate commerce" has been so frequently and so fully considered by the courts with such force of reason and amplitude of learning that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon the subject in this connection. Remembering that the Constitution is an instrument of enumeration rather than of definition, it is obvious enough that the extent of the power is limited by the meaning of the words in which it is granted. Story, in his Commentaries, says:

"The subject to be regulated is commerce. Commerce is something more than traffic; it is intercourse. It describes commercial intercourse between nations in all its branches and is regulated by prescribing rules for carrying on that intercourse. To construe the power so as to impair its efficacy would defeat the very object for which it was introduced into the Constitution."

The late Justice Miller, in his work on the Constitution, says:

"Traffic and trade are comprised of a great many elements, so far as the means are concerned by which and the persons by and between whom they are carried on."

Still more explicit is the language of the Supreme Court in McCall *v.* California (136 U. S., 104):

"Commerce includes the fact of intercourse and of traffic and the subject matter of intercourse and traffic. The fact of intercourse and traffic again embraces all the means, instruments, and places by and in which intercourse and traffic are carried on at those places and by and with these means."

To exclude from the power the regulation of the means of exchange and the use of credit in carrying on foreign commerce would imply that foreign commerce in the constitutional sense is limited to barter or exchange without the use of the great modern agency of credit. The admission that a suitable mechanism of exchange between countries facilitates foreign commerce, and no one denies that, is a concession of the entire ground of contention, for the purpose of the power to regulate is to facilitate, and any means that facilitates must therefore be included in the power to regulate.

Whether an international bank is a suitable means of facilitating foreign commerce is not a judicial but a legislative question. The decision of Congress on that question can not be reviewed by the courts. Congress may choose any means suitable to carry out a granted power. All means appropriate and not prohibited, if the end be within the constitutional mandate, are constitutional. This principle is nowhere more elaborately considered than in McCulloch *v.* Maryland. From that magazine of judicial learning we deduce some observations which carry the substance if not the words of that justly celebrated decision, and which apply as well to an international as to a national bank.

If any one proposition could command the universal assent of mankind, we might expect it would be this, that the Government of the Union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action. This would seem to result necessarily from its nature. It is the Government of all; its powers are delegated by all; it represents all and acts for all.

The nature of the Constitution requires that only its great outlines should be marked, its important objects designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature of the objects themselves.

Is it denied that Government has its choice of means or that it may employ the most convenient means, if to employ them it be necessary to erect a corporation? The power to create a corporation appertains to sovereignty and is not expressly conferred on Congress. The Government can not be restrained from creating a corporation as a means for performing its functions, for the reason that such an act is an exercise of sovereignty.

The power of creating a corporation is not an end for which other powers are exercised, but a means by which other objects are accomplished. In California *v.* Pacific Railroad Co. (127 U. S., 1) it was declared that Congress has the power to construct, or to authorize individuals or corporations to construct, railroads or national highways from State to State, and that that authority is essential to the complete control and regulation of interstate commerce.

Congress is empowered to make such laws as may be necessary and proper for carrying into effect the powers conferred on the Government. The word "necessary" does not exclude the choice of means which are appropriate. Necessary means are any means reasonably calculated to produce the end.

The Constitution does not prescribe the means by which Government shall execute its powers. Future exigencies could not have been foreseen and must be provided for as they occur. The Constitution does not restrain Congress or impair its right to exercise its best judgment in the selection of measures to carry into execution the constitutional powers of the Government.

Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional. (McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheaton.)

Keeping these principles in mind and remembering that the international bank authorized by this bill has no other purpose than to facilitate our foreign commerce by affording improved means of exchange between our own and other countries, one can hardly fail to see that the measure is entirely within the warrant of the Constitution. If, however, there still lingers in any mind a doubt of the soundness of the views suggested, it will certainly be removed by an examination of a few of the leading cases in which the question has received judicial consideration, notably the cases of Gibbons *v.* Ogden (9 Wheat., 196), United States *v.* Holliday (3 Wall., 417), People *v.* Brooks (4 Denio, 469), Brown *v.* Maryland (12 Wheat., 445), McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316), Legal Tender Cases (12 Wall., 457), Juilliard *v.* Greenman (110 U. S., 421), Veazie Bank *v.* Fenno (8 Wall., 533), and National Bank *v.* United States (101 U. S., 1).

Appended for information are the communications of President Harrison and Secretary Blaine, the report of the committee on banking of the International American conference, and a copy of the bill:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE RELATIVE TO THE REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE IN FAVOR OF AN INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN BANK.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of State, inclosing a report adopted by the International American Conference recently in session at this Capital, recommending the establishment of an international American bank, with its principal offices in the city of New York and branches in the commercial centers of the several other American Republics.

The advantages of such an institution to the merchants of the United States engaged in trade with Central and South America and the purposes intended to be accomplished are fully set forth in the letter of the Secretary of State and the accompanying report. It is not proposed to involve the United States in any financial responsibility, but only to give to the proposed bank a corporate franchise and to promote public confidence by requiring that its condition and transactions shall be submitted to a scrutiny similar to that which is now exercised over our domestic banking system.

The subject is submitted for the consideration of Congress in the belief that it will be found possible to promote the end desired by legislation so guarded as to avoid all just criticism.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May 27, 1890.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 27, 1890.

The PRESIDENT:

I have the honor to submit herewith the report of the committee on banking as unanimously adopted by the International American Conference recently in session in this city. It was the wish of the conference that this proposition, of such great interest to every American Republic, should, as promptly as possible, secure the earnest attention of the Congress of the United States.

The foreign commerce of the nations south of the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande amounts annually to more than $1,100,000,000. At

present the people of the United States enjoy only a meager share of this market, but the action of the recent conference will result, I believe, in the removal of certain obstacles which now tend to obstruct the expansion of our trade.

One of the most serious of these obstacles is the absence of a system of direct exchanges and credits, by reason of which the exporting and importing merchants of the United States engaged in commerce with Central and South America have been compelled to pay the bankers of London a tax upon every transaction. Last year our commerce with the countries south of us amounted to $282,005,057, of which the imports of merchandise were valued at $181,058,966, and the imports of specie and bullion were $21,236,791, while our exports consisted of merchandise valued at $71,938,181 and $8,668,470 in specie and bullion. Of the merchandise imported into the United States, the greater part was paid for by remittances to London and the cities of the Continent to cover drafts against European letters of credit. For use of these credits a commission of three-quarters of 1 per cent is customarily paid, so that the European banks enjoyed a large profit upon our business with a minimum of risk. This system steadily results in losses to our merchants in interest and differences in exchange as well as in commissions. These losses would be largely reduced by the establishment of an international system of banking between the American Republics.

The merchants of this country are as dependent upon the bankers of Europe in their financial transactions with their American neighbors as they are upon the shipowners of Great Britain for transportation facilities, and will continue to labor under these embarrassments until direct banking systems are established.

The report of the committee, hereto attached, presents a simple and easy method of relief, and the enactment of the measure recommended will, in the judgment of the conference, result in the establishment of proper facilities for inter-American banking.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES G. BLAINE.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING.

[As adopted by the International American Conference, April 14, 1890.]

Pursuant to resolutions passed at the meeting of the conference on December 7, 1889, your committee was appointed to consider and report upon the methods of improving and extending the banking and credit systems between the several countries represented in this conference, and now has the honor to submit, as the result of its deliberations, the following report:

Your committee believes that there is no field of inquiry falling within the province of this conference for the extension of the inter-American commerce more fundamentally important than that of international American banking, and that, in fact, the future of the commercial relations between North, South, and Central America will depend as largely upon the complete and prompt development of international banking facilities as upon any other single condition whatever.

In the opinion of your committee the question of the mechanism of exchange is secondary, if at all, only to the question of the mechanism of transportation. Even after better means of transportation than those which exist shall have been established, it will be impossible for the commerce between American nations to be greatly enlarged unless there be supplied to their merchants means for conducting the banking business which shall in some measure liberate them from the practical monopoly of credit which is now held by the bankers of London and the European Continent.

If there be an enlargement of the means of transportation, unaccompanied with an equal extension of financial facilities, only partial benefits will be derived from the former as compared with the benefits which might be derived were the two improvements to progress together.

Your committee is of the opinion that the commerce between the American countries might be greatly extended if proper means could be found for facilitating direct exchanges between the money markets of the several countries represented in this conference, even if there were no improvements in transportation.

The first effect would be to afford a more direct "clearance in account" of goods exported against goods imported.

The large amount of commissions now paid to the European bankers could not only be decreased, but such commissions would be paid to American bankers or merchants themselves, and in this way a share of the profits which now go almost solidly to the European money markets could be kept in the financial centers of this continent.

There does not exist to-day among the countries represented in this conference any organized system of bankers' exchanges or credits. For instance, drafts upon the United States are not attainable at all in many of the markets of South America, and in most of them are only salable at a discount below the sterling equivalent. In like manner drafts upon South and Central America are practically unknown in the money markets of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Chicago, and Boston.

The point has been made that to extend business between our States long credits must be given. How is it possible for manufacturers and merchants at distant points to form relations of such a character as to justify the granting of long credits? At present such relations are chiefly formed through the intervention of European banks and bankers, which are not interested in the extension of trade between the different countries represented in this conference except in a secondary and subordinate sense. The extension of trade between Europe and the Americas, not between the Americas themselves, is their first care. By the establishment of a well-organized system of international American banking our merchants and manufacturers would be able to establish improved credit relations, and those administering the system in the several money markets of the Americas would immediately become interested in fostering such relations and facilitating such business to the utmost extent.

The merchants of the United States now importing goods from the countries of South and Central America make such importations, as the investigations of your committee show, almost without exception, through the use of English bankers' credits.

The total foreign commerce of the West Indies, Mexico, and South and Central America amounted last year to about $1,200,000,000 United States gold. The committee have not been able to ascertain the amount of the commerce among the Latin-American States. The total exchange of commodities between the United States and countries to the south during the year ending June 30, 1888, aggregated $282,902,408, of which the imports into the United States amounted to $181,058,966 of merchandise and $21,236,791 of specie and bullion, and exports from the United States to $71,938,181 of merchandise and $8,668,470 of specie and bullion. Of the $181,000,000 of merchandise brought into the markets of the United States the greater part was paid for by remittance to London or the Continent, to cover drafts drawn in the exporting markets against European letters of credit.

For the use of these credits on Europe a commission of three-quarters of 1 per cent is customarily paid, and the foreign banks reap this great profit at a minimum risk, inasmuch as the drafts drawn against these credits are secured not only by the goods represented by the shipping documents against which the bills of exchange are drawn, but also by the responsibility of the party (generally the consignee) for whose account the letters of credit are issued, and without any outlay of cash, as the American merchant places the cash with the European bankers to meet such drafts at or before maturity.

This system results in the loss to America of interest and differences in exchange as well as of commissions, all of which could be saved to our countries if international American banking were so developed and systematized as to afford a market for drafts drawn against letters of credit issued in America, such as now exists for drafts drawn against European letters of credit.

At present, therefore, the situation is such that the merchants of this continent are virtually dependent upon European bankers so far as financial exchanges are concerned, notwithstanding the fact that there are ample capital and responsibility in the countries here represented, and it is the opinion of competent persons that such capital would be ready to avail itself of the opportunity of transacting this business directly between the financial centers of our respective countries without the intervention of London if the laws were such as to permit the conduct of the business of international banking under as favorable provisions as are now enjoyed by the European bankers. The prime difference would be that these transactions would be carried on by American instead of European capital, and that the profit would remain here instead of going abroad. This, however, is impossible of realization at present, in view of the fact that the banking houses of the United States doing foreign business are usually controlled by London principals, and that it is impossible, without some change in the legislation of the United States to secure a sufficient aggregation of capital in corporate form, and so free from the burdensome restraints and taxes now imposed upon moneyed corporations, as to permit competition on equal terms with the European bankers.

Many different plans have been discussed concerning the best means of facilitating direct banking business between our countries. Your committee has considered and dismissed a number of propositions relative to the establishment of banks by means of which the national governments themselves should afford financial facilities for inter-American banking. Such action, in your committee's judgment, does not fall within the proper sphere of government. There is no reason, however, why the Governments represented in this conference should not severally charter banking corporations to carry on business of the class which is now generally done by the great banking corporations of London; that is, not in the issuing of circulating bank notes, but for the purchase and sale of bills of exchange, coin, bullion, advancing on commodities generally, and for the issuing of bankers' letters of credit to aid merchants in the transaction of their business.

In the United States, where capital exists in particularly large volume and would lend itself most readily to business of this class, and consequently to the facilitating of international commerce, the laws are not such as to encourage the aggregation of capital for such purposes. So far as your committee has been able to discover after careful investigation there is no general statute of the United States nor of any of the States of the United States under which a banking company can be organized with ample capital which would have the power of issuing such letters of credit and transacting such business as is done by the leading banking companies of London, which virtually occupy the field. In the United States it will be necessary, in order to secure the proper facilities and the proper corporate existence, that there should be legislation granting a charter, and in most of the States such legislation is expressly prohibited by the terms of their constitution. Furthermore, the laws of the several States are such as to impose the severest restrictions upon moneyed corporations and to subject them to taxation so heavy that it would render it impossible to carry on the business of international banking in successful competition with the English, French, and German bankers.

Your committee believes that the best means of facilitating the development of banking business, and generally of financial relations between the markets of North, South, and Central America, as well as for improving the mechanism of exchange without calling on any Government whatever to exceed its proper functions, would be the passage of a law by the United States incorporating an international American bank with ample capital, with the privilege on the part of the citizens of the several countries in the conference to take shares in such bank pro rata to their foreign commerce, which bank should have no power to emit circulating bank notes, but which should have all other powers now enjoyed by the national banks of the United States as to deposit and discount, as well as all such powers as are now possessed by firms of private bankers in the matter of issuing letters of credit and making loans upon all classes of commodity, buying and selling bills of exchange, coin, bullion, and with power to indorse or guarantee against proper security, and generally to do whatever can be done by the great banking firms who are carrying on their business without the aid of corporate charters under the laws of a general partnership. Your committee believes, upon well-founded information, that the capital to such a bank would be promptly subscribed.

The United States Government might and should reserve the largest visitorial powers. The business of such bank should be conducted with perfect safety and with profit to its shareholders, and the greatest benefit to our international commerce. Branches or agencies of such a bank could be established in all of the principal financial centers of America, with the formal recognition of the governments of the several States in which such agencies are established, or arrangements might be entered into with existing banking institutions of the other countries for transacting the business, thus at once affording markets throughout the two continents for the purchase and sale of bills of exchange, facilitating and improving credit conditions generally, and at once affecting a complete mechanism of exchange such as already exists between our respective countries and the European money markets, but which has as yet no existence between the money markets of North, South, and Central America for the reason already stated.

One of the direct benefits to be derived by all of the Governments represented in the International Conference from the establishment of such a bank would be that the investors in the several countries in different classes of American securities would have better means than any which now exist for making such investments. For example, a South or Central American State about to float a foreign loan would feel itself less dependent upon a single combination or syndicate of European bankers than at present. There would be open to such borrowing State two markets to which to apply for national loans as

against a single market, to the mercy of which said borrowing Government is now virtually exposed. The same holds good as to all classes of State and municipal securities whatever. Latin-American investors would find means more readily at command for the investment in and investigation of all classes of North American securities, and the investors of the United States would also find means for the investigation of and in all classes of securities issued by the States, municipalities, or corporations of Latin America.

Your committee recognizes the fact that London has for many years derived the largest possible benefits through its banking facilities with our several States in taking all classes of American loans, which have generally proved themselves to be of most stable and desirable character, but, nevertheless, upon terms which have yielded the London bankers abnormally large profits simply because the element of competition does not exist by reason of the absence of proper banking relations between the several American countries. The institution of such a bank as proposed would at once afford relief against this state of affairs, and would be of benefit not only to the merchants in the manner described, but to all classes of investors generally and without distinction.

In recommending the organization of an international American bank, the recommendation is based upon the present condition of trade. The establishment of better means of transportation and the promotion of trade in other ways will enlarge the demand for the class of facilities of a banking character which has already been referred to. The rapidly increasing wealth of North and South America also enhances the need for a complete system of inter-American exchange, and insures the subscriptions for an adequate capitalization to an international American bank to meet such needs. As an evidence of this increase the valuation of the property of the United States in 1870 was estimated at $30,000,000,000; in 1880, at $43,600,000,000, being somewhat larger than the estimated value of the property of Great Britain at that time. The capital and the business of the Americas is now much larger than when European facilities for banking between Europe and the Americas were established.

Banks of the character described, having agencies in the financial centers of the countries here represented, would materially promote the establishment and immediate use of a common standard for calculating values whenever such a standard shall be determined upon by the countries in interest.

While the sentiments of the independent nations of this continent are favorable to the settlement of all disputes by arbitration as expressed by resolutions introduced in this conference, thus rendering war highly improbable if not impossible among them, there exists no such guaranty that war may not take place in Europe. In such event, as long as we remain solely dependent for our financial facilities upon European money centers, a complete demoralization of our credit facilities and our money markets would necessarily follow and cause financial disaster and distress, which would be considerably lessened, if not altogether avoided, were there a well-organized system of inter-American exchange.

It may be asked, Why can not the object sought for in this memorial be attained through the agency of a private bank? The answer is, that in the extension of inter-American trade it would be difficult, we might well say impossible, to impart either prestige or credit to a private bank. The establishment of an international bank by authority of Congress would promptly command from the other American Governments concurrent legislation which could provide the amplest and most trustworthy form of international cooperation. As neither the bank in the United States nor the branches that may be established elsewhere can have the power to issue circulating notes, the most complete evidence is afforded in that fact that the bank is to be devoted solely to the commercial interests of the two continents, and must rely for its profits upon the increase of the volume of business from which alone it can secure its profits.

After careful consideration your committee advises the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the conference recommends to the Governments here represented the granting of liberal concessions to facilitate inter-American banking, and especially such as may be necessary for the establishment of an international American bank, with branches or agencies in the several countries represented in this conference."

J. M. HURTADO, *Colombia.*
E. C. VARAS, *Chile.*
CHAS. R. FLINT, *United States.*
SALVADOR DE MENDONÇA, *Brazil.*
MANUEL ARAGON, *Costa Rica.*

WASHINGTON, *April 14, 1890.*

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, February 3, 1915.]

PAN AMERICANISM THE OBVIOUS OUTCOME OF THE WAR IN EUROPE.

The war in Europe has drawn a sharper line between the Old and New Worlds than could have been drawn by any other human agency. The Republics of this hemisphere are seen to be in a common family, not merely by propinquity, but by ideals which separate them immeasurably from Europe.

Democracy rules the New World, autocracy the Old. Peace and the prosperity of the common people are the New World's aims; selfish ascendancy by means of war is the Old World's aim. In the New World the worker has a chance. In the Old World he is food for powder.

The United States, towering above the other nations of this hemisphere, and sponsor for the democracy that stands like a stone wall between the individual and the despotism of government, has before it the duty of considering its relations with Europe and the Republics of the New World. Are these relations satisfactory? Are they on a basis that will endure? Are the best interests of democracy served by present ties?

The first fact that strikes the United States in considering its relations with Europe is that there is no sympathetic bond between them. Europe is coldly formal with this country when it is not openly hostile. American rights are respected when it is to Europe's interest to respect them, or when respect is exacted by financial, commercial, or physical force. Taking their cue from the throne itself, the political and social leaders of Europe look with secret antipathy upon America. They see in democracy the enemy of all they cherish—pride of place, unearned wealth, concentrated power, mastery of the masses. They would rejoice over the downfall of democracy in the New World. The establishment of kingdoms and empires in this hemisphere would not be delayed a moment if the spirit of Europe dared to make the venture.

On this side of the ocean the United States sees sister Republics in varying degrees of advancement. Some are feeble, others are backward, and a few are strong and progressive. In all of them is the divine spark of liberty and independence. All are at heart determined to survive, and to emulate the United States in spreading education and building up a citizenship that will appreciate self-government and maintain it against any assault.

The proper policy that should be pursued by the United States, in the light of the war in Europe, is very obvious. Already this Nation has guaranteed perpetuity of republican institutions in this hemisphere. Now, let it bring the Republics together in a common bond of defense, cooperation, and development. Let the Monroe doctrine become the doctrine of the Western Hemisphere, and not merely the fiat of the United States.

While Europe welters in blood, staggering under the burden of autocracies, aristocracies, and favored classes, the New World can be working out a common destiny of fraternity, commerce, and prosperity. There are leaders of thought in South America; there are strong, honest men in Central America; even in Mexico there are patriotic men who would lay down their lives for the sake of peace. Why can not they all meet in equality and friendship, charged by their respective peoples with the duty of evolving a Pan American policy—a policy that will serve as the charter of all future dealings between the democracy of the New World and the autocracy of the Old?

Under the congenial influence of a common bond of democracy, having liberty and independence for its object, the nations of the New World would soon turn a helping hand to one another. Commerce would flow freely among them, as a matter of course. The rich would help the poor, the peaceful would help the turbulent to recover its poise. With all American nations joining hands such a fester as the Mexican situation would be impossible. The nations would put a stop to it, both for Mexico's sake and for their own; and, above all, the way would be cleared for concerted intervention without incurring antagonism, or even criticism.

Already the first steps toward Pan Americanism have been taken by the action of certain South American nations in protesting against violations of neutrality by the belligerent nations of Europe. Further steps are being taken by the United States, in upholding the rights of neutrals at sea against the tyrannous and arbitrary naval power of Great Britain. The United States is making this fight for all the hemisphere. Thus it is bringing nearer, although perhaps unconsciously, the day when Europe will be confronted with the united spirit and force of the New World, speaking for democracy—for the individual rights of man, against the system which would keep him a machine.

[From the World's Work, December, 1914.]

AN AMERICAN BANK IN ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL—WHAT THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK IS TRYING TO DO.

[By James H. Perkins, vice president National City Bank.]

The National City Bank has for a long time been considering in what way it could best relate itself to the movement for promoting our foreign trade. Thought on this subject took definite crystallization this last spring, when plans were made for a foreign banking and commercial service. If there had been any doubt regarding the interest throughout the country of such a movement, it would have been dispelled by the answers received from a thousand letters mailed in May to the leading manufacturers and exporters of the country. This letter was preliminary to the final steps the bank planned to take in connection with the establishment of foreign service. In addition to the serious consideration which had been given to the matter here, actual research work had been done by special representatives sent to South America to make a study of the situation and the necessities of our commerce there.

For commercial expansion in the South American field there is a distinct need for our own banking facilities, but under our previous laws it would have been necessary to form an independent organization with large capital to be on anywhere near equal terms with the banks already established there by other countries. American capital has been in such demand for the development of our own country that it was generally considered inadvisable to divert to South America the large amount necessary for such a project. The Federal reserve act, which was recently passed, has made it possible, however, to establish in a foreign country a branch of a United States institution, placing behind the branch the resources and prestige of the parent institution. It was therefore decided, in response to the active interest evinced by American business men, to take advantage of this provision in the Federal reserve act and establish branches in South America. The directors of the bank, on June 30, 1914, authorized an application to the Federal Reserve Board for the privilege of establishing a branch at Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic, and one at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Owing to the fact that the Federal Reserve Board did not organize until August 10, 1914, action was not taken on the application until September 2, when the privilege sought was granted.

Toward the end of June, Mr. Robert O. Bailey, who formerly was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. J. C. Martine, formerly manager of the Bank of Cuba, left for Buenos Aires to attend to the preliminaries coincident with the organization of the branch in that city. Their arrival in Buenos Aires was simultaneous with the outbreak of the war. Although confronted by many difficulties, all the details in connection with the establishment of a branch there have been completed. The legal technicalities necessary to comply with the Argentine laws have been arranged, banking rooms have been selected, and it is expected that the branch will be in operation by the time this is printed. In the meantime the organization of the staff has been proceeding, with Mr. John H. Allen, formerly manager of the Bank of Haiti, as manager. He sailed for Buenos Aires with a number of assistants on September 26.

The service that it is hoped to render will be of somewhat varied character. The letter of inquiry, to which reference has been made, sounded the needs of the exporter, importer, and manufacturer for reliable credit information in reference to foreign markets. The universally valuable credit information available in this country has accustomed our business men to the use of such information as an absolutely necessary part of the machinery for transacting business, and immediately foreign fields are entered where little if any such information is available, they find that the lack of well-constructed and tabulated facts regarding the business houses with which they expect to transact business proves a barrier to merchandising. Therefore, the inquiry made by the National City Bank met with an immediate response in which the need for such information was emphasized. Based upon this specific necessity and general suggestions made in replies to many other letters which have been sent out inviting counsel and cooperation, a commercial service has been outlined which, it is hoped, will develop to be of material aid in the upbuilding of our South American trade.

In order to answer the requests for statistical data and general information and to centralize the general work, it was found necessary to organize within the bank what is, in effect, a foreign trade department under the direction of Mr. W. S. Kies. A library of trade statistics of South American countries is being collected; the various governmental publications concerning statistics are examined and the facts of immediate interest collated; reports from the Department of Commerce, the excellent Consular Service, the Pan American Union, customs and general business information are being analyzed and arranged in such a way that they will be available for the information of business men who are contemplating taking up South American business or going into it on a more elaborate scale. The statistical work is in charge of Mr. O. P. Austin, former chief statistician of the United States. There is also kept on file in the library records from which information can be given on customs duties, port charges, trade regulations, shipping facilities, insurance costs, etc. The foreign trade department will further serve as a clearing house for the information received from the commercial representatives attached to the various branches and will serve as the medium by which exporters and importers can be kept in close touch with the activities of the branches.

The facilities to be offered by the branches themselves come under three heads:

1. The bank will furnish the facilities which are generally supplied by branch banks everywhere; that is, they will accept deposits, issue letters of credit, handle collections, and deal in exchange. The operation of the branches will create a market for the American dollar, with the result that gradually direct exchange will become a fact between South America and the United States. Under the Federal reserve act national banks may make acceptance of long-time bills growing out of foreign commercial transactions. This provision creates an opportunity for an American bill to be developed similar to the best known financial instrument, the London bill, which is now the chief medium in the world's commerce. The "bill" is now a "sterling" instrument. It will be possible under the new order to draw an increasing number of such bills in dollars instead of pounds, and the world market for the dollar should be enlarged to a point where it will take a prominent place in international exchange. Direct transfers by cable of funds from the branch to the parent bank, or from the parent bank to any bank in the United States, and vice versa, will become possible with the minimum of expense. Gradually a broad discount market for American bills will be developed and will undoubtedly go a long way toward encouraging the use of the draft on New York instead of on London in settlement of international transactions.

(2) The gathering of credit information will be one of the most important functions of the branch. As rapidly as possible the branches will collect reliable credit information concerning South American business and will at the same time be in a position to give the South American business people correct credit information about the people with whom they have transactions in the United States. The development of credit files will, of course, be a matter of evolution and take a number of years. One of the best credit men in the National City Bank has been sent to South America to develop the credit departments of the branches. Duplicate files will be kept in New York, so that the furnishing of this information may be as full and expeditious as possible.

(3) There will be attached to each branch one or more commercial representatives, who in a broad sense may be said to be the personal representatives of American business interests. These men will study trade conditions in the country to which they are assigned and will form cooperative relations with the foreign business men who are interested in the commerce of this country. They will thus be in a position to act as intermediaries and be able to assist the representatives of American business interests who visit South America. They will look for trade opportunities, and when such opportunities arise will communicate with the foreign trade department of the bank, which will be in a position to indicate these opportunities to the interested business organizations here. They will, furthermore, be in a position to make investigations of the possibilities for particular articles in the market, and, when an exhaustive investigation along some technical line is required, to employ a technical representative who will be competent and reliable. Many firms have already asked that preliminary investigations of this kind be made, and in numerous instances requests have been made that the representative purchase various articles in the original package to be sent to the American manufacturer, so that he may not only ascertain the character and quality of the article but the way the article is prepared for market, packed, labeled, etc. The commercial representative will also be able to give information regarding refused shipments, customhouse delays, etc., and in other ways will be of assistance in smoothing out difficulties that are encountered by the exporter.

In order that the information of a general nature collected by the commercial representative may be promptly disseminated, the National City Bank is issuing a publication called The Americas, devoted to the upbuilding of trade between the two continents. Whenever important information is received bearing particularly upon certain trades, special letters or bulletins will be issued to notify those who are likely to be interested. In order to provide some means of doing business with Argentina during the serious breaking down of the exchange markets, the National City Bank made an arrangement, pending the establishment of the branch at Buenos Aires, for an exchange of credits with the Banca de la Nacional, the national bank of Argentina. As a result a large amount of export and import business has been made possible which otherwise would have been greatly retarded by the war conditions.

As soon as possible the branch in Rio de Janeiro will be established, and probably there will not be much delay in doing this.

It is planned to develop the service gradually and in full cooperation with the Governments and institutions of the sister Republics of the south. The undertaking means large expenditures, and any ultimate profit which may come to the bank as a result of this work will be determined by the success made in broadening the markets for the American producer.

—

[From the Iron Age.]

UNITED STATES BANKS IN SOUTH AMERICA—DEFINITE DATA ON THE HANDLING OF CREDITS BROUGHT OUT IN DISCUSSION AT THE MACHINE-TOOL CONVENTION.

The paper of Vice President H. R. Eldridge, of the National City Bank of New York, on "The establishment of American banking facilities in South America," as read before the Machine-Tool Builders' Association in New York October 22 brought forth a most interesting discussion, which was chiefly a prolongation of Mr. Eldridge's remarks, but on lines in part suggested by questions from his audience. Thus there were brought out just the facts manufacturers want most to know about the credit and banking side of business with South American countries.

In his address Mr. Eldridge said, in part: "That we could sell goods in South America in liberal quantities at this time is more than probable in view of the disrupted relations necessarily caused by the war, but that we would be justified in granting the long terms of credit to which they are accustomed is not so clear. These long terms of credit are directly the result of keen competition and are likewise responsible in no little degree for the financial conditions there prevailing.

DANGERS OF LONG CREDITS.

"All leniency should be shown in granting credit to responsible concerns, but when those terms go beyond the bounds of reason the road is paved toward the slough of speculation. If a merchant buys on six months' time an article which will be sold and realized upon within 90 days, he holds in his hands the proceeds 90 days longer than he should, and the temptation is constantly before him to either buy more goods, often beyond his needs, or to employ the funds in some line of speculation, both leading to undue expansion and often to financial failure. It would be well, therefore, not to be too liberal in terms of credit, even though the development of trade be retarded thereby, yet not unreasonably chary of granting terms of a favorable nature when conditions justify.

"The National City Bank of New York will open at Buenos Aires, Argentina, a branch, and as soon as practicable another at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The bank desires to do all it can to promote the increase of trade relations, and through its banking department offer a cheap and effective method of handling the exchanges between buyers and sellers. It is fully alive to the inconvenience probable exporters and importers suffer by the lack of dependable information of trade conditions, demands for certain lines of goods, shipping requirements, customhouse regulations and dues, a knowledge of the products of the various countries which could be imported into the United States to advantage, their character and the avenues through which they could best be had, and the numerous other branches of information so requisite for the proper handling of business obtainable. To permit of the dissemination of such information among American exporters and importers it is the bank's intention to maintain a corps of trade experts at each branch whose duty it will be to gather all the data possible that can be of benefit and to make it available in an intelligent manner through the columns of The Americas, which will be issued from time to time, and special bulletins when deemed advisable. Information of this character will, no doubt, be found quite valuable and may possibly prove the source of no little saving of expense to houses operating in South America. The service of this corps will be available to American merchants and special reports can be arranged for where desired. The bank will establish in each branch a credit department, and hopes within a reasonable time to be able to furnish exporters and importers valuable information as to the standing of South American dealers."

THE DISCUSSION.

S. H. Reck, Greaves-Klusman Tool Co., Cincinnati, started an important discussion when he said: "I think that the question every one of us would like to ask of Mr. Eldridge is, How we are going to have our sales in South American countries handled? We understand that German and English bankers have afforded exceptional facilities to German and English manufacturers and merchants for disposing of their goods in these markets, which are so far away that the individual manufacturer in most cases would find it extremely difficult, almost, you might say, impossible—except in the case of such great concerns as the General Electric, the Westinghouse, or the International Harvester—to satisfy themselves as to whether credits should be justly extended. It would seem, therefore, that that function of the American bank that would best serve us would be to pass upon the credits themselves. If the branch banks in those countries were to be merely offices through which discounts can be handled holding the American shipper primarily responsible, the offices of the bank will not be very helpful to us, and the American trade with those countries will not be greatly stimulated thereby. But if that bank is to perform the real function of a bank, to be an institution to which the purchaser in those markets who is worthy of credit can go and obtain funds with which to make purchases in this country, paying for the goods or obtaining an extension of the time necessary to pay for them from the American bank, then the American manufacturer and merchant will be aided in exactly the manner that the English and the German manufacturer have been helped in past years by German and by English banking institutions. If Mr. Eldridge can give us the results of the investigations he has been making as to how credits and discounts will be handled—if, for instance, one of us were to sell a bill of $10,000 worth of machine tools to a house in Buenos Aires or Sao Paulo, whether we will be held responsible for the time we give or whether the bank will establish the credit basis and finance the transaction—that is what we would all like to hear very much."

DETAILS OF THE BANKING PRACTICE.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. If you are entirely satisfied with the responsibility of the party to whom you are shipping you will be willing to sell him on ordinary terms of a draft payable in 60 or 90 days upon the firm itself. In that case, of course, you are not interested, providing you can get a market for that bill. But if you want to sell to some house that you are not very well acquainted with, be it in South America or in Europe, what you are going to require of that man is a reimbursement. He must go to some bank and arrange for that credit, and you in turn must accept that bank, providing the bank is satisfactory to you. But even in an instance like that you still, as the maker of the drafe, remain the sponsor of the credit. You are responsible for your faith in that purchaser, and that is the custom the world over.

COMES BACK TO HOME PRACTICE.

"But of course the liability that you are assuming is very remote. That is the very reason that a prime bank's bill commands such a fine discount over a bill on a firm in England or Germany. No matter how well that firm stands, the bank's credit is regarded as better, and given firms are credited according to the risk involved. And that is exactly the arrangement that you have got to make in all your transactions in South America or in any other foreign country; and that is why so much stress has been laid upon the subject of domestic acceptances, because our country is so vast that its business could not be handled except upon some basis that permits you to sell to a house in Washington that you never heard of by drawing a bill against a bank there, if the bank will furnish the credit. That is the way it has to be done.

"Now there are undoubtedly houses in Buenos Aires, Sao Paulo, or Rio de Janeiro that the National City Bank of New York will be perfectly willing to purchase bills on. Where you are not satisfied with

the credit, certainly you have only one thing to do: If they want your goods, let them pay for them or arrange down there through their own bank. They can, if need be, make a deposit there and cable to you that such an arrangement has been made. There is no difference in methods of doing business with houses in South America in that respect and elsewhere, except that there is a certain amount of inconvenience in getting the necessary information on which to base your credits. We are endeavoring to get up our credit files, as we want to know something about the character of the bills that we have to buy. We are perfectly willing to purchase bills on the more responsible houses in South America as well as on the more responsible banks. For instance, if you want to make a shipment of machine tools to a house in Buenos Aires and they give you a credit against a well-known bank there we would buy it as readily as one against you or against any of the other banks there whose standing we are familiar with as first class. We would be perfectly willing to buy those bills, if your customer finds it more convenient to give them to you.

"Mr. RECK. The manufacturer here, then, will be just as able to rely on the credits recommended by the National City Bank of New York in those various centers as he would be on the recommendations of any of the banks in this country on which he is accustomed to rely?

BUILDING UP CREDIT FILES.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. Exactly. Wherever you sell a bill of goods to a party that you don't know thoroughly or it involves a large amount, you are very careful to revise your credit-information data. It is the intention of the National City Bank of New York City to build up its credit files so that they will be as nearly accurate for that region as it is possible to make them, and we shall endeavor to give not only every customer but any American merchant inquiring the benefit of them. We do not insist that you do business with us to get this information. All you have to do is to ask us for it; we are willing to give it to you. We shall endeavor to be prepared to give as close information as is possible to obtain; but in a country where Dun and Bradstreet have found that only 18 per cent of the merchants are willing to give a financial statement, you can imagine what a difficult problem it is going to be. We have to rely a great deal upon reputation, but are going to get as good experts as we possibly can and dig down deep as we possibly can without having them throw us out of doors. We want to secure such information as will render it fairly safe to do business, and we propose to back up our faith; that is, where we honestly believe the merchant is first class and will pay his bills, we will accept bills for them.

"Mr. RECK. Mr. Eldridge, every member of this association is heartily in accord with your action. The establishment of workable bases of credit is one of the necessary moves that must be made; it is pioneer work which, together with means of transportation, must precede any successful effort to get that trade.

LITTLE PROFIT IN PIONEERING.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. I may say to you in passing that the National City Bank is not expecting to make very much money out of this proposition for a good many years to come. On the contrary, we look forward to giving up rather liberally in the way of our preliminary expense. We further realize that as soon as we blaze the way, if the thing is a big success, doubtless a great many other banks in this country will find it to their interest to establish branches there, and we will heartily welcome them, because the bigger the field the better for our country and for all of us.

"One of the great advantages of a foreign trade is readily understood when you take into consideration that every dollar of merchandise that leaves your shores for a foreign country gives you a call upon that country for $1 of gold, and that gold is the standard of value and the basis of all credit. The more we can protect the gold reserve of this country the more do we protect our merchants, our industries, and the cheapness with which credit may be obtained. Active foreign trade is one of the most desirable things that any country can possess, because it creates a tremendous call upon the gold of the world and forces the other countries who are our buyers to either give of their products in return or of their gold.

WEALTH FROM FOREIGN TRADE.

"Naturally any country that can develop a great foreign trade will develop a good import trade in the products of the country to whom our exports go. That country must in turn ship to us its products in order to reduce the balance of trade against it. The reason that London was able to hold its tremendous position in the business world lies in the fact that it is the clearing house of the world, where all international credits are settled. A draft on London is always given preference over a draft on Paris or on Berlin, because everybody can use it. On exactly the same principle a merchant down in, let us say, Memphis, Tenn., finds that he can not use St. Louis exchange as conveniently as he can New York exchange, because he has a greater call for New York exchange.

"That is the reason that London retains its tight grip upon all the countries of the world. It is this which enables London on a little old $250,000,000 of gold in normal times actually to control the commerce of the world. It finances the commerce of the world on a stock of gold not one-sixth of what we have in this country; and the reason that we in this country are not taking advantage of the great gold stock we have, which is double that of any nation in the world, is because we have never had the good sense to provide for its mobilization.

"We do not need gold certificates to circulate among our people. What man feels safer because he has a gold certificate in his pocket than if he had a national bank note? One is just as good as the other. Through our Federal reserve act we have taken a long step forward toward perfecting our financial system and improving financial conditions. You are going to see in the course of the next five years a great change in the way of doing business. We are gradually approaching scientific methods. We have been blundering in the dark in the past.

THE OUTLOOK FOR BETTER BUSINESS.

"I think we can all look forward to better business conditions when this great war is settled. We are going to be a long time recovering from the effects of the war. Our foreign trade is temporarily going to be larger than it has been in the past. The nations that are at war will be compelled to buy from us, because we are the only great nation capable of supplying them foodstuffs and articles of war that they must have. Logically, as long as the war continues, so long must we continue to make large exports, because they have got to have what we can sell them. That is going to help us; it is going to permit us, in a way, to protect ourselves, by the credits that must necessarily be established to purchase those things, against the load of securities that they may dump upon us.

"Personally I do not think that they are going to dump those securities upon us in the amounts that some have anticipated, for the simple reason that a man is going to want to sell, as a general thing, that which he thinks the least of and keep that which he most values. American securities to-day of a standard kind are the best available securities in the world, because this Nation is at peace and there is no reason why our securities should not continue paying dividends as they fall due. Therefore they are reliable, and the man who is not used to work, the man who is living on an income and could not make a living in any other way than clipping coupons, is going to give that very great consideration. Therefore I think that when this war is over, if it lasts one or two years, as a great many think it will, we will be in pretty good shape. But let us not delude ourselves with the idea that we are about to enter upon a great era of prosperity, because capital can not be impaired, permanent improvements can not be destroyed, human life can not be destroyed as it is being destroyed in Europe to-day without affecting the whole world. We are bound to feel the results, but we will feel them less than any great nation in the world.

"When this great struggle is over and the balance of trade is struck on the books you are going to find that your Uncle Samuel stands mighty well through having kept out of war, and will be able to show a better trial balance sheet than any nation on earth, and be able to go ahead and do business better than any of them. Then will come the time when we will realize the great value of mobilizing our gold reserve. We will by that time have still further added to it, because it will be hard to take it away from us when once we get on our feet, and then is the time when we can talk about financing other countries.

"Mr. C. WOOD WALTER (Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Cincinnati). You have described the function of those American banks as regards credit. Does the German or the English bank do any more than just that for the trade of those countries down there?

THE REASON FOR LONG CREDITS.

"Mr. ELDRIDGE. They finance bills, and they have been, as I understand it, quite liberal in their financing. That is, they would accept for various houses there—assume the credit responsibility themselves to a considerable extent where it was a very desirable customer. You understand that England and Germany have been right at one another's throats for business. Deep down in their hearts that is what has been the matter between England and Germany for a good while. England, for instance, had the South American trade pretty well in hand when Germany stepped in; England was selling its goods practically upon a 60-day basis. Germany came and, finding it hard to get the business, and realizing that most people are very much tempted by being able to get good credit, said to them: 'England makes you pay in 60 days; we are not hogs like them, we will make it 90' [laughter], and immediately a great deal of the English trade began drifting to the Germans. England comes up to the scratch and says: 'Germany is not as lenient as you think she is; we will make it 4 months.' And so it went on until they got it up to 6 months for goods that had always before been sold on 60 days' time.

"That was a very nice thing for the Argentine merchants; at least they thought so. As a matter of fact, it was one of the worst things that could have happened to any country, because when you sell goods on terms longer than you should and the purchaser realizes on them and gets the money in his jeans it always burns him. He can not resist the feeling that here is an excellent opportunity to buy a piece of property or make some less safe investment in a booming country, where land values fluctuate rapidly, and by the time the account really falls due his money is tied up or he has failed to make a profit on the investment. He may have gone into a losing speculation. I think that situation has developed disadvantageously in South American countries, especially Argentina.

CREDITS SHOULD BE SHORTENED.

"If therefore, trade is pushed with Argentina, it should be established on a solid business basis. Any of you can see the justice of that for yourselves and will recognize the truth of these observations. If a man does not have to pay anything for a good while, he begins to think he may never have to pay it. I know, as a banker, that I have met a great many people who never think of paying even when you suggest it to them. I have known merchants that go along year after year and never pay up. As long as they keep themselves in a solvent condition you are perfectly willing to loan them money; it is a safe risk. But you let a fellow get the idea that he can get credit as much as he wants and that he can extend whenever he wants to and there is no need of ever paying up on time—that man is in a precarious condition. His business is not being run in good shape, and his head may go under at any time that a stringency develops in the money market. But the man that keeps his business in good shape and has always ready assets sufficient to pay his bills as they fall due is a far more desirable customer. He is a good risk, and can always get money, no matter what sort of financial weather prevails."

[From the Bankers' Magazine, vol. 82, pp. 518–519, April, 1911.]

LATIN AMERICA—AN INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN BANK.

[By Elmer H. Youngman, editor of the Bankers' Magazine—Address before the Pan American Commercial Conference, Washington, D. C., February 17, 1911.]

Before entering on the discussion of a proposal to establish an American bank in Latin America or other foreign countries, it might be well to inquire, first, whether or not such a bank is needed; and, second, if found to be needed, what sort of bank it ought to be. These are very simple questions, perhaps, but to my mind they are of great importance.

First, as to the need of an American bank, or banks, in Latin America, opinion is far from being unanimous. We are told by some that the existing banks stand ready to supply all facilities necessary to carry on trade between the United States and Latin America, and that no necessity exists for establishing American banking institutions for further developing our commerce. That view, I think, is not entertained by those who have a practical first-hand knowledge of the subject.

Banking is not an entirely passive and impartial instrument of commerce. The railway or the ship may, possibly, be as ready to carry the goods of one nation or of one merchant as of another. Not so with banking. Each bank has its clients, as the lawyers have theirs. A bank selects its dealers, and deals only with whom it chooses. Sometimes the selection may be made from the standpoint of location, of particular lines of business, even of nationality. Banking may be cosmopolitan in many of its aspects, but the considerations named—and others that might be cited—have an important bearing on the business of those who deal with banks.

Besides, in many portions of Latin America, as in all partially developed countries, a bank is other than a mere institution of deposit

and discount. It assumes not infrequently the duties of a financial and commercial agent, with functions much wider than those pertaining to banking as generally understood.

If anyone from the United States should be in any country of Latin America with a view to carrying on some particular enterprise that required banking assistance, to whom could he turn most confidently, to an American bank, to a native local institution, or to a French, German, or English bank that might possibly be interested in defeating his efforts in favor of some rival? To ask this question is to answer it. And yet this is but one phase—and perhaps a relatively unimportant one—of this problem.

Certainly few would be so rash as to claim that the banks in this country have a thorough knowledge of Latin-American credits, or that they are prepared to grant credit on the terms necessary to place us in a position to compete on terms of equality with the European manufacturer or merchant in securing Latin-American trade.

Nearly every activity of production and trade comes into contact somewhere with the business of banking. The perfection of a country's commercial machinery—its smooth and effective working—depends very largely upon the character of its banks. Trade between nations arises, of course, from the demand existing in one country and the ability of another country to supply that demand at the right price. But this ability to furnish goods at a salable price will, to no small extent, be governed by the efficiency of the banking machinery. We need not stop to inquire whether banks create commerce or not. It is enough to know that they greatly facilitate it.

There is no doubt whatever in my mind that an American bank, properly organized and wisely managed, would be a powerful agent in extending our enterprise throughout Latin America and in developing our commercial relations with our southern neighbors, to the great advantage of all concerned.

Primarily this question in its narrower commercial aspect resolves itself into a matter of profit. If our banking capital can earn good profits in Latin America or elsewhere, why should we debar it from going there, and under the conditions most favorable to success? For example, can any good reason be given why our national banks, of large enough capital, should not be given the privilege of establishing branches in Mexico and Cuba, now exercised by the great chartered banks of Canada?

Second, if it be conceded that our banking relations with Latin America are capable of improvement, and that our banking capital should enter that field, it next becomes necessary to consider what kind of bank would be the best. The national bank act prohibits, and, as I believe, wisely prohibits, a national bank from having branches. I can seen no good reason, however, why our national banks of very large capital might not be permitted, under proper regulation, to have branches in the chief cities of Latin America and in other foreign countries.

But I do not believe this to be the best solution of the problem. The European nations, as well as Japan and Mexico, have learned the value of specialization in banking—the desirability of organizing banks adequately equipped with the powers for doing the work in hand. Some time we shall adopt that principle here. Let us adopt it now if we are to enter the foreign banking field with any hope of success. We must not venture into that field in our weakness, but in our might. I think we have had enough already of weak attempts to establish American banks in certain foreign countries with a result that might have been foreseen.

If we are to have a foreign bank worth anything, its capital must from the outset be large enough to command respect, and its management must rigidly conform to the soundest requirements of banking. An institution that would not only promote enterprise and develop trade, but that would add to our prestige and increase the respect of others for our business methods.

While it is very natural and proper that a bank of the character mentioned should find its first sphere of operations among our neighbors of Central and South America, I am of the opinion that its sphere should not be limited to those countries. I believe the time to be ripe for the formation of an international American bank, with a capital of not less than $100,000,000, having its head office in New York, with branches in Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, and in the great commercial centers of the world. It would, of course, be one of the first duties of such a bank to do everything essential to the mutual development of trade and enterprise between Latin America and the United States.

It is beyond my purpose at the present time to elaborate a plan for the organization of this bank. That is a detail for future consideration. Whether or not the sanction of Congress could be had for such an institution I do not know. The prestige afforded by a Federal charter would be helpful, but may not be indispensable. It might be advisable to organize first under State laws a pan-American bank, and the capital might be partly furnished here and partly in the countries where the banks are to be located. It may be remarked in passing that the trust company is something practically unknown in Latin America. There are legal difficulties in the way of establishing such institutions there, though these may be overcome. Judging from the experience of the trust company in the United States, Latin America ought to furnish an inviting field for the establishment of such institutions. In fact, a movement is now under way to organize a trust company in one of the principal Latin-American nations. The particulars of this movement I am not at liberty to disclose.

One thing we must remember—there should be international reciprocity in banking as well as in trade. If we expect to invade Mexico, Central and South America with our banks, we must expect the banks of those countries to come here. And if we restrict the operations of their banks here, we may expect them to throw like restrictions around our banks there. Already many foreign banks have agencies in New York and other American cities, but the State laws generally prohibit these agencies from doing a banking business; that is, they may not receive deposits, and thus their ability to make loans is largely curtailed. Can we reasonably expect that Latin America will allow privileges to our banks which we deny to theirs?

As the importance of the United States as an exporter of manufactured products grows each year and competition becomes keener the need of an institution like that herein suggested will become more and more apparent. It is wise to discuss this question now. It would be wiser perhaps to stop discussion and begin to take action.

One thing should be borne in mind—that the interests of those whom we are seeking to make our customers should be most carefully regarded. A Latin-American bank whose operations might in any way serve to provoke the antagonism of the banks already existing or that would meddle in political affairs might do much more harm than good. But a Pan American bank, or one of the broader scope indicated, properly organized and rightly managed, would be a powerful instrumentality in developing enterprise and trade, to the mutual benefit of ourselves and of the other countries concerned.

[From the Banking Law Journal, vol. 27, pp. 305–309, April, 1910.]

AN INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN BANK.

[By Maurice L. Muhleman, author of "Banking Systems of the World," etc.]

Considerable discussion has recently been caused by a proposition to establish an international bank under the auspices of the United States to be devoted to facilitating commercial and financial transactions between the several countries of the western continent.

This proposition is a reminder of the strange indifference shown by our Federal legislators to some of the most important enterprises in which the capital of the country could be profitably employed, at the same time furnishing us with a most powerful instrument to increase our business with the rest of the continent lying practically at our doors. Had we spent one-half as much in the way of developing the friendly commercial relations with South and Central America as has been spent to wrest trade from nations in the Orient we should have had results that would have warranted the outlays many times over.

Efforts are now being made to induce Congress to enact a reasonable law providing for subsidies to ships plying between our ports and those of South America. If properly adjusted and then properly carried out, the investment of several millions of dollars in a series of years in this way by the Government would unquestionably prove profitable to our business interests. The conditions for the development of our trade in that direction are particularly favorable at this time, and the President is justified in bringing his influence to bear upon Congress to accomplish the desired result. It is to be hoped that the elements that defeated similar projects in the past will not be permitted to dominate in Washington this year and defeat the enactment of the necessary legislation.

But we do not only require ships of our own to promote our commercial interests in South America; we need also that which every other nation of importance possesses—a bank that shall act as the handmaid to the commerce. Although there has been a little improvement in the conditions bearing upon our exchanges with countries to south of us, it is, upon the whole, still as true as it was 20 years ago that the bulk of that commerce pays a heavy banking toll to European countries, a toll that necessarily constitutes a tax upon our trade and prevents its development in the degree that the South American trade of other nations exhibits. We are the largest buyers of the products of these States, but we are far behind several countries of Europe in selling goods to the Latin Americans.

The project to establish a Pan American bank took definite shape in 1890, when a special committee appointed by the International American Congress—which had been convened in Washington by our then Secretary of State Blaine—recommended that the United States take the initiative in providing a banking institution to lessen the cost of exchange and promote the commercial relations between the countries. A bill to establish such a bank was then prepared, but failed to receive the approval of Congress. Another vigorous attempt was made in 1897, but again there was a lack of sufficient interest and business intelligence, and the bill was permitted to die. It is doubtful if even now there is a fair chance for such legislation, although considerable activity is being displayed by friends of the measure.

It is proper to say at the outset that the Government is not asked to contribute one dollar to the capital of the proposed bank or to assume any responsibility for its obligations. All that is asked is that it shall give it a charter, because no State charter would suffice for the purpose, and in many of the States such a charter could not be had. It is proposed to permit the Government to exercise supervisory powers through the Treasury Department, and the principles governing the operations of banks of a similar character chartered by foreign nations are to be applied in its case.

Manifestly the bank must have branches at all of the chief ports on the American Continent south of us; the head office would be located in New York City. As the business develops, agencies and branches would be established at other places, such as New Orleans, San Francisco, etc., which ports carry on very considerable trade in that region now, and may be expected to increase it.

The report of the committee of the conference, made in 1890, pointed out very succinctly and cogently why such an institution is needed; only one of the members of that body was a citizen of the United States, the others representing various Latin-American States participating in the conference. The commerce of the West Indies, Central and South America was then valued at some $1,200,000,000, of which the share of the United States was $283,000,000, $181,000,000 representing our purchases from them. To-day our commerce with South America alone is nearly $280,000,000; our purchases in 1909 amounted to $193,000,000; our exports to only $83,000,000. This shows the heavy balance against us.

The great bulk of the purchases by Latin America is made in Europe; the great bulk of its trade with us is carried in European ships, and is adjusted by exchange upon European banks, which have branches in every important place in the Southern American Continent. The committee estimated that the tax on our trade paid to European bankers for exchange alone was at the rate of three-fourths of 1 per cent. Since that date the aggressive policy of Germany and the growth of French and Italian interests, particularly in Brazil and Argentina, have probably caused some reduction in the tax rate. But it is still of sufficient importance to make it a burden upon the trade.

The process of financing transactions is clearly described in "The Discount System in Europe," by Paul M. Warburg, recently published by the National Monetary Commission, from which the following is quoted:

"If an American merchant buys coffee in Sao Paulo, he will generally pay for it by opening for the shipper a documentary credit in Europe—that is to say, the American purchaser makes an arrangement with the European banker by which the latter agrees to accept, let us say, a three months' bill drawn on him, with shipping documents attached, covering a certain shipment of coffee, the amount to be drawn being the equivalent of the amount due by the American purchaser to the South American shipper. The shipper will have no difficulty in selling to a bank in Sao Paulo his bill drawn on a first-class European banking house, and thus will promptly secure the money due him for the goods sold. The local bank in Sao Paulo will buy the bill without hesitation, because it knows that it need only send this foreign bill to England, Germany, or France, as the case may be, where, owing to the extensive

discount market in these countries, it can immediately rediscount the bill, thus securing repayment in cash for the amount invested. Indeed, if the Brazilian bank prefers to do so, it can at the moment of shipment, by cabling to Europe, fix the discount rate at which the bills will be discounted upon their arrival in Europe.

"When the bill reaches Europe the drawee puts his acceptance on it, and having thus obligated himself to pay the bill when due, the documents are in most cases released and sent to the American purchaser of the goods who opened the credit with the European bank. Of course, the American purchaser pays a commission to the European banker for the service rendered. The compensation depends on the standing of the purchaser and, in part, on the question of whether or not the documents are to be released upon acceptance—the American purchaser obligating himself to put the bank in funds before the bill falls due—or whether or not the documents are only to be given up by the accepting bank against cash payment by the purchaser. It may be said that the average compensation for such acceptance is between a quarter of 1 per cent up to three-quarters of 1 per cent for three months, according to the conditions of the case."

The existing system naturally diverts trade to Europe. If to-day one wishes to go to a South American port below the north coast, the most direct route is by way of Europe. Great cargoes of coffee, hides, etc., come to New York from Rio Janeiro and Buenos Aires, chiefly in foreign bottoms, of course; but most of the ships, instead of taking return cargoes here, carrying our manufactured goods back to pay for our purchases, take bills of exchange upon London or Hamburg, proceed to those ports, empty, if need be, to take the British and German shoes, textiles, etc., to the people in Brazil and Argentina.

It would appear, therefore, almost necessary, and certainly desirable, to develop our transportation facilities coincidently with the creation of a Pan-American bank. These two improvements should be brought about at the same time—and as soon as practicable. Already the situation is rendered more difficult than it was 10 and 20 years ago by the increased competition for business since Germany began its well-planned and well-executed program of taking trade from Great Britain. It will require much careful and well-directed work to place us even in third rank in commercial and financial importance in South America as a whole. But we shall fall behind much more if we permit opportunities to pass without action.

To illustrate the power of the present competitors that are in the field, it will be sufficient to take a recent statement of banks in Argentina, which gives the British institutions deposits of approximately $95,000,000, the one controlled by Spanish $60,000,000, the French one $25,000,000, the German ones $20,000,000, and the Italian institutions $50,000,000. All of these corporations are making handsome profits and are helping very materially to promote the trade between Argentina and the countries which they represent there. We can not expect to compete with these nations unless we equip ourselves adequately. In order to do this we must look to Congress.

It was through favorable legislation that Germany and the other nations succeeded in wresting from Great Britain the practical monopoly of that great market, which had been hers for generations merely by reason of acute business judgment and wise statesmanship. All of these countries except Spain are farther away than we are from the chief South American ports, yet all do relatively a much larger business there, and what should give even more cause for consideration by us, they all take toll from us through their banks. It was well said by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives in 1897 that a condition more humiliating to the people of the United States can hardly be conceived.

It is high time that something be done both by way of improving transportation means and by way of providing banking facilities. The way is open; the representative South Americans who have discussed these questions with our representatives would welcome these steps; they would in fact assist in many ways toward the establishment of the bank, including the investment of their own means in the capital thereof. With such an institution at work there would, to again quote from the committee report mentioned, "be a stimulation of intercourse, commercial and financial, such as would surprise those who are content to transact American business through European bankers."

It developed at that time that goods produced by us and shipped to Europe were actually reshipped from there to South America at a profit which the committee said "we are too slow or stupid to secure for ourselves." With the proper facilities these goods could evidently have been provided by us for South American use more cheaply, and the South American, who is not abnormally fond of paying high prices, fully appreciates this fact. But he is helpless; he looks to this great and wealthy nation to take the steps necessary to correct this absurd condition to the advantage and profit of both.

There have been public men who have questioned the constitutional authority of Congress to charter such a bank, but that question is to-day no longer a rational one; only the most hide-bound bourbon could entertain such an opinion in the face of the decisions of our highest court from the days of Marshall down. The regulation of conditions bearing upon our foreign commerce is specifically placed in the hands of Congress by the Constitution; it may use such means as seem to it judicious and not otherwise forbidden to carry out that purpose. The benefit to the Nation is finally to be regarded as a determining factor in settling the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the shipping bill now under discussion throughout the country may come before the House at a time when debate will be limited, and action hurried by caucus requirement. I venture, therefore, to take the opportunity now to lay before the House certain considerations concerning it which ought to have an influence in forming the judgment of men who will have to vote on this important measure. When a similar bill involving a transfer of belligerent merchant ships to a neutral flag was before us on August 3 I spoke as follows:

Now, it seems to me that if this bill is passed it will not create any more vessels. We will have to buy, if we buy at all, either vessels that belong to some of these belligerents, in which case the question of fraudulent transfer will be raised, or we will buy vessels that belong to citizens or subjects of some neutral power. They will be just as free from capture under any other flag as they would under ours. If we buy belligerent vessels, we are hunting trouble. The neutral vessels we do not need to buy, because we can ship our goods in them without buying them.

Now, it seems to me, with the definite announcement which has been made here that this bill is intended to be an emergency bill to meet the situation caused by the European war, the presumption of fraud in the transfer of foreign vessels to American registry would be held by a belligerent to be very great. Therefore the dangers that lie in this bill seem to me to be so great that I must vote against it.

To recapitulate: There are four ways in which the war is going to interfere with our foreign commerce. First, many merchant ships of the belligerents will be called into the naval service of their respective countries. Second, those that continue in the merchant marine will be subject to capture. Third, neutral ships carrying contraband will be subject to capture. Fourth, blockades will seriously interfere with all commerce bound to any of the countries engaged in the war.

We can not buy merchant ships of the class first mentioned; they will be in the navies. If we buy ships of the second class, we buy trouble. It will be of no use to buy vessels of the third and fourth classes, because as neutrals they already have all the rights they would have with American registry.

Further, on August 28, when the marine war-risk insurance measure was under discussion, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. STAFFORD. I have in my hand the report of that conference (referring to the London conference of 1907), to which our Government was a party, which reads as follows:

"The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void, unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy ship as such is exposed."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was vetoed by the English Government before it ever was adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Our Government committed itself to this principle, and the signatory powers submitted this rule to others for the guidance of the international prize court that was to be established pursuant to the recommendations of the second Hague conference.

Mr. TEMPLE. The Italian Government in its war with Turkey adopted this as its policy, in spite of the fact that it had not been ratified by the powers, and Great Britain and France have since announced they intend to act on the declaration of London, although not ratified.

And, again, on August 29, when the same bill was under discussion, I spoke as follows:

Now, it is a mistake to say that Great Britain vetoed that declaration. Great Britain signed it and the British Cabinet approved it. There is no ratification of a treaty in the Parliament, in either house, in Great Britain. Ratification is an executive act, according to the practice of the British Government, and is done by the cabinet. The status of this declaration of London in British law is perhaps about what the status of the Colombian treaty would be—the treaty that promises $25,000,000 to Colombia—if it should be ratified by the Senate and the House should fail to make the appropriation of $25,000,000. That would be a treaty signed and agreed to by the ratifying power, but failing to go into operation, because the legislation necessary to put it into operation failed to go through the House.

That is the status of the London declaration in British law. It was signed by the representatives of the British Government. It was approved by the cabinet. The Government prepared a bill to modify existing domestic law in England to bring it into harmony with the declaration of London. That bill passed the House of Commons, but failed in the House of Lords.

Mr. Chairman, before going into a discussion at length of the provisions of the declaration of London a short narrative showing the origin of the document would be in order. There has long been a difference in the practice of the nations with regard to a good many things covered by maritime law. We talk about international law, and international law is real. It has been ordinarily observed by nations at war and at peace; but with regard to maritime law there has been little uniformity, because there has been little agreement among the powers. The cases that come up—cases of contraband, whether absolute or conditional; cases involving the destination of conditional contraband; cases involving blockade, whether involving a neutral ship or an enemy or one that sails under the flag of the captor—all alike are tried in the court of the captor, and the courts of the various countries have followed different rules. There has been a general agreement as to the principles involved, but the principles have been variously applied under rules adopted by each power for its own courts. To meet that situation it was proposed at the second Hague conference in 1907 that an international prize court of appeals should be established, to which appeals might be taken from the decisions of the prize courts of the various nations. A treaty was drawn up and signed by the representatives of most of the powers at that conference. Certain objections developed later, however.

When the question of ratifying the prize-court treaty came up in this country there was objection upon the ground that we ought not to submit decisions of the United States to review by any court anywhere. This was to be an international prize court of appeals. Appeals may be taken from our ordinary prize courts—generally a United States district court acting as a prize court—to the Supreme Court of the United States. We were not willing to have the case appealed from the Supreme Court, and thus subordinate it to any court established in any part of the world.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman state whether a similar appeal is allowed, for instance, in the prize courts of Great Britain or France or Germany, to their higher court?

Mr. TEMPLE. To their higher courts?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; the British naval prize act permits an appeal to a higher court, and so does the law of most, if not all, of the maritime powers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I had not the pleasure of hearing the gentleman, but the subject upon which he is now talking is very interesting and a far-reaching one. Could not the objection, which touches our pride as respects an appeal from the United States Supreme Court to the international court, be obviated by permitting the appeal to go directly from the district court or the circuit court of appeals to the international court rather than through the medium of the Supreme Court?

Mr. TEMPLE. It was obviated in another way. The signatory powers agreed to an additional protocol to the original prize-court treaty which met the objection, and the treaty was afterwards ratified by the Senate with the protocol as an original part of the treaty. The protocol provided that powers which are prevented by difficulties of a constitutional nature from accepting the treaty in its original form shall have the right to declare in the instrument of ratification that recourse to the international prize court can only be exercised against them in the form of an action in damages for the injury caused by the capture.

When the Senate advised the ratification of the treaty it did so on the condition that such a declaration be made in the instrument of ratification. It follows that a case settled by the Supreme Court of the United States would not be reviewed in the international prize court.

That was not the only objection, however, to the international court of appeals. Great Britain objected to it on other grounds. The seventh article of the treaty to establish the prize court is as follows:

> If the question of law to be decided is covered by a treaty in force between the belligerent captor and a power which is itself, or whose subject or citizen is a party to the proceedings, the court is governed by the provisions of the said treaty. In the absence of such provisions the court shall apply the rules of international law. If no general recognized rule exists, the court shall give judgment in accordance with the general principles of justice and equity.

The last provision, that in the absence of treaty regulations and in the absence of recognized rule of international law the court shall give judgment "in accordance with the general principles of justice and equity," was deemed by the British authorities to be somewhat indefinite. "The general principles of justice and equity." That phrase might mean many things. Great Britain, in order that there might be recognized rules for an international prize court to follow, called a conference of the powers, which met in London.

The call was sent to 10 of the more important maritime powers of the world, including the six great powers of Europe—Germany, Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, France, Russia, and Italy—together with the United States, Japan, Spain, and Holland. In sending out her invitation the English Government declared "that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for His Majesty's Government to carry the legislation necessary to give effect to the treaty establishing the prize court "unless they could assure both Houses of the British Parliament that some more definite understanding had been reached as to the rule by which the new tribunal should be governed." I quote from the call sent out by Great Britain to the maritime powers.

Mr. GARNER. Would it disturb the gentleman if I asked him a question?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not in the least.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the gentleman's definition of the condition of this treaty of which he has spoken and the protocol, it was that you could go directly to this Hague tribunal and sue for damages?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Suppose that in the meantime the Supreme Court of the United States had held that the capture of a ship was legal, and later on The Hague tribunal should hold that the American Government was liable for damages. How would you enforce the decision of The Hague court, realizing that you would have to come to the Congress of the United States for an appropriation? Would not there be some difficulty in getting this body to accept The Hague tribunal's decision as against our own Supreme Court?

Mr. TEMPLE. The treaty obligation provides for a suit for damages, and I imagine that a treaty that has been approved by the Senate of the United States looking to this purpose would have very considerable influence with the House of Representatives. I do not know whether it would or not in the case of the Colombia treaty, but I think, in connection with a treaty of this kind there would be little doubt, if any, as to getting this House to make the appropriation which such action by the international court would require. But to continue with the narrative.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would it disturb the gentleman if I asked him a question in connection with the one just suggested by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman know of any adjudication by an international tribunal, whether it be an arbitration board or not, which has never been submitted and conformed to by the nation interested? Do I make myself clear?

Mr. TEMPLE. I do not know of any requirement that has ever been imposed on any nation by a board of arbitration that that nation has refused to meet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know the gentleman has studied matters of this sort and I wanted his opinion whether or not the prospects of the peace of the world are not very hopeful, so far as our past experince is concerned, in that all arbitrations heretofore rendered have been submitted to?

Mr. TEMPLE. The standard of honor among nations has ordinarily been higher than the standard of honor among men individually.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman let me make a short statement in that connection?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Under our treaty-making power the President and the Senate of the United States negotiate and confirm a treaty with a foreign nation. They even make treaties obligating this Government to pay certain sums of money annually. This House on three different occasions since I have been a Member of it has refused to carry out the provisions of that treaty by refusing to carry the appropriation. So the result is that any treaty made by our Government which obligates this Government to settle a financial transaction has got to come back to the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives, in the original instance, might not have confirmed the treaty.

Mr. TEMPLE. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Now, the powers accepted the invitation that had been extended by Great Britain to send representatives. Prof. George Grafton Wilson, of Brown University, lecturer also at Harvard University and at the Naval War College, and Admiral Stockton were representatives from the United States, both of them known and recognized far and wide for their familiarity with questions of international law. The London declaration of 1909 was the result of that conference. Great Britain called the conference for the purpose of determining what are the general recognized principles of international law. I quote from the call:

> His Majesty's Government therefore propose that another conference should assemble during the autumn of the present year with the object of arriving at an agreement as to what are the generally recognized principles of international law within the meaning of paragraph 2 of article 7 of the draft convention, as to those matters wherein the practice of nations has varied, and of then formulating the rules which, in the absence of special treaty provisions applicable to a particular case, the court should observe in dealing with appeals brought before it for decision.

Let me call attention to the distinction made in that call between rules on the one hand and generally recognized principles on the other. It was for the purpose of arriving at an agreement as to what are the generally recognized principles of international law, and then for the further purpose of formulating the rules which should interpret and apply those generally recognized principles.

Let me read also from the general report presented to the naval conference on behalf of this draft committee. After speaking of the work that had been done by the British Government in preparation for the gathering of the conference, the preparation of the so-called "Red Book," which contained the views of the various nations, the draft committee says:

> The conference could not but express its gratitude for this valuable preparatory work, which was of great assistance to it. It made it possible to observe, in the first place, that the divergences in the practices and doctrines of the different countries were perhaps less wide than was generally believed, that the essential ideas were often the same in all countries, and that the methods of application alone varied with traditions or prejudices, with permanent or accidental interests. It was therefore possible to extract a common element which it could be agreed to recommend for uniform application.

A common element existed in the divergent rules and practices of the various nations, and the members of the conference believed that they had found universally recognized, or at least generally recognized, principles of international law. The declaration of London contains a preliminary provision, which is as follows:

The signatory powers are agreed that the rules contained in the following chapters correspond, in substance, with the generally recognized principles of international law.

Now, what is the force of this declaration of London? It was, of course, reported to the various nations by the representatives of those nations, carrying the force of this almost authoritative opinion, that its chapters correspond, in substance, with the generally recognized principles of international law. It went to the Senate of the United States, and the Senate, acting in accordance with its usual practice, advised the ratification of the treaty by the requisite two-thirds vote on April 24, 1912. That is, the Senate ratified the declaration of London just exactly as it ratifies any other treaty that ever goes into effect. Formally ratification is an executive act. The Senate has only power to advise and consent to the ratification. It did in this case what it does in all cases, and in common speech we speak of the Senate as having ratified treaties. As a matter of fact, no proclamation was ever issued by the executive power of the United States, and ratifications have not been deposited at The Hague as provided for in the treaty. Technically it has not been ratified.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. TEMPLE. Very willingly.

Mr. GARNER. If the President negotiates a treaty and the Senate ratifies, and then the President never promulgates it, is it still a treaty?

Mr. TEMPLE. No. I say it is not ratified.

Mr. GARNER. So the President finally has an opportunity of withholding and nullifying a treaty after the Senate has ratified it?

Mr. TEMPLE. Ordinarily the President sends to the Senate only such treaties as he has already determined to ratify, if the Senate advises the ratification. In this case peculiar circumstances arose which I have already referred to. The English Government found that certain legislation was necessary to amend existing British law, to bring it into harmony with the new rules of the declaration of London. The bill so prepared by the Cabinet was passed by the House of Commons and failed to pass the House of Lords, so that the British Government was not ready to exchange ratification. We were ready. We were committed to it.

Mr. MADDEN. So that England is not committed to the London convention at all?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes. England is committed to it very thoroughly, as I shall show later—not by an exchange of ratifications, however. Article 56 of the declaration of London is the article that is of importance in connection with the proposed legislation for the transfer of ships owned by subjects of belligerent powers to the flag of the United States. Article 56 is as follows:

The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag, effected after the outbreak of hostilities, is void, unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade consequences to which an enemy vessel as such is exposed.

Mr. MADDEN. So the burden of proof would be on the neutral nation?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; the burden of proof would be on the claimant, and not on the captor, in the prize court.

Now, the question arises as to whether this is in force. I was asked a moment ago whether England was committed to this treaty. I hold in my hand an order in council, dated at the court at Buckingham Palace, on the 29th day of October, 1914, the essential part of which is as follows:

Whereas by an order in council dated the 20th day of August, 1914, His Majesty was pleased to declare that during the present hostilities the convention known as the declaration of London should, subject to certain additions and modifications therein specified, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government.

And then, after other preliminaries:

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of his privy council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. During the present hostilities the provisions of the convention known as the declaration of London shall, subject to the exclusion of the lists of contraband and noncontraband, and to the modifications hereinafter set out, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government.

I want to say that the exceptions and modifications have no bearing whatever on article 56, which touches the transfer of enemy vessels to a neutral flag. In the latter part of this order—and I shall not take the time to read all of it—is the following command:

The lords commissioners of His Majesty's treasury, the lords commissioners of the admiralty, and each of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state, the president of the probate, divorce, and admiralty division of the high court of justice, all other judges of His Majesty's prize courts, and all governors, officers, and authorities whom it may concern, are to give the necessary directions herein as to them may respectively appertain.

There is no doubt, then, that that paragraph of the declaration of London which bears on the question of transferring ships from a belligerent flag to a neutral flag is the law of the British prize courts that will try the cases. Secretary Bryan, in his letter to Senator STONE, said, "The declaration of London is not in force." That paragraph of it is in force in British prize courts, and they are the only courts that will have jurisdiction over cases of vessels captured by British warships.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, is there any appeal from those courts?

Mr. TEMPLE. There is no appeal to an international prize court.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I mean.

Mr. TEMPLE. Because the treaty, like the London declaration itself, failed of the final exchange of ratifications, so that we are thrown back to the original basis. Each nation provides its own rules of contraband and its own rules of prize cases, just as they did before the declaration of London was formulated at all. If they had the right to do that before, then they will certainly exercise that right now.

Mr. MADDEN. And from the rule promulgated there is no appeal?

Mr. TEMPLE. No appeal, except to British courts.

Mr. MADDEN. Except the appeal to arms?

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, it would be taken up for settlement by diplomacy, and the dispute might be referred to the court of arbitration at The Hague. What I wish to say is that the declaration of London is undoubtedly British law, whether it is recognized by the United States or not.

Now let me call your attention to the case of the *Benito Estenger*, which is recorded in volume 176 of United States Reports. This was a Spanish vessel, transferred to the British flag in June, 1898, captured by the United States steamer *Hornet* and condemned by the United States Court for the Southern District of Florida, sitting as a prize court. The case was carried by appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Chief Justice Fuller wrote the opinion, in which, after saying that the *Benito Estenger* "had complied with all the requirements of the British law," and had been transferred to British registry, he nevertheless affirmed the decision of the lower court. The vessel was sold and the money disposed of according to the prize law of our Nation then in force.

Mr. Beatty, the British subject who owned the vessel, had appealed the case, had lost, and had no recourse. I refer to that case not because it is on all fours with the case of the *Dacia* or any other case that might hereafter arise, but to show just one thing, that when the *Benito Estenger* complied with all of the requirements of British law that was not enough. We tried the case in accordance with our law. And when vessels transferred to the American flag comply with all the requirements of American law the British courts will try them in accordance with British law, and if we object they will cite the case of the *Benito Estenger* and many other cases. What we could do to them and that which we did to them without protest from them they will certainly claim the right of doing to us.

The declaration of London has been put in force not only by England but also by France, Russia, and Italy. Furthermore, Italy put it in force in the late war between Italy and Turkey, and article 47 of the declaration was tested in a peculiarly searching way.

I read from Oppenheim's International Law, volume 2, page 530:

According to the British and American practice, as well as that of some other States, which has hitherto prevailed, whenever a neutral vessel was stopped for carrying persons or dispatches for the enemy these could not be seized unless the vessel were seized at the same time. The release in 1861, during the American Civil War, of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, who had been forcibly taken off the *Trent*, while the ship herself was allowed to continue her voyage, was based by the United States on the fact that the seizure of these men without the seizure of the vessel was illegal. Since, according to the declaration of London, a neutral vessel rendering unneutral service of any kind is liable to be confiscated, it is evident that in such a case the enemy persons and dispatches concerned may not be taken off the vessel unless the vessel herself is seized and brought into a port of a prize court. However, article 47 provides that any member of the armed forces of the enemy found on board a neutral merchant vessel may be taken off and made a prisoner of war, although there may be no ground for the capture of the vessel.

And in a note on page 531, as follows:

Accordingly, in January, 1912, during the Turco-Italian War, the Italian gunboat *Volturno*, after having overhauled in the Red Sea the British steamer *Africa* going from Hodeida to Aden, took off and made prisoners of war Col. Riza Bey and 11 other Turkish officers. Although the declaration of London is not yet ratified by Great Britain, she did not protest.

She submitted to it without a protest, though she had not ratified the declaration.

Now, I want to say again, as I said on August 29, 1914, that it is the practice of nations that determines what international law is, and no legislative authority. I said then:

> Italy in her recent war with Turkey put that declaration of London into operation in spite of the fact that it is not international law. France and Great Britain have both announced their intention to put it into operation, in spite of the fact that ratifications have not been exchanged. That which is the practice of the nations becomes international law. There is no other test of international law than the practice of the nations. International law is not enacted. When we want to know what it is we study the practice of the nations, and when a maritime power like Great Britain and another like France and another like Italy put this into practice, and we ourselves have committed this Nation to it by signing it, by ratifying it in the Senate, as we have done, we, too, are committed to it. The only reason that it is not the law of the United States is because ratifications have not yet been exchanged. The Senate has acted on it finally. This is as nearly international law as anything can be that is not sanctioned and made certain by long practice.

I have just one other point that I wish to make, and I think it is a very important one. Suppose a dispute should arise between this country and Great Britain in regard to the seizure of some vessel transferred to the American flag from a belligerent flag, and we should succeed in taking it to the international tribunal at The Hague—the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague. What would be the decision of that court? In answer to that I refer you to the case of the French mail steamer *Manouba*.

In the note (Oppenheim, vol. 2, p. 531) is the following statement:

> The case of the *Manouba* ought likewise to be mentioned here. This French steamer, which plies between Marseille and Tunis, was stopped on January 16, 1912, by an Italian cruiser in the Mediterranean and 29 Turkish passengers, who were supposed to be Turkish officers on their way to the theater of war, were forcibly taken off and made prisoners. On the protest of France the captives were handed over to her in order to ascertain whether they were members of the Turkish forces, and it was agreed between the parties that the case should be settled by an arbitral award of the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague, Italy asserting that she had only acted in accordance with article 47 of the declaration of London.

Neither Italy nor France had ratified the London declaration. Neither of them had at that time issued any proclamation putting it into effect.

The two nations agreed to leave that case to the international tribunal at The Hague. I have in my hand here the award of the international tribunal at The Hague in this case, rendered May 6, 1913. Anybody who wishes to refer to this will find it in the American Journal of International Law for July, 1913, beginning on page 629. Without reading it at length, I read these sentences:

> Considering that the Italian naval authorities had, at the time of the capture of the *Manouba*, sufficient reason to believe that the Ottoman passengers who were on board were, some of them at least, soldiers enlisted in the enemy's army;
>
> That, consequently, these authorities had the right to compel the surrender of these passengers to them—

After an omission—

> For these reasons the arbitral tribunal declares and pronounces as follows—

And the fourth paragraph of its pronouncement is this:

> When once the *Manouba* was captured and taken to Cagliari, the Italian naval authorities were, in general and according to the special circumstances under which the act was committed, within their rights in proceeding, as they did, to the arrest of the 29 Ottoman passengers who were on board.

There was a case of a dispute between a neutral that had not ratified the declaration of London and a belligerent that was carrying it into effect, which dispute was carried to the International Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague, and the international tribunal sustained the belligerent that was enforcing the declaration of London. We should avoid any controversy of that kind with any power. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. In that case neither the belligerent nor the neutral had ratified the declaration of London?

Mr. TEMPLE. Neither the belligerent nor the neutral had ratified it, just as neither Great Britain nor the United States has ratified it; but the belligerent was putting it in force, just as Great Britain is now putting it in force.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TEMPLE. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. The two nations got that case before The Hague tribunal by agreement, did they not?

Mr. TEMPLE. That was the only way they could get it there.

Mr. BOOHER. If the United States and England should have trouble, unless they agreed to submit it to The Hague tribunal, it could not go there at all.

Mr. TEMPLE. We would either agree to arbitrate or probably fight it out.

Mr. BOOHER. It could not go to The Hague tribunal without an agreement of the parties?

Mr. TEMPLE. Never. There is nothing compulsory about it. There is no compulsory arbitration.

Mr. BOOHER. If the convention had been ratified, as it has been ratified by the United States and Great Britain, it would go to The Hague tribunal without agreement, would it not?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not if we chose to violate our treaty, which provides for arbitration.

Mr. BOOHER. Does it not provide that such a case shall go there?

Mr. TEMPLE. This London declaration makes no provision of that kind.

Mr. BOOHER. It would go to The Hague without any further agreement, would it not?

Mr. TEMPLE. Irrespective of the London declaration, we have now a general treaty of arbitration. Now, if we choose to disregard that treaty, there is no power that can send us to The Hague. I do not think we would choose to disregard it.

Mr. BOOHER. Then the London declaration does not make any difference about the right of either or both nations to go to The Hague, does it?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not at all. The London declaration does not affect the question of arbitration. The question is whether it is the law that the court will enforce after arbitration has been agreed to. We have general treaties of arbitration. Our question is, What law would The Hague tribunal enforce if we kept our treaty and went there with an arbitral dispute?

Mr. BOOHER. The tribunal would not enforce a law that this Government has never ratified, would it?

Mr. TEMPLE. That is the point I am making. The tribunal did enforce it in a dispute between France and Italy.

Mr. BOOHER. But they both agreed to go there on that issue, did they not?

Mr. TEMPLE. They agreed to go there on that issue; but, as I understand it, they did not agree as to what the law was before they went there. If they had agreed as to the law under which it was to be determined, the dispute could have been settled without any arbitration.

Mr. BOOHER. But suppose, now, that one nation or the other had not agreed to go there and submit to the London declaration, would The Hague tribunal have enforced the London declaration?

Mr. TEMPLE. Italy claimed that she was acting under the London declaration, and, as I understand the contention, France claimed that she had no right to act under the London declaration, and they submitted that dispute to the arbitral tribunal at The Hague.

Mr. BOOHER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's argument, and I want to get a little light. Suppose France had refused to submit that question to The Hague convention; could The Hague convention have decided it?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not at all. Italy and France would have had war.

Mr. BOOHER. I am trying to get your idea whether the nations that have not signed that convention would have to agree to submit to The Hague convention the question whether or not the London declaration was binding.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think I catch the gentleman's point. Once in a while an agreement is made in the treaty itself as to the principles that are to determine a dispute, and those principles are set forth at length. Such was the case in the *Alabama* dispute between the United States and Great Britain after the Civil War. In the treaty of Washington of 1871 three principles were set forth which we claimed were international law and Great Britain claimed were not international law; and in order to settle the dispute Great Britain agreed that the court of arbitration should act as if these principles were international law. That is possible.

Mr. BOOHER. My point is that if Great Britain had not agreed to that they could not have settled that proposition and bound Great Britain.

Mr. TEMPLE. They would have been likely to have had war.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman does not quite answer my question; they could not have bound Great Britain.

Mr. TEMPLE. There is no international sheriff to drag the parties into court.

Mr. BOOHER. It would not be necessary; my question does not ask whether its judgment could be enforced, but could The Hague tribunal have decided it?

Mr. TEMPLE. When a question of what is the law is left to a tribunal, that tribunal decides what is the law.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. In view of the case the gentleman has referred to, and the decision by the international

court, is it not true that if such legislation as is involved in the pending ship bill should be enacted and such a situation should arise as to the facts in that case disclosed, it would mean that the United States would be obliged to choose between the submission of the issues of that case to the tribunal at The Hague, which would doubtless decide as it did in the case the gentleman mentions, or go to war?

Mr. TEMPLE. There might be a third alternative; it might be settled by diplomacy. Many cases are settled by diplomacy.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. By our Government giving up?

Mr. TEMPLE. By somebody's yielding something.

Mr. PLATT. Might not the ship be taken into a French port and we have to submit to the old French law, which is much more severe than the declaration of London?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; the old French law is much more severe than the declaration of London. Under the old French law the transfer of a vessel from a belligerent flag to a neutral is forbidden, unless the claimant can show that when he bought the vessel he did not know there was a war going on, which would be difficult under the present conditions. Most people know that there is a war going on. The French law would be much more severe than the declaration of London, and I am inclined to think that the international court of arbitration will follow its own understanding.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman says "the French law"; is it not true that France is following the declaration of London?

Mr. TEMPLE. It is now; but if we convinced France that she ought not to put the declaration into effect, it would be her law, and not English law and not ours that would be our alternative.

Mr. MADDEN. They would try it under their own law and not under ours.

Mr. TEMPLE. Certainly.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, I have just come in, and therefore have not heard all that the gentleman has said. Does the gentleman have reference to the declaration of Paris?

Mr. TEMPLE. By no means. I am glad that the gentleman has mentioned the declaration of Paris, for I have some little time left and I want to show that unanimous consent is not necessary to the adoption of international law. The declaration of Paris in 1856 provided among other things that privateering is abolished. The other provisions of that declaration were: The neutral flag covers enemy's goods; neutral goods, contraband of war excepted, are not liable to capture under the enemy's flag; and that a blockade to be binding must be effective. But the first and most important thing is that privateering is abolished. The United States did not agree to that. It most decidedly dissented. President Pierce in his message of December 4, 1854, said that the bare statement of the condition in which the United States would be placed, after having surrendered the right to resort to privateers, in the event of a war with a belligerent of naval supremacy, will show that this Government could never listen to such a proposition.

So Secretary Marcy wrote, July 28, 1856, to Count Sartinges, French minister, replying to the invitation to adhere to the declaration of Paris:

> The policy of the United States has ever been, and never more than now, adverse to such establishments, and they can never be brought to acquiesce in any change in international law which may render it necessary for them to maintain a powerful Navy or a large Regular Army in time of peace. If forced to vindicate their right by arms, they are content, in the present aspect of international relations, to rely, in military operations on land, mainly upon volunteer troops, and for the protection of commerce in no inconsiderable degree upon their mercantile marine.

I should like to read what Oppenheim says about the declaration of Paris. Speaking of the declaration of Paris, Oppenheim, volume 2, page 220, says:

> Since, with the exception of a few States, such as the United States of America, Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Uruguay, all members of the family of nations, are now parties to the declaration of Paris, it may well be maintained that the rules quoted are general international law, the more so as the nonsignatory powers have hitherto in practice always acted in accordance with those rules.

We never agreed not to use privateers; but in the fierce struggle between the North and the South we did not use them, and we did not use them in the Spanish War. Why? We acquiesced in the declaration of Paris, although we never signed it. It is recognized as international law, our signature lacking nevertheless.

Also, let me mention one other thing which is of great general interest now, and which has become practically international law, to which the United States never agreed. Dumdum bullets were forbidden in the treaty adopted at The Hague conference, but some of the powers refused to sign the agreement not to use them.

As Great Britain had introduced bullets manufactured at the Indian arsenal at Dumdum, near Calcutta, the hard jacket of which did not quite cover the core, and which therefore easily expanded and flattened in the human body, the first Hague Peace Conference adopted a declaration, signed on July 29, 1899, by 15 powers, namely, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Mexico, France, Greece, Montenegro, Holland, Persia, Roumania, Russia, Siam, Sweden and Norway, Turkey, and Bulgaria, stipulating that the contracting powers should abstain, in case of war between two or more of them, from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body, such as bullets with hard envelopes which do not entirely cover the core or are pierced with incisions. Austria-Hungary, China, Germany, Italy, Nicaragua, Portugal, Japan, Luxemburg, Servia, Switzerland, and Great Britain acceded later.

The United States has never signed that treaty. Does anybody suppose that we would refuse to recognize that there is a general law, a general sentiment also, against the use of dumdum bullets? Unanimous consent is not required. The world almost, the great maritime powers certainly, have given adherence to the declaration of London. We have not. Whether it is law or not is one question. Whether we will be practically bound by the almost universal sentiment behind it is another question. It is dangerous to run into the face of the public opinion of the world on such points. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Is not the distinction in the cases the gentleman states rather that the nations which do not expressly ratify these agreements tacitly ratify them?

Mr. TEMPLE. I read from the President's message and from the correspondence of the Secretary of State who were in office in 1856 the emphatic refusal of the United States to recognize these things.

Mr. ROGERS. But there is a tacit agreement among the nations as to dumdum bullets, for example, I suppose, and the acquiescence is there, even though it has not taken the form of affirmative legislation or approval.

Mr. TEMPLE. Tacit acquiescence after a refusal to sign is what I am pointing out. I think there will be a tacit acquiescence in the declaration of London.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. We refused to accede to the declaration of Paris for the reason that we had no fleet of any moment but had a considerable fleet of merchantmen.

Mr. TEMPLE. We would not accede to it.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I say we could not accede to it, and we have not in a formal way, but possibly tacitly will adhere to the declaration of London. How many nations were signatories to the declaration of London?

Mr. TEMPLE. The declaration of London was signed by 10 powers, and only 10 were represented at the conference.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I was trying to reconcile our attitude with reference to a failure to accede to the declaration of Paris as well as the declaration of London.

Mr. TEMPLE. The point I was attempting to make was this, that a unanimous-consent agreement is not necessary to the actual existence of international law. We did not agree to the abolishing of privateering, yet it has been abolished. We did not agree not to use dumdum bullets, yet the world recognizes that there is a law against it. My hope is that this long advance in international maritime law, marked by the declaration of London, will not be hindered by the United States. It is a long step toward uniformity of practice and away from the old condition of things when every nation had its own law, and there was always friction. The United States is committed to it. It was signed by our delegates. Its ratification was advised by the requisite two-thirds vote of the Senate. We stood ready to exchange ratifications at the outbreak of this war. We advised it be made at least temporary law, and though Great Britain put it into effect, with certain modifications, we drew back entirely. And Mr. Bryan says it is not in force, when the King of England, in the order in council which I read to you, says it is in force in the only courts that will try prizes captured by vessels of the British Navy. We have no appeal from British courts, save an appeal that I am sure we would be horrified to make. We should rather avoid the entrance to a quarrel, especially when our cause at best would be doubtful and in opposition to the public sentiment of the nations and of our own people.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, by way of preface, I wish to say that when two or more nations go to war it does not necessitate that any neutral na-

tion shall quit or abandon its commerce. I wish to say, further, that we commit no unneutral act by permitting munitions of war to be shipped from any port of the United States or of its Territories. I wish to say, further, that after our experience in Mexico, I think we are as safe in the hands of this administration as we have been in any recent administration, as far as war is concerned. Besides, the administration is equipped and surrounded by high legal talent and experienced Army officers and high Naval admirals. The definition of every dictionary includes foodstuffs in the word "munitions."

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House to speak for a few minutes on the subject of neutrality. I am in receipt of many letters and petitions requesting me to support and vote for House joint resolution 377, and am now in possession of a large petition, signed generally by the merchants and leading business men of my home town, favoring such resolution.

This resolution is to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war. The petitions and letters ask me to work actively and vote for it so as to enact it into law during this session of Congress. They are all of similar purport, and many are of similar wording. No doubt other Members are daily in receipt of like requests.

I have filed the petitions here in the House and had them referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, before which the resolution is now pending.

I herewith wish to testify to the intelligence and high character of the signers and their lofty citizenship as being unexcelled. Many are among my warmest personal friends and neighbors, and all are in every way entitled to my highest consideration.

The resolution is as follows:

House joint resolution 377.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war of every kind (whether whole or in parts to be later assembled) from the territory or any seaport of the United States until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress.

This resolution covers nearly everything that can be used to aid or further the prosecution of a war. Munitions of war include foodstuffs, clothing, automobiles of all sorts, horses, mules, wagons, sleighs, harness, saddlery, cotton, wool, and products of field and factory, when suitable and intended for army purposes, as well as armament, shot, and shell.

Our Nation is not in the shipping business, and does not sell, ship, or transport munitions of war directly to any other nation either at peace or at war, and so we are dealing with individual rights. The sale and shipment of these products are by individuals, and when publication is made that 1,000,000 bushels of wheat, 2,000,000 pairs of shoes, $10,000,000 worth of harness and saddlery, 40,000 Ford automobiles, 200 Duplex war trucks, or 50,000 bales of cotton are sold for shipment to England, Germany, France, Belgium, Russia, or any other country, it means simply that such an order for these goods has been taken by some American manufacturer or purchaser for delivery at the factory or maybe to an American port, and then it is up to the purchaser to make his shipment and take the risk of delivery on his own account at the foreign port.

MUNITIONS OF WAR.

By the law of nations a neutral nation has the right to carry on its commerce in all trades without liability of forfeiture in goods and products not declared to be contraband, and by common consent noncontraband is permitted to be shipped unrestricted in a neutral vessel, while in the shipment of wheat, horses, automobiles, firearms, and so forth, the owner takes the risk of capture and loss of property.

We find the balance of trade in our favor has increased from $16,000,000 for the month of September to nearly $132,000,000 for the month of December, 1914, and quite all of the products of this trade can be used in and for carrying on war.

It is as necessary to have food products and clothing, shoes, blankets, and vehicles to prosecute and carry on a war as it is to have armament, rifles, and shells, so that if the export of the munitions of war of every kind are to be prohibited, such prohibition will be very far-reaching, and not only will our exports be quite extinguished but our manufacturing greatly affected, the sale of farm products reduced, and our foreign trade virtually come to a standstill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I will.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the gentleman's resolution were changed or modified in such a way as to cover only the exportation of guns, bullets, munitions of war, would the gentleman support it under those conditions?

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Well, I will get to that a little later on; but that is not the resolution I was asked to work for and have passed this session. I am talking about the resolution which these papers and my people have asked me to support and work for and endeavor to have passed. I would say to the gentleman I would hesitate before I would vote against a resolution to prohibit the export of powder and bullets to kill people with, but I would not want to say I would vote for a resolution prohibiting export of munitions of war broadly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Has the gentleman considered the question of the morality of the proceeding?

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. That is different.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I understand now the gentleman is discussing the legal proposition.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I have thought of that, but I am not basing this argument upon sympathy or upon the question of preference. I am basing it upon the law; and if we are going outside of this, as a moral question, why, of course, that might lead to my telling what particular faith I believe in. But that is not the question which we are dealing with. This is an international question. Now, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed.

The resolution makes no exception and seeks to prohibit our shipments to Italy, Holland, Spain, South America, China, and to all neutral countries.

The resolution further provides that it shall be discretionary with the President whether or not and when to prohibit such shipments. If it is wrong or unlawful to permit shipments of contraband or munitions of war, there should be no discretion about it. It ought not to be done.

But, Mr. Chairman, by the law of the very nations now at war, and by settled custom, this right is firmly and legally established.

I doubt not that the President has the right now to place an embargo upon the shipment of war material out of the United States. The President placed an embargo not long ago upon the shipment of arms into Mexico from the United States, although he subsequently permitted it.

Not long since a German vessel loaded with rifles and ammunition sailed for Vera Cruz, a Mexican seaport, and the President promptly sent our Army and fleet to that port, captured the city in battle, and prevented the unloading of the ship's cargo there; but the unloading took place at an adjacent port near Tampico. If the President had the authority then to say when firearms and ammunition might be transported into Mexico from the United States, or should not be shipped into Mexico, from Germany or any foreign nation, why has he not the discretion now?

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to say that we sent our Army and fleet to Mexico for the sole purpose of preventing that German ship from unloading 500,000 firearms and millions of rounds of ammunition, or whatever the number may have been, because I have such faith in the effectiveness of our Army and Navy, even if there is only 1 of the 59 submarines belonging to our Navy fit for service, and even if many of our battleships or dreadnaughts are not fit for first-line duty, and even if the size of our standing Army only equals the population of Grand Rapids, Mich., and a part of that Army is now in foreign lands, as to believe that we could have prevented that German ship from unloading the arms and ammunition if that had been the sole purpose, although I might be in a little doubt about our now being prepared to lick the whole world, as one might think we are from some of the hurrahs heard nowadays here on the floor of this Chamber.

We took Vera Cruz all right one day, with the loss of 17 of our brave boys and 70 wounded of the flower of our country. We held it a sufficient time, and then went away. When we left a considerable treasure followed us—only a million or so, but a considerable amount of money, we are credibly informed.

A majority of the Members are learned in the law and know that we ought not to break into a man's house or into his country or into his city and take away the property of another. When I was a child I was taught the Ten Commandments. Later I attended church on Sunday and enjoyed the sermons then as I do now. I remember some of the commandments yet—one about taking that which did not belong to me, and the one about killing. I wish that the rulers, crowned heads, and other potentates of Europe would keep all the commandments. I always enjoyed the sermon when the preacher would tell about the coming of the Prince of Peace, of Emmanuel, and also about beating the swords into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks. God speed the day! But until that time we must as a nation work out our own destiny. I am for peace. I want to be one of the last to favor war. It seems we ought to get along

without war in this enlightened age and generation. But, my friends, the Golden Age has not yet come—

When the war drum throbs no longer, and the battle flag is furled
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world;
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, wrapped in universal law.

To-day a majority of the most civilized nations of the earth are in brutal and unnecessary war. By this war not only the boundary of nations will be changed, but the struggle involves their very existence. The times call for clear-headed, patriotic statesmanship as much as they ever did in the history of our Republic. What is our duty? We as a nation have our rights. Those rights are of greater importance to us than the rights of any foreign nation. Among our rights are the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We do not want them invaded. We must know the right, and "knowing it, dare maintain."

NEUTRALITY.

President Pierce in his third annual message to the Thirty-fourth Congress in 1855 defined our rights as a neutral nation to carry on our commerce when he said:

The laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell to other of the belligerent powers articles of contraband of war or to take munitions of war or soldiery on board their private ships for transportation, and although in doing so the individual exposes his person or property to some of the hazards of war, his acts do not involve a breach of the national neutrality nor of themselves implicate the Government.

This was six years before the Civil War, and that principle of international practice was incorporated in article 7 of the Hague convention, October 18, 1907, which provides:

A neutral power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport on behalf of one or other of the belligerents of arms, munitions of war, or, in general, of anything which can be of use to an army or a fleet.

This convention was attended by the representation of the German Empire and signed by its delegates.

As a Nation we are friends of both sides of the contending nations of Europe. We are nowise responsible for the war. By electing to go to war these nations have fixed their status as that of belligerents, and their rights are determined by the rights of warfare. If this gives an advantage to either side, we are not responsible for it, and as a neutral Nation we can not change it.

By remaining neutral our status is fixed by the laws and customs of war and international agreements. Chief among the rights of the citizens of a neutral nation is the right to carry on commerce in all its branches, subject to the chances of seizure and forfeiture in case the merchandise is contraband, but with the utmost freedom in case the products are noncontraband. As neutrals we must treat all the belligerents alike, allowing to each side the same privileges, and not give a right to one side which we do not accord to the other. If to prohibit shipments would deny one side an advantage which rightfully belongs to it, or give to the other side rights to which it is not entitled as a belligerent, we should be very circumspect before enacting such a law and be careful that we do not commit a nonneutral act.

During the Franco-German War there was correspondence between the Prussian diplomatic representation in London and at Washington and the British and United States foreign secretaries concerning shipment of arms and ammunition to French armies, in which the Prussian Government contended that it was incompatible with strict neutrality that French agents should be permitted to buy up in the neutral country, under the eyes and cognizance of the neutral Government, many thousand breechloaders, revolvers, and pistols, with the requisite ammunition, in order to arm therewith the French people and make the formative of fresh army corps possible after the regular armies of France had been defeated.

Nothing, however, was done to prevent the shipment of these supplies, and the United States claimed entire liberty for the traffic in question.

OUR STATUS DEFINED.

Very recently, on January 8, 1915, Mr. Bryan, as Secretary of State, in a communication (S. Doc. No. 716) covering this subject to Senator STONE, defined, among other things, our rights and status as a neutral Nation, and I call your attention to two paragraphs of that letter. Answering the statement that the United States has not interfered with the sale to Great Britain and her allies of arms, ammunition, horses, uniforms, and other munitions of war, although such sales prolong the conflict, the Secretary says:

There is no power in the Executive to prevent the sale of ammunition to the belligerents.

The duty of a neutral to restrict trade in munitions of war has never been imposed by international law or by municipal statute. It has never been the policy of this Government to prevent the shipment of arms or ammunition into belligerent territory, except in the case of neighboring American Republics, and then only when civil strife prevailed. Even to this extent the belligerents in the present conflict, when they were neutrals, have never, so far as the records disclose, limited the sale of munitions of war. It is only necessary to point to the enormous quantities of arms and ammunition furnished by manufacturers in Germany to the belligerents in the Russo-Japanese war and in the recent Balkan wars to establish the general recognition of the propriety of the trade by a neutral nation.

It may be added that on the 15th of December last the German ambassador, by direction of his Government, presented a copy of a memorandum of the Imperial German Government which, among other things, set forth the attitude of that Government toward traffic in contraband of war by citizens of neutral countries. The Imperial Government stated that "under the general principles of international law, no exception can be taken to neutral States letting war material go to Germany's enemies from or through neutral territory," and that the adversaries of Germany in the present war are, in the opinion of the Imperial Government, authorized to "draw on the United States contraband of war and especially arms worth billions of marks." These principles, as the ambassador stated, have been accepted by the United States Government in the statement issued by the Department of State on October 15 last, entitled "Neutrality and trade in contraband." Acting in conformity with the propositions there set forth, the United States has itself taken no part in contraband traffic, and has, so far as possible, lent its influence toward equal treatment for all belligerents in the matter of purchasing arms and ammunition of private persons in the United States.

Answering the statement of general unfriendly attitude of the Government toward Germany and Austria, the Secretary says:

If any American citizens, partisans of Germany and Austria-Hungary, feel that this administration is acting in a way injurious to the cause of those countries, this feeling results from the fact that on the high seas the German and Austro-Hungarian naval power is thus far inferior to the British. It is the business of a belligerent operating on the high seas, not the duty of a neutral, to prevent contraband from reaching an enemy. Those in this country who sympathize with Germany and Austria-Hungary appear to assume that some obligation rests upon this Government in the performance of its neutral duty to prevent all trade in contraband, and thus to equalize the difference due to the relative naval strength of the belligerents. No such obligation exists; it would be an unneutral act, an act of partiality on the part of this Government to adopt such a policy if the Executive had the power to do so. If Germany and Austria-Hungary can not import contraband from this country, it is not, because of that fact, the duty of the United States to close its markets to the allies. The markets of this country are open upon equal terms to all the world, to every nation, belligerent or neutral.

The foregoing categorical replies to specific complaints is sufficient answer to the charge of unfriendliness to Germany and Austria-Hungary.

I am, my dear Senator,
Very sincerely, yours, W. J. BRYAN.

Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

WAR.

I am for peace all the time, and would only consent to declare war when justice demands it and the right is absolutely unquestioned. I am not for peace at any price, else there would have been no War of Independence, and we would be a dependency of England and not enjoying our independence to-day; else there would not have been the War of the Rebellion, and we would be two nations on this continent to-day instead of one.

When the right to arbitrate all questions of national dispute comes up, and the Monroe doctrine is submitted, it may surrender Mexico to colonization by other nations. If the Chinese or Japanese question comes up for arbitration at The Hague, the sun will not shed such radiant hues on the Golden Gate, and much of the attraction will have flown from the splendid domain of our beautiful Pacific coast.

Neither would I for one want to submit the right of a foreign nation to have a coaling station in Mexico or Cuba or in the Central American States.

I am not in favor of submitting all questions to arbitration as a national policy. Neither do I think that preparedness leads to war. We were not prepared in 1860 for the war so nobly fought and won by the boys in blue, but it came.

We were prepared for war when we told Maximilian to get his French Army and himself out of Mexico immediately after that war, and no war came.

ARMY AND NAVY.

Our national wealth is $150,000,000,000, double that of any other. Our Navy ranks third, and 14 nations of the world have a larger standing army than we have.

The following table showing the peace strength of nations having a larger standing army than the United States is found in the World Almanac, 1915, page 420:

Germany	870,000
France	783,493
Russia	1,500,000
Austria-Hungary	435,127
Italy	306,000
Great Britain	262,296
Japan	217,032
Spain	140,673
Roumania	103,460
Switzerland	143,220
Turkey	230,000
Greece	29,000
China	180,000

I voted for the Army appropriation bill; a standing Army of 100,000 men; for an appropriation for the upkeep of our Navy, providing for 2 battleships, 11 submarine torpedo boats (1 of the seagoing type), 5 torpedo-boat destroyers, 1 fuel-oil ship.

The total cost of this program is about $50,000,000, and the sum of $22,903,998 is recommended for construction the first year, and if we had kept the duty on sugar it would have paid the whole cost of their construction.

Much is said about the citizen soldier, but how many citizens nowadays are acquainted with firearms? Many of them never shot a gun, and fewer of them ever saw a modern weapon. In the days of the rebellion nearly every man was a marksman, and the first call recruited the squirrel regiments; but it is different now. In some of the States we have stringent game laws and less game, and the use or need of the gun does not obtain.

It would cost the Government little or nothing to make it mandatory for all citizens within military age to meet at least once a month at the country townhouse or city hall during the wintertime, if no oftener, and be shown a regulation Army rifle or be given an evening's instruction or lecture by a military officer or soldier, and be told with which foot to step off and upon which heel to about face. By so doing the citizen soldier would at least know something of what would be expected of him should he ever be called to arms.

DISARMAMENT.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the time will come when it will not be necessary to ever call our young men to arms, but now is not the time to disarm. World conditions are against that step at present. I wish that we might not furnish guns and bullets to kill people with. But whatever we may do in this regard the war will continue to the end. We must keep an even poise; we must keep strictly within our rights; we must maintain strict neutrality. We are not legally or equitably bound to close our factories or give up all our commerce. The belligerent nations alone must decide when to shut up their own great arsenals and factories and when to quit making guns and powder. I wish they would quit to-day. It was not contemplated by any nation that in case of war we should close our factories or not sell our farm products to any warring nation. That has never been the law, and we should exercise great care in adopting such a law. I would have some hesitancy in voting against a law placing an embargo upon powder and bullets should the President make the order, but would not want to support a law which would prohibit the shipment and exportation of all articles that could be used by an army to prosecute or carry on war, and am very much in favor of sending foodstuffs and raiment, medicine, and aid to the helpless and famine stricken in Europe. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has five minutes remaining.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman from New York yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND] such time as he desires.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article appearing in the February North American Review entitled "The bases of Republican confidence." The article was written by Col. George Harvey, editor of the magazine, and the man claiming to have originally discovered President Woodrow Wilson. While the public was aware that there have been some little differences between the discovered and the discoverer since the original discovery, there were recent indications that a happy reconciliation had taken place, but evidently the truce was but temporary. The article is somewhat illuminating and is presented in full:

THE BASES OF REPUBLICAN CONFIDENCE.

[By the editor.]

In idle wishes fools supinely stay;
Be there a will, and wisdom finds a way.
—The Birth of Flattery.

We may as well admit at the outset that the quite universal and plainly increasing confidence of Republicans with respect to the next national election is no mere "triumph of hope over experience"; it is a firm conviction. Neither leaders nor rank and file have the slightest doubt of coming success. Nor, incidentally, we are informed, if a liberal Republican be nominated, has Mr. Roosevelt—a fact of deep significance.

What, then, are the bases of this quite unprecedented feeling of certainty which finds manifestation a full 20 months before the event? Let us engage in common counsel forthwith.

The Republican chairman insists that the results now compiled prove conclusively that, if the recent November election had been for President, his party would have won not less than 288 electoral votes—a majority of 45. President Wilson, on the other hand, in his speech in Indianapolis, interpreted the figures as showing a Democratic majority of "about 80." Both seem to have erred. Putting aside all guesses and deductions, the votes actually polled for Senators and Congressmen are recorded as follows:

Votes polled at elections of 1912 and 1914.

STATES CARRIED BY REPUBLICANS ON NATIONAL ISSUES.

[S, popular vote for Senator; C, popular vote for Congressman.

States.	1914					1912		
	Electoral vote.	Vote.	Republican.	Democrat.	Progressive.	Taft.	Wilson.	Roosevelt.
Connecticut	7	S.	89,983	76,081	6,853	68,324	74,561	34,123
Delaware	3	C.	22,922	20,681	1,653	15,998	22,631	8,885
Idaho	4	S.	47,486	41,266	10,321	32,810	33,921	25,527
Illinois	29	S.	390,661	373,403	203,027	253,613	405,048	386,478
Iowa	13	S.	205,832	167,251	15,058	119,805	185,325	161,819
Kansas	10	S.	180,323	176,929	116,755	74,844	143,670	120,123
Massachusetts	18	C.	222,840	189,197	30,118	155,948	173,408	142,228
Michigan	15	C.	218,445	147,262	47,700	152,244	150,751	214,581
Minnesota	12	C.	180,482	87,305	24,737	64,334	106,426	125,856
New Hampshire	4	S.	42,111	36,382	1,938	32,927	34,724	17,794
New Jersey	14	C.	179,930	167,511	15,400	88,835	178,289	145,410
New Mexico	3	C.	23,812	19,805	1,695	17,733	20,437	8,347
New York	45	S.	639,112	571,419	61,977	455,428	655,475	390,021
North Dakota	5	S.	48,732	29,640	2,707	23,090	29,555	25,726
Ohio	24	S.	526,115	423,742	67,509	277,066	423,152	229,327
Pennsylvania	38	S.	519,830	266,436	269,175	273,305	395,619	447,426
Rhode Island	5	C.	38,801	35,186	1,321	27,703	30,142	16,878
Utah	4	S.	56,281	53,128	.....	42,100	36,579	24,174
Vermont	4	C.	36,980	13,685	9,545	23,305	15,350	22,070
Washington	7	S.	130,479	91,733	83,282	70,445	86,840	113,038
West Virginia	8	C.	111,387	102,223	8,605	56,754	113,197	79,112
Wyoming	3	C.	21,363	17,246	1,308	14,560	15,310	9,232
Total	275	.....	3,933,907	3,107,511	980,684	2,341,171	3,330,410	2,748,845

STATES CARRIED BY DEMOCRATS ON NATIONAL ISSUES.

Alabama	12	S.	12,320	63,389	4,263	9,731	82,439	22,680
Arizona	3	S.	9,183	25,800	2,608	3,021	10,324	6,949
California	13	S.	254,159	279,896	255,232	3,914	283,436	283,610
Colorado	6	S.	98,728	102,037	27,072	58,386	114,223	72,300
Indiana	15	S.	226,505	271,845	107,027	151,267	281,890	162,007
Kentucky	13	S.	144,758	176,605	14,108	115,512	219,584	102,795
Maine	6	C.	60,318	60,683	17,958	26,545	51,113	48,493
Maryland	8	S.	94,864	110,204	3,697	54,956	112,674	57,786
Missouri	18	S.	257,056	311,573	27,614	207,821	330,746	124,371
Montana	4	C.	26,161	37,012	6,694	18,512	27,941	22,456
Nebraska	8	C.	110,839	112,309	3,141	54,216	109,008	72,689
North Carolina	12	S.	87,095	121,241	.....	29,139	144,507	69,130
Arkansas	9	S.	11,222	33,449	.....	24,297	68,838	21,675

Votes polled at elections of 1912 and 1914—Continued.

STATES CARRIED BY DEMOCRATS ON NATIONAL ISSUES—Continued.

States.	1914					1912		
	Electoral vote.	Vote.	Republican.	Democrat.	Progressive.	Taft.	Wilson.	Roosevelt.
Florida	6	S.	.....	22,761	.....	4,279	36,417	4,535
Georgia	14	S.	.....	205,652	.....	5,190	93,171	22,010
Louisiana	10	C.	.....	40,545	8,867	3,834	60,966	9,323
Mississippi	10	C.	.....	36,060	.....	1,511	57,164	3,627
South Carolina	9	S.	.....	32,950	.....	536	48,355	1,293
Tennessee	12	C.	44,951	149,193	.....	59,444	130,335	53,725
Texas	20	C.	.....	173,177	.....	28,853	221,589	26,755
Virginia	12	C.	23,654	58,320	210	23,288	90,332	21,777
Wisconsin	13	S.	134,221	135,321	.....	130,878	164,409	58,661
Nevada	3	S.	8,038	8,078	.....	3,196	7,986	5,620
Oklahoma	10	S.	73,153	119,214	3,962	90,786	119,156	.....
Oregon	5	S.	88,297	111,748	26,220	34,673	47,064	37,600
South Dakota	5	S.	44,244	48,076	2,406	.....	48,942	58,811
Total	256	.....	1,809,766	2,847,138	511,079	1,143,785	2,962,609	1,370,662
Grand total	531	.....	5,743,673	5,954,649	1,491,763	3,484,956	6,293,019	4,119,507

Republican majority of electoral vote, 19; Democratic plurality of popular vote, 210,976.

Chairman Hilles attains his result by transferring Wisconsin's 13 votes from the Democrats to the Republicans upon the ground that, although a Democratic Senator was elected by a few hundred as a consequence of "local conditions," the total Republican majority for Congressmen exceeded 40,000.

President Wilson reached his conclusion by "taking the States where Senators were elected and, where Senators were not elected, taking the election of governors, and, where governors were not elected, taking the returns for the State legislatures or for the congressional delegates." Ignoring the vote for State legislators, which seems rather far-fetched, and substituting the vote for governor wherever one was chosen for the vote for Senator or Congressman given in the above tabulation, we find that—

States.	Democrats.		Republicans.	
	Gain.	Lose.	Gain.	Lose.
Idaho	4	.....	.....	4
Massachusetts	18	.....	.....	18
Michigan	15	.....	.....	15
Minnesota	12	.....	.....	12
West Virginia	8	.....	.....	8
Wyoming	3	.....	.....	3
California	.....	13	.....	.....
Colorado	.....	6	6	.....
Oregon	.....	5	5	.....
South Dakota	.....	5	5	.....
Wisconsin	.....	13	13	.....
Total	60	42	29	60

Net Democratic gain, 18; net Republican loss, 31. Progressive gain (California), 13.

ELECTORAL VOTE UPON THIS BASIS.

Democrats, 274; Republicans, 244; Progressives, 13—531. Democratic plurality, 30; Democratic majority, 17.

Assuming, as we fear we must, that the vote on national issues affords the better criterion, the question immediately arises, Can the Republicans reasonably expect to hold the 22 States, carrying 275 electoral votes, which they won in November? That the shrewdest of them honestly think so there can be no doubt. Indeed, they feel equally certain that they can abstract from the Democratic column Colorado (6), Maine (6), Oregon (5), South Dakota (5), and Wisconsin (13), making a grand total of 310 and affording a clear majority of nearly 100 electoral votes. Clearly, however, this calculation would be upset if President Wilson should succeed in winning over the remaining Progressives who still hold the balance of power in Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Idaho, and Washington. For ourselves, we have reached only the negative conclusion that whichever party loses New York is likely to lose the election. But so far as the actual results of November, 1914, are concerned, it was a drawn battle, leaving the Democrats slightly ahead in the popular vote and slightly behind in prospects relating to the choice of electors.

We come now to consideration of the political effect of the President's speech in Indianapolis from which the Republicans profess to have derived no little satisfaction. The common assumption that this deliverance signalized Mr. Wilson's purpose to become a candidate for reelection may be ignored. Whatever warrant the audience may have had for drawing such an inference from his remark to the effect that "there may come a time when the American people will have a chance to say whether I know what I am talking about or not," was dissipated instantly by his quick disavowal of intent to "start anything." Subsequently, moreover, he made it quite clear that he had in mind no more than a prospective verdict upon the achievements of the Democratic Party under his leadership.

That Mr. Wilson will make his attitude with respect to a renomination known at no distant day may be assumed with surety. So much he owes to his party no less than to other possible candidates who now courteously await an expression of his desire, but none knows better than Mr. Wilson himself that such a declaration necessarily involves interpretation of the second-term provision in the Democratic platform and, to be truly effective, must be explicit, not casual or inferential, and buttressed by sound and sufficient reasoning.

That he should seek to win popular favor in his first political utterance addressed directly to the people was but natural and no more than his duty, but his real purposes clearly were: (1) To justify the administration; (2) to confound his enemies within and without his party; and (3) to indicate a definite purpose to appeal to the great body of Independents and Progressives for support in the forthcoming national campaign. The speech was in effect a call to combat, and the challenge was accepted promptly by Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, the most forceful spokesman of the opposition and, as the foremost liberal Republican now living, a most promising candidate for the presidential nomination. This makes for an interesting contrast at the very beginning of a campaign which bids fair to find a high place in our political history.

The President spoke first as a militant partisan: "If I were not ready to fight for everything I believe in," he began, "I would think it my duty to go and take a back seat." He continued:

"The trouble with the Republican Party is that it has not had a new idea for 30 years. I am not speaking as a politician; I am speaking as a historian. I have looked for new ideas in the records and I have not found any proceeding from the Republican ranks. They have had leaders from time to time who suggested new ideas, but they never did anything to carry them out. I suppose there was no harm in their talking, provided they could not do anything. Therefore when it was necessary to say that we have talked about things long enough, which it was necessary to do, and the time had come to do them, it was indispensable that a Democrat should be elected President.

"I would not speak with disrespect of the Republican Party. I always speak with great respect of the past. The past was necessary to the present, and was a sure prediction of the future. The Republican Party is still a covert and refuge for those who are afraid, for those who want to consult their grandfathers about everything. You will notice that most of the advice taken by the Republican Party is taken from gentlemen old enough to be grandfathers; and that when they claim that a reaction has taken place, they react to the reelection of the oldest members of their party. They will not trust the youngsters. They are afraid the youngsters might have something up their sleeve."

Senator BORAH resented this as "a virulent attack upon one of the great political parties of the Nation," not only challenging "the wisdom of the leaders," but also assailing "the intelligence and the patriotism of its rank and file." Denying that the Republican Party had "not had a new idea in 30 years," he instanced the passage of the interstate commerce act in 1887, of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1893, of the antirebate act, and proceeded:

"We created a Bureau of Commerce and Labor, afterwards passing what is known as the pure-food law, of incalculable value to all the people, the postal-savings law, the parcel-post law, the physical valuation of railroads law, the employers' liability law, the law limiting the hours of service of railroad men, compensation for injuries to Government employees, the child-labor law for the District of Columbia, the Children's Bureau was established, publicity of campaign funds provided for, eight hours a day for Government employees and under Government contracts provided for, a law requiring the railroads to report accidents provided for, the boiler-inspection law, the Bureau of Mines established, the amendment of the Constitution providing for an income tax, the election of Senators by popular vote—and so on ad infinitum, dealing with each particular subject as it arose. Dealing with them sanely, safely, progressively, permanently.

"Then finally we passed that bill which has been so often criticized by the opposition, known as the Vreeland-Aldrich Act, dealing with the finances of the country. I call your attention to the fact, my friends, that when the crisis came a few months ago, and the European situation brought to us a condition unexpected, it was under the Vreeland-Aldrich Act that you proceeded to protect the credit and the business interests of this country. We had months before passed the Federal reserve bank act, but it was not called into activity; it was not put into operation. It was not tested in that crisis, but when the crisis came it was permitted to remain idle while the Vreeland-Aldrich Act was the act under which we proceeded to pass the shoals and pitfalls of those first days of the European crisis. While we did so the Federal reserve bank act lay—huge, cumbersome, bulky, expensive—cast upon the shore of the legislative sea like some antediluvian mastodon, not quite live enough for the menagerie and not quite dead enough for the operating table of the taxidermist; designed apparently for the Federal Treasury, but apparently on its way to the Smithsonian Institution."

When it is recalled further that, while the new banking law was finally enacted by the Democrats, its genesis was Republican and the "idea" from which it was developed was hatched in the brain of Grandfather Nelson W. Aldrich, the difficulty of finding warrant for the President's assertion that he spoke "not as a politician, but as an historian" becomes quite painfully apparent. Why Mr. BORAH refrained from contrasting the relative advantages to the country of lawmaking by grandfathers and youngsters can only be imagined; possibly because he felt abashed at being only 49 years old, while the President, at 58, was welcoming his first grandson. But let us pass on.

After having admitted with commendable frankness that each of the big parties is a minority and dependent for success upon the favor of

the unattached, the President evinced a most cordial and sympathetic regard for independent voters, saying:

"I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent person, and I want to say this distinctly. I do not love any party any longer than it continues to serve the immediate and pressing needs of America. I have been bred in the Democratic Party; I love the Democratic Party, but I love America a great deal more than I love the Democratic Party. And when the Democratic Party thinks that it is an end in itself, then I rise up and dissent. It is a means to an end, and its power depends, and ought to depend, upon its showing that it knows what America needs, and is ready to give it what it needs. That is the reason I say to the independent voter, you have got us in the palm of your hand. I do not happen to be one of your number, but I recognize your supremacy, because I read the election returns, and I have this ambition, my Democratic friends—I can avow it on Jackson Day: I want to make every independent voter in this country a Democratic voter. It is a little cold and lonely out where he is, because, though he holds the balance of power, he is not the majority, and I want him to come in where it is warm. I want him to come where there are great emotions."

To this Senator BORAH made no response. Possibly he considered accurate definitions injudicious at a time when Republican candidates are wondering just how "independent" it is desirable to be, or even to have been. Or it may be that he doubted his ability to compete with Mr. Wilson in conjuring up overpowering emotions for use upon occasion. In any case, he awaited elucidation, which forthcame—if we may use the President's own term as applied to Grandfather Andrew Jackson—forthrightly. It appears that the one thing Mr. Wilson has "a great, almost a reckless, enthusiasm about" is "human liberty," especially at this particular time in Mexico. His heart still beats loudly for the 80 per cent of submerged peons who have never had a "look-in," and he hopes that "God may speed them in getting it."

"That," he continued, "is what I mean by a great emotion, the great emotion of sympathy. Do you suppose that the American people are ever going to count a small amount of material benefit and advantage to people doing business in Mexico against the liberties and the permanent happiness of the Mexican people? Have not European nations taken as long as they wanted and spilt as much blood as they pleased in settling their affairs, and shall we deny that to Mexico because she is weak? No; I say. I am proud to belong to a strong nation that says, 'This country, which we could crush, shall have just as much freedom in her own affairs as we have. If I am strong I am ashamed to bully the weak. In proportion to my strength is my pride in withholding that strength from the oppression of another people.' And I know when I speak these things, not merely from the gracious response with which they have just met from you, but from my long-time knowledge of the American people, that that is the sentiment of the American people."

While frankly confessing our inability to comprehend this extraordinary blending of emotion and cynicism, it is perhaps explicable as an attempt at excuse for failure of a policy when compared with this, which follows:

"With all due respect to editors of great newspapers, I have to say to them I never take my opinion of the American people from their editorials. So that when some great dailies not very far from where I am temporarily residing thundered with rising scorn at 'watchful waiting,' Woodrow sat back in his chair and chuckled, knowing that 'he laughs best who laughs last'; knowing, in short, what were the temper and principles of the American people."

The time may come when we shall venture to surmise the aspiration which induced this curious self-delineation, but for the moment a sense of bewilderment is overwhelming. We quote again from Senator BORAH:

"The President now says that we are to let Mexico alone. How unfortunate that that was not the policy from the beginning. I think if he had said in the beginning that we were to let Mexico alone he would have been in an almost impregnable position. All that needed to have been added to that to make a perfect policy would have been that Mexico should respect the rights of American citizens and of foreigners living in that country. Let them settle their own form of government, let them elect whom they would, let them have a despotism or a republic, according as they lived up to the one or the other, and that we would recognize whatever form of government they established, always adding the proposition that, whether it was one form of government or another, the rights and the lives of American citizens should be protected thereunder.

"But we did go to Mexico, Mr. President. What did we go for? What were we at Vera Cruz about? What were the results of the expedition? The first result was that we killed 200 Mexicans; the second result was that we lost 19 of our own men. We were at war with Mexico. Had we killed one English subject or one German subject or one subject of France, there would have been no doubt about our being at war with that country. The only reason it did not take on all 'the pomp and circumstance of glorious war' was the fact that the country with which we were at war was unable to respond against the powerful enemy who had entered its borders. Not only did we intervene when we declared against Huerta, but we were at war when blood was shed upon the soil of Vera Cruz. That was the first result.

"The second result of our going there was the destruction of the only semblance of government which they had in Mexico.

"The third thing which we did in connection with it is one which may have far-reaching consequences in the future, and that is, we notified foreign nations that they must keep hands off of Mexico; that they must not build up or give sustenance and support to Huerta or to any form of government. The result of it was that we assumed the responsibility morally, if not legally, for the injuries which flowed from that time on to those foreign powers or to their nationals by reason of the acts or of the conduct of the warring factions of Mexico.

"Then we assumed further, Mr. President, at that time to reform the land laws of Mexico. So we did not let Mexico alone.

"What is the situation in Mexico to-day? Mr. President, the situation in Mexico to-day is indescribable. We have no conception of it. I doubt if it would be possible to conceive a proper measurement of the condition of affairs in Mexico unless we were there, but we know that it is as bad as it could possibly be in a civilized or semicivilized community. We know that over 250 of our own citizens have from time to time been murdered; we know that countless others have been injured in different ways and have no apparent remedy or redress.

"Now, sir, when a condition of affairs exists in Mexico such as the civilized world has seldom witnessed and Republicans rise to express their views as to what shall be done, the answer which we get from the public rostrum of the country by the Chief Magistrate of the Nation is practically, in the language of Barère, that the revolution in Mexico 'shall be permitted to float in upon seas of blood and that the man who questions the course of revolution in Mexico is to be suspected before the American people!'

"Mr. President, speaking for myself, I am desirous of peace with Mexico; I want no war; and I know we shall never take any part of the territory of that Republic; but above and beyond that, and more important to my mind, is the fact that we should at least protect our own citizenship, securing our women against ravishment and our men from murder at the hands of those ferocious men who prey upon our nationals wherever they find them in their territory. There are some things which are dearer to me than peace. I do know this, Mr. President, that no nation ever retains respect among the other nations of the earth or long maintains the consideration of other powers that does not protect its citizens and the honor of its women and prevent them from being ravished and murdered even upon its very doorsteps."

We make no comment now upon this utterance; we merely place it beside the President's declaration for comparison and judgment as to both relative merit and possible political consequences.

Senator BORAH expressed regret that the President should have made a partisan speech "at a time when this country had sore need of united wisdom and patriotism to deal with those matters which have been rendered delicate by reason of foreign conditions," resented his seeming insistence that Senators should accept his judgment without question or regard for their own convictions, deplored Democratic extravagance, quoted freely from Mr. Wilson's book on Constitutional Government, etc., greatly to the satisfaction of his Republican colleagues. With these outgivings, however telling, we need not concern ourselves. The real quality of Senator BORAH'S argument is indicated sufficiently by the excerpts presented above. Let us glance now along the whole fighting line.

The points of presumed weakness in the Democratic line-up selected by the coaches of the Republican team as likely to prove most vulnerable may be summarized as follows:

Depression of business: Despite the hopefulness manifested by financiers with respect to the future, the Republican leaders insist that prosperity is yet afar off; that the existing stagnation—18,280 commercial failures compiled by Bradstreet's for 1914—mark a new high record in sharp contrast with the reiterated assertions of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; that the existing stagnation is as far from being "a state of mind" as the depression of six months ago is proven by this result to have been "psychological"; and that in only a few lines of manufacturing can improvement be anticipated as a consequence of the war. That there is no limit to the foreign demand for war material is admitted, but, it is urged, the present capacity of factories is already overtaxed and can not be increased except through the construction of huge new plants, possibly in contravention of the administration's conception of neutrality, and in any case impossible of material accomplishment before November, 1916.

Prospective bankruptcy of the Treasury: This is fully anticipated as a consequence of declining revenues and increased appropriations, as indicated by the Treasury report of January 8, 1915, as follows:

Income of fiscal year to date	$319,609,606.02
Income last year to same date	354,867,122.21
Decrease in income	35,257,516.19
Outgo of fiscal year to date	401,798,001.15
Outgo last year to same date	390,892,111.52
Increase of outgo	10,905,889.63
Outgo over income this year	82,188,395.13
Outgo over income last year	36,024,989.31
Decrease in surplus	46,163,405.82

The Treasury estimate, submitted at the opening of Congress, of $1,090,775,154, or $18,000,000 less than the preceding year, is pronounced fictitious evidence of economy for political effect, since the "supplemental" estimates already aggregate $44,000,000, exclusive of $30,000,000 proposed for an omnibus public bill, $14,000,000 already made available in the urgent deficiency bill, and a possible appropriation of $30,000,000 for the purchase of ships. To the suggestion that partial relief may be obtained through the sale of Panama bonds, the reply is made that the bonds pay only 3 per cent, and, since they do not have the circulating privilege and can not under the law be sold for less than par, could not possibly find a market at this time.

Government ownership of ships: This proposal, although fathered by the Secretary of the Treasury and warmly espoused by the President, has found little public favor. It will be attacked as undemocratic; as a plain subsidy; as a deterrent of private investment in competition with the Government, which avows its intention to transact business at a loss; as advantageous only to shipbuilders and possibly to owners of interned German ships; and as perilous to the maintenance of peace with foreign nations. To the President's declaration that the scheme is necessary as a temporary measure to enable producers to reach markets the answer is made that inadequate transportation is due, not to dearth of ships but to lack of pier facilities, longshoremen, and other helpers in foreign ports, as indicated by the fact that 56 ships at London and 54 at Genoa were at the latest report awaiting turn to be unloaded. The President's accusation of excessive rates being charged is met with the assertion that the great delay caused by these conditions necessitates extra remuneration, and by reference to the fact that the present price of wheat is the highest ever known. The bill will probably succumb in this session to the determination of Republican Senators and the indisposition of Democrats headed by Mr. VARDAMAN. It is thought that the administration must then suffer from facing the alternative of acknowledging defeat or calling an extra session.

Mexico: If the warring factions and bloodthirsty bandits who now are despoiling their country shall soon heed the admonition of the President to unite in noble endeavor to establish a just Government with the consent and under the direction of the great majority of common people, the triumph of the administration's policy will be so overwhelming as to confound its critics. If not, the issue inevitably will be whether the United States owes it to her citizens to protect their lives and properties abroad as well as at home, or has no obligation beyond the shouting of caveat emptor to all who so far forget themselves as to cross the border line. In any case, it is quite evident, from the impassioned utterances of Senators LODGE and ROOT and BORAH, that the Republican team has yet to be convinced that the President's

chuckle at the prospect of laughing last is fully warranted by his intuitive knowledge of "the temper and principles of the American people."

National defense: It is perhaps but natural that the Republicans should feel that as a unit for preparedness they possess an advantage over political antagonists whose views are diversified.

The Colombia treaty: Whether or not an apology should be made to Colombia, accompanied by a payment of $25,000,000 for the loss of Panama, is beside the political mark. It suffices for the Republicans to know that the mere proposal has alienated Mr. Roosevelt and his considerable personal following so completely that the administration can not hope for support or cooperation from that source upon any conceivable grounds.

The Diplomatic Service: The mortification of Republicans at the unexpected efficiency demonstrated by our representatives in Europe is mitigated by the common judgment that the most useful services were rendered and the most notable success was achieved by the Republican ambassador who was retained in France long after his successor was appointed. It is also regarded as certain that such of the independent voters as are devoted to civil-service reform will not be attracted by the appointments to South America and may view the proceedings in San Domingo with aversion as a violation of trust.

Sectionalism: Republican leaders are well aware of the danger of playing with fire, but they will have difficulty in quenching the flame which leaped forth in New England when a leading journal asked bitterly if 20 dead men would have been branded as "conspirators" in Texas, as they were branded in Massachusetts and Connecticut, while three sons of the Lone Star State were sitting in the Cabinet and another was acting as the intimate adviser of the President.

Woman suffrage: Final relegation of this subject to the States, it is believed, will deprive the Democrats of an issue which Mr. Bryan surely would have espoused as an appeal for the 91 electoral votes easily controlled by women if they should act as a unit.

The colored vote: No doubt is felt that segregation at Washington will hold every negro in the Republican ranks—a fact, if it be a fact, of no little importance in States like Ohio, Indiana, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

Such, in brief, are some of the bases of Republican confidence. There are others of a more definitely political nature, embracing the universal disgust with Mr. Daniels, the quite common doubt of Mr. Bryan's efficiency as an executive, the propriety of Mr. McAdoo remaining in the Treasury as a son-in-law, the alienation of three at least of the ablest Democratic Senators, the disaffection of the so-called Clark Democrats who have not been accorded recognition, the seeming dissatisfaction of the chairman and other members of the national committee, and so on; but these are family affairs forbidden to intermeddlers.

Most satisfying of all to the Republicans is the reflection that they have a team, while the Democrats have only a captain—a great captain, to be sure, bold from his sense of power, firm in his resolute aloofness, sure of the justice of his cause—yet but one against so many and so strong.

So the President, in a speech which must be pronounced ill timed and ill judged, resembling nothing more closely than the traditionally putative effort of a tenor to sing bass, turns to the people. In them he has implicit confidence.

But that is not the question. Quite the contrary, we should say.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] as he may desire.

[Mr. KINKAID addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the pending sundry civil bill carries about $4,000,000 for rivers in addition to a $38,000,000 river and harbor bill now reported to the Senate; or in all $42,000,000 for dredgers, contractors, land reclamationists, and other beneficiaries for next year. This bill has the right of way in the Senate. By a peculiar situation other appropriation bills have not been reported.

Yesterday the House refused to give to the Navy a hospital ship in place of a worthless tub that has been used for many years.

The country is paying an income tax and a war tax and is facing a depleted Treasury in times of peace. It is not my purpose to discuss a mistake made by enacting the Underwood tariff bill, because that is now past history. The country has discovered that while striking down the domestic sugar business built up by an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars of private capital, we left the control of that business in the hands of refiners and irresponsible agencies without reducing one farthing the cost of sugar. While discouraging wool raisers of the country in striking down wool tariffs, we benefited no one excepting the foreign producer. While removing all protection to agriculture we did not aid domestic producers or consumers, because board of trade jugglers, whose customers own or control marketable wheat and other grains, do not include many farmers among the number. The American people know these things and they also know that many needed millions formerly used to run the Government were sacrificed by tariff tinkering until to-day we are confronted by new and differing forms of taxation and an empty Treasury with which to meet necessary burdens.

Before the passage of either the income tax or the war tax the Democratic platform, in 1904, said:

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality.

During the years 1904 and 1905 Government appropriations included the following items:

	Army.	Navy.	River and harbor.	All appropriations.
1904	$77,888,752	$81,876,791	$20,233,150	$736,578,402
1905	77,070,300	97,505,140	10,872,200	732,197,855

In 1912 the Baltimore Democratic platform said:

We denounce the profligate waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of the recent Republican Congress, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people.

Our Democratic friends are now in power. Facts speak louder than idle arguments, and we turn to comparisons with the following results:

	Army.	Navy.	River and harbor.	All appropriations.
1914	$94,266,145	$140,800,643	$51,118,889	$1,098,678,788
1915	101,019,212	144,868,716	26,998,500	1,116,118,138

Additional contract authorizations were made in 1914 of $68,505,074, and in 1915 of $40,333,000. Appropriations for 1916 fiscal year are not yet passed.

Instead of decreasing the appropriations or lessening "oppressive taxation" the party in power has jumped every appropriation in 10 years approximately 50 per cent, and rivers and harbors over 100 per cent, while "oppressive taxation" now includes every tax formerly levied with an income tax and oppressive war tax added to our burdens. Nor has the high cost of living been reduced in a single instance. The wastefulness and extravagance of this Democratic Congress has become generally known, but the opinion of Mr. FITZGERALD, the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a Democratic leader and a man best qualified to speak, is as follows:

Whenever I think of the horrible mess I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party I am tempted to quit my place. * * * Our Democratic colleagues have not given support to us thus far during this session of Congress. They have voted against recommendations they should not have voted against; they have unnecessarily piled up public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming a laughingstock of the country.

Here we have a Democratic platform utterance pledging economy, next a record showing unparalleled waste and extravagance in an administration, and finally the condemnation of his own party by its Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What will be the record for 1915? Will we curtail or reduce our expenditures? If so, where and how?

Within the past half dozen years we have been piling up enormous future obligations for worthless and wasteful waterways. After an expenditure of about $800,000,000 for waterways, nearly half of which has come in the past dozen years, we learn that future obligations have grown as follows:

Projects under way, due	$250,000,000
New projects, amount required	101,000,000
197 surveys 1915 bill, approximately	78,000,000
Total	429,000,000

We have been saddled with extravagant expenditures and more taxes and, in addition, with a future debt for waterways alone which may reach approximately $429,000,000, if the 1915 bill in the Senate becomes law. Only a portion of this indebtedness has been created by the present administration, but it is rapidly increasing, and no effort has been made to retrench. On the contrary, the 1915 bill pending in the Senate carries over $38,000,000, and 197 new surveys, involving an estimated present and future expenditure of $116,000,000. It is no excuse to say new surveys are not to be undertaken as present projects. Why appropriate $400,000 to make 197 new surveys? Why should we invite greed and waste on the one hand, while on the other is a declaration adopted by the Baltimore platform that economy shall rule and oppressive taxation cease? Wherein has an attempt been made to keep that promise?

I shall only briefly refer to the waterway waste, better known as the annual "pork barrel," which is typical of other expenditures denounced by Mr. FITZGERALD. In addition to an increase of over 100 per cent in 10 years, as shown, the 1914 pork-barrel bill reached over $60,000,000 in cash, counting in sundry civil bill items, or nearly 100 per cent more than all the appropriations for rivers and harbors for the two years of 1904 and 1905 put together, which a Democratic platform denounced. When

the last river and harbor bill was before the Senate, it was fought by Republican Senators, who denounced it because of its unparalleled fraud and waste. Search the records and you will not find the voice of a single Democratic leader at the other end of the Capitol raised in protest. The bill was defeated by a handful of Republican Senators, while the $20,000,000 substitute adopted by the Senate and the House was drawn by a Republican Senator.

There should be no politics in Government economy, but the record can not be disputed.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FREAR. For just a moment.

Mr. BARTLETT. What did the gentleman say was the appropriation for 1902–3?

Mr. FREAR. For 1904–5 they aggregated $31,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. For the two years?

Mr. FREAR. For rivers and harbors.

Mr. BARTLETT. For the two years or for each year?

Mr. FREAR. For the two years combined. This year $42,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does that include contract authorizations?

Mr. FREAR. That includes the sundry civil items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But does it include contract items?

Mr. FREAR. I suppose it does. In 1904 the river and harbor bill was $20,333,150.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the actual appropriation. What were the contract authorizations?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know; but it includes the sundry civil bill items and all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the sundry civil bill carries the appropriations——

Mr. FREAR. Then it includes all, because I took the sundry civil bill items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What I asked the gentleman is, How much were the authorizations in the river and harbor bill in addition to the actual appropriations?

Mr. FREAR. In both cases I have taken the same standard; that is, all that was contained in the river and harbor bill and in the sundry civil bill. I can not say as to the specific items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Last year there were practically no contract authorizations, but all cash appropriations, in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. FREAR. There were in the original sundry civil bill, and there are in this sundry civil bill here.

Mr. MANN. Besides, if the gentleman will permit, contract authorizations are paid for over a series of years. That is quite different from the actual appropriation to be paid for during the year.

Mr. FREAR. That is true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But if, for instance, there are fifty millions obligations, it must be met in the future. It does not attract as much attention, but there is more financial difficulty than where you make specific appropriations.

Mr. FREAR. In an attempt to economize we are refused a hospital ship for the Navy. What business man discharges his doctor or throws away money when times are close? What man refuses to buy medicine while extending gratuities to relatives and friends in times of business depression? What corporation other than our Government throws economy to the winds when burdensome taxes are levied to meet extravagances?

According to Engineers' reports, the total maintenance items in the 1915 rivers and harbors bill are $4,760,540. That sum should carry over until next year. When the House bill aggregating $34,000,000 was before us I briefly analyzed many of the worthless and many of the extravagant projects it contained. In the RECORD of Friday, January 29, were offered official refutation of claims of commercial needs, with a disclosure of the small actual commerce served by many expenditures. That bill, now reported to the Senate, reaches $38,000,000, in addition to $4,000,000 contained in the sundry civil bill before us, although $4,760,540 will meet pressing necessities of maintenance. Why is an appropriation made eight times larger than maintenance estimates? Why are we asked to survey 197 new projects contained in the bill when the Treasury is depleted and taxes were never more burdensome? Why are we placing approximately $78,000,000 more in obligations for 40 per cent of approved surveys, in addition to $350,000,000 in present obligations? Why does the 1915 economy rivers and harbors bill carry over $100,000,000 in present and probable future obligations? Why does a party that denounces oppressive taxation before election refuse to raise its voice against a hypocritical, wasteful "pork barrel" again thrust upon the people? Why does it refuse a hospital ship in order to waste millions, including $6,000,000 for a Mississippi land-reclamation scheme?

If we would find answer, ponder well these facts: Florida, with a comparatively small actual commerce, gets 30 projects out of 250 contained in the $38,000,000 bill. Do we not know that one of the custodians of the merchant marine bill and influential officials on committees at both ends of the Capitol are in a position to strongly represent Florida's interests in this bill?

North Carolina, with an insignificant actual commerce, gets 20 out of 250 contained in the $38,000,000 bill. Is it not true that close administration leaders, who steered the tariff bill to safety, have great influence on the committees and upon Congress when North Carolina's claims are urged?

Texas, with a comparatively small actual shipping traffic outside of Galveston, gets 20 extravagant projects out of 250 contained in the bill. It includes the trafficless Trinity, the trafficless Brazos, and a dozen other inexcusable items; and Texas has 18 distinguished Democratic Congressmen—all leaders. Why do Louisiana and Mississippi get 25 projects for those two States, and why does the lower Mississippi get $6,000,000 from the Government Treasury for a private land-reclamation project?

Who are two of the most influential and industrious and liberal waterway members to be found on the respective committees of either House or in the country? Why are the trafficless Missouri and the Mississippi and the $64,000,000 Ohio River extravagance to be given over $15,000,000 in the present bill?

Why has the bill been presented to the Senate by jumbling together projects in different States under one item, excepting to hide the actual projects and amounts given for maintenance to each? Why this sudden change in policy? Why not lump the whole bill, and thereby better deceive and confuse as to all of the projects? Why are the remaining projects in the bill scattered all over 35 remaining States of the country except to touch districts here and there and quiet opponents of the bill?

Why are 197 surveys to aggregate approximately $78,000,000 in approved projects scattered throughout the country, excepting to help bring votes to insure the bill's passage in both Houses? Why do we continue a waterway pork barrel in these days of war taxes and hard times?

The $38,000,000 river and harbor bill, with 197 new surveys, approximating $78,000,000 in additional future obligations, or about $116,000,000 in all, is one of the most extravagant waterway bills ever attempted to be saddled onto a tax-ridden people. It is a Democratic appropriation bill that discredits all partisan platform pledges of economy and merits the deserved denunciation given by Representative FITZGERALD. No extravagant pork bill was ever before passed in days of business depression, but we are now asked to break down all professions of economy and continue to improve wasteful or worthless projects.

The last river and harbor bill was for $53,000,000. It was killed by Republicans. It saved $53,000,000 in war taxes. The $38,000,000 bill of this year can be cut to $5,000,000 for maintenance, and thereby save another $33,000,000. Will any Democratic leader of the administration aid in realizing economy professions by helping to defeat the bill if it comes back to the House? Why is the $38,000,000 pork barrel of 1915 larger than the combined bills for 1904 and 1905, when Democratic conventions were resolving to economize and Democratic Senators were denouncing such bills?

What excuse is offered for a 100 per cent increase in 10 years?

What excuse is offered for the 197 new surveys in the 1915 bill? What excuse is offered for the present $350,000,000 waterway obligation?

What misrepresentation can pull a hypocritical veil over the 1915 bill so as to deceive the American people as to its contents or wastefulness?

Mr. MANN. It does not cost as much a year to extend it over a series of years within the discretion of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FREAR. The House is aware of the fact that the river and harbor bills are prolonged by the dribbling appropriations which are made.

If the country will pillory the bill and those who defend it, we will soon have a better system, a more economical administration, and an abolition of war taxes.

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and an ounce of performance is worth many pounds of convention pledges.

The American sailors yesterday asked for a hospital ship to care for the country's invalid defenders. Under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]

their request was rejected on the grounds of economy. Do we forget that less than three weeks ago an $18,700,000 private water-power project had an initial appropriation in the rivers and harbors bill? Its allowance was urged by the same Democratic leader upon the floor, but was defeated. Do we forget that less than three weeks ago a $34,000,000 river and harbor bill filled with wasteful and extravagant items was defended by the same able Democratic leader, and it was passed by his party, pledged to economy.

The American sailor asked for a hospital ship for the man who has volunteered to defend the Nation, but who is temporarily disabled—for the man who is lauded by all patriotic citizens and whose life is dedicated to his country's cause. He asked for bread and you gave him a stone.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. For just a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Upon what authority does the gentleman think the American sailor asked for that hospital ship? The Secretary of the Navy did not ask it.

Mr. FREAR. I assumed from the arguments made here yesterday that you had no suitable boat to answer that purpose.

Great political interests to-day are asking that you give them another pork barrel. Will you do it? We could almost buy three hospital ships with what we are spending for the lower Mississippi land-reclamation project. We could buy three hospital ships with what we are spending for the Ohio canalization scheme, counting sundry civil items. We could buy 15 hospital ships with what is contained in waterway appropriations this year over the cost of actual maintenance, and we would still have several million dollars left for emergencies.

Do not deceive yourselves. The country will hold any administration responsible for passing such a "humbug and a steal," as it was termed by one of your foremost statesmen in Congress.

Do not forget that a hospital ship is more necessary to the country than a pork barrel, and the country will not justify your actions in defeating the one or in passing the other.

When such standards of economy become known, sure and swift reward will come to any party that is responsible, nor will a war-tax-ridden people patiently bear wasteful and worthless waterway burdens when confronted by an empty treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All of the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], a member of the subcommittee which prepared the bill, is unable to be present to-day. He desires to use some time in general debate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate remaining on this side may be reserved, to be occupied some time next week by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wanted some time, and I was going to take some time between now and the next two or three weeks. I would like 10 minutes of time at least. Of course, I can not save this time for Mr. SHERLEY. He can get what time he wants at any time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We can save it with the consent of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has 58 minutes remaining under the agreement entered into this morning as to the amount of general debate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I feel like accommodating the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in every way, but it does not seem to me desirable to make an agreement at this time in reference to the continuation of the general debate after we commence reading the bill. When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] makes his request later I think it will be sufficient time to pass upon it, if he wants general debate on this bill. Of course his own bill will be before the House soon—the fortifications bill, of which he will have charge. I do not think it is desirable at this stage in the session to make an agreement about throwing over general debate until some time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is an unusual condition. The gentleman wishes to discuss matters pertinent to the bill.

Mr. MANN. If that is the case, and he makes the request in the House, I have no doubt the House will treat him with all courtesy at that time. I shall have to object to the request at present. I think we ought to make some progress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] any time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has exhausted his three hours.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, through the courtesy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] I had the privilege as well as the honor of an invitation to address the Republican Club of New York City on the 23d of last month on the subject of Government ownership of railroads. The occasion was a most pleasant and enjoyable one so far as I was concerned, for I found myself in the midst, I am sure, of the most hospitable surroundings and among the finest set of gentlemen to be found anywhere on earth outside of the precincts of home, or out West, where I reside. The program called for an informal discussion of the subject, much like a debate, in which I was followed by Mr. B. F. Yoakum, of the Frisco system; Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock, formerly of the Wall Street Journal; and Prof. Edward Sherwood Mead, of the University of Pennsylvania. Under the arrangements I was allowed 10 minutes at the close of the debate for rebuttal.

I can not claim to have been as successful in convincing my audience of financiers, bankers, railway men, and New York Republican Club members that the Government should adopt Government ownership as they were in convincing me that they knew how to royally treat a guest; but even from the standpoint of an ardent believer in Government ownership, I am sure the occasion was productive of great good. It was agreed as a preliminary rule of the debate that I was to go the limit for the doctrine in which I believed and should not hold back or expurgate my remarks for fear I would come in conflict with somebody's preconceived notions.

As a result of the notice given to that occasion by the Associated Press, the United Press, and other news agencies throughout the country, I have been besieged with requests for copies of the speech or for information on the subject of Government ownership of railroads by high-school debaters and others all over the country. I now desire to give all of these an opportunity to make such use of the results of my efforts as they can through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do not expect to incur the expense of reducing this speech to pamphlet form, and debaters and others wanting the information, or perhaps I should say wanting to learn if there is any information contained in my remarks, will have to inform themselves by obtaining a copy of the RECORD of this day.

Since that occasion I have added to and amplified my arguments, and I now present these, together with certain pertinent observations, which seem to me to be conclusive, on behalf of Government ownership of railroads.

I shall handle the subject here to-day as a repetition of the presentation made at that time, the only difference being that on this occasion, with the time allowed and the privilege of extension in the RECORD, I will be able to present arguments much more voluminous, if not more convincing.

The question for discussion, as stated on the program, was, "Should the Federal Government own or operate or only supervise the interstate railroads?"

This limited the subject matter to interstate railroads only, not intrastate or lines exclusively under the jurisdiction of any one State.

Next, the statement of the question conceded supervision by the Federal Government as essential. It raises no question on that score, nor would any sane, well-informed American raise that question. We might restate the proposition like this: Conceding that it is a proper policy for the Federal Government to supervise and regulate interstate railroads, would it be a proper policy under existing conditions for the Federal Government to own or operate them?

UNCLE SAM KNOWS HOW TO OPERATE THE RAILROADS.

It being agreed that Uncle Sam knows how to supervise the railroads, it must be admitted that he knows how to operate them. If he can tell the railroad owners exactly how to execute every detail of operation and management, as he is now doing through the Interstate Commerce Commission, he must know how.

Then we might again state the question like this: Since the Federal Government is competent to operate the railroads, and must instruct the present owners how to operate them, and must enforce its instructions and orders with United States marshals and penalties, should the Government also own or operate?

THE GOVERNMENT IS BIG ENOUGH TO OWN AND OPERATE THE RAILROADS.

Let us consider the Government of the United States as a great corporation, with 100,000,000 stockholders and a capitalization of $150,000,000,000, the latest estimate of our national wealth, with annual savings or dividends of $5,000,000,000.

The activities of this greatest corporation on earth extends in every conceivable direction. In the West it reclaims arid lands and owns and operates two short railroads in the Reclamation Service, and in Alaska it administers the details of its vast properties up there and is building and will operate its railroad system.

This gigantic corporation, with the people as its stockholders, manages a tremendous Military and Naval Establishment and controls in various ways the vast commerce between the States and safeguards American commerce on the high seas. It owns and operates for pay the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad and five great ocean liners between New York and Panama in ordinary carrying trade in competition with privately owned merchant ships.

This great corporation, whose monopolistic power makes no one fear except its enemies, if such there be, is not so great as to prevent it from successfully operating an ice-cream factory at Colon, hotels, eating houses, grocery stores, meat markets, steam laundries, and various other enterprises in the Canal Zone.

In the West it markets its timber on its vast public domain, and tells the coal baron who would monopolize the coal to figure how much coal he wants for actual use, and it—this vast corporation of yours and mine—will see what can be done toward a transaction that will have regard first of all for its stockholders—for you and me. To the water-power syndicate this corporation says: "I own these waterfalls for my stockholders, just as I own the timber and the coal. I'll enter into a lease with you if you will agree to operate the lease for the benefit of my stockholders first and your own stockholders second. If you want to sell water power on the square, all right; if not, I'll do it myself."

Every intricacy of the Postal Service, from the delivery of a post card to the shipment of a 20-pound parcel, is handled by our corporation with a nicety of perfection that makes every American proud. It accepts our savings on deposit and distributes the one billion of annual assessments in the education of our children, the training of the farmers and artisans, the saving of life and health, and for the well-being of us all.

Already 11 Republican Senators and 1 Progressive have gone on record without qualification for the most sweeping proposition for ship ownership and ship purchase and ship operation by the Federal Government that has ever been proposed. On January 24, 1914, when the Alaska railroad bill was up, such progressive men as Senators BRADY, BRISTOW, CUMMINS, FALL, GRONNA, KENYON, LANE, MARTINE of New Jersey, NORRIS, WORKS, and POINDEXTER—LA FOLLETTE was sick and could not vote—in supporting the Norris amendment took a stand with the vast body of American people when they voted to direct the President to acquire not less than 10 nor more than 20 merchant ships to engage in the passenger and freight business on both the oceans and in the coastwise trade. These splendid statesmen, exercising their honest, faithful, well-matured convictions, voted to appropriate $15,000,000 to start the Government in that enterprise. That proposition was defeated; but now the administration in power stands for the same thing. Can there be any doubt in the minds of any man who believes in the courage and sincerity of American statesmanship that this great corporation, which the people love, will stand its ground against the measly, grasping, greedy Shipping Trust, which stands at the doors of parliaments and on the thresholds of kings and proclaims its right and power to make and unmake republics and the governments of the earth according to the amount of gold in the form of subsidy it can bluff out the fawning, cringing, cowardly lords or sires or legislators with knee breeches and goggle-eyes, or whatever you call them in parliamentary terms?

Think of the insolence of a trust like the International Mercantile Marine Co., with Mr. J. Bruce Ismay of *Titanic* fame as president, which owns the American Line, the White Star Line, the Red Star Line, the Atlantic Transport Line, the Dominion Line, and controls the Leyland Line and the National Line, whose sailings comprise 47 distinct lines of service, which extend to practically all the ports of the world, with a fleet of 138 vessels of a tonnage of 1,355,236 tons, shifting its American-built and foreign-built vessels from English to American flag, according to legislation, for it owns English corporations and American corporations. With this vast fleet of vessels it says, "Ha, ha; sure, we are Americans; we know you want vessels to fly the American flag; we know you want vessels that can be converted into American transports in time of war; we know you want the Stars and Stripes to fly on an American merchant marine; and we know our boats will be used by the foreign nations for their troops in case of war. We know you need neutral ships to carry your cotton and your wheat, but we demand that you tax the people and give us a subsidy in gold or you do not get our ships. Of course, we are making 30 per cent; that is what we are in business for. My name is J. Bruce Ismay, saved from the *Titanic*, who is still defeating American claimants in their efforts to get damages for injuries for their losses on the *Titanic*, although we have had to pay the English claimants long ago. I am not afraid of your Government competition, because I know full well you will not get the votes except when you do not need them."

The Shipping Trust is the most infamous, independent, and arrogant combination on earth. We could cope with piracy on the high seas. We had naval heroes who were not afraid to lash their vessels to the sides of the pirate ships and take their crew but—

All right; but just watch what will happen when the American people really find out what is being handed to them.

I did not intend to make this diversion, but in laying down the lines of activity of this great corporation which we own, and in contemplating the necessity for Government ownership of railroads, it was natural to stray off a little on a burning subject like this, especially since the railroad interests in reality own most of the steamships flying the American flag.

I shall classify my arguments under three heads: (1) Democracy, (2) economy, and (3) efficiency.

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS.

The rule of democracy must be maintained among the stockholders of this great corporation, or else democracy and republican institutions will forever vanish from the earth and the idea of the people ruling a great nation will become a myth.

The railway system of the United States is valued by its owners at approximately $20,000,000,000. It collects annually over $3,000,000,000 of revenue and floats nearly a billion a year of new stocks and bonds. It has increased in value tremendously in the last decade. The unearned increment is far greater than the original investment. In other words, they have more than doubled in value and will continue to increase tremendously as the country develops.

COMBINATION AND CONCENTRATION POSSIBLE ONLY UNDER GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY.

Combinations and centralizations in transportation are absolutely essential. Monopoly of railways is inevitable and necessary. The attempt to keep the railways apart and compel them to fight each other is absurd and wasteful. Harriman, from one standpoint, did a great service for the people of the United States in going as far as he did toward Harrimanizing the railway systems. But such a tremendous machine, such a gigantic monopoly, can not live within the bounds of a republic. A government which collects only $1,000,000,000 a year for its own operation feels its weakness in the presence of an internal corporation whose annual revenues are three times that of the government itself and which passes into the hands of a very few men who control almost unlimited additional wealth through interlocking and correlated corporations. The only check to such powerful concentration is Government ownership.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS CREATES AN ARISTOCRACY OF WEALTH.

The raising of tariff by which some $300,000,000 is collected annually is said to be a power in the Federal Government which may make or unmake the business of the country over night. If the Government has power to paralyze industry and throw millions of men out of work or bestow untold blessing on everyone by a mere rearrangement of tariff schedules involving the collection of $300,000,000, how much greater than the Government is the organization which has the right to arrange freight and passenger tariff schedules for the collection of $3,000,000,000 annually, an amount that will probably be doubled in another decade. Such power naturally adds to itself other great interests such as the banking interests, the manufacturing interests, the water-power interests, and leads to an aristocracy of wealth in which a half dozen men become enthroned with more power than a king, a czar, or a kaiser.

The big transportation machine in the United States has become too big to live as a privately owned machine under the people's corporation known as the United States of America. The 100,000,000 stockholders of this $150,000,000,000 company called the United States of America have already concluded that the supremacy of the Government is challenged by this power within itself greater than itself. The inevitable result has been the opening of a fight which will be to a finish between the two institutions. Either the democracy of the people, asserting itself through the Federal Government, or the aristocracy of wealth, centered about the railway owners, must eventually fail. The Federal Government has already won the prelimi-

nary skirmish by compelling the railroads to submit to supervision even to the extent of fixing rates and controlling expenditures. There will be no retrogression, the people through their representatives will stand by the fight, public ownership will come very soon, and democracy will permanently prevail.

ECONOMY DEMANDS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Who has the ability to sound the depths or measure the heights of railroad extravagance in this country. Capitalized at $20,000,000,000, they give that sum as the present value of the railroad properties in the United States. I can not set forth what portion of this $20,000,000,000 is mere water, so called, or what portion represents a cash investment, but I have substantial proof that the water exceeds the cash that has been paid into the railroads out of the pockets of railway owners or investors.

There is no way to figure accurately this phase of the subject, but I find in the Railway Age Gazette, a partisan railway journal, for August 21, 1914, some very convincing evidence taken from the book by Prof. Walther Lotz, who is vouched for by the Railway Age Gazette as one of the best authors on railway management in the known world and accordingly a most valuable witness.

THE RAILWAYS OF GERMANY A "MILCH COW" FOR THE GOVERNMENT.

The author is against public ownership, and starts out with the statement that "Germany's State railroad system is an oppressive monopoly and a political mistake." He warns America and England against a similar error. The author presents that the Prussian railways are taking from the people vast sums of money to assist the Government. An annual profit of 4 per cent over interest is alleged to be harvested by these Government-owned railroads.

I quote from the report of the statement of Prof. Lotz as published in the Railway Age Gazette of August 21:

In addition to subsidizing out of railroads the ill-balanced State finances, Prussia has created from the same source a vast State property. This is shown by the railroad capital account. The railroad administration has written off an excessive amount of the original small capital outlay of $2,875,000,000. Altogether $750,000,000 has been amortized. So that of the original railroad debt only $2,125,000,000 remains outstanding. This, judged by European values, is ridiculously small capitalization for 38,000 kilometers, nearly all double, treble, or even quadruple tracked, and splendidly equipped. As a fact the present sale value of the state railroad system is appraised at $5,200,000,000. The increase in value is due to the putting back into the roads of part of the profits, to extensions built out of profits, and to natural rise in land and other values. The difference between the outstanding capital of two billion and odd dollars and the present value of $5,000,000,000 is the profit and property of the State.

GERMAN PEOPLE MAKE THREE BILLION BESIDES THE 4 PER CENT.

Consider this astounding statement of Prof Lotz—that the Prussian railroads referred to are worth $5,200,000,000 while they are capitalized on the Government capital account at only $2,125,000,000, so that, to use his own words—

the difference between the outstanding capital debt of two billion and odd dollars and the present value of $5,000,000,000 is the profit and property of the State.

A part of Germany's profit on the $5,000,000,000 worth of railroads referred to is $3,000,000,000. It has amortized a sufficient sum which, when added to the increased value or unearned increment of the roads, makes the entire system 60 per cent paid for and leaves only 40 per cent of its value, or two and one-quarter billion, still standing on the books. But that is not all. Prof. Lotz says these roads, after paying the 4 per cent interest and the amortized surplus of three billion and interest—

between 1882 and 1912 over one and one-quarter billion dollars has been taken out of the railroad profits and handed over to balance the State budget.

So in reality there is only one billion not already taken out of these roads by the people, or 20 per cent of the present value of the roads.

Apply these figures to our experience, and surely the advocates of private ownership would not claim less for American privately owned lines than is admitted for the German lines; and admitting for argument's sake that our roads are worth $20,000,000,000, that there is not a drop of water in the stocks and bonds, we find that the $20,000,000,000 worth of railroads should stand on the books at $4,000,000,000—20 per cent of their value—the $16,000,000,000 would have to be charged off, used to "subsidize ill-balanced State finances," amortized, credited to profits or surplus, if we have done as well as Germany, and all this in addition to 4 per cent interest. If the Government owned the lines as Germany does, and had done as well as Germany, the people would have that $16,000,000,000 as well as the interest paid in full. Certainly our private owners have done that well, because this eminent author says public ownership is a failure and American private ownership a success.

I am convinced that these figures as to German conditions are accurate, and that if the Government of the United States had operated the railroad system it would not have more than $4,000,000,000, or 20 per cent of the value of the roads, invested, so far as the "capital account" would show. The people would have the sixteen billion that are now the assets of the Harry Thaws, the Goulds, the Vanderbilts, the Rockefellers, the Hettie Greens, the Gates, the papas-in-law of foreign counts, and the guardians of rare and nameless poodles and collies and trotters and yachts.

AMERICAN PEOPLE LOSE SIXTEEN BILLION.

Who got the sixteen billion—the 80 per cent? In Germany it went into the public resources. Would it not have promoted economy for the sixteen billion to have gone to the public in America? In England it has gone to the Rothschilds, and in America it has not only been used to swell private fortunes but to gouge the public and corrupt public servants; to New Haven the widows, Rock Island the farmers, and Pere Marquette the Michiganders.

The bitterness of the dregs of the cup the people must drink in considering railroad extravagance in this country, and the reckless disregard of the public in developing these lines, is intensified by calling attention to the statement of this eminent railroad witness, Prof. Lotz, that the German lines are nearly all double or treble or even quadruple tracked and splendidly equipped.

It may be said that railroad construction, because of labor and prices of commodities, has been more expensive in this country than in Germany, but that will not hold good, for it is the stock argument of the private owners that German railways cost half as much again as ours, and owing to the excessive cost of right of way there as compared with the lavish 40-mile-wide gifts here there is truth in the claim.

Let him who would ridicule these figures, deduced from Prof. Walther Lotz, and the twenty billion capitalization claim of the railways, please consider what has happened in Great Britain. The railways in the United Kingdom under private ownership are valued at $314,000 per mile. Our lines will follow suit if they are permitted. At the same rate our system would be capitalized at eighty-one billion instead of twenty billion. There must be some reason why Germany can fight against the world and England can hardly fight with the world.

I have compiled some figures which appear to me to go a long way toward confirming the deductions just made in so far as reference is made to the American lines, which I now make part of these remarks:

Years.	Mileage.	Annual increase of mileage.	Freight cars owned.	Number of employees.	Total mileage of freight cars.	Passengers carried 1 mile.	Stock.	Bonds.	Total railway capital.	Capital increase by years.	Annual increase of capital per added mile.
1903	213,422	.....	1,753,389	1,312,537	[1] 14,039,924,661	[1] 20,795,314,141	$6,155,559,032	$6,444,431,226	$12,599,990,258	.....	.....
1904	220,112	6,690	1,798,561	1,296,121	[1] 14,560,997,712	[1] 22,347,726,788	6,335,899,329	6,873,225,350	13,213,124,679	$615,144,421	$91,950
1905	225,196	5,084	1,842,871	1,382,196	15,082,070,763	23,800,149,436	6,554,557,051	7,250,701,070	13,805,258,121	592,133,442	116,461
1906	230,761	5,565	1,958,912	1,521,355	.....	.....	6,803,760,093	7,766,661,385	14,570,421,478	765,163,357	139,310
1907	236,949	6,188	2,126,594	1,672,074	17,122,259,754	27,718,554,030	7,356,861,691	8,725,284,992	16,082,146,683	1,511,725,205	244,461
1908	240,846	3,897	2,231,181	1,436,275	16,857,003,236	29,082,836,944	7,373,212,323	9,394,332,504	16,767,544,827	685,398,144	175,878
1909	244,084	3,238	2,218,280	1,502,823	17,169,413,224	29,109,322,589	7,686,278,545	9,801,590,390	17,487,868,935	720,324,112	222,463
1910	249,992	5,908	2,290,331	1,699,410	18,981,573,779	32,338,496,329	8,113,657,380	10,303,474,858	18,417,132,238	929,263,303	159,980
1911	254,732	4,740	2,359,335	1,699,809	19,315,156,130	33,201,694,699	8,470,717,611	10,738,217,470	19,208,935,081	891,802,853	188,141
1912	258,033	3,301	2,382,674	1,716,380	19,466,402,067	33,132,354,783	8,622,400,821	11,130,135,443	19,752,536,264	543,601,183	164,678
Increase in 10 years	.....	33,611	629,258	392,843	5,426,477,406	12,337,040,642	2,466,841,789	4,685,604,217	7,152,545,006	.....	.....

[1] 1903 and 1904 as to freight and passengers averaged from reports for 1900 and 1905.

Note that the railroads increased in mileage in the 10 years from 1902 to 1912, 33,611 miles, or 15.7 per cent. In the same period the total capitalization in stocks and bonds went up from $12,599,990,258 to $19,752,536,264, which amounted to an increase of $7,152,546,006, or 36 per cent. The railroads enjoyed tremendous prosperity during the 10 years immediately prior to 1903. There was plenty of water pumped into the capitalization during that period. There was no real reason why the railway capital should have even gone as high as it was then.

"THE WHOLE OF LAKE MICHIGAN" LET IN.

In May, 1879, when the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railroad was formed, the fixing of the amount of the capital stock was a much-discussed question. James J. Hill wanted to hold it at $5,000,000. George Stephen wanted it $25,000,000. He argued that they might as well put the stock up to begin with, for if they tried it later there would be raised the "demagogic" cry of "water."

"Water," said Hill; "we've let the whole of Lake Michigan in already."

Their differences were compromised at $15,000,000, for what was a difference of $20,000,000—all excess water—between "empire builders," especially since the real builders of the West—the farmers, the artisans, the merchants, the home builders yet to come to the West—would have to pay the debt and the dividends and interest for all time to come and make it a source of revenue, not burden, to these private fortune builders.

How is that for economy? Does anyone suppose Uncle Sam could possibly have been as extravagant, if he had taken the view that it was his duty to build and own the railroads instead of subsidizing them with land grants and concessions with these "empire builders" at the pump handle?

The railroads were generally started off on a three-to-one basis. If the road was to cost $100,000,000 they would issue $100,000,000 of bonds and $200,000,000 of stock. Then they would double this when they began operations.

THREE HUNDRED PER CENT OR NOTHING—BUT FIGURES AND PAPER.

Prof. William Z. Ripley, professor of economics in Harvard University, in "A comprehensive, unbiased study of the methods that have been used to raise money for American railroads," published in the Railway Age Gazette for May 29, 1914, sets forth the practices a generation ago. It might be remembered that the organizing and the financial methods of a generation ago were as far behind the frenzied railroad financing of to-day as the oxcart of that period was behind the automobile of to-day. Here is what Prof. Ripley had to say:

A knot of promoters planning an enterprise first formed a railroad corporation and authorized, let us say, capital stock to the amount of $1,000,000. This consisted of 10,000 shares, par value $100. This stock was issued to themselves part paid ($10 per share), $100,000 in all being temporarily borrowed for the purpose. A glowing prospectus then offered for sale two millions of bonds, with the proceeds of which the road was to be built. These bonds were sold at 80, with perhaps a bonus of stock thrown in, thus realizing $1,600,000 in cash. From this the promoters reimbursed themselves for the $100,000 already advanced, by charging a 5 per cent commission for placing the loan. This left $1,500,000 cash in the treasury of the railway corporation, as well as a controlling portion of its own capital stock. The next step was the organization by these same directors of a construction company, which built the road for an actual outlay of $1,200,000. The railway directors now voted to pay their construction company $1,500,000 in cash for this work, and in addition the remainder of the share capital of the road. A profit to themselves of $300,000 plus the prospective value of the capital stock, which had cost them nothing, obviously resulted. If the enterprise were henceforth profitably operated, all well and good. If not, it might fail even to pay interest on its bonds. If bankruptcy ensued, a receiver, possibly representing the old stockholders rather than the bondholders, was appointed. In any event the promoters had realized 300 per cent on their first investment, itself borrowed, from the profits of the construction company. Moreover they still controlled the railroad through its capital stock. Thus were the foundations of a number of large fortunes laid—enough, that is to say, to envelop American railroad construction in an atmosphere of disrepute by no means generally deserved.

"JONES PAYS THE FREIGHT."

Remember that the people of the United States are the ones that have to pay every cent of revenue the railroads collect. "Jones pays the freight." "All the traffic will bear," said James J. Hill after he had "let all of Lake Michigan in."

Let us see what that kind of capitalization and organization led to. I am, as near as possible, proving my case out of the mouths of the railroads themselves, so I turn again to the Railway Age Gazette and urge my economy argument—and, I might add, a morality argument—by quoting from that journal's editorial utterance of May 29, 1914:

What are the remedies for such outrageous mismanagement as obtained on the New Haven when Mellen was its president? It is up to the financiers and railway executives of America to cooperate with public officials in finding an answer to that question. The New Haven is not the only railway that has been Mellenized, and such revelations as have been made regarding the financial management of some roads are enough to shake public confidence in railroad management in this country. The situation is worse than that. They are enough to shake the foundations of the confidence of the people of this and of other countries in the financial management of all kinds of business concerns in America, for the men directly or indirectly responsible for the mismanagement of railroads are as largely interested and as potent in manufacturing, mining, and other industries as they are in the railroad business.

And observe further, from the same article:

The great danger is that the disclosures regarding the conduct of the Mellens and the rest of their ilk will cause the passage of more radical legislation than the conditions justify. If excessively drastic legislation shall be passed, we trust that there will be no hypocritical wailing from Wall Street about ignorant public hostility toward railways and about the public being misled by demagogues. The buccaneers in Wall Street and the fools and cowards in Wall Street who let the buccaneers work their wills are the chief authors of such legislation. It is a toss-up whether the demagogues or the highbinders of finance are doing the more to bring all the details of business under the regulation of public officials. Eugene V. Debs, Morris Hillquit, and Upton Sinclair think that they are the real leaders of the socialistic movement in this country. They take themselves too seriously. The real leaders of socialism in this country are such men as Charles S. Mellen and the directors of the New Haven, Frisco, and other roads, who are too crooked, cowardly, indolent, or incapable to perform the duties of their positions.

That is not spoken from a soap box. That is uttered by the railroads' own darling publication. It is not owned in the sense that Mr. Slason Thompson's "Bureau of Railway News and Statistics" or the "Washington Bureau of Railway Economics" is owned. That "bureau" is the railroads, but the Railway Age Gazette is very dear to the heart of the railway world. It has an authorized capital of $1,200,000.

THE WHOLE SYSTEM WRONG—THE MORGANS AS WRONG AS THE MELLENS.

The quotations cited tend to lay all this extravagance and the blame therefor on the Mellens and other managers. But at this point the editor of the Railway Age fails in his application of the facts. He is accepted as a good witness as to what are the facts, but when it comes to his opinion testimony we will have to go a little further, reserving the right to recall this able editor and his splendid journal from time to time as to additional facts. This New Haven case is so typical and bears so strongly on the economy feature of my argument that I am impelled to give a view of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and the House of Morgan as the most extravagant set of men known in the railway world from the standpoint of the public, of "Jones," if you please, who pays the freight. The Mellens are mere tools of the Wall Street looters.

Morgan & Co. admit having received $837,608 from New Haven loans under a certain fiscal agency contract entered into on December 19, 1910, and terminated December 4, 1913, for themselves and their associates. In the Morgan letter, published in Railway Age Gazette March 13, 1914, attempt is made to apportion over a period of 20 years the income received from the New Haven by the Morgan firm, such amount being fixed by the figures presented by Mr. Morgan at $17,500 per year.

That suggestion naturally brings to mind the question of annual outlay under this fiscal agency contract covering a period of three years. Divide the total by three and you have $279,201.66 per year for the three years.

ENOUGH TO SALARY COL. GOETHALS FOR 55 YEARS.

This sum of $837,605 would salary a Col. Goethals at $15,000 per year for more than 55 years. If anyone supposes it was not a bigger job to build the Panama Canal than it would be to manage the railroads of the United States as one great system, then such a one ought to stop the leak in his think tank. The canal job was a fight in the Tropics against terrific obstacles, involving sanitation problems and calling for ability to pioneer and blaze a way without precedent. The railway machine is already on the go. Its new problems could be solved one at a time with the aid of a big machine constructed through many years.

What did Morgan and his friends do for the $837,605 of admitted commission, which, of course, constitutes but a small part of the Wall Street peculations on the New Haven? He attached his signature to a few papers, thereby pledging the savings of the people on deposit with him and his associates. Then he wrote out a nice letter on a letterhead bearing the inscription, "We loan on character only," to the widows and fiduciary agents of orphans and incompetents, "We offer an unusually good line of securities; you are advised to buy quick." All the time Mr. Morgan had on deposit at least $1,415,000 of the company's funds. His letter admits this amount as the average deposit for 11 years. The deposit was probably very much larger during the period of the fiscal contract.

If the Government had owned the New Haven, Mr. Morgan and all underwriting banking connections would have been as

useless as are the unemployed in an automobile plant. He would have been in the way, wanting to get the bonds and tendering a premium for them at 2½ per cent. But under the other scheme he and his friends took down nearly a million in cash, besides the velvet in securities for selling the bonds at nearer 7 per cent, and he was after a million and a half more. Uncle Sam sold his canal bonds at 2 per cent; but they say he could not sell railroad bonds. No; not after the Morgan plan, the American people would not permit it.

ECONOMY, THY NAME IS NOT MORGAN OR WALL STREET.

I say, economy demands Government ownership. Remembering that the New Haven is only one little corner—a drop in the bucket—of the railway machine in the United States, it seems further proof would be unnecessary. But what I have just set forth is nothing, comparatively speaking. I have not hinted at the peculations yet. When the storm broke over the New Haven and the widows and orphans realized they had been robbed blind by Mellen—no; by Wall Street—these same men, led by Morgan—operating on "character"—were about to take another commission twice as large as the entire grab already referred to. He had his hands on $1,670,000. The whole crew were about to be prosecuted, when Mr. Morgan resigned, and gave out a lot of philanthropic blubber about having resigned to put an end to interlocking directors and to aid the President in establishing his "constitution of peace."

The New Haven is very like the others as an economy argument. Ex-Gov. Folk, of Missouri, as attorney for the Interstate Commerce Commission, rendered an invaluable public service in exposing these transactions, notwithstanding the unpatriotic efforts to defeat him in his splendid work. Attorney General McReynolds was going through a pantomime, pretending to want to get at Morgan and his assistants who looted the New Haven; but Gov. Folk was holding him. "Turn me loose and I'll get him," said the Attorney General. All the while he was as free as the birds. In a few days the whole aggregation were closeted with the President, getting aid to the tune of about a billion dollars of extra currency at public expense, issued by emergency act of Congress on money and credits owned by the people, to pay for the stocks Wall Street had bought and did not have the money to pay for. And such was the interconnection between the Government and these financiers, that they got the money and Mr. McReynolds got the Supreme Bench, while ex-Gov. Folk got the thanks of all sincere men for his splendid work.

WHAT DID THEY DO WITH THE SEVEN BILLIONS?

While economy is under consideration let us revert to the fact, as shown by the table I have incorporated in these remarks, that the total railway capital of the railways in the United States increased in the 10-year period expiring June 30, 1912, $7,152,546,007. What did they do with this vast sum, which is more than a third of the entire present railway capitalization? During the 10 years 33,611 miles of new lines were constructed. If the above sum was used for new mileage, the cost per mile was $212,801.

During this time the United States Government, which the railway men say is so extravagant, built two railroads and equipped them in the Reclamation Service, one in Idaho 19 miles long and one in New Mexico 13 miles long. Both are standard gauge. The Idaho railway has for three years been in operation with daily train service, carrying mail, passengers, and freight. Both lines are in mountain country, with heavy rock cuts and bridges. On the Idaho railway the cost was $19,937 per mile and on the New Mexico line $21,085 per mile. There are three expensive bridges on the Idaho line. Equipment on this line cost $35,000 additional.

If Uncle Sam can build railroads at $20,000 per mile, why can not the "empire builders" do as well? It is a well-known fact that standard-gauge railroad can be built over the western prairies under favorable conditions as low as $10,000 per mile. But suppose we allow for awkward empire builders and estimate their new line at $25,000 per mile. At this rate it took $840,275,000 to build the 33,611 miles. But that takes only a little more than 10 per cent of the original sum. Subtract this amount and there still remains $6,512,710,006. Now, the question remains, Who got this six and a half billions?

WHO GOT THE SIX AND ONE-HALF BILLIONS?

That would buy a great many poodles and even race horses and yachts. What became of it? Economy cries out and demands information. Unborn generations as well as the present are to pay interest on this $6,500,000,000 for all time. The public is interested directly in the matter. The empire builders simply laugh at the ignorance back of this question. "You go along, now," he says, "That money went for improvements." Hold on; let us see about that. The policy has been to limit the new capital to new construction and to make improvements out of surplus and earnings.

James J. Hill made that plain in a speech on December 19, 1912, at the annual dinner of the Railway Business Association, in New York City, when he made this statement:

Our capitalization per mile is from one-half to one-fifth that of European countries, partly because the initial cost of construction was greater there, but largely because of a fixed difference in policy. The American railway makes improvements so far as possible out of earnings or surplus, leaving capital account to carry only new construction.

Does anyone maintain that Mr. Hill did not know what he was talking about? Of course not. Then it must follow that the six and one-half billions was not spent for improvements, for American railways do not do it that way. Mr. Hill says they do not. Besides this the records indicate that the railroads claim to have spent out of earnings approximately $2,000,000,000 during those 10 years for improvements. That was over $8,000 per mile, and it would seem that no greater sum was spent exclusive of the liberal chargings for upkeep and maintenance. Besides, this six and one-half billions is over $26,000 per mile, and that was enough to build the whole line new, as is proven by the United States Government building difficult and expensive construction at $20,000 per mile.

SIX AND A HALF BILLIONS GONE; NOTHING TO SHOW FOR IT—THEY TOOK BILLIONS IN DIVIDENDS BESIDES.

Another reason why it is impossible that this six and one-half billions was spent for improvements is the present deplorable condition of the lines. Because of railway insufficiency, disaster threatens the welfare of every man who engages in any gainful occupation. But let Mr. James J. Hill say it. He knows. I might put it too weak. I quote from his speech in New York City December 19, 1912:

It is no exaggeration to say that the commerce of the country, its manufacturing and agricultural industry, its prosperity as a whole, and the welfare of every man in it who engages in any gainful occupation can escape threatened disaster only by such additions to and enlargements of existing terminals at our great central markets and our principal points of export as will relieve the congestion which now paralyzes traffic when any unusual demand is made upon them. Our natural material growth will make this their chronic condition in the near future unless quick action is taken.

If you increase the size of a bottle without enlarging the neck, more time and work are required to fill and empty it. That is what has happened to the transportation business. In 1907 traffic was blocked on nearly all the principal eastern railway lines. It took months to convey an ordinary shipment of goods from one domestic market to another. The deadlock was broken partly by a panic that lessened the volume of business and partly by the efforts of railway managements to add, by increased efficiency, to the moving power of facilities at command. We neither anticipate nor desire perpetual business depression. While the limits of efficiency have not been reached, we know that it can not be made to cover the demands of our growth in population and production.

You can see that the six and one-half billions was not spent for terminals or equipment or efficiency, because "there ain't no such animal." As Mr. Hill says:

In 1907 traffic was blocked on nearly all the principal eastern railway lines. It took months to convey an ordinary shipment of goods from one domestic market to another. The deadlock was broken partly by a panic * * *.

That is quoted, mind you, from Mr. Hill. It took a panic to save the railroads and move the freight. That very year—1907—the railroads issued $1,511,725,205 of new stocks and bonds. Oh, you Empire builder, you high financier! That was $244,461 per mile for every mile of new line constructed that year. I say economy demands that the people, through their Government, raise the necessary money and see to it that it is spent on the roads, and not to buy poodles and yachts. Mr. Hill says from five to seven billions additional will be required. "Rates and capital must go higher, stocks and bonds must more nearly approach the European level," he says.

TREASURIES EMPTY—RECEIVERSHIPS, 754; FORECLOSURES, 994; BILLIONS GONE, 6½+.

Another reason why I am convinced that these tremendous stock and bond flotations—this six and one-half and other billions—did not go into the properties either in the form of improvements or newly added lines is the record of financial failures the railroads have shown. The Statistical Abstract gotten out by the Bureau of Domestic Commerce of the Federal Government, page 285, shows that since 1874, 754 railroad companies, with an aggregate mileage of 145,176 miles and a capitalization of $8,262,453,699, have gone through the hands of the judiciary under receiverships, and that during the same period 994 companies of 121,026 mileage and $7,392,978,502 capitaliza-

tion have been sold by the courts under the hammer in foreclosure proceedings.

UNCLE SAM HAS BEEN SOME RAILROAD MAN AFTER ALL.

Approximately two billions of these receiverships occurred while the mysterious handling of this six and one-half and other billions took place—that is, in the last 10 years—and to-day 23,000 miles of the Rock Island is in trouble—worse trouble, beyond all comparison, than exists or ever has existed in the Government-owned roads of France or elsewhere, I might remark in passing. Then there is the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient, the Atlantic, Birmingham & Atlantic, and the Moffat road in Colorado, all in the same wrecked condition. Prof. Ripley, of Harvard, commenting on these last-named roads, says in the Railway Age Gazette, August 28, 1914:

Their troubles are somewhat peculiar and are, in the main, due to local circumstances; for most of them represent invasion of territories in which the great banking and railroad interests are already intrenched. Undoubtedly the hostility of the great powers to these independent companies has been an appreciable factor contributing to their downfall.

Note the words "the great powers" and "the great banking and railroad interests." Here you have a fundamental argument for public ownership. Not only an economy argument, but a moral argument, and a democracy as well. The New Haven and other lines might be added to the list and, according to the representations recently made in the effort to get the 5 per cent rate increase from the Interstate Commerce Commission, they are practically all broke or they will be. James J. Hill in the speech above quoted referred to impending ruin if rates were not raised, and added:

That ruin will not be so immediate or complete for the railroads themselves as it will be for the business interests to which they will no longer be able to give a prompt and adequate service. It will be far-reaching, because its effect will touch every man, however humble, who is engaged in protective industry.

Do not forget the point; I am talking economy, and asking what became of the six and one-half billion dollars of stocks and bonds above any sum that could have been spent on new lines. It appears that the vast sum was not spent in such a way as to prevent deficits, receiverships, foreclosures, and shortages—preventing improvements.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP WOULD GIVE LOWER RATES.

Economy demands careful and honest rate making. It is not the men who ride upon the train or the merchants or the manufacturers alone who pay the transportation tax. Every individual pays a part of the tax whenever he eats a meal of victuals or buys a hat or a paper of pins. The transportation tax is parceled out almost on a per capita basis to everyone. The transportation tax is truly collected "at the source," the usual method being for the merchant to add 10 per cent for freight to every article as part of cost price before he offers it for sale.

The rate-making system of the railroads, instead of being a model arrangement where economy and impartiality prevails, as the defender of the special privilege of the railroad would have us believe, is the most gigantic travesty upon common sense or system in the world. Mr. Stickney, former president of the Chicago Great Western—an able railway president on the stand, remember—said in 1910 that there are 86,000,000,000—eighty-six billions; do you get that?—different rates in existence, and that these railroad tax collectors are changing these rates every minute in every working day.

If published—

Mr. Stickney says—

these rates would fill a bookshelf 1,530 feet long with books 8 by 10 inches in size. They would make 4,000 printed volumes of 1,000 pages each, an aggregate of 4,000,000 pages. (World's Work, November, 1910.)

With this conglomeration the railroads have been able to cover up the most glaring extravagance and favoritism, involving rebates and special privileges given to their particular friends. As tax gatherers they have used this transportation tax to develop certain sections at the expense of other sections. High-protection men would build a tariff wall to protect an "infant industry." Factories would grow up in various sections of the country in a dozen or more cities. In time in one of these cities, where the "right people" lived, the railroad transportation tax collectors would grant a special low commodity rate, and in a short time the other cities would find themselves short of orders, and the place that had the special rates would outstrip all other sections and become established as the great center for that particular product. Later I will take up the rate proposition more in detail and comparison. I refer to the general system now only to demonstrate that economy demands a change.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED LINES OF GERMANY ARE NOT BROKE.

But please compare the present policy in America with that which prevails in Germany. Prof. Lotz, cited by the Railway Age Gazette as a most reliable German authority, says Germany is charging too much. The railway system is a "Government milch cow," is the figure used, by which the German Government collects $200,000,000 clear profit, which sum goes into the public treasury each year, and three billions of value has been amortized for the public. Compare that situation with the deplorable condition the American roads are in. Prof. Lotz says German roads are "double, triple, and quadruple tracked," equipped up to the minute for military emergency as well as for commercial needs, but our poor, broken-down, failing, trust-tied, receiver-ridden, Mellenized, Morganated lines need from five to seven billion dollars, according to Mr. Hill, to put the roads in shape. They do need a tremendous sum to make up for the work of the looters, but who would get the money if they were permitted to sell the securities? You can hear them always calling for "More revenue," "More revenue." My mother used to tell us children a frog story along about time for the sandman's coming that ran like this:

"There was once an old toper who sat down to rest beside a stream in a lonely glen. A bullfrog observing a jug at the old man's side began to call out, 'More rum,' 'More rum.' The old fellow was good-natured, so he went to the brink of the stream where he heard the sound and poured overboard a little rum from his well-filled jug, and he returned to his rest. Presently the same voice was heard again calling, 'More rum,' 'More rum,' 'More rum.'

"The old man was a good-hearted son of old Erin, and so he responded time and again till the jug was about empty. The greedy frog increased its demand and set up a cry of 'Jug-an-all,' 'Jug-an-all,' 'Jug-an-all.'

"The old man saw he had yielded unjustly, but without feeling any pain of sacrifice whatever he heaved overboard the jug and all."

So we have the railroads calling for "More revenue," "More revenue."

It cost $12,000 to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of the letters and communications sent to the Interstate Commerce Commission to try and intimidate that body into granting the rate increase recently.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, efficient, earnest, faithful, as he has always been, had the commission hand over to the Senate these myriads of communications. It took 50 men running a half million dollars' worth of linotype machines all day long to set the type, which amounted to nearly a ton of metal when ready for the cast. Think of the lawyers' fees, the salaries of secretaries and stenographers in railroad offices and chambers of commerce required to prepare those communications.

The demands of the private owners for "more revenue" will not end as long as human avarice and the "itching palm" exists. The time has arrived to call a halt and for the American people to no longer play the part of the silly and stupid old rummy. Transportation is a public function, and the time has come for the public to take the railroads, ownership and all.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY AND LOW RATES DEMANDED.

In India you can ride at two-fifths of a cent a mile. In Switzerland you can ride half a month for $8.60 over all the steam, electric, and steamboat lines of Switzerland, or you can ride a whole year at a cost of 20 cents per day.

The following data is taken from Martin Johnson's book on Government ownership:

The public system of Belgium will carry you one-half a month for about $4.50; so also the public system of Hungary will carry you at $2.70, which is one-tenth of the charge here. The public system of Italy will carry you 963 miles for $7; the public system of Sweden 1,400 miles for $8.55; and that of Russia about 2,000 miles for $6. The Belgium system, furthermore, grants weekly tickets to workmen, good for 6 round trips or 12 rides, for distances and at rates as follows:

Three miles, 19 cents; 6 miles, 24 cents; 12 miles, 29 cents; 24 miles, 39 cents; 31 miles, 43 cents; 62 miles, 61 cents.

It will thus be seen that the Belgian laboring man can go to his work, 62 miles distant, or return for 5 cents, or a rate less than one-twelfth of a cent a mile.

These rates of travel promote the mobility of labor by enabling a man to go from his suburban place to the shops to work and in many other ways.

Prof. Frank Parsons says:

After studying Government freight rates on the ground and comparing them with American rates for similar distances and shipments, I found that the German per ton-mile rates on local traffic are generally less than one-third of ours.

Local rates in Germany and America compared.

Items.	Miles.	Average rate per ton-mile.	
		American railways.	German railways.
Iron ore	327	0.492	0.474
Structural steel	398	.73	.45
Cast-iron fittings	377	.69	1.28
Structural steel	63	2.22	1.17
Fertilizer	18	5.28	1.56
	36	3.33	1.20
	40	2.75	1.14
Raw cotton	22	4.55	2.75
	44	3.18	2.16
	39	3.08	2.24
Portland cement	65	2.15	1.16
	69	1.96	1.13
Hay	42	3.81	1.39
	98	2.45	1.04
Potatoes	34	3.53	1.21
	94	2.98	.92
Linseed oil	38	4.21	1.50
	39	3.59	1.50
	43	3.72	1.46
	78	2.05	1.34
Milk	20	18.40	5.18
	70	5.94	4.26
	31	9.68	4.81
	65	7.69	4.20

Is it not necessary to call a magician, a soothsayer, a wise man, to explain why the first four articles above fare so well on the trust-owned railroads of the United States?

AMERICAN RATES HIGHER THAN GERMAN.

They tell us American rates are lower than German rates. The facts prove the contrary. It is evidently unfair to compare German rates within the comparatively small area of Germany with rates in the United States at large, which contains an area so many times greater than Germany. By making a general average in which is included transcontinental hauls of trainload after trainload of lumber and coal and other commodities from one ocean to the other with the rate in Germany on small packages and large over the lesser area and the shorter haul, a lower rate per ton-mile apparently may be "figured" in this country by a good figurer, but in this discussion, in such imposing presence as is here assembled, it would be an insult to make any such comparison.

Railroad rates in the United States will not stand up under a fair comparison with German rates. It is conceded by all that the loading and unloading charges are the principal expense in freight transportation.

In Germany the average haul is 70.7 miles; in the United States the average haul is 244.05 miles. There is much more to be said for German rates as against American rates.

In Germany express is carried as regular freight. This is handled, of course, quite often and involves short local deliveries. Think of comparing the average rate per ton-mile on a carload of express packages hauled 100 miles and delivered at points along the line with a trainload of wheat or coal or lumber hauled 3,000 or more miles. In America we haul much more raw materials and mining products than in Germany, where more manufactured articles are hauled.

RATE COMPARISONS IN ENGLAND AND GERMANY.

England and Germany are similarly situated, and a comparison of rates in those two countries would be a test of private ownership and Government ownership under like conditions. The following comparisons are to the point:

It costs $5.72 to transport a ton of hardware from Birmingham to London, while the rate for the same class of goods over the same distance in Germany is about $2.25. Cotton goods, from Manchester to London, cost per ton $8.76; in Germany, the same distance, $4.86 to $5.60. General machinery, from Leeds to Hull, costs $6.09; in Germany, over precisely the same distance, $1.09 per ton.

SOME POSSIBLE SAVINGS ENUMERATED.

There are many other savings that would be made in addition to the savings on dividends and interest, which I will discuss later. Slason Thompson says in the New York Herald, August 30, 1908, that Government and State regulation cost the railroads $20,000,000 annually. I think that is a very conservative estimate for all the attorneys' fees and other expenses of the railroads in this line. No doubt the expense to the National Government and the 48 States is another $20,000,000. Here is $40,000,000 that could be saved to the public by Government ownership. The court expenses and receiverships, with all the fees and costs attached, when allowance is made for the judges' salaries, the witness fees and jury fees, lawyers' fees and all other expenses, I have no doubt, amount to another $20,000,000; so here we have $60,000,000 that the Government would save at the start.

In every city and town the several railways keep offices, with expensive appointments and clerks and stationery. Agents are kept in the field to solicit passengers and freight. Advertisements of all kinds are used. If the Government owned the railroads all these duplications would be cut out. Tremendous rent charges in the cities and towns would be saved, salaries of presidents would be eliminated. Freight cars would be at home wherever they were found, always ready for a load in any direction. They would not have to be sent back home. With a big "U. S." they would always be at home. Harriman always claimed that concentration would effect great savings along these lines. The Government pays a tremendous sum to the railroads for carrying the mail and other Government freight, and for carrying Government officers on official business and men of the Army and Navy. The profit on all this traffic would be saved. All these items would surely reach $40,000,000, and raise the total savings from these incidental items to $100,000,000 per year.

SAVINGS ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS.

All interest, dividends, surplus, and profits of every kind now realized, except the interest the Government would pay on the actual cash paid for the railroads on their funded debt, would be velvet for the Government. It seems to be generally conceded that $16,000,000,000 will cover the value of the roads and that the sum the Government would have to pay would not exceed that amount.

The Government could doubtless fund this sum in Government bonds at not over 3 per cent, or at $480,000,000 per annum for interest. In 1912 the total net revenue of the railroads was $871,005,294. The saving here would accordingly be $391,005,294. It should be remembered that we probably could not refund by ordinary methods all the bonds at once, some not being due, and all of this saving on interest could not be realized till all the bonds were refunded. But there would be many ways to bring the bondholders to time.

Another source of saving would be the increase in value of the real properties of the railroads, the coal lands, the oil lands, the terminals. That would surely amount to 2 per cent on the value of the roads, or $320,000,000 per year. In other words, the railroads, their upkeep being already fully allowed for, will double in value, reach $320,000,000, through unearned increment in 50 years. This is not an unreasonable estimate, considering the natural increase in population and in commerce in 50 years. German roads have more than doubled in value in less time.

Scientific management, according to so eminent an authority as Louis D. Brandeis—I will cite him presently—would save the railroads $365,000,000 a year, or one million a day. Depending on this feature, forgetting the melons that no longer would be cut, forgetting the commissions that never again would be paid to the Morgans and the great banking interests, forgetting the rebates that would be saved, and many other savings that might be mentioned, and we yet have to our credit over a billion dollars a year, as follows:

Miscellaneous	$100,000,000
Interest and dividends	391,005,294
Scientific management	365,000,000
Increase through unearned increment	320,000,000
Total	1,176,005,294

From this you can deduct 10 per cent for safe figuring and still have more than a billion a year, or practically $3,000,000 a day, of savings, or two million a day, exclusive of the unearned increment.

EFFICIENCY DEMANDS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

I have assigned efficiency of railroad service and management as a ground for Government ownership. Efficiency is involved in all I have heretofore said. There can be no efficient operation that is immoral. The widespread immorality in railway management is known to every child that is able to lisp the words "New Haven, Rock Island, Frisco, Pere Marquette, Southern Pacific." There have been investigations, prosecutions, and exposures without number.

I can not at this time go into the question of safety and dispatch, which is involved in efficiency, but I am sure that the administration of the post-office system shows that the Government will promote safety and dispatch to the highest degree possible. The great bulk of governmental activities are such that financial return, the balancing of expense against income, does not have to be considered. There is often criticism of the financing in those departments. But in every case where this

financial problem enters the Government always gives a good account of itself. The critics against the postal operation are growing fewer and fewer every year.

Three years ago Louis Brandeis (already referred to), opposing an increase of rates which was demanded by the railroads with an urgency most remarkable, advised the railroads that huge economies could be attained through scientific management that would save at least "$1,000,000 per day." In the conclusion of his brief in opposition to the granting of the demand for increase in rates Mr. Brandeis said:

> This investigation has developed clearly that the railroads, to meet any existing needs, should look not without but within. If their net income is insufficient, the proper remedy is not higher rates, resulting in higher costs and lessened business, but scientific management, resulting in lower costs, higher wages, and increased business. If their credit is impaired, the proper remedy is not to apply the delusive stimulant of higher rates, but to strengthen their organizations by introducing advanced methods and eliminating questionable practices. Thus they will maintain credit by deserving it.

I have already shown that there were many receiverships during all this period, and the railroads presented an awful story in order to get this increase. But all the railroads were not suffering. Some roads were prospering while others languished. There was not uniform efficiency; hence there was uniform inefficiency, for the lines must be considered as a system. The fact that the Pennsylvania carried an item of freight from New York to Chicago with absolute efficiency does not make efficient service if the item of freight originated at Boston and was not properly handled before it got to New York. The very fact that some roads are piling up such tremendous profits while others languish speaks most emphatically for inefficiency.

The rate increase in which Mr. Brandeis was first engaged was refused, but within a few months Sir George Paish, of the London Statist, a very eminent English authority on financial matters, expressed his views as follows, to Englishmen, who own about $4,000,000,000 of American railway securities:

> The securities of American railways appear to be specially attractive at current prices and were it not for the situations in the Balkans, and the heavy sales of stock that have been effected in consequence, much higher prices than those now current would prevail.

Yet American railway men a few months before were claiming their rates were too low to permit sufficient revenue and make their securities go on the market.

Further in the same article Sir George Paish says:

> From whatever point of view, therefore, the matter is regarded, stocks at current prices are attractive. * * * It will be seen from the statement herewith that, apart from any additional expansion, the Great Northern is earning a dividend of 11.6 per cent at the present time, and it is distributing only 7 per cent; that the Northern Pacific is paying 7 per cent on a very large ordinary capital; that the Union Pacific is earning 15 per cent and is paying 10 per cent; and that the Atchison and Southern Pacific are earning 9 per cent and distributing 6 per cent. * * * Indeed, we could go through the greater part of the securities of the railways of the United States and show the attractiveness of both bonds and stocks.

And in the Statist for March 1, 1914, only a few weeks later, Sir George says:

> The earnings of American railways continue to show large expansion. * * * In fact, all the indications continue to show that the profit in American railways in the current year to June 30 will be very large, and that no one need have any doubts as to the ability of the companies to maintain their current rates of distribution.

To be sure these views do not gibe with the dolorous records of receiverships and foreclosures any more than they do with the awful representations made of impending disaster when increased rates were wanted. But, aside from the fakery practiced, the whole situation tells of inefficiency, because the transportation problem is one problem for the whole country. Inefficiency in New England and Colorado and Texas cause the public to suffer. The Postal Service is the same everywhere, and so ought the transportation service to be uniform. It is absurd to call it efficient with one end of the line in the hands of a receiver or being sold under the hammer and the other end paying 15 per cent on "all of Lake Michigan." The toll of profits, the transportation tax, is not uniform. One section has to pay more than the other and every section suffers from inefficient service.

Some must do without service entirely, as is shown by the following instance of inefficient management and investment given Engineering News, November 5, 1914:

> A railway 90 miles long in western New York was to be abandoned on November 1, according to an order issued by the New York Supreme Court, which has directed the receiver of the property to cease all operation of trains and take up the track. The railway in question is that part of the Buffalo & Susquehanna Railway extending from near Buffalo to Wellsville. The company owning the road has been in the hands of a receiver for over four years. The court's action in ordering the discontinuance of operation of the road and the taking up of the track was made on petition of the United States Trust Co. of New York, the trustee for the bondholders of the company.
>
> The facts appear to be that the road in question is the least profitable part of the Buffalo & Susquehanna line to operate. Lines located farther south in Pennsylvania do an extensive coal business, but the difficult grades to the north make it cheaper to send the coal to lake ports over other roads than to haul it over the Buffalo & Susquehanna line from Wellsville. Undoubtedly the bondholders have the right to stop operating an unprofitable property and to get what little salvage they can out of it by taking up the rails. This salvage will be small, however, for under present market conditions relaying rails are salable only at a very low price.
>
> The abandonment of the road will be a serious matter to the farming communities along it, which depend upon it for transportation. The roadbed and tracks are in good condition, and represent an investment that could not be replaced, probably, short of $2,000,000.

Imagine how Mr. Slason Thompson would interview himself in a leaflet from his "Bureau of railway news and economics" if he had noted an incident of this kind in some Government-owning country. "A State railroad on the rocks," he would say, yet he could get the records of over 900 foreclosures in the United States alone under private ownership.

The article above quoted, which is perfectly reliable, gives the value of the road, which consists of 90 miles, at about $2,000,000, or $22,222 per mile. This company was capitalized at $10,000,000, and had a funded debt of $7,059,000. Stocks and bonds to value of road was nearly 10 to 1. Get the conductor to "put you off at Buffalo" and you can go out and see this. It is not in New South Wales or Borneo; it is in New York.

ENGLAND A WARNING AGAINST PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

It may be profitable to consult the experience of other nations whose railways are privately owned. The only leading nations where private ownership prevails and Government ownership is not accepted as a national policy are the United States and England. Spain and Turkey come next, if you would call them "leading." I have already cited the United States to prove the general proposition that private ownership leads to extravagance and public ownership to economy and efficiency, and have shown by the excessive aggregate English capitalization where we are going to land.

When an empire builder wants to brag about what American private lines have done, he generally refers to the high capitalization of England. James J. Hill, in his New York speech, December 19, 1912, placed the capitalization of the lines of the United Kingdom at $275,000 per mile and in England alone at $314,000 per mile. Here you have a sample of what private ownership will do if given license. I have already shown that American roads increased their capitalization over $7,000,000,000 in 10 years. With the surplus laid aside and the betterments they claim to have made out of earnings during this 10 years you have nearly a billion of increase per year. How long will it take us to reach England's capitalization?

Mr. Slason Thompson, of his railway bureau, issued a statement on October 4, 1908, which he called Leaflet No. 2, to show the utter futility of Government ownership. Comparing the American railway shipping with that on the State-owned lines of New South Wales, Australia, he said:

> If American shippers, in 1907, had paid the Australian rates on the freight carried, their total payment to the railways would have been $5,678,433,362, instead of $1,823,651,998 they actually paid; where they have been credited with nearly $4,000,000,000 in the ledgers or the good will of American shippers.

Of course it would be just as reasonable to compare taxicab rates with street car rates as to compare the sparsely settled island Commonwealth of Australia with the great American Republic. But the comparison is useful, for 12 days later Mr. Thompson, who is doing this work for the railway companies, issued Leaflet No. 3. In this he compared England and the United States, and told the public what the American people would have to pay at English rates. He said:

> Applying the British rate of 2.34 cents to the freight carried by American railways in 1907 would have cost American shippers $5,536,472,527, which is $3,712,820,618 more than they did pay—or within $300,000,000 of $4,000,000,000.

So, according to the railways' bureau, run by the railways' representative, Mr. Thompson, if American shippers paid Australian rates they would lose approximately $4,000,000,000, or if they paid British rates they would lose approximately $4,000,000,000. The United States is all right in that comparison, but what becomes of England, with a population of 34,488,233, to 1,646,734 in New South Wales—the particular Australian State in question—over twenty times the population, yet an area in England of 58,575 square miles to 309,460 in New South Wales. The density of the population in England is 588 to the square mile, in New South Wales 5. About 100 to 1, yet New South Wales, under State-owned lines, has just as low rates as England under private ownership. The States of the Commonwealth of Australia are unfortunate in not having uniform gauge of railway between the several States, much to their detriment. But any arrangement under Government ownership can cope with private ownership in its native heath

and fully perfected as in England. Certainly England has had time and opportunity to perfect her system.

Mr. Slason Thompson made a comparison of interest which I will quote here which compares Government ownership with private ownership in Europe as to the proportion of earnings paid to labor. He compares these figures with certain American figures which I will not add. He made the comparison on December 17, 1908, in a paper before Friendship Club at Oak Park, Ill., referring to 1907 records as follows:

England devoted to earnings 37 per cent of income and to labor 27 percent.

Germany devoted to earnings 35 per cent of income and to labor 34 per cent.

France devoted to earnings 40 per cent of income and to labor 31 per cent.

These figures show private ownership of England lowest in proportion of income devoted to labor.

ENGLISH FINANCIERS AND RAILROAD MEN ASHAMED OF THEIR SYSTEM.

Let us get the full truth about private ownership of railroads in England from those who know. Every student of financial and commercial subjects knows Sir George Paish, editor of the London Statist. I am going to quote from "an authorized report"—perfectly English, don't you know—by Lord Claud Hamilton, chairman of the Great Eastern Railway, to his executive board, published in the London Statist on February 21, 1914; and for fear some one will think this a phoney statement or some wild-west ebullition—such, for instance, as Mr. James J. Hill made when he told how all the American privately owned railways are about to go broke and bring calamity on the country and on every individual engaged in industry, "inevitable unless you raise rates so we can get several necessary billions"—I am going to let Sir George Paish introduce Lord Claud Hamilton, chairman of the railway board, and editorialize his "authorized statement." I quote from a leading editorial by Sir George Paish, in the Statist of February 21, 1914, entitled "Railway management: Science versus rule of thumb":

The country owes a deep debt of gratitude to Lord Claud Hamilton and to the board of the Great Eastern Railway for having at length discovered the grave situation of our railway industry and in having manfully and honestly disclosed to everyone the real state of affairs. The disclosures of the chairman of the Great Eastern Railway are the more important because hitherto Lord Claud Hamilton has been one of the pillars of the old edifice, has imagined that the management of the British railways was beyond criticism, and that what British railway managers did not know was not worth knowing. We are convinced that no one deplores the necessity for his statements more than Lord Claud Hamilton himself, an Englishman of Englishmen.

* * * * * * *

No one regrets the necessity for the speech of the chairman of the Great Eastern more than the editor of this journal. In almost every direction England takes either the premier position or is a good second.

* * * * * * *

But the business of railway transportation, where everything was favorable to us and where we ought to have held the lead and set an example to all the world, is still conducted upon principles very similar to those upon which our great-grandfathers carried on the business of transportation in mail coaches and in carriers' carts.

* * * * * * *

Lord Claud Hamilton has truly described what has been going on in an interview this week: "My company has endeavored, by arranging for their staff to attend lectures at the London School of Economics, to give them some training, but it did not appear to have led to any result." How could Lord Claud expect results? The lecturer can not lecture without material, and scientific material about British railways is neither compiled nor permitted to be compiled, except by the Northeastern Railway, and only a very small amount of the Northeastern data are published.

I might break in at this point to call attention to the fact that it was the Government of the United States, not the American railway managers, that forced the collection of data and scientific material in the United States.

Sir George Paish continues:

Surely when a chairman of the importance of Lord Claud Hamilton makes a statement such as the following the errors from which our railways have suffered and are still suffering will now be remedied:

"It is a subject of great regret to my mind and to the minds of all chairmen that on our English railway systems at the present time there is an acknowledged dearth of first-class men coming to the front capable of fulfilling the duties of general managers. But this does not apply merely to the office of general manager. There is dearth of first-rate men coming to the front for even our minor appointments."

* * * * * * *

Sir George continues to quote from Lord Claud:

I believe the system in vogue at the present time on all our railways has outgrown its usefulness. Our railway systems are divided into what I may call water-tight compartments. You have the traffic department, the goods department, the engineer's department, and other departments, and they are kept so apart that as a rule there is very little exchange from one to the other on the part of young men who form the majority of the clerks belonging to those departments.

Sir George concludes the write up:

We have dealt with it (Lord Claud's statement) in the manner that we have because we realize that the unscientific working of British railways was a very serious matter, * * * because it entails heavy and unnecessary burdens of expense for railway transportation, which the country ought not to be called upon to bear, a burden that falls with great weight upon the shoulders of the vast number of men employed in the railway industry at low rates of wages, as well as upon traders and passengers. Our unscientific railway methods have already caused the country unnecessarily to expend hundreds of millions of pounds of capital which otherwise would have been available for increasing the income and wealth of the nation and thereby contribute to the well-being of every citizen.

The upshot of this whole affair was that Lord Claud announced to his board that he had hired an American railway manager to come over and take charge of the road. But that will not remedy the situation. The American manager will find his hands tied—and then the things already full of water—might as well send for the hose to cure dropsy.

NATIONALIZATION IS THE PROPOSED REMEDY IN ENGLAND.

There is only one remedy. That is for the public to take over and own the agencies of transportation. It will come in England either by revolution and confiscation or by a square bargain. In England it is admitted that public sentiment is strongly in favor of Government ownership, and a royal commission has been appointed to study the matter. In commenting on the situation in England, the Railway Age Gazette of December 5, 1913, says:

The growing interest in the subject of railway nationalization is strikingly illustrated by the recent appointment in Great Britain of a royal commission to inquire into the relationship between the railway companies and the State in respect of matters other than safety of working and conditions of employment, and to report what changes, if any, in that relationship are desirable. The announcement comes almost simultaneously with that of the National Civic Federation in this country of its intention to undertake a national survey of social progress which will include a study of the question whether regulation of railways and other public-service corporations is a failure and whether State ownership should be substituted for that of private capital.

Mr. E. M. Ackworth, the most conservative railroad authority in England, made a statement recently to the effect that 9 out of every 10 people in Great Britain would vote for public ownership if the question were submitted to a vote.

The Nation, one of the most reliable English journals, on October 11, 1913, had an article on "The coming nationalization of railways." The article referred to the movement as one which is "rapidly advancing." Further the following language is used:

When we find such a champion as Mr. W. M. Ackworth predicting the probability of nationalization we know what to think. Indeed, any far-reaching business man with a large holding of railway capital can hardly fail to perceive that he stands to gain by a favorable deal in the near future with the State.

I have already compared rates in England and Germany and showed the advantages that exist in favor of Germany.

SPAIN SUBSIDIZES PRIVATE LINES.

Spain is recognized as a private-ownership country. Every year the people go into their pockets for taxes to the railroads. Under public ownership such taxes would be heralded by the paid publicists of the American railroads as deficits. The roads would be called failing lines. Spain levied and laid aside for railroad aid in 1908, 10,000,000 pesetas—about $2,000,000—and in 1912 this sum was increased to $3,000,000. It is said, however, that the actual liability of the Government under its guaranties in respect to its concessions granted up to January 1, 1912, amounted to $600,000, the remainder of the sum still being held as a surplus to guarantee private railroad interest. The service is wretchedly poor, and rates are high for the service rendered. The lines are maintained at a different gauge to the French roads. Great inconvenience is experienced and great economic losses sustained. The remedy there is the same as elsewhere. Last March the following press notice was sent out, which tells of the awakening of Spain to the necessity of nationalization:

MADRID, *March 17.*

The ministry of commerce has ordered plans drawn for a standard gauge railroad with double track from the French frontier to Madrid to insure direct and rapid communication between the Spanish capital and the north.

It is calculated that the time occupied by the journey can be reduced from 13 hours to 7, and the journey from Paris to Madrid, which now takes 27½ hours by the fastest train, it is hoped will be reduced to 20 hours. The new road will also do away with the inconvenience of changing cars at the frontier.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP BEING UNIVERSALLY ADOPTED.

Many do not realize that Government ownership of railroads has been accepted by the verdict of practically all the civilized nations of the world as essential. The soundness of the principle that railway transportation, just as the postal service, is a Government function has been generally recognized. Only four important nations refuse to recognize the principle. These are England, Spain, Turkey, and the United States.

Without question public ownership is inevitable, and, for many reasons, the quicker it comes the better. Like the offerings of the sibylline woman to Tarquin, the Roman Emperor, the price is ever increased while the value and volume of the

offering diminishes. The Government has already advanced far toward public ownership. The railroads recognize this fact. It is the universal claim of the railroads that unless the lines of regulation are relaxed Government ownership will come, and the representatives of the people say to the railroads that unless they reform and submit to regulation cheerfully the people will take the roads.

The Railway World, though strongly opposed to Government ownership, in March, 1909, said:

Government ownership is the inevitable consequence of the present system of regulation.

The late President Finley, of the Southern Railway, said in 1909:

I do not believe that the sentiment of a majority of our people is in favor of Government ownership, nor do I believe that Congress and our State legislatures are consciously moving in that direction; but I do believe that if some of the more extreme legislation already enacted is supplemented along the lines now proposed the immediate result must be the breaking down of the system of private ownership.

Surely there has been no let-up, and plenty of supplemental legislation has been enacted. There is no disposition to retreat. The Interstate Commerce Commission assumes new and far-reaching power in the recent rate decision.

Prof. Hadley, president of Yale, a firm believer in private ownership, sums up the situation in his work on Railway and Transportation as follows:

There is a strong popular feeling, to a large extent unsuspected by those in authority, in favor of Government ownership of railways as a system. No one can have much to do with the more thoughtful laboring man without finding out how strong the feeling is and what hopes are based upon it. The fact that the question is not under discussion must not blind us to the fact that forces are at work which may prove all but revolutionary when the question does come under discussion.

Only a few months ago Chairman Thorne, of the Iowa State Railroad Commission, declared for Government ownership of railroads, and expressed the opinion that Government ownership would lessen transportation taxes at least $400,000,000.

The Railway Age Gazette, very partisan in favor of private ownership, and an advocate of the railroads from every standpoint, in its issue of December 12, 1913, recognized that the question of Government ownership is now a burning question before the American people and urges the railroads to meet the question with the best arguments that can be presented.

PRESIDENT WILSON FOR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP IN ALASKA.

What does President Wilson mean in his recent message, when he says:

A duty faces us with regard to Alaska which seems to me very pressing and very imperative; perhaps I should say a double duty, for it concerns both the political and the material development of the Territory. The people of Alaska should be given the full Territorial form of government, and Alaska, as a storehouse, should be unlocked. One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should itself build and administer, and the ports and terminals it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

There is no argument for Government ownership and operation of railroads in Alaska that does not obtain everywhere else in America. Private ownership is just as logical or illogical there as anywhere else.

Under date of June 8, 1914, the following news item was published from London:

Probably the most important and significant—certainly the most comparative and frank—statement yet made by a United States railway magnate was given out to-night by Newman Erb, president of the Minneapolis & St. Louis, Denver & Salt Lake, Ann Arbor, and Tennessee, Alabama & Georgia Railroads. Mr. Erb for the past 30 years has been prominent in the railway enterprise of the United States. The fact that he is in close touch with President Wilson and intimate friend of former President Roosevelt and a frequent witness at sessions of the Interstate Commerce Commission lends added interest to the statement: "Nationalization (Government ownership) of railways in the United States is inevitable. The prime troubles of the railways as at present constituted is the fact that the actual owners no longer control them, but are forced to bow to the dictates of the great banks upon which they are dependent. What I am going to say I already have told President Wilson. And when I addressed the President I spoke for, and now speak for, virtually every practical railroad man in the United States; that is to say for every man interested in the ownership of railroads. The nationalization of railroads is as sure now as taxes."

A still better argument for Government ownership than the fact that it is coming is that it already has come. Only minor and unimportant countries hold out firmly and rigidly against it.

The Government can operate these enterprises successfully. The Panama steamships, after allowing the ordinary amount for depreciation, charging to profit and loss the value of one of the vessels which was wrecked, still made an ample return on the capital invested, after reducing the rates practically 50 per cent and hauling cargo after cargo of Government freight and passengers without any profit whatever. The Panama Railroad is making a splendid success, as the Government reports will show.

The Reclamation Service is a marvelous success, and has increased the national wealth in large sums by turning barren wastes into cultivable lands. The Government operates a coal mine about three-fourths of a mile north of Williston, N. Dak., to supply fuel for the reclamation power house.

The main entry to the mine is about 2,000 feet in length, 6 feet wide, and 6 feet high. The underground workings are at an average depth of 100 feet. Ventilating shafts secure good air. Perfect drainage is maintained, and the mine is kept dry for the workmen.

ONE OF THE BEST ARRANGED MINES IN THE STATE.

The State mine inspector inspects the mine regularly, and in a recent report says:

This is one of the best arranged mines in the State and is kept in safe condition.

The average output is 100 tons per day. About 12 to 15 miners are employed and paid 60 cents to 80 cents per ton, depending upon location. The average output of a miner is 6 to 10 tons per day. On December 31, 1913, the report showed that 34,365 tons had been mined.

The net average earnings after expense for explosives and supplies is deducted are $3.50 to $5 per day of eight hours. Laborers on track work, hauling, and so forth, are paid $2.75 per day for surface and $3 per day for underground work. Miners are furnished with permissible explosives at a slight advance above cost. A mess is maintained at the mine where meals can be obtained for 25 cents. Sleeping quarters are furnished free. A bathroom with individual lockers gives the men an opportunity of using hot and cold shower baths. During the six years that this mine has been operated no fatal accidents have occurred, and only two or three serious ones. One miner had his leg broken by the fall of coal immediately after a blast. His net earnings were $4.72 per day, and he was paid this amount under the compensation act of May 30, 1908, during the period of disability.

The mine was opened in 1908, and up to 1913 was operated only during the irrigation season of about five months in each year. The average amount of coal mined has been about 5,000 tons per year, and on June 30, 1913, a total of 30,000 tons had been mined at a cost of $1.78 per ton, including all maintenance costs. In future, due to the fact that electric current is being supplied to the city of Williston under contract, the mine will be operated continuously, and it is expected that about 10,000 tons of coal will be mined per year and that the cost will be reduced, as it will not be necessary to maintain the mine idle for seven or eight months of the year. In 1911, during the five months that the mine was in operation, the cost of mining coal was $1.41 per ton, with a minimum charge of $1.31 in July.

If we adopt the lessons of the Panama Railroad and its steamships, and the Alaska Railroad, and the Government railroad at Arrow Rock Dam, in North Dakota, in the Reclamation Service, all owned by the Government; and if we catch the facts about the ship-purchase bill, now pending, and, it is hoped, soon will be enacted into law, we must conclude that the policy of Government ownership of railroads soon will become an established policy of the United States of America.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. IGOE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the President to invite certain Governments to send delegates to the Pan American Medical Congress.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

S. 6121. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara and State of New York.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further general debate, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aberdeen, Wash., post office: For commencement, $1,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer, but before offering it formally I think I can save time by stating the purpose of it. It is a very long one and I will not read it. I now move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] proposed to offer an amendment as to certain various items in this bill. And the purpose of your

suggestion was that the motion to strike out might be made in a lump? Is that it?

Mr. GILLETT. I will explain. My purpose is this, namely, to strike out all after line 2, on page 2, down to and including line 6, on page 22, which means to strike out all the appropriations for public buildings, and then insert a list which I have written out here, covering two pages, of all the buildings which are now in progress.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, the gentleman proposes to strike out of the bill all beginning with line 2, page 2, down to line 7, page 22? Is that it?

Mr. GILLETT. That is my purpose. It is to strike out all the public buildings, and then reinsert those which are under progress of construction now. My intent and argument is this, that with the state of the Treasury to-day and the probable income during the next fiscal year public buildings are a luxury and not a necessity, and it is wise for us to defer these buildings, which can be just as well appropriated for later, and not appropriate for any of them the coming year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion? Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to be allowed to offer his amendment at the place designated at the end of these public buildings, covering all these items? I think that would reach the purpose the gentleman has in view.

Mr. GILLETT. I will be perfectly willing to do it in that way.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That will save the gentleman offering an amendment after each of these items separately, and would be valuable in the interest of time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, is it proposed not to have the amendment read?

Mr. BARTLETT. It has not been read yet.

Mr. GILLETT. I was going to explain it first.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, the amendment is in order at this place, and he has the right to offer an amendment here.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. To strike out this amendment?

Mr. MANN. To strike out this amendment and give notice after his amendment is agreed to to strike out the other items as they were read.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. As they were read?

Mr. MANN. Yes; as they were read; but it would probably be better to give him the right to offer his amendment after line 6, on page 22, is read.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That was the suggestion I made to the gentleman, to proffer a unanimous-consent request, in the interest of saving time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to consume as little time as possible, and so, in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], I ask unanimous consent when we shall have reached line 6, on page 22, to offer an amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of this, more delay?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman should know that the committee in reporting it is going to stand by this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Some of these buildings have been authorized for seven years, and they have not been built yet. I do not think we should wait any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] asks unanimous consent that when we shall have reached line 6, of page 22, he shall be permitted to return to offer an amendment striking out all the items after line 2, of page 2, and substituting some provision in lieu thereof. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] objects.

Mr. DONOVAN. I will withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fayetteville, Tenn., post office: For completion, $15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 13, after the figures "$15,000" insert "Fordyce, Ark., post office: For completion, $50,000."

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, in 1910 Senator ROBINSON, who then represented my district, obtained an authorization for a site for this building, and in March, 1913, I secured authorization for the building. I trust the committee will now permit my amendment to go in. The people need this building. Fordyce is a splendid and flourishing little city. Until this bill was reported I felt, from information obtained, that the authorization which I had secured would be carried and that the appropriation of $50,000 would be made available. I know that war conditions have shortened our revenues, but, considering the fact that the Government is now paying six or seven hundred dollars yearly as rent for a post-office building, I sincerely hope the appropriation will be granted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish the committee to understand exactly what the situation is relative to this building. The same situation exists relative to two other buildings. The appropriations for public buildings carried in the bill are for public buildings in their order in the program established by the Treasury Department in accordance with the well-known rule. When a site is actually obtained and the building authorized, a number is given to the project. Thereafter, as new projects are taken up, they are taken up in numerical order. No building is provided for in the pending bill except such as have been taken up in accordance with that well-established rule.

The Treasury Department requested that provision be made for three buildings which it was proposed to advance out of their turn—one at Arkadelphia, Ark.; one at Fordyce, Ark.; and one at Willow, Cal. It was stated that the reason for advancing those buildings out of their order was that a proposal had been made that the citizens of the localities or some other persons should furnish to the Treasury Department the plans in accordance with which the buildings were to be erected. The committee reached the conclusion that even if the plans were prepared and furnished by some outside party, the Supervising Architect's Office would be compelled to give such time and service in the examination of the plans in order to determine whether they were satisfactory, as to amount, practically to the preparation of the plans themselves. The committee followed the rule that has been followed by the committee during my service upon it—not to recommend appropriations for buildings out of their order except in the case of some very extraordinary emergency, resulting, for instance, from the destruction of an existing building by fire or some other catastrophe.

At Fordyce, Ark., a site was authorized in 1910, to cost $5,000. In the public building bill of 1913 a building to cost $50,000 was authorized. If this building be provided for at this time because plans are furnished by some source other than the Supervising Architect's Office, it means that this building will be advanced over a great many other buildings which had been authorized a number of years previously.

These are the facts. The Committee on Appropriations did not believe that it would be justified in recommending appropriations to advance the three buildings out of their turn, and I am compelled to antagonize the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman on what basis these estimates are made. Are the buildings on the market and ready for construction when these appropriations are made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of the appropriations are for buildings now under construction, and others are for buildings for which it is expected contracts will have been let and construction commenced prior to June 30, 1916.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I notice there are a number of these items, where the appropriation is only $1,000, reading, "For commencement, $1,000." Is it expected that you can commence the construction of a public building to cost perhaps from $50,000 to $300,000 by expending a thousand dollars?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriations for public buildings are immediately available, and continue available until expended. For more than 20 years at the short session of Congress it has been the policy to appropriate for a period of 16 months, and at the long session of Congress to appropriate for a period of 7 or 8 months. Now, for any building that the Treasury Department believes will be under contract and work commenced upon it prior to the 30th of June, 1916, such sum has been included as will be required, and in a number of instances not more than $1,000 is required to pay for some preliminary expenses.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me ask the gentleman one further question. Do these amounts usually follow the estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. BARTLETT. Altogether.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Altogether. The committee accept the recommendation of the department and carry the amount recommended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Georgetown, Ky., post office: For completion, $45,00.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that a cipher has been omitted inadvertently in line 25, on page 7.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It should be $45,000. I ask that the Clerk correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the correction will be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Globe, Ariz., post office and courthouse: For commencement, $1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out the last word. What is the limit of cost on this post office where $1,000 is appropriated?

Mr. BARTLETT. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very frequently this appropriation is to pay the expenses of sinking test pits on the site.

Mr. BARTLETT. Getting ready.

Mr. MADDEN. That is an extraordinary situation.

Mr. MANN. At Globe, Ariz.; that ought to be sufficient to build a post office for that town.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Supervising Architect states that it is expected that funds will be required before the close of the fiscal year 1916 for the sinking of test pits and the surveying of the site, and he asks $1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the lot purchased?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MADDEN. One thousand dollars for sinking test pits!

Mr. FITZGERALD. And surveying the site, in order to determine the dimensions of the building.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody who builds a building in Globe, Ariz., or anywhere near there, knows exactly what the character of the earth is upon which the foundation will have to be built.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Supervising Architect's Office in all these cases determines the character of the earth in which the foundation is laid.

Mr. MADDEN. It is just like throwing money into the lake to spend $1,000 for the purpose which the gentleman has stated, and it is evidently only for the sentimental purpose of allowing the Representative from that district to say to his people that he got an appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am unable to answer that. The Supervising Architect states that that is what is required.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the limit of cost of the building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. An appropriation of $1,000 is a farce under such circumstances, and it ought not to be allowed to go into the bill. It is just like a game of bunco on the Members of the House, pretending to say that $1,000 is needed for the purpose of sinking test pits. I have never seen a case before in any other bill where such an appropriation was made. It is the first case. It is useless. It is a waste of money. It does not accomplish any good, unless it helps the Member from that district politically, and I do not know whether that is any good or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Such items have been carried in the sundry civil bill as long as my memory goes back.

Mr. MADDEN. A thousand dollars?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A thousand dollars. The gentleman will understand that when the department advertises for bids it either must give information as to the character of the material to be found in the excavation or else the contractor must make such allowances that it will be impossible for the department to make contracts that will be of very great value.

Mr. MADDEN. In all my years of experience I have never seen anything of that sort necessary, unless you were going to build a tunnel somewhere.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is talking about how private concerns would conduct business, and we are talking about how the Government conducts it.

Mr. MADDEN. I know how the Government ought to conduct it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Government advertises for the construction of a building upon a certain site——

Mr. MADDEN. I know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it furnishes the bidders information regarding the site itself.

Mr. MADDEN. It furnishes a plan of the site and the specifications on which the man makes the figures in connection with the plan.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it furnishes information of the character of the ground.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody that bids on a little building like this knows the character of the ground, and if the Government did not furnish it he would find out himself. No man of any responsibility would bid on putting up a building and take the Government information without ascertaining it for himself. I say it is money thrown away.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suppose somebody must make a survey so that the building will fit the site.

Mr. MADDEN. The plans are there, and the man that is going to put up the building always sees that the building is put on the lot in the way that it ought to be, and there is no need of any special survey.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MAGUIRE] smiles at me. I recollect that in a case in Nebraska, I do not know whether it was in his district or not, after a building had been erected, it was found out that one side of it had been erected upon either a filled place or on particularly soft ground, and before it was possible to move into the building it was necessary to provide money to make the building stand up and keep it stable.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish to verify in part what the chairman has just said. There were unforeseen conditions in the earth, the ground many years before had been filled in, and it made it practically impossible to complete the building in the best form. The architect had to do a part of the work over again, to reinforce the foundation, because of the fact that the architect and inspectors did not understand the formation of the ground upon which they built.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I see that there are 36 of these $1,000 appropriations. They are for sites that have already been secured.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are for buildings upon sites that have been secured.

Mr. DILLON. I fail to see any necessity for the appropriation, but it rather shows the activity of the 36 Congressmen.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be a desirable reason.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. In looking over the bill, which I see is very carefully and skillfully drawn, I notice that the gentleman has about 80 commencements, and they run from $1,000 to $200,000. Will the gentleman kindly explain about that? He has explained about the $1,000, but what about those that exceed $1,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Those are the amounts of money that the Supervising Architect states will be required between now and the 30th of June, 1916, to meet the continuing obligations on the buildings.

Mr. GOULDEN. Why are they called "commencements"?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because they are the commencements of new buildings. The items are distinguished in this way: When an appropriation is made for a building for the first time the word "commencement" is used; where a building is under construction and an additional amount is required but not all needed to complete, the word "continuation" is used; when the appropriation is finally made, within the authorization, the word "completion" is used. By the use of the different terms it is possible to tell by looking at the item within what category the project is.

Mr. GOULDEN. The word "commencement" seems to be a misnomer, because it looks as if after the site had been secured you are going to appropriate money to begin over again.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to begin the building.

Mr. GOULDEN. You are starting a new building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and we begin the building under a definite contract. Nothing has been appropriated prior. The first paragraph in the bill for sites says:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION AND SITES.

For sites, commencement, continuation, or completion of public buildings within the respective limits of cost authorized by law, rent and removal expenses in cities pending extension and remodeling of buildings, severally, as follows.

Whichever expression is used describes accurately the category in which it belongs.

Mr. GOULDEN. In a section of the district that I represented for eight years, but now by another [Mr. BRUCKNER, of the twenty-second], a site has been secured costing $250,000, and I have held this Member back from trying to secure money for the building by telling him that this was not the time to make a demand on the Treasury; and, secondly, that the building had not been authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and now, from the reading of the bill, these are new buildings to be appropriated for, and I feel that perhaps I have misled him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These buildings have been authorized for some time, and they are now being reached in their order. If the building that my colleague refers to had been authorized and was reached in order, provision would have been made in the bill for it, whether he or his colleague had any knowledge of it or not.

Mr. GOULDEN. The building has never been authorized, but we have the site, and have had for some time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, no money in this bill will be carried for it. No money in this bill is carried for buildings that have not been authorized. The Committee on Appropriations does not authorize public buildings.

Mr. GOULDEN. I wanted to make sure about the use of the term "commencement."

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is as I have said—the commencement of a building which has been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not think the gentleman from New York has made this matter clear, at least he has not to me. I want to call his attention to lines 13 and 14 on this same page 8:

Greenwich, Conn., post office: For commencement, $50,000.

That is exactly the same language that is used in the item now under consideration, found in lines 3 and 4. In the case at Greenwich, Conn., I presume the plans have been completed and a contract is or is about to be let, and it is estimated that it will require $50,000 to meet the money that the contractor will earn between now and June 30, 1916. In the case of Globe, Ariz., I would like to ascertain whether or not that is money to be used in preparing plans and specifications or money that will be earned by a contractor who may get the contract to erect that building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it is to provide the surveys necessary to be performed before they feel free to advertise and let the contracts.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is probably correct about that, because the man who may bid on this building in Arizona may live in the city of New York, and the plans and specifications, in order to be complete, must show what the foundation will be. I can appreciate how some money may be necessary to be expended by the department in preparing plans and making a survey, but I do not believe this money is to be used to pay a contractor who subsequently may take the contract. I would like to ask the gentleman in the case of Greenwich, Conn., whether there was ever an appropriation for that building previous to the $50,000 item? In other words, was $1,000 appropriated there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Then, this is a departure, as was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], to make these small appropriations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken. The condition is this: In Greenwich, Conn., a building to cost $90,000 is authorized. It is expected that they will be ready to let the contract in the second quarter of the fiscal year 1916, so that for the balance of that fiscal year $50,000 will be earned. Globe, Ariz., is not nearly as far up on the list, if I recall correctly, as Greenwich, and they will not reach anything like the stage where they are ready to let a contract during the fiscal year 1916, but they will be prepared to survey the lot and to make the tests. If I understand anything about buildings, before plans are prepared for the erection of a building on a certain lot a survey is made. For instance, under the law a public building can not be constructed within a certain distance of another building. There must be a certain space between the building and the adjacent building, and a survey is necessary.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I understand that. Here is a case where a building at Globe, Ariz., is authorized to cost $100,000. A building at Greenwich, Conn., is authorized to cost $90,000. In the one case where the building is to cost $100,000, $1,000 is now proposed to be appropriated, while in the other case $50,000 is to be appropriated. I assume from what the gentleman says that the Greenwich case will probably be upon the market and the contract let by reason of the fact that it was authorized at some previous Congress to the one in Arizona, several months ahead of the building at Globe.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the population of Globe, Ariz., I will ask the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can state to the gentleman that I have been there and it is quite a large town.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The population in 1910 was 7,083.

Mr. MADDEN. And what are the postal receipts?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The postal receipts in 1913 were $21,784, the money-order receipts were $307,942, and the postal savings receipts were $57,324.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, here we have a town with 7,500 people, with postal receipts——

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, the authorization was $15,000 for the site in the act of 1910, and the building, to cost $100,000, was authorized in the act of 1913.

Mr. MADDEN. The total amount is how much?

Mr. FITZGERALD. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars for building and site.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, here we have a town of 7,500 people, with postal receipts of $21,000, and we propose to erect a building the cost of which, including the lot, will be $115,000. The interest upon that will be $3,450 a year at the rate of 3 per cent; the janitor service will not be less than $600; lighting, heating, and repairs will amount to $1,200; making, in all, $5,250, while a building suitable for the city's needs could be rented for not to exceed $1,200 a year. Post-office revenues during the current fiscal year are running behind at the rate of $20,000,000, and to-day I have word from the city of Chicago, that turns in $20,000,000 of surplus every year from its post office, that because of the shortage of revenues 350 letter carriers have had their salaries cut from $1,200 a year to $1,000 a year, and more to come; and yet we go on with this extravagance and this waste of public money and take it out of the hides of men who carry tons of mail every week upon their backs. There is not any justification for putting up a public building in any town in the United States with a population of less than 25,000 people. Nobody can justify it either from a governmental standpoint or from the standpoint of economy, and no man engaged in a private business enterprise would submit to this kind of extravagance for a minute.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MADDEN. Not just now.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Twenty million dollars surplus from one city office, and yet, on account of the $20,000,000 shortage of revenue and the enactment of Democratic tariff laws, we are compelled to turn the men who have devoted their lives to the Government service either out of employment or reduce their wages from $1,200 to $1,000 a year. Can you justify this kind of appropriations under such conditions? I do not believe that the American people when they understand the facts in the case will submit to this kind of appropriations. Public buildings for the performance of public business ought to be erected only in places where the business of the Government justifies it, and I maintain that the business of the Government does not justify appropriations for public buildings where the cost of maintenance of a building, including the interest charge, is five times as much as you can rent a building for to do the work. You talk about Government ownership and some men plead for it. Go on with it if you will; plunge the country into bankruptcy if you want to; but you can not do it with my vote or except over my protest. Here we have an opportunity to economize and we will not do it. We still spring forward in our reckless waste of public money. We have taxed the people on every necessity of life to maintain the ordinary running expenses of this Government. We have appropriated more money in the last year than in any year of the Government's history. Never in all the history of America was there such extravagance as is witnessed under the present administration, and as a result of that extravagance we are obliged to witness the appalling spectacle of men who have devoted for the past 20 years the best there is in them having their salaries reduced from a living wage to the standard of poverty. No consideration whatever is given to the work that they have already done or the advancement of the interests of the Government by their work. All they are given in return for their patriotic devotion to the Government is an order to reduce their compensation or to be thrown out of employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. If the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in his younger official days had had as much virtue or care or concern for the Treasury as he has to-day we would not know of the conditions that have taken place in the past. This authorization was under Republican government originally, and the gentleman was present and submitted without any protest.

Mr. MADDEN. This is a good time to stop it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wished to be fair, he would say to his associates, "We will give the Democrats credit." The Republican Member from Illinois should say of the Democrats, "They did not have the greed, they did not have the avarice, in getting appropriations that we had when we Republicans were in power."

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. Because five places in the State of Wyoming, with a total population of the whole State only half the population of the district I represent, five buildings with an expenditure amounting to $497,000 passed a Republican Congress, although the total population of the five localities was less than 10,000 souls. If the gentleman wanted to be fair, as an old Member, a capable Member, he should not arrogate to himself——

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I will signify when I get ready to yield to the distinguished gentleman. [Laughter.]

I am going to heap coals of fire upon his head. He ought not to rise in his seat and appear indignant as to things he has seen to-day, because he has seen them before. I repeat, $497,000 were appropriated for five public buildings in the State of Wyoming, and the total population of the five localities is not over 10,000, and no protest from the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. There was no wail from the men who were plucking the Treasury at that time. But now he has become virtuous, and on the eve of his day, like those other great philanthropists, he is trying to do something in the way of restitution, hoping that in his future home it will be noticed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will just say to the gentleman that the Republicans always had funds with which to meet their obligations when they were in power.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from New York that this is Saturday night, and that we commenced at 11 o'clock this morning and it is now after 5 o'clock. We have probably gotten into a debate that will prevent any progress with the bill, anyhow, to-night. I think we ought to adjourn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the time to have protested against these public buildings was when the bill authorizing the construction of the buildings was before the House.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I think the gentleman's recollection is in error.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I protested, but the RECORD does not show that the gentleman from Illinois made any protest at that time.

Mr. MADDEN. The RECORD shows that I made a speech against it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I have just had the matter looked up in the library, and that is why I am speaking so authoritatively.

Mr. MADDEN. Look it up again.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was one of those who protested against the public building bill. I tried to have a record vote of the Members of the House upon it. I could not even get one-fifth of those present to join in ordering the yeas and nays upon the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just a minute. I have not finished yet.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois did not do that; and I am not certain that the item in which he was interested was in that bill or in a separate bill. That was an item providing $75,000 for the immigrant station at Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I am not interested in any item. I have never asked for any item.

Mr. MANN. That was not in the public building bill at all.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I have never asked for any item in the bill.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. DONOVAN. You have not the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has the floor, and is yielding to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I decline to be interrupted. Mr. Chairman, the time to protest against public buildings, on the ground that it is unwise and bad policy to erect them, is when the buildings are authorized. After they are authorized and sites have been acquired and plans have been prepared and work is about to be commenced, it is just as futile as shooting at the moon as to try to stop the appropriation. I know I do a great many things that do not always meet the success they deserve in this House, but I always try to avoid antagonizing things as utterly impossible to prevent such appropriations as those under consideration.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that my friend from New York is weakening in his virtue. When the Treasury was full and there was plenty of money for public buildings he took credit to himself for opposing their authorization, but when the Treasury is empty and no one knows where the money is coming from he plumes himself upon appropriating money for them. However, in justice to the gentleman, I might add that I believe his opposition to the public building bill was not wholly because of the provisions in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I never feel it is necessary either to apologize or to defend my conduct in the performance of my public duties. I believe, however, it is only fair to say this: That if I had the determination or if I occupied that responsible position in the Government that would be controlling in the determination of questions of what the expenditures of the Government should be in the next fiscal year, they would be at least $50,000,000 less than they will be. But I do not believe I have been commissioned to assume all of the burdens of Government. While I am a part of and cooperating with the administration, my views are not always in accord either with the majority here or in other places.

I am ready to do my part. I would not have hesitated, if the responsibility were mine, to have eliminated over $50,000,000 more than will be eliminated from the various appropriation bills to be enacted by Congress at this session; and I would do it with the absolute conviction that no material interest of the Government or of the public would be in the slightest degree impaired. [Applause.] But all over the country the cry has gone up that in order to relieve distress, in order to furnish employment, in order to keep turning the wheels of industry, that the Federal Government, the State governments, and local communities should rush public enterprises.

It reminds me of the history of Rome, when the Roman Emperors were compelled one day to give great games in order to entertain the populace and the next day to authorize public works in order to keep them out of mischief. Whenever we have a situation where the Government must provide food and amusement and work, we have arrived at that point where the discerning student of history can see the rocks ahead upon which the Government is bound to be wrecked.

Mr. MANN. That is good advice, but I hate to have it wasted on the House when there are so few present. I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am sorry that it was made at that particular time in my remarks. I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Will not the gentleman withhold his point until the pro forma amendment can be disposed of, so that it will not be pending when the consideration of the bill is resumed?

Mr. MANN. I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the President to invite certain Governments to send delegates to the Pan American Medical Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to preside to-morrow.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Sunday, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the gentleman from New York to proceed on Monday with the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is my intention to ask the House to do so.

Mr. MANN. That is the same thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe it is the desire of all to pass this bill speedily and, so far as the House is concerned, to do everything possible to enact the appropriation bills in ample time at this session. I am quite sure I do not wish to go through the same grind after the 4th of March that I have had since Congress convened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAYES, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. WATSON, for one day, on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. STEPHENS of California, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Philip Gavin (H. R. 4859), no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Sunday, February 7, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Miles W. Elliott *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1561); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Susan E. Baylies, daughter and sole heir of William McE. Dye, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1562); to the Committe on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John A. Barnett *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1563); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Otto F. Peters, guardian in lunacy of Presley-Bishop, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1564); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John Blair *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1565); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William O. Bidlack *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1566); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sallie Perdue, widow of Granville C. Perdue, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1567); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

8. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Richard F. Jacks *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1568); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

9. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of H. Grant Howarth, heir of Jonathan Howarth, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1569); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

10. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Edwin G. Munsell et al., heirs of Cyrus Hall, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1570); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

11. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Erastus Guy *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1571); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

12. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph E. Beatty *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1572); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

13. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Duane D. Finch *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1573); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

14. Letter from the Commissioner of Patents transmitting a report of the business of the Patent Office for the year ended December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1574); to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed.

15. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting estimates of appropriations required by the several departments of the Government on account of the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for prior years (H. Doc. No. 1575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 21349) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Midland, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 21350) to increase the limit of cost of the construction of a Federal building at Eureka Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 21351) to provide for the construction of a suitable office for the United States customs barge service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 21352) providing for the adjudication of a certain claim by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 21353) for the relief of J. A. Stanfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 21354) granting a pension to David R. Locke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 21355) granting a pension to John McGowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 21356) granting a pension to Jennie W. Koehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Missouri-Kansas Turnbezik and various citizens of Boston, urging passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of California State Senate, favoring passage of rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of inmates of the Confederate Memorial Home, Washington, D. C., favoring Works-Estopinal pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: Memorial of Catholic Order of Foresters and Council of Cleves, Ohio., favoring passage of the civil-service

retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Julius Juch and 80 others, of Newark, Ohio, urging passage of bills to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Rev. H. L. Jacobs, John H. Shope, J. C. Day, A. P. Day, J. Heiss, Frank Turner, A. C. Wilt, D. McClure, and William Gilling, all of Altoona, Pa., protesting against passage of H. R. 20644, relative to a censorship of publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of John J. Pfenninger and Nanewal Bread Co., of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Tenth Ward Improvement Association, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of an appropriation by Congress for public works; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petitions of 16 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of St. Louis, Florissant, Clayton, Freedom, King City, and Creve Coeur, all in the State of Missouri, and Kansas-Missouri Turnbezirk, Leavenworth, Kans., in favor of bills providing for an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of German-American Alliance (552 members) of Wausaw, Wis.; Schiller Lodge, of Middletown, Conn.; and German Evangelical Church (1,000 members), of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of bills providing for an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance of Hohenwald, Tenn., and resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana held at New Orleans, La., in favor of bills providing for an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROCKSON: Petition of C. E. Marshall, Samuel F. Adams, and other lighthouse keepers, favoring increase in ration money for lighthouse keepers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Rev. Joseph Oesch and 32 other citizens of Sheboygan rural route No. 5, Wisconsin, asking for the passage of a law at this session to levy an embargo on all material useful in war, save foodstuffs and wearing apparel and surgical supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring the passage of the Kern-McGillicuddy workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 15222); to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of New York Engravers' Union No. 1, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Memorial of Missouri-Kansas Turnbezirks, representing 2,000 citizens of Missouri and Kansas, also 165 citizens of the sixth district of Missouri, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of National Independent Equal Rights League, Boston, Mass., against passage of "jim crow" law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOOD: Memorial of Iowa State Senate, favoring investigation by Congress of the origin of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Volks-Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against power given the Postmaster General with regard to the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Louisiana State Federation of Labor and the Washington Camp, No. 34, I. O. S. of A., favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of H. H. Mier and 30 other citizens of Hancock County, Ind., protesting against House bill 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Fred Sandwehr and 190 other citizens of Hancock County, Ind., protesting against House bill 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against passage of House bill 18666, ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Central Bureau of Philadelphia (Pa.) Yearly Meeting of Friends, General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends, Philadelphia Pa., opposing legislation looking toward increased armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAZARO: Petition of R. E. Lee Camp, No. 14, United Confederate Veterans, Opelousas, La., relative to granting relief for southern cotton claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communications of Albert H. Richard, New Britain, Conn.; William Bonkosky, New Britain, Conn.; and C. Fred Johnson, Kensington, Conn., in re House joint resolution 377, House joint resolution 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Letters from the Volks-Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Emil Schaefer, John Klein, J. J. Fehr, C. Soehnchen, Ernest Obermeyer, and other citizens of Philadelphia, urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of German Evangelical Protestant Church and 3 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of N. P. Alifas, president District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, favoring House bill 17800, relative to the Taylor system of shop management; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of J. F. Callheath, secretary American Mining Congress, favoring House bill 15869, to better conditions among miners; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also (by request), petition of M. H. MacCoy, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of the American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring House bill 15222, the Kern-McGillicuddy workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the executive committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, favoring Senate bill 5211, relative to military instruction in colleges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the Retail Grocers' Protective Union of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of G. W. Campbell and 11 others of Wheeling, W. Va., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Harrison County, W. Va., urging Congress to bring about the United States of the World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of Meriden, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Polish National Alliance, of Perth Amboy, N. J., protesting against the passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of Albert Towe and 193 citizens of Charlotte, Mich., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions from 60 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 344, creating a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, copy of a letter from the Canadian Club, Los Angeles, Cal., to President Wilson, favoring export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by 15 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, communication from British-American League, Los Angeles, Cal., reciting purposes of organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 2,527 American citizens, favoring passage of bills to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

JUL 7 1915